

ISRG Journal of Economics, Business & Management (ISRGJEBM)



ISRG PUBLISHERS

Abbreviated Key Title: Isrg J Econ Bus Manag

ISSN: 2584-0916 (Online)

Journal homepage: <https://isrgpublishers.com/isrgjebm/>

Volume – III Issue -IV (July-August) 2025

Frequency: Bimonthly



FACTORS THAT DETERMINE THE SUCCESS, SUSTAINABILITY AND CHALLENGES OF FAMILY-OWNED RESTAURANT BUSINESSES IN THE NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION: BASES FOR RESTAURANT BUSINESS MODEL

ERWIN R. RANCES

Our Lady of Fatima University, Quezon City, Philippines

| **Received:** 01.07.2025 | **Accepted:** 05.07.2025 | **Published:** 07.07.2025

***Corresponding author:** ERWIN R. RANCES

Our Lady of Fatima University, Quezon City, Philippines

Abstract

The study focused specifically on family-owned restaurant businesses within the National Capital Region (NCR) of the Philippines. The NCR comprises sixteen highly urbanized cities and one municipality, providing a diverse and representative setting for the research.

Firmographic Profile of the Family-owned restaurant mostly are 15 years and above with 11 –15 employees 500,001 – 2,000,00 capitalization with multi- services 741 or 63%, Located in 4th District. Type of restaurant mostly are Fine Dining and partnership as type of business.

Success factors of the owners of the family-owned restaurant business interms of location “Agree”, management, customer service, menu variety, quality of food, cost control, interpreted as “Strongly Agree”.

Profitability of Family-Owned Restaurant in terms of technology, marketing and promotion, “Agree”. On the other hand, increase demand for delivery service, waste reduction strategy interpreted as Strongly Agree. Challenges Encountered in The Operation of The Family-Owned Restaurant Businesses success planning, Businesses Difficulties in management, financial issues, Lack of Professionalization, separating family and business, “Agree”.

There is no significant difference in the assessment of the respondent on the success of the family-owned restaurant business when firmographic profile is considered. There is no significant difference in the assessment of the respondent on the profitability of the family-owned restaurant business when firmographic profile is considered Based on the result of the study linear regression model was also develop.

I. INTRODUCTION

Family-owned restaurants play a significant role in the Philippine food industry, where business ownership and operations are primarily managed by family members. These establishments are deeply rooted in Filipino culture, often characterized by multigenerational management structures in which individuals related by blood, marriage, or adoption actively influence the vision and direction of the business (Center for Family Business, 2019). Their unique family dynamic allows them to pursue distinct business goals while maintaining close personal ties.

According to the World Bank (2020), the Philippines continues to experience economic growth, driven in part by an expanding middle class and an increasingly dynamic restaurant sector. Restaurants are central to Filipino social life, serving as venues for gatherings, celebrations, and everyday dining. This environment has led to a noticeable increase in family-owned restaurants across the country, many of which blend tradition with innovation to remain competitive.

Modern trends are reshaping how family-owned restaurants operate. To address evolving customer demands—such as preferences for healthier, organic, vegetarian, and gluten-free options—these businesses are rethinking their traditional models. Additionally, growing competition among family-run establishments has intensified the need for uniqueness in terms of menu offerings, dining experience, and brand identity. Despite these opportunities, challenges remain.

Family-owned restaurants often struggle with internal management issues, particularly succession planning, which can lead to disputes and operational instability. The overlap between family relationships and business roles can blur boundaries, making it difficult to separate emotional and personal issues from professional decision-making. Leadership conflicts may also arise when different family members have divergent visions and management styles, potentially impacting overall performance.

Research Questions:

1. What is the firmographic profile of the family-owned restaurant in terms of:
 - 1.1 number of years its operations,
 - 1.2 number of employees,
 - 1.3 capitalization to open the restaurant,
 - 1.4 type of services offered,
 - 1.5 location,
 - 1.6 type of restaurant, and
 - 1.7 type of business formation?
2. What are the assessments of the owner-respondents on the success factors of the family-owned restaurant businesses in terms of:
 - 2.1 location,
 - 2.2 management practices,
 - 2.3 customer service,
 - 2.4 quality of food,
 - 2.5 menu variety, and
 - 2.6 cost control?
3. What are the assessments of the respondents on the sustainability of the family-owned restaurant business in terms of:
 - 3.1 profitability,

- 3.2 management practices,
- 3.3 quality of the food,
- 3.4 pricing of the products,
- 3.5 marketing and promotion, and
- 3.6 innovation?

4. What are the assessments of the respondents on the challenges encountered in the operation of the family-owned restaurant businesses in terms:
 - 4.1 succession planning,
 - 4.2 difficulties in management,
 - 4.3 financial issues,
 - 4.4 lack of professionalization,
 - 4.5 separating family and business,
 - 4.6 staff shortage, and
 - 4.7 supplier shortage?
5. Is there a significant difference in the respondents' assessment of the success factors of the family-owned restaurant business when a firmographic profile is considered?
6. Is there a significant difference in the respondents' assessment of the sustainability factors of the family-owned restaurant business when the firmographic profile is considered?
7. Is there a significant relationship between the success and sustainability factors of the family-owned restaurant business?
8. Is there a significant relationship between the success factors and challenges encountered by the family owned restaurant business?
9. Is there a significant relationship between the sustainability factors and challenges encountered by the family-owned restaurant business?
10. What Family-owned restaurant business model may be developed, based on the findings of the study?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Strategies of the Coconut Businesses:

Family-owned restaurants in the Philippines operate within a unique framework where business and family dynamics are deeply intertwined. Studies have examined key factors such as ownership structures, generational transitions, management styles, and succession planning, all of which shape how these businesses function (Gimenez-Jimenez & Calero-Medina, 2022; Dyer, 2020).

Family businesses often involve multiple generations and relationships—parents, children, spouses, and extended family—taking on various roles such as owners, directors, employees, and advisors (Ghadoliya, 2020). These businesses can be categorized as: (1) Family-Owned, (2) Family Managed and Owned, and (3)

Family Led and Owned, depending on the level of family involvement in ownership and management.

In the Philippines, about 80% of enterprises are family-run, including major corporations like Ayala, SM, and JG Summit. Though many are publicly listed, family members often retain leadership roles and board positions, maintaining significant influence over company direction (Jonston, 2023).

Entrepreneurial orientation plays a vital role in the success of these enterprises. Research shows that family-owned restaurants that embrace innovation and proactive business strategies tend to perform better and sustain growth in competitive markets (Wiklund & Shepherd, 2023; Chrisman et al., 2020).

SWOT Analysis of the Family-owned businesses in the Philippines:

Strengths:

Strong Family Commitment and Trust: Built-in trust among family members supports open communication, loyalty, and shared long-term goals.

- **Personalized Customer Service:** Family-run operations often deliver warm, hands-on customer experiences that foster loyalty.
- **Flexible Decision-Making:** Informal structures enable quick responses and operational flexibility.
- **Heritage and Authentic Cuisine:** Family recipes and traditions contribute to unique menu offerings that appeal to loyal and new customers.
- **Cost Efficiency:** Family members often take on multiple roles, reducing labor costs and increasing operational efficiency.

Weaknesses:

Lack of Succession Planning: Many businesses are unprepared for leadership transition, leading to instability.

- **Blurring of Family and Business Roles:** Emotional decisions and interpersonal conflicts may interfere with professional management.
- **Limited Access to Capital:** Difficulty in securing external funding restricts growth and innovation.
- **Low Professionalization:** Resistance to change or reliance on tradition can hinder modern business practices and competitiveness.
- **Inadequate Staff Recruitment:** Overreliance on family limits access to diverse skills and talents.

Opportunities:

Growing Demand for Local and Authentic Food: Rising consumer interest in homegrown, unique dining experiences benefits family-owned establishments.

- **Digital Transformation:** Adoption of technology (e.g., online ordering, digital marketing, POS systems) can improve efficiency and reach.
- **Sustainability Trends:** Emphasizing eco-friendly practices and sourcing can attract environmentally conscious customers.
- **Government and NGO Support:** Programs for MSMEs

(Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises) offer training, funding, and market access.

- **Tourism and Urban Growth:** Increasing population and tourism in NCR provide a growing customer base.

Threats:

Intensifying Competition: Both corporate food chains and new independent restaurants heighten market competition.

- **Economic Instability:** Inflation, rising food costs, and pandemic-related risks affect consumer behavior and profitability.
- **Supply Chain Disruptions:** Unreliable suppliers or shortages in raw materials can disrupt operations.
- **Staff Turnover and Shortage:** Difficulty attracting and retaining skilled workers, especially from outside the family.

Changing Consumer Preferences: Demand for healthier, sustainable, or tech-integrated dining may outpace some traditional restaurants' ability to adapt.

III. METHODS

The researcher conducted this investigation using a quantitative method. It will use the descriptive technique. Employing a descriptive evaluative, comparative, and correlational method with a survey form as the primary instrument. According to Palladino (2018), descriptive research seeks to describe and document the characteristics of a certain phenomenon or group of individuals without manipulation or interference. Additionally, (Babbie, 2017), descriptive research entails observing, documenting, and analyzing the behavior, attitudes, and relationships of individuals and groups in specific environments.

Population and Sample of the Study

This research study's demographic consisted of management officials from family-owned restaurants. It used purposive sampling techniques, which are suited for the study because they allow me, the researcher, to perform an in-depth examination of the phenomenon. Purposeful sampling also allows for the identification of varied situations, the presentation of multiple views, and the inclusion of participants who provide value to the study. The population for this study consists of family-owned restaurants operating in the National Capital Region (NCR)

The National Capital Region serves as the geographical scope, encompassing various urban and suburban areas within its jurisdiction.

To ensure diversity in the sample, restaurants that are explicitly identified as family-owned, currently operational family-owned restaurants, restaurants of varying sizes, including both small-scale and large-scale establishments, and restaurants of various types, such as fine dining, casual dining, fast-food, and others, are included. The exclusion includes chain restaurants that are not

family-owned, as well as enterprises with little or no family participation. The sampling frame will include family-owned eateries operating in the National Capital Region. The list of potential participants will be compiled from corporate directories, industry groups, and government databases.

Table 1

Respondents of Family Owned Restaurant Per City

| Geographical Spread of family owned Restaurant in NCR | Total | Respondents per (Family Owned Restaurant Business) | Total Population (Respondents) | Sample of Respondents | Actual Number of Respondents |
|---|---------------|--|--------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| Manila | 3,568 | 1 | 3568 | 178 | 64 |
| Marikina City | 659 | 1 | 659 | 33 | 12 |
| Parañaque City | 1,543 | 1 | 1543 | 77 | 42 |
| Pasay City | 1,159 | 1 | 1159 | 58 | 26 |
| Las Piñas City | 666 | 1 | 666 | 33 | 12 |
| Makati City | 4,545 | 1 | 4545 | 227 | 183 |
| Muntinlupa City | 1,175 | 1 | 1175 | 59 | 45 |
| Pasig City | 2,501 | 1 | 2501 | 125 | 97 |
| Pateros | 50 | 1 | 50 | 8 | 5 |
| Taguig City | 1,437 | 1 | 1437 | 72 | 23 |
| Mandaluyong City | 1,245 | 1 | 1245 | 62 | 54 |
| Quezon City | 6,621 | 1 | 6621 | 331 | 221 |
| San Juan City | 601 | 1 | 601 | 30 | 8 |
| Caloocan City | 1,186 | 1 | 1186 | 59 | 275 |
| Malabon City | 459 | 1 | 459 | 23 | 32 |
| Navotas City | 104 | 1 | 104 | 5 | 34 |
| Valenzuela City | 1,390 | 1 | 1390 | 70 | 43 |
| Total | 28,909 | | | 1445 | 1176 |

Statistical Treatment

The data that was obtained from this present study are statistically treated. Following the data collection processes, all raw data will be tabulated, calculated, and evaluated using statistical software.

Frequency and Percentage. It was used to support the answer SOP 1 that measures the distribution of a dataset relative to its mean and will be calculated as the square root of the variance.

Weighted Mean. It was used to answer SOP 2-4 to assess the indicators under the profitability and challenges encountered of family-owned businesses.

Likert Scale

| Scale | Interval | Qualitative Interpretation |
|-------|------------|----------------------------|
| 4 | 3.50-4.00 | Strongly Agree |
| 3 | 2.50-3.49 | Agree |
| 2 | 1.50- 2.49 | Disagree |
| 1 | 1.00-1.49 | Strongly Disagree |

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The firmographic profile shows that most family-owned restaurants in the National Capital Region (NCR) have been operating for over

10 years (62.6%), indicating strong community ties. The majority operate with 11–20 employees, highlighting the importance of close team dynamics and family culture in operations. Capital investment varies, but a large number (61.5%) fall within the ₱1,000,001–2,000,000 range, suggesting moderate startup requirements. Most businesses offer multiple services (63%), including family-style, home delivery, and lounge services, showing adaptability to customer demands. Restaurants are mostly located in the 2nd and 4th Districts, reflecting potential market concentration in these areas. Fine dining is the leading restaurant type (45.7%), followed by fast food (29.9%), while casual and buffet formats hold smaller shares. In terms of legal structure, nearly half are partnerships (48.5%), showing a preference for shared control, while corporations (38.8%) offer scalability and liability protection. Sole proprietorships remain relevant for those valuing direct ownership and personal engagement.

Firmographic Profile of the Family-Owned Restaurant Businesses

Table 2

Firmographic Profile of the Family-Owned Restaurant

| | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Number of years of its Operations | | |
| 1 – 5 years | 180 | 15.3 |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|------|------|
| 6 – 10 years | 260 | 22.1 |
| 11 – 15 years | 337 | 28.7 |
| 15 years and above | 399 | 33.9 |
| Number of employees | | |
| 11 –15 | 668 | 56.8 |
| 16 – 20 | 384 | 32.7 |
| 21 and above | 124 | 10.5 |
| Capitalization to Open the Restaurant | | |
| Less than 500,000 | 180 | 15.3 |
| 500,001 – 1,000,000 | 120 | 10.2 |
| 1,000,001 – 1,500,000 | 352 | 29.9 |
| 1,500,001 – 2,000,00 | 372 | 31.6 |
| 2,000,001 and above | 152 | 12.9 |
| Type of services offered | | |
| Family Service | 261 | 22.2 |
| Lounge Service | 29 | 2.5 |
| Home Delivery | 145 | 12.3 |
| Others (multi- services) | 741 | 63 |
| Location | | |
| 1 st District | 144 | 12.2 |
| 2 nd District | 360 | 30.6 |
| 3 rd District | 288 | 24.5 |
| 4 th District | 384 | 32.7 |
| Type of restaurant | | |
| Fine Dining | 538 | 45.7 |
| Buffet | 154 | 13.1 |
| Casual Dining | 132 | 11.2 |
| Fast food | 352 | 29.9 |
| Type of business formation | | |
| Sole Proprietorship | 150 | 12.8 |
| Partnership | 570 | 48.5 |
| Corporation | 456 | 38.8 |
| Total | 1176 | 100 |

Table 3

Success Factors of the Owners Of The Family-Owned Restaurant Businesses In Terms Of Location

| Indicator | Weighted Mean | Qualitative Interpretation |
|---|---------------|----------------------------|
| 1 The restaurant is accessible by public transportation and major roads | 3.48 | Agree |

| | | |
|--|------|----------------|
| 2 The restaurant has parking for customer | 3.05 | Agree |
| 3 The location is area safe and well-lit at night | 3.43 | Agree |
| 4 The restaurant has suitable for future expansion or growth | 3.95 | Strongly Agree |
| Grand weighted mean | 3.48 | Agree |

Legend: 3.5-4.00 Strongly Agree; 2.5-3.49 Agree; 1.50-2.49 Disagree; 1.0-1.49; Strongly Disagree

It shows the success factors of the owners of the family-owned restaurant business in terms of location Grand weighted mean 3.48 as Agree, "The restaurant is accessible by public transportation and major roads" WM= 3.48, "The location is area safe and well-lit at night" WM=3.43 interpreted, " The restaurant has parking for customer" WM=3.05, as Agree, while "The restaurant has suitable for future expansion or growth" WM=3.95 interpreted as "Strongly Agree".

Table 4

Success Factors of the Owners Of The Family-Owned Restaurant Businesses in terms of Management Practices

| Indicator | Weighted Mean | Qualitative Interpretation |
|---|---------------|----------------------------|
| 1 The restaurant has well-defined job descriptions and responsibilities for each position. | 3.77 | Strongly Agree |
| 2 The restaurant has a proper system in place for tracking inventory, ordering supplies, and managing cash flow | 3.75 | Strongly Agree |
| 3 The restaurant has trained effectively and regularly the employees. | 3.74 | Strongly Agree |
| 4 The restaurant has a process for handling customer complaints and feedback. | 3.58 | Strongly Agree |
| Grand weighted mean | 3.71 | Strongly Agree |

Legend: 3.5-4.00 Strongly Agree; 2.5-3.49 Agree; 1.50-2.49 Disagree; 1.0-1.49; Strongly Disagree

It shows the success factors of the owners of the family-owned restaurant business in terms of management practices, "Grand weighted mean" 3.71, "The restaurant has well-defined job descriptions and responsibilities for each position" WM=3.77, "The restaurant has a proper system in place for tracking inventory, ordering supplies, and managing cash flow" WM= 3.75, "The restaurant has trained effectively and regularly the employees" WM=3.74, "The restaurant has a process for handling customer complaints and feedback" WM=3.58 interpreted as Strongly Agree. Job definitions and responsibilities are seen as a critical success factor, with owners placing a strong emphasis on clear organizational structures to ensure smooth operations. Operational

systems for inventory, supplies, and cash flow management are essential, with owners strongly agreeing that these systems contribute to their restaurant's success by maintaining efficiency and financial stability. Employee training is highly valued, highlighting the importance of investing

in continuous development to improve service quality and enhance staff morale. Customer complaint management is also an important factor, though slightly less emphasized than the other areas, as it plays a role in ensuring customer satisfaction and brand improvement.

Table 5

Success Factors of the Owners of the Family-Owned Restaurant Businesses in Terms Of Customer Service

| Indicator | Weighted Mean | Qualitative Interpretation |
|---|---------------|----------------------------|
| 1 The restaurant employees are trained to consistently provide friendly, efficient, and attentive service to customers. | 3.74 | Strongly Agree |
| 2 The restaurant customers were greeted in a friendly and welcoming manner when entering the restaurant. | 3.73 | Strongly Agree |
| 3 The restaurant has a process in place for taking customer orders accurately and efficiently. | 3.69 | Strongly Agree |
| 4 The restaurant has a process for handling customer complaints and feedback, and for resolving issues quickly and effectively. | 3.54 | Strongly Agree |
| Grand weighted mean | 3.67 | Strongly Agree |

Legend: 3.5-4.00 Strongly Agree; 2.5-3.49 Agree; 1.50-2.49 Disagree; 1.0-1.49; Strongly Disagree

It shows the success factors of the owners of the family-owned Business in terms of customer service” Grand weighted mean of 3.67 Strongly Agree.” The restaurant employee trained to consistently

Provide friendly, efficient and attentive service to customers” WM=3.74, “The restaurant customers greeted in a friendly and welcoming manner when entering the restaurant” WM=3.73, “The restaurant has a process In place for taking customer orders accurately and efficiently “ WM=3.69

“The restaurant has a lace for handling customer complaint and feedback, And for resolving issues quickly and effectively” WM=3.54 Strongly Agree.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATION

This section provides a synthesis of the findings and a discussion. It comprises a description of the findings, a conclusion based on the study's findings, and recommendations to assist fix the problem.

1. Firmographic Profile of the Family-owned restaurant

Firmographic Profile of the Family owned restaurant as to number of years of its operations: 1 – 5 years 180 or 15.3%, 6 – 10 years 260

or 22.1%, 11 – 15 years 337 or 28.7 and 15 years and above 399 or

33.9%. Number of employees: 11 –15 668 or 56.8%, 16 – 20 384 or

32.7 lastly 21 and above 124 or 10.5 Capitalization to open

the restaurant: Less than 500,000 180 or 15.3%, 500,001 – 1,000,000

120 or 10.2%, 1,000,001 – 1,500,000 352 or 29.91%, 500,001 –

2,000,00 372 or 31.6% and 2,000,001 and above 152 or 12.9%. Type of services offered: Family Service 261 or 22.2%, Lounge Service 29 or 2.5%, Home Delivery 145 or 12.3% and Others (multi- services) 741 or 63%. Location: 1st District 144 or 12.2%, 2nd

District 360 or 30.6% 3rd District 288 or 24.5 and 4th District

384 or 32.7%. Type of restaurant: Fine Dining 538 or 45.7%,

Buffet 154 or 13.1%, Casual Dining 132 or 11.2%, Fast food 352 or 29.9%. Type of business formation: Sole Proprietorship 150 or 12.8%, Partnership 570 or 48.5% and Corporation 456 or 38.8%.

2. Success Factors of the Family-Owned Restaurant Business

Success factors of family-owned restaurant business in terms of location Grand weighted mean 3.48 interpreted as “Agree”, management practices Grand weighted mean 3.71, customer service Grand weighted mean 3.67, menu variety Grand weighted mean 3.63, quality of food Grand weighted mean 3.61, and cost control Grand weighted mean 3.59, were interpreted as “Strongly Agree”.

3. Sustainability Factors Of Family-Owned Restaurant

Sustainability of family-owned restaurant in terms of profitability Grand weighted mean 3.41, marketing and promotion Grand weighted mean, 3.20, and innovation Grand weighted mean 3.41, all were interpreted as “Agree”. In terms of management practices Grand weighted mean 3.71, quality of food Grand weighted mean

3.67 and pricing of the products Grand weighted mean 3.51, all were interpreted as “Strongly Agree”.

4. Challenges Encountered In The Operation Of The Family-Owned Restaurant

Challenges Encountered In The Operation Of The Family Owned Restaurant Businesses in terms of success planning Grand weighted mean 3.36, difficulties in management Grand weighted mean 3.27, financial issues Grand weighted mean 3.31, lack of professionalization Grand weighted mean 3.28, separating family and business and staff and supply shortage, had a Grand weighted mean 3.26, and all were interpreted as “Agree”.

5. Significant Difference In The Assessment Of The Respondent On The Success Of The Family-Owned

Restaurant Business When Firmographic Profile Is Considered

There is no significant difference in the assessment of the respondent on the success of the family owned restaurant business when firmographic profile is considered.

6. Significant Difference In The Assessment Of The Respondent On The Sustainability Of The Family-Owned Restaurant Business When Firmographic Profile Is Considered

There is no significant difference in the assessment of the respondent on the profitability of the family owned restaurant business when firmographic profile is considered.

7. Relationship between the Success and Sustainability Factors of the family owned restaurant business

Strong Relationship as to Technology, Food Quality, Marketing, Cost Control, and Waste Reduction are all statistically significant and show a moderate correlation with success. This suggests that operational efficiency and modernization are central to sustainability. Low but Significant Correlation as to Management, Menu Variety, and Customer Service have lower correlations but still statistically influence business outcomes. These are foundational, though not as impactful individually.

No significant relationship in terms of Location ($p = 0.889$) showed no significant relationship—suggesting that family-owned restaurants can thrive regardless of exact location, possibly due to customer loyalty or niche offerings.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Firmographic Profile of the Family owned restaurant mostly are 15 years and above with 11 –15 employees 500,001 – 2,000,00 apitalization with multi- services 741 or 63%, Located in 4th District. Type of restaurant mostly are Fine Dining and partnership as type of business.
2. Success factors of the owners of the family-owned restaurant business in terms of location interpreted as “Agree”, management practices, customer service, quality of food, menu variety, and cost control, interpreted as “Strongly Agree”.
3. Sustianability of family-owned restaurant in terms of profitability, marketing and promotion, and innovation interpreted as “Agree”. On the other hand management practices, quality of food and pricing of the products, interpreted as “Strongly Agree”.
4. Challenges Encountered In The Operation Of The Family-Owned Restaurant Businesses in terms of success planning, difficulties in management, financial issues, lack of professionalization, separating family and business, staff and supply shortage, interpreted as “Agree”.
5. There is no significant difference in the assessment of the respondent on the success of the family owned restaurant business when firmographic profile is considered.
6. There is no significant
7. difference in the assessment of the respondent on the sustainability of the family owned restaurant business when firmographic profile is considered.
8. Based on the result of the study linear regression model was also developed.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The study recommended that the owner of a family owned restaurant take the following activities to ensure the business's long-term survival:

1. The owner should have a plan on how to pass along a family business. This could be accomplished by identifying the best member in the family with the necessary abilities, interests, and concern for the family's history. The best person should be motivated to work towards a larger business. Attending seminars/trainings on business entrepreneurship, leadership, and other related courses as part of the plan is required in order to advance to higher positions in the company.
2. Consider an outsider in the family. Outsider in the family may refer to someone who is not a family member but has a successful track record in business, such as a business consultant.

Encourage full engagement and involvement of family members in their business ventures. Family members should always be involved in company operations such as planning how to run the business, making managerial and financial decisions, and investing, among other things. As a result, family members will develop a strong dedication to the firm.

REFERENCES

1. Adrianse, L. S., & Rensleigh, C. (2013). Web of science, Scopus and Google scholar: A content comprehensiveness comparison. *The Electronic Library*, 31(6), 727–744.
2. Astrachan, J. H. (2010). Strategy in family business: Toward a multidimensional research agenda. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 1(1), 6–14.
3. Ács, Z. J., Varga, A. (2005). Entrepreneurship, agglomeration and technological change. *Small Business Economics*, 24(3), 323–334.
4. Acedo, F. J., Barroso, C., Galan, J. L. (2006). The resource-based theory: dissemination and main t ends. *Strategic Management Journal*, 27(7), 621-636.
5. Aidin, S. (2015). New Venture Creation: Controversial Perspectives and Theories. *Economic Analysis*, 48(1984), 101–109.
6. Aldrich, H. E. *Organization Evolving*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 1–34.
7. Aldrich, H. E., Martinez, M. A. (2001). Many are called, but few are chosen: Anevolutionary perspective for the study of entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 25(4), 41-56
8. Appio, F. P., Martini, A., Massa, S., Testa, S. (2016). Unveiling the intellectual origins of Social Media-based innovation: insights from a bibliometric approach. *Scientometrics* (Vol. 108). Springer Netherlands.
9. Arenius, P., Minniti, M. (2005). Perceptual variables and nascent entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics*, 24(3), 233–247.
10. Barnett, T., Eddleston, K. A., & Kellermanns, F. W. (2009). The effects of family versus career role salience on the performance of family and nonfamily firms. *Family Business Review*, 22(1), 39–52.
11. Berrone, P., Cruz, C., & Gomez-Mejia, L. R. (2012). Socioemotional wealth in family firms: Theoretical dimensions, assessment approaches, and agenda for

- future research. *Family Business Review*, 25(3), 258–279.
12. Bonilla, C. A., Merigó, J. M., & Torres-Abad, C. (2015). Economics in Latin America: A bibliometric analysis. *Scientometrics*, 105(2), 1239–1252.
 13. Broadus, R. (1987). Toward a definition of “bibliometrics”. *Scientometrics*, 12(5-6), 373–379.
 14. Callon, M., Courtial, J.-P., Turner, W. A., & Bauin, S. (1983). From translations to problematic networks: An introduction to co-word analysis. *Information (International Social Science Council)*, 22(2), 191–235.
 15. Casillas, J., & Acedo, F. (2007). Evolution of the intellectual structure of family business literature: A bibliometric study of FBR. *Family Business Review*, 20(2), 141–162.
 16. Casillas, J. C., Moreno, A. M., & Barbero, J. L. (2010). A configurational approach of the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and growth of family firms. *Family Business Review*, 23(1), 27–44.
 17. Cherchem, N. (2017). The relationship between organizational culture and entrepreneurial orientation in family firms: Does generational involvement matter? *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 8(2), 87–98.
 18. Chrisman, J. J., Chua, J. H., De Massis, A., Minola, T., & Vismara, S. (2016). Management processes and strategy execution in family firms: From “what” to “how”. *Small Business Economics*, 47(3), 719–734.
 19. Chrisman, J.J., Chua, J.H. and Litz, R. (2020) Comparing the Agency Costs of Family and Non- Family Firms: Conceptual Issues and Exploratory Evidence. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 28, 335-353
 20. Jess H. Chua, James J. Chrisman, and Pramodita Sharma Defining the Family Business by Behavior.
 21. Cobo, M. J., López-Herrera, A. G., Herrera-Viedma, E., & Herrera, F. (2011). Science mapping software tools: Review, analysis, and cooperative study among tools. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 62(7), 1382–1402.
 22. Courtial, J. (1994). A cword analysis of scientometrics. *Scientometrics*, 31(3), 251–260.
 23. Dana, L., Kumar, S., Pandey, N., & Sureka, R. (2021). The journal of small business management: A bibliometric overview of 1996–2019. *Journal of Small Business Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00472778.2020.1844492>.
 24. De Massis, A., & Rondi, E. (2020). Covid-19 and the future of family business research. *Journal of Management Studies*.
 25. De Massis, A., Kotlar, J., Campopiano, G., & Cassia, L. (2013). Dispersion of family ownership and the performance of small-to-medium size private family firms. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 4(3), 166–175.
 26. De Massis, A., Sharma, P., Chua, J. H., & Chrisman, J. J. (2012). Family business studies: An Gl'anzel, W., & Schubert, A. (2004). Analysing scientific networks through co-authorship. *Handbook of quantitative science and technology research* (pp. 257– 276). Springer.
 27. Goel, S., Mazzola, P., Phan, P. H., Pieper, T. M., & Zachary, R. K. (2012). Strategy, ownership, governance, and socio-psychological perspectives on family businesses from around the world. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 3(2), 54–65.
 28. Gudmundson, D., Hartman, E. A., & Tower, C. B. (1999). Strategic orientation:Differences between family and nonfamily firms. *Family Business Review*, 12(1), 27–39. Habbershon, T. G., & Williams, M.
 29. L. (1999). A resource-based framework for assessing the strategic advantages of family firms. *Family Business Review*, 12(1), 1–25.
 30. Harris, D., Martinez, J. I., & Ward, J. L. (1994). Is strategy different for the family-owned business? *Family Business Review*, 7(2), 159– 174.
 31. Hopp, W. J. (2004). Fifty years of management science. *Management Science*, 50(1), 1–7. Huybrechts, J., Voordeckers, W., & Lybaert, N. (2013). Entrepreneurial risk taking of private family firms: The influence of a nonfamily CEO and the moderating effect of CEO tenure. *Family Business Review*, 26(2), 161–179.
 32. ial empirical evidence on how family firms in five European countries cope with the corona crisis. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*.
 33. Kraus, S., Ribeiro-Soriano, D., & Schüssler, M. (2017). Fuzzy-set qualitative comparative analysis (fsQCA) in entrepreneurship and innovation research – The rise of a method. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-017-0461-8>.
 34. La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., & Shleifer, A. (1999). Corporate ownership around the world. *The Journal of Finance*, 54(2), 471– 517.
 35. Landström, H., Harirchi, G., & Åström, F. (2012). Entrepreneurship: Exploring the knowledge base. *Research Policy*, 41(7), 1154–1181.
 36. Le Breton-Miller, I., Miller, D., & Bares, F. (2015). Governance and entrepreneurship in family firms: Agency, behavioral agency and resource-based comparisons. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 6(1), 58–62.
 37. Lindow, C. M., Stubner, S., & Wulf, T. (2010). Strategic fit within family firms: The role of family influence and the effect on performance. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 1 (3), 167–178.
 38. Madison, K., Runyan, R. C., & Swinney, J. L. (2014). Strategic posture and performance: Revealing differences between family and nonfamily firms. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 5(3), 239– 251.
 39. Martínez-López, F. J., Merigó, J. M., Valenzuela-Fernández, L., & Nicolás, C. (2018). Fifty years of the European Journal of Marketing: A bibliometric analysis. *European Journal of Marketing*, 52(1/2), 439–468.