Abstract: Family businesses are of particular economic relevance in the international hospitality and tourism industry. However, there are few studies that address their specific characteristics and objectives. The aim of this study is to produce a bibliometric overview that reveals the structure underpinning the analysis of the tourism family business in the business and management research field. The study also reveals the evolution of this research over time, as well as the most relevant related concepts and study gaps. Through a keyword co-occurrence analysis and a systematic review of 129 studies on tourism family businesses published between 1997 and 2020, the main contributions were organized into four thematic clusters, which include specific theoretical approaches. The clusters are Entrepreneurship, Marketing Orientation and Innovation Performance; Capabilities and Competitiveness; Sustainability; and Strategy and Economic Performance. On the basis of these results, this study introduces an integrative framework for tourism family business research, clarifying the rich diversity of research paths that seek to explain tourism business competitiveness, and identifying potential directions for future research aimed at further developing the field.
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1. Introduction

In recent years, tourism has experienced continuous expansion and has undergone a process of differentiation, making it one of the world’s largest—and still growing—economic sectors [1,2]. It plays a relevant role both as a tool for achieving competitiveness and as a driver of regional development and sustainability [2], thus attracting a much interest from many researchers [2,3].

Family businesses (FB, hereafter) represent a significant share of total global business, with figures ranging between 55% and 90% in various different countries [4]. As such, they contribute to the growth of the global economy, while their inherent complexities make them an interesting type of business to study [5]. They also encompass an organizational model that symbolizes the spirit of private initiative and entrepreneurial orientation [6]. They have a major presence in today’s developed and emerging economies, and among both SMEs and large corporations [4]. Tourism FB (TFB hereafter) is no exception to this pattern [7], as family-owned firms dominate the Hospitality and Tourism (H&T) industry globally [8–10].

There is no single definition of FB in the literature [9], although it is generally agreed that family members exert a strong influence over the firm [11,12] through family control of the share capital over the generations [13] and their high degree of involvement in management and corporate governance structures [14]. The understanding of how FB differs from nonfamily businesses is based on strategic, cultural, and environmental factors [15–17] linked to a particular industry or sector in which they operate.

To date, we know relatively little about FB management in the H&T industry [13]. In their evaluation of bibliometric studies in tourism, Koseoglu et al. [18] report a lack of studies on important subjects such as the FB, in spite of their importance for the H&T
industry. Indeed, Fu et al. [19] suggest that researchers should attempt to provide more evidence in subfields of the entrepreneurship literature focused on the H&T industry, examining topics such as FB.

Thus, despite the current economic and social importance of tourism and FB in the global social and economic structure, there is a lack of studies that analyze the specific characteristics of TFB, with the tourism sector considered a contextual variable in most of the existing research on the topic.

To advance the field of research focused on TFB, it is important to identify and disentangle the variety of approaches or academic domains that exist within it and trace the evolution of the field over time [5,20]. To that end, the main objectives of this research are: (1) to analyze the defining characteristics of TFB; (2) to conduct a bibliometric study to systematically identify the variety of research themes studied, related theoretical roots, and main contributions to the TFB research field, thereby revealing its structure, evolution, and main trends and impacts; and (3) to develop an integrative, multitheoretical framework which reveals potentially underexplored topics and emerging areas that merit further attention in TFB research.

Bibliometric analysis is an important way to move a research field forward by providing a transparent audit trail for both disseminating and legitimizing existing articles and establishing the way for new research to appear [21]. A number of studies in the literature have used bibliometric techniques in order to identify seminal works and scholars in tourism research [22], and literature about tourism and topics such as quality [21], entrepreneurship [19], and sustainability [1,23]. There have also been recent bibliometric analyses of FB with a focus on subject areas such as internationalization [16], innovation [24], innovation and sustainability [25], and the quality of family journals [5].

Due to the lack of bibliometric analysis of the literature about TFB and also due to their importance, the aim of this study is to provide an in-depth bibliometric analysis of the evolution of the topic in the literature. Specifically, we use a keyword occurrence method combined with in-depth reading and review of the selected social sciences papers published between 1997 and 2020 (up to 30 November 2020) to provide an up-to-date, systematic overview of existing TFB research. Interestingly, we found only 192 articles relating to the fields of both FB and the H&T industry, which we filtered down to 129 articles related to business and management fields. In addition to advancing the understanding of TFB characteristics, we examine keyword co-occurrence among published articles and identify four thematic clusters that describe the intellectual foundations of existing TFB research, thus capturing major ongoing research themes. The clusters are: (1) entrepreneurship, marketing orientation, and innovation performance, (2) capabilities and competitiveness, (3) sustainability, and (4) strategy and economic performance. For each cluster, we identified seminal papers constituting the foundations of the related TFB research.

Lastly, on the basis of the results of the keyword co-occurrence analysis, we map the links between the different thematic clusters and theoretical foundations identified, thereby providing an integrative model of TFB research. In doing so, we identify both existing research paths and gaps in the literature, which represent possible directions for future TFB research.

This bibliometric analysis will be beneficial not only for researchers but also for decision-makers in private and public organizations. For, researchers it offers critical discussions and suggestions related to theory development and future research, as well as indicating how said research can be enhanced through a multidisciplinary approach that complements theoretical and methodological bases. For decision-makers, it will help to guide their strategies and actions aimed at fostering a robust, coordinated destination ecosystem, with a focus on the social, environmental, technological, and innovation aspects found to be crucial for the international competitiveness of tourist destinations.
2. Tourism Family Business Conceptualization

Habbershon et al. [26], drawing inspiration from the resource-based view (RBV), point out that the set of resources and capabilities that FB possess as a result of the interactions between the family as a whole, the individual family members, and the business—referred to as familiness [27]—can be a source of competitive advantages and key to the analysis of their performance.

However, the mere existence of such resources and capabilities stemming from their status as FB do not necessarily represent an advantage, as clearly put forward by the “ability and willingness” debate seeking explanations of innovation performance [28]. In this regard, the classic theories associated with the study of FB ownership, governance, and management structures—namely, the RBV [29] and agency theory [30]—should be accompanied by behavioral arguments relating to stewardship [31] and the socioemotional wealth (SEW) approach [17,32]. Rooted in economics, agency theory has focused on identifying the optimal organizational designs that make it possible to prevent conflicts, align ownership and management interests and objectives, and favor information sharing and effective decision-making [30].

Unlike agency theory, stewardship theory [31] addresses the search for the optimal organizational structure to enhance the transfer of knowledge and exploitation of opportunities, empowering managers and employees, from a sociological and psychological basis. Instead of assuming divergent interests, this approach views managers as stewards, intrinsically motivated to serve the firm’s and principal’s objectives [33].

Under an SEW perspective, the analysis of the FB objectives and orientations that determine the allocation of firm-specific resources and capabilities goes beyond a focus on financial value [34]. Family-centered nonfinancial goals include family control and influence, binding social ties, harmony, legacy, and preferential treatment of family members [32].

Recent contributions have pointed out that it may not be SEW per se that distinguishes FB from nonfamily businesses, but rather how the family dynamic alters the influence of SEW on outcomes of interest [35]. Thus, as shown by this study, there is a growing trend in the TFB literature of analyzing the role of dynamic capabilities or innovation capabilities in creating, integrating, and reconfiguring internal resource capabilities and strategies to continually address, or bring about, changes in the business environment [36,37]. Specifically, since 2017, 42% of papers in this field of research used a dynamic capabilities or innovation capabilities approach, as identified by the author keywords or keywords plus.

Even though the dynamic capabilities theory [36], considered a dynamic extension of the RBV, significantly influences FB management research [38], it has made a limited contribution to the analysis of innovation processes and competitiveness as an interaction between the family, its individual members, and the firm [39].

This approach should be complemented with agency theory, stewardship theory, and SEW, as innovation capabilities development and management are affected by ownership, managerial and governance mechanisms, and bodies that hold decision-making power in the firm [40], as well as the objectives, values, and culture that characterize the firm [33].

The aim of the present bibliometric study is to gain a better understanding of the defining characteristics and dynamics of TFB in the field of business management, which in turn offer a clear understanding of the key determinants of their competitiveness. The analysis of the 129 papers that constitute the sample of this study reveals that TFB have very specific characteristics, inherent to this economic sector. We provide a summary of these characteristics below, considering the elements that play a role in the competitiveness of TFB and that are influenced by the tourism activity itself [41].

2.1. Family Business Objectives and Characteristic Behaviors of Family Owners and Management

TFB are often centered on a vision which places personal or family needs and preferences ahead of growth and profit maximization [7,42], yet this presents them with specific challenges for entrepreneurship [43] and inheritance [44,45]. This feature is directly related to the fact that the majority of TFB are SMEs or even micro businesses [7,46], and the
founder is still the owner and director [10,13,47,48]. Specifically, in the study by Kallmuenzer et al. [46], nearly 70% of surveyed firms from Western Austria, Vorarlberg, Tyrol, and Salzburg are small firms with fewer than 49 employees. This percentage is even higher (nearly 87%) in the study by Camisón et al. [49].

Rural tourism establishments are a case in point: small, farm-based FB are often established as a sideline or hobby, usually by women, to support the main farm business [50].

Family entrepreneurs in tourism are especially motivated by region-specific social and environmental objectives [46,51], and affected by the quality and natural heritage of the surrounding environment [12]. They thus show high levels of sustainability awareness or corporate social responsibility (CSR) compared to firms in other industries [12,52,53].

The reputation and status as FB, linked to social acceptance of and community support for their business activities [54], is crucial for their competitiveness in the H&T industry [12]. Thus, while firms often adopt sustainability strategies for economic reasons, TFB are more likely motivated by long-term performance and transgenerational survival [17] and SEW goals [32].

Environmental uncertainty is another major influence on entrepreneurial behavior in TFB, because of the extreme seasonality of some tourist destinations [55], linked to the climate and natural environment. This is the case, for example, with “sun and sand” destinations (e.g., Benidorm) or winter tourism (e.g., the Alps). In this context, developing the capacity for innovation in TFB is fundamental to the ability to compete locally [56–58] and also enhances regional competitiveness [58–60], given that most TFB tend to be committed to staying in their local town/area [9,51,61].

2.2. Family Business Assets, Ownership, and Governance Structure

Seasonal demand fluctuations cause many H&T initiatives to be planned as secondary and part-time operations [55]. According to Getz and Nilsson [55], FB are the predominant type of firm in the H&T industry and have specific characteristics that allow them to deal with seasonality in the sector. These authors claim that TFB managers tend to minimize labor costs by putting in long hours of hard work themselves; however, low rates of return can be an impediment to children taking over the business. Since the family residence and property are often an integral part of the business, failure could mean the loss of family assets and the family wealth invested in them, which tends to be fairly substantial [53].

For tourist accommodation businesses, when the family lives on site, some of the costs of staying open can even be considered as family subsistence costs [55]. The nature of the work and the seasonality of some destinations mean there is limited potential for inheritance. This is exacerbated by the lack of succession planning, above all in small and micro tourism businesses [62,63].

The human resources in TFB are usually characterized as having much experience but a low level of professionalization [60,62,64,65]. Moreover, they tend to have limited business planning and evaluation capabilities, and little inclination towards cooperation, networking, and the use of advanced management systems and tools related to information technologies [66,67]. TFB are also generally thought to be highly conservative and risk averse [53], which seems to be translated into reduced capital investment in technological, management, and marketing innovation [11,68–70].

TFB managers are especially focused on cost reduction [67] and cost control [53], with TFB usually securing financing from a combination of internal funds and bank loans [62,64], often maintained through investments in tangible collateral assets [71]. However, the factors that determine whether TFB will innovate may or may not be economic, but tend to be linked to risk aversion, the maintenance of traditional products, family control, and avoidance of disclosure [68].

2.3. External Effects: Geographical Location, Natural Environment, and Tourist Destination

TFB embedded in a tourist destination develop entrepreneurial [9,13] and sustainability-oriented behavior [72] while valuing sociocultural factors, family tradition [70,73], and
long-term cooperation \cite{13,74,75}. A degree of complementarity and interdependence between TFB and the agents in their value system allow them to anticipate business model innovations, which boost local development and facilitate the creation of a competitive and attractive “tourist entrepreneurial ecosystem” \cite{76,77}.

The embeddedness of TFB in a tourist destination also provides access to shared assets \cite{78} that have proven critical for growth and intergenerational success \cite{75,77}. Local authorities and public institutions (e.g., institutes, technological centers, or professional associations) play a key role in the way shared assets are accumulated and improved in a tourist district \cite{60,61,79}; for example, they may organize training courses to boost innovation and ensure tourists’ needs are met \cite{74,80,81}. Support from education and research institutions (e.g., universities and technology transfer agencies) and mediated activities such as startup hubs and accelerator programs \cite{77} are particularly important in the H&T industry given tourist companies’ typical reluctance to cooperate in sharing practices and innovation \cite{82}.

Among these institutions, the TFB literature highlights the role of destination management organizations (DMOs) \cite{83}. They help tourism firms embedded in a tourism destination to develop long-term strategic planning and marketing strategies, to preserve local resources and heritage, and to drive change among the tourism agents in the value system—all of which are crucial for the competitiveness of both tourism businesses and destinations \cite{58,59,76,79,84}. Regulatory councils, designations of origin, and protected designations of origin also play a critical role in quality control and ensuring compliance with regulations \cite{85,86}.

2.4. Tourist Perspective and Behavior

Despite these liabilities, TFB are valued for their reputation. The incentive to enhance their social status in the local community through a positive image acts as a mechanism protecting the assets of both the TFB and the family itself during times of crisis. Among the values associated with TFB internal identity and the external image they present to the market, the literature has highlighted their altruism, friendliness, and passion for work \cite{12,87,88}.

In this vein, from a demand-side perspective, Presas et al. \cite{89} found that TFB customers experience, interpret, and understand familiness as a bundle of four distinct dimensions, which are seen as valuable, differentiating factors of the travel experience: (1) getting acquainted with the business, (2) having direct communication with the TFB family owners, (3) feeling TFB hospitality and hospitableness, and (4) perceiving “authenticity” and “slow travel” values in their experience. This familiness makes the tourist feel more “at home” than with nonfamily firms, indicating that the fact a company is family owned or run is an essential part of the tourist experience \cite{90}. These characteristics, combined with professionalism in service provision, are appreciated by customers, even as a distinctive brand with an emotional added value \cite{91}, which helps to build loyalty towards particular TFB \cite{92}. The relational qualities and social capital of TFB are also a key asset for engaging customers in value co-creation \cite{51}.

3. Materials and Methods

To explore existing TFB research, we carried out a bibliometric study based on an analysis of the co-occurrences \cite{93} of the keywords used in publications on the subject, with the aid of VOSviewer software \cite{94}. Keyword co-occurrence analysis involves looking at the keywords that occur together in articles. This type of quantitative analysis can reveal the structure underpinning a certain topic in a discipline and its evolution, as well as the most relevant related concepts. Furthermore, the analysis of the thematic clusters identified may show networks among papers, based on their keywords and topics, helping to reveal trends \cite{95}. 
To identify and retrieve the articles, we used the Clarivate WoS database, considered one of the main academic databases for the assessment of scientific output worldwide [96], without filtering by year or language. The data retrieval was performed on 30 November 2020.

To gain a general overview of the publications, we searched for the terms that we consider capture TFB research; specifically, (“family business”” OR “family firm”” OR “family enterprise”” OR “family organization”” OR “family company”” OR “family influence”” OR “family SME”” OR “family involvement””) AND (“tourism”” OR “tourism sector”” OR “hospitality”” OR “tourism and hospitality”” OR “hotel””) in titles, abstracts, or indexing terms of a dataset limited to articles. This search yielded 136 results. After filtering out articles not related to the fields of business, management, or economics, we were left with a sample composed of 92 publications on family business and tourism and hospitality.

The same was done with the Scopus database, where we searched in titles, abstracts, and keywords for the terms (“family business”” OR “family firm”” OR “family enterprise”” OR “family organization”” OR “family company”” OR “family influence”” OR “family owned”” OR “family controlled”” OR “family SME”” OR “family involvement”) AND (“tourism”” OR “tourism sector”” OR “hospitality”” OR “tourism and hospitality”” OR “hotel”). The search was limited to articles from the business field (LIMIT-TO (DOCTYPE, “ar”) AND (LIMIT-TO (SUBJAREA, “BUSI”)), with a sample of 121 publications. Of these, 84 were eliminated because they were already in the WOS database, or because they did not fit the search criteria. Thus, 37 publications from the Scopus database were added to the 92 publications from the WOS database, resulting in a final sample of 129 publications.

We treated the input text file with the keywords before obtaining the results of the bibliometric analysis with VosViewer. Specifically, we integrated words with the most co-occurrences that have a similar meaning (e.g., capabilities and capacities), acronyms (e.g., CRS) and plural forms of the keywords. In order to help the reader gain a clearer understanding of the research steps followed, Figure 1 presents a schematic of the research method.

![Figure 1. Research method diagram.](image-url)
4. Results

4.1. Evolution of Published Papers and Main TFB Research Streams

Figure 2 shows the evolution in the number of papers related to TFB published during the 13-year period 1997–2020. According to the Clarivate WoS database, the first article on TFB, [97], appears in 1997 and was cited on this basis 55 times; since then, articles on the subject have regularly been published. A clear upward trend over time, especially after 2014, can be observed, indicating the increased importance of the subject in scientific research.

![Figure 2. Annual publications in Web of Science (WoS) on TFB research.](image)

We analyzed articles using the VOSviewer program to identify the most frequent keywords, shown below. The analysis of the networks can be used to create a graphic map of the relationships between the data. Figure 3 displays the networks created by taking the 565 keywords (introduced by the authors), filtered to obtain a minimum of four occurrences; this process resulted in 32 keywords related to TFB in the articles. Nodes represent keywords and links between nodes show co-occurrence. Using VOSviewer software, a node can be made to represent the number of papers in which a keyword is used, such that the larger the node, the greater the frequency of the keyword. The same color indicates a group of connected keywords or cluster. The lines depict the number of articles in which a specific keyword appears in conjunction with another. The distance between nodes represents how many articles the two keywords are in together compared to co-occurrences with other keywords.

Based on this information, the next step was to conduct a cluster analysis [95] of these 565 concepts. The program identified four clear groups of theoretical analysis, based on keywords that appear together or keyword occurrence. The resulting clusters are shown in Figure 4. We describe these four clusters below, together with their main focuses of analysis and publications in the literature.
4.2. **Cluster 1: Entrepreneurship, Marketing Orientation, and Innovation Performance**

The first cluster contains 34 papers focused on these issues in the H&T industry. Figure 4 shows the frequency with which these keywords are cited in the articles that make up this cluster. Innovation is mainly understood in terms of outputs (new products, processes, and technologies). Small family wineries from Spain, Uruguay, Argentina, and Italy are used as examples; they acquire technology and modern winery equipment and diversify through increased involvement in wine tourism and wine exports [79].

Innovation performance in tourism is more limited in FB than in nonfamily businesses [68], where tradition can suppress traits such as risk-taking and striving for achievement [73], as well as potentially resulting in low diversity, a scarcity of competence, and a lack of fundamentally new thinking [98]. However, Altinay et al. [73], Giacosa et al. [47], and Vrontis et al. [84], claim innovation and tradition are not incompatible if companies can balance innovation and respect for the family’s values and different generations (see Table 1). In this vein, Yazici et al. [92] suggest that successful growth depends on entrepreneurs’ ability to combine factors related to their personality and orientation with others linked to strategy and opportunities derived from internal family relationships and external nonfamily relationships. The innovation and differentiation processes at destination level are external factors that can explain entrepreneurship orientation. The paper by Peters and Kallmuenzer [13], one of the most important in this cluster (Table 1), explains that the embeddedness of FB in their destination and region shapes their entrepreneurial behavior, and they appear to show a greater “commitment to stay” in their town than their nonfamily counterparts [99]. This strong commitment reinforces the systematic framework proposed by Morrison [9] (Table 1), for whom the entrepreneurial process in FB depends on the cultural, industry, and organizational context. The continuity of TFB is critical for the livelihood and sustainability of regional destinations that rely on the H&T industry [99]. Entrepreneurs who want potential successors to continue the operation in the future also need to involve them in the destination management and in the long-term tourism planning, reconsidering destination governance patterns [83].
In addition, some articles emphasize the importance of innovation performance for economic performance, through market differentiation and customer satisfaction [83,89]. The rural hospitality industry in particular is dominated by FB and shaped by high-contact services, where hosts and guests co-create value [75], so investing in the management and control of this collaboration can boost innovation results [100]. Innovativeness in TFB is as relevant for performance as in non-TFB, although control mechanisms established to monitor the activities and performance of FB managers tend to be inefficient in TFB [46]. This reinforces the need for a better understanding of the nexus between small and micro enterprises and innovations, as previous research has largely overlooked the effects of policy and governance on innovations in tourism [101].
Table 1. Most cited papers related to Entrepreneurship, Marketing Orientation, and Innovation Performance.

| Journal                                      | NC  | Authors                        | Year | Theoretical Lens(es)                                                                 | Sample                               | Main Variables                                                                 | Main Results                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Family Business Concept                                                                 |
|----------------------------------------------|-----|--------------------------------|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| TOURISM MANAGEMENT                           | 210 | Thomas, R; Shaw, G; Page, SJ   | 2011 | Inter-, multi- and disciplinary studies that contribute to current understanding of small firms in tourism | SMEs                                 | Small tourism firms, future research agenda                                  | Three areas for future research: i) development (application of theories of business growth or the development of explanations for structural changes within the sector); ii) emerging areas (informal economy, local economic development and policy formation for the sector); iii) established areas topics where research on certain aspects lags behind (such as small firms and sustainability) or because there has been a sustained effort which has borne fruit but requires development, notably theoretically (such as lifestyle businesses) | Firms that may be owned and managed by a family (a structure) |
| INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ENTREPRENEURIAL BEHAVIOR & RESEARCH | 98  | Morrison, A                   | 2006 | Entrepreneurship Application of a systematic framework                               | Entrepreneurial process, industry setting, organisational context, entrepreneurial socio-economic outcomes | Entrepreneurial process in family business depends on cultural, industry and organizational context | Within the context of entrepreneurship, family businesses may be established for social and economic purposes, and mesh domestic and business dimensions towards the attainment of lifestyle goals                                                                                                                                          |                                                                                         |
| BRITISH FOOD JOURNAL                         | 94  | Vrontis, D; Bresciani, S; Giacosa, E | 2016 | Innovation strategy Three semi-structured interviews with the CEO; direct observations in wine shops and restaurants; documentation from websites, interviews in magazines and websites with other family members | Consumer perception, cultural identity, tradition, product innovation, process innovation, territory | Innovation and tradition are not opposites; on the contrary, a blend of the two has been crucial in achieving and maintaining a sustainable competitive advantage | Family businesses has specific mechanisms and dynamics (Chrisman et al., 2012). In its innovation, the company is strictly connected to the “familiness” factor (Dunn, 1995; Sirmon and Hitt, 2003)                                                                                                                    |                                                                                         |
### Table 1. Cont.

| Journal | NC | Authors                          | Year | Theoretical Lens(es) | Sample | Main Variables | Main Results                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Family Business Concept |
|---------|----|---------------------------------|------|-----------------------|--------|----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HOSPITALITY MANAGEMENT | 64 | Altinay, L; Madanoglu, M; Daniele, R; Lashley, C | 2012 | Entrepreneurship      | 205 British university students pursuing tourism and hospitality management degree at a major British university | Family tradition, locus of control, tolerance ambiguity, innovativeness, need for achievement, risk taking, entrepreneurial intention | Family entrepreneurial background and innovation influence the intention to start a new business; there is positive relationship between tolerance of ambiguity and risk taking propensity; and a negative relationship between locus of control and risk taking propensity. It’s important to take a more holistic approach when researching the factors that influence entrepreneurial intention | Socio-cultural factors and in particular family tradition in the same line of business is identified as an influential factor on the entrepreneurial behaviours of individuals. So, family tradition was measured, based on the question whether anybody in the family has a prior entrepreneurship experience |
| CURRENT ISSUES IN TOURISM | 27 | Peters, M; Kallmuenzer, A | 2015 | Entrepreneurship | 17 interviews with family owner-managers of hospitality family firms throughout the state of Tyrol, Austria, from different Tyrolean regions and from businesses of different sizes and age. | Performance, entrepreneurial orientation, entrepreneurial behavior | Family firms in hospitality and tourism are peculiar. Their embeddedness in the destinations and regions outlines their entrepreneurial behavior | (i) Ownership and management, (ii) majority of shares, (iii) family members in the business (Chua, Chrisman and Sharma, 1999; Litz, 1995; Miller, Le Breton-Miller and Scholnick, 2007; Westhead and Cowling, 1998) |
| BRITISH FOOD JOURNAL | 21 | Giacosa, E; Ferraris, A; Monge, F | 2017 | Innovation strategy | Two semi-structured interviews with the CEO; direct observations in shops; documentations, and past interviews in magazines and websites with other family members | Food innovation, customer perception, cultural identity, tradition, territory | The company is characterized by a strong combination of tradition and innovation, both in products and processes. Its competitiveness is the result of a balanced management of innovation, in respect of the family’s values, thanks to the active presence of two family generations. | Family businesses has specific features, mechanisms, and behavior (Chrisman et al., 2012), and a heterogeneous nature – stemming from a merging of family and business (Chua et al., 2012) |
4.3. Cluster 2: Capabilities and Competitiveness

The second cluster, Capabilities and Competitiveness, comprises 31 articles (Figure 4). The most cited paper (Table 2) is the seminal work by Getz and Carlsen [7], which demonstrates the dynamics of FB in tourism. An important practical paper in this cluster is the case study by Presas et al. [90] (Table 2), showing that family values and familiness can play a role in the strategic vision, the organizational culture and the corporate image of a FB in the H&T industry.

Among the most important capabilities included in this cluster are innovations or dynamic capabilities [37], due to their proven impact on financial and operational performance [102,103]. In this respect, we can identify a link to cluster 1; however, in this cluster, innovation is approached in terms of capabilities and processes, while in cluster 1 innovation is related to outputs. As an example, in the FB-driven Alpine hospitality industry of Western Austria, family dynamics play a key role in supporting the exchange of ideas for innovation between family members, employees, guests, and local competitors [57].

In this vein, one aim of the papers in this cluster is to determine the role of contingent variables in the relationship between dynamic capabilities and competitiveness. For example, Camisón et al. [40] claim that dynamic capabilities vary according to the designs of the ownership, corporate, and family governance structures. They draw attention to the lack of enterprise culture in subsequent generations in the Spanish H&T industry, which is also found in other countries [80,104]. However, some traditional TFB do manage to have entrepreneurial insights [105] and explore innovative ways to respond to the challenges they face [59], while considering the ongoing commitment of the successors [106].

Gender and succession are two of the most relevant moderating variables in the relationship between dynamic capabilities and competitiveness, as shown by their relevance in the cluster. In fact, succession receives a much attention in the literature about knowledge accumulation capabilities and professional development [15,62]. In this respect, the low level of managerial [80] and practical experience [104] and network relationships [56,102] of young entrepreneurs is a challenge to both the succession process and innovation capabilities [92]. As Hauck and Prügl [11] (Table 2) show, family factors are related to the owner–manager’s perception of the intrafamily leadership succession phase as an opportunity for innovation activities in FB, with emotional and family ties playing an important role in the succession process [106].

Finally, the cluster highlights the importance of FB ownership characteristics linked to gender. One of the most relevant studies in this cluster (Table 2), by Bensemann and Hall [50], found that, in the rural tourism accommodation sector in New Zealand, traditional gender divisions of labor appear to have been transferred from the private home domain into the business. As such, women’s positionality in TFB incorporates a wide range of factors that are part of a more general lifestyle entrepreneurship strategy [50], with psychological benefits (self-achievement, control of their own life, and control of succession). The dominance of traditional gender roles in the H&T industry [50] is further reinforced by cultural patterns and ideologies, as shown in the studies by Amad [80], Banki and Ismail [62], and Mei et al. [104]. However, in TFB that follow a lifestyle entrepreneurship strategy, women tend to be well represented in family ownership, family management, and family control of the board [107]. That said, tourism can be a way to transform the traditions in a society, as shown by Turkish [108] and Indonesian [109] examples. In fact, the study by Rachmawati et al. [109] emphasizes the role of women’s family involvement in strengthening the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and business performance.
### Table 2. Most cited papers related to Capabilities and Competitiveness.

| Journal                                      | NC | Authors                | Year | Theoretical Lens(es)                                                                 | Sample                                                                 | Main Variables                                                                 | Main Results                                                                 | Family Business Concept                                                                 |
|----------------------------------------------|----|------------------------|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| ANNALS OF TOURISM RESEARCH                   | 157| Getz, D; Carlsen, J    | 2005 | A priori determination of keywords (owner, owner–operator, family, gender, small business, entrepreneur, business growth/failure) summarizes the literature review paper’s about family business in tourism | Family business, family dynamics, entrepreneurship, development        | Four major themes identified in the literature are discussed: i) small and family business operations, ii) links to entrepreneurship, iii) roles and responsibilities of family members, iv) destination or community development | Three-dimensional developmental model of family business (Gersick, Davis, Hampton and Lansberg, 1997) |
| JOURNAL OF FAMILY BUSINESS STRATEGY         | 55 | Hauck, J; Prugl, R     | 2015 | Perceived suitability of the succession phase for innovation activities, adaptability, intergenerational authority, family member’s closeness to the firm, history of family bonds, investment in social ties | 81 owner-managers of family firms in the Austrian tourism industry     | Family adaptability and its member’s closeness to the firm are associated with the succession phase as opportunity for innovation | Firms entirely owned (100%) and managed by the family                                |
| CURRENT ISSUES IN TOURISM                    | 26 | Ahmad, SZ              | 2015 | Characteristics of the owners/managers of SMSHs in the UAE: male, young and middle-aged with secondary- and higher-education levels, new to the tourism industry. Motivations for the business ventures: wanting to be financially independent, become one’s own boss, involvement in family business and the opportunities of the hotel business. Key business challenges: stiff competition in the hotel industry, increased operating costs, reduced demand and lack of skilled employees. Key strategies employed to face these challenges: offering competitive pricing, improving the marketing and channels of promotion, enhancing the quality of service and providing superior customer service. | 115 small- and medium-sized hotels owners/managers from three cities in the United Arab Emirates | SMSHs and SMEs motivation and business challenges                              | Small and medium companies                                                          |
| Journal                                      | NC | Authors                          | Year | Theoretical Lens(es)                                                                 | Sample                                                                 | Main Variables                                                                 | Main Results                                                                 | Family Business Concept |
|----------------------------------------------|----|---------------------------------|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| JOURNAL OF BRAND MANAGEMENT                  | 17 | Presas, P; Munoz, D; Guia, J    | 2011 | Corporate branding                                                                  | A tourism-based family company (Grup Mas de Torrent) based in Catalonia (Spain) | Familiness, corporate branding, sustainable development, business growth, tourism experience | Familiness support sustainable practices; being a family business is essential for the guest | Familiness (Habbershon and Williams, 1999)                                   |
| INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CONTEMPORARY HOSPITALITY MANAGEMENT | 14 | Kallmuenzer, A                  | 2018 | Innovation                                                                         | 22 hospitality family firm owner-managers in Western Austria           | Drivers of innovation, competitive advantage, entrepreneurial family          | Entrepreneurial family and employees are key drivers for innovation as actors internal to the firm, but also the guests and regional competitors as external drivers provide comprehensive innovation input. These innovation efforts are perceived to stimulate growth and business development | Families are owners and managers at the same time and that; a minimum of two members are active in the management (Chua et al., 1999; Miller et al., 2007; Westhead and Cowling, 1998) |
| INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF GENDER AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP | 13 | Bensemann, J; Hall, CM          | 2010 | Entrepreneurship                                                                    | 10 interviews with female copreneurs and 108questionnaires from the New Zealand owners from the farmstay or B&B sector of rural tourism businesses | Copreneurial expectations, roles and responsibilities of women’s experiences specifically | Rural tourism accommodation sector in New Zealand is characterised by lifestyle and copreneurs running their businesses as a “hobby”; non-economic and lifestyle motivations are important stimuli to business formation; a gendered ideology persists, as copreneurial couples appear to engage in running the accommodation business using traditional gender-based roles mirroring those found in the private home | Couples in business together (copreneurs) are one form of family business |
4.4. Cluster 3: Sustainability

A key focus of analysis in cluster 3, Sustainability, is the internal and external antecedents of sustainability performance in TFB, with entrepreneurial orientation and initiatives being among the determinants that have received the most attention [52,58]. As with the FB literature, research on sustainability is relatively new, despite its contribution to firms’ competitiveness and growth [53,110]—another key concept in this cluster—and tourist destinations [76]. Sustainability, which is the topic that cuts across all 31 papers in this cluster, refers to the organizational practices and actions that take into account the triple bottom line of economic, social, and environmental performance.

As shown by the number of co-occurrences (Figure 4), there is special interest in the analysis of rural tourism, which is believed to play a relevant role in contributing to sustainability. Tourism in rural areas is seen as an engine for improving the quality of rural life and local growth and development [42,67], and is an essential complementary source of income and diversification in developing countries [42,97,111]. In addition, the SEW approach is one of the most important concepts in this cluster.

Despite the current expansion of rural tourism, the economic performance of tourism in rural areas has been limited [67]. As shown in Table 3, one of the reasons for this is the inefficiencies in meeting customer demands due to inadequate managerial knowledge and professionalization [67] and innovation [112]. In this vein, as we have pointed out above, special emphasis is placed on entrepreneurship orientation, which encourages innovation in family tourism activities aimed at meeting social, environmental, and economic objectives [25,46,112,113].

To analyze the entrepreneurship process and sustainability performance of the H&T industry various levels of analysis have been undertaken, focusing on family entrepreneur lifestyle, behavior, and perceptions; FB characteristics, assets, practices, objectives, ownership, and governance structure; and FB and institutional agents comprising the entire tourist destination. Taking an individual perspective, the seminal paper by Getz and Carlsen [54] highlights lifestyle and personal values in rural FB as predominant goals in both the startup and operations stages (Table 3). A similar finding is reported by Peters and Schuckert [43], who demonstrate the importance of examining entrepreneurs’ quality of life to determine their innovation capabilities and initiatives. However, replicating the previous study, Zhao and Getz [114] demonstrate that business performance and growth are higher priorities in Eastern developing countries. Furthermore, family-related goals are more prominent there than in Western countries.

Peters et al. [110] study hospitality entrepreneurs, showing that both individual factors, related to personal health, familial embeddedness and financial wellbeing, and contextual factors, linked to the embeddedness in the region and the legal and political situation, have an impact on the entrepreneur’s quality of life, business decisions, and firm growth.

The importance of the external environment of the tourist destination for innovative managerial behavior in TFB, and both financial and nonfinancial outcomes, is also confirmed in the study by Doh et al. [74], who highlight the community’s attitude toward tourism and the attractiveness of the community as a tourist destination. Similarly, Zapalska and Brozik [81] view the development and growth of TFB as contingent on certain external environmental restrictions such as high taxation, the lack of low-cost, long-term financing, and the lack of cooperative networks, business training programs, and technical support. The study by Kallmuenzer et al. [51] of hospitality FB also emphasizes their embeddedness in and commitment to their tourist destination as a crucial determinant of good governance structures.

Kallmuenzer et al. [12] perform an analysis of TFB, showing that after satisfying financial requirements, these firms are predominantly motivated by environmental and social objectives in their decision-making (see Table 3). However, Memili et al. [53] show that TFB ownership negatively impacts the adoption of sustainability practices, and that this relationship is negatively moderated by the long-term orientation of FB.
In their analysis of the resources, capabilities and characteristics defining successful transgenerational TFB, Ismail et al. [115] point out that the most important factors in these companies’ resilience are related to bridging relationships and reputation, contextual embeddedness, and capacity to adapt and change.

Focusing on TFB strategies, Yoshida et al. [112] show how advanced diversified tourism farms characterized by entrepreneurship, skill management, and social networks achieve better economic and social performance. Carter and Ljunggren [116] confirm the importance of entrepreneurial households in supporting the development of new FB growth (see Table 3). Ertuna et al. [113] aim to identify the institutional logic that determines CSR and acts as a driver of sustainability in two Turkish hotels, comparing one subsidiary of a multinational company and one local hotel. They also seek to determine the extent to which sustainability practices and CSR align with local institutional logic and needs. For their part, Villanueva-Álvaro et al. [117] analyze the environmental management practices and outcomes of small rural tourism companies in Spain, finding that low-category establishments show more sustainable behavior (see Table 3).

Elmo et al. [25] conducted a bibliometric analysis of 19 case studies published between 2015 and 2020 on the innovation and sustainability drivers identified in TFB. The results of this study reveal the importance of innovation strategies for sustainability outcomes but point to their limited implementation in technological, managerial, and marketing areas.

Finally, from a destination perspective, Duarte-Alonso [86] explores the food regulatory council of one region of La Palma in the Canary Islands. The council acts as a social anchor contributing to the wealth of rural regions by promoting local food cultures, propelling change, and providing support in the production process.

4.5. Cluster 4: Strategy and Economic Performance

The last cluster, Strategy and Economic Performance, with 33 papers, includes classic studies on the influence of ownership, managerial involvement, and corporate governance on economic performance and growth, as can be seen in the frequency with which these keywords are cited (Figure 4). This cluster emphasizes the importance of familiness—in terms of entrepreneurship capability and self-efficacy [61] and FB-owner exit planning [118] (Table 4)—for business innovation [119] and economic performance [55].

Kallmuenzer et al. [75] (Table 4) also emphasizes the relevance of networking and financial resources in connection to entrepreneurial orientation as potential drivers of economic performance. An additional influence is the environmental uncertainty in which the H&T industry operates. The seminal study by Getz and Nilsson [55] (Table 4) reveal that owners of TFB use three categories of strategy (coping, combating, capitulating) to adapt to environmental uncertainty and extreme seasonality, which have major implications for business operations and the survival of TFB [120].

In other studies, tourism experts posit that family involvement drives firms’ cooperative behavior and social responsibility [121], which in turn can influence firm economic performance [122]. FB have been shown to perform better both financially and socially (CSR) than their nonfamily counterparts, as Singal [121] states in her influential study (Table 4). She argues that FB in the US are financially stronger, despite not investing more in CSR than nonfamily firms, after controlling for their financial performance, measured by credit ratings. Her results stand in contrast to those reported by Esparza Aguilar [123], who found that Mexican micro-, small-, and medium-sized enterprises (MSMEs) engage more in CSR practices than nonfamily businesses. Singal [121] also found that these firms invest more in mitigating concerns than in implementing positive initiatives to build strengths in CSR performance.
Table 3. Most cited papers related to Sustainability.

| Journal                        | NC  | Authors                        | Year | Theoretical Lens(es)                                                                 | Sample                                                                 | Main Variables                                                                                                           | Main Results                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Family Business Concept                                                                                     |
|-------------------------------|-----|--------------------------------|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| TOURISM MANAGEMENT            | 240 | Getz, D; Carlsen, J            | 2000 | Managerial perception, objectives and expectations                                      | 198 family-owned business of Western Australia                     | Lifestyle, family-related goals, profitability, succession plans                                                                                                                                  | The motivations of entrepreneurs in rural tourism are predominantly lifestyle-related, and profitability driven, being the family succession not clearly defined | A business-owned business which is owner operated or one family owns controlling interests |
| ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT | 74  | Alsos, Gry Agnete; Carter, Sara; Ljunggren, Elisabet | 2014 | Entrepreneurial household strategy and Familiness                                      | 4 case studies of rural regions of Norway and Scotland               | Household strategy, family business growth and diversification, resources and capabilities, networks, trust, behavioural control                                                                     | Entrepreneurial household strategy for supporting the development of new family business growth through its management and use of business portfolios and resources, the use of family kinship relations and the mitigation of risks and uncertainty through self-imposed controls of the activities and behaviour. | A business-owned business which is owner operated or one family owns controlling interests |
| ANNALS OF TOURISM RESEARCH    | 55  | Wilson, D                      | 1997 | Ethnographic approach                                                                  | Perceptions of tourists and the host community; participant information | Environmental protection, local community health                                                                                                                                          | Low-budget tourism as the best option to involve small indigenous family business in North Goa, just for the protection of environment and the local community wealth and sociocultural values, in spite of the government’s promotion of hotel development. | Small indigenous family business (analyzed them, but didn’t conceptualize FF) |
| SUSTAINABILITY                | 22  | Villanueva-Alvaro, Juan-Jose; Mondejar-Jimenez, Jose; Saez-Martinez, Francisco-Jose | 2018 | Sustainability                                                                      | 396 Spanish small rural tourism companies                           | Environmental management practices and outcomes                                                                                                                                         | Identification of actors which determine the sustainability behaviour of rural establishments. The establishments of low categories with more sustainable management practices and outcomes                                  | Entrepreneurs from small and medium companies (analyzed them, but didn’t conceptualize FF) |
| Journal                          | NC | Authors                                      | Year  | Theoretical Lens(es)               | Sample                     | Main Variables                                                                 | Main Results                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Family Business Concept                                                                                               |
|---------------------------------|----|----------------------------------------------|-------|------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| TOURISM MANAGEMENT              | 17 | Park, Duk-Byeong; Doh, Kyung-Rok; Kim, Kyung-Hee | 2014  | Managerial behaviour              | 225 Korean tourism farms  | Product/service development, business planning and evaluation, promotions, human resource management, networking, cost reductions and financial performance | The results reveal that managers have primarily focused on product/service development, human resource management and cost reduction; and only product/service development and promotions have a significant impact on financial results.                                                                                                                                   | A business-owned business which is owner operated or one family owns controlling interests                          |
| JOURNAL OF SUSTAINABLE TOURISM  | 16 | Kallmuenzer, A; Nikolakis, W; Peters, M; Zanon, J | 2017  | Socio-emotional wealth (SEW)       | 152 rural family firms of Western Austria | Economic, social and environmental performance trade-offs                      | The results show that after satisfying financial requirements, these firms are predominantly motivated by environmental and social objectives in their decision-making, instead of obtaining greater utility from these outcomes than additional financial profits. The findings show that respondents place greater importance on environmental legal regulations, and the impact on ecosystems and jobs creation and stakeholder satisfaction.                                 | Firms having at least two family members actively involved in managing the firm and the family owning at least 50% of the company |
According to Memili et al. [4], nonfinancial goals such as preserving SEW can limit the economic performance of small- and medium-sized FB in the H&T industry, but their psychological capital can buffer such negative effects, helping them to achieve transgenerational sustainability. Indeed, in their study of Spanish family hotels, Diéguez-Soto et al. [124] found a positive influence of family involvement on a hotel’s online reputation.

Examining the relationship between blockholder ownership, asset endowment, and corporate performance in the European lodging and food and beverage industries, Masse et al. [71] found evidence that family and nonfamily blockholders perform differently. FB have tended to adopt a differentiation strategy focused on profit margin, with low sales rotation [71], typical of businesses with high capital intensity, in contrast to nonfamily firms, with greater capital productivity [49].

As for internationalization strategies, Andreu et al. [8] found that Spanish FB in hotel chains prefer to take on the ownership of hotels abroad, to keep control over their international operations and performance; conversely, nonfamily chains prefer rental agreements, which entail a smaller investment and a less risky entry mode. Internationalization is also seen in this cluster as a diversification strategy, which can be essential for the long-term success of TFB [125] and a determining factor in the economic performance of Spanish hotel FB. Rienda et al. [126] include the degree of internationalization as a mediating variable in their model of family involvement and performance, with results suggesting that a greater level of family involvement in the firm positively correlates with economic performance. These findings underscore the importance of FB heterogeneity, as differences in family involvement and ownership may lead to different strategic choices, with the consequent impact on hotel performance [126].

In addition to the relationship between family involvement and ownership and economic performance, another issue that emerges is the need to measure performance, taking into account different criteria. One of the most cited papers in this cluster, Karatepe [127] (Table 4), analyzes organizational performance in social terms, offering a better understanding of the impacts of psychological involvement and social support of hospitality employees on job satisfaction, family satisfaction, and turnover intentions. The paper by Betton et al. [85] stresses the importance of employing measures of both financial and personal goals, as they better capture the business motives of owners and managers in small firms, particularly in the H&T industry.

In this context, technology is shown to be crucial for the implementation of an overall performance measurement system [66], reducing information asymmetries and agency costs [128]. Specifically, Kang et al. [129] show how the Sustainability Balanced Scorecard (SBSC) is used as a systematic tool for business management to assess the performance of the hotel industry and ensure the achievement of business goals and vision. In the SBSC, the business is divided into five dimensions: financial, customer, internal business, learning and growth, and nonmarket perspective. In spite of the fact that the resource limitation affecting FB [49] requires strict management practices [66], managers of FB—particularly MSMEs [130] in the H&T industry—seem to use less accounting and financial information than their nonfamily-business counterparts [128].
| Journal                          | NC  | Authors                  | Year | Theoretical Lens(es)                  | Sample                                                                 | Main Variables                                      | Main Results                                                                 | Family Business Concept                                                                 |
|---------------------------------|-----|--------------------------|------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| TOURISM MANAGEMENT              | 84  | Getz, D; Nilsson, PA     | 2004 | Seasonality of tourist demand         | Survey with 84 owners of different activities related to tourism, from two municipalities on Bornholm; structured interviews with 33 owner-operators | Demand, extreme seasonality, family business, strategy | Extreme seasonality has implications for family life, business growth or viability | A business venture owned and/or operated by one person, couple or family (Barry, 1975) |
| INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF        | 31  | Singal, M                | 2014 | Instrumental theory                   | The matching of ESG data, with Standard and Poor’s credit ratings data and stock return data, stock files results in a final panel sample of 580 firm-years related to the hospitality and tourism sector on U.S. | Family firm, corporate social responsability, financial performance, financial condition, slack resources, credit ratings | Family firms are financially stronger, but don’t invest more in CSR than nonfamily firms | Fractional ownership by founding family or descendants plus membership on the board of directors (Anderson and Reeb, 2003) |
| HOSPITALITY MANAGEMENT          |     |                          |      |                                       |                                                                         |                                                     |                                                                                  |                                                                                        |
| JOURNAL OF HOSPITALITY & TOURISM | 23  | Hallak, R; Assaker, G; O'Connor, P | 2014 | Entrepreneurship                      | 298 usable responses from family-owned (158) and nonfamily-owned (143) small-and medium-sized tourism enterprise owners in regional South Australia | Entrepreneurial self-efficacy, enterprise performance | Tourism business owners’ Entrepreneur Self Efficacy (ESE) have a significant positive effect on enterprise performance, being an important predictor of business performance | “Is your business a family-owned business?” (Getz and Carlsen, 2000) |
| RESEARCH                       |     |                          |      |                                       |                                                                         |                                                     |                                                                                  |                                                                                        |
| TOURISM MANAGEMENT              | 14  | Kallmuenzer, A; Kraus, S; Peters, M; Steiner, J; Cheng, CF | 2019 | Entrepreneurship                      | 113 owner-managers of SMEs tourism firms from the tourism and hospitality industry in the Austrian Chamber of Commerce’s database of owner-manager led firms; 13 face-to-face interviews with these respondents | Entrepreneurial orientation, financial resource, environmental uncertainty, performance | Six different configurations, which can be grouped into high or low environmental uncertainty settings and highlight the relevance of multidimensional Entrepreneurial Orientation (EO), financial endowment, and personal and professional networks to high firm performance | Small and medium companies                                                                 |
| Journal | NC | Authors | Year | Theoretical Lens(es) | Sample | Main Variables | Main Results | Family Business Concept |
|---------|----|---------|------|-----------------------|--------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|
| INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HOSPITALITY & TOURISM ADMINISTRATION | 8 | Karatepe, OM | 2009 | Psychological involvement and Social support | 107 fulltime frontline employees of the 4- and 5-star hotels of Albania | Job involvement, family involvement, work social support, family social support, job satisfaction, family satisfaction, turnover intentions | Family involvement and family support increased family satisfaction, while job involvement and work support amplified job satisfaction. Work support did not significantly affect family satisfaction and family support did not demonstrate any significant relationship with job satisfaction. There are significant negative effects of both work and family support on turnover intentions. Lower job satisfaction led to higher turnover intentions. In contrast, family satisfaction was found to exacerbate employees’ turnover intentions | Ownership structure (independently/family-owned) |
| INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HOSPITALITY AND TOURISM ADMINISTRATION | 7 | Crawford, A; Naar, J | 2016 | Entrepreneurship and Cognitive Dissonance Theory | 120 B&B owner/operators, innkeepers, and entrepreneurs from U.S. market | Job satisfaction, work life balance, family involvement, exit planning | B&B entrepreneurs are aware of and engaged in exit planning and the majority of Bed and Breakfast entrepreneurs are lifestyle entrepreneurs | “Are you the owner/entrepreneur?” |
4.6. An Integrative Framework for Studying Tourist Family Businesses

The analysis of the literature on TFB reveals particular features that set these companies apart in terms of preferences, characteristics, and behaviors relating to their ownership and management, resources, capabilities, and strategic guidance of the company as a whole. These features shape the way in which these firms relate to the set of stakeholders in the tourist destination in which they compete, and the perceptions of customers and the community. The study of TFB competitiveness is made more complex by the fact that it depends on both the business itself and on the destination in which it is located [82,131].

Despite the growing trend in this literature, it remains fragmented. Indeed, the present bibliometric study reveals a proliferation of disparate theories and findings in research streams that are relatively isolated and disconnected from each other [19,68,101]. Building on the analysis presented so far, we propose an integrative framework that reorganizes the thematic clusters and the theoretical approaches detailed above (Figure 5). We believe that the proposed framework is useful given that these approaches are complementary and mutually necessary to attain an overview of the issue of TFB competitiveness and its firm-specific and external or environmental determinants.

At the core of Figure 5, there are the four main themes emerging from the bibliographic coupling. Each cluster contains the main keywords used to describe the theoretical approach of the cluster. Above each cluster, the supporting theoretical frameworks are shown, with arrows indicating where they are common to different clusters. At either side we see the main interdependent units of analysis under study—TFB and tourist destinations—and their defining characteristics that can explain competitiveness in the H&T industry [76,132]. This framework can help us to trace the paths followed by research communities to date. Consequently, it can be used to identify current research gaps and interrelated research questions (RQ, hereafter) that future research should address in order to advance this field of research. We group these RQ according to their relation to the four clusters identified in this bibliometric study.

Figure 5. The research paths on TFB.

We start our discussion by examining the Entrepreneurship and Innovation Performance cluster. As seen in the previous section, the application of classical theories (such as...
agency and entrepreneurship theories) is more common than approaches such as SEW and stewardship theory. The papers in this cluster focus on the analysis of the entrepreneurial profile of the founder and his/her capacity for innovation performance (e.g., [79]), above all, on a technological basis. This analysis can be expanded by observing the behavior and objectives of the founder/entrepreneur under other theoretical lenses.

Furthermore, the literature to date has paid little attention to the importance of the strategic legacy of the founder and of the dominant cultural patterns in the family [133] in terms of their investment in resources and capabilities, and the establishment of objectives that determine the company’s results in innovation [134]. Consequently, we recommend that future research investigates the following questions:

**RQ1:** What insights about TFB founders’ decision-making processes can be gained through different theoretical lenses, such as SEW and/or stewardship theory?

**RQ2:** How does the legacy and culture of the family affect the objectives, asset investment, and innovation performance of TFB?

Regarding the determinants of innovation performance, the literature contains some studies based on contingency theory perspectives that point to the impact of environmental forces. Yet despite this interest, few studies have analyzed the relative contribution to tourism firms’ international competitiveness of integration in a specific tourist destination, compared with other external effects arising from the structural characteristics of the national, regional, and industry levels [78]. Fewer still have done so for TFB. Attention has been paid to the effect of the territorial framework on tourism firms’ innovation performance [9,13]; however, more research is needed to unveil its specific effect on both TFB innovation capabilities and performance, with a focus on the shared competences [78] to which only embedded TFB have access [110]. This research is also especially significant considering the importance of the role played by FB compared with nonfamily firms when it comes to creating and preserving SEW [17] by enhancing collaborative relationships with external stakeholders. Thus:

**RQ3:** What impact do environmental competitive forces at the national, regional, industry, and tourist destination level have on TFB orientation, resources, and capabilities, and how do they affect innovation performance?

**RQ4:** How is the embeddedness of TFB in a tourist destination translated into more innovation capabilities and innovation performance? Specifically, which TFB characteristics allow them to absorb and integrate external shared knowledge competences with the firm’s internal ones to boost innovation performance?

The literature on TFB has also devoted attention to efforts to increase innovation capabilities [40], as it is a key factor in a firm’s adaptation to a changing environment [56,59]. The second thematic cluster relates to Capabilities and Competitiveness, with innovation and dynamic capabilities being among the most important capabilities [90]. In terms of theoretical underpinnings, it relies on dynamic capabilities, RBV, and agency theory. Therefore, this group of analysis approaches innovation in terms of capabilities and processes [11,40,57]. However, the growing academic output on this topic has not yet produced conclusive results [39]. The literature has yielded contradictory evidence, with some studies that identify FB as especially innovative, dynamic, and proactive [56,60], while other studies associate family involvement with risk-averse behaviors [40,65,106], and conservatism, incompatible with an entrepreneurial orientation. Among the limitations of the previous research seeking to explain this issue, it is worth noting the common confusion between innovation as a result (or innovative performance), and innovation as a capability (or dynamic capabilities).

The most dynamic current within the research, relying on the RBV, analyzes how the company’s resources are generated, regenerated, and combined to create new capabilities that can produce value over time through innovation (e.g., [36]). From this perspective, innovation as performance is consequently a visible result of dynamic capabilities and their application in the introduction of new or improved products or processes, or new
organizational ideas. The distinction between clusters 1 and 2 in this study makes it possible to provide clarity on this conceptual differentiation. Moreover, it can shed light on the differential characteristics of TFB that can foster the creation and development of dynamic capabilities and innovative performance.

This will make it possible to add to the knowledge base on:

**RQ5:** What are the moderating effects of defining TFB elements—ownership, management, and governance—on the relationship between dynamic capabilities and innovation performance?

Families can develop important dynamic capabilities [60,90]. Therefore, there is a need to determine which TFB characteristics can foster or hinder the creation and development of dynamic capabilities [135]. Given that the development of resources and capabilities is the result of business decisions, the analysis of the germination process requires analysis of the specific features of the bodies in which responsibility and decision-making power rests. Agency theory points to the ownership structure as a determinant of the company’s behavior, since its profile has important consequences for decision-making, exploitation of opportunities, resource and capabilities development, and attitude towards risk [48,136,137]. Therefore, we recommend that researchers consider:

**RQ6:** What ownership and control structures, related to family involvement, are the most suitable for promoting dynamic capabilities and innovation performance in TFB?

Agency theory has also been applied to examine the need for certain managerial and corporate governance mechanisms to mitigate the negative effects of agency costs (e.g., [14,138]), and to optimize the exploitation of opportunities and the development of dynamic capabilities. Although the stewardship approach [31] and SEW [17] have had a minor impact on the study of TFB, they should be used to complement this analysis from a behavioral and sociological perspective.

To this end, in line with both agency theory and the stewardship approach, the professional development of managers and heirs has been recommended [102,139], as well as the establishment of specific family governance mechanisms such as family councils, administration boards [40,83,101,137], family protocols, and regulatory frameworks [140]. The stewardship approach also emphasizes the study of coordination and integrating mechanisms, emotional factors, and culture that foster family innovation processes [31]. However, almost all the published studies on the effects of FB ownership, management, and corporate governance structures on dynamic capabilities are theoretical in nature [40] or exploratory case studies [60,90]. Similarly, the contributions about the influence of family culture and objectives on dynamic capabilities are also theoretical and qualitative (e.g., [141]). Using complementary study approaches, researchers should seek to add to the knowledge base on the following RQ:

**RQ7:** How does the professionalization of the manager and the development of adequate corporate governance mechanisms impact the development of dynamic capabilities in TFB?

**RQ8:** What effect does family involvement have on the learning mechanisms underlying dynamic capabilities, considering intangible assets such as the family’s values and culture?

Although succession is a relevant issue in studies about knowledge accumulation capabilities, professional development [70,80], and innovation [68], little is known about the conflicts triggered by succession processes in TFB. In addition, studies should consider the possible evolution over the generations for the preferences of the managers and owners who guide strategic decisions in FB [142], as this will be reflected in FB investments aimed at developing dynamic capabilities and their results in terms of technological innovations and sustainability. Thus:

**RQ9:** How can innovation or dynamic capabilities be used to involve young heirs in TFB?

**RQ10:** Which strategies, structures, and practices can TFB use to reduce potential conflicts in a succession process, and extract the benefits of knowledge diversity for dynamic capabilities development?

The importance of FB ownership and management characteristics shows a strong link to gender [108] in the articles analyzed in this cluster. However, future analyses can move
on from studying the barriers that women face, to focus on the differences that they can bring to the strategic management of the TFB. Thus:

RQ11: What are the main characteristics, behaviors, and assets of women’s managerial capabilities in TFB?
RQ12: Can gender-diverse management teams provide more dynamic capabilities and competitive advantage for TFB?

The third research path looks at TFB in terms of Sustainability. This cluster contains all the papers related to SEW and sustainability performance, which go far beyond a focus on economic performance in hospitality, covering social behavior and environmental issues [67,88]. These works are based on the premise that TFB have extended their socioemotional priorities to include nonfamily stakeholders and the social welfare of the community in the tourist destination. However, one of the gaps that the cluster reveals relate to the very concept of sustainability performance. In addition, new contributions are needed in order to reveal the relationship between noneconomic goals linked to sustainability performance and innovation goals and behaviors [39], recognizing innovation as key to promoting sustainable development in tourism [25,68]. Consequently, we recommend that researchers investigate the following questions:

RQ13: Which specific strategies, capabilities, and governance mechanisms influence sustainability performance (economic, social, and environmental) in TFB?
RQ14: How do environmental and social performance objectives interact with innovation strategies?
RQ15: What role do dynamic capabilities play in the sustainability performance of TFB?

This branch of the literature also includes the papers related to rural tourism [54,67], which emphasize the importance of natural environmental resources for the sustainability of tourism competitiveness [53,110]. However, the strong emphasis on the relationship between rural tourism and the environment raises the need for more research on the applicability of the concept of sustainability throughout the tourism chain.

RQ16: Which sections of the tourism chain are most in need of assistance to execute strategies aimed at improving sustainability performance in TFB?
RQ17: How is sustainability performance approached in the different subsectors of the family H&T industry?

The fourth research path is that of Strategy and Economic Performance, which mainly consists of papers addressing agency theory, familiness, and performance. The effect of family managerial involvement on economic performance remains unclear, with some studies pointing to a positive impact through market orientation [61], customer satisfaction [66], and external cooperation [75]. Conversely, other studies report a negative effect due to nepotism and entrenchment [49]. Therefore, more research is needed on this topic to open the black box of family involvement in business management.

RQ18: Which contingent factors help strengthen family managerial involvement and positively affect its economic performance?

Future research can also explore in more detail the behavioral aspects related to family ownership, considering not only the figure of the founder and/or the founding couple, but also the different generations who work together, and the family members who are heirs but do not work in the business, with further analysis of the interdisciplinary and psychological aspects of TFB.

RQ19: How do the different roles played by different family members and their life aspirations impact TFB performance?

Finally, this classical line of FB research should move towards more current concepts such as SEW, and broader measures of business performance. Therefore, future researchers should address the following question:

RQ20: As viewed through the SEW theoretical lens, what are the TFB characteristics that have the greatest impact on the achievement of a balanced economic, social, and environmental performance?
Finally, our analyses have brought to light certain gaps that cut across all clusters, such as the lack of studies that analyze the boundaries of the TFB construct itself, indicating a need for conceptual support. In the vast majority of studies analyzed, the H&T industry is treated as a contextual variable. In addition, in all the research avenues outlined above, we see a need to study TFB in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, considering how TFB dynamic capabilities and performance have been affected. FB appear to play a special role in the management of crises, due to the objective of intergenerational survival [38].

5. Conclusions

The FB model is crucial for the tourism sector worldwide and explaining the determinants of its competitiveness is a cornerstone of strategic business and management research. This is reflected in the inclusion of articles about TFB in top business and management journals.

Using bibliometric analysis of publications in Clarivate WoS and Scopus, this article provides a bibliometric and content overview of the selected articles, revealing an up-to-date picture of the trends in research on FB in the H&T industry. By so doing, it points to ways to advance the field and offer a better understanding of the competitive challenges currently facing TFB. As far as we are aware, there are no previous bibliometric studies on the H&T industry that have simultaneously focused on tourism and FB in the business and management research fields, with an analysis of the main theoretical approaches applied.

We find a rising trend in the field of study, especially since 2014. Contributions up to 2020 were analyzed, and four thematic clusters were identified through keyword co-occurrence analysis. This analysis revealed the main themes, their relative importance, and related theoretical approaches. The resulting clusters were Entrepreneurship, Marketing Orientation and Innovation Performance; Capabilities and Competitiveness; Sustainability; and Strategy and Economic Performance. These results thus highlight the heterogeneity of the literature both in terms of research topics and theoretical lenses used.

This study also presents evidence of academia’s efforts to understand the phenomenon of TFB, with studies that help to define the characteristics of FB in this sector (e.g., [7,9,13,64,73,75,89]), incorporating multilevel characteristics of ownership, family, business, tourist destination, and demand.

As a result of the review, we also provide an integrative model that makes a twofold contribution to TFB theory development: (1) it identifies the environmental/external and firm-specific determinants of TFB competitiveness and their complementarity, in terms of innovation and economic and sustainability performance; and (2) it provides guidance for future research on FB in the H&T industry, framed in the business and management research field.

In general terms, the study shows that Entrepreneurial Orientation (or Innovation) is the most widely used lens through which to view the topic. However, scholars in the field of tourism should turn their attention to the most current FB concepts, developed by theorists in this field of study. This process will help generate synergies between FB research and tourism studies and support the construction of a much-needed theoretical framework for TFB.

The results of the study also draw attention to the fact that there are still few studies analyzing the profile and dynamics of FB that best adapt it to the H&T industry, with most of these studies focused on the founding entrepreneur. To help fill this gap, more research is needed on TFB-specific goals, SEW preservation, and characteristics that determine innovation management in the succession process.

Future studies should also delve deeper into the analysis of different types of TFB, which may create unique advantages and disadvantages for managing and applying dynamic or innovation capabilities to achieve innovation outputs [143]. That is, an analysis is needed of the moderating role played by idiosyncratic TFB characteristics in the innovation-input–innovation-output relationships [39]. This should be accompanied by the application of different theoretical behavioral and governance approaches, as pointed
out above. Specifically, the dynamic capability theory should be the central paradigm in efforts to gain an understanding of the learning and innovative process in TFB.

Future studies should also consider how TFB can outperform nonfamily firms in extracting value from external knowledge flows and competences coming from their embeddedness in a tourist destination.

Both economic and technological innovation performance have received attention in TFB empirical literature [25]. However, in spite of their contribution to the SEW of TFB, the link between innovation performance and new strategic outcomes, organizational and managerial methods, and commercial and marketing actions has been largely overlooked. This gap is even greater in the context of sustainability analyses and when considering the nature of the different types of innovation outputs (incremental, radical, or disruptive) [39]. This suggests that there is still room for the analysis of other TFB performance criteria.

In addition, the sample underscored the dearth of studies discussing the importance of examining the subsectors of the H&T industry, separately or otherwise. As such, they merit further investigation. As Masset et al. [71] stated, different subindustries can give rise to distinct conclusions on their ownership structures, asset intensity, operations, and performance.

The literature review in this study not only helps scholars with future research but also provides TFB managers and policymakers in a tourist destination with new knowledge on key drivers of competitiveness.

The results of this analysis indicate that sustainability issues are of central importance to the planning and management of TFB and destinations. In this regard, competing in the tourism sector increasingly requires managers to formulate strategies aimed at fostering innovation, while minimizing any negative impact of their products, services and operations on the natural environment.

FB should thus bear in mind that, although their distinctiveness in innovation is insured in the market, their environmental behavior is an essential value in this new competitive arena (with more environmental problems, restrictions, and requirements) for their raison d’être: intergenerational succession.

In this context, managers of TFB should be especially concerned with professionalization aimed at strengthening the core capabilities and identity of the company [60,65], while enabling the development of a business model based on sustainability.

Professionalization is also at the core of the strategic development, and planning and governance strategies aimed at guaranteeing a successful succession process, the disruption of gender roles, technological development, stakeholders’ satisfaction, and the management of cooperation and partnerships essential for the innovation processes of TFB and their long-term growth [68,137]. Educational centers should thus be aware of the heterogeneity of FB and the need to adapt education programs to meet their special requirements [144].

Furthermore, our insights are also useful for policymakers. Considering TFB commitment to and embeddedness in their destinations [78], public organizations in tourist destinations are fundamental in promoting cooperation and creating networks of agents through associations and other contractual formulas that do not threaten FB with loss of control (for example nonequity hotel chains and joint ventures). Strong cooperation between TFB and other public and private agents in their regional tourism innovation system, such as universities, tourism businesses, and administrations, can also provide TFB with the assets needed to carry out innovative green collaborative projects [72,77], which also have an impact on the sustainable development and growth of the tourism destination.

Policymakers should also encourage the adoption of business models fostering smart destinations [145] based on technology, innovation, and sustainability. Thus, implementing fiscal policies or providing direct investments to support R&D and social and environmental innovation in TFB will represent a strategic driver enabling policymakers to bolster the competitiveness of the tourism sector.

In this respect, it is necessary to emphasize the role of public organizations, such as INVAT-TUR (Instituto Valenciano de Tecnologías Turísticas, Valencian Institute of Tourism
Technologies). They collaborate with public and private research organizations from different geographical areas, working on R&D activities and providing technical assistance and specific market knowledge to tourism organizations in the tourist destinations of the Valencian Community [145].

6. Limitations and Future Research Avenues

This study has several limitations. First, the analysis could include more keywords and expressions related to FB, such as “small business,” or “entrepreneurship”, or “small and medium-sized enterprise”. Likewise, future studies should include more keywords related to the H&T industry (e.g., “restaurant”, “tourism agency”). Second, the study focused on the related scientific output in the business and management area; however, due to the complexity surrounding FB and tourism, there is a need for an interdisciplinary approach, including contributions from other scientific fields, such as geography and psychology. Such an approach could complement both the theoretical basis and the discussion of the results. Third, new papers could also use other bibliometric analysis software, or take advantage of other functionalities offered by VOSviewer. Moreover, while bibliometric methods help reduce subjectivity, we cannot rule out the possibility that the analysis of the intellectual core and the theoretical roots could be influenced by some interpretative biases. For that reason, we need more bibliometric studies addressing the TFB research field.

It is our hope that this study will help establish the theoretical basis for developing an empirical explanatory model of TFB competitiveness, based on the complementarity of firm-specific and external or environmental effects. In-depth analyses of case studies will also be valuable.
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