





-  **Communities (vulnerability is a continuous variable)**
-  **Interaction between families and Family Business**
-  **Contributions of Family Business to communities**
-  **Effects of communities on family and family business**

Figure 2: Conceptual Model for Interface Between Family, Business and Community

General Procedures

In 1997, telephone interviews were administered to a national sample of 794 families who owned a business. The business manager and the household manager were both interviewed in more than half (414) of the cases. In 259 cases, the individual who performed both roles was interviewed; in the remainder (121 cases), either the household manager or the business manager was interviewed, but not both persons. A total of 1,208 individuals were interviewed in the 794 households. The proposed research builds on the data from these families.

First, included in the 1997 data base are both postal zip codes and the Federal Information Processing Standards (FIPS) codes that identify the household's geographical location. Using these identifiers, the characteristics of the community in 1980 and 1990 will be added to each household record. Relevant community characteristics include the following: unemployment rate; percentage of families in poverty; percentage of families headed by single parents; population changes; job structures; measures of market size (per capita income, 1990); median household; Effective Buying Income (EBI) for 1997; change in market size (change in population; change in per capita income between 1980 and 1990); and purchasing power as measured by population multiplied by per capita income between 1980 and 1990 (Kean, et al. 1998); as well as other selected social and economic data items.

Data on county characteristics relating to household and family types, employment by industry, sources of income, and labor force supply will be collected from the Census of Population and Housing, the Bureau of Economic Analysis' Regional Economic Information System, and the Bureau of Labor Statistics' Employment & Unemployment series. These county characteristics will then be linked to the respondent records by use of the county FIPS code.

These community characteristics will be used to develop a variety of possible measures of economic vulnerability (for example, change in per capita income by county during the most recent time frame available) and possibly even a scale of community economic vulnerability include some of those listed above. Each household will be assigned a score representing the economic vulnerability of the community in which it was located in 1997 when the data were gathered. Households could be classified as being in either an economically vulnerable community or a community that is not economically vulnerable, or the scale could be used as a continuous variable in multivariate analyses. A limitation of this procedure, of course, is that the community data are restricted to data gathered in the decennial census. If community data from the 2000 census are available during the life of the project, they also will be added to the household record.

Second, the second year of this proposed project, the 1208 individuals interviewed in 1997 (i.e., the business managers and household managers from 794 households plus 414 households in which these managers were not the same individual) will be administered a second telephone interview in the fall of 2000. In their discussion of the analysis of panel data gathered from households, Duncan and Hill (1985) argue persuasively that the application of the concept of a longitudinal household essentially is impossible. The reason is that the sorts of changes in

households that are of interest are precisely those that cause the household to become a different household: births, deaths, divorce, splitoffs. They recommend, as do others, that longitudinal analyses be centered on an individual; the characteristics of households in which that individual lived at different points in time become part of the data record for that person. In this proposed project, individual data records for those persons in the same household can be assembled into a household record that will be similar to the household record developed from the 1997 data. Of course, a household record can be formed in 2000 for households in which a single individual was interviewed in 1997 and recontacted in 2000. Based on previous data collection efforts in which attempts were made to recontact households in which someone was working in or from the home in 1989 (Loker, Hennon, & Heck, 1995), it is anticipated that 80% of the 1,208 individuals will be available for reinterview in 2000.

Between the interviews in 1997 from the current project and the proposed interviews for 2000, there is the issue of attrition of households but not the loss of businesses. This proposed project is to track people, not businesses; the questionnaires will be designed to branch to questions specifically for those no longer in business (i.e., why they left, etc.). Therefore, the problem is a standard one of population attrition and is not complicated by business attrition. To increase the ability to relocate the 1997 households, letters with "Address Correction Requested" on the envelope are being sent to the respondents every six months. The first letter, sent in September of 1998, included a summary fact sheet about the businesses contacted. The second letter, to be mailed in February, 1999, will detail business finances. Future letters will include other issues of potential interest to the respondents. Although the letters are a way to inform the participants about the results of the study, their primary purpose is to track the respondent households. For a small fee (\$.50 per address), the post office will forward the letter, and they will report the change of address to the sender. Semi-annual contacts will ensure that forwarding orders, good for a year, have not expired.

Telephone interviewing will be used because the costs of conducting telephone interviews are lower than face-to-face contacts with respondents. Using the telephone method, interviewers can be centralized, trained, and supervised extremely effectively. Telephoning also eases the process of locating respondents as well as obtaining their cooperation for an interview. This method also accommodates the disclosure of sensitive and personal information often inherent in the nature of family businesses (Dillman, 1978).

Some of the questions included in the interview in 2000 schedule will be identical to, or modifications of, those in the 1997 interview schedule: detailed financial information about the household and the business; business management practices and household management practices; and basic demographic data about the household and its members, such as age, sex, employment status, and involvement of each member in the business. Additional questions will focus on changes that have occurred between 1997 and 2000. Of particular interest will be changes in business ownership and management and changes in household composition. For example, if the 1997 business owner/manager is no longer in that role, questions will be asked regarding reasons for the change; no attempt will be made to contact the 2000 business owner/manager.

Additional questions also will be formulated that will be designed to elicit detailed information about the business owner's view of the community climate, value systems, and culture for his/her business and his/her interactions with the community's social, economic, and political structure. The household manager will be asked questions regarding his/her family's interaction and satisfaction with community resources and services such as schools, recreation facilities, shopping opportunities, and social institutions.

Plan of Work Based on Research Objectives

Five years are requested to complete the research and disseminate results (See ATTACHMENT #3: PROPOSED TIME FRAME). Researchers involved in NE-167R form the core of the committee who wrote this proposed project. In addition to the development of a conceptual framework and preparing this proposal, the committee will adapt the instrumentation from NE-167R to meet the new proposed research objectives. The following is an outline of how each research objective is to be accomplished.

Objective 1: To compare the interaction of family systems and business systems in economically vulnerable and nonvulnerable communities.

Procedure: Based on the scale of economic vulnerability, communities will be divided into two or three groups: economically vulnerable, economically nonvulnerable, or those two groups plus a third, mixed group, depending on the content and distribution of the scale of economic vulnerability. The data gathered in 1997 will be reanalyzed with parallel analyses, one for each of the two or three groups. Of particular interest will be the comparison of multivariate models of business and family viability, based on the model presented in Figure 1.

Multivariate techniques such as the survival modeling (life event analyses) will be used to examine the continuity of the family business ownership. OLS and tobit analyses of change in income and satisfaction will be conducted. The research analyses addressing this objective will be completed by three groups. One group will focus on the family (Indiana, Iowa, Minnesota, Montana, New York, Ohio, and Canada). A second group will focus on the business (Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Utah, and Wisconsin), and a third group of scientists will focus on the interaction between the family and the business (Hawaii, Minnesota, North Dakota, Rhode Island, and Canada).

Objective 2: To identify effects of community structure and characteristics on families and their businesses.

Procedure: Specific community characteristics will be used in multivariate models of the 1997 data that focus on business viability and family viability (Figures 1 and 2). Project scientists from Indiana, Iowa, New York, North Dakota, Rhode Island, Vermont, Wisconsin and Canada will analyze the effects of community structure and community characteristics on the family. Researchers from Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Nebraska, Pennsylvania, Utah, Vermont and Wisconsin

will concentrate on the effects of community structure and community characteristics on the business.

A subset of data that includes individuals still in the same household who continue to be engaged in a family business will be formed from the data collected in the fall of 2000. A household-level data file will be constructed that includes individual, household, and business characteristics, and interaction with the community as reported by the business and household managers. Business viability and family viability will be examined in the community context through multivariate models that include community characteristics linked to FIPS and zip codes, and the business and household manager's views of the community.

Objective 3: To estimate the economic and social contributions of family businesses to communities over time.

Procedure: A series of descriptive statistics will be used to project the impact of family businesses on various economic and social institutions at the state, regional, and national levels in 1997 and 2000. Analysis of this objective will be coordinated by two groups of project scientists. One group (Indiana, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island, Vermont, Wisconsin and Canada) will focus on the economic contributions of family businesses to the community in 1997 and 2000. Projected will be gross and net business income, and contributions to the employment base in the community.

The other group (Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, Wisconsin) will analyze the social and political interactions between family businesses and communities in 1997 and 2000. For those who are responsible for successful business operations, the fundamental ability to deal with the community environment as it relates to the family business — interrelationships of economic, social, and political dimensions — will yield a difficult and constantly changing challenge, as well as numerous opportunities. Inherent within relationships among individuals and/or systems of individuals, such as the family, business and community systems, are feelings of obligation to reciprocate actions (Coleman, 1994). The creation or destruction of social capital is dependent upon the degree and quality of interaction between/among individuals. For example, a high degree of social capital within a community is reflected in a cohesive and reciprocal commitment to the viability of the community among its residents.

Changes that have occurred in the political economy of American life have resulted in unique and often disconcerting influences on businesses. The impact of such alterations may produce positive or negative synergism that affects the welfare and viability of rural economies and businesses. Policymakers and business support groups (such as mayors' offices and local economic development groups) often are overlooked in analyses of rural economic development efforts. Nonetheless, these units, when they exist, appear to be major influencing factors; there is, expectedly, wide disparity between interest in economic development and the capacity to undertake it, especially in the smallest communities (Walzer & Deller, 1991). The fact that family business managers may be community leaders and members of these groups, increases potential

synergism. Thus, such analyses will increase our knowledge of the interactions between family businesses to their communities.

Statistical Analysis and Dissemination of Results

The analytical methods adopted to achieve the stated research objectives will vary depending on the research question addressed. The first research objective will use appropriate descriptive univariate and bivariate analytical techniques such as unidimensional scaling, cluster analysis, Chi-square tests of association and analyses of variance. The methodological emphasis in the first objective will be exploratory and descriptive in nature. Multivariate modeling and longitudinal methods will be used when appropriate.

Investigation of managerial activities and adjustment strategies will be initiated by improving and pre-testing measurement instruments. Once the research concepts are properly operationalized and measured, managerial behaviors will be analyzed intensively. Techniques such as factor analysis and covariance analysis will be used to identify specific management styles and adjustment strategies manifested by household and business managers of a family involved in a family business. Relationships between management behavior and subsequent outcomes will be examined by using more sophisticated multivariate techniques such as causal modeling, multiple classification analysis and regression techniques. When regression techniques are used, the nature and measurement of the dependent variable will be matched to the appropriate technique. For example, dependent variables that have limited, restricted, or binary values will dictate the use of probit, logit or tobit regression procedures.

Both descriptive and analytical comparative statistics will be used to discover similarities and differences between those business owners in economically vulnerable communities and those not in economically vulnerable communities in the 1997 National Family Business Survey and the reinterview data in 2000. The addition of community characteristics will require multivariate analyses and longitudinal methods, with family and business outcome measures as dependent variables and family, business, and community characteristics as independent variables.

Research findings and results will be published by the various project scientists in appropriate professional journals such as: *Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice; Journal of Human Resources; Journal of Family and Economic Issues; Journal of Small Business Management; Journal of Entrepreneurial and Small Business Finance; Monthly Labor Review; Journal of Extension; Black Enterprise; Journal of Rural Sociology; Academy of Management Journal; Review of Black Political Economy; Family Business Review; Clothing and Textiles Research Journal; and Journal of Behavior Economics*. Other family-oriented journals will be appropriate for the family resource management results: *Journal of Family Issues; Journal of Consumer Studies and Home Economics; Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences; Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal; Family Relations; Financial Counseling and Planning; Marriage and Family Review; and Journal of Marriage and the Family*.

The dissemination of information to families and professionals helping families to assess the feasibility of establishing or continuing family businesses will be achieved via presentations to such professionals as well as educational programs and through popular media. These efforts will be in addition to dissemination of research findings through professional publications and presentations. Where appropriate, Cooperative Extension personnel and publications will provide assistance.

Expected Outcomes

Research findings from this revised project can be used to quantify the economic and social contributions of family businesses to their local, state, and national economies and communities. Also, community interactions will be examined so that policy makers and community leaders can be better informed about business creation, expansion, and retention as well as job creation and retention capacities. For example, business output, number of jobs, and incomes for families and individuals will be documented for the economically vulnerable communities under study.

Expected outcomes of the proposed project also will include in-depth and longitudinal analyses of targeted business-owning households and comparative analyses with extant national samples of family businesses. The study of businesses, their owning families and their communities within targeted economically vulnerable locations will make an important contribution to the general business management, performance, and growth literature. In addition, family functioning and management literature will be broadened as will the limited literature on business viability over time. The analytical methods utilized will depend on the research objective and question under study and will include a wide-range of univariate, bivariate, and multivariate techniques. Research results will be disseminated via conference proceedings, journals, monographs, and books. In addition, extension materials for business owners and their families and policy makers will be developed using research findings as baseline information.

ORGANIZATION:

The group developing this proposal has worked together since 1984, first as North East Committee 59 (NEC-59), later as NE-167, the Technical Committee for the project, "At-Home-Income Generation: Impact on Management, Productivity and Stability in Rural/Urban Families," and as the current NE-167R, the Technical Committee for the project, "Family Businesses: Interaction of Work and Family Spheres." Committee members are elected to the offices of chairperson and secretary. The chairperson, in consultation with the administrative advisor, notifies the technical committee members of the time and place of meetings, prepares the agenda, and presides at meetings of the committee. The secretary records the minutes and manages other details such as telephone conference calls. Other committee members have been assigned duties of local arrangements and proposal writing as well as other committee work.

The central site for the proposed project is Cornell University and the proposed institution for the centralized data collection is Iowa State University. The following State Agricultural

Experiment Stations will be involved in this project, if approved: Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Utah, Vermont, and Wisconsin. Scientists have been grouped into three overlapping subcommittees that will address each of the research objectives. These working groups, with additional members as identified, will complete the plan of work and analyses described in the procedures section of this proposal.

SIGNATURES:

REGIONAL PROJECT TITLE:

Family Business Viability in Economically Vulnerable Communities

S. Kay Obendorf
Administrative Advisor

2/2/99
Date

Wendy R. Mackenzie
Chairperson, Regional Association of Directors

3/12/99
Date

George E. Coffey
Administrator, Cooperative State Research, Education,
and Extension Service

5/13/99
Date

REFERENCES:

NOTE: Publications from the NE-167 project noted by an asterisk. Publications from current NE-167R project may be cited in the narrative but are listed in Attachment #4.

Ahrentzen, S. B. (1990). Managing conflict by managing boundaries. *Environment and Behavior*, 22, 723-752.

Alcorn, P. B. (1982). *Success and survival in the family-owned business*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Alderfer, C. P. (1988). Understanding and consulting to family business boards. *Family Business Review*, 1, 249-261.

Ambrose, D. (1983). Transfer of family-owned business. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 21(1), 49-56.

Amos, R., Jr. (1987). Influence of urban areas on regional development. *Review of Regional Studies*, 17(3), 37-46.

Aram, J. D., & Coomes, J. S. (1985). Public policy and the small business sector. *Policy Studies Journal*, 13, 692-700.

Aronson, R. L. (1991). *Self-employment - a labor market perspective*. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.

Astrachan, J. (1988). Family firm and community culture. *Family Business Review*, 1, 165-189.

Astrachan, J. H., & Kolenko, T. A. (1994). A neglected factor explaining family business success: Human resource practices. *Family Business Review*, 7(3), 251-262.

Avery, R. J., & Stafford, K. (1991). Toward a scheduling congruity theory of family resource management. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 12, 325-344.

Balkin, S. (1989). *Self-employment for low-income people*. New York: Praeger.

Barach, J. A. (1984). Is there a cure for the paralyzed family board? *Sloan Management Review*, (Fall), 3-12.

Barach, J. A., & Ganitsky, J. B. (1995). Successful succession in family business. *Family Business Review*, 8(2), 131-155.

Barach, J. A., Gantisky, J., Carson, J. A., & Doochin, B. A. (1988). Entry of the next generation: Strategic challenges for family business. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 26(2), 49-56.

- Barkley, D. L., & Hirschberger, S. (1992). Industrial restructuring: Implications restructuring: Implications for the decentralization of manufacturing to nonmetropolitan areas. *Economic Development Quarterly*, 6(1), 64-79.
- Barnes, L. B. (1988). Incongruent hierarchies: Daughters and younger sons as company CEOs. *Family Business Review*, 1, 9-21.
- Barnes, L. B., & Hershon, S. A. (1976). Transferring power in the family business. *Harvard Business Review*, 54(4), 105-116.
- Barry, B. (1975). The development of organization structure in the family firm. *Journal of General Management*, 3(1), 42-60.
- Bartik, T. J. (1991). *Who benefits from state and local economic development policies?* Kalamazoo, MI: W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.
- Bastow-Shoop, H., Leistriz, F. L., Jolly, L., Kean, R., Gaskill, L., Jasper, C., & Sternquist, B. (1995). Factors affecting the financial viability of rural retail businesses. *Journal of the Community Development Society*, 26(2), 169-185.
- Bates, T. (1991). Financial capital structure and small business viability. In R. Yazdipour (Ed.), *Advances in small business finance* (pp. 63-78). Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Bauer, J. W. (1990). Rural families and their economic well-being; procedures, methods and conceptual model of north central regional project NC-182. In M. L. Carsky (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 36th Annual Conference of the American Council on Consumer Interests* (p. 329). Columbia, MO: University of Missouri.
- Bauer, J. W., Hira, T. K., Wilhelm, M. S., Varcoe, K. P., & Thomas, S. (1993). The determinants of worry over chronic health. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 14, 275-291.
- Beavers, W. R., Hampson, R. B., & Hulgus, Y. F. (1985). Commentary: The Beavers systems approach to family assessment. *Family Process*, 24, 398-405.
- Beavers, W. R., & Voeller, M. N. (1983). Family models: Comparing and contrasting the Olson circumplex model with the Beavers systems model. *Family Process*, 22, 85-97.
- Becker, E. H. (1984). Self-employed workers: An update to 1983. *Monthly Labor Review*, 107(7), 14-18.
- Becker, G. (1965). A theory of the allocation of time. *Economic Journal*, 75, 493-517.
- Beckhard, R., & Dyer, W. G., Jr. (1983a). Managing change in the family firm: Issues and strategies. *Sloan Management Review*, 16(2), 59-65.

- Beckhard, R., & Dyer, W. G., Jr. (1983b). Managing continuity in the family-owned business. *Organizational Dynamics*, 12(1), 5-12.
- Begley, T. M., & Boyd, D. P. (1986). Executive and corporate correlates of financial performance in smaller firms. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 24(2), 8-15.
- Benedict, B. (1979). Family firms and firm families: A comparison on Indian, Chinese, and Creole firms in Seychelles. In S. M. Greenfeld, A. Strickon, & R. T. Rubey (Eds.), *Entrepreneurs in cultural context*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Berenbeim, R. (1984). *From owner to professional management: Problems in transition* (Report no. 851). New York: Conference Board.
- Berney, R. E., & Owens, E. (1985). A theoretical framework for small business policy. *Policy Studies Journal*, 13, 681-91.
- Besser, T. L. (1997). *The significance of community to business social responsibility* (Project No: IOW03459). Ames: Iowa State University.
- Birley, S. (1986). Succession in the family firm: The inheritor's view. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 24, 36-43.
- Blake, C. G., & Saleh, S. D. (1995). A model of family owned small business performance. *Family Business Annual*, 1(Section I), 22-30.
- Blau, D. M. (1987). A time-series analysis of self-employment in the United States. *Journal of Political Economy*, 95, 445-467.
- Blotnick, S. (1984). The case of the reluctant heirs. *Forbes*, 134, 180.
- Boswell, J. (1972). *The rise and decline of small firms*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Bowman-Upton, N. (1989). Transition Planning and business succession for women entrepreneurs. In O. Hagen, C. Rivchun, & D. Sexton (Eds.), *Women-owned businesses* (pp. 151-182). New York: Praeger.
- Bowman-Upton, N., & Dugat, S. (1987). Family business succession: Issues for the founding entrepreneur. *Proceedings of the United States Association for Small Business and Entrepreneurship* (pp. 11-14), Milwaukee, WI.
- Bowman-Upton, N., Seaman, S. L., & Dyer, P. (1991). A preliminary analysis of family system types in family business. In *Proceedings of the United States Association for Small Business and Entrepreneurship* (pp. 150-156). San Diego, CA.

- Bowman-Upton, N., & Sexton, D. L. (1987). Family business succession: The female perspective. *Proceedings of the International Council on Small Business* (pp. 68-73).
- Brockhaus, R. H. (1989). Risk-taking propensity of entrepreneurs. *Academy of Management Journal*, 23, 509-520.
- Brown, R. (1995). *Family business: Rethinking strategic planning*. Paper presented to the 40th Annual International Council on Small Business, Sydney, Australia.
- Bruno, A. V., & Tyebjee, T. T. (1982). The environment for entrepreneurship. In C. A. Kent, D. L. Sexton, & K. H. Vesper (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of entrepreneurship* (pp. 288-307). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Carland, J. C., Hoy, F., & Boulton, W. R. (1984). Differentiating entrepreneurs from small business owners: A conceptualization. *Academy of Management Review*, 9(2), 354-359.
- Carlino, G. A., & Mills, E. S. (1987). The determinants of county growth. *Journal of Regional Science*, 27(1), 39-54.
- Casson, M. (1991). *The entrepreneur: An economic theory*. Hampshire, England: Gregg Revivals.
- Chami, R. (1997). *What's different about family businesses?* (Working paper). Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame, Department of Finance and Business Economics.
- Christiansen, C. R. (1953). *Management succession in small and growing enterprises*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, Graduate School of Business Administration.
- Churchill, N. C., & Hatten, K. J. (1987). Non-market based transfers of wealth and power: A research framework for family businesses. *American Journal of Small Business*, 12(2), 53-66.
- Cliff, J. (1997, August). *The mystery of small business performance: Means, motives, methods, and opportunities*. Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the Academy of Management, Entrepreneurship Division, Boston, MA.
- Cole, R., & Wolken, J. D. (1996). Bank and nonbank competition for small business credit: Evidence from the 1987 and 1993 National Surveys of Small Business Finances. *Federal Reserve Bulletin*, 82, 983-995.
- Coleman, J. S. (1994). *Foundations of social theory*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

- Constand, R. L., Osteryoung, J. S., & Nast, D. A. (1991). Assets-based financing and the determinants of capital structure in the small firm. In R. Yazdipour (Ed.), *Advances in small business finance* (pp. 29-46). Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Constantine, L. L. (1986). *Family paradigms: The practice of theory in family therapy*. New York: Guilford.
- Cooper, A. C., & Daily, C. M. (1997). Entrepreneurial teams. In D. L. Sexton & R. W. Smilor (Eds.), *Entrepreneurship: 2000* (pp. 127-150). Chicago, IL: Upstart Publishing Company.
- Cooper, A. C., Willard, G. E., & Woo, C. Y. (1986). Strategies of high-performing new and small firms: A reexamination of the niche concept. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 1(3), 247-260.
- Covin, J. G. (1991). Entrepreneurial versus conservative firms: A comparison of strategies and performance. *Journal of Management Studies*, 28, 439-463.
- Covin, T. J. (1994). Profiling preference for employment in family-owned firms. *Family Business Review*, 7, 287-296.
- Covin, J. G., & Slevin, D. P. (1989). Strategic management of small firms in hostile and benign environments. *Strategic Management Journal*, 10, 75-87.
- Cox, E. S. (1982). *Family structure and external openness: A two-dimensional model*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.
- Cox, E. S. (1996). The family firm as a foundation of our free society: Strengths and opportunities. In R. K. Z. Heck (Ed.), *The entrepreneurial family* (pp. 8-15). Needham, MA: Family Business Resources Publishing.
- Cushing, B. J. (1987). Location-specific amenities, topography, and population migration. *Annals of Regional Science*, 21(2), 74-85.
- Daily, C. M., & Dollinger, M. J. (1992). An empirical examination of ownership structure in family and professionally managed firms. *Family Business Review*, 5, 117-136.
- Daily, C. M., & Thompson, S. S. (1994). Ownership structure, strategic posture, and firm growth: An empirical examination. *Family Business Review*, 7, 237-250.
- Danco, L. A. (1980). *Inside the family business*. Cleveland, OH: University Press.
- Danco, L. A. (1982). *Beyond survival: A business owner's guide for success*. Cleveland, OH: University Press.

Danco, L. A., & Jonovic, D. (1981). *Outside directors in the family-owned business*. Cleveland: University Press.

Danes, S.M. (1994). *Rural family business: Predictors of viability* (USDA Rural Development NRI Proposal). St Paul: University of Minnesota.

Danes, S.M., & Rettig, K. D. (1993). Farm wives' business and household decision involvement in times of economic stress. *Home Economics Research Journal*, 21, 307-333.

Dannhaeuser, N. (1993). The survival of family-operated firms under developed conditions: The case of Hassfurt, Germany. *The Journal of Developing Areas*, 27, 307-328.

Davis, J. H. (1982). *The influence of life stage on father-son work relationships in family companies*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Business Administration, Harvard University.

Davis, J. H., & Tagiuri, R. (1981). *The incidence of work relationships between relatives in the family business* (Unpublished paper). Boston, MA: Harvard Business School.

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

Davis, P., & Stern, D. (1980). Adaption, survival, and growth of the family business: An integrated systems perspective. *Human Relations*, 34 (4), 207-224.

Deacon, R. E., & Firebaugh, F. M. (1975). *Home management context and concepts*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Deacon, R. E., & Firebaugh, F. M. (1981). *Family resource management: Principles and applications*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Deacon, R. E., & Firebaugh, F. M. (1988). *Family resource management: Principles and applications* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Dean, S. M. (1992). Characteristics of African-American family-owned businesses in Los Angeles. *Family Business Review*, 5, 373-395.

Dess, G. G., Ireland, R. D., & Hitt, M. A. (1990). Industry effects and strategic management research. *Journal of Management*, 16(1), 7-27.

Dillman, D. A. (1978). *Mail and telephone surveys*. New York: Wiley.

Doherty, W.J., & Colangelo, N. (1984). The family FIRO model: A model proposal for organizing family treatment. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 10, 19-29.

- Doherty, W. J., Colangelo, N., & Hovander, D. (1991). Priority setting in family change and clinical practice: The family FIRO model. *Family Process*, 30, 227-240.
- Donnelley, R. G. (1964). The family business. *Harvard Business Review*, 42(4), 93-105.
- Dumas, C. (1988). *Daughters in family-owned businesses. An applied systems perspective*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Fielding Institute, Santa Barbara, CA.
- Dumas, C. (1989). Understanding of father-daughter and father-son dyads in family-owned businesses. *Family Business Review*, 2, 31-46.
- Dumas, C., Dupuis, J. P., Richer, F., & St-Cyr, L. (1995). Factors that influence the next generation's decision to take over the family firm. *Family Business Review*, 8, 99-120.
- Duncan, G. J., & Hill, M. S. (1985). Conceptions of longitudinal households: Fertile or futile? *Journal of Economic and Social Measurement*, 13, 361-375.
- Dunkelburg, W. C., & Cooper, A. C. (1982). Patterns of small business growth. *Academy of Management Proceedings* (pp. 409-413).
- Dunn, B. (1996). Family enterprises in the UK: A special sector? *Family Business Review*, 9, 139-156.
- Dunne, T., Roberts, M., & Samuelson, L. (1987). *Plant failure and employment growth in the U.S. manufacturing sector*(Unpublished manuscript). University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University, Department of Economics.
- Dyer, W. G., Jr. (1986). *Cultural change in family firms: Anticipating and managing business and family transitions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dyer, W. G., Jr. (1989). Integrating professional management into a family owned business. *Family Business Review*, 2, 221-235.
- Dyer, W. G., Jr. (1994). Potential contributions of organizational behavior to the study of family-owned businesses. *Family Business Review*, 7, 109-132.
- Dyer, W. G., Jr., & Handler, W. (1994). Entrepreneurship and family business: Exploring the connections. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 19(1), 71-83.
- Edwards, F. R. (1964). The banking competition controversy. *National Banking Review*, 3, 1-34.
- Edwards, L. N., & Field-Hendrey, E. (1996). Home-based workers: Data from the 1990 Census of Population. *Monthly Labor Review*, 119(11), 26-34.

- Ellehausen, G. E., & Wolken, J. D. (1990). *Banking markets and the use of financial services by small and medium sized businesses*. Washington, DC: Federal Reserve System Board of Governors.
- Eng, C. A., Dollinger, M. J., & Daily, C. M. (1990). The value orientations of minority and non-minority small business owners. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 15 (1), 23-35.
- Ensley, M. D., & Banks, M. C. (1992). Raising questions about entrepreneurial teams. In the *Proceedings of the 1992 Meeting of the Southern Management Association*.
- Ensley, M. D., & Spencer, B. A. (1997, August). *Expanding the horizons of new venture research: Toward a more complete conception of the determinates of new venture performance*. Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the Academy of Management, Entrepreneurship Division, Boston, MA.
- Evans, D. G., & Leighton, L. (1989). Some empirical aspects of entrepreneurship. *American Economic Review*, 79, 519-535.
- Fiegenger, M. K., Brown, B. M., Prince, R. A., & File, K. M. (1994). A comparison of successor development in family and nonfamily businesses. *Family Business Review*, 7, 313-329.
- Finney, B. J., & Wambsganss, J. R. (1990). Family-owned firms in Kansas: Results of a survey. *Kansas Business Review*, 14(1), 22-31.
- Fitchen, J. M. (1995). Why rural poverty is growing worse: Similar causes in diverse settings. In E. N. Castle (Ed.), *The changing American countryside: Rural people and places*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Fitzsimmons, V. S., Hira, T. K., Bauer, J. W., & Hafstrom, J. L. (1993). Financial management: Development of scales. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 14, 257-274.
- Flora, J. L., & Johnson, T. G. (1991). Small businesses. In C. B. Flora, & J. A. Christenson, (Eds.), *Rural policies for the 1990's* (pp. 47-59). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Ford, R. H. (1989). Establishing and managing boards of directors: The other view. *Family Business Review*, 2, 142-146.
- Fox, W., & Murray, M. (1991). Local public policies and interregional business development. *Southern Economic Journal*, 413-427.
- Fratoe, F. A. (1986). A sociological analysis of minority business. *Review of Black Political Economy*, 15(Fall), 5-30.

- Fredland, J. E. (1985). Psychic income and self-employment. *Journal of Private Enterprise*, 1(Fall), 121-126.
- Fredland, J. E., & Little, R. D. (1981). Self-employed workers: Returns to education and training. *Economics of Education Review*, 1, 315-337.
- Friedman, M., & Friedman, S. (1994). *How to run a family business*. Cincinnati: Better Way.
- Friedman, S. (1991). Sibling relationships and intergenerational succession in family firms. *Family Business Review*, 4, 3-20.
- Fuguitt, G. V., Brown, D. L., & Beale, C. L. (1989). *Rural and small town America*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Gaskill, L., Jasper, C., Bastow-Shoop, H., Jolly, L., Kean, R., Leistriz, L., & Sternquist, B. (1996). Operation planning and competitive strategies of male and female retailers. *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research*, 6(1), 76-96.
- Gaston, R. J. (1989). The scale of informal capital markets. *Small Business Economics*, 1, 223-230.
- Glueck, W. F., & Meson, T. S. (1980). *A literature analysis of concepts*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Annual Meeting, Detroit, MI.
- Goffee, R., & Scase, R. (1991). Proprietorial control in family firms: Some functions of 'quasi-organic' management systems. *Family Business Review*, 4, 337-352.
- Goldberg, S. D., & Wooldridge, B. (1993). Self-confidence and managerial autonomy: Successor characteristics critical to succession in family firms. *Family Business Review*, 6, 55-73.
- Green, G. P., & Fleishmann, A. (1989). Analyzing local strategies for promoting economic development. *Policy Studies Journal*, 17(3), 557-573.
- Green, G. P., Fleischmann, A., & Kwong, T. M. (1996). The effectiveness of local economic development policies in the 1980s. *Social Science Quarterly*, 77(3), 609-625.
- Green, S., & Pryde, P. (1990). *Black entrepreneurship in America*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Greenwood, M. J., & Hunt, G. L. (1984). Migration and interregional employment redistribution in the United States. *American Economic Review*, 74, 957-969.
- Greenwood, M. J., & Stock, R. (1990). Patterns of change in the intrametropolitan location of population, jobs, and housing: 1950 to 1980. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 28, 243-276.

- Gruidl, J. S., & Pulver, G. C. (1991). A dynamic analysis of net migration and state employment change. *The Review of Regional Studies*, 21(1), 21-38.
- Halbrendt, C., Sullivan, P., & Wang, Q. (1996). *Entrepreneurial activities: A possible solution to rural, female poverty* (Project No: VT-AE-00557). Burlington, VT: University of Vermont.
- Handler, W. C. (1989a). *Managing the family firm succession process: The next-generation family member's experience*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, School of Management, Boston University.
- Handler, W. C. (1989b). Methodological issues and considerations in studying family businesses. *Family Business Review*, 5, 257-276.
- Handler W. C. (1990). Succession in family firms: A mutual role adjustment between entrepreneurs and next-generation family member. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 15(1), 37-51.
- Handler, W. C. (1992). The succession experience of the next generation. *Family Business Review*, 5, 283-307.
- Handler, W. C. (1994). Succession in family business: A review of the research. *Family Business Review*, 7, 133-158.
- Handler, W. C., & Kram, K. E. (1988). Succession in family firms: The problem of resistance. *Family Business Review*, 1, 361-379.
- Hansen, N. M. (Ed.). (1972). *Growth centers in regional economic development*. New York: Free Press.
- Harris, D., Martinez, J. I., & Ward, J. L. (1994). Is strategy different for the family-owned business? *Family Business Review*, 7, 159-174.
- Harvey, M., & Evans, R. E. (1994). The impact of timing and mode of entry on successor development and successful succession. *Family Business Review*, 7, 221-236.
- *Heck, R. K. Z. (1988). A profile of home-based workers. *Human Ecology Forum*, 16(4), 15-18.
- *Heck, R. K. Z. (1991). Employment location choices: Factors associated with the likelihood of homebased employment. *Lifestyles: Family and Economic Issues*, 12, 217-233.
- *Heck, R. K. Z. (1992). The effects of children on the major dimensions of home-based employment. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 13, 315-346.

*Heck, R. K. Z., Saltford, N.C., Rowe, B., & Owen, A. J. (1992). The utilization of child care by households engaged in home-based employment. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 13, 213-237.

*Heck, R., & Stafford, K. (1991). Earning income at home. *Human Ecology Forum*, 19(4), 21-23.

*Heck, R. K. Z., & Walker, R. (1993). Family-owned home businesses, their employees, and unpaid helpers. *Family Business Review*, 6, 397-416.

*Heck, R. K. Z., Winter, M., & Stafford, K. (1992). Managing work and family in home-based employment. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 13, 187-212.

Heidrick, G. W. (1988). Selecting outside directors. *Family Business Review*, 1, 271-277.

Henry, M., Drabenstott, M., & Gibson, L. (1987). Rural growth slows down. *Rural Development Perspectives*, 3, 25-30.

Hershon, S. (1975). *The problems of management succession in family businesses*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, Boston, MA.

Herzog, H. W. Jr., & Schlottmann, A. M. (Eds.). (1991). *Industry location and public policy*. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press.

Higgins, J. M. (1994). *The management challenge: An introduction to management*. New York: Macmillan.

Hira, T. K. (1990). Residents in economically gaining and declining rural communities and their perception of changes in community and impact on household's financial situation. In M. L. Carsky, (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 36th Annual Conference of the American Council on Consumer Interests* (p. 334). Columbia, MO: University of Missouri.

Hira, T. K., Fitzsimmons, V. S., Hafstrom, J. L., & Bauer, J. W. (1993). Factors associated with expectation of household's future financial condition. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 14, 237-256.

Hirschl, T. A., & Brown, D. L. (1995). The determinants of rural and urban poverty. In E. N. Castle (Ed.), *The changing American countryside: Rural people and places*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.

Hollander, B. S., & Elman, N. S. (1988). Family-owned businesses: An emerging field of inquiry. *Family Business Review*, 1, 145-164.