2 Research on marketing in family firms

2.1 Theoretical perspectives

In this subchapter, I will briefly elaborate on the main theories about family firms used to explain differences between family and non-family businesses. As this dissertation takes on the consumer perspective, family firm theories with an intra-organizational perspective are somewhat of secondary relevance because what matters is that consumers perceive a firm as family-influenced. Yet, a basic understanding of the theoretical background on family firm distinctiveness is essential because it offers explanatory value in understanding why family firms are perceived differently: because of their unique behavior and characteristics. Moreover, studies, which will be discussed in the following literature review on marketing in family firms, largely use these theoretical perspectives to derive hypotheses and explain their findings. The following subchapters will introduce the resource-based view (2.1.1), organizational identity theory (2.1.2), and socioemotional wealth theory (2.1.3). In each subchapter I will also briefly discuss the theories' application in marketing-related research on family firms to show their relevance for the overarching research question of this dissertation.

2.1.1 Resource-based view

The resource-based view (RBV) is one of the most dominant and popular theoretical perspectives in strategic management literature, especially when it comes to explaining why certain firms outperform others. The RBV focuses on the heterogeneity of firms and claims that the resources of a firm are the key source of competitive advantage, and thus key to a firm's success. A firm's resources "include all assets, capabilities, organizational processes, firm attributes, information, knowledge, etc. controlled by a firm that enable the firm to conceive of and implement strategies that improve its efficiency and effectiveness" (Barney, 1991, p. 101). Barney (1991) contends that in order to serve for "sustained" competitive advantage, a resource has to be valuable, rare, imperfectly imitable, and non-substitutable. The RBV has been applied to different contexts, including to family business research (e.g., Eddleston, Kellermanns, & Sarathy, 2005; Habbershon & Williams, 1999; Sirmon & Hitt, 2003). Here, Habbershon and Williams (1999) first introduced the term "familiness" as the idiosyncratic "bundle of resources that are distinctive to a firm as a result of family involvement" (Habbershon & Williams, 1999, p.1). Specifically, familiness

M. Rosina, *The Power of Communicating the Family Firm Status*,
Familienunternehmen und KMU, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-19699-8_2

describes a unique and inimitable bundle of resources in a given family firm that emerges from the interaction between the family and the business systems. The familiness concept has also been used in marketing research on family firms where it has been argued that a family firm's image "is a contributing resource and capability that provides family businesses a potential advantage by highlighting their distinctive familiness" (Craig et al., 2008, p. 354). That family firm image, it has been suggested, can be a resource of competitive advantage and contribute to firm performance as it enhances the "family business' ability to persuade customers to make purchasing decisions based on the perceived attributes of the seller" (Craig et al., 2008, p. 351).

2.1.2 Organizational identity theory

Organizational identity theory has its roots in social identity theory developed in social psychology (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). Social identity theory argues that people classify themselves and others into different social categories, for instance based on gender, religion, political views, age, or organizational membership (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). Such categories help individuals to segment and order their social environment on the one hand, and it provides ground for self-identification on the other. It supports an answers the question of "who am I?" for example, by enabling categorizations of oneself such as, "I am German", "I am a woman" and assigning the prototypical characteristics of these social categories to oneself. Some categories are certainly mutually exclusive (e.g., man vs. woman), but others are overlapping and the absorption of characteristic behaviors and opinions will depend on the degree of the individual identification with a certain category/social group (Ashforth & Mael, 1989).

In recent years, social identity research has increasingly found application in organizational science (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Ashforth & Mael, 1996; Cornelissen, Haslam, & Balmer, 2007; Hogg & Terry, 2001). Here, organizational identity theory tries to understand "what we do" as an organization and "who we are as an organization" (Nag, Corley, & Gioia, 2007). Organizational identity can be understood as the collective behavior and identity of an organization, which is rooted in its history and values (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Nag et al., 2007). It gives an organization a sense of continuity and distinctiveness and provides behavioral guidance for members of the organization. Organizational identity is socially constructed, thus, it only exists to the extent that organizational members believe in it and identify with it. If "individuals define themselves in terms of the organization, they internalize its mission, ideology, and values, and by extension, strategies and customary ways of doing things" (Ashforth & Mael, 1996, p. 44). In family business research, it is argued that family members tend to have a higher identification with the organization due to overlapping firm and family identities – especially when the family name is part of the company name (Deephouse & Jaskiewicz, 2013; Dyer & Whetten, 2006; Memili et al., 2010). Marketing-related research on family firms has suggested that such identity overlaps incentivize family members to protect their corporate image and strive for a favorable corporate reputation (Deephouse & Jaskiewicz, 2013; Dyer & Whetten, 2006; Memili et al., 2010; Zellweger et al., 2010; Zellweger et al., 2012), for instance via increased levels of social responsibility, the striving for nonfinancial goals (e.g., satisfaction of non-family stakeholders), and a long-term orientation (Zellweger et al., 2012; Zellweger et al., 2013). These behaviors were argued to lead to a favorable perception of family firms by consumers (Zellweger et al., 2010). Hence, the positive behaviors related to a family firm identity might be a reason for consumers to favor buying from family firms compared to from non-family firms.

2.1.3 Socioemotional wealth theory

As noted by Berrone et al. (2012), “'foreign' paradigms designed for organizations where economic instrumentality is assumed fall short of adequately dealing with the uniqueness of family firms. For family business studies, this practice has often led to contradictory empirical results, theoretical interpretations, and a forced application of borrowed logic to explain descriptive findings” (Berrone et al., 2012, p. 258-259). Based on these shortcomings, family business research developed a new, “home-grown” theory: the socioemotional wealth theory. The socioemotional wealth (SEW) model is based on the behavioral agency theory (Wiseman & Gomez-Mejia, 1998) that claims that firms make decisions with reference to the dominant principals of the firm such that decisions preserve accumulated endowment in the firm (Berrone et al., 2012). For family firms, this means that family principals will not only make decisions based on economic reference points, but also based on their family principles to preserve “socioemotional” wealth endowment. SEW describes the “non-financial aspects of the firm that meet the family's affective needs, such as identity, the ability to exercise family influence, and the perpetuation of the family dynasty” (Gomez-Mejia, Haynes, Nunez-Nickel, Jacobson, & Moyano-Fuentes, 2007, p. 106). Berrone et al. (2012) have proposed five dimensions of SEW which they called the “FIBER” dimensions: family control and influence, identification of family members with the firm, binding social ties, emotional attachment of family members, and renewal of family bonds to the firm through dynastic succession. Research argues that family firms often adopt a proactive stakeholder engagement and act more socially responsible because it helps them to preserve their SEW (e.g., Cennamo et al., 2012; Cruz, Larraza-Kintana, Garcés-Galdeano, & Berrone, 2014; Dou, Zhang, & Su, 2014; Zellweger et al., 2013). Similarly to the notion of organizational identity theory, marketing-related research on family firms has argued that such "social" behaviors that follow considerations to preserve the family firms' SEW might produce a positive external perception of family firms by consumers (Deephouse & Jaskiewicz, 2013). This, in turn, might positively influence consumer buying preferences for family firm brands.

2.2 Literature review

The goal of this subchapter is to provide an up-to-date overview of all relevant research that has been conducted at the intersection of family firm and marketing research with the focus on the research question of *whether consumers prefer family firm brands over those of non-family firms and if so, why they favor family firm brands over non-family firm brands*.

As mentioned, marketing-related research is still largely absent in the field of family business research (Blombäck & Craig, 2013; Kashmiri & Mahajan, 2014a; Reuber & Fischer, 2011). Hence, this subchapter will focus on the broader topic of "marketing" rather than reviewing certain research segments such as consumer perception or family firm image/branding to capture all relevant findings that might provide direct or indirect insights into the overarching research question.

In a systemic literature review I focused on literature published until autumn 2015 in peer-reviewed journals. My search criteria's scope was defined by the Academic Journal Guide 2015 (ABS Ranking), where I focused on all journals graded 4 or 3 in the categories defined as relevant (see Table 1). Relevant categories were defined as those in which a topic in the broader marketing and family business context is of potential interest – hence, categories such as "finance", "accounting" or "information management" were excluded. Additionally, I included all remaining grades (2 and 1) in the categories "marketing" and "entrepreneurship and small business management" as marketing is the primary focus of this dissertation and a majority of family business articles are published in journals in the entrepreneurship category, for instance in the "Family Business Review". In total, this resulted in 181 journals. Even though not included in the ABS Ranking, I additionally included the peer-reviewed "Journal of Family Business Management" in my search as it is a relevant journal in the field of family business research. I used the "Web of Science" database as it covers a broad range of the selected target journals. To compensate for the journals that were not covered by the database, I manually searched each missing journal on its journal website. No restriction on the publication date was applied.

Table 1: Literature review's subject fields based on ABS journal ranking

Subject field	Grades reviewed	Number of journals
Entrepreneurship and small business management	All	20
General management, ethics and social responsibility	4, 3	17
Human resource management and employment studies	4, 3	15
International business and area studies	4, 3	9
Marketing	All	66
Organisation studies	4, 3	9
Psychology – general	4, 3	20
Psychology – organisational	4, 3	21
Strategy	4, 3	4
Total		**181**

I used a broad range of marketing search terms (e.g., "marketing", "consumer", "customer", "buying behavior", "buying preference", "brand", "branding", "image", "reputation", "communication", "identity", "perception", "attitude") to ensure inclusion of all relevant articles. In an iterative process, I added further search terms, which seemed to be relevant in the context of consumer perception of family firms (e.g., "willingness to pay", "Corporate Social Responsibility", "CSR", "trust", "authentic", "quality", "commitment", "goodwill", "doing good", "organic", "loyal", "feel good", "well-being", "happiness"). Articles had to meet two criteria: (1) use one or more search terms related to the marketing context in the keywords, article title or abstract, as well as (2) one of more keywords related to family business research (e.g., "family firm", "family business", "family influence", "family control", "family led", "family owned", "family ownership", "family SME", "family enterprise").

The search resulted in 176 articles in the Web of Science database. After reviewing the abstracts, 38 articles were found relevant and 138 articles were identified as not relevant, for example, as the research was not related to marketing or the focus was not on family businesses. In addition, 26 relevant articles were found via the direct search on the journal websites. Thus, the final data set consisted of 64 articles matching all selection criteria. Contributions came from 22 journals in a time frame of 1988-2015.

In terms of research focus, only 11 articles focused on the "consumer" as the unit of analysis of which 8 articles specifically analyzed consumer opinions about family firms and 3 articles investigated the opinions of potential job candidates. All other 53 articles focused on the firm as a research object to test or derive theoretical assumptions. This underlines the lack of including the consumers' point-of-view in family business research. In terms of type of analysis, 52 articles used an empirical study, of which 38 articles used a quantitative research method and 14 a qualitative research method. 12 articles were conceptual, of which 3 had only an anecdotal reference to the overarching search topic of whether it is favorable to communicate a family firm status and why.

In terms of topics covered, the articles fell into seven main categories: research related to consumer perceptions on family firms, research on family firm identity and culture, studies examining the image and reputation of family firms, research explicitly focusing on family firm branding, research on the market orientation of family firms and their marketing practices, and research on corporate social responsibility in family firms. Not all categories are based on an external view on the firm; some are on intra-organizational characteristics (e.g., family firm identity and culture). I chose to include articles in these categories in my review if they provided hints on why family firms behave differently, for instance, in the sense that they are perceived differently (e.g., more positively) by external stakeholders.

Assigning the articles to categories partially resulted in overlaps, as some of the topics are strongly intertwined, for example, consumer perceptions of family firms and family firm image/ branding. If the overlap was high, the article was used in both categories and highlighted as such. If the overlap was rather small, for example, anecdotal/referential to another topic, I categorized the article according to its main topic. To structure the findings of the literature review, the subchapters will be organized in these main categories. Depending on their relevance for the research scope of my dissertation, I will describe some articles in more detail than others. Table 2 provides an overview of all 64 reviewed articles including information on their category, research object, type of analysis, study type and sample used, key findings, and main theoretical perspective. If the study was of explorative nature, the theoretical perspective was highlighted as "n/a".

Table 2: Overview of reviewed articles

Study	Journal	Category	Research object	Type of analysis	Study type/ sample	Key findings	Theoretical perspective
Adams et al. (1996)	Family Business Review	CSR	Firm	*Qualitative*	771 structured interviews with 244 (214 family firms, 230 non-family) firms	• Family firms employ informal methods to encourage ethical behavior compared to formal codes in non-family firms • In family firms role modeling of expected behaviors more important	n/a
Aronoff and Ward (1995)	Family Business Review	Consumer perceptions	Firm	*Conceptual*	n/a	• Family firms rely on a network of trust, hence, reputation of trustworthiness basis for family firms to perpetuate, prosper and expand	Agency theory
Beck and Kenning (2015)	International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management	Consumer perceptions Family firm image	Consumer	*Quantitative*	Online survey with 142 German consumers	• A strongly perceived family firm image of a retailer has: • A direct positive effect on new product acceptance of unfamiliar brands sold at the retailer • An indirect positive effect on new product acceptance of unfamiliar brands sold at the retailer through perceived trustworthiness	n/a
Beck et al. (2011)	Family Business Review	Market orientation	Firm	*Quantitative*	Survey with 111 small, established family firms from Belgium/ Netherlands	• Family firms which are controlled by the founding family execute higher market orientation than family firms controlled by later generations	n/a
Berrone et al. (2010)	Administrative Science Quarterly	CSR	Firm	*Quantitative*	Environmental performance based on emissions of 194 U.S. (101 family, 83 non-family) firms	• Family firms had a better environmental performance, specifically at the local level, independent from whether the CEO was a family member or not	SEW
Bingham et al. (2011)	Journal of Business Ethics	CSR	Firm	*Quantitative*	Corporate social performance data of 706 S&P 500 family and non-family firms	• Family firms engage in higher levels of CSR • Authors argue that this is because of their different identity orientation • Family firms tend to have a more relational orientation toward their stakeholders	Stakeholder theory

Table 2: Overview of reviewed articles (continued)

Study	Journal	Category	Research object	Type of analysis	Study type/ sample	Key findings	Theoretical perspective
Binz et al. (2013)	Journal of Family Business Strategy	Consumer perceptions Family firm reputation	Consumer	*Quantitative*	Online survey with 253 Swiss consumers	• Consumers tend to associate relational qualities with family firms: being trustworthy, supporting good causes, good employers, or caring about the environment • Relational qualities positively influence consumer buying preferences	n/a
Block (2010)	Family Business Review	Consumer perceptions	Firm	*Quantitative*	2,638 observations on percentage change in workforce of 414 S&P 500 firms	• Family management moderates relationship between firm profitability and the probability of downsizing • Family owners tend to avoid deep job cuts, because they care more about their reputation	Agency theory, stewardship theory
Block and Wagner (2014)	Journal of Family Business Strategy	CSR	Firm	*Quantitative*	2,128 observations from 399 S&P 500 firms	• CSR strategy in family firms is influenced by emotions • Family and founder firms are different regarding CSR concerns: • Family and founder ownership = less concerns about CSR • Family and founder management = higher concerns about CSR	SEW
Blombäck and Brunninge (2013)	Corporate Communi-cations: An International Journal	Family firm branding	Firm	*Conceptual*	n/a	• Family firms can leverage their "hybrid" identity organization to build heritage-based brands and corporate identities • Authors propose six typologies (based on different degrees of communicating the family, business and family business history) to illustrate types of historical references	Brand heritage
Blombäck and Ramírez-Pasillas (2012)	Corporate Communi-cations: An International Journal	Family firm branding	Firm	*Qualitative*	In-depth interviews with 14 CEOs from small and medium-sized Swedish family firms	• Three types of logics for choosing a family-based corporate brand identity; guided by intuitive, emergent, and strategic processes • Results show that building a family-based brand identity is not always an outcome of careful marketing planning, but often made without concern for marketing matters	Corporate brand identity

Table 2: Overview of reviewed articles (continued)

Study	Journal	Category	Research object	Type of analysis	Study type/ sample	Key findings	Theoretical perspective
Botero et al. (2013)	Journal of Family Business Strategy	Family firm identity	Firm	*Quantitative*	Website analysis of 1,036 family firms from Australia, U.S., UK	• Likelihood to communicate family firm identity differs among family firms (57% communicated that they were family firms, of which 26% did this in an explicit manner in the "home" or "about us" page, of those 7% used explicit messages in both pages) • Disclosing family firm identity differs: • Among industries (positive correlation in retail and manufacturing; negative in service) • With market focus (communication of family firm identity more likely in B2C markets compared to B2B markets) • By firm age (the older, the more likely) • By country of origin (communication of family firm identity more likely in Australia compared to U.S.)	Organiza-tional identity theory
Byrom and Lehman (2009)	Marketing Intelligence & Planning	Family firm branding	Firm	*Qualitative*	Case study of Australian Coopers Brewery	• Family ownership can be leveraged to build strong brands, for example, by emphasizing the family's history and tradition	n/a
Carrigan and Buckley (2008)	International Journal of Consumer Studies	Consumer perceptions CSR	Consumer	*Qualitative*	In-depth interviews with 19 female consumers from the UK and Ireland	• Consumers have positive associations about family firms: higher product/service quality, trustworthy, integer, socially responsible, more motivated and better trained staff • Consumer associate a "feel-good" factor with family firms, making them feel special/valued • Consumers tend to associate family firms as small organizations with local concerns	n/a
Cennamo et al. (2012)	Entrepreneur-ship Theory and Practice	CSR	Firm	*Conceptual*	n/a	• Family firms show higher levels of corporate social performance than non-family firms based on SEW considerations	SEW

Table 2: Overview of reviewed articles (continued)

Study	Journal	Category	Research object	Type of analysis	Study type/ sample	Key findings	Theoretical perspective
Cooper (2005)	Journal of Small Business Management	Family firm marketing practices	Firm	*Quantitative*	Web survey with 452 business executives (of 82 family, 370 non-family firms)	• No evidence that family firms consider customer relationship management as more important to their firm's success compared to non-family firms • Non-family firms ahead in initiating and implementing customer service initiatives	n/a
Covin (1994a)	Family Business Review	Consumer perceptions	Consumer (potential job cand.)	*Quantitative*	Survey with 225 students at a large U.S. state college	• Considering employment preferences, students perceive family firms as a desirable career choice	n/a
Covin (1994b)	Journal of Small Business Management	Consumer perceptions	Consumer (potential job cand.)	*Quantitative*	Survey with 223 students at a large U.S. state college	• Considering employment preferences, students perceive family firms as being more concerned about the happiness of their employees, more moral and more open to problems	n/a
Craig et al. (2008)	Journal of Small Business Management	Consumer perceptions Family firm image CSR	Firm	*Quantitative*	Mail survey with leaders of 218 small and medium-sized Western U.S. family firms	• Family firms communicating the family firm status have performance advantages • Authors argue that this is because consumers tend to have positive associations with family firms, for instance, being specifically trustworthy and customer-oriented	RBV
Cruz et al. (2010)	Academy of Management Journal	Consumer perceptions	Firm	*Quantitative*	Telephone survey with CEOs of 122 Spanish family firms	• Family firms seem to be able to capitalize on trust	Agency theory
Cruz et al. (2014)	Entrepreneur-ship Theory and Practice	CSR	Firm	*Quantitative*	598 listed European firms	• Positive effect of family ownership on social dimensions related to external stakeholders • Internally, authors found negative effects based on SEW biases • In contrast to non-family firms, national standards and industry conditions did not affect the level of CSR in family firms	SEW
Danes et al. (2008)	Journal of Small Business Management	Family firm marketing practices	Firm	*Quantitative*	Phone interviews with 572 small family firms	• Family firms focus on a customer-orientation, rating customer reputation as their most relevant business goal	System theory

Table 2: Overview of reviewed articles (continued)

Study	Journal	Category	Research object	Type of analysis	Study type/ sample	Key findings	Theoretical perspective
Deephouse and Jaskiewicz (2013)	Journal of Management Studies	Family firm reputation	Firm	*Quantitative*	Online questionnaire with 194 (61 family, 133 non-family) firms from 8 countries (average of 175 respondents per firm)	• Family firms have a better reputation, especially when the family firm is family-named • Family ownership and family board representation positively correlated with a favorable reputation – hence, family needs to have sufficient organizational power to implement measures which enhance a favorable corporate reputation	SEW, social identity theory
Denison et al. (2004)	Family Business Review	Family firm culture	Firm	*Quantitative*	Survey with 409 (20 family, 389 non-family) firms	• Corporate culture of family firms more "positive" compared to culture in non-family firms • Family firms with higher investments in the development of their people • Family firms more consistent in their culture in terms of core values and agreement	Organiza-tional culture theory
Deniz and Suarez (2005)	Journal of Business Ethics	CSR	Firm	*Quantitative*	Survey with 112 Spanish family firms	• Family firms differ in their orientation towards CSR • Family firm CSR orientation can be associated both with negative and positive characteristics of the relationship to stakeholders • Results show that family firms are not a homogeneous group	n/a
Dou et al. (2014)	Family Business Review	CSR	Firm	*Quantitative*	2,821 Chinese private firms	• Family ownership positively associated with proactive stakeholder engagement and charitable donations	SEW
Dyer (1988)	Family Business Review	Consumer perceptions Family firm culture	Firm	*Qualitative*	Culture mapping of > 40 family firms based on variety of sources	• Family firms with 4 different types of culture; culture influences whether family firm survives over next generations • In some family firms there are cultural patterns which are characterized by particularism and nepotism	n/a

Table 2: Overview of reviewed articles (continued)

Study	Journal	Category	Research object	Type of analysis	Study type/ sample	Key findings	Theoretical perspective
Dyer (2006)	Family Business Review	Consumer perceptions	Firm	*Conceptual*	n/a	• Family firms have certain advantages related to the goodwill and trustworthiness associated with the family name • Thus, positive perception of family firms by consumers	Agency theory, RBV
Dyer and Whetten (2006)	Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice	CSR	Firm	*Quantitative*	Social performance ratings of 261 (59 family, 202 non-family) S&P 500 firms	• Family firms more socially responsible along several dimensions • Authors argue that this is in order to protect family assets and due to higher reputational concerns in family firms (based on identity overlaps and association of family firms with the family name)	Self-interest theory, identity theory and moral capital
Eddleston et al. (2010)	Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice	Consumer perceptions	Review, mostly firm	*Conceptual*	n/a	• Based on a review of articles related to trust, authors conclude that family firms are more likely to build and maintain a reputation for trustworthiness	Review of different theories in relation to trust
File et al. (1994)	Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing	Family firm marketing practices	Firm	*Quantitative*	Exploratory study of 124 U.S. family and non-family firms	• Family firms interact differently with their service providers before, during and after the purchase • For example, they are more likely to engage in more intensive pre-purchase search, in positive post-purchase word-of-mouth and show higher levels of post-purchase loyalty	System theory
Gallo (2004)	Family Business Review	CSR	Firm	*Qualitative*	In-depth interviews with 44 family firm experts from 19 different countries	• Family firms are better in carrying out their social responsibilities and focus on building social wealth over generations • Family firms are “schools” in values such as unity, commitment, and helping others	n/a
Hauswald and Hack (2013)	Family Business Review	Consumer perceptions	Firm	*Conceptual*	n/a	• Family ownership (to the extent that it is perceivable to the stakeholder) positively influences stakeholders' perception of benevolence	SEW

Table 2: Overview of reviewed articles (continued)

Study	Journal	Category	Research object	Type of analysis	Study type/ sample	Key findings	Theoretical perspective
Hauswald et al. (2015)	Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice	Consumer perceptions	Consumer (potential job cand.)	*Quantitative*	Conjoint experiment with 175 senior-level business administration students at five universities in Germany	• Communication of family influence often associated with trustworthiness, security, and stability but also with inflexibility and resistance to change • Family influence attracts job seekers in general • Degree of attraction depends on job seekers' personal values (e.g., students who value conservation more attracted than students who value openness to change)	Person-organization fit
Kashmiri and Mahajan (2010)	International Journal of Research in Marketing	Family firm image CSR	Firm	*Quantitative*	130 publicly-owned U.S. family firms (35 family-named, 95 non-family-named)	• Family-named family firms show higher levels of CSR, a higher representation of consumers' voice (they are more likely to include a chief marketing officer in their boards) and have higher strategic emphasis • Family-named family firms perform better than non-family named family firms; this is partially mediated by their higher levels of CSR and higher strategic emphasis	n/a
Kashmiri and Mahajan (2014a)	Journal of Business Ethics	Family firm image CSR	Firm	*Quantitative*	1,294 product introduction announcements of 107 publicly listed U.S. family firms	• Family-named family firms perform better in terms of shareholder value compared to non-family named family firms • Performance partially mediated by ethical product-related behavior: family-named family firms tended to have a history of avoiding product safety issues and deceptive advertising	n/a
Kashmiri and Mahajan (2014b)	International Journal of Research in Marketing	Family firm marketing practices CSR	Firm	*Quantitative*	275 large publicly listed U.S. (148 family, 127 non-family) firms	• Family firms exhibit a unique marketing behavior in times of recession compared to non-family firms: high levels of advertising intensity, higher rates of new product introductions, higher levels of CSR • Family firms outperform non-family firms during recession; partially mediated by their marketing behavior and higher CSR focus	n/a

Table 2: Overview of reviewed articles (continued)

Study	Journal	Category	Research object	Type of analysis	Study type/ sample	Key findings	Theoretical perspective
Keller-manns et al. (2012)	Entrepreneur-ship Theory and Practice	CSR	Firm	*Conceptual*	n/a	• SEW can also negatively affect corporate social performance, for example, via family-centric behavior	SEW
Kovacs et al. (2014)	Organization Science	Consumer perceptions	Consumer	*Quantitative*	Study 1: 1,271,796 unsolicited online reviews of 18,869 restaurants in three major U.S. metropolitan areas Study 2: Experiment with 191 consumers	• Restaurants which are perceived as authentic by consumers receive higher ratings, even after controlling for restaurant quality • Independent, family-owned, and specialist restaurants perceived as more authentic by consumers than chains, non-family-owned, and generalist restaurants	n/a
Krappe et al. (2011)	Journal of Family Business Management	Consumer perceptions Family firm branding	Consumer	*Qualitative*	2 staged, qualitative interviews with randomized sample of 110 people across Germany	• Family firms are perceived as a brand on their own and as the most sustainable and social type of firm (e.g., socially responsible, good employers) • However, family firms tend to be perceived as rather inflexible, stagnant, hierarchic and less innovative – this is specifically the case for middle-sized family firms	Personal construct theory
Lyman (1991)	Family Business Review	Family firm marketing practices	Firm	*Qualitative*	Interviews with 78 small, face-to-face family businesses (e.g., clothing shops, grocery stores, or gift shops) in the area of California, U.S.	• Family and non-family firms differed in various aspects of customer service • Family firms: informal and unwritten customer policies, with more flexibility, relying on trust in employees • Non-family firms: higher level of formal, written, and structured customer service policies, more impersonal	n/a
McGuire et al. (2012)	Journal of Business Research	CSR	Firm	*Quantitative*	Social performance data of 473 (118 family and 355 non-family) firms	• Family firms have a better social performance than non-family firms	n/a

Table 2: Overview of reviewed articles (continued)

Study	Journal	Category	Research object	Type of analysis	Study type/ sample	Key findings	Theoretical perspective
Memili et al. (2010)	Journal of Family Business Strategy	Family firm image	Firm	*Quantitative*	Mail survey with 163 privately held Swiss family firms	• Strong identity overlap between the family and the firm positively influences the likelihood for family firms to build a family firm image • In turn, family firm image positively impacts (self-assessed) firm performance in terms of higher growth effects (sales and market share growth)	Organiza-tional identity theory
Micelotta and Raynard (2011)	Family Business Review	Family firm branding	Firm	Quantitative	Website analysis of 92 of the world's oldest family firms (Europe, Anglo-Saxon countries South Africa, Latin America, Japan)	• Depending on their industry and size, family firms apply different branding strategies as to whether the central element in their branding strategy is the family, the product, or the company • Family preservation (family as the focal item) = small, local firms with non-technological focus • Family enrichment (convey family ownership, but focal item is product/service) = industries emphasizing craftsmanship and innovation such as the luxury goods (e.g., jewelry) and service sector (e.g., banking) • Family subordination (downplaying family ownership) = large multinational companies	Corporate brand identity
Miller and Le Breton-Miller (2003)	Strategic Organization	Consumer perceptions	Firm	*Conceptual*	n/a	• Attributes typically associated with family firms are trust, commitment, and a customer-oriented focus • Family identity can be used strategically to gain a competitive advantage	n/a
Moore (2006)	International Journal of Consumer Studies	Consumer perceptions	Consumer	*Qualitative*	Semi-structured and in-depth interviews with 50 Irish consumers of farmers markets	• Consumers prefer (organic) family firms for being smaller, more homely, honest, trustworthy, very informed, giving good advice and creating a personal touch	n/a

Table 2: Overview of reviewed articles (continued)

Study	Journal	Category	Research object	Type of analysis	Study type/ sample	Key findings	Theoretical perspective
O'Boyle et al. (2010)	Family Business Review	CSR	Firm	*Quantitative*	526 U.S. family firms	• Positive relationship between family involvement and ethical focus • Increased ethical focus as a predictor of increased financial performance	n/a
Orth and Green (2009)	Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services	Consumer perceptions	Consumer	*Quantitative*	Experiment with 26 students from a public university in the U.S.	• Family-owned grocery stores scored significantly higher on image, service, trustworthiness, and customer satisfaction • Family-owned grocery stores associated with higher frontline employee benevolence and better problem-solving orientation • However, worse selection and price/value	n/a
Panwar et al. (2014)	Journal of Business Ethics	Consumer perceptions CSR	Consumer	*Quantitative*	Mail survey with 278 U.S. consumers	• Perceived legitimacy for CSR activities higher for family firms compared to non-family firms • Suggests a positive consumer perception of family firms regarding CSR	n/a
Presas et al. (2011)	Journal of Brand Management	Family firm branding	Firm	*Qualitative*	Case study of tourism industry	• Conceptual model showing how family firms (tourism industry) can build a successful family brand and how this can get an essential part of the guest experience	n/a
Robins (1991)	Journal of Marketing Management	Family firm marketing practices	Firm	*Qualitative*	In-depth case study of large UK family firm	• Family firm's marketing planning of tactical, short-term nature; no formal, long-term strategic marketing planning - however, sophisticated marketing at the operational level • Family firms seem not to correspond with traditional "evolutionary" models used in marketing literature	n/a
Ruiz Jimenez et al. (2015)	Journal of Business Ethics	Family firm culture	Firm	*Quantitative*	Survey with 410 managers from 126 (90 family, 36 non-family) firms	• Family firms show higher levels of organizational harmony, defined by work climate, trust, and participation in family firms • Positive and significant influence of harmony on family firm performance	n/a

Table 2: Overview of reviewed articles (continued)

Study	Journal	Category	Research object	Type of analysis	Study type/ sample	Key findings	Theoretical perspective
Smith et al. (2014)	Journal of Family Business Strategy	Consumer perceptions	Firm	*Quantitative*	Online survey with 125 senior executives/owners of U.S. retail and service sector family firms	• Strong, positive relationship between trust and relationship commitment (in retailer-vendor strategic partnerships) • Family influence creates value in strategic partnership relationships	Commitment-trust theory
Stavrou et al. (2007)	Journal of Business Ethics	Consumer perceptions	Firm	*Quantitative*	204 (102 family, 102 non-family) Fortune 500 businesses	• Family firms downsize less irrespective of financial performance considerations	Stakeholder theory
Steier (2001)	Family Business Review	Consumer perceptions	Firm	*Qualitative*	Case studies of 3 Canadian family firms	• Trust is a strategic advantage to family firms • Authors discuss how trust as a governance mechanism evolves as family firms mature	n/a
Sundara-murthy and Kreiner (2008)	Entrepreneur-ship Theory and Practice	Family firm identity	Firm	*Conceptual*	n/a	• Family firms differ in the degree to segment/integrate their family and firm identity • Authors argue that the family firm identity is so unique that it cannot easily be copied by a non-family firm	Boundary theory
Tagiuri and Davis (1996)	Family Business Review	Consumer perceptions	Firm	*Conceptual*	n/a	• Family firm attributes create loyalty and promote trust	System theory
Tokarczyk et al. (2007)	Family Business Review	Market orientation	Firm	*Qualitative*	In-depth interviews with 8 family firms from the food and forest industry	• Higher levels of familiness are related to higher levels of market orientation • As a market-oriented culture was positively associated with firm performance in the literature, authors argue that familiness can contribute to building a competitive advantage in family firm	RBV
Uhlaner et al. (2004)	Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development	CSR	Firm	*Qualitative*	Interviews with small and medium-sized Dutch family firms	• Family firms tend to have a special relationship with their stakeholders (especially with their customers and employees)	n/a

Table 2: Overview of reviewed articles (continued)

Study	Journal	Category	Research object	Type of analysis	Study type/ sample	Key findings	Theoretical perspective
Vallejo (2008)	Journal of Business Ethics	Family firm culture	Firm	*Quantitative*	Survey with 410 employees from 126 (90 family, 36 non-family) firms	• Culture in family firms differs from culture in non-family firms • Level of harmony is higher in family firms Family firm employees show higher levels of commitment	Institutionalism, transformational leadership theory
Zachary et al. (2011)	Family Business Review	Market orientation	Firm	*Quantitative*	Content analysis of 1,120 shareholder letters from 224 S&P 500 family and non-family firms	• Family firms exhibit lower levels of market orientation compared to non-family firms	n/a
Zellweger et al. (2010)	Journal of Family Business Strategy	Consumer perceptions Family firm identity	Firm	*Conceptual*	n/a	• Family firm identity contributes to firm performance: • Inside: due to identity overlaps (family and firm identity) family managers incentivized to support goals and strategies of the firm • Outside: positive consumer perceptions about family firms • However, there also seem to be negative associations with family firms such as nepotism and particularism	Organizational identity theory
Zellweger et al. (2012)	Journal of Family Business Strategy	Family firm image CSR	Firm	*Quantitative*	Mail survey with CEOs of 179 privately held Swiss family firms	• Family firm image positively impacts performance • Community social ties (CSR), family firm pride, and long-term orientation influence the likelihood of family firms to communicate their family firm status to external stakeholders	Organizational identity theory
Zellweger et al. (2013)	Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice	Family firm identity	Firm	*Conceptual*	n/a	• High overlap between family/firm identity makes family concerned to protect and strive for a favorable corporate reputation • Due to this, family firms increasingly strive for nonfinancial goals (satisfaction of non-family stakeholders), the higher the identity overlap	Organizational identity theory

2.2.1 Consumer perceptions of family businesses

2.2.1.1 The consumer as a research object

There is little research that specifically investigates whether consumers actually perceive family businesses differently from non-family businesses. In the literature search, I found eleven articles that explored existing associations to family-owned businesses among consumers or potential job candidates in particular. Even though job candidates are not consumers in a direct sense, they have an external, consumer-like perspective on family firms.

One of the first studies that sheds insight into the perception of family-owned businesses was conducted by Moore (2006). Focusing on a specific consumer - the consumer of organic fresh fruits and vegetables who buys at farmers markets in Ireland - Moore (2006) was interested in why such products are bought, how the interaction and experience was with the vendor, how and why trust was generated and how this fitted into the overall lifestyle and identity of the consumer. Via fifty in-depth interviews he found that consumers prefer (organic) family businesses for being smaller, homely, very informed and for giving good advice. Moreover, consumers appreciated the "personal touch" family businesses create. "Talking to the people" who ran the businesses made consumers believe that there is more honesty in the transaction (Moore, 2006). His findings suggest that consumers perceive family-owned businesses as more trustworthy, specifically when they are small and consumers are able to directly interact with the owner of the business.

Similar results were found by Orth and Green (2009) who looked at how consumers perceive and relate to family and non-family owned grocery stores. They used a critical incident approach and exposed 126 students from a public university in the US to generic store type information (either of a family-owned or a non-family owned grocery store) and asked them to recall a specific store that fitted this profile. They then used a questionnaire to find out how the family-owned stores were evaluated in terms of image, trustworthiness, satisfaction, and loyalty in comparison to their non family-owned counterparts. They found that family-owned grocery stores scored significantly higher on image, service, trustworthiness, and customer satisfaction. Moreover, consumers associated family firms with higher frontline employee benevolence and a better problem-solving orientation. In terms of selection and price/value, family firms scored worse and there were no differences in loyalty. But even though being a family business did not have a direct effect on loyalty, the authors used an integrative loyalty framework to show how image elements influence consumer loyalty directly and indirectly via satisfaction and trust.

In their exploratory work, Carrigan and Buckley (2008) tried to better understand UK and Irish consumer perceptions of family firms. They conducted 19 semi-structured in-depth interviews with female consumers within both rural and urban areas. The interviews were structured along the themes of how and why they shopped the way they did, how they felt about the shopping choices and how they experienced shopping in a family business. Their results indicated that consumers ascribe significant integrity to the way family firms are run and that they have high trust and faith in their honesty. This resulted in a higher expectation of the product and service quality of family firms versus non-family firms. Consumers even expressed that they were willing to pay more for the better quality experience – for example a consumer stated "I do find sometimes that you are going to pay extra for the experience of shopping in a family business (...) but I think the experience is more pleasurable so it outweighs the expense for me anyway" (Carrigan & Buckley, 2008, p. 661). Mutual trust was also reflected in consumers' anecdotes on pricing; they believed that the family business would charge the appropriate amount, even if the pricing structure was unclear.

Another finding of Carrigan and Buckley's (2008) work was that consumers connected a "feel good" factor with family firms. This was attached to a "personal touch" and a "special bond" that family firms create with their consumers. For instance, family firms were described as having a better understanding and knowledge of the consumer; for example, they knew their names or were aware of their specific preferences and shopping habits. Moreover, consumers believed that they had friendlier, well-trained, and more loyal staff. Consumers highly valued these attributes as it made them fell "special" and more valued by the family firm, which in turn created "authentic" and enduring relationships. Often, the personal touch was also connected to the fact that there was a high proximity to the owner of the business. This fostered mutual trust, as consumers believed that the owner had more "at stake" and thus invested more in each transaction than other type of firms. Further, many consumers believed that family firms are more socially responsible. They were described as providing social contributions to the community "in return for the customer base they get from the community" (Carrigan & Buckley, 2008, p. 663). Both in urban and rural areas, family firms were seen as "part of the 'glue', that held together their communities" (Carrigan & Buckley, 2008, p. 663). Another participant stated that a family business is "...a small-ish, kind of brings to mind things like cosy, comfortable, I would expect loyalty, not particularly high-tech, and part of the community, quite community-oriented" (Carrigan & Buckley, 2008, p. 656). Moreover, consumers associated family firms with small, local businesses. For instance a consumer argued that, “When someone’s dealing with (...) a family business (...) you wouldn’t just be a number, you would actually be a person (...) you feel you can trust them (...) that they’re not going to let you down (...) big businesses like Tesco, I don’t think they’d be so bothered because there’s lots of other people, they’re not bothered about using you and they’re not bothered about you (...) you’re not an individual, you’re just one of the masses” (Carrigan & Buckley, 2008, p. 661).

Another study that suggests that family firms are perceived positively by consumers was conducted by Krappe et al. (2011). Using an empirical approach based personal construct theory and drawing from identity-oriented brand theory and a sociological-based understanding of brands, the authors investigated the distinct connotations consumers have with family firms and whether family firms are perceived as a brand on their own. Based on two-staged qualitative interviews with a sample of 110 consumers across Germany, the authors found that family firms are seen as the most sustainable and social type of firm. Family firms were perceived as specifically socially responsible and as good employers with fair and safe working conditions. However, at the same time, Krappe et al. (2011) also found negative associations related to family firms. Specifically mid-sized family firms were perceived as being hierarchic, stagnant, less flexible, and less innovative. The authors argued that “family” evokes a twofold connotation in the mind of consumers and that the “perception of family businesses and their different evaluations are clearly influenced by the underlying myths of surrounding the family, when compared to other company forms” (Krappe et al., 2011, p. 44). Based on the distinct perceptions about family firms among consumers, Krappe et al. (2011) concluded that family firms can be in fact described as a brand of their own.

Based on the first findings indicating a positive consumer perception of family businesses, Binz et al. (2013) were the first to empirically test the relationship between consumer perception and actual consumer buying preferences. Specifically, they hypothesized that family firms have a superior firm reputation which in turn positively translates into consumer buying preferences for family firm products and services. In an online survey with 253 Swiss consumers (of which 174 participants completed the family firm version and 79 the non-family, publicly-owned firm version), they collected data on how consumers perceive the corporate reputation of family and non-family businesses and how they would hypothetically rate their preferences and purchase intentions. Corporate reputation was measured in terms of “relational” and “business” qualities. Relational qualities are those related to how a company does its business. They include whether a consumer has a good feeling about the firm, trusts, admires and respects the company; whether the company seems to stand behind its products, supports a good cause, is environmentally friendly and whether it maintains high standards with its employees. Business qualities are those related to what a company does to be successful. Business qualities look at whether the firm develops innovative and high-quality products, has good employees, whether it offers good value for money and tends to outperform its competitors (Binz et al., 2013). Consumer preferences were measured on the basis of three items; namely the hypothesized relevance of the products and services[6], the hypothesized buying preference[7] and the willingness to pay a price premium for the product or service[8] (Binz et al., 2013, p.7). Using covariance-based structural equation model, Binz et al. (2013) results showed a meaningful and significant relationship between relational qualities and consumer preferences for family firms. In terms of business qualities, the relationship was insignificant – for both types of firms. The authors concluded that communicating the family firm status to consumers is valuable as it fosters consumers' preference for the products and services offered by the family firm, mainly because of the relational qualities consumers associate with family firms.

Another study was conducted by Kovács, Carroll, and Lehman (2014). They tested the often-used theoretical assumption that authentic organizations receive higher value ratings. Even though they did not focus on family businesses specifically, they looked at whether certain types of organizations, including those that are family-owned, are more likely to be perceived as authentic. In a first study, they conducted a content analysis of 1,271,796 unsolicited online reviews of 18,869 restaurants in three major US metropolitan areas from 2004 to 2011. The results indicated that restaurants perceived as authentic by consumers received higher ratings, even after controlling for restaurant quality. Moreover, independent, family-owned, and specialist restaurants were perceived as more authentic by consumers than chains, non-family-owned, and generalist restaurants. Kovács et al. (2014) confirmed these findings in a second, experimental study similar to the one by Orth and Green (2009). Participants received descriptions and photos of restaurants

[6] "When you purchase a product or service, how important is it that the company you buy from is a [family firm/publicly-owned (non-family) company], and not a [publicly-owned (non-family) company/family firm]?"
[7] "In a purchasing situation, I would prefer the product or service of a [family firm/publicly-owned (non-family) company] over the product or service of a [publicly-owned (non-family) company/family firm]"
[8] "I would be willing to pay somewhat more for the product or service of a [family firm/publicly-owned (non-family) company] as compared to a product of service of a [publicly-owned (non-family) company/family firm] owned all else being equal"

that fitted the restaurant categories determined in the first study and were then asked to evaluate the restaurant in terms of authenticity, quality, and overall value (Kovács et al., 2014).

The study by Panwar et al. (2014) compared family with non-family firms from a consumer perspective in respect to the perceived legitimacy of CSR actions. Using a sample of 278 U.S. consumers, they found that the perceived legitimacy for CSR activities was higher for family firms compared to non-family firms, suggesting a positive consumer perception of family firms in regard to CSR.

The most recent study that investigated consumer perceptions of family firms was conducted by Beck and Kenning (2015). Based on an online survey with 142 German consumers, the researchers investigated the effect of a retailers' family firm image on new product acceptance of unfamiliar products sold at the retailer. They found that a strongly perceived family firm image increased perceived trustworthiness. Moreover, their findings suggest that a strong family firm image of the retailer increases new product acceptance. Hence, similarly to the study by Binz et al. (2013), the study by Beck and Kenning (2015) offers explanatory value to the consequences of a positive consumer perception of family firms, suggesting that there is a positive effect on consumer buying preferences. However, as Beck and Kenning (2015) looked at the retailer's family firm image and the new products introduced at the retailer concerned other, unknown firms, the conclusion is only of an indirect nature.

Lastly, there is also research on how family firms are perceived by potential job candidates, namely by university students. In her empirical analyses, Covin (1994a, 1994b) was interested in the attitude of university students towards family firms and their employment preferences in family firms. Her findings suggest that family firms are perceived as good and more loyal employers. They are seen as a desirable career choice (Covin, 1994a), and perceived as being more concerned about the happiness of their employees, more moral and more open to problems (Covin, 1994b). The study by Hauswald, Hack, Kellermanns, and Patzelt (2015) supports these findings. Based on a conjoint experiment with 175 German senior-level business administration students the authors found that family firms are often associated with trustworthiness, security, and stability but also with inflexibility and resistance to change. Moreover, their study suggests that even though family influence attracted potential job candidates in general, the degree of attraction depended on the job seekers' personal values (e.g., students who valued conservation were more attracted than students who valued openness to change).

In summary, first empirical evidence suggests a positive consumer perception of family firms on which family firms could capitalize when promoting their family firm status. However, it is necessary to further confirm these findings. As the literature reviews shows, only a small number of studies specifically investigate consumer perceptions of family firms. Thus, even though a favorable consumer perception of family firms "remains an intuitively attractive proposition, little empirical evidence exists to support the belief" (Carrigan & Buckley, 2008, p. 657).

Furthermore, the studies in this subchapter had a very narrow focus in terms of the type of family business they used as a reference point: grocery stores, farmers markets in Ireland, and restaurants. This was helpful for first, exploratory work, but as these are all rather small and local types of businesses, it raises the question of whether these results can be generalized to other types and especially to larger family firms. Even though Carrigan and Buckley (2008) asked consumers about their associations and shopping experiences with family firms in general, the answers by respondents imply that consumers thought about small, local family businesses. The authors noted that the failure of consumers to recognize the scale and scope of family businesses indicates that especially international family firms do not promote their family ownership.

Binz et al. (2013) did not resolve this issue as they, similar to Carrigan and Buckley (2008), asked consumers about family firms in general, without providing any details or hypothetical company information. From these quantitative approaches one cannot draw conclusions about the type of family firm consumers have in mind when they answer the questions.

Lastly, the study by Orth and Green (2009) used hypothetical store information to describe a family/non-family grocery store. When reading through the store type information it quickly becomes clear that the descriptions were not sufficiently objective as they implied certain positive assumptions about family firms. For instance, the family firm version included sentences like, "Employees are treated as family and remain with the store longer than usual" whereas the non-family version read, "Employees are treated correctly and remain with the store about average" (Orth & Green, 2009, p. 252). Internal validity, meaning that the manipulation of the independent variable is the only explanation for variations in the dependent variable (Cook & Campbell, 1979; Shadish, Cook, & Campbell, 2001), was not ensured in their experiment.

2.2.1.2 The firm as a research object

There are, in addition, empirical and conceptual studies that allow conclusions about the perception of external stakeholders on family firms. Even though conclusions largely speak in favor of a positive stakeholder perception of family firms, the literature also raises negative associations.

Craig et al. (2008), in an empirical study, looked at whether the communication of the family firm status influences firm performance. Their findings, based on a quantitative study that included 218 family business leaders, suggest that developing and promoting a “family-based brand identity” positively influences firm performance indirectly, via a customer-centric orientation. They concluded that a “family-based brand enhances the family business’ ability to persuade customers to make purchasing decisions based on the perceived attributes of the seller” (Craig et al., 2008, p. 351), such as being specifically trustworthy and customer-oriented.

Further, there are theoretical findings suggesting that stakeholders, including consumers, bestow positive attributes on family firms. Dyer (2006) argued that external stakeholders tend to have a positive perception of family businesses due to the goodwill and trustworthiness they associate with the family name. Hauswald and Hack (2013) hypothesized that family ownership positively influences stakeholders' perception of benevolence. Furthermore, several anecdotal contributions argued specifically that family firms can capitalize on their trustworthiness (Cruz, Gomez-Mejia, & Becerra, 2010; Dyer, 2006; Eddleston, Chrisman, Steier, & Chua, 2010; Miller & Le Breton-Miller, 2003; Smith, Hair, & Ferguson, 2014; Steier, 2001; Tagiuri & Davis, 1996; Ward & Aronoff, 1995), commitment and customer-orientation (Miller & Le Breton-Miller, 2003).

Furthermore, family firms downsize less than non-family firms (Block, 2010; Stavrou, Kassinis, & Filotheou, 2007) and they donate more (Stavrou et al., 2007). It can be assumed that these characteristics can contribute to a positive public perception of family firms as being a “good employer” and caring about their communities.

However, the literature also referred to negative stereotypes associated with family firms. These include nepotism, particularism and being stagnant and resistant to change (Binz et al., 2013; Dyer, 1988; Hauswald et al., 2015; Krappe et al., 2011; Zellweger et al., 2012). However, as these negative perceptions by stakeholders remain largely anecdotal they need to be empirically explored in more detail.

2.2.2 Family firm identity and culture

In the family business literature, there is a stream of research that looks at family firm identity and culture. It was early argued that one aspect that differentiates family businesses from non-family businesses is culture (Dyer, 1988) and the cultural aspect even became one aspect of defining family firms in the essence approach (Astrachan et al., 2002). As described in chapter 1.4, firm identity and culture are intra-organizational characteristics that provide ideas on how family firms might portray themselves (firm image) differently and thus be perceived differently (firm reputation) by stakeholders. Hence, it is necessary to include and discuss these findings here. But, as mentioned earlier, I will only present those studies that have explanatory value in the research context of this dissertation – those that can be linked to the marketing context. For instance, studies that looked at how family firm identity or culture impacts succession or strategy development were left out. In addition to the study by Dyer (1988) mentioned earlier in the context of consumer perceptions, I found seven relevant studies that I elaborate on in more detail in the following section. All of them address the overarching question of whether and why family firms behave differently than their non-family firm counterparts.

Vallejo (2008) looked at the question of whether the culture of family firms and non-family firms is different. Based on a sample of 410 questionnaires from 126 family and non-family firms, his empirical study found that the culture is indeed different: in family firms, the level of harmony is higher and employees of family firms show greater levels of commitment. Similar results were found in the study by Ruiz Jiménez, Vallejo Martos, and Martínez Jiménez (2015). In interviews with 410 family and non-family managers from 90 family firms and 36 non-family firms, they found higher levels of organizational harmony, defined by work climate, trust, and participation in family firms. Moreover, they showed that harmony had a positive and significant influence on family firm performance. Likewise, the culture survey by Denison, Lief, and Ward (2004) based on a sample of 20 family firms and 389 non-family firms found that the corporate culture of family firms was more "positive" than the culture of their non-family firm counterparts. For example, family firms had higher investments in the development of their people and they were more consistent in their culture in terms of core values and agreement. Taken together, these findings suggest that employees in family firms tend to have a positive opinion of family firms as being a "good employer". This is in line with the findings by Covin (1994a, 1994b), as described in the subchapter 2.2.1.1, indicating that family firms are often perceived as good, more loyal and moral employers. Employees are consumers in their private domain and share their views and opinions.

Hence, this positive perception can be (at least partially) transferred to a general consumer perception of family firms.

Zellweger et al. (2010, 2013) introduced organizational identity theory to examine the question of why family firms behave differently. In a theoretical study, Zellweger et al. (2013) investigated why family firms strive for nonfinancial goals, which is a point often argued in the family business literature. They maintained that a controlling family will be concerned about protecting and striving for a favorable corporate reputation if there is a high overlap between the family and the organizational identity. Hence, family firms increasingly strive for nonfinancial goals, namely the satisfaction of non-family stakeholders via, for example, autonomy, supportiveness, or trustful relations, the higher the identity overlap between family and firm. Zellweger et al. (2010) elaborated further on the theory of organizational identity as a dimension of familiness. The authors argued that the organizational identity dimension demonstrates how a family defines and views the firm and hence facilitates the creation of familiness. They hypothesized that leveraging organizational identity aspects of familiness both inside and outside the firm can lead to performance advantages. Internally, family firm managers are incentivized to make great efforts in supporting the family firm goals and strategies as family and firm identities are often strongly intertwined. If the family also personifies the business to external stakeholders, for example, by bearing the family name in the company name, the family firm identity becomes an external resource to the firm as family firms seem to be perceived positively by consumers. Hence, the authors concluded that family firm identity can create distinctiveness and even translate into a competitive advantage (Zellweger et al., 2010). This conclusion is supported by the research by Sundaramurthy and Kreiner (2008) that investigated the integration of family and business identities based on boundary theory and suggested that a family firm identity is so unique that it cannot be easily copied. This is a perquisite for competitive advantage (Sundaramurthy & Kreiner, 2008).

Based on the assumption that family involvement creates a source for distinctiveness and competitive advantage, Botero et al. (2013) were the first to suggest the idea of multiple family firm identities and to explore if and how family firms communicate their family identity to external stakeholders. To do so, they analyzed 1,036 family firm websites from the U.S., UK, and Australia and found that family firms differ in their likelihood to disclose their family firm identity. Only 57% communicated the family firm status on their websites of which 26% used explicit messages such as “we are a family firm” in the “home” page or “about us” page. Of those, only 7% of the analyzed firms used explicit messages in both pages. Based on these results, the authors argued that it "seems like family businesses are not leveraging the positive associations that can result when involvement of the family is communicated to stakeholders" (Botero et al., 2013, p. 20). The likelihood of disclosure of the family firm identity was dependent on firm characteristics. The authors found a positive correlation with the age of the family firm. Also, there were differences among industries: family firms operating in the retail or manufacturing industry were more likely to communicate their family firm status whereas there was a negative correlation in the service sector. Moreover, family firms operating in B2C markets were more likely to disclose the family firm identity compared to B2B markets. However, the authors do not provide a "why" to these results.

2.2.3 Family firm image and reputation

There is research that specifically investigates family firm image and reputation. The guiding question of the studies in this field is whether a family firm image/reputation positively impacts firm performance. Firm image and firm reputation are strongly intertwined and largely used interchangeably in the family firm literature; however, they are different. As described in chapter 1.4, firm image can be described as how a firm portrays itself (e.g., as a family-owned firm), which is usually an outcome of a firm's intra-organizational characteristics, its identity (does the firm understand itself as a "family firm"?). The respective research related to family firm identity was presented in the last chapter. Firm reputation is what external stakeholders actually perceive (Brown & Dacin, 1997). Thus, firm image and firm reputation can be seen as "two sides of the same coin".

In the systematic literature review, eight relevant articles fell in this category, of which three (Beck & Kenning, 2015; Binz et al., 2013; Craig et al., 2008) were already discussed in the subchapter 2.2.1 due to content overlaps with consumer perception research. For those articles, I will only discuss the new, additional insights here. The studies in this category investigated the reputation of family firms compared to non-family firms (Deephouse & Jaskiewicz, 2013), the implication of a family firm image on firm performance (including mediators of this relationship) (Craig et al., 2008; Kashmiri & Mahajan, 2010, 2014a; Memili et al., 2010; Zellweger et al., 2012), and consumer preferences (Beck & Kenning, 2015; Binz et al., 2013).

Deephouse and Jaskiewicz (2013) analyzed whether family firms have a better reputation than their non-family owned counterparts and whether the reputation of family firms is even higher when the family name is part of the company name. Using a sample of 194 large firms from eight different countries with disparate governance systems and cultures, of which 61 were family-owned (family member part of the board) and of those 21 had the founders' family name in their company name, they interviewed on average 175 respondents per firm. Respondents consisted of different actual and potential stakeholder groups (e.g., customers, employees, investors and community members). Their results suggest that family firms have a better reputation, and that the corporate reputation is even higher, if the family firm is family-named. Based on identity theory and the concept of SEW, the authors argue that the higher the identification with the business, the higher the likelihood that a favorable reputation will be protected as it contributes to the families' SEW. The authors argued that "heightened identification motivates family members to pursue a favorable reputation because it allows them to feel good about themselves, thus contributing to their socioemotional wealth" (Deephouse & Jaskiewicz, 2013, p. 337). Identification increases when the family name is part of the company name. Moreover, family ownership and family board representation were positively correlated with a favorable reputation. They concluded that this is because a family needs to have sufficient organizational power to be able to implement appropriate measures enhancing a favorable corporate reputation (Deephouse & Jaskiewicz, 2013).

In a quantitative study, Memili et al. (2010) found evidence for a positive relationship between family firm image and performance. Based on a mail survey approach with 163 privately held Swiss family firms, the authors investigated how family ownership and family expectations affect the development of a family firm image and entrepreneurial risk taking, and eventually firm performance. They found that family ownership and high family expectations, meaning a strong identity overlap between the family and the firm, positively influenced the likelihood of family firms building a family firm image. Moreover, they showed that a family firm image in turn positively impacted (self-assessed) firm performance in terms of higher growth effects (sales and market share growth). They explained this relationship with the help of organizational identity theory arguing that family managers have more at stake if there is a high identity overlap between family and firm, making them more prone to protect the corporate image. The study by Zellweger et al. (2012) focusing on an organizational identity perspective complements Memili and colleagues' (2010) findings. Based on a sample of 179 privately-held Swiss family firms, in which CEOs held an ownership stake, they found that a family firm image positively impacted (self-assessed) performance. Also, they showed that community social ties, family firm pride, and long-term orientation influenced the likelihood of family firms to communicate their family firm status to external stakeholders.

The studies by Kashmiri and Mahajan (2010, 2014a) analyze the family firm image from a different angle. Unlike the other studies described here, they contrasted family firms with each other: those that carry the family name in their company name with those that are non-family named. Even though not all family-named family firms might be recognized as family firms (e.g., Dell Inc.), the authors argue that family-named family firms are more likely to be recognized as such by consumers and stock markets and rewarded for being family firms, for instance with higher perceived trustworthiness of new product introductions. Hence, I included the articles in the family firm image rather than the family firm identity category of the literature review. In their first study, Kashmiri and Mahajan (2010) investigated whether family-named family firms and non-family named family firms differ in their strategic behavior and their performance. Based on a sample of 130 publicly-owned family firms in the U.S., they found that family-named family firms differed substantially in the following characteristics: family-named family firms had higher levels of CSR, a higher representation of consumers' voice (i.e., they were more likely to include a chief marketing officer on their boards), and they had a higher strategic emphasis (i.e., they allocated more resources to advertising than to research and development (R&D)). Similar to previous argumentation in this stream of research, the authors concluded that this is because of higher reputational concerns. If the firm image suffers in a family-named family firm, the family image suffers as well. Hence, the family is more prone to protect their corporate image. Moreover, the authors showed that family-named family firms actually also performed better (i.e., in terms of return on assets (ROA)) and that this positive relationship was partially mediated by higher CSR levels as well as by their higher strategic emphasis.

Kashmiri and Mahajan (2014a) investigated whether family-named family firms perform better in terms of a higher shareholder value impact for their new product introductions. Similarly to their previous research, they asked themselves whether this relationship would be mediated by differences in the firm's strategic behavior. Based on a survey among 107 publicly listed family firms from the U.S. and 1,294 of their new product introductions, they found that family-named family firms indeed performed better in terms of shareholder value. Moreover, they showed that this performance was partially mediated by their ethical product-related behavior: firms with the family name as part of their company name tended to have a history of avoiding product safety issues and deceptive advertising. The authors concluded that the “presence of the founding family’s name as part of a family firm's name acts as a valuable firm resource" (Kashmiri & Mahajan, 2014a, p. 81).

In their study, Craig et al. (2008) suggested that customer buying behavior is not directly influenced by the fact that a company portrays itself as a family firm. Rather, it is that consumers only effectively recognize the values related to a family firm image when a family firm engages in a customer-centric competitive orientation towards the marketplace. As already described in 2.2.1.2, the authors' empirical look at whether the communication of the family firm status influenced firm performance found that developing and promoting a family firm image positively influenced performance (in terms of growth, profitability) indirectly, via a customer-centric orientation. By contrast, a product-centric orientation did not channel a family firm image in a way that it impacted firm performance.

The studies by Binz et al. (2013) and Beck and Kenning (2015) as already mentioned in chapter 2.2.1.1, provide implications about the effect of a family firm image on consumer preferences and hence, ultimately on family firm performance. Beck and Kenning (2015) found that the higher a retailers' family firm image, the better consumers accepted new, unfamiliar products sold at the retailer. Their findings imply that a family firm image has a positive effect on consumer buying behavior. Binz et al. (2013) argued that family firms have positive attributes bestowed on them by consumers, namely "relational qualities"[9]. The authors found that these relational qualities positively influence consumer preferences for family firm products and services. Thus, they concluded that communicating the family firm status positively impacts firm performance.

2.2.4 Family firm branding

I found five studies which explicitly deal with family firm branding (strategies); all of them are of qualitative or conceptual nature. The studies tried to identify the branding strategies that family firms use (Blombäck & Brunninge, 2013; Micelotta & Raynard, 2011); their rational behind it (Blombäck & Ramírez-Pasillas, 2012), whether family firms can be described as a brand on their own (Krappe et al., 2011), or they used case studies to understand how a successful family

[9] Relational qualities are those related to how a company does its business and include whether a consumer has a good feeling about the firm, trusts, admires and respects the company; whether the company seems to stand behind its products, supports a good cause, is environmentally friendly and whether it maintains high standards with its employees (Binz et al., 2013).

corporate brand can be created (Byrom & Lehman, 2009; Presas, Muñoz, & Guia, 2010). As already described in subchapter 2.2.1.1, the study by Krappe et al. (2011) suggests that family firms are perceived as a brand on their own as consumers have distinct associations about family firms.

Micelotta and Raynard (2011) analyzed how family firms communicate their family ownership visually and textually on their official company websites. By doing so, they contribute to the research described in 2.2.2 conducted by Botero et al. (2013) who found that family firms vary in whether and how they communicate their family firm identity on their websites. Based on a sample of 92 of the world's oldest family businesses, Micelotta and Raynard (2011) found that family firms apply different branding strategies as to whether the central element in their branding strategy was the family, the product or the company. They referred to these strategies as family preservation, family enrichment, and family subordination. The family preservation strategy sets the family as a focal item in branding – for example, the family name, family emblems, or family photos are prominently depicted on the websites and the core of corporate branding. The authors found that family firms applying the family preservation strategy were usually rather small, local firms with non-technological focus. Firms pursuing the family enrichment strategy convey their family ownership, but the focus of their branding is product or service attributes. The authors identified this strategy as particularly prominent in industries that emphasize craftsmanship and innovation such as luxury goods (e.g., jewelry) and service sector business (e.g., banking). As the authors noted, "the products and services are portrayed as being continuously enriched over time, as cumulative know-how and skills are passed from one generation of the family to the next" (Micelotta & Raynard, 2011, p. 211), making this strategy specifically useful to convey trust, authenticity and ability. The third strategy, namely the family subordination strategy, downplays family ownership and focuses on the company, for example, on past achievements and its vision – somehow distancing it from the family origin. This strategy has been used specifically by large multinational companies. To explain the use of this strategy, the authors referred to past research that argued that family firms can also evoke negative associations, such as being inefficient or less professional. Moreover, they hypothesized that another reason for deemphasizing family ownership could be that 7 of the 21 firms in this category were publicly traded. They reasoned that for such companies it might be easier to appeal to and serve a large and varied number of stakeholders when downplaying family ownership (Micelotta & Raynard, 2011).

Blombäck and Brunninge (2013) looked at the opportunities of heritage-based branding for family firms. They were interested in this topic because they hypothesized that as family firms are “hybrid” identity organizations, they can leverage this identity co-existence in building heritage-based brands and corporate identities. In their conceptual work, their argument was based on the concept of brand heritage and findings from the family business literature; they developed six typologies to illustrate types of historical references in family firms. Their typology is based on different degrees of communicating the family, business and family business history and can serve as a marketing planning tool for family firms.

In another study, Blombäck and Ramírez-Pasillas (2012) examined why family firms choose to build a family-based brand. Based on qualitative interviews with 14 CEOs from small and medium-sized Swedish family firms, they identified three types of logic for choosing and developing a family-based corporate brand identity, guided by intuitive, emergent, and strategic processes. Family firms following the intuitive process based their family firm brands on subconscious and instinctive beliefs and constructed the family firm brands with no or only very limited corporate brand management and marketing planning considerations. They also identified family firms that build family firm brands based on an emergent process in which the creation was based on an interplay between the company's and family managers' identities. In the third category, they found family firms that build family firm brands based on rigorous strategic marketing planning. Unfortunately, the authors did not reveal how many family firms fell in each category, but they explicitly noted that the “results highlight how decisions that define corporate brand identity are not necessarily a consequence of rigorous marketing planning, but are sometimes made without concern for marketing matters” (Blombäck & Ramírez-Pasillas, 2012, p. 7). However, their sample only included small companies and these often do not have rigorous marketing planning - independent from being a family firm or not.

Based on a case study in the tourism industry, Presas et al. (2010) developed a conceptual model to illustrate how firms operating in the tourism industry can build a successful family brand and how this can become an essential part of the guest experience. The study by Byrom and Lehman (2009) investigated heritage and innovation in family businesses using a case study on the Australian brewery “Coopers”. The authors showed Coopers Brewery to be a firm that successfully leverages its family ownership to build a strong brand. To do so, Coopers Brewery emphasizes the family's history and tradition in their marketing strategy and engages in high levels of philanthropic activities positively affecting the firm's reputation in its community. The authors framed this concept as an “extended family” approach, which is expressed in how consumers, employees and the community are engaged.

2.2.5 Family firm market orientation

Three studies investigated the market orientation of family firms. Two of the studies compared family firms with the others to identify the characteristics that lead to market orientation in family firms. Based on a case based approach with eight family firms from the food and forest products industry, Tokarczyk, Hansen, Green, and Down (2007) found that higher levels of familiness are related to higher levels of market orientation. They concluded that “familiness qualities, including, but not limited to, strategic focus, customer orientation, family relationships, and operational efficiency, do contribute to a propensity for execution of an effective market orientation” (Tokarczyk et al., 2007, p. 17). Based on past literature that has shown that a market-oriented culture is positively associated with firm performance, they argued that familiness can contribute to building competitive advantage in family firms. Based on a quantitative study of small, established family firms from Belgium and the Netherlands, Beck et al. (2011) analyzed whether the generation in control influences the level of market orientation. The authors found that family firms controlled by the founding family engaged in higher levels of market orientation than family firms controlled by later generations. This is basically in line with the findings by Tokarczyk et al. (2007), as familiness should be higher when the founding family is still in place to run the business rather than when later generations, who are often more dispersed in their interests and ownership structure, are in charge.

Somewhat in contrast to the findings described above, which suggest that family involvement is generally positively associated with market orientation, Zachary, McKenny, Short, and Payne (2011) showed that family firms exhibit lower levels of market orientation than their non-family firm counterparts. They based their conclusions on a content analysis of 1,120 shareholder letters from 224 businesses in the S&P 500.

2.2.6 Family firm marketing practices

Six studies focused on the marketing behavior of family firms. They looked at whether family firms are different in their marketing planning (Robins, 1991) or purchasing behavior (File, Mack, & Prince, 1994), and whether family firms outperform non-family firms because of their (unique) marketing behavior (Kashmiri & Mahajan, 2014b). Moreover, there are three studies that looked at customer service or customer relationship management in family firms (Cooper, Upton, & Seaman, 2005; Danes, Stafford, Haynes, & Amarapurkar, 2009; Lyman, 1991).

Robins (1991) investigated the marketing planning of larger family firms based on an in-depth case study on one such business. He found that marketing planning in this type of firm was different to traditional marketing theory. Even though the marketing mix was found to be in effective use and taken very seriously, its planning was of a tactical, short-term nature and the author did not find a formal, long-term strategic marketing planning. Robins (1991) concluded that marketing planning did not correspond with the "evolutionary" models used in marketing literature, which argues that marketing professionalizes as the firm grows and matures. Robins (1991) reasoned that "there might be a category of company that succeeds in developing quite sophisticated marketing at the operational level without undertaking strategic marketing at all. Indeed, the value of this case study from a theoretical perspective is that it shows how highly professional, integrated marketing can be managed for a long period of time without ever "maturing" into a really forward-looking strategic process" (Robins, 1991, p. 339). How the family component influenced and enhanced this specific marketing behavior was not investigated by the study and thus remains unclear, requiring more research to derive meaningful conclusions and subsequent practical implications.

File et al. (1994) investigated how marketing of family firms differs from non-family firms in a business-to-business (B2B) context in terms of their purchasing behavior. Based on an exploratory study of 124 family and non-family firms, they found that family firms interact differently with their service providers before, during and after the purchase. For instance, they were more likely to engage in a more intensive pre-purchase search, in positive post-purchase word-of-mouth and showed higher levels of post-purchase loyalty. The study supports past research findings that family firms act differently towards their stakeholders (in this case service providers) (Cennamo et al., 2012; Zellweger et al., 2010; Zellweger et al., 2012). Thus, one can conclude that "otherness" of family firms in terms of behavior stimulates a different and unique external perception of family firms.

Kashmiri and Mahajan (2014b) analyzed whether family firms engage in a unique marketing behavior and whether it helps them outperform non-family firms during recession. Based on a quantitative study with 275 large publicly listed U.S. firms (148 family and 127 non-family firms) they identified that family firms indeed exhibit a unique marketing behavior. In contrast to non-family firms, they tended to continue high levels of advertising intensity and rates as well as higher rates of new product introductions in times of economic downturn. Moreover, family firms sustained higher levels of CSR. Family firms outperformed non-family firms during recession (in terms of Tobin's q[10]), which was partially mediated by their proactive marketing behavior and higher focus on CSR.

Lyman (1991) investigated whether family and non-family firms differ in their customer service practices, hypothesizing that family ownership has a positive influence on customer service interactions. Based on interviews with 78 business managers (48 were family members of the owner family) of rather small, face-to-face businesses (e.g., clothing shops, grocery stores, or gift shops) in California, the author looked at how family values influenced the design and implementation of customer service practices. The findings indicated that family-owned stores differed in various aspects from non-family-owned stores when it came to customer service. Customer policies were rather informal and unwritten, allowing more flexibility and relying on trust in their employees. The focus was on the emotional reaction to the policy rather than on certain, desired behaviors that employees were required to show. In non-family businesses, Lyman (1991) found a higher level of formal, written, and structured customer service policies. Customer service was more impersonal and policies were rather detailed. In contrast to family businesses, policies focused on a required behavior as a reaction to customer concerns. Moreover, service policies functioned as a supervisory mechanism for employees.

Lyman's (1991) findings are in line with existing research findings on how consumers perceive the customer service of family firms described in subchapter 2.2.1: family firms are associated with higher frontline employee benevolence, a better problem-solving orientation, and creating a more personal touch. In line with this, Danes et al. (2009), who interviewed 572 managers from small family firms, found that family firms had a high customer focus, rating customer reputation as their most relevant business goal. Unfortunately, the authors did not compare their findings with non-family firms.

The study by Cooper et al. (2005) suggests contrasting conclusions. Based on a web-survey with 452 business executives (370 non-family and 82 family businesses[11]) obtained from a market research panel, they found that family business managers did not consider customer relationship management more important to their firm's success than did non-family firm managers. Moreover, the authors determined that non-family firms were ahead in initiating and implementing customer

---

[10] Tobin's q is a performance measure and the formula for calculating it is: share price at end of calendar year ∗ number of common stock shares outstanding at end of calendar year + liquidating value of the firm's preferred stock + current liabilities − current assets + book value of long-term debt) / book value of total assets (Kashmiri & Mahajan, 2014b).
[11] Of those, 49 firms had less than 500 employee and 11 firms had more than 10,000 employees.

service initiatives, which is in line with the findings by Lyman (1991), which suggested informal and unwritten policies in family firms. However, the differences found between family and non-family firms in Lyman's (1991) study might be due to differences in firm size. Small firms usually have less professionalized processes. Even though Lyman (1991) looked at small, face-to-face businesses, it was not clear whether the non-family owned stores in his sample were part of a larger chain.

2.2.7 Family firms and corporate social responsibility

As the research findings in the previous subchapters suggest, CSR seems to be a particularly important marketing tool for family firms. As described earlier in another context, family firms were found to engage in higher levels of CSR than their non-family business counterparts (Kashmiri & Mahajan, 2014b), especially when the family name was part of the company name (Kashmiri & Mahajan, 2010, 2014a) and when the family firm engaged in a family firm image (Zellweger et al., 2012). Moreover, customers often perceive family firms as being more socially responsible than non-family firms (Binz et al., 2013; Carrigan & Buckley, 2008; Krappe et al., 2011; Panwar et al., 2014).

In the literature search, I found a large number of studies dealing with CSR in family firms[12]. Only those studies were included that are of explanatory value for understanding whether family firms are perceived as more socially responsible and why. Articles that took a very detailed view on, for instance, differences among family firms along certain CSR dimensions (e.g., Marques, Presas, & Simon, 2014; Niehm et al., 2008), were excluded. In total, this resulted in fourteen articles adding to the CSR-related findings described earlier[13]. Here, unlike in the previous subchapter, studies are not described in detail, but rather main findings and implications for this research are summarized.

Eight studies compared family firms with non-family firms. Their findings suggest that CSR practices differ in terms of ethics-related attitudes, behaviors and experiences. For instance, family firms employed informal methods to encourage ethical behavior compared to formal codes

---

[12]For a detailed review on CSR, philanthropic practices and ethics in family firms refer to the Special Issue of the Family Business Review (2014) on “Social Issues in the Family Enterprise” (van Gils, Dibrell, Neubaum, & Craig, 2014).
[13]The studies referred to CSR as “corporate social performance” and/or “proactive stakeholder engagement”. I will use these terms analogously with CSR in the following.

in non-family firms (Adams, Taschian, & Shore, 1996). Moreover, emotions seem to play a more important role in family firms (Block & Wagner, 2014). Furthermore, empirical findings suggest that family ownership positively influences the level of CSR (Bingham, Gibb Dyer, Smith, & Adams, 2011; Dyer & Whetten, 2006; McGuire, Dow, & Ibrahim, 2012) and the firm's environmental performance in terms of pollution (Berrone, Cruz, Gomez-Mejia, & Larraza-Kintana, 2010). But, as Cruz et al. (2014) found, the positive effect of family ownership seems to focus on external stakeholders; internally, the authors found negative effects and explained that this is due to a SEW bias. Lastly, the previously mentioned study by Panwar et al. (2014) found that perceived legitimacy for CSR activities is higher for family firms compared to non-family firms, suggesting that consumers perceive social commitments in family firms as a somewhat "natural" mode of behavior.

Further, there are five studies that considered the heterogeneity of family firms. In line with the empirical findings described above, these findings suggest that higher family ownership is generally positively associated with corporate social performance, charitable donations (Dou et al., 2014), and ethical behavior (O'Boyle, Rutherford, & Pollack, 2010). This is backed up by further qualitative findings that showed that family firms focus on building social wealth over generations (Gallo, 2004) and thus engage in building special relationships with their customers and employees (Uhlaner, van Goor-Balk, & Masurel, 2004). However, Deniz and Suarez (2005) empirically showed that family firms differ in CSR based on their orientation towards CSR, which can be associated both with negative and positive characteristics of their relationship to stakeholders.

Finally, there are also conceptual contributions that explain why family firms engage differently in CSR. Based on the SEW concept, Cennamo et al. (2012) argued that family firms show higher levels of corporate social performance than non-family firms based on considerations designed to preserve their SEW. Using the same theoretical perspective, Kellermanns, Eddleston, and Zellweger (2012) reasoned similarly, but stressed that SEW can also negatively affect corporate social performance, for example, via family-centric behavior. This is in line with empirical findings suggesting that family ownership does not always affect corporate social performance only in a positive way (Cruz et al., 2014; Deniz & Suarez, 2005) emphasizing that CSR commitment is not always a universal characteristic of family firms. However, a general conclusion on a positive perception related to CSR can be drawn from the research presented here.

2.3 Summary

The literature review leads to the three following main conclusions, which are also summarized in Table 3.

Conclusion 1: Family firms have unique characteristics, which generally lead to positive perceptions by internal (e.g., employees) and external (e.g., customers and service providers) stakeholders.

Table 4 provides a detailed overview of internal and external stakeholders' associations with family firms identified in the literature review. There is both empirical and theoretical/ anecdotal evidence for the specific associations stakeholders appear to have with family firms. The empirical evidence, as subdivided in Table 4, was generated in consumer related studies with the consumer as the unit of analysis. There is also some empirical evidence with the firm as the unit of analysis, which allows inferences about the perception of stakeholders about family firms.

Most of the associations with family firms are of a positive nature. Research findings indicate that family firms are often perceived as more trustworthy compared to their non-family firm counterparts (e.g., Beck & Kenning, 2015; Binz et al., 2013; Carrigan & Buckley, 2008; Moore, 2006). Moreover, initial results indicate that family firms are perceived as more authentic (Kovács et al., 2014) and are perceived as providing a value-added service, better quality (Carrigan & Buckley, 2008; Kovács et al., 2014; Orth & Green, 2009) and social contributions to the community (Carrigan & Buckley, 2008; Krappe et al., 2011; Panwar et al., 2014). Also, family firms are frequently perceived as "good" employers (Binz et al., 2013; Covin, 1994a, 1994b; Hauswald et al., 2015; Krappe et al., 2011), with friendly, well-trained, and loyal staff (Carrigan & Buckley, 2008; Moore, 2006; Orth & Green, 2009). In addition, family firms were found to downsize less in times of economic downturn (Block, 2010; Stavrou et al., 2007) possibly contributing to a positive perception as a "good" employer. On the negative side, however, family firms are associated with such things as nepotism and particularism or as being resistant to change (Binz et al., 2013; Dyer, 1988; Hauswald et al., 2015; Zellweger et al., 2012). Nevertheless, this evidence remains largely anecdotal and has not been sufficiently empirically confirmed.

Even though many large, international firms are family-owned, family firms are perceived as being small and local (Carrigan & Buckley, 2008; Micelotta & Raynard, 2011; Moore, 2006). Carrigan and Buckley (2008, p. 659) argued that while this "suggests limited awareness of the scope and scale of family businesses, it may also reflect the lack of emphasis placed upon their family credentials by international firms." Indeed, the research conducted by Micelotta and Raynard (2011) suggests that large family firms especially hesitate to emphasize their family ownership in their external communications. Botero et al. (2013, p. 19) hypothesize, "it may be that managers and decision makers in family firms may not see these benefits and, therefore, see no reason to explicitly communicating their family firm image to others outside or inside the firm."

Moreover, as illustrated in Table 4, family firms were found to show unique, positive behaviors. They seem to engage in building a positive organizational culture (Denison et al., 2004; Ruiz Jiménez et al., 2015; Vallejo, 2008) and engage in higher levels of CSR (e.g., Berrone et al., 2010; Dyer & Whetten, 2006; Kashmiri & Mahajan, 2010, 2014a, 2014b). Moreover, family firms tend to focus on the consumer in their marketing activities and customer relationship practices, specifically acting customer-oriented (e.g., Craig et al., 2008; Danes et al., 2009; Lyman, 1991). Even though research largely confirms these positive behaviors, there are also partially ambiguous findings. For instance, Cooper (2005) found that family firms did not consider customer relationship management to be more important than did their non-family firm counterparts. Non-family firms were even ahead in initiating and implementing customer service initiatives. Such mixed findings indicate that a strict differentiation between family and non-family firms is not always useful. As it is increasingly noted in the family firm literature, family firms are not a homogenous group of firms but heterogeneous in many dimensions as they come from a variety of industries and cultural backgrounds (Chrisman et al., 2012; Chua et al., 2012; Sharma & Nordqvist, 2007; Zellweger et al., 2013). However, as this research focuses on whether there are general differences between the consumers' perception of family firms compared to non-family firms, I will maintain this differentiation throughout this dissertation.

Table 3: Literature review's main findings

Conclusions	Details	Studies
1 *Family firms have unique characteristics, which generally lead to positive perceptions by internal (e.g., employees) and external (e.g., customers and service providers) stakeholders ...*	... see findings in Table 4	see Table 4
2 *Communicating the family firm status appears to have a positive effect on firm performance, because ...*	... consumer perception is positive and influences consumers' buying preferences for family firm products and services	Direct empirical evidence: Binz et al. (2013) Indicational evidence: Beck and Kenning (2015)* Craig et al. (2008)**
	... due to identity overlaps and subsequent reputational concerns, family firms are more prone to protect their corporate image. Due to this, they tend to have a better reputation, engage in higher levels of CSR, the satisfaction of non-family stakeholders, and more ethical product-related behavior (e.g., no deceptive advertising) and behave more long-term oriented	Direct empirical evidence: Memili et al. (2010) Zellweger et al. (2012) Indicational evidence: Deephouse and Jaskiewicz (2013)*** Kashmiri & Mahajan (2010, 2014a)*** Zellweger et al. (2010)****
	... of their customer-centric/market orientation	Craig et al. (2008)
3 *There are differences among family firms in communicating their family firm status, based on ...*	... the degree of family ownership, family pride, long-term orientation, community social ties and identity overlap (family and firm) - the higher, the more likely it is that the firm portrays itself as a family firm	Memili et al. (2010) Zellweger et al. (2012)
	... the firm's age (the older, the more likely), market focus (family firms operating in B2C markets are more likely to communicate their family firm status), industry sector (family firms operating in the retail, manufacturing or luxury goods industry are more likely to communicate their family firm status whereas there is a negative correlation in the service sector), country of origin (communication of family firm identity more likely in Australia compared to US)	Botero et al. (2013) Micelotta and Raynard (2011)
	... the firms' size (small, local firms with non-technological focus tend to emphasize their family ownership - large, international firms tend to undermine their family ownership)	Carrigan and Buckley (2008) Micelotta and Raynard (2011)
	... strategic marketing planning considerations	Blombäck and Ramírez-Pasillas (2012)

* Look at the retailers' family firm image.
** Focus on the firm as a research object, not the consumers.
*** Differentiate between family-named and non-family named family firms. This does not equal family firm image vs. no family firm image. However, Kashmiri et al. (2014a) suggest that family-named family firms tend to be recognized as such by external stakeholders (e.g., consumers, stock markets) and get rewarded for being family-owned (e.g., via higher perceived trustworthiness).
**** Conceptual article.

Table 4: (Unique) characteristics of family firms

	Characteristics		Empirical evidence: Consumer perspective	Empirical evidence: Firm perspective	Conceptual/Anecdotal: Firm perspective
Associations with family firms	*General (positive)*	**Trustworthy**	Beck and Kenning (2015) Binz et al. (2013) (via Relational Qualities) Carrigan and Buckley (2008) Moore (2006) Orth and Green (2009)	Craig et al. (2008)	Dyer (2006) Cruz et al. (2010) Miller and Le Breton-Miller (2003) Steier (2001) Smith et al. (2014) Tagiuri and Davis (1996) Ward and Aronoff (1995)
		Authentic	Kovacs et al. (2014)		
		Honesty/integrity	Carrigan and Buckley (2008) Moore (2006)		
		Personal touch, special bond, "feel good" factor, more "homely"	Binz et al. (2013) (via Relational Qualities) Carrigan and Buckley (2008) Moore (2006)		
		Better staff (friendlier, well-trained, more loyal, gives good advice, is very informed)	Carrigan and Buckley (2008) Moore (2006) Orth and Green (2009)		Lyman (1991)
		Goodwill, benevolence			Dyer (2006) Hauswald and Hack (2013) Miller and Le Breton-Miller (2003)
		Good employer (e.g., more loyal, more open to problems, more concerned about the happiness of their employees, less downsizing, more positive firm culture and organizational harmony)	Binz et al. (2013) (via Relational Qualities) Covin (1994a, b) Hauswald et al. (2015) Krappe et al. (2011)	Block (2010) Denison et al. (2004) Ruiz et al. (2015) Stavrou et al. (2007) Vallejo (2008)	
	General (neutral)	**Small**	Carrigan and Buckley (2008) Moore (2006)		
	General (negative)	**Nepotism, particularism**		Dyer (1988)	Binz et al. (2013) Zellweger et al. (2012)
		Resistant to change/stagnant/inflexibility	Hauswald et al. (2015) Krappe et al. (2011)		Zellweger et al. (2012)
		Price/value & selection worse (in grocery stores)	Orth and Green (2009)		

Table 4: (Unique) characteristics of family firms (continued)

	Characteristics		Empirical evidence: Consumer perspective	Empirical evidence: Firm perspective	Conceptual/Anecdotal: Firm perspective
Behaviors of family firms	*Unique marketing behavior*	**Unique marketing behavior** (e.g., higher levels of advertising intensity and rate of new product introduction in recession; often no long-term, strategic marketing planning)		Blombäck and Ramírez-Pasillas (2012) Kashmiri and Mahajan (2014b) Robins (1991)	
		Customer-oriented		Craig et al. (2008) Danes et al. (2009) Gallo (2004) Lyman (1991) Uhlaner et al. (2014) *Constrasting findings*: Cooper et al. (2005)	
		Higher product & service quality	Carrigan and Buckley (2008) Kovacs et al. (2014) Orth and Green (2009)		
		Higher market orientation		Beck et al. (2011) Kashmiri and Mahajan (2010) Tokarczyk et al. (2007) *Constrasting findings:* Zachary et al. (2011)	
		Post-purchase loyalty (B2B context)		File et al. (1994)	
	Sustainability/ Ethics	**(More) socially responsible, environmentally friendly and ethical**	Binz et al. (2013) (via Relational Qualities) Carrigan and Buckley (2008) Krappe et al. (2011) Panwar et al. (2014)	Adams et al. (1996) Berrone et al. (2010) Bingham et al. (2011) Dou et al. (2014) Dyer and Whetten (2006) Gallo (2004) Kashmiri and Mahajan (2010) Kashmiri and Mahajan (2014a, b) McGuire et al. (2012) O'Boyle et al. (2010) Uhlaner et al. (2004) Zellweger et al. (2012) *Mixed findings:* Cruz et al. (2014) Deniz and Suarez (2005)	Block (2010) Cennamo et al. (2012) Kellermanns et al. (2012)
	Culture	**Unique organizational culture**		Block (2010) Denison et al. (2004) Ruiz Jimenez et al. (2015) Vallejo (2008)	Dyer (2006) Zellweger et al. (2010)

Conclusion 2: Communicating the family firm status appears to have a positive effect on firm performance.

There is empirical evidence that family firms portraying themselves as family-owned have better performance when compared to non-family firms and non-family named family firms. For instance, family firms have been found to have a better reputation than non-family firms, especially when the family name is part of the firm name (Deephouse & Jaskiewicz, 2013). Additionally, family-named family firms were shown to perform better than non-family named family firms (Kashmiri & Mahajan, 2010, 2014a). Moreover, there are studies that have empirically linked the promotion of a family firm image with superior firm performance (Beck & Kenning, 2015; Binz et al., 2013; Craig et al., 2008; Memili et al., 2010; Zellweger et al., 2012).

Research applied different perspectives in terms of research focus and theory to analyze and explain their findings. The studies by Binz et al. (2013) and Beck and Kenning (2015) were the only studies investigating the consumer perspective. Binz et al. (2013) found that a family firm image positively influences consumer buying preferences for family firm products and services. Beck and Kenning (2015) showed that a retailer's family firm image positively influences the acceptance of new, unfamiliar products sold at the retailer. However, their findings are only indirectly related to family firm products and services as the unfamiliar products were produced by other, unknown firms. However, this indirectly supports the findings by Binz et al. (2013) as they suggest that a family firm image positively influences buying preferences. Similarly, but focusing on the firms' market orientation as a research object, Craig et al. (2008) argued that communicating the family firm status leads to performance advantages in family firms when there is a (customer-centric) market orientation. All other studies focused on the firm and its intra-organizational characteristics (e.g., the family and the firm identity) in explaining their findings. Specifically, these studies used organizational identity theory and the concept of SEW, maintaining that family firms behave more responsibly due to identity overlaps between the family and the firm identity. These studies argue that this leads to reputational concerns, specifically when the family name is part of the firm name. This, in turn, leads to higher levels of CSR, more ethical product-related behavior (e.g., less deceptive advertising), the satisfaction of non-family stakeholders, and ultimately to superior firm performance (Deephouse & Jaskiewicz, 2013; Kashmiri & Mahajan, 2010, 2014a; Memili et al., 2010; Zellweger et al., 2010; Zellweger et al., 2012).

In summary, the “family” component appears to make family firms act and behave differently due to (family and firm) identity overlaps and SEW preservation consideration. These considerations make them more prone to protect their corporate image/reputation and seem to encourage a socially responsible, customer-centric market orientation. In turn, family firms are perceived positively by their stakeholders. Ultimately, this perception apparently affects consumer buying preferences for family firm products and services.

Conclusion 3: There are differences among family firms in communicating their family firm status.

Not all family firms communicate their family firm status. In their empirical study, Botero et al. (2013) found that only half of the 1,036 family firms analyzed actually disclosed their family firm status, and only one out of four family firms disclosed their status in an explicit manner. Specifically, large, international firms hesitate to emphasize their family ownership (Carrigan & Buckley, 2008; Micelotta & Raynard, 2011). Also, there appear to be differences in the likelihood of communicating the family firm status depending on the family firm's age (positive correlation), its market focus, and industry sector. For instance, in B2C markets, as well as in the retail, manufacturing, and luxury goods industry, family firms are more likely to communicate their family firm status. Moreover, it has been argued that the likelihood that a family firm will emphasize family ownership externally depends on the degree of ownership and the degree of the overlap between the family and the firm identity; the greater the overlap, the more likely it is that the firm will portray itself as a family firm (Memili et al., 2010). Lastly, Blombäck and Ramírez-Pasillas (2012, p. 7) have determined that those family firms that communicate family ownership, often do not act so as “a consequence of rigorous marketing planning”, but sometimes without deliberate marketing planning considerations. Whether some family firms communicate their family firm status to benefit from positive consumer perceptions remains unexplored.

In conclusion, the findings of the literature review imply that it is basically favorable for family firms to build a family firm image and include the family firm status in the marketing and branding strategies. Building a family firm image appears to be a valuable source of distinction.

However, the findings also show that there is generally little research at the intersection of marketing and family businesses. Thus, further research is required to confirm the first findings. In particular, there is a lack of knowledge when it comes to consumer perceptions and buying behavior. There are only a few studies that provide indications of how consumers perceive family firms (Beck & Kenning, 2015; Binz et al., 2013; Carrigan & Buckley, 2008; Kovács et al., 2014; Moore, 2006). Moreover, to my knowledge, only one study (Binz et al., 2013) directly addressed the question of how the assumed positive perceptions actually influence consumer buying behavior.

As Carrigan and Buckley (2008, p. 657) note, even though a favorable consumer perception of family firms "remains an intuitively attractive proposition, little empirical evidence exists to support the belief." To date, research has largely focused on the firm as a research object and remained largely theoretical or anecdotal when it comes to the consumer. Furthermore, it is of vital interest whether the findings can be generalized to large family firms as to date they often hesitate to promote their family ownership.

If it is favorable to communicate the family firm status, family firms need to understand in detail what consumers think, and how and why they behave the way they do to effectively adapt their marketing strategies. My dissertation aims to tackle these research gaps.

http://www.springer.com/978-3-658-19698-1

The Power of Communicating the Family Firm Status
The Positive Effect of Family Firms as a Brand on
Consumer Buying Behavior and Consumer Happiness
Rosina, M.
2018, XVIII, 188 p. 6 illus., Softcover
ISBN: 978-3-658-19698-1