POLISH JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES
Biel M.

2024
Vol.29 No.2

FAMILY OWNERSHIP AS A FACTOR INFLUENCING THE CHOICE OF GOALS OF FAMILY BUSINESSES

Biel M.*

Abstract: Family businesses are enterprises characterized by a specific, broad set of goals of family and business nature, which can be in conflict with each other. The purpose of this article is to examine the impact of selected ownership-related factors on the process of setting the goals of family businesses, and more specifically, on the choice between alternative family and business goals. The data necessary for the analysis was collected through surveys of 300 family businesses managers. The hypotheses were verified using the non-parametric chi-square test. The analyses carried out showed that, of the determinants studied, the family's share in the ownership of the business (whether family members are the only owners or whether there is a non-family partner in the company) is the greatest importance, while the number of family owners (one vs. at least two) does not significantly affect the choice between goals. This article makes an important contribution to research on family business, as it shows the role of family ownership factors in the process of choosing between alternative family and business goals. Such an approach is not very popular in the literature on the subject, but it is a valuable addition to existing approaches.

Key words: family business, family business goals, family ownership, goal selection

DOI: 10.17512/pjms.2024.29.2.06

Article history:
Received March 09, 2024; *Revised* April 28, 2024*; Accepted* May 04, 2024

Introduction

Entrepreneurship, which can be conceptualized as a business practice that involves the ability to organize and run a company (Tuksatit and Rajiani, 2020), is a key element in the development of any economy (Kobylińska and Ryciuk, 2022; Ślusarczyk et al., 2023; Głodowska and Wach, 2022), and family businesses are a special type of entrepreneurship. These companies are permanently embedded in the landscape of economies around the world, and their key role is unquestionable (Spanos et al., 2008; Krošláková et al., 2021; Sedliačiková et al., 2022). Family involvement in ownership and management is of great importance to these enterprises and affects many areas of their operation. Family ownership gives an enterprise its specificity and makes it different in many aspects from its non-family counterparts. These differences have already been fairly well studies in the literature from various angles (Kotey, 2005; Chen et. al., 2010; Cruz et al., 2014; Soler et al., 2017; Forcadell et al., 2018; Pimentel, 2018; Hernández-Linares and López-Fernández, 2020; Fang et al., 2021; Fabel et al., 2022;), and for many economies

* **Magdalena Biel**, Ph.D., Czestochowa University of Technology, Faculty of Management, Poland;
✉ email: magdalena.biel@pcz.pl,
ORCID: 0000-0003-1199-8892

(Westhead and Cowling, 1997; McPherson, 2010; Esparza Aguilar, 2019; Hradský, 2020; Samsami and Schøtt, 2021; Borralho and Duarte, 2022; Domańska and Zajkowski, 2022), but there are still many topics that need deeper analysis. Family businesses, as specific business entities that combine the subsystems of business and family subsystems, have a broad set of goals. In addition to business goals, which are largely identical to those of non-family firms, there is a whole range of family goals, closely related to the aspirations of the owner family (Aparicio et al., 2017). In many cases, the two sets of goals - business and family - conflict, forcing managers of family businesses to choose between them (De Massis et al., 2018). This is reflected in the approach of many researchers, who present them on the basis of opposites (Vazquez and Rocha, 2018). It becomes legitimate to ask what factors influence the fact that in a situation of conflict of interest, some companies will prefer business goals and others will prefer family goals. This is important because goals determine the willingness of family businesses to act (Williams Jr et al., 2018).

The topic of family firms' goals is increasingly well researched in the literature, although a number of gaps can still be seen (Vazquez and Rocha, 2018). Williams et al. (2019b) outlined seven major themes related to the goals of family businesses, which are: goal formation/selection steps; antecedents to goal setting; parties involved in, or influencing, goal selection; goal formation algorithms; proposed goal formation research questions; conflict among potential goals; conflict or alignment among stakeholders related to forming goals. The importance of goals in relation to selected aspects of family business management was examined by Biel and Ślusarczyk (2023). Chua et al. (2018) showed that performance evaluation depends on the specifics of the goal system adopted in the company, and Williams Jr et al. (2019a) presented a scale to measure performance based on the specific goals of family businesses. Westhead (2003) and Veider and Kallmuenzer (2016) studied the differences in generational approaches to goals, and Della Piana et al. (2019) identified the goals that owners/managers of family businesses consider crucial to their development. Diaz-Moriana et al. (2024) focused on examining issues related to managers' attempts to balance economic and non-economic goals, and Lee and Marshall (2013) tried to profile the characteristics of the family businesses and to examine the influence of goal orientation on family business performance Basco (2012) examined the relationship between family goals and the presence of family members on the board of directors. Graves et al. (2022) demonstrated the influence of non-financial family goals on internationalization, while Pieper et al. (2020) and Williams et al. (2020) examined the importance of religious goals and their relationships to other goals. Much attention has also been paid by researchers to socioemotional wealth (SEW), which is a specific set of goals of family businesses (Junsheng Dou et al., 2020; Belda-Ruiz et al., 2022; Razzak and Jassem, 2019).

Also, issues related to various aspects of family ownership have received numerous studies. However, researchers have primarily focused on issues such as the impact of family involvement (along with various moderators) on performance (Poutziouris et al., 2015; Hernández-Trasobares and Galve-Górriz, 2017; Lwango et al., 2017;

Wang and Shailer, 2017; Kinias, 2022; Kurniawan and Ardyan, 2022), the role of family ownership and family management in crisis survival (Laffranchini et al., 2022; Block and Ulrich, 2023; Kinias, 2022), the impact of family ownership on multinationality (Mondal et al., 2022), business expansion (Zhang et al., 2012), approaches to risk (Lee et al., 2018) and risk management (González et al., 2020) and dividend policy (Miller et al., 2022; Benjamin et al., 2016) or the impact of generations on company operations and management practices (Lussier and Sonfield, 2010; Ślusarczyk and Baryń, 2018), innovation (Hillebrand, 2019), entrepreneurial orientation (Cruz and Nordqvist, 2012) and internationalization (Blanzo-Mazagatos et al., 2024; Urkiola and Anasagasti, 2022).
However, there are still few broader attempts to link the ownership structure to the goals of family businesses, especially in the context of the choice between alternative goals of business and family nature. Therefore, the purpose of this article is to examine the impact of selected ownership-related factors on the process of setting the goals of family businesses, and more specifically, on the choice between alternative family and business goals. As mentioned earlier, some family and business goals are in obvious conflict with each other, and the managers of these companies must decide which goal is more important.

Literature Review

Family businesses are a very heterogeneous group of enterprises. Their great diversity influences the fact that there is still no single, universally valid definition. However, due to the growing interest in these companies, some researchers are calling for a single definition, which will greatly facilitate research and comparison of results (Ratten, 2023). The lack of a single definition also results in a variety of criteria for distinguishing and classifying family businesses. Categorization can be subjective, declarative or descriptive, and many approaches also take into account specific quantitative measures (Węcławski and Żukowska, 2019). Among the defining criteria, the most common are (Więcek-Janka, 2013; Lušňáková et al., 2019):

- structural criterion – related to the family's ownership of a specific part of the property (usually over 50%);
- functional criterion – involvement of family members in management;
- combination of structural and functional criteria;
- intergenerational transfer criterion;
- subjective criterion – self-recognition as a family business.

Despite the lack of a uniform definition, there is widespread agreement that family businesses owe their specificity to the intermingling od distinct subsystems, among which are family and business (Davis and Tagiuri, 1989) or, more broadly, family, business and ownership (Gersick et al., 1997). Strong ties between the business and the family are one of the distinguishing features of family businesses, and the family is often at the center influencing the business formally or informally (Moresová et al., 2021). These subsystems operate according to different rules, are characterized by different values, norms, ways of functioning and goals (Biel and Ślusarczyk, 2022), which in certain situations can lead and problems with the hierarchy of aspirations (Węcławski and Żukowska, 2019).

By combining the family and the business with their sets of goals into a single entity, family firms are characterized by a far greater variety of goals than non-family firms, moreover, they have a far broader set of these goals. In family businesses, in addition to typical financial goals, there is a whole range of non-financial goals that arise from family involvement and influence the behavior of firms (Chrisman et al., 2012; Vajdovich et al., 2021; Civelek et al., 2021; Basco, 2012). Putting the issue of the goals of family businesses a little more precisely, the literature distinguishes four main groups of goals: family economic goals, family non-economic goals, business (non-family) economic goals and business (non-family) non-economic goals (Basco, 2017). Economic goals are generally considered to be the same for family and non-family businesses, so it is the non-economic goals that specifically distinguish family-owned businesses (Raghavan, 2024).

It is believed that in family businesses, where it is usually the owner family that forms the dominant coalition deciding on the most important issues related to the functioning of the business, it is the non-economic family goals that are of particular importance (Chua et al., 2018). Admittedly, not all non-economic goals are family-focused, but the vast majority fall under family goals, such as intergenerational succession, maintaining family harmony, appropriate family social status, identity and reputation, and perpetuating family values (Diaz-Moriana et al., 2024; Mishchuk et al., 2021). Understanding the comprehensiveness of the goals of family businesses is crucial, as they affect the operation of these businesses and the strategic decisions made within them (De Massis et al. 2016; Williams Jr et al., 2018; Basco, 2017).

There are many ways in which the various goals are in relationship with each other - they can be in conflict, independent or synergistic (Diaz-Moriana et al., 2024). The operation of two distinct sets of goals (family and business) generates the risk of significant conflicts between them in terms of time, funds and resources allocated to achieving these goals (Junsheng Dou et al., 2020; De Massis et al., 2018; Williams et al., 2018). Therefore, managers of family businesses face the need to meet the demands of both subsystems, which often requires a choice between goals and affects the way family businesses operate and are effective (Chrisman et al., 2014).

The goals of family businesses are an important source of their diversity, making individual family businesses different from one another. The goals of family businesses, like all other organizations, are the result of a compromise between different stakeholder groups (Chwiłkowska-Kubala et al., 2023). In family businesses they express the aspirations of the most important stakeholder group, which is the family (Williams Jr et al., 2018). Therefore, each company is characterized by its own set of goals (Zellweger et al., 2013), in which higher priority can be given to different aspirations. At the same time, researchers point out that there is no one-size-fits-all set of goals (Węcławski and Żukowska, 2019). Family businesses can adopt a more business-oriented or a more family-oriented orientation, which has a significant impact on many aspects of these businesses (Putri and Viverita, 2019). The broad set of goals of family businesses and the possible different orientations also mean that measuring the performance of family businesses cannot be one-dimensional and cover only financial issues. It must be approached holistically, taking into account a variety of goals (Williams Jr et al., 2019a).

Family businesses, however, are strongly differentiated not only in terms of the set of goals pursued and the optics adopted (family or business), but also in terms of ownership issues, such as the size of the family's share of ownership, the number of family members involved in the business (as owners or managers) and the generation in charge of the business. Numerous studies have shown that these issues are important to the operation of family businesses and also determine their behavior. It is emphasized, for example, that the resources, structure and management of family businesses can change depending on the generation involved in the business (Belda-Ruiz et al., 2022). Lussier and Sonfield (2010), comparing three generations of family businesses, showed that when the business passes into the hands of successive generations, some management practices change, but some remain the same. Kurniawan and Ardyan (2022), on the other hand, point to the differences in firm performance based on the generation of the leaders of the firms, company size and company age. On the topic of the impact of the size of the family ownership on the performance of family businesses, Cho et al. (2018), based on Korean listed companies, showed that too high a level of family ownership can threaten to break the company, and González et al. (2020) in their study showed that the relationship between the concentration of enterprise ownership in the hands of the family and the implementation level of enterprise risk management is non-linear. Lee et al. (2018), on the other hand, proved that families with a lower level of business ownership are less inclined to take risks, while the inclination is higher when the family has a greater share of business ownership. A study by López-Delgado and Diéguez-Soto (2015) showed that family businesses owned by a single person perform better than firms with a greater number of family members as co-owners. De Massis et al. (2013) pointed to the existence of a U-shaped relationship between the degree of family ownership dispersion and firm performance, and Miller et al. (2022) showed that equity dispersion is positively associated with dividends.

The above considerations regarding the goals of family businesses and the importance of ownership issues allowed the formulation of three research hypotheses:

H1: There are statistically significant differences in goal attitudes between wholly family-owned companies and those with a non-family partner.

H2: There are significant differences in the approach to goals between family businesses in the hands of founders and family firms in the hands of successors.

H3: In family business owned solely by one family member, there is more emphasis on family goals than in family firms with more family owners.

Research Methodology

The data necessary for the analysis was collected through surveys of 300 family businesses managers. The data collection was handled by a specializes company. To distinguish family businesses, the criterion of self-awareness was chosen, directing the survey to businesses that perceive themselves as family-owned. The survey was conducted in 2024 using the CAWI method supported by CATI. The design of the questions in the survey questionnaire was taken largely from Biel and Ślusarczyk (2023). Statistical analyses to the verify the hypotheses were carried out in the PS IMAGO Pro, version 9.0. Frequency distribution was tested in the program, and due to the nominal nature of the measurement scales of the input data, the hypotheses were verified using the non-parametric chi-square test. Statistically significant differences are marked in the tables as follows: † $p < 0.10$; * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$. Table 1 explains the designations of various alternative goals that were analyzed.

Table 1. Alternative family and business goals by couple

Pair number	Alternative goals	
	Family goals (A)	Business goals (B)
1	Keeping the business in the hands of the family	Increasing the scale of operations
2	Providing jobs to family members	Possessing competent and qualified staff
3	Increasing the level of family income	Investing in the business's development
4	Avoiding conflicts in the family	Avoiding conflicts in the business
5	Financial security of the family	Financial security of the business
6	Maintaining decision-making powers related to daily operations	Using the knowledge of professional managers employed in managerial positions
7	Maintaining family norms and values in the business	Adapting the business to the worldview requirements of the environment
8	Avoiding risk	Earn higher profits due to new ventures
9	Have a long-term perspective of operation	Have a quick return on invested capital

Research Results and Discussion

The first issue analyzed was the relationship between the family's share of business ownership (whole vs. part) and the choice between alternative family goals (A) and business goals (B). The results on this issue are shown in Table 2.

The results show that in companies where all ownership is in the hands of the family, the family goal was more important in five pairs, while in the remaining four cases, the business goal received more indications. In contrast, in the group of companies with a non-family partner, a much greater focus on business goals can be observed - the family goal was more important only in the ninth pair.

In pairs one, five, six and eight, when the family is the sole owner of the business, family goals are more often chosen, while in businesses with non-family shareholders, business goals are more important. The observed differences are statistically significant ($p<0.001$ for the first, fifth and sixth pairs, and $p=0.015$ for the eighth pair). Pair No. 2, 3, 4 and 7, in both study groups generally received more indications of business goals, but there are statistically significant differences between the groups, saying that when all ownership of a business is in the family, family goals are significantly more often chosen (than in businesses with non-family partner) ($p=0.003$ for the third pair, $p<0.001$ for the fourth pair and $p=0.008$ for the seventh pair). Only in the case of pair two we can speak not of a statistically significant difference, but of a trend ($p=0.089$). On the other hand, in the ninth pair in both groups, the family goal turned out to be more important, and also in this case we can talk about a statistically significant difference ($p=0.004$) - this goal is significantly more often chosen in companies with sole family ownership.

The results clearly indicate that having a non-family partner significantly changes the approach to goals in a family business. If the family owns all the ownership, family goals are more often more important, while if there are non-family partners in the company, business goals turn out to be more important. It can be said, in a way, they "level out" an overly familial attitude. Given that statistically significant differences were noted in eight pairs (additionally, in one pair there is a statistical trend), the first hypothesis can be unequivocally positively verified and it can be concluded that in companies with wholly family ownership there is significantly more emphasis on family goals than in companies with a non-family shareholder.

Table 2. chi-square test results for the relationship between the amount of family ownership in a business and the choice between alternative goals (Q1: Is all ownership owned by one family?)

Q1		1st pair		2nd pair		3rd pair	
		A	**B**	**A**	**B**	**A**	**B**
Yes	**N**	88	79	66	101	80	87
	% column	67.7%	46.5%	62.3%	52.1%	66.1%	48.6%
	% row	52.7%	47.3%	39.5%	60.5%	47.9%	52.1%
No	**N**	42	91	40	93	41	92
	% column	32.3%	53.5%	37.7%	47.9%	33.9%	51.4%
	% row	31.6%	68.4%	30.1%	69.9%	30.8%	69.2%
$\chi2$ test		$p < 0.001$***		$p = 0.089$†		$p = 0.003$**	
Q1		**4th pair**		**5th pair**		**6th pair**	
		A	**B**	**A**	**B**	**A**	**B**
Yes	**N**	76	91	90	77	105	62
	% column	68.5%	48.1%	73.2%	43.5%	71.9%	40.3%
	% row	45.5%	54.5%	53.9%	46.1%	62.9%	37.1%
No	**N**	35	98	33	100	41	92

	% column	31.5%	51.9%	26.8%	56.5%	28.1%	59.7%
	% row	26.3%	73.7%	24.8%	75.2%	30.8%	69.2%
χ2 test		p < 0.001***		p < 0.001***		p < 0.001***	
Q1		**7th pair**		**8th pair**		**9th pair**	
		A	**B**	**A**	**B**	**A**	**B**
Yes	**N**	78	89	85	82	113	54
	% column	65.0%	49.4%	63.4%	49.4%	62.4%	45.4%
	% row	46.7%	53.3%	50.9%	49.1%	67.7%	32.3%
No	**N**	42	91	49	84	68	65
	% column	35.0%	50.6%	36.6%	50.6%	37.6%	54.6%
	% row	31.6%	68.4%	36.8%	63.2%	51.1%	48.9%
χ2 test		p = 0.008**		p = 0.015*		p = 0.004**	

Another factor that may influence the choice between family and business goals is the generation of owners. Hypothesis two assumes that there are differences in the approach to goals between the founders (first generation) and subsequent generations of business owners. Table 3 shows the results of the chi-square test for the relationships studied.

Table 3. chi-square test results for the relationship between ownership generation and the choice between alternative goals
(Q2: To which generation does ownership belong?)

Q2		**1st pair**		**2nd pair**		**3rd pair**	
		A	**B**	**A**	**B**	**A**	**B**
Only first	**N**	85	97	67	115	76	106
	% column	65.4%	57.1%	63.2%	59.3%	62.8%	59.2%
	% row	46.7%	53.3%	36.8%	63.2%	41.8%	58.2%
Next	**N**	45	73	39	79	45	73
	% column	34.6%	42.9%	36.8%	40.7%	37.2%	40.8%
	% row	38.1%	61.9%	33.1%	66.9%	38.1%	61.9%
χ2 test		p = 0.144		p = 0.505		p = 0.532	
Q2		**4th pair**		**5th pair**		**6th pair**	
		A	**B**	**A**	**B**	**A**	**B**
Only first	**N**	72	110	87	95	102	80
	% column	64.9%	58.2%	70.7%	53.7%	69.9%	51.9%
	% row	39.6%	60.4%	47.8%	52.2%	56.0%	44.0%
Next	**N**	39	79	36	82	44	74
	% column	35.1%	41.8%	29.3%	46.3%	30.1%	48.1%
	% row	33.1%	66.9%	30.5%	69.5%	37.3%	62.7%
χ2 test		p = 0.254		p = 0.003**		p = 0.001**	
Q2		**7th pair**		**8th pair**		**9th pair**	
		A	**B**	**A**	**B**	**A**	**B**
Only first	**N**	76	106	91	91	116	66
	% column	63.3%	58.9%	67.9%	54.8%	64.1%	55.5%

	% row	41.8%	58.2%	50.0%	50.0%	63.7%	36.3%
Next	**N**	44	74	43	75	65	53
	% column	36.7%	41.1%	32.1%	45.2%	35.9%	44.5%
	% row	37.3%	62.7%	36.4%	63.6%	55.1%	44.9%
χ2 test		p = 0.440		p = 0.021*		p = 0.135	

The results show that in companies with only first-generation owners business goals were more important in six pairs, in one pair the number of indications of both goals was equal, and in two pairs family goals were more important. In contrast, in companies with owners of successive generations, business goals were eight times more important, and only in one pair did the family goal receive more indications. In pairs Nos.1-5 and 7, regardless of which generation owns the business, the business goal was mostly considered more important. The situation is similar for pair No. 9, with family goal being more important this time. Only with regard to pair No. 6, can a difference be observed depending on the generation - in companies exclusively in the hands of the founders, the family goal was more important, while in companies owned by successors, the business goal was more important.
The analyses conduced indicate that statistically significant differences exist only for the fifth (p=0.003), sixth (p=0.001) and eighth (p=0.021) pairs. In these pairs, business goals orientation is significantly higher in companies in the hands of successive generations. In the remaining pairs, there are no statistically significant differences between the groups studied. Despite finding some dissimilarities between companies owned by founders and successors, the second hypothesis stating the existence of such differences cannot be unequivocally confirmed. Instead, it can be said that there are specific pairs of alternative family and business goals to which the studied generations have significantly different approaches.
Another factor that may influence the choice between family and business goals is the number of family members who own the business. The third hypothesis is that companies owned solely by one family member place more emphasis on family goals than companies with more family owners. Table 4 shows the results of the chi-square test for the relationships tested.

Table 4. chi-square test results for the relationship between the number of family owners of a business and the choice between alternative goals (Q3: How many family owners own shares?)

Q3		**1st pair**		**2nd pair**		**3rd pair**	
		A	**B**	**A**	**B**	**A**	**B**
One	**N**	57	90	47	100	56	91
	% column	43.8%	52.9%	44.3%	51.5%	46.3%	50.8%
	% row	38.8%	61.2%	32.0%	68.0%	38.1%	61.9%
More than one	**N**	73	80	59	94	65	88
	% column	56.2%	47.1%	55.7%	48.5%	53.7%	49.2%
	% row	47.7%	52.3%	38.6%	61.4%	42.5%	57.5%
χ2 test		p = 0.118		p = 0.233		p = 0.439	

Q3		4th pair		5th pair		6th pair	
		A	B	A	B	A	B
One	N	54	93	66	81	76	71
	% column	48.6%	49.2%	53.7%	45.8%	52.1%	46.1%
	% row	36.7%	63.3%	44.9%	55.1%	51.7%	48.1%
More than one	N	57	96	57	96	70	83
	% column	51.4%	50.8%	46.3%	54.2%	47.9%	53.9%
	% row	37.3%	62.7%	37.3%	62.7%	45.8%	54.2%
χ2 test		p = 0.926		p = 0.178		p = 0.303	
Q3		7th pair		8th pair		9th pair	
		A	B	A	B	A	B
One	N	57	90	63	84	94	53
	% column	47.5%	50.0%	47.0%	50.6%	51.9%	44.5%
	% row	38.8%	61.2%	42.9%	57.1%	63.9%	36.1%
More than one	N	63	90	71	82	87	66
	% column	52.5%	50.0%	53.0%	49.4%	48.1%	55.5%
	% row	41.2%	58.8%	46.4%	53.6%	56.9%	43.1%
χ2 test		p = 0.671		p = 0.537		p = 0.210	

The results indicate that there are no significant differences in attitudes toward family and business goals between family companies with one family owner and those which more family members. Regardless of the number of owners, family goals were more frequently chosen in pairs No. 1-5 and 6, while family goals were more frequently chosen in pair No. 9. The only major difference was seen in pair No. 6, where in businesses with one family owner, the family goal was more often chosen, while the other group was more likely to choose the business goal. There were no statistically significant differences, so it cannot be shown that the number of family owners influences the choice between family and business goals. Therefore, the third hypothesis stating that companies owned solely by one family member place more emphasis on family goals than companies with more family owners cannot be positively verified.

The analyzes conducted showed the existence of statistically significant differences in six of nine pairs, so it can be assumed that the total number of owners (including both family and non-family) has an impact on goal setting in family businesses. Taking into account the results of the previous aspect analyzed (number of owners who are family members), it can be concluded that non-family owners are largely responsible for the differences. This thus confirms the results obtained when analyzing the ownership structure, which indicate that having a partner from outside the family strongly influences the choice between goals (shifts the focus towards business goals).

The results of the research indicate that in the case of goal conflict, business goals are more often chosen, although the focus on business goals is stronger than in the study conducted by Biel and Ślusarczyk (2023), but this is due to a different sampling. The analyzes conducted show that the level of family ownership significantly influences the goals of family businesses, making family goals take on special importance. These results correspond to some extent with the results of other studies indicating that family ownership and its size affect various aspects of business operation, including those indirectly related to goals. Cho et al. (2018) found that above a certain amount of family ownership, the survival of the listed company is threatened, so there should be a balance between family and public ownership. In this way, owners must strive to balance their interests, which prevents family goals from being prioritized over business goals. The results of the study by Zhang et al. (2012), on the other hand, show that family ownership has a negative impact on the total level of company expansion, which can be related to to the goals of "increasing the scale of operations" and "earn higher profits due to new ventures". The research in this article also showed that the ownership generation influences the choice of goals slightly, shifting the focus in subsequent generations towards only selected goals like higher earnings from new ventures. This corresponds quite well with the results of a study by Westhead (2003), who found that family goals above business goals are placed more often by the first generation. It also confirms, in a way, the results obtained by Urkiola and Anasagasti (2022), suggesting that the transition of the company into the hands of succesive generations affects the intensity of exports, and therefore, in a way, the increase in the scale of operations. It can also be related to the research of Lussier and Sonfield (2010), who indicate that as generations change, some management practices change and some do not. Thus, it is an impact similar to that of goals - some of them are affected by the owner generation, and some are not.

Conclusion

Family businesses are enterprises that can shape their goals in different ways, emphasizing different priorities and adopting different approaches. For some, it is more important to meet the needs of the family, resulting in giving greater importance to family goals, while others focus primarily on the needs of the business, adopting a business orientation. Reality often forces family business managers to choose between conflicting family and business goals, which in many cases is not an easy task. The research and analysis results presented in this article indicate that there are ownership-related factors that determine these choices in some way, but not all of them are significant. The greatest influence appears to be the level of ownership of the company remaining in the hands of the family – in wholly family-owned businesses, there is a significantly more family-oriented focus than in businesses with a non-family co-owner. It seems much less important whether the company is in the hands of the first or subsequent generations. Intergenerational differences were shown only for some pairs of alternative goals, with companies in the hands of subsequent generations found to have a greater focus on business goals. In contrast, the analyzes conducted showed no significant effect of the number of family owners on the choice between goals. Regardless of whether the company is

owned by only one family member or a larger number of them, business goals are chosen more often - there are no significant differences in this regard.
This article makes an important contribution to research on family business, as it shows the role of family ownership factors in the process of choosing between alternative family and business goals. Such an approach is not very popular in the literature on the subject, but it is a valuable addition to existing approaches. The analyzes carried out are, of course, not free from limitations, which at the same time may provide room for further research. One of them is a two-dimensional approach. In the future, it would be interesting to see how the choice between family and business goals is affected by different levels of ownership or the number of owners, as well as what differences there are in this regard between different generations. Comparison between family businesses from different countries may also be of interest.

References

Aparicio, G., Basco, R., Iturralde, T. and Maseda, A., (2017). An exploratory study of firm goals in the context of family firms: An institutional logics perspective. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, *8*(3), 157-169.

Basco, R., (2012). *The effect of family-oriented objectives on board composition* (No. 27). Universidad Catolica del Norte, Chile, Department of Economics.

Basco, R., (2017). Where do you want to take your family firm?" A theoretical and empirical exploratory study of family business goals. *BRQ Business Research Quarterly*, *20*(1), 28-44.

Belda-Ruiz, M., Sánchez-Marín, G. and Baixauli-Soler, J. S., (2022). Influence of family-centered goals on dividend policy in family firms: A socioemotional wealth approach. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, *18*(4), 1503-1526.

Benjamin, S. J., Wasiuzzaman, S., Mokhtarinia, H. and Rezaie Nejad, N., (2016). Family ownership and dividend payout in Malaysia. *International Journal of Managerial Finance*, *12*(3), 314-334.

Biel, M., Ślusarczyk, B., (2023). *Family Business and Management: Objectives, Theory, and Practice*. Routledge.

Biel, M., Ślusarczyk, B., (2022). Management methods and tools in family businesses: Impact on the effectiveness of achieving goals. *Journal of International Studies*, *15*(4), 180-195.

Blanzo-Mazagatos, V., Delgado-García, J. B. and Barrero, J. P., (2024). Involvement of multiple generations in management and internationalization of family firms in Spain: the moderating effect of SEW dimensions. *Journal of Family Business Management*, *14*(1), 153-170.

Block, J., Ulrich, L., (2023). Are family owners and managers good stewards in global crises? Evidence from stock market reactions to Covid-19. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, *14*(1), 100534.

Borralho, J., Duarte, M. I., (2022). Determinants of Dividend Payout in Unlisted Spanish Family and Non-Family Firms. *European Journal of Family Business*, *12*(2), 124-136.

Chen, S., Chen, X., Cheng, Q. and Shevlin, T., (2010). Are family firms more tax aggressive than non-family firms?. *Journal of Financial Economics*, *95*(1), 41-61.

Cho, J., Miller, D. and Lee, J., (2018). Too much of a good thing: Family involvement and the survival of listed Korean firms. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, *9*(4), 223-237.

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

Chrisman, J. J., Chua, J. H., Pearson, A. W. and Barnett, T., (2012). Family involvement, family influence, and family–centered non–economic goals in small firms. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *36*(2), 267-293.

Chrisman, J. J., Memili, E. and Misra, K., (2014). Nonfamily managers, family firms, and the winner's curse: The influence of noneconomic goals and bounded rationality. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *38*(5), 1-25.

Chua, J. H., Chrisman, J. J., De Massis, A. and Wang, H., (2018). Reflections on family firm goals and the assessment of performance. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, *9*(2), 107-113.

Civelek, M., Ključnikov, A., Fialova, V., Folvarčná, A. and Stoch, M., (2021). Major obstacles in innovative activities of family-owned SMEs: Evidence from Czechia. *Economics and Sociology*, *14*(2), 137-149

Chwiłkowska-Kubala, A., Malewska, K. and Mierzejewska, K. (2023). The importance of resources in achieving the goals of energy companies. *Engineering Management in Production and Services*, *15*(3), 53-68.

Cruz, C., Nordqvist, M., (2012). Entrepreneurial orientation in family firms: A generational perspective. *Small Business Economics*, *38*, 33-49.

Cruz, C., Larraza–Kintana, M., Garcés–Galdeano, L. and Berrone, P., (2014). Are family firms really more socially responsible?. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *38*, 1295-1316.

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

De Massis, A., Kotlar, J., Campopiano, G. and Cassia, L., (2013). Dispersion of family ownership and the performance of small-to-medium size private family firms. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, *4*(3), 166-175.

De Massis, A., Kotlar, J., Mazzola, P., Minola, T. and Sciascia, S., (2016). Conflicting selves: Family owners' multiple goals and self-control agency problems in private firms. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *42*(3), 362-389.

Della Piana, B., Vecchi, A., Marino, V. and D'arco, M., (2019). How do family firms grow? The strategic goals of innovation and internationalization. *International Journal of Business and Management*, *14*(2).

Diaz-Moriana, V., Clinton, E. and Kammerlander, N., (2024). Untangling goal tensions in family firms: A sensemaking approach. *Journal of Management Studies*, *61*(1), 69-109.

Domańska, A., Zajkowski, R., (2022). Barriers to gaining support: a prospect of entrepreneurial activity of family and non-family firms in Poland. *Equilibrium. Quarterly Journal of Economics and Economic Policy*, *17*(1), 191-224.

Esparza Aguilar, J. L., (2019). Corporate social responsibility practices developed by Mexican family and non-family businesses. *Journal of Family Business Management*, *9*(1), 40-53.

Fabel, O., Mináriková, D. and Hopp, C., (2022). Differences and similarities in executive hiring decisions of family and non-family firms. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, *13*(2), 100481.

Fang, H. C., Memili, E., Chrisman, J. J. and Tang, L., (2021). Narrow-framing and risk preferences in family and non-family firms. *Journal of Management Studies*, *58*(1), 201-235.

Forcadell, F. J., Ubeda, F. and Zúñiga-Vicente, J. Á., (2018). Initial resource heterogeneity differences between family and non-family firms: Implications for resource acquisition and resource generation. *Long Range Planning*, *51*(5), 693-719.

Gersick, K.E., Davis, J.A., Hampton, M. and Lansberg, I., (1997). *Generation to Generation Life Cycles of the Family Business*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Głodowska, A., Wach, K., (2022). Entrepreneurship research in Central and Eastern Europe: A systematic literature review and bibliometric analysis. *Journal of International Studies*, *15*(3), 201-214.

González, L. O., Gil, L. I. R., Santomil, P. D. and Herrera, A. T., (2020). Ownership, board, and enterprise risk management. *European Journal of Family Business*, *10*(1), 44-55.

Graves, C., Shi, H. X. and Barbera, F., (2022). Family-centred non-economic goals and the internationalisation of family firms: Evidence from Australia. *International Business Review*, *31*(4), 101974.

Hernández-Linares, R., López-Fernández, M. C., (2020). Entrepreneurial orientation, learning orientation, market orientation, and organizational performance: Family firms versus non-family firms. *European Journal of Family Business*, *10*(1), 6-19.

Hernández-Trasobares, A., Galve-Górriz, C., (2017). Diversification and family control as determinants of performance: A study of listed business groups. *European Research on Management and Business Economics*, *23*(1), 46-54.

Hillebrand, S., (2019). Innovation in family firms–a generational perspective. *Journal of Family Business Management*, *9*(2), 126-148.

Hradský, O., (2020). Comparison of remuneration in family and non-family firms in the Czech Republic. *Journal of Family Business Management*, *10*(3), 265-276.

Junsheng Dou, N. W., Su, E., Fang, H. and Memili, E., (2020). Goal complexity in family firm diversification: Evidence from China. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, *11*(1), 100-310.

Kinias, I., (2022). The performance of family firms during crisis periods: the case of Greece. *European Journal of Family Business*, *12*(1), 63-79.

Kobylińska, U., Ryciuk, U., (2022). Selected contextual factors and entrepreneurial intentions of students on the example of Poland. *Engineering Management in Production and Services*, *14*(3), 13-27.

Kotey, B. (2005). Are performance differences between family and non-family SMEs uniform across all firm sizes?. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Research*, *11*(6), 394-421.

Krošláková, M. N., Khouri, S., Čvirik, M., Tomášková, A., Drábik, P. and Derkawi, H., (2021). The business environment of family enterprises in Slovakia-perception of external barriers. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, *24*(2), 321-335.

Kurniawan, D., Ardyan, E., (2022). Impacts of Company Size, Company Age, and the Generation of the Leader on Firm Performance. *Binus Business Review*, *13*(3), 273−283.

Laffranchini, G., Hadjimarcou, J. and Kim, S. H., (2022). The first turnaround response of family firms in a crisis situation. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, *13*(1), 100434.

Lee, E. J., Chae, J. and Lee, Y. K., (2018). Family ownership and risk taking. *Finance Research Letters*, *25*, 69-75.

Lee, Y. G., Marshall, M. I., (2013). Goal orientation and performance of family businesses. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, *34*, 265-274.

López-Delgado, P., Diéguez-Soto, J., (2015). Lone founders, types of private family businesses and firm performance. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, *6*(2), 73-85.

Lussier, R. N., Sonfield, M. C., (2010). A six-country study of first-, second-, and third-generation family businesses. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Research*, *16*(5), 414-436.

Lušňáková, Z., Juríčková, Z., Šajbidorová, M. and Lenčéšová, S., (2019). Succession as a sustainability factor of family business in Slovakia. *Equilibrium. Quarterly Journal of Economics and Economic Policy*, *14*(3), 503-520.

Lwango, A., Coeurderoy, R.and Giménez Roche, G. A., (2017). Family influence and SME performance under conditions of firm size and age. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, *24*(3), 629-648.

McPherson, M., (2010). Business practices within South Asian family and non-family firms: A comparative study. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Research*, *16*(5), 389-413.

Miller, D., Amore, M. D., Quarato, F. and Corbetta, G. (2022). Family ownership dispersion and dividend payout in family firms. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, *13*(3), 100436.

Mishchuk, H., Samoliuk, N. and Yurchyk, H., (2021). *Decent work: evaluation and ensuring in human capital management:* monograph: Szczecin: Centre of Sociological Research. p. 140.

Mondal, A., Ray, S. and Lahiri, S., (2022). Family ownership, family management, and multinationality: Evidence from India. *Journal of Business Research*, *138*, 347-359.

Moresová, M., Sedliačiková, M., Drábek, J., Šuleř, P. and Vetráková, M., (2021). The impact of internal determinants on management of family business in Slovakia. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, *24(2)*, 307-320.

Pieper, T. M., Williams Jr, R. I., Manley, S. C. and Matthews, L. M., (2020). What time may tell: An exploratory study of the relationship between religiosity, temporal orientation, and goals in family business. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *163*(4), 759-773.

Pimentel, D., (2018). Non-family employees: levels of job satisfaction and organizational justice in small and medium-sized family and non-family firms. *European Journal of Family Business*, *8*(2), 93-102.

Poutziouris, P., Savva, C. S. and Hadjielias, E., (2015). Family involvement and firm performance: Evidence from UK listed firms. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, *6*(1), 14-32.

Putri, A. C., Viverita, V., (2019). Risk preference of founder and descendant of Indonesian family firms. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, *20(2)*, 414-425.

Raghavan, S., (2024). Goal setting for family firm owners: An agency-stewardship perspective. *Corporate Ownership and Control*, *21*(2), 8–16.

Ratten, V., (2023). Editorial: A new definitionof family business. *Journal of Family Business Management*, *13*(3), 545.

Razzak, M. R., Jassem, S., (2019). Socioemotional wealth and performance in private family firms: The mediation effect of family commitment. *Journal of Family Business Management*, *9*(4), 468-496.

Samsami, M., Schøtt, T., (2021). Family and non-family businesses in Iran: coupling among innovation, internationalization and growth-expectation. *European Journal of Family Business 11*, 40-55.

Sedliačiková, M., Moresová, M., Stasiak-Betlejewska, R., Drábek, J. and Schmidtová, J., (2022). The use of controlling as a tool of competitiveness in family and non-family businesses in transition economies. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, *26*(1), 250-270.

Soler, I. P., Gemar, G. and Guerrero-Murillo, R., (2017). Family and non-family business behaviour in the wine sector: A comparative study. *European Journal of Family Business*, *7*(1-2), 65-73.

Spanos, L., Tsipouri, L. and Xanthakis, M., (2008). Corporate governance rating of family firms at the Athens exchange market. *Managerial Finance*, *34*(7), 465–478.

Ślusarczyk, B., Baryń, M., (2018). Generation Matters? The Approach of the Family Business Representatives of Different Generations to Selected Aspects of Their Functioning (pp. 25-26) [in:] *Innovation Management and Education Excellence Through Vision 2020* (ed.) Soliman KS. Norristown: International Business Information Management Association (IBIMA).

Ślusarczyk, B., Moghavvemi, S. and Tehseen, S., (2023). Women and business: Empirical study on economic constraints, legal conditions, and social support influencing women entrepreneurs in Malaysia and Poland. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*, *11*(2), 87-102.

Tuksatit, N., Rajiani, I., (2020). Entrepreneurial Drivers of Innovation Success–International Business Perspectives. *Global Journal of Entrepreneurship and Management*, *1*(1), 1-15.

Urkiola, E., Anasagasti, M. A., (2022). Internationalization and family firms: The influence of family involvement on exports. *European Journal of Family Business*, *12*(2), 173-183.

Vajdovich, N., Heidrich, B., Németh, S. and Németh, K., (2021). Closer to the heart: An analysis of the goals of Hungarian family-owned wineries. *Forum on Economics and Business/Közgazdász Fórum*, *24*(2), 22-48.

Vazquez, P., Rocha, H., (2018). On the goals of family firms: A review and integration. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, *9*(2), 94-106.

Veider, V., Kallmuenzer, A., (2016). Assessing long-term orientation among founder-and descendant-led firms. *Journal of Family Business Management*, *6*(1), 2-22.

Wang, K. T., Shailer, G., (2017). Family ownership and financial performance relations in emerging markets. *International Review of Economics and Finance*, *51*, 82-98.

Westhead, P., (2003). Company performance and objectives reported by first and multi-generation family companies: a research note. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, *10*(1), 93-105.

Westhead, P., Cowling, M., (1997). Performance contrasts between family and non-family unquoted companies in the UK. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Research*, *3*(1), 30-52.

Węcławski, J., Żukowska, B., (2019). Refreshing typologies based on family firms' goals: the perspective of "first-generation enterprises". *Central European Management Journal*, *27*, 128-146.

Więcek-Janka, E., (2013). *Wiodące wartości w zarządzaniu przedsiębiorstwami rodzinnymi*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Politechniki Poznańskiej.

Williams Jr, R. I., Pieper, T. M., Kellermanns, F. W. and Astrachan, J. H., (2018). Family firm goals and their effects on strategy, family and organization behavior: A review and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *20*, 63-82.

Williams Jr, R. I., Pieper, T., Kellermanns, F. and Astrachan, J., (2019a). Applying an organizational effectiveness approach to measure family business performance. *Journal of Family Business Management*, *9*(3), 349-374.

Williams, R. I., Matthews, L. M. and Manley, S. C., (2020). What Goals do Firms with Religious Owning Families Achieve: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Ethics and Entrepreneurship*, *10*(1), 4-23.

Williams, R. I., Pieper, T. M., Kellermanns, F. W. and Astrachan, J. H., (2019b). Family business goal formation: A literature review and discussion of alternative algorithms. *Management Review Quarterly*, *69*, 329-349.

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

Zhang, X., Venus, J. and Wang, Y., (2012). Family ownership and business expansion of small-and medium-sized Chinese family businesses: The mediating role of financing preference. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, *3*(2), 97-105.

WŁASNOŚĆ RODZINNA JAKO CZYNNIK WPŁYWAJĄCY NA WYBÓR CELÓW FIRM RODZINNYCH

Streszczenie: Firmy rodzinne to przedsiębiorstwa charakteryzujące się specyficznym, szerokim zestawem celów o charakterze rodzinnym i biznesowym, które mogą pozostawać ze sobą w sprzeczności. Celem artykułu jest zbadanie wpływu wybranych czynników związanych z własnością na proces ustalania celów firm rodzinnych, a dokładniej rzecz ujmując – na wybór pomiędzy alternatywnymi celami rodzinnymi i biznesowymi. Dane niezbędne do analizy zebrano w badaniu ankietowym przeprowadzonym wśród 300 menedżerów firm rodzinnych. Hipotezy zweryfikowano za pomocą nieparametrycznego testu chi-kwadrat. Przeprowadzone analizy wykazały, że spośród badanych determinant największe znaczenie ma udział rodziny we własności przedsiębiorstwa (czy członkowie rodziny są jedynymi właścicielami, czy też w firmie jest wspólnik spoza rodziny), natomiast liczba rodzinnych właścicieli (jeden vs co najmniej dwóch) nie wpływa w istotny sposób na wybór pomiędzy celami. Artykuł wnosi istotny wkład w badania nad przedsiębiorstwami rodzinnymi, gdyż ukazuje rolę czynników związanych z własnością rodzinną w procesie wyboru pomiędzy alternatywnymi celami rodzinnymi i biznesowymi. Podejście takie nie jest zbyt popularne w literaturze przedmiotu, stanowi jednak cenne uzupełnienie dotychczasowych ujęć.

Słowa kluczowe: firma rodzinna, cele firm rodzinnych, rodzinna własność, wybór celów