RAIS RESEARCH ASSOCIATION for INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES
June 6-7, 2024

10.5281/zenodo.12684539

Synergizing Innovation Dynamics: A Comprehensive Examination of Tradition and Creativities in Family-Owned Firms

Azzeddine Allioui

ESCA Ecole de Management, Morocco, aallioui@esca.ma

ABSTRACT: This research investigates the complex dynamics of innovation postures inside family businesses, revealing a typology that combines a predilection for risk with a strong adherence to tradition. The diverse routes illuminated by the Seasoner, Re-enactor, Digger, and Adventurer attitudes inside family enterprises have a distinctive impact on the innovation atmosphere. Through an examination of the relationship between these positions and the aspects of the family system, namely aim variety and coherence, we can decipher the paradox of innovation willingness in family businesses. Moreover, succession presents a critical occasion for reorientation, providing insight into how intergenerational family enterprises manage the intricate equilibrium between risk-taking and tradition.

KEYWORDS: innovation dynamics, tradition, family-owned firms, intergenerational family enterprises

1. Introduction

It is important to investigate the correlation between digital transformation and family management, with particular emphasis on the advancement of technical advancements. Based on discernible attributes of family-led enterprises, including a focus on non-economic family-oriented objectives, long tenure, emotional attachments to current assets (Gómez-Mejía et al. 2011), and inflexible cognitive frameworks, the hypothesis postulates that heightened family participation in the leadership team exhibits an inverse relationship with the advancement of innovation (De Massis et al. 2016).

How can family-owned enterprises maximize their capacity for innovation? The existing body of literature concerning innovation in family firms has produced contentious findings, notwithstanding significant advancements in the field. Despite the perception that family firms are more traditional and conservative, a considerable number of the most creative enterprises in the world are family owned. This underscores an evident dichotomy in the propensity for innovation shown by family-owned enterprises. Drawing upon existing scholarly works concerning innovation inside family-owned enterprises and family structures (De Massis et al. 2016), we contend that family attributes constitute a significant but disregarded determinant in this paradoxical conflict.

The notion of the family business innovation posture is introduced, along with a typology consisting of four ideal types: Seasoner, Re-enactor, Digger, and Adventurer (SRDA). In addition, to overcome the will-capacity contradiction, we investigate and show with empirical data the essential alignment between the family business innovation posture and family-related aspects. By exploring the effects of intrafamily succession, the article examines the implications of the typology for research on innovation in family businesses. It also identifies crucial directions for future research to advance the current understanding of the family's role in innovation in family businesses and provides family business owners, managers, and consultants with actionable insights (De Massis et al. 2016).

Despite being vilified for being traditionalists and conservative for passing on the family company lineage, family firms include a substantial proportion of the most creative enterprises in the world (Kammerlander et al. 2017). Innovation is universally acknowledged as a critical catalyst for both organizational and economic growth (Garud et al. 2013).

Furthermore, the significance of innovation in ensuring the enduring viability of family enterprises is emphasized by an expanding collection of scholarly works. These studies together illustrate notable distinctions in terms of innovation between organizations that are family-owned and those that are not. As an example, family firms may exhibit a greater propensity for expeditious execution of discontinuous technology implementation decisions, in contrast to their non-family company counterparts.

Like non-family enterprises, family businesses allocate less resources towards innovation due to risk aversion, frugality, wealth concentration, and more decision-making authority, according to study. On the contrary, when the family not only owns but also controls the firm, they are more successful at converting these inputs into inventive outputs (Duran et al. 2016), indicating a significant familial influence on innovation (De Massis et al. 2016). Even though research reveals that family firms and non-family enterprises innovate differently, the origins of this distinction continue to baffle academics. Despite their greater capability, family firms innovate less, according to recent research (Chrisman et al. 2015); this highlights the "will-capacity contradiction" in family company innovation. Family-owned enterprises must comprehend the solution to this innovation conundrum to realize their full potential. Sadly, most of the research on creativity in family firms has neglected the substantial and varied influence of the family on innovation in family enterprises (De Massis et al. 2016), focusing only on the business side (De-Massis et al. 2016). In recent times, there has been a growing need to further integrate family system theory and family-related characteristics to elucidate the unique creative behaviors shown by family firms and to reveal the underlying processes at play (Jaskiewicz et al. 2017). To bridge this knowledge gap and provide fresh insights on the family's involvement in family business innovation, our research investigates the following inquiry: In what ways does the family system facilitate the resolution of the will-capacity issue and the release of the family business's innovative potential?

Our attention is directed on the notion of the family business innovation stance, which is the owning family's strategic orientation that influences the atmosphere, philosophy, and innovative practices of the organization (Chrisman, Chua, and Sharma 2005). Through an analysis of the diverse innovation stances of family businesses in correlation with varying degrees of risk aversion and adherence to tradition, we have constructed a typology including four archetypal types: Seasoner, Re-Enactor, Digger, and Adventurer (SRDA). By incorporating this typology into family system theory, we contend that family companies may unlock their innovation potential and address the will-capacity contradiction by ensuring congruence between their innovation attitude and family-related features (De Massis et al., 2016). Our study focuses specifically on two family-related aspects: the variety of family aspirations and family cohesiveness. Family unity is established by the "emotional connection that members of the family feel for one another" (Gómez-Mejía et al. 2011). The term "diversity of family goals" refers to the extent to which individuals within a family company actively seek a wide array of corporate objectives (De-Massis et al. 2013). By utilizing illustrative examples and empirical evidence gathered from family business consultants in conjunction with our theoretical framework, we discern optimal configurations of risk propensity, tradition adherence, family unity, and goal diversity that are most probable to empower family-owned enterprises to overcome the paradox of will-capacity. In conclusion, our study underscores the potential for intrafamily succession to adjust these dimensions and release their capacity for innovation.

Innovation, which encompasses the series of undertakings by which an organization devises, constructs, launches, and provides novel goods, services, processes, or business models, is the principal catalyst for attaining a competitive edge and achieving exceptional business outcomes (Blundell, Griffith, and Van Reenen 1999; Calantone, Cavusgil, and Zhao 2002). Although innovation is undeniably vital for family companies to sustain their long-term success and regain their competitive edge, they are sometimes seen as resistant to change and conventional (Duran et al. 2016), in addition to being more reliant on trajectories than non-family enterprises. In contrast, the reality that more than fifty percent of the most creative firms in Europe are family-owned contradicts these opinions. Because of this indeterminate empirical evidence, scholars have progressively shifted their attention towards comprehending the causes of this dispute, elucidating the connections between innovation inputs and outputs in family-owned enterprises, and explicating the influence of family participation on innovation endeavors (De-Massis et al. 2013; Rod 2016).

Family owners' inclination toward long-term goals may indicate a greater propensity to allocate resources towards innovation. However, the data show that they spend less in research and development owing to risk aversion and the possibility that greater agency expenses could result in internal family disputes. However, family firms have the potential to turn innovation inputs into outputs more efficiently than non-family enterprises, which may sometimes result in even greater innovation outputs. Scholars contend and substantiate the notion that family-owned enterprises exhibit more efficiency while allocating a smaller capital investment towards innovation, hence doing more with less. Hence, an exclusive emphasis on innovation outputs or inputs impedes the development of a comprehensive comprehension of innovation inside family enterprises, particularly about their distinctive inventive conduct (De Massis et al. 2016).

As evidenced by the fact that family businesses benefit from more flexible structures and decision-making processes (Craig 2006), less formalized processes, the implementation of idiosyncratic resource bundling processes, and infrequent reliance on external collaborations, there has been a growing focus in research on innovation activities. Concerning the risk acceptance associated with adopting discontinuous technology, family firms may face substantial obstacles when examining control objectives, intrafamily succession, and the use of discontinuous technologies. However, family-owned enterprises also gain speedier adoption, better flexibility, resilience, and long-term investments after overcoming these challenges (Konig 2013).

2. Navigating the Paradox of Will and Capacity in Innovation within Family Businesses

The existing body of literature about innovation in family firms has mostly focused on enterprise-level innovation drivers, with less attention paid to the influence of the family structure (De Massis et al. 2016). This has constrained our present comprehension of the ways in which familial elements may influence the unique conduct of family-owned enterprises. Capacity and willpower are two essential but individually inadequate prerequisites for family-oriented differentiated conduct. Capacity can be described as the authority vested in the family to determine, distribute, augment, or divest the resources of a business. This authority stems from the family's participation in the ownership, governance, and management of the enterprise, and includes the freedom to select from various strategic (Chrisman, Chua, and Sharma 2005), tactical, and structural alternatives. Will represents the entrepreneurial zeal of the engaged family members to pursue unique conduct, motivating the proprietor to steer the company in a trajectory that aligns with the objectives of the family.

As a result of these adequacy criteria, scholars propose that innovation within family enterprises is marked by the "will-capacity paradox," which posits that while having the potential to innovate more than non-family enterprises, family enterprises have a reduced propensity to do so. Their enhanced ability to innovate is influenced by their leader's seniority, long-term perspective, and tacit knowledge. Lack of necessary skills, risk aversion, unwillingness to share power with non-family members, and socioemotional issues all contribute to their diminished propensity for innovation (Gómez-Mejía et al. 2011; Chrisman et al. 2015). Therefore, family enterprises encounter the will-capacity dilemma of innovation, which hinders their ability to innovate despite their stronger want to do so. Hence, it is critical that this dilemma be resolved to unlock their capacity for creativity (De Massis et al. 2016).

De Massis, in an initial effort to provide recommendations for addressing the innovation paradox, formulated the notion of "family-driven innovation" as a collection of internal strategic choices that amalgamate characteristics of diverse innovation decisions with the factors that contribute to the heterogeneity of family businesses (Chrisman, Chua, and Sharma 2005). Additionally, the dichotomy between intent and ability should be investigated in the context of exploration and exploitation innovation strategies for family businesses. The ability and will of family proprietors interact to ascertain organizational complexity, which is defined as the concurrent endeavor for exploration and exploitation. Furthermore, they explicate the variety of innovation in family businesses by citing variations in objectives, governance frameworks, and resources (De Massis et al. 2016).

The extant body of research mostly examines enterprise-level determinants to reconcile the will-capacity conundrum and elucidate contentious results about family business innovation. This approach focuses extensively on company structure and governance (Nordqvist, Sharma, and Chirico 2014). We propose that, in addition to analyzing the company, it is crucial to evaluate the family system and its intrinsic features to comprehend family heterogeneity and how it influences the innovative behavior of family businesses. This aligns with previous recommendations to include an analysis of the family unit and its diversity to further understanding of family business conduct (Jaskiewicz et al. 2017). However, instead of examining the direct impact of the family on innovation within family businesses, we delve into this complex phenomenon by recognizing the family as the fundamental and distinguishing characteristic of such enterprises and examining its correlation with the innovation orientation of family businesses (De Massis et al. 2016). Therefore, the present investigation addresses the following inquiry: In what ways does the family system facilitate the resolution of the will-capacity issue and the release of the family business's innovative potential?

3. Assessing the Landscape of Innovation in Family Businesses

Expanding upon family system theory and existing research about innovation within family enterprises, the present study focuses on the innovation posture of family firms. The notion of stance, as defined in the field of strategy, pertains to the overarching competitive orientation of the organization. It is "exemplified by the degree to which senior executives are willing to undertake business-related risks, encourage innovation and change in order to secure a competitive edge for their company, and engage in aggressive competition with other organizations." Organizations that adopt a conservative strategic attitude tend to exhibit reduced propensity for risk-taking, innovation reluctance, and a reactive approach. Conversely, an entrepreneurial strategic posture motivates companies to engage in initiative-taking risk-taking and innovation. The literature operationalizes this predisposition toward innovation along several dimensions, including the allocation of human resources to innovation activities and the amount of R&D spending, to establish the strategic attitude (Chrisman, Chua, and Sharma 2005).

Scholars specializing in innovation define the innovation posture, which is founded upon the strategic posture concept, as "the company's orientation towards innovation; it establishes the dominant organizational culture concerning the launch of new products; and it determines the company's overall direction, as evidenced by its risk profile and competitive standing" (Calantone Cavusgil, and Zhao 2006). The organization's capacity to partake in creative endeavors is limited by its stance; this attribute at the corporate level signifies its standing within the innovation ecosystem and its readiness to participate in and get advantages from innovation. A corporation that adopts a defensive innovation posture lags market leaders by offering fewer goods with modest modifications, while an aggressive innovation posture results in the introduction of a considerable number of latest items in front of rivals. Most of the research devoted to innovation posture has focused on its effects on competitive advantage and business performance (Miller et al. 2007), but its antecedents have received less attention.

Family business innovation posture is the strategic orientation that the owning family (Chrisman, Chua, and Sharma 2005), or more precisely, the family group engaged in the dominant coalition of the business, imparts to the family business. This orientation shapes the climate, philosophy, and innovation practices of the business. Family involvement in the dominant coalition of the business contributes to the distinctive characteristics of innovation within family businesses. Hence, by directing our attention towards the innovative stance of the family enterprise, we might potentially enhance our comprehension of the family's impact on innovation. We find two aspects of the innovation posture of family firms, in line with the existing body of research on the subject: risk inclination and adherence to tradition (De Massis et al. 2016).

3.1. Evaluating the Likelihood of Risks: A Comprehensive Examination of Risk Probability in Business Contexts

Risk propensity can be described as "the individual's perceived likelihood of attaining rewards linked to the successful completion of a proposed scenario, which is necessary for them to consent to the repercussions associated with failure, in contrast with the alternative situation which presents comparatively lesser rewards and less severe consequences than the proposed situation." At the individual level, the tendency for risk-taking among CEOs, which refers to their readiness to allocate substantial resources to capitalize on possibilities or partake in activities with unclear results, has been recognized as a catalyst for innovation. The combination between the degree of CEO risk-taking and certain aspects of the family company (such as the proportion of family members in the management team and the number of generations participating) results in varying degrees of innovation within the new product line. Research indicates that risk inclination is reduced in family firms relative to non-family enterprises at the corporate level (De Massis et al. 2016). Furthermore, the extent of family engagement in the company influences this phenomenon. Given this corpus of information, we define risk propensity as the predisposition of the family company to engage in activities that carry the element of unpredictability about the result. Consequently, a family enterprise characterized by a tendency for elevated risk accepts unpredictability, fosters individual initiative among family members, and promotes innovative thought. A low-risk family enterprise, on the other hand, prefers "playing it safe" and is thus more reticent to place bets on some of its concepts.

3.2. Committed to Tradition: Exploring Firm Devotion to Heritage

The collection of information, abilities, resources, manufacturing methods, symbols, values, and beliefs associated with the past constitutes tradition. In a recent study, scholars emphasized the significance of the historical background of a family company in relation to creativity. They identified a novel approach to product creation known as "innovation by tradition." In contrast to the prevailing recommendation in innovation management to prioritize the future over the past, this approach proposes that certain family-owned enterprises possess a distinct array of capabilities that allow them to assimilate and reinterpret knowledge that is temporally distant in order to foster innovation through the utilization of historical insights (De Massis et al. 2016). From this standpoint, we define attachment to tradition as the extent to which the family enterprise is entrenched in its historical roots and aspires to pass them on to subsequent generations. Family enterprises that place significant emphasis on tradition communicate narratives that have been rhetorically reconstructed regarding the past actions of the founder and family. These enterprises also honor their ancestors, pay close attention to their history, and strive to safeguard their heritage for future generations. On the contrary, family enterprises that have a tenuous connection to tradition are more concerned with the future and the present, seeing their current situation as a foundation for innovation. The past is considered a component that demands the family company to progress.

By integrating these two aspects, a framework of distinct innovation postures with alternate orientations is established, which the family may influence to shape the organization's innovation atmosphere, philosophy, and practices. With respect to these two aspects, we delineate a typology including four distinct combinations, each of which propels family-owned enterprises towards the adoption of exceptionally creative practices (De Massis et al. 2016).

3.3. A Collection of Innovation Stances within Family Enterprises

Typologies have been advocated for by scholars in the domain of family companies to enhance our comprehension of diverse innovation methodologies. A typology, being an exceptional method of theory formation, is a collection of ideal types theoretically developed from a given set of principles [that] identifies several ideal kinds, each reflecting a distinct amalgamation of organizational features intended to ascertain the pertinent conclusion (s). By combining contextual, structural, and strategic aspects to forecast the variance of a desired result (Chrisman, Chua, and Sharma 2005), a typology generates configurations. When a set of ideals comprises full and mutually exclusive kinds that can be assessed with validity and dependability, and has a well-established theoretical base, it is deemed worthwhile. The configurational method recognizes that each kind of framework permits several paths to success, so giving a theoretical basis for the continuation of numerous similar design decisions that may all result in the intended consequence. Motivated by the classification of innovation postures within family firms into discrete theoretical categories, we embrace a multidimensional framework to acknowledge the intricate and interconnected characteristics of innovation within this sector. In accordance with the principle of equifinality, no variation in the level of innovativeness is assumed among the postures that have been described. On the contrary, we contend that family enterprises can foster innovation by adopting four distinct orientations: Seasoner, Re-enactor, Digger, and Adventurer.

To begin with, the Seasoner posture is distinguished by a dearth of risk-taking propensity, a reluctance to engage in action, and a low regard for tradition. This culminates in an innovation orientation that is likely to redefine the significance of the present situation in comparison to previous periods, all while avoiding an excessive degree of risk. This stance is characterized by its idea of repurposing existing materials in an unconventional manner to create something more appetizing without compromising their core. Furthermore, the Re-family enactor's company innovation posture is characterized by a strong adherence to tradition and a reluctance to take chances, which results in the family business innovating near the status quo (De Massis et al. 2016).

The Re-enactor stance is distinguished by the adoption of a historical mindset that encourages innovation via the exploration of inherited values and recollections of the family firm, with a low tolerance for risk. Furthermore, the Digger posture integrates contemporary resources and capabilities for innovation with a steadfast commitment to tradition and a propensity for high risk-taking, thereby facilitating the interweaving of distinctive, traditional organizational resources and capabilities rooted in history and heritage. As a result of the Adventurer's low commitment to tradition and strong tendency for accepting risks, family firms that embrace this stance are motivated to innovate by abandoning the past and engaging in hazardous endeavors. Adventurers are distinguished by their audacious intent to innovate beyond current patterns. Family enterprises who take this stance do so with the intention of disrupting the status quo via innovation (De Massis et al. 2016). By using collected knowledge, history is used to create something distinct from present and previous events.

In family enterprises, each of the identified innovation postures may result in exceptionally inventive behavior and performance (Miller et al. 2007). The objective of this study is to highlight the potential for diverse approaches to innovation and to construct a theoretical framework based on the characteristics of each position within our typology. To expand upon our conjecture, we illuminate the intricacies of the innovation stance within family businesses by expanding the scope of our theory beyond the business system. By investigating aspects of the family system that influence family business innovation, we offer potential solutions to the paradox of wills versus capacities (De Massis et al. 2016).

3.4. Analyzing the Interaction Between Family Unity and Diverse Goals in Family Enterprises

Proposed theories in the subject of family science explain family dynamics and results. A new study (Kammerlander et al. 2017) proposes the use of sociological, psychological, and educational insights to facilitate a more sophisticated integration of family science and management research. To examine family enterprises, Jaskiewicz delineates four facets of family heterogeneity concerns: family structures, family functions, family events, and family interactions (among family members). Family systems theory investigates the significance of interactions among family members in relation to the results of family businesses. It conceptualizes the family system as an open-ended, hierarchical structure in which members endeavor to preserve equilibrium. Hence, family systems theory places emphasis on interpersonal interactions as opposed to structural and characteristic factors, recognizing the critical role of communication among family members in shaping the established state of the family. By establishing membership requirements, rituals, and regulations, the family system provides a perfect setting for integrating family science (particularly family systems theory) with established management theories to get a deeper understanding of organizational phenomena like innovation.

The examination of decision-making outcomes within family enterprises necessitates an analysis of the attributes of familial relationships. Scholars contend that the significance attributed to certain objectives is contingent upon the influence wielded by people or collectives engaged in the processes of decision-making. Based on extant literature, the distinctive consolidation of ownership and management that distinguishes family enterprises ought to provide an advantage onto the dominant coalition in the form of enhanced authority to enforce its agenda upon the company. The term "family company" is often used by scholars to refer to an "enterprise owned by a dominating coalition managed by family members or a limited number of families." Nonetheless, familial solidarity is not always high, and a lack thereof might weaken the dominating coalition. Additionally, studies on goal setting dispute the notion that owner families seek identical aims and objectives, as is often assumed in the literature on family businesses. Two essential features so emerge from our investigation of the family system: the variety of family objectives and family cohesiveness. To provide a scholarly contribution to the field of innovation in family enterprises (De Massis et al. 2016), we investigate these two aspects.

3.5. Diverse Family Objectives: A Spectrum of Goals in Family Enterprises

Goal alignment is seen in the literature as advantageous for coordination since it reduces disagreement among various stakeholders on the organization's best interests. Family business professionals underline that non-economic objectives are a crucial differentiating factor between family firms and non-family enterprises, in addition to economic objectives. The field of family business literature examines the divergence of objectives between family and non-family members. It operates under the assumption that family members are primarily concerned with non-economic family-centric objectives, such as preserving family harmony and maintaining control over the business, while non-family members are more concerned with maximizing their economic gain. Family members endeavor to accomplish a diverse array of personal objectives, and scholarly investigations have uncovered evidence that contradicts the notion that goal congruence among family members is a practical expectation.

Consequently, the interplay between the family, ownership, and business systems fosters the pursuit of a multitude of individual objectives, thereby resulting in a variety of family goals, which is the degree to which family members pursue their own aims. Diversity of objectives is a neutral dimension; having a large or low diversity of goals does not have any immediate positive or negative implications. Increased levels of variety in family objectives may give rise to conflicts, such as those across generations or among family members with varying degrees of engagement in the enterprise. However, this may also be advantageous by igniting individual interests. On the contrary, a lack of goal variety within a family indicates that all members strive towards the same objective, such as placing emphasis on non-economic family-oriented objectives. Nonetheless, this kind of alignment may have adverse consequences by impeding the growth of contrasting concepts.

3.6. The Unified Essence of Family Cohesion

Family systems theory research investigates the elements that promote family functioning. The convergence of familial and corporate interests may give rise to a more substantial degree of dispute than in enterprises governed by other systems. Family cohesion, which Olson (1979) defines as "the emotional bond that family members have toward one another," is essential for accessing or creating resources and divesting assets in the event of financial difficulties (Gómez-Mejía et al. 2011). A cohesive family, for instance, obtains easier access to added information through the networking of its members. In high cohesiveness households, generosity and reciprocity predominate. On the contrary, non-cohesive families tend to embrace individualistic thinking and engage in opportunistic conduct. In general, top management teams comprised of family members and relatives have a strong feeling of unity, which fosters a better sense of belonging and confidence in the talents of team members.

Nevertheless, family business cohesiveness may pose considerable obstacles to leveraging the wealth of various perspectives inside the unit, as it may isolate individuals from external influences, foster groupthink and compliance, and stifle constructive arguments. Indeed, the "glue" that binds a family during times of crisis may become too rigid if there is a dearth of variation in the family's receptiveness to alternatives. A highly cohesive family shares and collects experiences across generations and functional domains; yet, as generations separate, it becomes increasingly difficult to sustain family cohesiveness. In contrast, diminished family cohesiveness may have adverse consequences such as discord. However, the lack of a strong unifying force might facilitate the infiltration of novel concepts from networks outside the immediate family, so encouraging the emergence of fresh perspectives.

The influence of the family system on organizational processes and results is more pronounced in situations when family members exhibit unity of purpose and cohesion. On the contrary, family enterprises are adversely affected by an overemphasis on familial emotional relationships and an extreme lack of variety in aims (Gómez-Mejía et al. 2011). It is our contention that the presence of diverse family objectives and varying degrees of family cohesiveness contribute to the variety of family relationships, which in turn gives rise to distinct behaviors within family companies. In lieu of supposing a positive or negative connotation for goal variety and coherence, we examine the combination of high and low levels of these two aspects of the family system to answer the contentious findings in the literature about innovation in family firms (De Massis et al. 2016).

4. Ensuring Alignment: Harmonizing the Family Business's Innovation Stance with Family System Dimensions

Academics advocate for a more comprehensive investigation of the interplay between family and corporate systems. Our contention is that for innovation to flourish inside family enterprises, the innovation posture of the organization must be congruent with the dimensions of the family system. Alignment is seen as sets of viable alternative designs that are equally effective and internally consistent within their structural models. Each set of feasible designs represents a distinct configuration of circumstances. By adhering to this line of reasoning, we discern configurations that guarantee congruence between the family business's innovation stance and the dimensions of the family system. This resolves the paradox between capability and willingness and liberates the family business's innovation potential. In the sections that follow, we examine the attributes of each ideal form of innovation posture inside the family company in conjunction with family system characteristics. To further this investigation, we provide illustrative instances of family enterprises that have effectively realized their capacity for innovation by embracing an innovation attitude that corresponds with the attributes of their family structure (De Massis et al. 2016). The family business's commitment to innovation aligns with a familial structure marked by limited emotional connections and a lack of goal variety (Gómez-Mejía et al. 2011). To preserve and advance the family company despite a lack of family unity, family members improve the firm's procedures and outcomes while assuming negligible risk and without reciprocating backing for dramatic changes. This position is guided by the notion of creating something more "appetizing" while minimizing reliance on one's ancestry and using the potential of the past in an alternative manner. Family enterprises that have a low degree of familial connectedness are too inward-focused to forward the family agenda and miss chances to track new macrotrends. Presently, a considerable number of family-owned enterprises remain oblivious to the concepts of big data, artificial intelligence, smart manufacturing, and the Internet of Things. They persist in incrementally enhancing their output with the conviction that their enterprise will endure indefinitely.

The Luray Caverns Corporation, the third most frequented cave in the United States, serves as a prime illustration of the Graves family business's commitment to innovation (De Massis et al. 2016). The Graves siblings, consisting of two brothers and four sisters, have maintained two coalitions of the older against the younger for years, which has led to a low degree of coherence. The siblings all strive to gain from one another in pursuit of comparable economic objectives. This innovative posture of the family firm fosters a multitude of little adjustments, often challenging previous customs and entailing minimal risk.

Families who align with this innovative position of the family business are those characterized by a high degree of historical and value-rooted attachment and a low degree of goal variability. They continually innovate in accordance with their established customs, exhibiting a reluctance to undertake risks. The business concept entails preserving the historical character of the company and ensuring its continuity throughout generations. Family members may have reluctance in voicing their opinions and challenging concepts because of a kind of groupthink that is inherently present in such households.

In addition to guardianship of the business's keys, a founder father imparts to his kid all the enduring traditional values that the organization was founded on. The family enterprise incorporates the whole family's identity, beliefs, and experiences, and is resistant to innovation that challenges its history (De Massis et al. 2016). An instance that exemplifies reconstitution is the Smarties confectionery corporation. Under the strong leadership and cohesiveness of the four granddaughters of the founder, the company has manufactured candy in accordance with the original recipe since 1949. While the granddaughters do want to boost the efficiency of their firm via the use of modern technology, their conventional product remains unchanged, and the family's enduring heritage of values and beliefs is preserved for future generations.

The diverse objectives pursued by individual family members are effectively channeled through the intense sense of unity within the family towards an innovation trajectory that aligns most closely with the innovation stance of a family business, which is characterized by a propensity for taking risks while remaining steadfast in adherence to tradition. Since family members are reluctant to disrupt family peace, robust cohesiveness may restrict the ability of individuals to generate innovative ideas because of reduced freedom of exploration and rigid cognitive frameworks (De Massis et al. 2016).

Certain family firms have access to a wealth of extraordinary expertise and abilities that they might use to foster innovation. When family members unlock this container, acknowledging the intrinsic worth of the enterprise and elevating it via groundbreaking outcomes, the consequence is remarkable and unmatched. Beretta serves is a prime illustration of the innovative posture adopted by the Digger family company. Although the Beretta family, which has produced weapons since 1526, has distinct objectives, it remains a close-knit unit. Beretta fosters its commitment to innovation by means of strategic acquisitions and the creation of new goods in areas that are comparatively intimate to its fundamental operations (Chrisman, Chua, and Sharma 2005). They have innovated for fifteen generations by integrating contemporary and traditional resources and talents while preserving a strong connection to the past.

A family business innovation stance corresponds to the pursuit of diverse individual goals and low cohesion by family members. This stance permits family members to pursue independence and investigate opportunities for innovation in sectors or markets that are either like the core business or distinct from it, thereby creating a sense of detachment from the familial nest. This family structure is consistent with the adventurer position, which is characterized by a low regard for tradition and a strong inclination towards taking risks, which allows for the flexibility to cultivate creativity (De Massis et al. 2016).

The "emotional storm" caused by family disputes results in rivalries and alliances, as well as envy and jealously (Gómez-Mejía et al. 2011). Family sometimes establishes "kingdoms" inside an organization. Two relatives or cousins engaged in the same enterprise divide into distinct geographic territories, one in Poland and the other in Brazil; each kingdom administers its domain autonomously, without regard for the activities of the others or even engaging in competition with other divisions. (Familiar Professional) An exemplary instance of a family business embracing this position is the Italian retail chain Esselunga, which is under the ownership of the Caprotti family. Bernardo Caprotti retained exclusive ownership of the company until his death in 2016, at which point he bequeathed the shares to his progeny (16.7 percent to each of his children from his first marriage and 66.7 percent to his second wife and their daughter).

Consistently, family cohesiveness has been weak, as individuals grapple with many relationship challenges and pursue divergent objectives that materialize in disagreements and legal issues. The configuration of this family system is consistent with the adventurer stance, which is a family orientation marked by a strong inclination towards risk-taking and a tendency to deviate from previous customs. This orientation has prompted the family business to innovate by utilizing design thinking tools and introducing new services and products. Our research illuminates the innovative positions of family businesses via the development of a typology that distinguishes between those with high and low degrees of risk inclination and adherence to tradition. By expanding our theoretical framework, we contend that family firms must embrace an innovation orientation that aligns with the cohesiveness and goal variety aspects of their family system to fully harness their innovative capabilities. This connection is essential for resolving the contradiction of the innovation willingness of family businesses (De Massis et al. 2016).

Businesses and families are dynamic, ever-changing systems. Succession represents a momentous juncture in the trajectory of a family enterprise, potentially affecting two facets of the family system: the variety of family objectives and the unity of the family. In addition, succession provides an opportune chance to calibrate the risk propensity and traditionalism that define the innovative posture of the family firm. Such modifications enable the willingness-capacity contradiction to be resolved by further innovation, a transition from one ideal type to another, or the adoption of a new configuration that unlocks the business's innovation potential.

To examine this contention, we choose three instances of family enterprises (Stew Leonard's, Amramp, and Liang Ping) that achieved a novel arrangement via succession, therefore realigning the innovation posture of the family firm with the family system's dimensions. Interviews were conducted with the successors of three family firms who had previously had professional experience at other organizations before joining their family company. They engaged in a conversation on their family and company, specifically addressing how the takeover would affect the innovative posture of the family firm (De Massis et al. 2016).

The objective that unites succeeding generations is to enhance the family enterprise. Regarding tea, a conventional product, the first generation exhibits a prudence against allocating substantial financial and temporal resources towards innovation due to its risk aversion and preoccupation with monetary gains. It is the responsibility of the second generation to assume control of the company and implement novel, significant initiatives that will appeal to the younger generation. In general, entrepreneurs prefer to adhere to convention by including more data and streamlining the procedure.

Succession provides the chance to realign the innovation posture of the family company and the various components of the family system. This enables family enterprises to address the dichotomy between capability and willingness by either adopting a different innovation posture or fostering congruence between their innovation stance and the aspects of the family system (De Massis et al. 2016).

Within the realm of research concerning innovation in family enterprises, the notion of the family business innovation stance is formulated. This stance denotes the strategic orientation that the proprietoring family (Chrisman, Chua, and Sharma 2005), specifically the family group affiliated with the business's dominant coalition, bestows upon the family business. This orientation influences the business's ambiance, guiding principles, and innovation methodologies. Two elements are discerned from the analysis of the innovation posture of family businesses: a penchant for risk and a strong adherence to tradition. We classify four family business innovation attitudes into a typology according to their adherence to tradition and tendency for low or elevated levels of risk. Digger, Seasoner, Re-enactor, and Adventurer (De Massis et al. 2016).

The four viewpoints provide to the organization an innovation-oriented perspective distinguished by distinct qualities. Nonetheless, just defining the position does not enough to overcome the conundrum of willingness. Our argument is that to resolve the paradox and unlock the innovation potential of the family business, it is critical to ensure alignment between the innovation stance of the family business and the family system dimensions (De Massis et al. 2016), namely family goal diversity and family cohesion. This is achieved by emphasizing the significance of these dimensions. As a result, we examine theoretically configurations of the four indicated dimensions that guarantee alignment. To support this claim, we provide illustrative instances of creative family firms that conform to our configurations. In conclusion, we examine the topic of succession as a critical chance to align the family business's innovative position with the family system's dimensions to resolve the contradiction.

5. Conclusion

As we examine the innovation positions of family businesses, we navigate a nuanced spectrum that falls somewhere between concordance and incongruity. The convergence of the Seasoner's steadfast adherence to tradition, the Re-enthusiastic enactor's acceptance of history, the Digger's exploration of unexplored domains, and the Adventurer's ambitious quest for originality unveils a diverse fabric of creativity inside family-owned businesses.

The results of our study emphasize the significant impact that succession has on the family business environment. Successors, endowed with the authority to readjust risk aversion and tradition, designate the trajectory of innovation for the family enterprise (De Massis et al. 2016). The need for this reevaluation, which is instigated by succession, becomes apparent as the solution to the dichotomy between the ability and motivation to innovate in family firms.

As this paper on the innovative postures of family businesses concludes, we encourage more investigation into the complex interplay between entrepreneurial ingenuity and familial relations. "Harmony and Dissonance: Unraveling Family Business Innovation Stances" serves as an entreaty to both academics and professionals, compelling them to further explore the intricacies of family companies. Within this domain, innovation and tradition converge in a distinctive entrepreneurial symphony.

References

Blundell, Richard, Rachel Griffith, and John Van Reenen. 1999. "Market share, market value and innovation in a panel of British manufacturing firms." *The Review of Economic Studies* 66(3): 529-554.

Calantone, Roger J., S. Tamer Cavusgil, and Yushan Zhao. 2002. "Learning orientation, firm innovation capability, and firm performance." *Industrial Marketing Management* 31(6): 515-524.

Chrisman, James J., Jess H. Chua, and Pramodita Sharma. 2005. "Trends and directions in the development of a strategic management theory of the family firm." *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 29(5): 555-576.

Chrisman, James J., Jess H. Chua, Alfredo De Massis, Federico Frattini, and Mike Wright. 2015. "The ability and willingness paradox in family firm innovation." *Journal of Product Innovation Management* 32(3): 310-318.

De Massis, Alfredo, Federico Frattini, Josip Kotlar, Antonio Messeni Petruzzelli, and Mike Wright. 2016. "Innovation through tradition: Lessons from innovative family businesses and directions for future research." *Academy of Management Perspectives* 30(1): 93-116.

Duran, Patricio, Nadine Kammerlander, Marc Van Essen, and Thomas Zellweger. 2016. "Doing more with less: Innovation input and output in family firms." *Academy of Management Journal* 59(4): 1224-1264.

Garud, Raghu, Philipp Tuertscher, and Andrew H. Van de Ven. 2013. "Perspectives on innovation processes." *Academy of Management Annals* 7(1): 775-819.

Gomez-Mejia, Luis R., Cristina Cruz, Pascual Berrone, and Julio De Castro. 2011. "The bind that ties: Socioemotional wealth preservation in family firms." *Academy of Management Annals* 5(1): 653-707.

Jaskiewicz, Peter, James G. Combs, Kristen K. Shanine, and K. Michele Kacmar. 2017. "Introducing the family: A review of family science with implications for management research." *Academy of Management Annals* 11(1): 309-341.

Kammerlander, Heidi, Jan Nielsen, Jens Kjeldsen, Torben Knudsen, Sonia Friedman, and Bente Nørgård. 2017. "The effect of disease activity on birth outcomes in a nationwide cohort of women with moderate to severe inflammatory bowel disease." Inflammatory Bowel Diseases 23(6): 1011-1018.

Miller, Danny, Isabelle Le Breton-Miller, Richard H. Lester, and Albert A. Cannella Jr. 2007. "Are family firms really superior performers?" *Journal of Corporate Finance* 13(5): 829-858.

Nordqvist, Mattias, Pramodita Sharma, and Francesco Chirico. 2014. "Family firm heterogeneity and governance: A configuration approach." *Journal of Small Business Management* 52(2): 192-209.