Family Business Review
2019, Vol. 32(2) 106–130
© The Author(s) 2019
Article reuse guidelines:
sagepub.com/journals-permissions
DOI: 10.1177/0894486519848512
journals.sagepub.com/home/fbr
SAGE

Capturing Family Firm Heterogeneity: How Taxonomies and Typologies Can Help the Field Move Forward

Keith H. Brigham[1], Nadine Kammerlander[2], and Donald O. Neubaum[3]

Introduction

As the field of family business continues to mature, it is not surprising that there is a growing recognition of the degree of heterogeneity among family firms. While many earlier studies focused on differences between family and nonfamily firms, more and more research is centered on identifying the sources and types of variance among family firms. Given the increasing need to better understand differences among family firms, we propose that a configurational approach, which is often reflected in typologies (which are conceptually developed) or taxonomies (which are empirically derived), is a particularly useful perspective to examine within-group heterogeneity. Thus, the goal of this special issue on "Typologies and Taxonomies of Family Business" is to (1) highlight the utility of using typologies and taxonomies in advancing family business research and (2) promote the use of these approaches in fostering a better understanding of the heterogeneity that exists among family firms, and how this heterogeneity might be linked to important organizational outcomes.

With these goals in mind, this commentary provides a review of articles in the extant family business literature that have used typologies or taxonomic classifications to describe family businesses. Our review lays the foundation for the subsequent presentation of a synopsis of each of the four articles contained within the special issue. Finally, we conclude with a discussion of suggestions for future research using typologies and taxonomies and their application to family firm heterogeneity. We start by discussing the most common approach used.

Typologies or Classification Schemes of Family Businesses

We started our search for published typologies and taxonomies of family businesses by searching ABI/INFORM for articles with different combinations of "family business*," "family firm*," "typology," and "taxonomy" in abstracts, keywords, and full text. We supplemented our list with other articles identified as we conducted our review. Based on our review of the extant literature, we identified 23 articles that relied upon typologies or categorization schemes to classify different family firms. While typologies (e.g., Dyer, 2006; Li & Daspit, 2016) use a theoretical rationale to create groups in which to place family firms that appear to share common features or characteristics, classification schemes (Nordqvist, Sharma, & Chirico, 2014; Scholes & Wilson, 2014; Sharma, 2002) use specific decision rules based on a series of unique identifying characteristics to place family firms into mutually exclusive groups (Doty & Glick, 1994). A closer examination of the 23 typologies or classification schemes found in the literature enabled us to create several different groups of typologies or classification schemes, based on either the types of variables used to create them or the nature of the issue the typology intended to address. While Table 1 provides details about each of these 23 studies, we summarize a few of these groups of typologies below.

As one might expect, the largest category included eight typologies or classification schemes that attempted to classify "types" of family businesses across a number of common defining characteristics (e.g., Corbetta, 1995; Nordqvist et al., 2014; Scholes & Wilson, 2014;

[1]Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX, USA
[2]WHU-Otto Beisheim School of Management, Vallendar, Germany
[3]Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, FL, USA

Corresponding Author:
Donald Neubaum, College of Business, Department of Management, Florida Atlantic University, 777 Glades Road, Boca Raton, FL 33431, USA.
Email: dneubaum@fau.edu

Table 1. Typologies of Categorization Schemes of Family Businesses.

Authors	Purpose	Dimensions	Typology Types
Astrachan, Klein, and Smyrnios (2002); 1,441 citations	Typology of family influence on the business	1. Power: considers the involvement of the family in (a) ownership, (b) governance, or (c) management 2. Experience: considers a generation active in (a) ownership, (b) management, and (c) governance, or the number of contributing family members 3. Culture: considers (a) the overlap between family and business values or (b) family's commitment to the business	Combine the four dimensions into a single continuous scale
Barontini and Bozzi (2018); 0 citations	Categorization scheme of family involvement in the firm	1. Generational stage: founder or descendants 2. Family representation on the board: lone or multiple family members 3. CEO type: family or professional CEO	1. Founder-lone-family CEO 2. Founder-lone-professional CEO 3. Founder-multiple-family CEO 4. Founder-multiple-professional CEO 5. Descendent-lone-family CEO 6. Descendent-lone-professional CEO 7. Descendent-multiple-family CEO 8. Descendent-multiple-professional CEO
Bergamaschi and Randerson (2016); 14 citations	Typology defining family businesses' perceptions of corporate social responsibility (CSR)	Relies upon the three subsystems within family businesses: 1. Ownership 2. Family 3. Business	1. Instrumental: firm engages only in direct and short-term CSR activities when it supports shareholder interests 2. Pragmatic: firm concerned with a large number of economic and social stakeholders who hold a variety of expectations 3. Autopist: all three subsystems have equal weight and consideration is given to their overlap 4. Engaged: family system becomes engaged as CSR is seen as a mean to express family values

(continued)

Table 1. (continued)

Authors	Purpose	Dimensions	Typology Types
Blomback and Brunninge (2013); 56 citations	Typology of ways to communicate family business and family business history as part of their corporate identity and branding	1. Historical time frame: history (as it is) or heritage (as it was and is) 2. Identify frame: family, business, or family business	Six approaches for how family firms can include history as part of their corporate identity and branding: 1. Distinct description of family history 2. Distinct description of the family in terms of the past, present, and future 3. Distinct description of company history 4. Distinct description of the company in terms of past, present, and future 5. Description of the family in company history 6. Description of the family in company in terms of pat, present and future
Corbetta (1995); 135 citations	Typology that identifies four types of family firms, which sheds light on three development patterns among them	1. Ownership structure: (a) absolute ownership, (b) closed limited family ownership, (c) closed extended family ownership, or (d) open family ownership 2. Governance: (a) board of directors and directive bodies made up entirely of family members, (b) boards made up of family members and directive bodies made up of family and nonfamily members, or (c) boards and directive bodies made up of family and nonfamily members 3. Complexity: (a) few dozen employees, (b) up to 100 employees, or (c) larger firms These types of family businesses also reflect stages of evolution commonly experienced by family firms; family firms evolve based on the following: 1. The extent to which guiding principles are shared among family members 2. The extent to which family members are committed to act for the good of the firm	Family business types: 1. Domestic family businesses: small firm with tight family ownership and governance control 2. Traditional family business: medium to large firm with tight family control of ownership and the board of directors but with nonfamily members on directive bodies 3. Extended family business: medium to large firm with extended family ownership and family and nonfamily involvement in governance 4. Open family business: medium to large firm with widely shared capital and family and nonfamily involvement in governance Evolution patterns of family businesses: 1. Family firm systems (high shared principles and high firm commitment) 2. Separation among family members by mutual consent (low shared principles and high firm commitment) 3. Corporate discord (low shared principles and low firm commitment) 4. Decline of the family-firm system (high shared principles and low firm commitment)

(continued)

Table 1. (continued)

Authors	Purpose	Dimensions	Typology Types
Daspit, Madison, Barnett, and Long (2018); 8 citations	Typology explaining how unbalanced family structure can lead to unbalanced human resource practices and asymmetric treatment between family and nonfamily member employees	Relies upon the circumplex from family systems theory, which assesses the level of the following: 1. Family cohesion 2. Family flexibility	Four unbalanced and one balanced family business systems emerge: 1. Chronically enmeshed: extreme closeness, loyalty, and interdependence among family members with a lack of consistency in family leadership and direction 2. Rigidly enmeshed: high family interdependence and loyalty with authoritarian family leadership 3. Chaotically disengaged: high independence among family members with little not no leadership or loyalty to the family 4. Rigidly disengaged: authoritarian family leadership among incohesive, disloyal family members 5. Balanced: ideal balance between cohesion and flexibility with an appropriate level of adaptation and healthy level of dependence and loyalty of the family to the firm
De Massis, Frattini, Kotlar, Petruzzelli, and Wright (2016); 90 citations	Typology of new product innovation strategies followed by family firms	1. Sources of past knowledge: either knowledge pertaining to the traditions of the firm itself or knowledge pertaining to the tradition of the territory in which the firm is located 2. Type of product innovation: innovations that offer new functionalities by innovating the technologies on which the product is built or innovations that determine a change in the reasons why customers buy a product by building on its original meaning	Four types of innovation through tradition strategies were identified: 1. Interiorizing knowledge from the firm's past and reinterpretations to enable new product functionalities 2. Interiorizing knowledge from the firm's past and reinterpretations to enable new product meanings 3. Interiorizing knowledge from the territory's past and reinterpretations to enable new product functionalities 4. Interiorizing knowledge from the territory's past and reinterpretations to enable new product meanings

(continued)

Table 1. (continued)

Authors	Purpose	Dimensions	Typology Types
Diéguez-Soto, López-Delgado, and Rojo-Ramírez (2015); 29 citations	Categorization scheme of family involvement in the firm		1. Entrepreneurial firms: same person is sole shareholder, director, and CEO 2. Copreneurial family business: shareholder, director, and CEO positions held by 2 people of opposite sex but with different surnames married in family business 3. Independent family business: family ties among shareholder, director, and CEO positions with less than 25% held by any one shareholder 4. Professional family business: names of shareholders and/or and directors match but differ from the CEO 5. Solely family-run business: names of shareholders and/or directors match, and match the name of the CEO
Distelberg and Sorenson (2009); 142 citations	Typology that challenges the family-first vs. business-first dichotomy of family businesses by offering a range of balanced family business systems	Single dimension of value orientations, varying from family-first to business-first orientations	1. Business depleting: family goals predominant with no interest succession or investing in the future of the business 2. Family emphasis: family goals dominate with some interest in investing in the business to sustain family goals 3. Balanced emphasis: alignment between family and business goals with equitable flow of resources between them 4. Business emphasis: business goals dominate with some interest in investing in the family to maintain the vitality of the business 5. Family depleting: business goals predominant with no interest in supporting the family

(continued)

Table 1. (continued)

Authors	Purpose	Dimensions	Typology Types
Dyer (2006); 982 citations	Typology explaining the "family effect" on firm performance	1. Agency costs: high or low agency costs based on alignment or opportunism 2. Family assets: family may bring value in terms of high human, social, physical, and financial capital 3. Family liabilities: family may represent a liability in terms of important organizational capital	1. Clan family firm (low agency costs and high family assets): goals of the family and managers are the same, and family provides important human, social, and financial capital to the firm, enhancing performance 2. Professional family firm (high agency costs and high family assets): relationships and governance based on professional codes of conduct as control and monitoring systems limit family opportunism 3. Mom & Pop family firm (low agency costs and high family liabilities): firm experiences low agency costs but fails to develop familial assets, limiting growth and performance 4. Self-interested family firm (high agency costs and high family liabilities): utilitarian and altruistic relationships are common as family members advance their own interests, diminishing performance
Fletcher (2010); 46 citations	Classification scheme of coentrepreneurship in family businesses	Extends Litz (1995) by adding couples to two dimensions: 1. Ownership control of the business: individual, couple, or intergenerational family 2. Management role in the business: individual, couple, or intergenerational family	Adds five possible outcomes: 1. Couple-owned, individual managed 2. Couple-owned, couple-managed 3. Couple-owned, intergenerational managed 4. Couple-managed, intergenerational owned 5. Couple-managed, individual owned
Garcia-Castro and Sharma (2011); 9 citations	Categorization scheme of family involvement in firms	1. Family ownership (1% or less is nonfamily business, 5% is the crossover point, with over 25% being high family ownership) 2. Family member on the board 3. Family member chair of the board 4. Family CEO 5. Successful succession (firm over 30 years old considered to have completed succession successfully)	Of the 32 possible outcomes, 10 different combinations of family firm involvement were commonly identified

(continued)

Table 1. (continued)

Authors	Purpose	Dimensions	Typology Types
Gilding, Gregory, and Cosson (2015); 83 citations	Typology of motives in succession planning	1. Family harmony: weak or strong 2. Continuity of family business: weak or strong	Four types of motives for family business succession planning identified: 1. Institutionalization: strong continuity, strong harmony 2. Implosion: weak continuity, weak harmony 3. Imposition: strong continuity, weak harmony 4. Individualism: weak continuity, strong harmony
Holland and Boulton (1984); 146 citations	Typology of the evolution of four family business types, reflecting the balance between the family and the business	Family businesses based on the following four initiating actions: 1. Founding 2. Entry of a family member into management or ownership 3. Ownership by a nonfamily member 4. Liquidation or family holdings	1. Prefamily 2. Family 3. Adaptive family 4. Postfamily
Labaki, Michael-Tsabari, and Zachary (2013); 34 citations	Typology capturing how emotions bind the family and its business, affecting its emotional characteristics	Relied upon family systems theory, exchange theory, and emotional dissonance theory to develop a typology of emotional interface between the family and business systems	1. Enmeshed family businesses: extreme high levels of family cohesion and consensus and little independence; high levels of emotional closeness and loyalty are demanded 2. Balanced family businesses: clear boundaries between closeness and separation, with corroborative effort to keep family and business balanced 3. Disengaged family business: unstable leadership, inconsistent goals and outcomes, lack or role clarity, low loyalty, and emotional separateness
Li and Daspit (2016); 29 citations	Typology of family firm innovation types based on the family involvement in governance and type of socioemotional wealth objections	1. Family involvement in dominant coalition, either being high (i.e., composed of all family members, or low (i.e., composed of family and nonfamily members) 2. Socioemotional wealth intentions, either being restrictive (e.g., short-term, conservative strategies to preserve immediate wealth) or extended (i.e., less conservative to preserve transgenerational family wealth)	Four family business innovative strategies 1. Limited innovators: limited family knowledge pool and limited investment in innovation 2. Potential innovators: diverse knowledge resources but restricted investments in innovation 3. Intended innovators: moderate investment in innovation limited by restricted family knowledge resources 4. Active innovators: sizeable investments in innovation matched with diverse knowledge pools

(continued)

Table 1. (continued)

Authors	Purpose	Dimensions	Typology Types
Litz (1995); 846 citations	Typology defining family firms based on management and ownership structure	1. Effective control of management: individual, familial, or widely held 2. Control of ownership: individual, familial, or widely held	Creates nine possible comes, 5 of which reflect significant family interests
Litz (1995); 846 citations	Typology modeling the intentions to become a family business	1. Realization of intraorganizational family-based relatedness: family or nonfamily 2. Intention toward intraorganizational family-based relatedness: family or nonfamily	Creates four outcomes: 1. Family business 2. Nonfamily business 3. Potential family business 4. Potential nonfamily business
Muntean (2016); 3 citations	Categorization scheme relating ownership structure to political behavior of family firms	1. Capital source: publically traded or privately held 2. Concentration of family ownership: principal owner present or not	Four types of ownership structures: 1. Publically traded without principal 2. Publically traded with principal present 3. Privatively held without principal 4. Privately held with principal present
Nordqvist, Sharma, and Chirico (2014); 117 citations	Classification scheme for nine family business types	1. Family involved in management: (a) family operators, (b) family supervisor, or (c) family investor 2. Family involvement in ownership: (a) controlling owner, (b) sibling owner, and (c) cousin consortium	Nine types of family businesses 1. Controlling owner-family operator 2. Sibling partners-family operator 3. Cousin consortium-family operator 4. Controlling owner-family supervisor 5. Sibling partners-family supervisors 6. Cousin consortium-family supervisor 7. Controlling owner-family investor 8. Sibling partners-family investor 9. Cousin consortium-family investor

(continued)

Table 1. (continued)

Authors	Purpose	Dimensions	Typology Types
Randolph, Li, and Daspit (2017); 8 citations	Typology of postures toward corporate entrepreneurship (CE) in family firms	1. Knowledge acquisition capability (either limited or expanded, based on the reliance on knowledge capital available within the family or more broadly from trusted partners outside the family network) 2. Transgenerational succession intentions: (either negligible or salient, based on the priority of succession efforts and concerns)	1. Constrained family business: limited knowledge resources and prioritization towards current generation leads to limited CE activities 2. Competency-enhancing family: focus beyond current family members is dampened by limited knowledge resources, leading to moderate but limited CE scope 3. Diversified family-dominant business: broad knowledge resources and focus on current family members leads to moderate, uncoordinated CE 4. Dynastic family business: broad networks and focus beyond current family members lead to expansive, synergistic CE
Rondi, De Massis and Kotlar (2018); 14 citations	Typology addressing the role of the family system in describing a family firm's innovative potential	1. Risk taking propensity 2. Tradition attachments: extent to which family is anchored in the past	Four types of family firms identified: 1. Seasoner: low risk taking and low tradition attachment 2. Reenactor: low risk taking and high tradition attachment 3. Adventurer: high risk taking and low tradition attachment 4. Digger: high risk taking and high tradition attachment
Scholes and Wilson (2014); 9 citations	Categorization scheme of possible configurations for family firm trusts	1. Composition of the board: (a) nonfamily, (b) mixed, or (c) family 2. Type of trust: (a) family, (b) mixed, or (c) nonfamily	1. Family board, family trustees 2. Family board, mixed trustees 3. Family board, nonfamily trustees 4. Mixed board, family trustees 5. Mixed board, mixed trustees 6. Mixed board, nonfamily trustees 7. Nonfamily board, family trustees 8. Nonfamily board, mixed trustees 9. Nonfamily board, nonfamily trustees

(continued)

Table 1. (continued)

Authors	Purpose	Dimensions	Typology Types
Sciascia, Clinton, Nason, James, and Riveria-Algarin (2013); 26 citations	Typology relating family communication dynamics and innovativeness	1. Conversation orientation: degree to which families create a climate where all family members are encouraged to participate freely in interaction about a wide variety of topics (high or low) 2. Conformity orientation: degree to which families create a climate that stresses homogeneity of attitudes, values, and beliefs (high, medium, or low)	Six types of communication patterns identified: 1. Consensual families: high conversation, high conformity 2. Protective families: high conversation, low conformity 3. Supportive: high conversation, medium conformity 4. Temperate: lower conversation, medium conformity 5. Open: high conversation, low conformity 6. Free: low conversation, low conformity
Shanker and Astrachan (1996); 919 citations	Typology of family involvement in the firm	Considered a number of dimensions which reflect family involvement: 1. Strategic control 2. Founder/family CEO 3. Family involvement in management 4. Multiple-generation involvement 5. Control of voting stock 6. Succession intentions	Three groups of family firms were identified: 1. Broad: little direct family involvement 2. Middle: some family involvement 3. Narrow: high family involvement
Sharma (2002); 108 citations	Categorization scheme of family involvement in the family business	Stakeholder map consisting of four dimensions, each with no, one, or many representatives: 1. Family owners and employees 2. Family owners 3. Nonfamily employee owners 4. Nonowner family employees	72 mutually exclusive configurations of family firm stakeholders identified

(continued)

Table 1. (continued)

Authors	Purpose	Dimensions	Typology Types
Sundaramurthy and Kreiner (2008); 253 citations	Typology reflecting the degree of integration between the family and business identities in family firms	Level of integration between family and business identities is manifest in six observable means: 1. Association between the family and business image 2. Culture 3. Personnel 4. Ownership/governance 5. Contractual relationships with the family 6. Relationships between family and business finances	Integration of family and business integration is along a continuum between: 1. Segmented identities: low integration of identities 2. Integrated identities: high integration of identities
Westhead and Cowling (1998); 790 citations	Develop a scale of family business activity	1. Self-regarded as a family business 2. Family ownership 3. Family involved in management 4. Second-generation or more family ownership	1. Business perceived to be a family business 2. More than 50% of voting shares held by the largest family group 3. More than 50% of voting shares held by the largest family group and business perceived to be a family business 4. More than 50% of voting shares held by the largest family group, business perceived to be a family business, and one or more members of the management team was a family member 5. More than 50% of voting shares held by the largest family group, business perceived to be a family business, and more than 51% of the management team was drawn from the dominant family group 6. More than 50% of voting shares held by the largest family group, business perceived to be a family business, one of more member of the management team was a family member, and the company was owned by second-generation or more family members 7. More than 50% of voting shares held by family group, business perceived to be a family business, more than 51% of the management team was drawn from the dominant family group, and the company was owned by second-generation or more family members

Shanker & Astrachan, 1996; Sharma, 2002). Most of these studies utilized family involvement characteristics to create groupings related to family ownership (Corbetta, 1995; Garcia-Castro & Sharma, 2011; Muntean 2016; Nordqvist et al., 2014, Shanker & Astrachan, 1996; Sharma, 2002), family involvement in governance (Corbetta, 1995; Garcia-Castro & Sharma, 2011; Scholes & Wilson, 2014; Shanker & Astrachan, 1996) or management (Diéguez-Soto, López-Delgado, & Rojo-Ramírez, 2015; Nordqvist et al., 2014; Shanker & Astrachan, 1996), the type of family trust (Scholes & Wilson, 2014), or generational involvement (Barontini & Bozzi, 2018; Westhead & Cowling, 1998). For example, Corbetta's (1995) typology considered the dispersion of equity ownership, the influence of the family on the board of directors, and firm size. Corbetta argued that the pattern of these characteristics change as family firms evolve from domestic family businesses—represented by tight ownership and control of the firm—to open family businesses, which are medium-to-large firms with widely dispersed ownership and nonfamily involvement in the firm's governance. Similarly, Shanker and Astrachan (1996) considered a number of dimensions which reflected the family's involvement in the firm (i.e., strategic control, founder/family CEO, family involvement in management, multiple-generation involvement, control of voting stock, and succession intentions) to develop a three-category typology, ranging from little direct family involvement to high family involvement in the firm.

An example of a classification scheme is offered by Nordqvist et al. (2014), who used three mutually exclusive categories of family involvement in management (i.e., family operators, family supervisors, and family investor) and ownership (i.e., controlling ownership, sibling ownership, and cousin consortium) to develop a three-by-three categorization. Sharma (2002), Garcia-Castro and Sharma, (2011), Diéguez-Soto et al. (2015), and Barontini and Bozzi (2018) take a similar approach albeit with different sets of characteristics.

A common theme in family business research reflects on how family businesses balance the needs or interests of the family with those of the business (i.e., family first vs. business first). Three typologies model how family firms balanced these oft-times competing tensions. Holland and Boulton (1984) presented the first such typology based on initiating actions that naturally occur in the evolution of a family business. The four initiating actions (i.e., firm founding, entry of a family member into the management or ownership of the firm, ownership by nonfamily members, and liquidation of family holdings to an individual or another firm) reflect significant demarcations between one family business era and the next, each requiring the firm to alter the relative weight of family versus business considerations. Similarly, by examining the level of integration between family and business identities on six observable characteristics (i.e., association between the family and business image, culture, personnel, ownership and governance, contractual relationships with the family, and relationships between family and business finances), Sundaramurthy and Kreiner (2008) developed a three-category typology of family involvement in the business, ranging from little direct family involvement to high family involvement. Finally, Distelberg and Sorenson (2009) developed a typology of family businesses based on their value orientation in terms of the extent to which the family firms value either the businesses' or the family's interests, grounded at one end by a business depleting family business while the opposite end is grounded by the situation where the businesses' goals are dominant.

Two typologies relied on the circumplex model from family systems theory. Daspit, Madison, Barnett, and Long's (2018) typology shows how family firms' balance between family cohesion and family flexibility has implications for their firms' human resource practices and the level of symmetry of treatment between family and nonfamily employees. Similarly, Labaki, Michael-Tsabari, and Zachary's (2013) typology integrated family systems, exchange, and emotional dissonance theories to model how the balance between family cohesion and independence can be used to capture how emotions bind the family and its business, affecting its emotional characteristics.

Five typologies considered innovation activities of family firms. Specifically, two examined how family firms' long-term intentions, as manifest in either their socioemotional wealth (SEW) intentions or transgenerational succession intentions, had implications for the firms' innovative strategies (Li & Daspit, 2016) or posture toward corporate entrepreneurship (Randolph, Li, & Daspit, 2017). Li and Daspit (2016) suggested that family firms with extended, long-term views on transgenerational wealth, along with having nonfamily members in the dominant coalition, would demonstrate the most aggressive innovation strategies. Conversely, those family firms with a restricted, short-term view toward wealth preservation, as well as having family members dominate the dominant coalition, were likely to be poor innovators and devote limited efforts towards innovation. Randolph et al.'s (2017) typology forwards that family firms with strong transgenerational succession intentions and expansive knowledge integration capabilities were most likely to pursue aggressive corporate entrepreneurship and innovation strategies. On the other hand, family firms with limited transgenerational succession intentions, and constrained knowledge acquisition capabilities, will pursue meager corporate entrepreneurship activities. Typologies developed by Rondi, De Massis, and Kotlar (2018) and De Massis, Frattini, Kotlar, Petruzzelli, and Wright (2016) considered how family tradition can influence family firm's innovations while Sciascia, Clinton, Nason, James, and Riveria-Algarin (2013) highlight the effect of communication patterns and family dynamics on the innovation process.

Taxonomies of Family Businesses

As shown in Table 2, our review also includes 14 taxonomies identified in previous family business research. A taxonomic approach uses an empirical method for classification into groups or types (see the articles in this special issue for a much deeper discussion of taxonomies). As with the typologies, several of the taxonomies we identified captured the extent to which either family or business goals or values were dominant in the firm's approach to business. For example, Basco and Perez Rodriguez (2009, 2011) considered how the family's involvement in four management and governance issues (i.e., the strategic planning process, board of directors, human resource practices, and succession planning practices) meaningfully differentiate family firm practices and outcomes. Their empirical results from 732 privately owned Spanish firms identified four family business types: immature, business-first, family-first, or family enterprise–first family businesses. Basco (2017) considered how economic versus noneconomic orientations and family versus business orientations could be used to identify unique family business profiles. His empirical results identified six different family business types that reflected, in part, the extent to which family or business goals were emphasized in the firm. Although not specifically creating clusters of types of family businesses, Tagiuri and Davis (1992) empirically identified six significant dimensions of family business goals.

Similarly, Birley, Ng, and Godfrey (1999) measured family involvement based on 17 different issues, such as how children should be involved in the firm, how long parents should be involved in the firm, and how family shares in the business should be divided. Cluster analysis identified three distinct family business profiles, where the firms possess family-centered beliefs, business-centered beliefs, or family/business balanced beliefs. In their study of founders of family firms in Spain, García-Álvarez and López-Sintas (2001) found that family firms could be uniquely assigned to different clusters based on the values of the founder. Specifically, these authors identified four clusters of family firms based largely on the extent to which the founders viewed the business as an ends, or a means, and the extent to which group or self-fulfillment goals dominated the founders' value set.

Taking a systems approach, two taxonomies considered the strength and permeability of the family and business systems. Distelberg and Blow's (2011) three firm typology modelled how family firms vary based on the strength of the boundary of the family system. Specifically, these authors examined the communication patterns and strengths (i.e., rigid to diffused) of the family, business, ownership, and total communication networks. Multilevel analysis identified three distinct boundary strength categories: (1) rigid boundary firms making conscious efforts to limit perceptions of being a family business and more frequent communication across the family–nonfamily systems than within the family system; (2) permeable boundary firms, featuring frequent communication within the family group, well as across the family system boundary; and (3) diffuse boundary firms with weak boundaries around the family system and significant communication between family and nonfamily members. In a similar vein, Zody, Sprenkle, MacDermid, and Schrank (2006) developed a taxonomy modeling the permeability of the boundaries of the family and business systems, identifying two types.

Two recent typologies have been developed to consider how family firms approach the innovation and new product process. Specifically, Rondi, De Massis, and Kotlar (2018) consider how the family system is associated with the family firm's innovative potential. Based

Table 2. Taxonomies of Family Businesses.

Authors	Data	Purpose	Dimensions	Typology types
Basco (2017); 26 citations	732 Spanish firms in SABI (Sistema de Análisis de Balances Ibéricos) and Dun & Bradstreet databases	Develop a taxonomy of family business goal profiles	1. Economic vs. noneconomic orientation 2. Family vs. business orientation	Identified 6 profiles: 1. Short-term business-oriented goal 2. Long-term business-oriented goal 3. Stewardship business-oriented goal 4. Short-term family-oriented goal 5. Long-term family-oriented goal 6. Stewardship family-oriented goal
Basco and Rodriguez (2009); 199 citations	732 Spanish enterprises	Determine how dimensions of family and business are associated with family and business success	Family firms vary by the extent to which family issues are considered in the following: 1. Strategic processes 2. Board of director functions 3. Human resource practices 4. Succession planning	Three clusters identified: 1. Immature family enterprise: low consideration of family in in management and governance dimensions 2. Family enterprise–first: family has stronger relevance than the business 3. Business-first: low consideration of family across all dimensions
Basco and Rodriguez (2011); 79 citations	732 Spanish family businesses in the SABI and Dun & Bradstreet databases	Develop a taxonomy of ideal types of family firms based on the family's involvement in governance and management	Extent to which 4 key organizational domains reflect family- or business-oriented decisions: 1. Strategic processes 2. Succession 3. Human resources 4. Board of directors	Identified 4 clusters: 1. Family enterprise–first 2. Immature group 3. Business-first 4. Family-first
Birley, Ng, and Godfrey (1999); 234 citations	534 firms in the United Kingdom	What is the appropriate role of family in the business and how does those pressures create different types of family businesses?	Family involvement based on 17 different issues: 1. Early involvement of children 2. Family in the business 3. Entry and exit 4. Children's interest 5. Children's ownership/responsibilities 6. Succession and equity 7. Equity and parental death 8. Parental involvement 9. Retirement 10. Defining the family business 11. Separating the family and business 12. Effectiveness of the professional advisors 13. Next generation involvement 14. The family and shares 15. The family and income 16. Sibling rivalry 17. Regrets	Cluster analysis identified 3 clusters: 1. Family business jugglers: lacks any strong views, but seeks a balance between family and business concerns 2. Family rules: strong family-centered beliefs about the importance of family members in all aspects of the business 3. Family out: strong business-centered beliefs where family member should not necessarily be involved in nor benefit from the business

(continued)

Table 2. (continued)

Authors	Data	Purpose	Dimensions	Typology types
Dalpiaz, Tracey, and Phillips (2014); 51 citations	Single case study of Alessi, a family-owned Italian design and manufacturing firm	Taxonomy of how successors use family business narratives to legitimate their succession	Successor's narrative construction of the succession includes the legitimization of the following: 1. The successor as a person 2. The actions he/she champions	1. Constructing sense of family: conveying the successor is connected to family members who have held controlling positions 2. Family eulogizing: praise the successor bestows on product associated with the family members who championed them 3. Highlighting nonfamily endorsement: telling stories to convey the successor's personal qualities through direct and indirect endorsement by important external actors
Dekker, Lybaert, Steijvers, Depaire, and Mercken (2013); 95 citations	532 Belguim small- and medium-sized enterprises	Determine how the level of professionalism can differentiate between family firms	Factor analysis identified five dimensions reflective of family business professionalism: 1. Presence of financial control systems 2. Nonfamily involvement in governance systems 3. Formal human resource control systems 4. Decentralization 5. Top-level activeness	Four clusters identified: 1. Autocracy: firms scored relatively low on all dimensions; family retains control over the firm 2. Domestic configuration: high amounts of financial control systems alongside high involvement of family in governance; management still in the hands of the family but adoption of control systems has professionalized the firm 3. Administrative hybrid: high amounts of financial controls and formal human resource systems, and low family involvement in governance systems; high levels of professionalism signicantly diminish the family's involvement in the firm 4. Clenched hybrid: decentralization and low amounts of financial control systems matched with high nonfamily involvement in governance; family has relinquished some control of the firm without adopting professional control systems as informal controls remain widespread

(continued)

Table 2. (continued)

Authors	Data	Purpose	Dimensions	Typology types
Distelberg and Blow (2011); 43 citations	63 family firms in Midwestern United States	How family firms vary based on the strength of the boundary of the family system	Examined the communication patterns and their strengths (from rigid to diffused) of four networks: 1. Family 2. Business 3. Ownership 4. Total communication network	Identified three common archetypes: 1. Rigid boundary: conscious efforts made to limit perceptions of the being a family business and more frequent communication across the family–nonfamily systems than within the family system 2. Permeable boundary: frequent communication within the family group, and well as across the family system boundary 3. Diffuse boundary: weak boundaries around the family system and significant communication between family and nonfamily members
Erdogan, Rondi, and De Massis (in press); 0 citations	8 long-standing Turkish family firms	Taxonomy to address how family firms manage the paradox between tradition and innovation	1. Family's approach toward tradition, either preservation (commitment to the founder's values) or revival (failure and regret to maintain familial traditions) 2. Family's approach toward innovation, either segregation (iconic products distinguished from new products and processes) or integration (protecting the essence of traditional products and production)	Four strategies to manage tradition and innovation paradox identified: 1. Protecting the heritage (preservation and segregation): products viewed as a means to preserve the family's values and heritage 2. Maintaining the essence (preservation and integration): preserve the past while using tradition as a resource to develop new offerings 3. Embracing nostalgia (revival and segregation): searching family traditions and values and attempting to reintegrate them into current products, processes, and designs 4. Restoring the legacy (revival and integration): revival of classic products and family traditions occurring parallel to innovation

(continued)

Table 2. (continued)

Authors	Data	Purpose	Dimensions	Typology types
García-Álvarez and López-Sintas (2001); 61 citations	13 Spanish family business founders	Taxonomy of family firms based on founders' values	Identified 45 values based on structured interviews, reduced to two dimensions: 1. Business dimensions: business as a means vs. business as an end 2. Psychological dimension: self-fulfillment vs. group orientation values	Four clusters of family firm founders identified: 1. Family tradition: founders' values such as family traditions, human relationships, or ethical orientation, or family sense affect firm decisions 2. Founder-achievers: short-orientations are common as business is a means to earn the family's living 3. Founder-strategists: founders value the sense of achievement, internal control, and long-term orientation the business affords 4. Founder-inventors: self-fulfillment, innovation, and family orientation dominate this value system
Leiß and Zehrer (2018); 4 citations	10 predecessors and successors in family firms	Typology of how intergenerational communication patterns affect succession	Typology defining variables include the following: 1. Time 2. The individual 3. The institution (the family and the business. 4. Society	Four communication patterns were identified on two continuums between continuity and change and relatedness and autonomy: 1. Authoritarian protection: patriarchal structure where the father sets the course for succession at an early stage 2. Ambivalent entanglement: unplanned succession process as successor oscillates between succession and nonsuccession 3. Independent reorientation: open approach to succession where the senior develop exterior transfer scenarios 4. Coevolutionary development: high degree of generativity with the children being socialized into the company, emotional interconnectedness, and parents serving as role models

(continued)

Table 2. (continued)

Authors	Data	Purpose	Dimensions	Typology types
Miller, Minichilli, and Corbetta (2013); 224 citations	4,592 firm-year observations from the Italian Observatory of Family Firms	Empirically classified family firms into 4 different types of family leadership	1. Firm size: *ln*(sales) 2. Ownership concentration: percentage of family ownership in the firm	1. Small, concentrated ownership 2. Small, diffused ownership 3. Large, concentrated ownership 4. Large, diffused ownership
Swoboda and Olejnik (2013); 20 citations	504 small- and medium-sized German companies	Taxonomy of international strategies of family firms	1. Culture: international orientation, risk orientation, and people orientation 2. Strategy: differentiation, low-cost, or marketing standardization 3. Structure: integration, centralization, or specialization	Cluster analysis identified 4 types: 1. Domestic-focused traditionalists: focus on penetrating home market 2. Global standardizers: standardized marketing and centralized decision making to achieve global efficiency 3. Multinational adapters: low market standardization and decentralization 4. Transnational entrepreneurs: highly international and high acceptance of risk
Tagiuri and Davis (1992); 603 citations	524 participants in the Smaller Company Management Program at Harvard Business School	Develop a typology of family business goals	74 items related to family business goals	Although the authors did not create discrete groups of firms, they did identify a typology of types of family business goals: 1. Quality of work life goals 2. Providing immediate financial security to owners 3. Developing new and quality products 4. Firm as a vehicle to growth, social advancement and autonomy 5. Corporate citizenship 6. Job security

(continued)

Table 2. (continued)

Authors	Data	Purpose	Dimensions	Typology types
Uhlaner (2005); 69 citations	885 Dutch small- and medium-sized enterprises drawn from the MKB-Beleidspanel	Created a family orientation index as a means to operationalize family involvement in the business	1. Family ownership: more than ½ of all shares in the hands of one family 2. Representation of family in management: one or more of the management team is drawn from the owning family 3. Family proportion of management team: at least 50% of the management team drawn from the owning family 4. Family determines strategy: members of one family determine the strategic direction of the firm to some degree 5. Plans to transfer to family: current plans include transfer of the firm to the next generation 6. Self-perception: would the firm be described as a family business	
Westhead and Howorth (2007); 281 citations	272 private family firms in the United Kingdom	Taxonomy of types of private family firms	1. Company ownership: ownership is along a continuum from closely held by the ownership, diluted with the family, or diluted outside the family 2. Management structure: family management is along a continuum of either family-dominated or nonfamily-dominated 3. Company objectives: company objectives range along a continuum from family objectives to financial objectives	Seven conceptual family firm types were identified: 1. **Cousin consortium family firms** 2. **Large open family firms** 3. Entrenched average family firms 4. Multigenerational open family firms 5. **Professional family firms** 6. **Average family firms** 7. Multigenerational average family firms The four empirically verified clusters are in **boldface** above
Zody, Sprenkle, MacDermid, and Schrank (2006); 51 citations	187 family businesses in Midwestern state	Taxonomy examining the relationship between boundaries of the family and business systems in family firms	Taxonomy based on the permeability of the boundaries of the following: 1. Family system 2. Business system	1. Enmeshment: Boundaries are diffuse, which results in business decisions that are made in accordance with what is perceived as best for the family 2. Disengagement: rigid boundaries, lead to business decisions made in the best interests of the firm and family decisions made without regard to the business

on the firm's risk taking propensity and the extent to which family is anchored in the past, these authors identify four types of family firm innovators. Similarly, De Massis et al. (2016) develop a typology of new product innovation strategies followed by family firms, based on the sources of past knowledge and the type of product innovation the firm. Thus, four types of innovation through tradition strategies were identified.

Miller, Minichilli, and Corbetta (2013) and Westhead and Howorth (2007) both used the concentration of family ownership as a key variable in their taxonomies. Miller et al. combined ownership concentration (i.e, concentrated or diffused) with firm size (i.e., small or large) to create a four-cluster taxonomy. Westhead and Howorth (2007) added family management (i.e., family- or nonfamily-dominated) and company objectives (i.e., family objectives to financial objectives) and empirically identified four clusters of family business types.

Two taxonomies have examined the relationship between communication and family business succession. Dalpiaz, Tracey, and Phillips (2014) highlight how communication patterns are used to legitimize the successors and the succession process, while Leiß & Zehrer (2018) consider how intergenerational communication patterns effect subsequent succession.

Dekker, Lybaert, Steijvers, Depaire, and Mercken (2013) created a four-cluster taxonomy reflecting the level of professionalization within family firms. These authors used factors such as the presence of financial control or formal human resource management systems, and nonfamily involvement in governance as indictors of increasing levels of professionalization.

Although not specifically forwarding a family business taxonomy, Uhlaner (2005) developed an index using several of the criteria frequently used in other family business taxonomies and typologies. Using Guttman scaling techniques, she sorted five family business orientation criteria (i.e., family representation in ownership, management and management team, family influence in strategy, and succession intentions) along a single continuum and created a family orientation index.

Articles in This Special Issue

In this special issue, we are pleased to present four articles which introduce new taxonomies to the literature. Two articles examined the role of innovation and entrepreneurship in family firms. Prior family firm research has identified a number of antecedents that either impede or foster innovation in those firms. In their article titled "A Configurational Approach on Family Firm Innovation," Kosmidou and Ahuja (2018) take an important step to integrate and reconcile those extant findings. Building on survey responses from 277 small- and medium-sized, U.S.-based family firms and analyzing them using fsQCA (fuzzy set qualitative comparative analysis), they develop propositions about which configurations might lead to high levels of innovation in those firms. In particular, they investigate different combinations of emphasis put on SEW dimensions, generational involvement, professionalization, and environmental dynamism. Interestingly, when developing their taxonomy, the authors revealed that there is no necessary condition for achieving high levels of innovation in the sample they studied. The authors further reveal that SEW intention plays a key role for innovativeness of family firms, yet is in itself not sufficient; rather, it needs to be coupled with other contingencies in order to yield high innovation. Moreover, their analysis reveals that the presence of nonfamily managers is needed only for high levels of innovation when the emphasis of SEW is low in the family firm. Going beyond prior research, Kosmidou and Ahuja also identify configurations of environmental-, firm-, and family-level factors that lead to low levels of innovation in the respective firm.

In their study titled "A Taxonomy of Family Firms and Entrepreneurial Orientation," Kellermanns, Stanley, Hernandez-Linares, and López-Fernández (2019) use five characteristics of family firms (i.e., ownership, generational management, CEO family member, firm size, and the presence of a board of directors) to create a taxonomy of family firm types. These authors argue that the prior inconsistent relationships found between family firms, entrepreneurial orientation (EO), and performance are due to the fact that previous researchers have not effectively modeled the heterogeneity of family firms by not considering the contingent relationships that exist between the variables used to define family businesses. Using latent profile analysis, they develop a taxonomy consisting of four different types of family firms, and then predict which types of family firms will be more likely to pursue an EO, as well as which will achieve higher levels of firm performance. Their results show that, for example, family firms with boards of directors, a family CEO, and at least 50% family ownership (which they labelled Tempered Family Firms), demonstrated higher levels of EO and performance than similar family firms without a board (Strong Family Influence firms). These same firms also demonstrated higher levels of proactivity and competitive aggressiveness than those in the Strong Family Influence group, a finding that affirms the importance of establishing a board of directors for the pursuit of EO. They also found that large and older family firms (labelled Dynasties) where more proactive than Strong Family Firms, and more aggressive than either family firms in the Strong Family Firms or Tempered Family Firms groups. Overall, this study sheds light on why some family firms are more entrepreneurially oriented and better performers than others. This study, as well as the Kosmidou and Ahuja study (2018), show how the professionalization of family firm can have a profound effect upon family firm outcomes. As suggested by Kellermanns et al., professionalization in the form of board of directors can provide family firms with valuable idiosyncratic resources, enabling them to make better decisions, achieve better outcomes, and increase financial performance.

The other two articles included in this special issue use taxonomic approaches to examine the important areas of family social capital and family values. In their article titled "Family Social Capital in the Family Firm: A Taxonomic Classification, Relationship With Outcomes, and Direction for Advancement," Sanchez-Ruiz, Daspit, Holt, and Rutherford (2019) posit that family social capital is potentially a valuable resource for family firms will vary in configurations and levels across family firms. To better understand and identify these differences, the authors develop an empirical taxonomy of family social capital. Using a sample of 845 firms from the 2002 American Family Business Survey, three distinct clusters of family firms are identified: Instrumental (high), Identifiable (moderately low), and Indistinguishable (low). Notably, the authors took the extra step of replicating their analyses using 646 firms from the 2007 American Family Business Survey and in examining the association of the clusters with both economic and noneconomic outcomes. Overall, the analyses supported the three-cluster solution and demonstrated that the configurations of family social capital within clusters relate differently to economic and noneconomic outcomes. The study reinforces the idea that family social capital is an important source of heterogeneity among family firms and provides a deeper understanding of how it may manifest. Furthermore, their findings support the idea that different configurations of family social capital will likely result in trade-offs with respect to different performance outcomes and that equifinality may often arise. Thus, like many multidimensional resources, there will be varying levels, and the utility of the configuration will depend on the outcome of interest to the family firm. Finally, the authors build on the taxonomic approach used in their study to provide a helpful discussion of future research directions related to family social capital.

In their article titled "Family Firm Values Explaining Family Firm Heterogeneity," Rau, Schneider-Siebke, and Günther (2019) argue that values are the idiosyncratic resources that differentiate family- from nonfamily firms (and family firms from each other) as family firm values are at the core of family firm behavior. Building on values theory, this article suggests that the value profiles of family firms will be distinctly different from nonfamily firms participating in the same industry. These authors also posit that the value profiles of family firms will display greater heterogeneity than the values profiles of nonfamily firms. Rau et al. make these assertions based on two reasons. First, while nonfamily firms are largely confronted by a single dominant institutional logic, that being the commercial logic (Jaskiewicz, Combs, & Rau, 2015), family firms face the commercial logic as well as the family logic, which will increase the relative heterogeneity of value profiles in family firms. Second, since the dominant coalition in family firms are likely to have shared experiences and overlapping value profiles as the result of being raised within the same family, and since their relative tenure on the top management team of the family business is likely to be longer than the typical executive's in a nonfamily firm, the chance for their personal values to be institutionalized within the family firm increases. Thus, common value profiles, along with longer tenure, will increase the chance that family values will become ingrained in the family firm, which will make family firms' value profiles more heterogeneous relative to nonfamily firms. Using data collected from websites of 170 family and 80 nonfamily firms in the German machine tool industry, Rau et al. (2019) conducted content analysis and cluster analysis to create a five-cluster taxonomy of family firms based on their value profiles. The value profiles they found were significantly different from the value profiles of nonfamily firms (which clustered around three value profiles), supporting their arguments. This study contributes to the literature by identifying unique value profiles upon which family firms can be classified, and shows that family firms' value profiles are unique from those displayed by nonfamily firms.

In sum, the four articles selected for inclusion of this special issue all use taxonomic approaches to address what have been identified as important sources of heterogeneity among family firms. These articles highlight the heterogeneity and variety of configurations of family firms across several different important dimensions, while also providing useful classifications that can serve as a basis for future research, as we discuss below.

Future Research Areas

While early family firm research predominantly focused on identifying the idiosyncrasies of a seemingly homogeneous group of family firms, more recent academic endeavors acknowledge the heterogeneous nature of family firms (Chua, Chrisman, Steier, & Rau, 2012). Indeed, when looking at the often diverging findings on family firm outcome variables, such as entrepreneurship or firm performance, one could conclude that family firm behavior is characterized by more variance as compared to other forms of businesses. While some family firms are among the most innovative firms worldwide, others seem to have fallen out of time. While some family firms can be considered economic rockstars, others are among the walking dead, surviving merely through subsidies by the family. So what does this evidence imply for further research on taxonomies and typologies?

First, the significant heterogeneity found across family firms signals the importance of continued work to identify meaningful taxonomies and typologies. In general, family firms can vary along three basic dimensions: (1) the business family, (2) the family business, and (3) the nexus of business family and family business. As Rau et al. (2019) showed, business families can vary with regard to the values that they possess. Literature from family science (Constantine, 1983) offers typologies of families, such as the circumplex model (Olson, Sprenkle, & Russell, 29179) previously utilized by Daspit et al. (2018) and Labaki et al. (2013). Researchers might dig deeper into this issue, categorizing business families with regard to, for instance, their traditions, the size of the family, their geographical distribution, or their level of conflicts or (dis)agreements. With regard to the family business, the articles in this special issue developed categories for their EO or innovation, thereby considering, for instance, the role of nonfamily managers or environmental contingencies. Further studies are encouraged to focus on, among others, family firm strategic orientation or ownership professionalization. Some of the articles in this special issue have also touched upon the intersection of the business family and the family business, for instance, by considering the generational involvement in the business. Building especially on the willingness versus ability framework, further areas of worthwhile research emerge: What types of influence does the family have on the business—with regard to not only strength but also means (e.g., operational, board, or shares)—and what are the specific consequences of the different forms of influence? What would meaningful categorizations of family influence on the business look like? As noted above, prior research has commonly used easily identifiable characteristics to model the family's potential influence on the firm (e.g., Barontini & Bozzi, 2018; Corbetta, 1995; Nordqvist et al., 2014; Shanker & Astrachan, 1996; Sharma, 2002). We encourage future researchers to develop taxonomies and typologies that go beyond publically available attributes of family firms and consider and characteristics and processes that are unique to family businesses (e.g., family dynamics, rivalry, conflict, or communication patterns).

Second, it would be worthwhile studying the antecedents of family firm types. Many of the articles in this special issue were very effective in illustrating the consequences of different family firm types. Studying the consequences of family firm types is important as such research reveals behavioral differences among firms, which might ultimately have important implications for both shareholders and stakeholders of family firms. However, we still lack a profound understanding of why business families and family businesses differ and how and why business families and family businesses self-select into the specific types of the taxonomies and typologies found in the literature. What factors, for instance, lead to different values that business families pursue? What drives a family's willingness, or unwillingness, to exert substantial influence on their firm? Are these differences based on rational or emotional choice, or circumstance? Understanding those differences is important as they are key to consequential actions and behaviors. For example, if a founder is aware of how his or her decisions affect the strategic positioning and/or the path dependency of the family firm, he or she might act differently as compared to a case of ignorance of such mechanisms.

Third, families' and firms' positions in typologies and taxonomies are likely to change over time. This is good news for business families and family businesses as it allows them to affect their own fate and to move from more destructive to more constructive types. However, to date, we know surprisingly little about such dynamics. Indeed, prior research has mostly focused on path dependency of family firms, thereby emphasizing the stable nature of business family and family business types. Some of the early family business work has acknowledged the dynamic nature of family firm typologies (Corbetta, 1995; Holland & Boulton, 1984) by, for example, describing how family firms change from being controlled by founders, siblings, and ultimately cousin consortiums over time (Gersick, Lansberg, Desjardins, & Dunn, 1999). Yet those studies mostly refer to external triggers (e.g., time or growth) that affect a family firm's change of position in a typology. While associated with considerable effort, it is notable that family firms are also able to change their position in a typology/taxonomy by themselves. By reconsidering who is part of the family, as well as by adapting structures and strategies, families might be able to substantially change who they are and what their family business is. Future work might study such change processes, focusing on how and why such changes occur. Family firms often transition over time, from being family firms to nonfamily firms and vice versa (Brigham & Payne, 2015). Typologies and taxonomies, such as those discussed in this article, would also be useful frameworks for studying how family firms transition (from a within-group perspective across family firm types) over time.

The articles in this special issue reveal that in order to develop an in-depth understanding of the family firm typologies, we need to combine different methodological approaches and integrate research from other disciplines. Large-scale fieldwork, based on survey and interviews, allows us to reveal which types of family firms are predominant in which context. This is particularly important since many taxonomies might be dependent on not only culture but also other formal and informal institutions. For example, are the value profiles found Rau et al.'s (2019) study of German machine tool industry generalizable to other cultures, or even other industries? Is the "business first" or "family first" question (Ward, 1987)—one of the earliest family firm typologies used in research—dependent on the nature of the culture (i.e, collectivist or individualist) in which the family and the business are embedded? As such, identified taxonomies should be replicated and potentially refined in other geographical or competitive contexts. Case studies, and in particular, longitudinal single case studies, might be helpful to reveal how and why family firms change their positioning with regard to taxonomies over time. As an emergent method of data analysis, configurational approaches, such as fsQCA and latent profile analysis, might help identify predominant patterns and thus contribute to identifying meaningful typologies.

References

Astrachan, J. H., Klein, S. B., & Smyrnios, K. X. (2002). The F-PEC scale of family influence: A proposal for solving the family business definition problem. *Family Business Review*, *15*, 45-58.

Barontini, R., & Bozzi, S. (2018). Family firm heterogeneity and CEO compensation in Continental Europe. *Journal of Economics and Business*, *97*, 1-18.

Basco, R. (2017). "Where do you want to take your family firm?" A theoretical and empirical exploratory study of family business goals. *Business Research Quarterly*, *20*, 28-44.

Basco, R., & Rodríguez, M. J. P. (2009). Studying the family enterprise holistically: Evidence for integrated family and business systems. *Family Business Review*, *22*, 82-95.

Basco, R., & Rodríguez, M. J. P. (2011). Ideal types of family business management: Horizontal fit between family and business decisions and the relationship with family business performance. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, *2*, 151-165.

Bergamaschi, M., & Randerson, K. (2016). The futures of family businesses and the development of corporate social responsibility. *Futures*, *75*, 54-65.

Birley, S., Ng, D., & Godfrey, A. (1999). The family and the business. *Long Range Planning*, *32*, 598-608.

Blomback, A., & Brunninge, O. (2013). The dual opening to brand heritage in family businesses. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, *18*, 327-347.

Brigham, K. H., & Payne, G. T. (2015). Article commentary: The transitional nature of the multifamily business. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *39*, 1339–1347.

Chua, J. H., Chrisman, J. J., Steier, L., & Rau, S. B. (2012). Sources of heterogeneity in family firms: An introduction, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *36*(6), 1103-1113.

Constantine, L. L. (1983). Dysfunction and failure in open family systems, I: Application of a unified theory. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *45*, 725-738.

Corbetta, G. (1995). Patterns of development of family businesses in Italy. *Family Business Review*, *8*, 255-265.

Dalpiaz, E., Tracey, P., & Phillips, N. (2014). Succession narratives in family business: The case of Alessi. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *38*, 1375-1394.

Daspit, J. J., Madison, K., Barnett, T., & Long, R. G. (2018). The emergence of bifurcation bias from unbalanced families: Examining HR practices in the family firm using circumplex theory. *Human Resource Management Review*, *28*, 18-32.

Dekker, J. C., Lybaert, N., Steijvers, T., Depaire, B., & Mercken, R. (2013). Family firm types based on the professionalization construct: Exploratory research. *Family Business Review*, *26*, 81-99.

De Massis, A., Frattini, F., Kotlar, J., Petruzzelli, A. M., & Wright, M. (2016). Innovation through tradition: Lessons from innovative family and directions for future research. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *30*, 93-116.

Diéguez-Soto, J., López-Delgado, P., & Rojo-Ramírez, A. (2015). Identifying and classifying family businesses. *Review of Managerial Science*, *9*, 603-634.

Distelberg, B. J., & Blow, A. (2011). Variations in family system boundaries. *Family Business Review*, *24*, 28-46.

Distelberg, B., & Sorenson, R. L. (2009). Updating systems concepts in family businesses: A focus on values, resource flows, and adaptability. *Family Business Review*, *22*, 65-81.

Doty, D. H., & Glick, W. H. (1994). Typologies as a unique form of theory building: Toward improved understanding and modeling. *Academy of Management Review*, *19*(2), 230-251.

Dyer, W. G., Jr. (2006). Examining the "family effect" on firm performance. *Family Business Review*, *19*, 253-273.

Erdogan, I., Rondi, E., & De Massis, A. (in press). Managing tradition and innovation paradox in family firms: A family imprinting perspective. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*.

Fletcher, D. (2010). "Life-making or risk-taking"? Co-entrepreneurship and family business start-ups. *International Small Business Journal*, *28*, 452-469.

García-Álvarez, E., & López-Sintas, J. (2001). A taxonomy of founders based on values: The root of family business heterogeneity. *Family Business Review*, *14*, 209-230.

Garcia-Castro, R. G., & Sharma, P. (2011). Family involvement-firm performance link: Winning configurations revealed by set-theoretic methods. *Universia Business Review*, *32*, 54-69.

Gersick, K. E., Landsberg, I., Desjardins M., & Dunn B. (1999). Stages and transitions: Managing change in the family business, Family Business Review, *12*(4), 287-297.

Gilding, M., Gregory, S., & Cosson, B. (2015). Motives and outcomes in family business succession planning. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *39*, 299-312.

Holland, P. G., & Boulton, W. R. (1984). Balancing the "family" and the "business" in family business. *Business Horizons*, *27*(2), 16-21.

Kellermanns, F., Stanley, L., Hernandez-Linares, R., & López-Fernández, M. C. (in press). A taxonomy of family firms and entrepreneurial orientation. *Family Business Review*.

Kosmidou, V., & Ahuja, M. K. (2018). A configurational approach on family firm innovation. *Family Business Review*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1177/0894486519827738

Jaskiewicz, P., Combs, J. G., & Rau, S. B. (2015). Entrepreneurial legacy: Toward a theory of how some family firms nurture transgenerational entrepreneurship, *Journal of Business Venturing*, *30*(1), 29-49.

Labaki, R., Michael-Tsabari, N., & Zachary, R. K. (2013). Exploring the emotional nexus in cogent family business archetypes. *Entrepreneurship Research Journal*, *3*, 301-330.

Leiß, G., & Zehrer, A. (2018). Intergenerational communication in family firm succession. *Journal of Family Business Management*, *8*, 75-90.

Li, Z., & Daspit, J. J. (2016). Understanding family firm innovation heterogeneity: A typology of family governance and socioemotional wealth intentions. *Journal of Family Business Management*, *6*, 103-121.

Litz, R. (1995). The family business: Towards definitional clarity. *Family Business Review*, *8*, 71-81.

Miller, D., Minichilli, A., & Corbetta, G. (2013). Is family leadership always beneficial? *Strategic Management Journal*, *34*, 553-571.

Muntean, S. C. (2016). Political behavior in family- and founder-controlled firms. *Journal of Family Business Management*, *6*, 186-206.

Nordqvist, M., Sharma, P., & Chirico, F. (2014). Family firm heterogeneity and governance: A configuration approach. *Journal of Small Business Management*, *52*, 192-209.

Randolph, R. V., Li, Z., & Daspit, J. J. (2017). Toward a typology of family firm corporate entrepreneurship. *Journal of Small Business Management*, *55*, 530-546.

Rau, S. B., Schneider-Siebke, V., & Günther, C. (in press). Family firm values explaining family firm heterogeneity. *Family Business Review*.

Rondi, E., De Massis, A., & Kotlar, J. (2018). Unlocking innovation potential: A typology of family business innovation postures and the critical role of the family system. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1016/j.fbs.2017.12.001

Sanchez-Ruiz, P., Daspit, J. J., Holt, D. T., & Rutherford, M. W. (in press). Family social capital in the family firm: A taxonomic classification, relationship with outcomes, and direction for advancement. *Family Business Review*.

Scholes, L., & Wilson, N. (2014). The importance of family firm trusts in family firm governance. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *38*, 1285-1293.

Sciascia, s., Clinton, E., Nason, R. S., James, A. E., & Riveria-Algarin, J. O. (2013). Family communication and innovativeness in family firms. *Family Relations*, *62*, 429-442.

Shanker, M. C., & Astrachan, J. H. (1996). Myths and realities: Family businesses' contribution to the US economy—A framework for assessing family business statistics. *Family Business Review*, *9*, 107-123.

Sharma, P. (2002, August). *Stakeholder mapping technique: Toward the development of a family firm typology*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management conference, Denver, CO.

Sundaramurthy, C., & Kreiner, G. E. (2008). Governing by managing identity boundaries: The case of family businesses. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *32*, 415-436.

Swoboda, B., & Olejnik, E. (2013). A taxonomy of small- and medium-sized international family firms. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship*, *11*, 130-157.

Tagiuri, R., & Davis, J. A. (1992). On the goals of successful family companies. *Family Business Review*, *5*, 43-62.

Uhlaner, L. M. (2005). The use of the Guttman Scale in development of a family orientation index for small-to-medium-sized firms. *Family Business Review*, *18*, 41-56.

Ward, J. L. Keeping the family business healthy. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.

Westhead, P., & Cowling, M. (1998). Family firm research: The need for a methodological rethink. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *23*, 31-56.

Westhead, P., & Howorth, C. (2007). "Types" of private family firms: An exploratory conceptual and empirical analysis. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, *19*, 405-431.

Zody, Z., Sprenkle, D., MacDermid, S., & Schrank, H. (2006). Boundaries and the functioning of family and business systems. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, *27*, 185-206.

Author Biographies

Donald O. Neubaum is a DeSantis Distinguished Professor in the College of Business at Florida Atlantic University. He is Senior Associate Editor of Family Business Review and an editor for Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, and he currently serves as Chair for the Entrepreneurship Division of the Academy of Management.

Nadine Kammerlander is chaired professor of family business at WHU – Otto Beisheim School of Management in Germany. She holds a PhD in Management from the Otto-Friedrich University of Bamberg, Germany. Her research focuses on innovation and leadership in family firms as well as family offices.

Keith H. Brigham is the Kent R. Hance professor of entrepreneurship in the Rawls College of Business at Texas Tech University. Brigham's primary research interests are in entrepreneurial cognition, temporal orientation, and family business.