



AUTHOR(S):

TITLE:

YEAR:

Publisher citation:

OpenAIR citation:

Publisher copyright statement:

This is the _____ version of a work originally published by _____
(ISBN _____; eISBN _____; ISSN _____).

OpenAIR takedown statement:

Section 6 of the "Repository policy for OpenAIR @ RGU" (available from <http://www.rgu.ac.uk/staff-and-current-students/library/library-policies/repository-policies>) provides guidance on the criteria under which RGU will consider withdrawing material from OpenAIR. If you believe that this item is subject to any of these criteria, or for any other reason should not be held on OpenAIR, then please contact openair-help@rgu.ac.uk with the details of the item and the nature of your complaint.

This publication is distributed under a CC _____ license.

NETWORKING AND ENTREPRENEURIAL FAMILY FIRMS

Sarah Drakopoulou Dodd (ALBA Graduate School of Business), Alistair R Anderson (Aberdeen Business School, RGU) and Sarah Jack (Lancaster University)

Sarah Drakopoulou Dodd

Associate Professor of Entrepreneurship, and Academic Director of AHEAD

ALBA Hub for Enterprise and Development, ALBA Graduate School of Business

Athinas Ave. & 2A Areos Str., 166 71 Vouliagmeni, Greece

Tel: +30 210 896 4531-8

E-mail: dodsarah@alba.edu.gr

Alistair R. Anderson

Professor and Director of the Centre for Entrepreneurship

Aberdeen Business School, Robert Gordon University, Kaim House

Garthdee, Aberdeen, AB 24 7QE

Tel: +1224 263883

E-mail: a.r.anderson@rgu.ac.uk

Sarah L. Jack (Address for Correspondence)

Professor – Institute for Entrepreneurship and Enterprise Development

Lancaster University Management School

Lancaster

LA1 4YP

Tel: +1524 593540

Email: s.l.jack@lancaster.ac.uk

Abstract

We investigate the role of networks in the growth processes of the entrepreneurial family firm. The study adds to two main streams of literature, drawing together theoretical developments from the family firm realm and networking theory, to investigate the ways in which these structures and processes interact to facilitate and inhibit entrepreneurial growth. The chapter also draws on international field data, thus adding to our knowledge of the context-specific nature of entrepreneurial growth processes, family firms, and networking. Growth strategies for many of the studied family firms tended to be driven by resources available within the family-firm nexus. In many cases, market and technology evaluation took place through quite formal, “professional” mechanisms. The use of weak-ties, which has come to be seen of diminished importance for non-family entrepreneurs, appeared more significant for family-firm growth.

Acknowledgements: Special thanks to research assistants, Alexis Komselis (of AHEAD, ALBA) and Artur Steiner (SRUC) for their support around some data collection activities. And, to the Institute for Entrepreneurship and Enterprise Development (IEED) and Lancaster University for its support for this project through Higher Education and Innovation Funding (HEIF).

Key Words: Family-Owned Business; Networking; Entrepreneurship; Venture Growth; International Entrepreneurship

INTRODUCTION

In this Chapter, we investigate the role of networks within the context of family firms. Our concern is how might networks support those family firms that look to engage in the process and practice of entrepreneurship. Our conceptual starting point is that networking provides structure, process and content for entrepreneurial firms (Hoang and Antoncic, 2003; Elfring and Hulsink, 2007; Slotte-Kock and Coviello, 2010). The social ties that form networks shape information, skills and knowledge availability, and perception of specific opportunities (Bruderl and Preisendorfer, 1998; Uzzi, 1997; Davidsson and Honig, 2003; Hite, 2005; Renzulli and Aldrich, 2005). Network relationships frame access to resources, customers and strategic partners, as well as configuring the entrepreneur's own perceived legitimacy. Networks may be especially important within the *familiness* of family business in that they provide external focal points to compare with the internalities of the family itself. The importance of networking holds true for venture creation, as well as for subsequent entrepreneurial developments of the enterprise. Moreover, ventures which survive start-up, and pursue growth, show signs of substantial evolution in their networking practices and relationships. In essence then, the importance of external business-friendly ties to venture growth is now well established. There is also evidence for the increasing strengthening of what begin as arms-length business ties, but transmute into rich, multiplex and complex relationships.

Family firms are characterized by the work/family dynamic and the relationship which this offers, which has been referred to as being unique (Dodd et al, 2012). But the link to entrepreneurial theorising has drifted as studies have tended to focus on structure, succession and business issues rather than process, practice and what drives their very existence and growth. This is a pity because by the very definition, a family firm is characterised by the special nature of the family relationship. Hence relationships outside

the family should be interesting. Nonetheless, recent discussions have started to recognize that family firms can be entrepreneurial (Fayolle, Randerson, Dossena and Bettinelli, 2014), especially in the ways in which they might grow and develop. However, , much less is known about how the family might draw on networks and the impact these networks might have on if, and how, the family firm practices entrepreneurship and how venture growth might come about. The findings from the general entrepreneurship literature linking entrepreneurial venture growth and networking have thus far been so robust that it seems likely that this ought to be the case in family firms. Nevertheless, there are a number of contingencies which modify the nature of entrepreneurial networking, such as nationality (Dodd et al, 2002), ethnicity (Anderson and Lee, 2008), gender (Jack et al, 2011), class (Anderson and Miller, 2003), business sector, venture position in value-chain, and - as noted already – stage of venture development (Anderson et al, 2010). Moreover, relational issues are likely to have a strong effect on the family firm's distinctive interconnections (Anderson et al, 2012). It thus seems feasible to propose that whilst networking will be as important for family firms as it is for other entrepreneurial ventures, some aspects of networking processes, structures and content may well be specific to the family firm context and influence how they engage with entrepreneurial process and practice.

We therefore pose the question, how do family firms who are engaged in the practice of entrepreneurship enhance, extend and evolve external network ties for venture growth? To address this question, we draw together theoretical developments from the family firm realm, and entrepreneurial networking theory, to analyze data from 12 family firms who were perceived to be acting entrepreneurially through the exploitation of new opportunities (Stevenson and Jarillo, 1990; Shane and Venkataraman, 2000). In doing so we investigate the ways in which these structures and processes interact to impact upon entrepreneurial growth. Three countries were selected for the fieldwork –

Scotland, England, and Greece - and both rural and urban contexts from each country were chosen. Family firms were purposefully chosen (Gartner and Birley, 2002; Pratt, 2009) who were identified as being 1) interesting at a theoretical level and 2) willing to share openly their experiences with the research team. Semi-structured interviews were carried out with 12 family firm entrepreneurs. Special attention was paid to issues relating to networking and growth. The constant comparative method (Jack et al, 2014) was utilized to analyze interview transcripts, with team members moving between data and theory in an iterative pattern until few new insights occurred.

Our findings identified interesting and important divergence in the patterns of networking enacted by family firm entrepreneurs during venture growth. For example, growth strategies for many of the family firms tended to be driven by resources available within the family-firm nexus. Market and technology evaluations took place through quite formal, “professional” mechanisms in many cases. The usage of weak-ties, which has come to be seen of diminished importance for non-family entrepreneurs, appeared more significant for family-firm growth. This has implications for the way we perceive networking within the context of the family firm and especially for the practice of entrepreneurship.

This Chapter presents an overview of the academic literature pertinent to the research question, focusing especially on the growing body of work on entrepreneurial networking and growth, as well as attempting to unpick the complicated story of growth in the family firm. Next, the possible interactions between these two scholarly streams are discussed, to consider the specific nature of family firm networking during venture growth. The study’s methodology is then recounted, followed by our findings. Finally, results are discussed in the light of extant conceptual and empirical contributions, and conclusions drawn.

ENTREPRENEURIAL NETWORKING, GROWTH, AND THE FAMILY FIRM

Entrepreneurial Networking and Growth

In the past decade scholars have attempted to examine the development of entrepreneurial networks over time, from pre-start up through establishment to venture growth. Whilst accepting that there are certainly other valuable approaches to studying entrepreneurial networking throughout the growth process (Jack et al, 2008; Anderson et al, 2010; Slotte Kock and Coviello 2010), the life-cycle, staged model provides a helpful frame for considering these issues. Typically, such an approach focuses on three stages in the new venture's "life": pre-start; establishment, and growth (see for example, Jack et al, 2008, 128-129).

Considering first the pre-start phase, entrepreneurs dedicate a substantial amount of time to deploying existing social contacts, and identifying who key contacts may be to secure resources (Larson and Starr, 1993). Indeed, the very opportunity and resource perception which gives rise to the venture may derive largely from nascent entrepreneurs' close social ties (Hite, 2005). Existing social networks thus provide the main foundation for the venture (Lechner and Dowling, 2003), and are especially likely to include family, friends and business contacts from earlier employment (Anderson et al, 2010; Larson and Starr, 1993; Pages and Garmise, 2003; Ram, 2001). Family members in particular are often especially important and promote entrepreneurship, identify opportunities, offer practical assistance, provide specialized advice and act as sounding blocks. Former colleagues and customers offer a mid-level entry point for the new venture (Anderson et al, 2010). Much time is spent developing and maintaining these key contacts (Greve and Salaff, 2003), although there is also some evidence of new, instrumental ties being generated to meet specific start-up needs (Larson and Starr, 2003).

Such new ventures as survive the pre-start phase typically next enter a stage of venture establishment. Networks are both *deepened*, through the on-going strengthening of existing ties, and also *broadened*, through the development of new network contacts. Ties which during start-up were essentially instrumental are often deepened, with social dimensions developing in economic ties, and potentially vice versa, as relationships become multiplex (Larson and Starr, 1993; Johannisson, 1995). In terms of broadening networks, Jack et al (2008) find that entrepreneurs may recognize the need to shift the level, managerial position and status of their business contacts to a higher plane. They seem to achieve this by gathering a very wide pool of potential strong-tie contacts, with whom they share personal affinity, and who also appear to offer possible benefits to their firm. Greve and Salaff (2003) also find that during venture establishment more time is spent on network expansion. Technology entrepreneurs, in particular, have been shown to increase sales through the development of marketing networks during venture establishment, whilst also making the most of their technology base by leveraging co-opetition networks (Lechner and Dowling, 2003).

After establishment, ventures that have survived and thrived typically strive to attain substantial growth. This is the main focus of the current study, and hence will receive more detailed analysis than the two earlier stages (pre-start and establishment) reviewed above. One hallmark of entrepreneurial networking at the growth stage is that some aspects of strong-tie interaction may become routinized, or delegated to other people within the entrepreneur's venture (Larson and Starr, 1993; Jack et al, 2008). This provides the relational space for the entrepreneur to "trigger" the pool of latent ties developed during establishment, hunting for the ideas, opportunities and resources that will fuel their growth (Greve and Salaff, 2003; Jack et al, 2008). Similarly, Lechner and Dowling (2003) show that technology

entrepreneurs often achieve venture growth by extending the co-opetition networks (activated during establishment) into through-going technological partnering.

Many scholars note that during the growth phase, it is probable that relational limits may be reached (Lechter and Dowling, 2003). Specific relational ties achieve their full multiplex complexity and richness during the growth stage, with strong emotional bonds, high levels of trust, elevated exchanges of information and resources, and well-integrated organizations (Larson and Starr, 1993). Entrepreneurs and their strong ties may thus already be giving each other such an abundance of support that still more is not really possible. To grow further, an entrepreneur must find ways to move beyond what Hite and Hesterley (2001) perceptively call “identity-based strong tie networks”, to avoid being held back by over reliance on family and friends ties (Johannisson and Mønsted, 1997). Practices to overcome these relational constraints may include a more calculative approach to rationally choosing network partners (Hite and Hesterley, 2001); as well as continued development and deployment of ever-higher level strong ties. Other approaches uncovered in studies of entrepreneurial growth networking include internalizing high-level strong ties through the mechanism of board directorates. Entrepreneurs have also been found to build new strong ties – often through a brokered connection – to explore specific new product, service and market development. Subsequently, growth is driven by the creation of product and service innovations in line with the articulated needs of these new strong ties, and with the requisite resources extracted from the network, rather than being de facto held within the entrepreneurs’ own venture. As this discussion has shown, in recent years a much clearer and quite consistent picture has emerged of the nature of entrepreneurial networking throughout various stages in a venture’s life. What this has led to is an appreciation of the nature of networking during entrepreneurial growth. However,

still relatively unexplored is the nature of networking of family firms and how this relates to entrepreneurial practice.

It is noteworthy that it is along social cultural lines that differences in entrepreneurial networking can most commonly be seen. Although broad universal patterns in entrepreneurial networking have been observed (Aldrich et al 1989; Johannisson and Nilsson, 1989), national cultures have been found to shape social contexts and patterns and practices of networking in quite specific ways (Birley, Cromie and Myers, 1991; Aldrich and Sakano, 1995; Staber and Aldrich, 1995; Greve, 1995; Drakopoulou Dodd and Patra, 1998; Drakopoulou Dodd et al, 2002; Mitchell et Co, 2004), suggesting various forms rather than being universal in character (Klyver et al: 2007:3; 2008:333-335). For example, recent work has even gone so far as to suggest that German start-up networking patterns may vary very substantially indeed from other cultures (Witt et al, 2008). Other studies have indicated that gender (Aldrich et al; 1989), ethnicity (Bagwell, 2007; Ram, 1993), and indigeneity (Foley, 2008) may also influence some elements of entrepreneurial networking. This is not surprising since, as Curran and colleagues have argued, “networks are best seen as primarily cultural phenomena, that is as sets of meanings, norms and expectations usually linked with behavioural correlates of various kinds” (Curran et al 1995). Since the family is one of humanity’s most significant societal forms, we anticipate that for those engaged in entrepreneurial practices the influence of relational ties on venture growth in family firms is an interesting area to study.

Given the idiosyncratic nature of family firm relational matrices can we expect to see such extensive uses made of external strong ties during venture growth? Equally, since family firms are of their very nature comprised of “identity-based strong ties”, how can they move beyond the constraints of relational

limits to ties for growth? Before we explain how our empirical study explored such issues, it is important to consider the specific nature of growth within the family firm, and its specific facilitators and inhibitors.

The Complicated Story of Growth in Family Firms

The foundation of the family firm is entrepreneurship (Chua et al, 2004). Many family firms act entrepreneurially through identifying and exploiting opportunities (Stevenson and Jarillo, 1990; Shane and Venkataraman, 2000), their behavior, strategies or practices (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996). Yet, little work has been carried out which really delves into the relationship between entrepreneurship and how it connects with family firms (Begin and Fayolle, 2013). Family entrepreneurship offers a way to incorporate what families provide that supports entrepreneurial endeavors (Begin and Fayolle, 2013).

In a family firm, there are many complicated, diverse and every changing interactions between the two key institutions of family and business venture. These complex interactions take place within a frame that appears to *both* simultaneously promote stability and conservatism, whilst *also* seeking entrepreneurial growth. Depending upon which is most likely to protect the socio-emotional wealth invested within their ventures, for example, business-owning families may enact either very risky, or, conversely, very risk-averse, strategic behaviours (Gómez-Meja et al., 2007). Matters are complicated still further, since within the same family firm factions may arise around the degree of individual identification with the family (Minichilli et al, 2010).

The tradition of stability associated with family firms may be characterized by a long-term strategic view, by firm-specific special skills and knowledge, by a passionate commitment to the venture, and by

an emphasis on the continuity of certain core values and norms (Chrisman et al., 2005; Habbershon, Williams and MacMillan, 2003; Habbershon and Williams, 1999; Miller and Le Breton-Miller, 2006; Shepherd and Zahra, 2003; Sirmon and Hitt, 2003; Tagiuri and Davis, 1996; Zahra, 2005; Zahra, Hayton and Salvato, 2004). Recent evidence has emerged that family firms are less likely to engage in diversification than non-family firms (Gómez-Meja et al., 2010). Miller et al (2008) have argued that, if taken to extremes, this stewardship culture may turn into corporate stagnation, and inhibit growth very strongly indeed (see also Arregle, Hitt, Sirmon and Very, 2007). Such stagnation is often associated with a venture culture that prioritizes the needs and desires of the family, through kin-specific altruism (Lubatkin, Schulze, Ling and Dino, 2005; Schulze, Lubatkin and Dino, 2002).

On the other hand, and notwithstanding these forces towards stability and conservatism, family firms have also been found to have some specific drivers of organizational growth. Because ownership and managerial control are so concentrated, family firms may act quite rapidly, aggressively, flexibly and independently (Carney, 2005; Chrisman et al 2009; 745; Miller and Le Breton-Miller, 2006). Innovation and entrepreneurship may also become enculturated within the family firm (Craig and Moores, 2006; Zahra et al., 2004), as key behavioural norms are developed and enhanced over several generations, and thus provide special resources to fuel family firm growth (Eddleston et al 2008:27).

In a recent examination of organization renewal within family firms, Drakopoulou Dodd and Theoharakis (2010) were able to conclude that certain family firms exhibit strong tendencies towards “morphing”, which in turn generated substantial organizational growth. Their findings show that “founder CEOs, CEO growth aspiration, and succession planning facilitate morphing within the family firm.... whilst higher proportions of family employees curtails morphing”.

Overall, then, it seems clear that some family firms develop a culture of innovation and organizational renewal which fuels venture growth. Making the most of their specific knowledge, skill, commitment, flexibility, and rapidity, the enhanced performance of such firms may go some way toward explaining the continued success of the family firm sector (Chrisman et al 2009).

Networking and Growth in the Family Firm

As the literature reviewed above makes clear, most conceptualizations of growth issues within the family firm concentrate on the somewhat paradoxical dynamics of entrepreneurial culture and conservatism. Relatively little consideration has been given to the significance, or otherwise, of networking practices and processes for venture growth and how these support entrepreneurial practice within the family firm environment. Zahra (2010, 358) has shown that family firms leverage their organizational social capital to invest in newer ventures, thus accessing novel knowledge. Miller et al (2008:57) note that the networked cronyism of some large, established family firms with leading institutions (including government) may act to enhance conservatism and to inhibit entrepreneurship. Morck and Young (2003, 2004) have made similar arguments suggesting that successors may be more likely to seek growth through political rent-seeking, rather than through the pursuit of opportunities through entrepreneurship. If this is indeed so, then it suggests at least one possible growth strategy for family firms is indeed dependent upon social capital, albeit through the vehicle of political network ties.

An additional possibility for large family firms may be that their network position places them so as to be visible and attractive to other, potential growth partners. This visibility is enriched by a belief in the legitimacy of the venture as a family firm, which is seen to “guarantee” certain modes of business,

values, and strategies. These two elements – visibility and family firm legitimacy – combine to make the venture and its family members attractive business partners to other similar organisations, who then construct growth opportunity propositions which they present to the large family firm. Evidence for such practices has been found both by sociologists studying the Medici clan in medieval Florence (1993), as well as more recent work examining a large Irish waste management group (Clinton et al, 2010). Similarly, family firms can leverage their social capital to invest in new innovative firms, “in pursuit of new knowledge that can fuel innovation and entrepreneurship, thereby overcoming conservatism” (Zahra, 2010, 359).

Within the entrepreneurial context, ties to others have been argued to shape information, skills and knowledge and how specific opportunities might be perceived and exploited. Network relationships frame access to resources, customers and strategic partners, as well as configuring the entrepreneur’s own perceived legitimacy. Critical to the early stages of the family firm are relationships and entrepreneurship. If networks are key for entrepreneurship (Hoang and Antoncic, 2003; Jack et al, 2008; Slotte Kock and Coviello, 2010), then we can expect those family firms engaged in entrepreneurship to be drawing on the networks in which they are embedded and to use these embedded ties as a mechanism to extend the activities of the firm. The personal and public worlds of the family-in-business are intertwined and because of this we can anticipate that networking will prove important for venture growth. At the very least, we can expect important and complex interactions. It might even be that networks provide external focal points to compare with the internalities of the family itself. What interests us is how do family firms who are engaged in the practices of entrepreneurship enhance, extend and evolve external network ties for venture growth?

METHODOLOGY

For the study, we selected three countries in which to carry out the fieldwork. These were Scotland, England and Greece. We also chose to look at family firms located in both rural and urban contexts from each country. Within these contexts, we also looked to choose family firms who we felt would be willing to share their experiences with members of the research team. Family firms are known for being secretive. So, to enhance the study and our exploration we purposefully sought to look at firms with whom some form of trust was already established as we felt this would lead to more depth in the detail of the data gathered. Sample firms tended to be known to the authors, their research assistants and/or university colleagues. Our selection criteria also involved only those firms who could demonstrate that they were entrepreneurial in their outlook, that growth had been achieved and where at least the second generation of family leader was actually running the venture. All firms also had to have more than one family member employed to work with the business and all had to be controlled by the owning families (Schulze and Gedajlovic, 2010, 197). Table One shows the features of the 12 firms which were used for this study. Our respondents of these firms were typically the current CEO, or led a strategic business unit of the family firm. In one case our respondent was the former CEO of the firm who then moved to the position of Chairman of the Board (President) of the group. Our sampling process was purposeful (Gartner and Birley, 2002; Pratt, 2009). Our sample was theoretical in having the characteristics that fitted our enquiry. Conceptually, our sample consisted of respondents who were all well-placed to discuss entrepreneurial practice, growth strategies and how network ties were drawn on within the context of the family firm.

INSERT TABLE ONE ABOUT HERE

Semi-structured interviews with carried out with our 12 family firm entrepreneurs. Particular emphasis was placed on the themes and issues of interest for the study and which related to networking and growth. Interviews were then transcribed. For the Greek data interviews were also translated into English by the native-speaker interviewer. Following on from this, transcripts were read and re-read, and notes on emergent themes were entered into research diaries (Easterby-Smith et al, 1999). We continued reviewing the material to clarify emergent themes, until few new insights occurred to us (Human and Provan, 1996). As the readings and reflections developed, categories and concepts emerged within our research notes. Incidents and experiences, observations and responses were continually compared with others within emerging categories. This constant comparative method (Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Alvesson and Sköldbberg, 2000; Silverman, 2000) has become an accepted approach of dealing with entrepreneurial network analysis (Human and Provan, 1996; Hill et al, 1999; Jack, 2009). Throughout this process of theme emergence, in constant comparison to extant theory, we iteratively and simultaneously continued the development of our framework, (Uzzi, 1997).

The research team presented and compared the three sets of initial coding, both with each other, and with a working framework of expectations derived from the literature. As field data provided empirical evidence to compare with the framework, elements of it were “retained, revised, removed, or added” (Uzzi, 1997). Coding categories were agreed upon by the research team. We continued the development of our framework, in constant comparison to extant theory, returning to “fine tune” the categories and concepts in the light of this theoretical labour. We then jointly produce an illustrated summary of the major themes and the relationships between them. For the elements within the data which related to networking and venture growth, a simple explanatory framework emerged which encapsulated various aspects of two main themes. The first of these themes covers the origins of growth opportunities, whilst

the second incorporates investigating and enacting growth paths. This framework is presented in the findings below, and provides the basis for our subsequent analysis and discussion.

FINDINGS

Origins of Growth Opportunities

Growth strategies for many of the family firms studied tended to be driven by resources available within the family-firm nexus. We found a strong belief that ready to hand resources should be used as the fundamental basis for building growth opportunities. A variety of family assets were used in this fashion to spring board growth strategy. These included material resources, such as redundant buildings, or land. Also frequently viewed in this way were family human assets. The skills and knowledge of family members – especially younger ones – offered a resource base that could be leveraged to generate growth opportunities.

Interestingly, these growth opportunities often took the form of related diversification, so that a kind of hub and spoke pattern of strategic development emerged, with a range of new “ventures” being grown around the central conceptual and commercial core of the family firm. Several examples of such resource-driven growth paths are presented in Table Two below. Instructive is Ioannis’ comment that this type of development broadens the base of the firm, and reduces the risk exposure which overly-specialized firms can experience. It may be that hub-and-spoke venture growth is especially suited to family firms, as they strive to combine a culture of entrepreneurship and innovation (expressed through the launch of new SBUs), with protecting the family assets from certain external risks (through related diversification), whilst fully exploiting family firm skills, resources, “name”, and knowledge (by spinning new SBUs out from the central core, or hub). Although not the main focus of this study, this is such an interesting finding in its own right that we intend to develop the insights further in future work.

Table Two – Origins of Growth Opportunities

Illustrative Example	Respondent	Source of Capital
“we realized that our location on this very busy main road was an opportunity for us and so my parents developed this idea of the farm shop, and having this building, a redundant barn, in which to develop the shop”	Freda EngFarm	Location and Empty Property drive new opportunity
“This building my Mother ran as a guest house for 10 years to make money for my Father to start his business...this building became the offices for my Father’s company which was growing...then.. the shop in ‘CountryTown’ which had been doing well for a few years, it came into the ground floor of this building”	Elaine EngStone	Multiple uses over time for a specific piece of family property; the largest capital asset in the family.
Jock decided to cease one type of activity, upon which the original business had been founded, because it was an inefficient use of an expensive asset (space, capacity): “because **** was only a small part of the business as it is now the decision was basically made to utilize the space it was taking up”	Jock ScotHome	Under-utilized capacity and capital can also be re-configured to facilitate venture growth
“we decided to expand as we had the capacity”	Andreas HellasDrink	Excess Capacity drives expansion motivation

<p>“everything was on ration...at the end of the war... we just had a small business, just doing some jam when we could get sugar and...putting beetroot into vinegar when we could get jars”</p>	<p>Douglas ScotFood</p>	<p>Post-war growth totally driven by the production in-puts made available during rationing: resource-driven</p>
<p><i>Q: Advantages of family firm?</i> A: “Financially its capital is limited and small...it cannot grow and it can raise limited debt”</p>	<p>Babis HellasSupplies</p>	<p>Lack of financial capital is a barrier to growth in family firms</p>
<p>Giorgos (and later his siblings) developed a diversified business around their produce trading, moving into B2B, distribution, and gourmet importation as their skills, contacts and resources developed (eg, from running their own produce distribution to managing B2B logistics for others)</p>	<p>Giorgos HellasProduce</p>	<p>Family firm skills, resources and contacts used as springboard for venture growth</p>
<p>“I inherited a good name. A brand name....This helped me and I grew fast”</p>	<p>Babis HellasSupplies</p>	<p>Family “core” as foundation for growth</p>
<p>“Stone has always been part of what we do here. There is that thread of continuity and the people who have been coming here for 30 years remember it as such”</p>	<p>Elaine EngStone</p>	<p>Hub and spoke development of diversified ventures around “core” of stone</p>

<p>Hari's family firm has developed a range of diversified ventures around their core skills and brand in the information field, including conferences, print media, e-communication.</p>	<p>Hari HellasInfo</p>	<p>Hub and spoke development of diversified ventures around "core" of information</p>
<p>"The company has widened its product base, by including, apart from *****, products with *****. And we have also taken over distribution for some products. This has given the increase in turnover and has provided a broader base for endurance and growth"</p>	<p>Ioannis HellasDeli</p>	<p>Hub and spoke diversification explained as providing the protection of a broader base.</p>

Family Human Capital and Growth Opportunities

For many respondents, sources of growth opportunities included related-diversification driven by the special skills, interests, and passions of new generation leadership. It was interesting that examples of such growth were proffered during interview by new and old generations alike, and in a variety of commercial settings. As Table Three below shows, the types of family human capital described in this way included business experience outside the family firm, formal education, and interests and passions. Interestingly, explanations for siblings choosing to *not* join the family firm were very often couched in terms of skills, passions and education not being complementary to the firm.

<p>Table Three - Family Human Capital and Growth Opportunities</p>		
<p>Illustrative Example</p>	<p>Respondent</p>	<p>Type of Human Capital</p>

<p>“My daughter...runs the company, she was a management banker, so she is very good with money, that is why she does the takeover things”</p>	<p>Douglas ScotFood</p>	<p>Business experience outside the family firm fuelling growth opportunities</p>
<p>Andreas, like his father, studied chemical engineering. He wanted to be a scientist, to stay in the University, but was tempted back to the family business because “I liked the scientific aspect, not the financial one”. Andreas uses his scientific knowledge - and the large lab he build, to drive new product development.</p>	<p>Andreas HellasDrink</p>	<p>Inclination and education fuelling growth opportunities</p>
<p>“I came back into the business...and my skills complemented theirs, that was to do with people and systems and strategizing...I think my heart was here really, I had a strong connection with the place and was very passionate about what my parents had started here”</p>	<p>Freda EngFarm</p>	<p>Inclination, passion and education fuelling growth opportunities</p>
<p>“Based on my own inclination to science, I managed to combine the experience that was scattered in the business with science. So, nowadays the company has fully covered the product in terms of organization, trading and scientific knowledge”.</p>	<p>Ioannis HellasDeli</p>	<p>Inclination and education fuelling growth opportunities</p>

<p>Babis' sole proprietorship is a sales and service representative for his former employer, but it is so closely linked to the family firm (which sells a different range of specialized supplies) that “we have the same customers, we share some suppliers; and the network”</p>	<p>Babis HellasSupplies</p>	<p>Adding new product range to existing firm, based on new generation prior employment</p>
<p>“That experience of working outside of the business was vastly important to me...going out and measuring yourself against other people and creating your own identity and learning where your skills are...Then knowing what you really want to do, can you do that within your own business?”</p>	<p>Elaine EngFarm</p>	<p>Business experience outside the family firm fuelling growth motivation</p>
<p>“My whole thing was doing things with my hands when I was young, it was making models...it is a very manual business...so when potential suppliers were coming in here with a new product and saying ‘you should sell this’, because of my technical background, you know, we could take it to bits, see if it was a good product”</p>	<p>Jock ScotHome</p>	<p>Screening new product opportunities using skills which have their roots in childhood passions</p>
<p>“I could have not studied correctly, could have flunked through school and then thought, it is alright, I can just go and work for my Dad...I went</p>	<p>Keith EngService</p>	<p>New generation desire to prove itself generates the resources which fuel later</p>

<p>to University, I got a first, I got my Masters, went and worked for a big investment bank...so I always did everything to prove myself, so no one could say it is a silver spoon”</p>		<p>growth</p>
<p>“I think if they went out and learnt something that they could bring to the business that would be better. If you are interested in...what we are doing, then go and find yourself a qualification first...something that you can bring to the business, so you are not tied to it”</p>	<p>Larry EngArtisan</p>	<p>Children, their education and the future of the family business (aged 5 and 8!)</p>
<p>“I used to have lego and make things and she would sit with her ponies and her dolls. Just not interested in this. It is not what drives her; she just likes babies so she is a midwife”</p>	<p>Keith EngService</p>	<p>Sibling chooses to NOT join family firm since interests & skills do not suit</p>
<p>“I have got the common sense, and he has got the intellect...he would be far too advanced for what this company needs...as a kid I was always the one mucking about helping my dad, and he was always the one reading a book or on the computer”</p>	<p>Jock ScotHome</p>	<p>Sibling chooses to NOT join family firm since interests & skills do not suit</p>

Also, when respondents were considering whether, and on what terms, youth and child family members might join the organization, this issue was again raised. In these contexts, many respondents explicitly

stated that youth and child family members should *first* gather educational and experiential capital to bring into the business, as the basis for future growth, before formal employment within the business.

Some of the children discussed in such terms were not yet at school, whilst others were approaching the end of formal education. In some cases, the children themselves were depicted as expressing a desire to develop fully their own talents and potential so as to be able to offer something (other than just the family name) to the venture. Some younger respondents also emphasized how much they had wanted to bring something special to the venture, to be seen to have earned their position. The interest-specific training, experience and education of children was thus seen to offer multiple benefits to the firm: respect for the new entrants, as well as a foundation for future growth opportunities through the development of diverse human resources.

There was little constraint placed on what areas might be helpful for the firm; rather the focus was on the interests, passions and inherent strengths of these young people. However, the complete mismatch between some sibling interests and the family firm were cited as a rationale for their pursuing a career elsewhere, so the scope for the firm to make use of a range of diverse skills was not seen to be infinite, although wide indeed.

Commercial Capital and Growth Opportunities

Another source of growth opportunities was the desire to more fully exploit under-utilized assets, such as property, or excess capacity. Again, these stimulated diversification growth strategies, dependent on the nature of the asset. An empty barn in a great location provided the basis for a shop and café; excess capacity in a manufacturing firm drove the development of a new more modern line of drinks; a large

family home was turned into a guest house to generate funding for other family start-ups; the family brand name allowed a fast-start for a related business supplies venture. All the family firms which we encountered that utilized this approach were based in rural areas, in both countries studied. It may be that the paucity of other resources available within the rural periphery is such as to enforce an enhanced thriftiness upon such family firms, so that maximizing the potential of all commercial capital is especially desirable.

It is instructive that where financial capital is mentioned, it is the *lack* of funds which is sometimes presented as a barrier to growth. The family firms in our study, as the research to date would predict, do not have substantial accumulations of financial assets to drive their growth paths forward. However, nor do they typically seek out substantial growth funds – either as debt or equity –from external stakeholders. There seems relatively little interest in financial capital as a growth tool, nor in developing strong-tie relationships with angel investors, venture capitalists and so forth. One respondent only – Elaine – had borrowed substantially to upgrade her business: but even here her objective was clearly stated as being to make the venture aesthetically perfect, rather than to pursue growth.

Investigating and Enacting Growth Paths

Investigating growth possibilities, making strategic decisions, and implementation of new strategies were largely enacted through on-going, succinct conversations within the immediate group of family-firm employees. However, we also found quite frequent utilization of formal, rational, management techniques for researching, analyzing, and planning growth paths. These two complementary processes contrast with those utilized by non-family entrepreneurs, who often articulate ideas in short intense periods of informal, detailed brainstorming within their firms, with large numbers of their (non-kin)

staff. Idea validation and development for non-family entrepreneurs appears to typically occur through close innovative collaboration with external business-friends, especially customers and suppliers.

On-going Conversational Process

An important element in investigating growth possibilities was also found to involve conversations within the firm. These were not lengthy, one-off brain storming conversations, but rather were typically a series of brief exchanges between family members on going over quite a substantial period of time. Many of these conversational snippets took place within the domestic environment, as well as in the work place, for several of our respondents. Larry's long description of the process, shown below, is replicated in the processes described by many of our respondents (see Table Four).

“Informal, very informal. We just kind of meet up where we need to. We will just pitch some ideas and go away and think about it some more. Come back again, it is that kind of thing you know it grows in the mind, you touch base and it is this constant to-ing and fro-ing over the same thing. There is no formula, but this is an issue now we need some action. It is a just five or ten minutes, here or there, it is constant throughout the day. Nothing, just incidental, you know I am just going down.....have you thought of this....yes, that is a good point, anyway I will speak to you later. It is that non stop, the pair of us and he seems to come to me just as much now, it is very much a two way street, he is as dependent on me as I am on him now, that is the kind of relationship that we have got to”. (Larry)

Table Four -On-going Conversational Process
--

Illustrative Example	Respondent	Aspect of Conversation
<p>“We use each other as sounding boards, you know what are you thinking, what are your thoughts, give it a go”</p>	<p>Larry EngArtisan</p>	<p>Sounding boards</p>
<p>“One of us will come up with a suggestion and we go away and try it, so we do it between us”</p>	<p>Larry EngArtisan</p>	<p>Empiricism – trying ideas out</p>
<p>“We might say a word, ‘we must do this thing. What is your opinion? Yes. Lets do it.’ With very brief processes”</p>	<p>Giorgos HellasProduce</p>	<p>Brevity in decision making</p>
<p>“When I am 80% sure that I want to do something, I ask and then I might be certain that it is the right move”</p>	<p>Babis HellasSupplies</p>	<p>Confirmation, validation across the generations.</p>
<p>“There are still always things that go on in your own head that still only involve discussion to get a conclusion in your own mind, by speaking to my father”</p>	<p>Jock ScotHome</p>	<p>Confirmation, validation across the generations.</p>
<p><i>Q: When were you actually introduced to the family business?</i></p> <p>A: “A large part of what is talked about within the family...family meals and the like, so you just absorb a lot”</p>	<p>Elaine EngStone</p>	<p>Ubiquity of family-firm conversations, in business and private life</p>

<p>“it is very informal...Christmas dinner, all the time, somebody will just spark something, a comment or discussion”</p>	<p>Freda EngFarm</p>	<p>Ubiquity of family-firm conversations, in business and private life</p>
<p><i>Q: How do discussions take place?</i> A: “Everywhere. We might meet by the stairs, in a meeting, at home over lunch”.</p>	<p>Costas HellasLogistics</p>	<p>Ubiquity of family-firm conversations, in business and private life</p>
<p>“When you are in an entrepreneurial family you will talk for a while about football, for a while about politics and then it is just your business you talk about”</p>	<p>Costas HellasLogistics</p>	<p>Very high quantity of business conversations within the family</p>
<p>Q: Now your daughter runs the business do you communicate with each other?...is it more formal or informal? A: “Yes, every second or third day...she will just say ‘hello Dad’ and we have a cup of coffee and we chat, the other thing is that we trust each other, you have got to have trust”</p>	<p>Douglas ScotFood</p>	<p>Continuous, detailed, informal conversations</p>
<p>“In a family business, the most significant issue is to make use of the experience, and...in order to use it, you need a continuum. You cannot walk up to someone and say ‘Father...what would you do in</p>	<p>Hari HellasInfo</p>	<p>Continuous, detailed provision of information, to keep other family members informed enough to converse</p>

this case?’ They need continuous information and details. Otherwise they cannot offer you detached advice.”		/ contribute effectively
“With my sister and my aunt we discuss everything: thoughts, opinions, views”	Ioannis HellasDeli	Continuous, detailed conversations
“I would say do you not think that we ought to have meetings, and I can remember them both bursting out laughing and saying ‘good God she wants meetings, what on earth do you want meetings for?’”	Elaine EngStone	Resistance to formalization of communication, conversational form of decision making.

Respondents told us that they used their family as sounding boards, to verify that their 80% certainty was valid, to present and approve suggestions. Occasionally, we found evidence that a single brief exchange might be enough to trigger agreement that a new opportunity should be tried out immediately. Empiricism seems highly valued, and family trust permits people to try ideas out in practice. This brevity in decision making appears to support perceptions of the family firm using centrality of control as a means to drive commercial flexibility and rapidity, as the scholarly literature has long suggested.

Formal Evaluation Process

Market and technology evaluations took place through quite formal, “professional” mechanisms in many cases (see Table Five). Douglas developed his internationalization strategy in the 1950s drawing closely upon “push-pull” conceptualizations to drive his market entry. This is a remarkably early adoption of a formal marketing tool, especially when we recall Douglas’ peripheral geographic location in rural

Scotland. Formal market research and feasibility studies were also mentioned by Freda and Elaine. Information search was not left to serendipity, but was highly focused and made use of professional publications, the internet and other media. We were surprised to find that all examples of such formal, rational evaluation were provided by respondents in rural environments (with the exception of Jock). Perhaps this can be explained by the difficulty in building informal growth networks from a peripheral setting necessitating a more structured approach.

Table Five - Formal Evaluation Process		
Illustrative Example	Respondent	Type of Evaluation
“My brother did a feasibility study into pick your own strawberries”	Freda EngFarm	Formal Feasibility Study
“Harvard had come up with this idea of push-pull sell” (this refers to a market entry strategy in the 1950s)	Douglas ScotFood	Theoretical basis for market entry strategy
Q: Sources of information and support? A: “The Internet. The mass media”	Babis HellasSupplies	Rational, focused market information search
Jock literally takes potential new products to pieces to test them thoroughly, “to see if it was a good product, or whether it was going to fall to pieces when it was sold you know”	Jock ScotHome	Formal, physical new product testing
“You build up a database and I would do questionnaires and I would get them to fill them in and get some responses...”	Elaine EngStone	Formal Market Research

“I did a lot of work myself in finding out about customers and developing a brand to get people interested in coming here”	Freda EngFarm	Planned, managed, rational research and marketing activities driving growth
--	------------------	---

Weak-Tie Utilization

External to the family, the usage of weak-ties, which has come to be seen of diminished importance for non-family entrepreneurs, appeared more significant for those family-firms involved in entrepreneurship and growth. It is very important to note that even though these relationships were often of very long standing, they seldom developed a social aspect. New weak-ties were identified in a very calculating fashion on the basis of what the firm’s needs were. Communication focused on specific business concerns.

Tie maintenance did not extend into socialization, but was built into the low-intensity routines of everyday life. It should be noted that, on a personal level, our respondents may indeed have close personal friends outside the venture – as Giorgos describes below, in Table Six - but that the family firm does not seem to be on the list of topics routinely shared with such strong ties.

Table Six - Weak-Tie Utilization		
Illustrative Example	Respondent	Type of Tie and Utilization
“ I might discuss business, with much less detail, with people I work with...mostly general discussion...'how do	Babis HellasSupplies	Simple on-going scanning via weak ties

you see the new tax measures?' ...simple stuff"		
Costas met key contacts – suppliers and customers – in a purely business setting “not..at a café or a tavern...while working; delivering, receiving, etc”. He continues to rely on these business contacts: “daily contact with the customer in the market ...tells me whether I need to change something”	Costas HellasLogistics	Even after many years, these key weak ties have not become socialized, multiplex, friendship relationships.
“Company issues...that is just kept in house and you sort things out...There are probably only two people that we get involved with outside of the company”	Jock ScotHome	Very limited external ties, ascribed to inherent secrecy
“We get on, we don’t brag about what we do, we keep things in house...some customers know that “Peter” (<i>father</i>) has retired, some probably aren’t aware; you know we are quite a private company”	Keith EngService	Very limited external ties, ascribed to inherent secrecy
“The magazines would come and visit and try and get business from you, so I would make them sit there for 2 hours whilst I asked them everything about...who buys your magazine, why do they buy, adverts work”	Elaine EngStone	Calculative development of weak tie to meet specific business need.
“There were always people who helped us with their knowledge, for example...a professor at the University in <i>GreekTown</i> , a good contact, who helped us set up the quality control laboratory”.	Ioannis HellasDeli	Calculative development of weak tie to meet specific business need.
“I heard that Mr. So-and-So is a specialist...and I invited	Andreas	Calculative development

<p>him here. We had long discussions...I took the initiative”</p>	<p>HellasDrink</p>	<p>of weak tie to meet specific business need.</p>
<p>“I did an awful lot of searching out people to speak with while I was doing LEAD...it was laying the foundations for what I am doing now”</p>	<p>Freda EngFarm</p>	<p>Creating a purposive weak tie network to support business growth</p>
<p>Hari talked with enthusiasm about an older long-standing “acquaintance of the company” from the industry who had been helpful because of “how free his mind is”. But he then said that frequency of contact was “rare...formal...not once a month or every two months”. When asked what the alter takes from the relationship he answered “they get satisfaction from the fact that the company has not discharged them”</p>	<p>Hari HellasInfo</p>	<p>Even the network relationships which are perceived as especially influential, are - given closeness of tie, formality, and frequency of contact – weak ties.</p>
<p>“Our business can get very close to very large customers, and we have got a very low turnover of staff, very many people have been here for over ten plus years. So we have got good continuity, when customers ring up it always the same person that they are dealing with”</p>	<p>Keith EngService</p>	<p>Non-family employees maintain many customer and supplier ties</p>
<p>“Three very good friends that I love...special people, sometimes they know more than my brothers and sister. It has nothing to do with business. It can even take a year till I discuss something with them that has to do with the business”</p>	<p>Giorgos HellasProduce</p>	<p>Strong ties may be personally very important friendships, but inter-actions are not often related to the</p>

		business
“When I went to America another discovery that I made was non-executive directors, to have important people, more significant people...these were men of great experience who were able to advise me...about 1964 I had my first non-executive director...they came fishing with me, they used to say we had our board meetings on the river bank, you had a glass of whisky in your hand over lunch”	Douglas ScotFood	Unlike the rest of our respondents, Douglas acts like high growth entrepreneurs, bringing in very senior non-execs and using socialization to develop rich, multiplex ties with them.

The single exception to this practice that we encountered was Douglas, who showed many similar behaviours to non-family entrepreneurs in this area. Douglas, very early on in his long reign as CEO, recruited senior non-executive directors to his firm, and socialized these relationships extensively through the seductive and judicious use of salmon fishing and Scotch whisky. It is interesting that here we see Douglas’ rurality turned into an asset to deepen his ties with key professional contacts.

Some evidence was also presented that long-term non-family employees had shouldered the responsibility for building and maintaining somewhat stronger network ties, especially within customer and supplier businesses. By spending perhaps an entire working career delivering to, selling to, collecting from and meeting with these partner ventures, trusted non-family employees developed relationships which provided an additional on-going asset to the family firm. Figure One (Appendix One) summarizes our findings, showing the patterns of family firm networking-for-growth which we identified through this study, and which will be discussed further below.

DISCUSSION

Family firms engaged in entrepreneurship in several instances appear closer to formal, rational models of interaction with the market place than non-family entrepreneurs (who typically develop well-embedded strong customer, supplier, and other industry ties which act as the foundation for growth). Table Seven compares and contrasts the two modes of networking processes during venture growth, which highlight the importance of social capital in general, and strong ties in particular, for non-family entrepreneurs. Perhaps contrary to pervading stereotypes, it appears as though family firm growth patterns may be far more rational and “professional” than the socialized growth paths associated with non-family entrepreneurs.

Table Seven - Networking Processes during Venture Growth: Family Firms Engaged in Entrepreneurial Practice

<i>Identifying Opportunities</i>	<i>Growth</i>	Driven by under-utilized, or newly available, commercial and human capital held within the family firm
<i>Articulating Opportunities</i>	<i>Growth</i>	Articulate ideas in longish periods of disrupted conversations: a few words here and there to move thinking onwards and clarify specific points
<i>Investigating Opportunities: Formal techniques</i>	<i>Growth</i>	Frequent utilization of formal, rational, management techniques for researching, analyzing, and planning growth paths
<i>Investigating Opportunities: Weak-Tie Development & Maintenance</i>	<i>Growth</i>	Family members take market readings as a routine part of their interactions with weak-tie contacts, who are kept at arms' length. Seek out relevant specialists purposively, as new weak ties

As the fieldwork findings above have illustrated, it seems as though for family firms, commercial and family human capital are the starting point for venture growth paths, and not social capital. Idea articulation is carried out over a quite long period of time, via the vehicle of very brief interactions to frame specific elements in the opportunity conceptualization. The family becomes immersed in an on-going conversation characterized by the exchange of a sentence or two several times a day, until clarity is reached. Much of the communication is tacit, perhaps since kin can “fill in the gaps”, and more easily recognize what has been left unsaid.

It is especially noteworthy that family firms engaged in entrepreneurship use diverse existing resources as the dynamic to create growth opportunities, often around some core concept representing the firm's heart, such as "stone", "farm", "produce" or "information". We have suggested that such hub-and-spoke venture growth may offer family firms a way to combine elements of great importance to them. The core itself provides the stability, continuity and identity which demarcates the specific family firm over time. By diversifying around this core, using the broad interests and passions of family members, risks of over-specialisation are mitigated, reducing risk. New generation members are enabled to build their own identities, and to earn individual respect, through their educational and professional labours. The pursuit of growth through creation of "spoke" SBUs sustains the culture of entrepreneurship, change and excitement which is the lifeblood of the family firm.

It is also important to ask why family firms appear not to make extensive use of strong ties. One possible answer is that some of the market-scanning and relationship management labour in family firms is, perhaps surprisingly, carried out by (non-family) employees. Because employees often spend very long periods of their working life – sometimes all of it – within a single family firm, they are well-placed to develop substantive relationships with customers, suppliers and other market players. We found several instances where trusted, long-term employees were acting to manage such key relationships, rather than the family managers themselves. Could it be that family firms are delegating this most delicate task to their long-term staff? For non-family entrepreneurs we have found it is the everyday management of the firm which is delegated to trusted staff, freeing the entrepreneur to develop, maintain and exploit social capital in the external networked environment. Do family firm leaders prioritize internal managerial control so strongly that they retain responsibility for this, rather than managing social capital? Does the

family firm tradition of control, and secrecy, deny them both the time and the inclination to embed fully in surrounding business networks? At the least, this intriguing juxtaposition demands further study.

A second possibility to explain the lack of networking for growth in family has to do with the liability of newness experienced by non-family entrepreneurs, especially solo founders, who experience a driving need to develop market-place legitimacy. A strong family “brand” delivers a quality-guarantee within the business environment for new family firm ventures/growth paths, which legitimation an entrepreneur can only secure through enacting social capital.

A third explanation may have to do with the intensity of relationships within the family firm. Non-family entrepreneurs often experience professional loneliness and isolation, as they struggle to build their firms. The real warmth with which they discuss the strong tie relationships in their embedded networks indicates the importance of their emotional aspects. Indeed, family metaphors are often encountered as entrepreneurs talk about strong tie alters acting like their brother, grandfather, big sister, and so on. Family firm leaders and members enjoy such close, deep and intense relationships within their own firms, where the strongest of all ties – those of kinship – bind the venture and family together. It seems feasible that the very nature of these strong internal ties limits the possibilities of outside ties. Perhaps a helpful metaphor is to imagine some sort of family barrier which is very hard to permeate.

CONCLUSION

Our research question was how do family firms who are engaged in the practice of entrepreneurship enhance, extend and evolve external network ties for venture growth? In addressing this question, this study highlights the special nature of networking for growth which differentiates family from non-

family firms. We find that the highly socialized nature of entrepreneurial growth does not appear to be practiced in family firms where exploiting internal resources; articulating ideas through special on-going family discourse; applying formal rational evaluation tools; and relying on weak tie network contacts are found instead. Some initial explanations of this phenomenon are proposed, which include family firm leaders' preference for secrecy and control over embeddedness; the pre-legitimation which a family "brand" provides to new projects; and the emotional intensity of bonds within the family firm. This is of significance for teachers, scholars, practitioners and policy-makers alike. In particular, it raises the concern that the recent focus on life-cycle understanding of entrepreneurial networking configurations and processes may not adequately explain all forms of enterprise. Perhaps an extension of our theorization in this area is called for, exploring cases and contexts which are not amenable to stage model accounts.

Limitations inherent within the study include those traditionally associated with the small samples necessitated by qualitative work: especially generalizability and representativeness. Interview methods also have certain drawbacks, such as the potential for post-hoc rationalization of past actions, self-serving bias, and so forth. We have attempted to tackle these limitations to so degree by crafting a sample which is diverse in terms of sector, location, size and generation. The strong consistency of our findings across this diverse sample adds to their confidence and robustness, as well as suggesting some degree of universalisability.

In terms of future research, we identify three main areas of potential interest. Firstly, discourse within the family firm environment appears to play a special role as a mechanism for investigating and enacting growth. It seems likely that further research in this area would be beneficial, perhaps enriched by

insights from other disciplines, most notably anthropology, into kin discourse. Secondly, the insight that the related diversification described by so many of our respondents seems to form some kind of hub-and-spoke pattern also offers substantial potential for deeper analysis. Whilst many new venture opportunities were pursued by the family firms we studied, they all seemed to centre round some sustained, core vision of what the family firm is and does. Not only did this core form the foundation for venture creation but also the building blocks for growth.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, A.R., Jack, S.L. & Drakopoulou Dodd, S. 2005. 'The role of family members in entrepreneurial networks: beyond the boundaries of the family firm'. *Family Business Review*, 18(2): 135-154.
- Anderson, A.R., Drakopoulou-Dodd, S. & Jack, S. (2010) *Network Practices and Entrepreneurial Growth*. *Scandinavian Journal of Management* 26(2) 121-133
- Anderson, A. R., Dodd, S. D., & Jack, S. L. (2012). 'Entrepreneurship as connecting: some implications for theorising and practice'. *Management Decision*, 50(5), 958-971.
- Anderson, A. R., & Lee, E. Y. C. (2008). 'From tradition to modern: Attitudes and applications of guanxi in Chinese entrepreneurship'. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 15(4), 775-787. Anderson, A. R., Dodd, S. D., & Jack, S. (2010). 'Network practices and entrepreneurial growth'. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 26(2), 121-133.
- Anderson, A. R., & Miller, C. J. (2003). "'Class matters": Human and social capital in the entrepreneurial process'. *Journal of Socio-economics*, 32(1), 17-36.
- Arregle, J. L., Hitt, M. A., Sirmon, D. G. & Very, P. (2007). 'The development of organizational social capital: Attributes of family firms'. *Journal of Management Studies*, 44, 73-95.
- Brüderl, J. and Preisendörfer, P. (1998). 'Network Support and the Success of Newly Founded Businesses'. *Small Business Economics*, 10, 213-225.
- Carney, M. (2005). 'Corporate governance and competitive advantage in family-controlled firms'. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 29, 249-265.
- Carney, M., & Gedajlovic, E. (2003). 'Strategic innovation and the administrative heritage of east Asian family business groups'. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 20, 5-26.

- Chrisman, J. J., Chua, J. H. & Kellerman, F. (2009) 'Priorities, Resource Stocks, and Performance in Family and Nonfamily Firms' *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* **33** 739-760.
- Chrisman, J. J., Chua, J. H. & Steier, L. (2005). 'Sources and consequences of distinctive familiness: An introduction'. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, **29**, 237-247.
- Clinton E. A. Nason, R. S. & Zellweger T. M. (2010) 'The Effect of Reputation on Entrepreneurial Behavior in Family Firms: A Resource Perspective', Paper presented at the *Babson College Entrepreneurship Research Conference*, Lausanne, June 2010
- Davidsson, P. and B. Honig (2003). 'The role of social and human capital among nascent entrepreneurs', *Journal of Business Venturing*, **18**, 301–331.
- Drakopoulou Dodd, S. Jack, S.L. & Anderson, A.R (2006) "The Mechanisms and Process of Entrepreneurial Networks: Continuity and Change", in *Advances in Entrepreneurship, Firm Emergence and Growth* Volume 9, Shepherd et al (eds), Elsevier pp 107-145.
- Drakopoulou Dodd, S. Jack, S.L. & Anderson, A.R (2012) "Being in time and the family owned firm", *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 29(1), 35-47.
- Drakopoulou Dodd, S. & Theoharakis, V (2010) "Which aspects of "familiness" influence continuous strategic renewal in family firms?" Presented at the *Babson College Entrepreneurship Research Conference*, Lausanne, June 2010.
- Dodd, S. D., Jack, S., & Anderson, A. R. (2002). Scottish entrepreneurial networks in the international context. *International Small Business Journal*, 20(2), 213-219.
- Eddleston, K., Kellermanns, F. W. & Sarathy, R. 'Resource Configuration in Family Firms: Linking Resources, Strategic Planning and Technological Opportunities to Performance' *Journal of Management Studies* **45**: 1 26-50.
- Elfring, T. and Hulsink, W. (2007). 'Networking by entrepreneurs: Patterns of tie formation in emerging organizations'. *Organization Studies*, **28**, 12, 1849-72.
- Gartner, W.B. and Birley, S., 2002. Introduction to the special issue on qualitative methods in entrepreneurship research, *Journal of Business Venturing*, 17, 387-395.
- Gedajlovic, E., Lubatkin, M. H. & Schulze, W. S. (2004). 'Crossing the threshold from founder management to professional management: A governance perspective'. *Journal of Management Studies*, **41**, 899-912.
- Gómez-Meja, L.R., Takács Haynes, K., Núñez-Nickel, M., Jacobsen K.J.L. & Moyana-Fuentes J., (2007) 'Socioemotional Wealth and Business Risks in Family-Controlled Firms: Evidence from Spanish Olive Oil Mills' *Administrative Science Quarterly* **52** 106-137.

- Gómez-Meja, L.R., Makri, M. & Larraza Kintana, M (2010) 'Diversification Decisions in Family-Controlled Firms', *Journal of Management Studies*, 47:2, 223-254.
- Greve, A. & Salaff, J. 2003 "Social networks and entrepreneurship". *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice*, 28(1): 1-23.
- Gudmundson, D., Tower, C.B. & Hartman, F.A. (2003) 'Innovation in small businesses: culture and ownership structure do matter'. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship* 8, 1-17.
- Gulbrandsen, T. (2005). 'Flexibility in Norwegian family-owned enterprises'. *Family Business Review*, 18, 57-76.
- Habbershon, T. G., Williams, M. & MacMillan, I. C. (2003). 'A unified systems perspective of family firm performance'. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18, 451-465.
- Habbershon, T. G. & Williams, M. L. (1999). 'A resource-based framework for assessing the strategic advantages of family firms'. *Family Business Review*, 12, 1-25.
- Hite, J. (2005). 'Evolutionary processes and paths of relationally embedded network ties in emerging entrepreneurial firms'. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 29, 1, 113–144.
- Hoang, H. & Antoncic, B. (2003) "Network-based research in entrepreneurship: A critical review", *Journal of Business Venturing* 18:2, pp165-187.
- Jack, S.L., Drakopoulou Dodd, S. & Anderson, A. R (2008). "Change and the Development of Entrepreneurial Networks over time Processual Perspective", *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 20(2), 125-159.
- Jack, S.L., Moulton, S., Anderson, A. R., & Dodd, S. (2010). An entrepreneurial network evolving: patterns of change. *International Small Business Journal*, 28(4), 315-337.
- Jack, S., Moulton, S., Anderson, A. R., & Dodd, S. (2014). Using the constant comparative technique to consider network change and evolution. Forthcoming book chapter In Helle Neergaard and Claire Leitch (eds, 2013) *Handbook of Qualitative Research Techniques and Analysis in Entrepreneurship*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham .
- Johannisson, B (1998) "Personal Networks in Emerging Knowledge-based firms: spatial and functional patterns", *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 10:4, pp297 – 313.
- Johannisson, B. & Nilsson, A. (1989). "Community entrepreneurs: Networking for local development". *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 1(1): 3-19.
- Johannisson, B & Mønsted, M (1997) "Contextualizing Entrepreneurial Networking", *International Journal of Management and Organization* Fall 1997 27:3 pp 109 – 137.

- Klyver, K & Hindle, K (2007) "The Role Of Social Networks At Different Stages Of Business Formation" *Small Business Research* 15:1, 22-38.
- Larson, A (1992) "Network Dyads in Entrepreneurial Settings: A Study of the Governance of Exchange Relationships" *Administrative Science Quarterly* 37 (1992): 76- 104.
- Larson, A., & Starr, J. A. (1993). "A network model of organization formation" *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 17(2): 5-15.
- Lechner, C. & Dowling, M. (2003). "Firm networks: External relationships as sources for the growth and competitiveness of entrepreneurial firms". *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 15(1): 1 - 26.
- Lubatkin, M. H., Schulze, W. S., Ling, Y. & Dino, R. N. (2005). 'The effects of parental altruism on the governance of family-managed firms'. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, **26**, 313-330.
- Lubatkin, ML, Ling, Y & Schulze, W.S. (2007) 'An Organizational Justice-Based View of Self-Control and Agency Costs in Family Firms' *Journal of Management Studies* **44**:6 955-971.
- Miller, D. & Le Breton-Miller, I. (2006). 'Family governance and firm performance: Agency, stewardship, and capabilities'. *Family Business Review*, **19**, 73-87.
- Miller, D, Le Breton-Miller, I. & Echolike, B (2008) 'Stewardship vs. Stagnation: An Empirical Comparison of Small Family and Non-Family Businesses' *Journal of Management Studies* **45**:1 51- 78.
- Minchilli, A., Corbetta, G. & Macmillan, I. (2010) 'Diversification Decisions in Family-Controlled Firms' *Journal of Management Studies*, 47:2, 205-222
- Padgett, J.F. & Ansell, C.K. (1993) 'Robust action and the rise of the Medici', 1400-1434, *The American Journal of Sociology* (98) 1259 – 319.
- Pages, E & Garmise, S (2003) "The power of entrepreneurial networking", *Economic Development Journal*, Summer 2003 pp 20- 30.
- Pratt, M. 2009. From the editors: for the lack of a boilerplate: tips on writing up (and reviewing) qualitative research, *Academy of Management Journal*, 52 (5), 856-862.
- Ram, M (1994) "Unravelling social networks in ethnic minority firms" *International Small Business Journal*, 12:3, 42-53.
- Ram, M (2001) "Family Dynamics in a Small Consultancy Firm: A Case Study" *Human Relations* 54:4, 395-418.
- Renzulli, L. A. and Aldrich, H. E. (2005). 'Who Can You Turn To? Tie Activation within Core Business Discussion Networks'. *Social Forces*, **84**, 1, 323-341.

- Schulze, W.S. & Gedajlovic, E.R. 'The Family and Enterprise: Unpacking the Connections – Guest Editors' Introduction' *Journal of Management Studies*, 47:2, 191-204.
- Schulze, W. S., Lubatkin, M. H. & Dino, R. N. (2002). 'Altruism, agency, and the competitiveness of family firms'. *Managerial and Decision Economics*, **23**, 247-259.
- Schulze, W. S., Lubatkin, M. H., Dino, R. N. & Beholds, A. K. (2001). 'Agency relationships in family firms: Theory and evidence'. *Organization Science*, **12**, 99-116.
- Shepherd, D. & Zahra, S. (2003). 'From conservatism to entrepreneurialism: The case of Swedish family firms'. *Unpublished paper. Boulder, CO: University of Colorado*.
- Slotte Kock, S & Covielle, N (2010) "Entrepreneurship Research on Network Processes: A Review and Ways Forward", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 31-57.
- Sirmon, D. & Hitt, M. A. (2003). 'Creating wealth in family business through managing resources'. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, **27**, 339-358.
- Tagiuri, R. & Davis, J. (1996). 'Bivalent attributes of the family firm'. *Family Business Review*, **9**, 199-208.
- Uzzi, B. (1997). 'Social structure and competition in interfirm networks: the paradox of embeddedness'. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **42**, 1, 35-67.
- Zahra, S. A. (2005). 'Entrepreneurial risk taking in family firms'. *Family Business Review*, **18**, 23-40.
- Zahra, S.A. (2010) 'Harvesting Family Firms' Organizational Social Capital: A Relational Perspective' *Journal of Management Studies*, 47:2, 345-366.
- Zahra, S. A., Hayton, J. C. & Salvato, C. (2004). 'Entrepreneurship in family vs. Non-family firms: A resource-based analysis of the effect of organizational culture'. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, **28**, 363-381.

Table One – Sample Summary

Respondent	Age / Sex	Generation	Role	Urban / Rural	Country	Company Alias	Sector/s	Number of Employees (FTEs)
Andreas	53, Male	5 th of 5	President	Rural	Greece	HellasDrink	Manufacturing Drinks	22
Babis	31, Male	3 rd of 3	CEO	Rural	Greece	HellasSupplies	Business Supplies	2
Costas	32, Male	3 rd of 3	Function Head	Rural	Greece	HellasLogistics	FMCG Shop Supplies	40
Douglas	89, Male	3 rd of 4	President (was CEO)	Rural	Scotland	ScotFood	Food Manufacturing	1,500
Elaine	60, Female	3 rd of 3	CEO (was SBU head)	Rural	England	EngStone	Diverse Ventures around Stone: production & sales	10 (in spin off) 40 (in family group)
Freda	39, Female	2 nd of 3	SBU Head	Rural	England	EngFarm	Diverse Ventures around Farm: production and sales	28
Giorgos	42, Male	2 nd of 3	SBU Head	Urban	Greece	HellasProduce	Diverse Ventures around Produce Trading	17
Hari	44, Male	2 nd of 2	CEO	Urban	Greece	HellasInfo	Diverse Ventures: Information & Media	300 (+)
Ioannis	55, Male	2 nd of 3	CEO	Urban	Greece	HellasDeli	Manufacturing branded gourmet product	110
Jock	35, Male	2 nd of 2	CEO	Urban	Scotland	ScotHome	Home Improvements Artisans	70
Keith	29, Male	2 nd of 2	Senior Manager	Urban	England	EngService	Complex Industrial Supplies and Service	18
Larry	36, Male	2 nd of 2	Director	Urban	England	EngArtisan	Business Service Artisans	6 (+ contractors)

Appendix One
Figure One: Family Firms - Networking for Growth

