Beyond the Name: Analysis of Cohesion Factor in Name Congruence and Socioemotional Wealth Relation of Family Business

Steven W. Day
North Carolina Central University

John Aiyede
University of Louisville

In the forthcoming study, our overarching objective is to embark on a comprehensive exploration of the intricate linkages between the family name and the socioemotional wealth intrinsic to family businesses. This investigation places a specific emphasis on unraveling the mediating role played by family cohesion in shaping these complex dynamics. Our theoretical endeavor seeks to make a distinctive contribution to the scholarly landscape by providing nuanced insights into the multifaceted relationships within family businesses. By anchoring our study in the foundation of established literature, our aim extends beyond expanding empirical understanding to substantively contribute to the theoretical discourse that shapes the broader landscape of family business dynamics. As we delve into this exploration, we anticipate our findings will not only enrich our understanding of the interplay between family names, family cohesion, and socioemotional wealth but also offer valuable insights for practitioners, policymakers, and scholars invested in the success and resilience of family-owned enterprises.

Keywords: family business, family cohesion, name congruence, socioemotional wealth relation, stakeholder theory, family firms

INTRODUCTION

In the intricate tapestry of family businesses, the strategic integration of the family name into the firm's identity has emerged as a formidable approach, wielding the power to fortify the symbiotic relationship between familial and business identities. This strategic alignment, propounded by the seminal work of Deephouse and Jaskiewicz (2013), posits that the incorporation of the family name into the firm's nomenclature stands among the most effective methods for strengthening the nexus between family and firm identities. The ramifications of this strategic decision transcend the realms of familial connections, resonating profoundly with both internal family members and external stakeholders. Family names, revered as quintessential symbols of heritage, tradition, and continuity across diverse cultures, assume a paramount role within the context of family businesses. Notably, these names often evolve into integral components of the business's brand and reputation, endowing both the family and the firm with a distinctive and enduring character. This conceptualization finds resonance in scholarly discourse, as elucidated by De Massis, Kotlar, Mazzola, Minola, and Sciascia (2018), along with Sundaramurthy and Kreiner (2008). These scholars contend that family names encapsulate visible characteristics of the family, contributing significantly to the reinforcement of the bond between family and firm identity. Beyond the palpable manifestations of familial identity, researchers have illuminated the nuanced behavioral consequences associated with family names in the dynamic context of family businesses. The works of De Massis et al. (2018) and Deephouse and Jaskiewicz (2013) underscore the far-reaching impact on socioemotional wealth, emphasizing that the presence or absence of a family name in the firm's identity bears implications for the family firm's distinctive attributes and its proclivity to enhance socioemotional wealth. Gomez-Mejia, Cruz, Berrone, and De Castro (2011) accentuate the overarching influence of the family name within the family firm paradigm, asserting its role in carrying reputational and social sanctions. This positioning situates family businesses as particularly attuned to concerns of legitimacy and reputation, fostering a responsive stance towards external stakeholders to preclude being labeled as irresponsible corporate entities.

The interplay between family names, reputation, and stewardship is further expounded upon by the motivation of family firm owners to safeguard the legacy embodied in both the family name and the firm itself. This protective inclination extends beyond immediate financial gains, characterized by a view of the family name and reputation as legacies to be transmitted to subsequent generations. Anecdotal evidence suggests that family owners exhibit a heightened incentive to avert negative publicity, exemplified by a reluctance to undergo scrutiny such as IRS audits (Chen et al., 2010). Consequently, this drive to preserve the family name and reputation is posited to correlate with heightened product/service quality and superior returns on investment, aligning with the attributes of a high-quality leader. However, the incorporation of a family name into a family business is not devoid of intricacies. Recent studies, epitomized by the works of Gómez-Mejia et al. (2018) and Kotlar et al. (2018), introduce the nuanced dynamics of family name congruence, conflict, and subjective firm valuations. These studies unveil a U-shaped relationship, wherein mild conflicts within families sharing the same name amplify vulnerability and financial focus. As conflicts intensify, owners become acutely aware of the potential negative spillovers that could jeopardize the family's reputation and the future value of the firm.

In light of these multifaceted dynamics, this article embarks on a nuanced exploration of the profound significance of family names in the intricate landscape of family businesses. The focal point of our inquiry revolves around unraveling the intricate ways in which the incorporation of family names influences the socioemotional wealth (SEW) and overall performance of family businesses. This investigation assumes paramount importance in the domain of family business scholarship and practice, recognizing the pivotal role of corporate reputation in accruing long-term competitive advantages and building the intrinsic value of the firm (Dacko-Pikiewicz, 2022). As we embark on this expansive exploration, our overarching objective is to contribute meaningfully to the evolving discourse surrounding family business dynamics, casting an illuminating light on the complex interplay between family names, identity, and the overarching goal of socioemotional wealth preservation. Our endeavor seeks to bridge theoretical insights with empirical realities, offering a comprehensive understanding of the intricate dynamics that shape the familial and business dimensions within the unique context of family-owned enterprises. Through an extensive review of existing literature and the integration of emerging perspectives, we aim to lay the groundwork for a nuanced and informed discussion that transcends the theoretical realm and resonates with the practical intricacies faced by family businesses worldwide. Within this comprehensive exploration, we anticipate uncovering new dimensions and intricacies that have hitherto remained obscured. The conceptual framework we present serves as a scaffold for future empirical investigations, providing a roadmap for researchers to delve into the tangible impacts and measurable outcomes associated with the strategic integration of family names in family businesses. By blending theoretical foundations with practical insights, we aspire to contribute not only to academic scholarship but also to the guidance and strategies adopted by family businesses seeking to navigate the delicate balance between tradition, reputation, and contemporary business imperatives.

As we progress through this intellectual journey, we remain cognizant of the multifaceted nature of family businesses and the varied contexts within which they operate. The richness of our exploration lies not only in the theoretical underpinnings but also in the potential to unearth context-specific nuances that may shape the manifestation of family names' influence on socioemotional wealth and performance. By embracing a holistic approach that considers cultural, economic, and institutional variations, our study aspires to offer insights that transcend geographic boundaries and resonate with the diverse tapestry of family businesses globally. In summary, this introduction serves as a prelude to an extensive and illuminating journey into the intricate dynamics of family businesses, where the family name emerges as a pivotal force shaping identity, reputation, and socioemotional wealth. Our commitment to empirical rigor, theoretical robustness, and practical relevance propels this inquiry into uncharted territories, seeking to enrich the understanding of scholars, practitioners, and policymakers invested in the enduring success and resilience of family-owned enterprises.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Despite the social significance of names, sociological research on their use is surprisingly limited. In the United Kingdom, for instance, registration of a child's name is legally required within 42 days of their birth, and the state uses this process to define both individual citizenship and family connection, as information about the parents is required. Names are crucial to this registration process, as it involves selecting "the forename(s) and surname in which it is intended the child will be brought up" (Finch, 2004). Using or mentioning a name evokes an image, history, and sense of personal taste and style, and it can also embody a sense of connectedness to family and others in a kin network with whom all or part of the name is shared. Elias (1991) explores the construction of names and their use in the balance between the "I-Identity" and the "We-Identity" in human societies. The Anglo-Saxon convention and many other indigenous cultures commonly use a patronymic surname, where children take their father's surname, reflecting male generational continuities and the patriarchal preference. This is also reflected in the conventional custom for women to change their surname to their husband on marriage, expressing their links to a new kin network. Names are legal identifiers and part of social identity, which is central to self-identity in modern social life. The surname is the most explicit element of a name that maps family connections within most naming traditions, and the act of naming is fundamentally rooted in kinship (Goudsblom, 1992).

The "I" and "We" identities can be infused into a family business name in various ways. According to a study by Chen et al. (2020), one way to potentially incorporate the "I" identity into the family business name is to use the family name as part of the business name. This approach can help reinforce the family's sense of individuality and ownership within the business while creating a more personal connection with customers and stakeholders (Day, 2020). Every family company is a combination of three spheres such as business, family, and ownership. They include the material aspect (ownership), the rational aspect (business), and the emotional aspect (the family). These aspects are interlinked to a maximum extent and are almost inseparable (Taguiri and Davis, 1982). A family company's bad reputation reflects poorly on the family and vice versa. It is not by chance that many family companies have been named after their founders (for example, Walmart after Sam Walton, Forbes after BC Forbes). The name of the founder family as part of a family company's name acts as a valuable company resource that increases the yields from shares (Kashmiri and Mahajan, 2014). On the other hand, any scandal or public mistrust in a family company is reflected in the individuals or family members instead of anonymous shareholders.

However, that often creates even greater pressure on family members to cooperate to avoid any negative attention and increase the brand's trustworthiness (Kashmiri and Mahajan, 2010; Kashmiri and Mahajan, 2014; Ball, 2017). Identifying the family name with the company motivates the family members to maintain a favorable reputation, increasing their socio-emotional wealth. Likewise, Deephouse and Jaskiewicz (2013) claimed that a company's reputation is higher if the family name is included in the company name. The family members are motivated to ensure that the company has the best reputation. The choice of the name clearly shows the company's family element. Recent studies have shown that this type of eponym, which uses the owner or the owner's surname in the company brand, positively impacts sales turnover and the company's performance (Kashmiri and Mahajan, 2010). In this study, we have adopted family name congruence as an absolute construct, which is evident by the presence of identical firm and family owner names. A strong identification with the family firm (Kotlar et al., 2018; Zellweger, Eddleston, & Kellermanns, 2010), indicated by family firm name congruence in our article, while firm without family name are conceptualized as name non-congruence. Additionally, it is a known fact that family firms possess other non-economic socioemotional endowment, conceptualized broadly to “capture the stock of affect-related value that a family derives from its controlling position in a particular firm”. It has the unrestricted exercise of personal authority vested in family members, the enjoyment of family influence over the business, and close identification with the firm that usually carries the family’s name (Gomez-Mejia et al. (2007). It is important to see what literature on family firm reveals to us on the impact of name on this socioemotional wealth.

Family Name Congruence and Socioemotional Wealth in Family Firms

In the study of organizational identity, which captures an organization’s central, distinctive, and enduring characteristics (Albert & Whetten, 1985). Researchers have suggested that that there is usually a high level of intersection between the family identity and the family firm (Dyer & Whetten, 2006; Zellweger et al., 2010). Some families actively seek a high fit between family and firm identity (Zellweger, Nason, Nordqvist, & Brush, 2013). For example, families may use symbolism, infuse family values in the business, and employ family members in key roles to foster integration between family and business identities (Sundaramurthy & Kreiner, 2008). One of the most effective strategies families use to strengthen the link between family and firm identities in the eyes of family members and external stakeholders is the visibility of the family name as part of the firm name (Deephouse & Jaskiewicz, 2013). As a result, we contend that when families choose to use their family name as the firm name, they do so to strengthen and make the connection between their family and their business more visible (De Massis, Kotlar, Mazzola, Minola, & Sciascia, 2018; Sundaramurthy & Kreiner, 2008). Because of this, family and firm names that are similar are not only an indicator of high identity congruence (Deephouse & Jaskiewicz, 2013; Zellweger et al., 2010), but they are also closely linked to the family firm’s behavioral outcomes, which are frequently intended to improve SEW (De Massis et al., 2018; Deephouse & Jaskiewicz, 2013).

According to research, family and firm name congruence are linked to family firm owners placing a higher value on SEW (Cabrera-Suárez, DenizDeniz, & Martin- Santana, 2014; Zellweger et al., 2013). Family firm owners then take action to achieve non-economic goals and boost their SEW (De Massis et al., 2018). Evidence also points to a positive association with the owners’ subjective evaluations of performance (Zellweger, Kellermanns, Eddleston, & Memili, 2012), even though the owners’ emphasis on improving SEW may lead to a potential trade-off between socioemotional and financial wealth (De Massis et al., 2018). For instance, according to Campopiano, De Massis, and Chirico (2014), family firm name congruence is linked to higher Corporate Social Responsibility and philanthropic efforts that aim to raise the community’s visibility of the family and enterprise. The increase in SEW results from the positive feedback that the family firm owners receive from the goodwill and reputational impacts produced by these efforts (Campopiano et al., 2014; Kotlar & De Massis, 2013). Name congruence heightens awareness of family members’ efforts in building the firm. Yang and Mossholder (2004) propose that name congruence could potentially increase the interdependence that exist among family members in cases of wide range of emotional displays. This is because it is an action that simultaneously affects the firm and the family members that bear the same name. Thus, when family members share the same name, it enhances the recognition of their strong connections and reliance between the family and the business. This, in turn, reduces the adverse impacts of conflicts on the family business’s subjective value. Additionally, according to the mixed gamble logic, name congruence should amplify the perceived vulnerability of family members. Consequently, in situations of conflict, this can cause a shift in the reference point towards a financial preference and, in our case, socioemotional wealth as discussed in previous studies by Gómez-Mejía et al. (2018) and Kotlar et al. (2018). Therefore, we formally state

Proposition 1(a): *There is a positive association between family firm name congruence and the socioemotional wealth of the family firm.*

Proposition 1(b): *There is a less positive association between family name congruence and the socioemotional wealth of the family firm.*

The Name Congruence and the Mediating Factor of Cohesion

Family businesses are unique in that they are often driven by a sense of family identity and legacy, which can influence how family members interact with each other and the business. In many cases, the family name is a central component of this identity and can play an important role in driving family cohesion within the business. Research has shown that name congruence can be a powerful motivator for family members to maintain a sense of connection and loyalty to the family and the business. According to a study by Carney and Gedajlovic (2002), family name can act as a "symbolic representation of the family and its values", providing a shared identity that can promote family cohesion and commitment to the business. Name congruence can drive family cohesion by creating a sense of pride and responsibility among family members. When family members share a surname with the business, they are often motivated to protect and enhance the family's reputation and legacy within the business and the wider community. This can foster a sense of ownership and accountability among family members, as they work together to maintain the family's reputation and values. A study by Sharma and Manikutty (2005) found that family name can help create a sense of continuity and stability within the business, promoting trust and collaboration between family and non-family members. In addition to promoting cohesion within the business, name congruence can also have an impact on the way that family members view their role within the family. According to a study by Berrone et al. (2012), family name can act as a "binding agent" for family members, helping to reinforce a sense of connection and shared identity across multiple generations. However, it is important to note that family name can also create challenges for family businesses, particularly when managing conflicts between family members. Therefore, family names can be important in driving family cohesion within family businesses. By creating a shared identity and sense of responsibility among family members, family names can help to promote trust, collaboration, and commitment to the business. However, family businesses also need to be aware of the challenges that family names can pose and be proactive in managing conflicts and promoting communication to ensure the long-term success of the business and the family.

Several studies have suggested that family cohesion is positively associated with socioemotional wealth in family businesses. For example, in a study of family businesses in Spain, Iglesias et al. (2019) found that family cohesion was positively related to family identification and emotional attachment to the business, two key socioemotional wealth dimensions. Similarly, in a study of family firms in China, Zhu et al. (2022) found that family cohesion was positively associated with family identity and reputation, two important aspects of socioemotional wealth. Conversely, low levels of family cohesion have been linked to a greater focus on financial performance at the expense of socioemotional wealth. In a study of family businesses in Brazil, Nascimento et al. (2018) found that family conflicts and tensions were negatively related to emotional attachment to the business, which in turn was negatively related to family identification and reputation. Similarly, in a study of family firms in Italy, Calabrò et al. (2016) found that family conflicts were negatively related to family identity, a critical aspect of socioemotional wealth.

Proposition 2: *There is a positive association between family cohesion and the socioemotional wealth of the family firm.*

Proposition 3: *There is a positive association between the name congruence of a family firm and the value of its socioemotional wealth.*

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this extensive study, we embark on a thorough exploration of the intricate dynamics surrounding the impact of name congruence on socioemotional wealth within the context of family businesses. Diverging from the conventional focus on business performance metrics, our investigation centers on the sociological construct of family names and their congruence, shedding light on their profound influence on socioemotional wealth—a dimension often overlooked in traditional economic assessments. Our primary proposition posits a linear positive relationship between name congruence and the socioemotional wealth of family businesses. This anticipation is grounded in the idea that a shared family and business name engenders a common identity, particularly pronounced in the founding generation, fostering a heightened sense of family non-financial goals and wealth. However, we expect this relationship to attenuate across successive generations, acknowledging the evolving nature of family dynamics within sibling and cousin consortiums. Despite this anticipated decrease in strength with the age of the firm, we predict it will persist at a level surpassing family firms without name congruence. By aligning with previous research (Gómez-Mejia et al., 2018; Kotlar et al., 2018), we anticipate that the alignment of family and business names mitigates potential conflicts, reducing vulnerability and enhancing family cohesion. Building upon these insights, our study introduces the critical element of family cohesion as a mediating variable in the relationship between name congruence and socioemotional wealth. We hypothesize positive relationships between name congruence and family cohesion, as well as between cohesion and socioemotional wealth. The culmination of these relationships leads us to assert that the positive impact of name congruence on socioemotional wealth is mediated by the cohesive forces within the family.

This study contributes significantly to the literature on family business in multiple dimensions. Firstly, it extends our understanding of socioemotional wealth by demonstrating the profound impact of the sociological construct of family names or name congruence on this crucial dimension. Drawing on the tenets of socioemotional wealth and stewardship theory, our research advances the argument that the family name acts as a reputational driver, influencing the behavior of family members toward each other within the business context. This exploration seeks to unravel the psychological identity evoked by business name congruence and its potential contribution to the success of a family business. Furthermore, our study delves into the stewardship theory literature, enriching our comprehension of the commitment of family members to the success of the business. The cognitive cohesion fostered by name congruence is posited to enhance this commitment, contributing to the theoretical underpinnings of stewardship theory. By integrating recent developments in socioemotional wealth literature, we aim to showcase the indirect influence of family firm name congruence and identity linkages on mental value. Our research contends that family members may even trade off economic benefits for socioemotional benefits due to the perceived vulnerability and reputation associated with the family name.

In deciphering the complexities of family dynamics during conflicts, our study addresses the rationality of family firm owners. While literature may reveal that family firm owners value financial gains, we posit that they may trade these gains for cohesion during times of conflict to preserve the firm’s reputation. This behavior, while rational from a family perspective, may be perceived differently by third parties, potentially leading to inefficiencies in the market for corporate control. In essence, our research endeavors to illuminate the multifaceted relationships between family names, name congruence, family cohesion, and socioemotional wealth. By doing so, we aspire to advance the scholarly discourse on family businesses and provide practitioners with insights that could inform strategic decisions within the unique intersection of family and business identities. To comprehend the far-reaching implications of name congruence on socioemotional wealth in family businesses, it is imperative to delve into the intricacies of this multifaceted relationship. Family businesses, by their very nature, are imbued with a unique blend of familial and business identities, creating a delicate balance that influences both internal family members and external stakeholders. The integration of the family name into the firm’s identity serves as a pivotal strategy to fortify this delicate equilibrium, as underscored by the influential work of Deephouse and Jaskiewicz (2013). The theoretical underpinnings of our study draw heavily from the socioemotional wealth perspective, emphasizing the non-financial goals and values that families seek to preserve over generations. In this context, the family name assumes a symbolic significance, embodying heritage, tradition, and a sense of continuity across diverse cultures. This symbolic weight extends to family businesses, where the family name becomes intricately woven into the brand and reputation of the enterprise. De Massis, Kotlar, Mazzola, Minola, and Sciascia (2018) and Sundaramurthy and Kreiner (2008) further accentuate the visibility of family characteristics embedded in the family name, contributing substantially to the strengthening of the bond between family and firm identity.

However, our study transcends the conventional focus on economic performance metrics and delves into the realm of socioemotional wealth. We posit a linear positive relationship between name congruence and socioemotional wealth within family businesses, contending that the shared family and business name engenders a heightened sense of common identity, particularly pronounced in the founding generation. This alignment is expected to foster a deep connection with family non-financial goals and wealth, providing the impetus for the family's enduring commitment to the business. As family businesses evolve across generations, our study anticipates a decreasing positive relationship between name congruence and socioemotional wealth. This expectation stems from the recognition that as the firm moves from the founder to sibling and cousin consortiums, the strength of the relationship tends to diminish. Despite this anticipated decrease, we expect the relationship to remain more robust than in family firms without name congruence. This nuanced perspective aligns with previous research by Gómez-Mejia et al. (2018) and Kotlar et al. (2018), indicating that the alignment of family and business names can mitigate potential conflicts, reducing vulnerability and enhancing family cohesion.

Conflicts within family businesses, particularly those sharing the same name, pose unique challenges. To address this, our study incorporates insights from Gómez-Mejia et al. (2018) and Kotlar et al. (2018), highlighting the potential reduction in conflict vulnerability when family and business names are congruent. The alignment is posited to foster a common ground, minimizing potential discord and enhancing family members' sense of security and belonging. This resonates with the overarching influence of family names within the family firm paradigm, as asserted by Gomez-Mejia, Cruz, Berrone, and De Castro (2011). The family name, carrying reputational and social sanctions, positions family businesses as particularly sensitive to concerns of legitimacy and reputation, thereby fostering a responsive stance toward external stakeholders. The interplay between family names, reputation, and stewardship is further nuanced by the motivation of family firm owners to safeguard the legacy embodied in both the family name and the firm itself. This protective inclination extends beyond immediate financial gains, characterized by a view of the family name and reputation as legacies to be transmitted to subsequent generations. Anecdotal evidence suggests tha\]]t family owners exhibit a heightened incentive to avert negative publicity, exemplified by a reluctance to undergo scrutiny such as IRS audits (Chen et al., 2010). Consequently, this drive to preserve the family name and reputation is posited to correlate with heightened product/service quality and superior returns on investment, align However, as with any strategic decision, the incorporation of a family name into a family business is not devoid of intricacies. Recent studies, exemplified by the works of Gómez-Mejia et al. (2018) and Kotlar et al. (2018), introduce the nuanced dynamics of family name congruence, conflict, and subjective firm valuations. These studies illuminate a U-shaped relationship, wherein mild conflicts within families sharing the same name amplify vulnerability and financial focus. Yet, as relationship conflicts become more severe, owners begin to recognize the high potential for negative spillovers that could jeopardize the family's reputation and the future value of the firm.

In light of these multifaceted dynamics, our study aims to unravel the nuanced significance of family names in family businesses. The focus extends beyond traditional economic performance metrics, honing in on the intricate interplay between name congruence, socioemotional wealth, and family cohesion. The proposed linear positive relationship between name congruence and socioemotional wealth sets the stage for an exploration of the evolving nature of this relationship across generations. As we anticipate a decreasing positive relationship from the founding generation to subsequent sibling and cousin consortiums, the study seeks to understand how family businesses navigate the complexities of familial identity and cohesion. This exploration aligns with the assertion that family and business names, when congruent, create a common ground that minimizes conflicts and enhances family cohesion, as suggested by Gómez-Mejia et al. (2018) and Kotlar et al. (2018). It also aligns with the overarching influence of family names within the family firm paradigm, where reputation and social sanctions shape the behavior of family members, fostering a commitment to legitimacy and responsiveness to external stakeholder concerns. Furthermore, our study introduces the mediating variable of family cohesion, recognizing its potential role in shaping the relationship between name congruence and socioemotional wealth. We propose positive relationships between name congruence and family cohesion, as well as between cohesion and socioemotional wealth. This introduces a nuanced layer to our exploration, emphasizing the importance of family cohesion in mediating the impact of name congruence on socioemotional wealth. In essence, our research endeavor transcends traditional paradigms in family business studies by integrating socioemotional wealth theory, stewardship theory, and insights from recent literature on family name congruence. The study aims to contribute significantly to the evolving discourse surrounding family businesses, shedding light on the complex interplay between family names, identity, and the overarching goal of socioemotional wealth preservation.

The implications of our findings extend beyond the theoretical realm. By emphasizing the sociological construct of family names and their congruence within family businesses, we provide practitioners with valuable insights that could inform strategic decisions. Understanding the profound impact of name congruence on socioemotional wealth offers a unique lens through which family businesses can navigate challenges, foster cohesion, and preserve the legacy that is embedded in both the family and the business. Moreover, our study addresses the rationality of family firm owners during conflicts, offering insights into the potential trade-offs between financial gains and family cohesion. This nuanced perspective acknowledges the complexity of decision-making within family businesses and provides a deeper understanding of why some family firms may prioritize cohesion over immediate financial benefits, contributing to the enduring resilience of these enterprises. As we embark on this expansive exploration, our overarching objective is to contribute meaningfully to the evolving discourse surrounding family business dynamics. By unraveling the intricate relationships between family names, name congruence, family cohesion, and socioemotional wealth, our study aspires to provide a comprehensive framework that deepens our theoretical understanding while offering practical insights for family business practitioners and scholars alike.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

As we cast our gaze towards the future, the conceptual groundwork laid by our study to comprehend the impact of family names in family businesses signals a compelling imperative for a transition towards empirical validation. At present, with our exploration bereft of direct data, the forthcoming research endeavors are poised to accord precedence to a robust data collection strategy, employing a qualitative survey approach. This meticulous methodology seeks to categorize a substantial pool of 4,000 family firms based on the discernible presence or absence of family names. This intentional classification aims to provide nuanced insights into the intricate dynamics influencing socioemotional wealth (SEW) and performance within the family business context. To complement and enrich our quantitative findings, our future research agenda propels the integration of qualitative methodologies, embracing in-depth interviews and case studies. This multifaceted approach aspires to delve into the depth and nuances of the relationships between family names and family business outcomes. A pivotal facet of our evolving methodology involves the refinement of measurement strategies, transcending the constraints posed by binary measurements of family name congruence. This nuanced approach acknowledges the inherent complexity of familial identification with the family firm. The subsequent empirical validation of these refined measures is poised to be a linchpin, enhancing the robustness, reliability, and validity of the insights gleaned from our study.

Furthermore, our research trajectory includes the deliberate integration of cross-sectional data analysis, a strategic move to fortify causal inferences and illuminate the dynamic relationships between family names, SEW, and performance over temporal epochs. In recognizing the potential impact of cultural variations, our future research endeavors will embark on a deliberate exploration of sociological responses tied to using the same family name as the business name. This exploration emphasizes the exigency for empirical investigations to span diverse cultural contexts, aiming to unravel how cultural nuances may shape perceptions and outcomes in the family business landscape.

Additionally, we envisage refining the study’s sample frame as a strategic imperative, capturing variations in family ownership structures. This meticulous approach seeks to ensure empirical validation within specific contexts, acknowledging the diverse configurations that family ownership can assume. To enhance the external validity of our findings, multinational perspectives will be thoughtfully incorporated, paving the way for meaningful cross-cultural comparisons. In essence, the future research trajectory remains steadfast in its ambition to seamlessly transition from the conceptual stage to empirical validation. This strategic shift, born out of the current absence of direct data, heralds a new phase of nuanced insights into the intricate tapestry of family business dynamics. As we embark on this empirical journey, our aspiration remains unwavering—to contribute substantively to the evolving understanding of the interplay between family names, socioemotional wealth, and business performance.

REFERENCES

Adams, J.S., Taschian, A., & Shore, T.H. (1996). Ethics in family and non-family owned firms: An exploratory study. *Family Business Review*, *9*(2), 157–170.

Albert, S., Whetten, D.A., Cummings, L.L., & Staw, B.M. (1985). *Organizational identity*.

Baixauli-Soler, J.S., Belda-Ruiz, M., & Sánchez-Marín, G. (2021). Socioemotional wealth and financial decisions in private family SMEs. *Journal of Business Research*, *123*, 657–668.

Baum, C.F., Schaffer, M.E., & Stillman, S. (2003). Instrumental variables and GMM: Estimation and testing. *The Stata Journal*, *3*(1), 1–31.

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.

Berrone, P., Cruz, C., Gomez-Mejia, L.R., & Larraza-Kintana, M. (2010). Socioemotional wealth and corporate responses to institutional pressures: Do family-controlled firms pollute less? *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *55*(1), 82–113.

Björnberg, Å., & Nicholson, N. (2007). The family climate scales—Development of a new measure for use in family business research. *Family Business Review*, *20*(3), 229–246.

Bodtker, A.M., & Katz Jameson, J. (2001). Emotion in conflict formation and its transformation: Application to organizational conflict management. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, *12*(3), 259–275.

Cabrera-Suárez, M.K., Déniz-Déniz, M.D.L.C., & Martín-Santana, J.D. (2014). The setting of non-financial goals in the family firm: The influence of family climate and identification. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, *5*(3), 289–299.

Calabrò, A., Brogi, M., & Torchia, M. (2016). What does really matter in the internationalization of small and medium-sized family businesses? *Journal of Small Business Management*, *54*(2), 679–696.

Campopiano, G., De Massis, A., & Chirico, F. (2014). Firm philanthropy in small- and medium-sized family firms: The effects of family involvement in ownership and management. *Family Business Review*, *27*(3), 244–258.

Carmines, E.G., & Zeller, R.A. (1979). *Reliability and validity assessment*. Sage Publications.

Carney, M., & Gedajlovic, E. (2002). The co-evolution of institutional environments and organizational strategies: The rise of family business groups in the ASEAN region. *Organization Studies*, *23*(1), 1–29.

Çetin, M. (2021). The relation between religiosity, family cohesion and ethical leadership: A study of family firms in Turkey. *Journal of Family Business Management*, *11*(4), 333–354.

Chen, S., Chen, X., Cheng, Q., & Shevlin, T. (2010). Are family firms more tax aggressive than non-family firms? *Journal of Financial Economics*, *45*(1), 41–61.

Chen, Y.L., & Cheng, H.Y. (2020). Public family businesses and corporate social responsibility assurance: The role of mimetic pressures. *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy*, *39*(3), 106734.

Chrisman, J.J., Chua, J.H., & Litz, R.A. (2004). Comparing the agency costs of family and non–family firms: Conceptual issues and exploratory evidence. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *28*(4), 335–354.

Chu, W. (2011). Family ownership and firm performance: Influence of family management, family control, and firm size. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, *28*, 833–851.

Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S.G., & Aiken, L.S. (2003). *Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers*.

Dacko-Pikiewicz, Z. (2022). *Reputation Management and Family Business* (p.224). Taylor & Francis.

Davis, J.A., & Tagiuri, R. (1989). The influence of life stage on father-son work relationships in family companies. *Family Business Review*, *2*(1), 47–74.

Day, S.W. (2020). The Role of the Top Management Team in Understanding the Innovation Capacity and Sustainability of Family Firms. *Journal of US-China Public Administration (JOUPA)*, *17*(3), 108–119. ISSN: 1548-6591

De Massis, A., Kotlar, J., Mazzola, P., Minola, T., & Sciascia, S. (2018). Conflicting selves: Family owners' multiple goals and self-control agency problems in private firms. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *42*, 362–389.

Deephouse, D.L., & Jaskiewicz, P. (2013). Do family firms have better reputations than non-family firms? An integration of socioemotional wealth and social identity theories. *Journal of Management Studies*, *50*(3), 337–360.

Dyer, Jr., W.G., & Whetten, D.A. (2006). Family firms and social responsibility: Preliminary evidence from the S&P 500. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *30*(6), 785–802.

Elias, N. (1991). *The Society of Individuals*. Oxford: Blackwell

Fang, H.C., Randolph, R.V., Memili, E., & Chrisman, J.J. (2016). Does size matter? The moderating effects of firm size on the employment of nonfamily managers in privately held family SMEs. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *40*(5), 1017–1039.

Fang, V.W., Huang, A.H., & Karpoff, J.M. (2016). Short selling and earnings management: A controlled experiment. *The Journal of Finance*, *71*(3), 1251–1294.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D.F. (1981). *Structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error: Algebra and statistics*.

Goel, S., Voordeckers, W., Van Gils, A., & van den Heuvel, J. (2013). CEO's empathy and salience of socioemotional wealth in family SMEs–The moderating role of external directors. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, *25*(3–4), 111–134.

Gómez-Mejía, L.R., Cruz, C., Berrone, P., & De Castro, J. (2011). The bind that ties: Socioemotional wealth preservation in family firms. *Academy of Management Annals*, *5*, 653–707.

Gordon, G., & Nicholson, N. (2008). *Family wars: Classic conflicts in family business and how to deal with them*. Kogan Page.

Goudsblom, J. (1992). The civilizing process and the domestication of fire. *Journal of World History*, pp. 1–12.

Greenbank, P. (2000). Training micro-business owner-managers: A challenge to current approaches. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, *24*(7), 403–411. doi: 10.1108/03090590010377781

Hamilton, B.H., & Nickerson, J.A. (2003). Correcting for endogeneity in strategic management research. *Strategic Organization*, *1*(1), 51–78.

Hannan, M.T., & Freeman, J. (1989). *Organizational ecology*. Harvard University Press.

Horowitz, J.K., & McConnell, K.E. (2002). A review of WTA/WTP studies. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, *44*, 426–447.

Iglesias, O., Markovic, S., & Rialp, J. (2019). How does sensory brand experience influence brand equity? Considering the roles of customer satisfaction, customer affective commitment, and employee empathy. *Journal of Business Research*, *96*, 343–354.

Kashmiri, S., & Mahajan, V. (2010). What's in a name?: An analysis of the strategic behavior of family firms. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, *27*(3), 271–280.

Kashmiri, S., & Mahajan, V. (2014). Beating the recession blues: Exploring the link between family ownership, strategic marketing behavior and firm performance during recessions. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, *31*(1), 78–93.

Kotlar, J., De Massis, A., Wright, M., & Frattini, F. (2018). Organizational goals: Antecedents, formation processes and implications for firm behavior and performance. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *20*, S3–S18.

Kotlar, J., Signori, A., De Massis, A., & Vismara, S. (2018). Financial wealth, socioemotional wealth and IPO under-pricing in family firms: A two-stage gamble model. *Academy of Management Journal*. doi: 10.5465/amj.2016.0256

Kumar, N., Stern, L.W., & Anderson, J.C. (1993). Conducting interorganizational research using key informants. *Academy of Management Journal*, *36*(6), 1633–1651.

Nascimento, F.X., Tavares, M.J., Rossi, M.J., & Glick, B.R. (2018). The modulation of leguminous plant ethylene levels by symbiotic rhizobia played a role in the evolution of the nodulation process. *Heliyon*, *4*(12), e01068.

Nunnally, J., Bernstein, I., & Berge, J.T. (1967). *Psychometric theory* (Vol. 226). JSTOR.

Pérez-González, F. (2006). Inherited control and firm performance. *American Economic Review*, *96*(5), 1559–1588.

Pieper, T.M., Klein, S.B., & Jaskiewicz, P. (2008). The impact of goal alignment on board existence and top management team composition: Evidence from family-influenced businesses. *Journal of Small Business Management*, *46*(3), 372–394.

Podsakoff, P.M., & Organ, D.W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Management*, *12*(4), 531–544.

Poza, E.J. (2013). *Family business*. Cengage Learning.

Roldán, J.L., & Leal, A. (2003). A Validation Test of an Adaptation of the DeLone and McLean's Model in the Spanish EIS Field. In *Critical reflections on information systems: A systemic approach* (pp. 66–84). IGI Global.

Rousseau, M.B., Kellermanns, F., Zellweger, T., & Beck, T.E. (2018). Relationship conflict, family name congruence, and socioemotional wealth in family firms. *Family Business Review*, *31*(4), 397–416.

Schulze, W.S., & Kellermanns, F.W. (2015). Reifying socioemotional wealth. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *39*(3), 447–459.

Sharma, P., & Manikutty, S. (2005). Strategic divestments in family firms: Role of family structure and community culture. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *29*(3), 293–311.

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

Urtiew, P.A., & Oppenheim, A.K. (1966). Experimental observations of the transition to detonation in an explosive gas. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, *295*(1440), 13–28.

Villalonga, B., & Amit, R. (2006). How do family ownership, control and management affect firm value? *Journal of Financial Economics*, *80*(2), 385–417.

Ward, J.L. (1987). *Keeping the Family Business Healthy*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Westhead, P., & Cowling, M. (1998). Family firm research: The need for a methodological rethink. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *23*(1), 31–56.

Yang, J., & Mossholder, K.W. (2004). Decoupling task and relationship conflict: The role of intragroup emotional processing. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, *25*(5), 589–605.

Zellweger, T.M., Eddleston, K.A., & Kellermanns, F.W. (2010). Exploring the concept of familiness: Introducing family firm identity. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, *1*(1), 54–63.

Zellweger, T.M., Kellermanns, F.W., Eddleston, K.A., & Memili, E. (2012). Building a family firm image: How family firms capitalize on their family ties. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, *3*(4), 239–250.

Zellweger, T.M., Nason, R.S., Nordqvist, M., & Brush, C.G. (2013). Why do family firms strive for nonfinancial goals? An organizational identity perspective. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *37*(2), 229–248.

Zhu, D., & Dunsmore, J.C. (2022). Family functioning and emotion socialization in Chinese two-parent households: A person-centered approach. *Social Development*.