

SUPPLEMENTARY DOCUMENT TO

“A Review of Conflict and Cohesion in Social Relationships in Family Firms”

This supplementary document contains additional information not included in the manuscript due to space constraints. The appendix is composed of three Tables. Table S1 provides a detailed description of the queries adopted in our search. Table S2 delineates the analytical protocol used. Finally, Table S3 provides a detailed overview of the 89 papers included in our review, reporting for each the method employed, sample description, theory/perspective adopted, geographic area, whether it is a FF versus non-FF study or a study on FFs only, and the study focus.

Table S1. Details on the queries used to search the literature (extraction limiters criteria reported in the notes below the table)

Procedures		WOS	EBSCO
1a. Search on ISI Web of Science®	(TS=("family business*" OR "family firm*" OR "family enter*" OR "familin*" OR "family control*" OR "family led*" OR "family owner*" OR "family-based") AND TS=("Social Capital*" OR "tie*" OR "cohesi*" OR "harmon*" OR "attachment*" OR "love" OR "affection" OR "conflict*" OR "disagree*" OR "disharmon*" OR "dislik*" OR "strif*" OR "tension"))	1257	
	TOTAL in Web of Science	N= 1257	
1b. Search on EBSCO Business Source Premiere	KW (("family business*" OR "family firm*" OR "family enter*" OR "familin*" OR "family control*" OR "family led*" OR "family owner*" OR "family-based")) AND KW (("Social Capital*" OR "tie*" OR "cohesi*" OR "harmon*" OR "attachment*" OR "love" OR "affection" OR "conflict*" OR "disagree*" OR "disharmon*" OR "dislik*" OR "strif*" OR "tension"))		86
	AB (("family business*" OR "family firm*" OR "family enter*" OR "familin*" OR "family control*" OR "family led*" OR "family owner*" OR "family-based")) AND AB (("Social Capital*" OR "tie*" OR "cohesi*" OR "harmon*" OR "attachment*" OR "love" OR "affection" OR "conflict*" OR "disagree*" OR "disharmon*" OR "dislik*" OR "strif*" OR "tension"))		479
	TI (("family business*" OR "family firm*" OR "family enter*" OR "familin*" OR "family control*" OR "family led*" OR "family owner*" OR "family-based")) AND TI (("Social Capital*" OR "tie*" OR "cohesi*" OR "harmon*" OR "attachment*" OR "love" OR "affection" OR "conflict*" OR "disagree*" OR "disharmon*" OR "dislik*" OR "strif*" OR "tension"))		75
	TOTAL in EBSCO Business Source Premiere without duplicates		N= 514
1c. Search on EBSCO EconLit	KW (("family business*" OR "family firm*" OR "family enter*" OR "familin*" OR "family control*" OR "family led*" OR "family owner*" OR "family-based")) AND KW (("Social Capital*" OR "tie*" OR "cohesi*" OR "harmon*" OR "attachment*" OR "love" OR "affection" OR "conflict*" OR "disagree*" OR "disharmon*" OR "dislik*" OR "strif*" OR "tension"))		0
	AB (("family business*" OR "family firm*" OR "family enter*" OR "familin*" OR "family control*" OR "family led*" OR "family owner*" OR "family-based")) AND AB (("Social Capital*" OR "tie*" OR "cohesi*" OR "harmon*" OR "attachment*" OR "love" OR "affection" OR "conflict*" OR "disagree*" OR "disharmon*" OR "dislik*" OR "strif*" OR "tension"))		145
	TI (("family business*" OR "family firm*" OR "family enter*" OR "familin*" OR "family control*" OR "family led*" OR "family owner*" OR "family-based")) AND TI (("Social Capital*" OR "tie*" OR "cohesi*" OR "harmon*" OR "attachment*" OR "love" OR "affection" OR "conflict*" OR "disagree*" OR "disharmon*" OR "dislik*" OR "strif*" OR "tension"))		17
	TOTAL in EBSCO EconLit without duplicates		N= 147
	TOTAL STEP 1	N= 1257	N= 661

2. Exclusion of non-ABS Journals	Confine the search to articles published in academic journals listed in the Chartered Association of Business Schools' Academic Journal Guide (2018) - ABS Academic Journal Guide	-632	-150
	TOTAL STEP 2	N= 625	N= 511
		WOS and EBSCO	
3. Databases Union	Database merging	N= 1136	
	Exclusion of duplicates	-415	
	TOTAL STEP 3	N= 721	
4. Sample identification	Divide remaining articles into three categories (A – papers relevant to the research objective, B – papers whose relevance was unclear, C – non-relevant papers).	A: N= 70 B: N= 107 C: N= 544	
5.	Read and discuss the B papers for inclusion of only relevant articles in line with the literature review scope		
	TOTAL STEP 5	N= 86	
6.	Look at the studies in the sample papers' reference list (backward citation) and check their relevance through independent readings of manuscripts by each of the co-authors*	3	
	FINAL SAMPLE	N= 89	
Notes: TS= Searches title, abstract, author keywords, and Keywords Plus; KW= keyword; AB= abstract; TI= title			
Extraction limiter criteria:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Published up to 31 December 2019, with no initial time limit set• Scholarly (peer reviewed) journals• Language: English• Document types: article or review			
*The three articles added in Step 6 are: Davis & Harveston (1999); Levinson (1971); Salvato & Melin (2008).			

Table S2. Analytic protocol used to review each study

<p>A. Article database preparation</p> <p>1. Create an Excel file including all the articles in our sample and the following columns:</p> <p><i>a) For the systematic analysis</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Creation of one column for each of the following aspects:• Article ID• Authors• Type of study (i.e., empirical, conceptual, literature review)• Nature of study (i.e., qualitative, quantitative, mix)• Sample description• Key findings (i.e., drivers, outcomes, moderators, mediators)• Comparative study (i.e., focus on FFs only or comparison between FFs and non-FFs)• Main theory(ies)/perspectives• Level of analysis (i.e., family, FF, TMT/Boards)• Research questions• Hypotheses/propositions• Measures of cohesion and conflict• After reading and describing all the definitions, the researcher passed the analysis to two colleagues who referred back to the original articles, checked and corrected inconsistencies. <p><i>b) For the thematic ontological analysis</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Conflict definition (T1)• Type of conflict (T2)• Cohesion definition (T1)• Type of cohesion (T2)• Overall focus (conflict, cohesion, both, peripheral) (T3).
<p>Details of the process that led to the creation of the ontological map</p>
<p>B. Identification of conceptualizations of conflict and cohesion</p> <p>1. A researcher read each article considering the main definitions of conflict and/or cohesion.</p> <p>2. A researcher identified a descriptive statement outlining the primary definitions (when available) for each article.</p> <p>3. After reading and describing all the definitions, the researcher passed the analysis to two colleagues who ensured that the descriptive statements in point 2 were complete and correct.</p> <p>4. Two researchers met to compare the descriptive statements and identify initial thematic names discussing eventual discrepancies in perceptions/opinions. The researchers met at every 25 articles.</p> <p>5. A first list of thematic names (T1, T2, and T3) was created for each article.</p> <p>6. Three researchers carefully re-reviewed all the articles and the classifications provided individually, checking for consistency and clarity in the classification, and annotating eventual discrepancies and thematic labels.</p> <p>7. The discrepancies and annotations were checked and discussed when needed, leading to a refined list of thematic names.</p>
<p>C. Definition of the ontological themes</p> <p>Three levels of thematic descriptions of the conceptualizations.</p> <p>T1 is the definition of conflict and/or cohesion provided in the article.</p> <p>T2 is a second order theme that includes the cluster of articles with similar conceptualizations.</p> <p>T3 is the macro-theme “conflict” or “cohesion” simply summarizing whether the article is about conflict and/or cohesion.</p>
<p>D. Ontological map creation and validation</p> <p>1. A map that represents the various conceptualizations of conflict and cohesion (Figure 2a and Figure 2b) including the second order (T2) themes.</p> <p>2. A further check by all the authors individually returning to the articles and ensuring that the ontological map themes are consistent and fit.</p>
<p>E. Process quality control</p> <p>1. Each article received the same attention, was coded by one author but independently checked by a second researcher.</p> <p>2. The analysis entailed the definition of three orders of themes with the aim of depth and completeness.</p> <p>3. All themes were controlled comparing them against each other (for differentiation) and back to the original classifications and definitions (for coherence).</p> <p>4. The authors of this analysis actively participated, sharing their reflections, doubts, perspectives, and discussing iteratively until reaching consensus on the classification.</p>

Table S3. Papers included in the literature review.

Article	Method	Sample Description	Theory/Perspective	Geographic Area	FF vs. non-FF	Focus
Anderson & Reeb (2004) https://doi.org/10.2307/4131472	Quantitative	403 firms from Standard & Poor's 500 belonging to different industries	Agency/stewardship theories	North America	Family versus non-family firms	Conflict
Aragón-Amonarriz et al. (2019) https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3728-7	Qualitative	3 Mexican family SMEs belonging to different sectors	n.e. (reference to stewardship theory, socioemotional wealth and literatures on family social capital-family business responsible ownership-corporate governance)	North America	Conceptual comparison	Conflict
Athanassiou et al. (2002) https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-9516(02)00073-1	Quantitative	42 Mexican family firms belonging to different industries: 201 individuals answered. 2 questionnaires were used, one for the founder and one for each of the other TMT managers.	Social network theory	North America	Only family firms	Cohesion
Avloniti et al. (2014) https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-013-0271-6	Conceptual	n.a.	n.e. (integration of different literatures: family business, sociology, psychology)	n.a.	Only family firms	Conflict
Beehr et al. (1997) <a href="https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199705)18:3<297::AID-JOB805>3.0.CO;2-D">https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199705)18:3<297::AID-JOB805>3.0.CO;2-D	Quantitative	17 family firms and 17 non-family businesses From U.S. belonging to the manufacturing industry	Role theory (theory on role conflict in the workplace)	North America	Family versus non-family firms	Conflict & Cohesion
Bettinelli (2011) https://doi.org/10.1177/0894486511402196	Quantitative	90 responses from directors of Italian family firms	Process-based view of boards with agency theory; stewardship theory, resource dependence theory integrated	Europe	Conceptual comparison	Cohesion
Björnberg & Nicholson (2007) https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-6248.2007.00098.x	Quantitative	291 participants from various U.K. Institutions of higher education, including staff, faculty, and students	Family systems (rooted in family psychology)	Europe	Family versus non-family firms	Cohesion
Björnberg & Nicholson (2012) https://doi.org/10.1177/0894486511432471	Qualitative + Quantitative	8 U.K. family firms for the qualitative research + 960 participants for the quantitative research	Attachment/ social identity theory (from social psychology)	Europe	Only family firms	Cohesion
Bobillo et al. (2013) https://doi.org/10.3846/16111699.2012.707621	Quantitative	338 Spanish family firms	n.e. (Use of different literatures: traditional internationalization theory along with family business literature -to propose a new perspective that accounts for family firm characteristics)	Europe	Conceptual comparison	Conflict
Brenes et al. (2006) https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2005.09.011	Qualitative	3 family firms from Latin America belonging to different industries	n.e. (Use of family business literature)	Latin America	Only family firms	Conflict
Cabrera-Suárez et al. (2014) https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfbs.2014.05.003	Quantitative	173 family firms from Spain	Socioemotional wealth perspective	Europe	Conceptual comparison	Cohesion

Carr et al. (2011) https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2011.00499.x	Quantitative	341 family business founders or cofounders from the U.S.	Social capital theory (sociology)	North America	Only family firms	Cohesion
Cater et al. (2016) https://doi.org/10.1177/0894486516656255	Qualitative	19 family firms from U.S. belonging to different industries	Conflict theory + different literatures: family and team dynamics in succession	North America	Only family firms	Conflict
Chirico & Salvato (2016) https://doi.org/10.1111/etap.12114	Quantitative	199 Swiss family firms belonging to different industries	Knowledge-based theoretical approach	Europe	Conceptual comparison	Conflict
Chirico et al. (2011) https://doi.org/10.1002/sjfb.121	Quantitative	199 Swiss family firms belonging to different industries	Resource-based view (resource orchestration)	Europe	Conceptual comparison	Conflict
Chrisman et al. (2012) https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2010.00407.x	Quantitative	1060 family firms from the U.S. belonging to different industries	Behavioral/ stakeholder theories (organizational studies)	North America	Conceptual comparison	Cohesion
Claßen & Schulte (2017) https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-04-2016-0071	Qualitative	21 family members of German family firms belonging to different industries	Systems theory	Europe	Conceptual comparison	Conflict
Collin & Ahlberg (2012) https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfbs.2012.11.001	Quantitative	68 small and medium-sized Swedish family firms	Evolutionary psychology (theory of inclusive fitness)	Europe	Only family firms	Conflict
Davis & Harveston (1999) https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-6248.1999.00311.x	Quantitative	1002 family firms from the U.S. belonging to different industries	n.e. (use of family business succession literature)	North America	Only family firms	Conflict
Davis & Harveston (2001) https://doi.org/10.1111/0447-2778.00003	Quantitative	1002 family firms from the U.S. belonging to different industries	Conflict theory	North America	Only family firms	Conflict
De Clercq & Belausteguigoitia (2015) https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfbs.2015.04.003	Conceptual	n.a.	n.e. (use of conflict management and social capital literature)	n.a.	Only family firms	Conflict & Cohesion
de Vries (1993) https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(93)90071-8	Conceptual	n.a.	n.e. (use of psychology literature)	n.a.	Only family firms	Conflict
Discua Cruz et al. (2013) https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2012.00534.x	Qualitative	7 case studies of FETs from Honduras belonging to different sectors	Stewardship/social capital theories	Central America	Conceptual comparison	Conflict
Duréndez et al. (2019) https://doi.org/10.1111/auar.12217	Quantitative	281 Spanish family firms belonging to different industries	Agency theory	Europe	Conceptual comparison	Conflict
Eddleston & Kellermanns (2007) https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2006.06.004	Quantitative	107 questionnaires returned from 60 U.S. family firms	Stewardship theory	North America	Only family firms	Conflict
Eddleston & Morgan (2014) https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfbs.2014.08.003	Conceptual (Editorial)	n.a.	n.e.	n.a.	Family versus non-family firms	Cohesion
Eddleston et al. (2008) https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-627X.2008.00252.x	Quantitative	37 privately held family firms from the U.S.	Multilevel theory and research design	North America	Only family firms	Conflict
Ensley (2006) https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2006.00148.x	Quantitative	351 managers from 168 family firms listed in the Inc. 500 belonging to different industries	n.e. (reference to literature on intragroup conflict)	North America	Only family firms	Conflict
Ensley & Pearson (2005) https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2005.00082.x	Quantitative	196 managers from 88 firms listed in the 1994 Inc. 500; 192 managers from 70 firms listed in the 1996 Inc. 500; 168	Upper echelon/ theories on behavioral dynamics of teams	North America	Family versus non-family firms	Conflict & Cohesion

		managers from 66 firms listed in the 199 Inc. 500				
Ensley et al. (2007) https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2006.12.012	Quantitative	88 non-family and 112 privately held family firms listed in the Inc. 500	Upper echelons/ tournament theories	North America	Family versus non-family firms	Conflict & Cohesion
Fernández-Roca et al. (2014) https://doi.org/10.1017/S1467222700016116	Qualitative	Single case of a Spanish family firm	n.e. (use of business history and family business literature)	Europe	Only family firms	Conflict & Cohesion
Filser et al. (2018) https://doi.org/10.1111/j.pim.12433	Quantitative	166 family SMEs in the first wave; 103 family SMEs in the second wave from Finland	Socioemotional wealth perspective/ family functionality view (from sociology)	Europe	Only family firms	Cohesion
Filser, et al. (2013) https://doi.org/10.1108/01409171311306409	Literature Review	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	Only family firms	Conflict
Gagné et al. (2014) https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2014.906403	Literature Review	n.a.	General theory of relationships (organizational behavior)	n.a.	Conceptual comparison	Conflict
Goergen et al. (2015) https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2015.08.011	Quantitative	150 firms from the German stock exchange	n.e (reference to corporate governance literature)	Europe	Family versus non-family firms	Conflict
Haberman & Danes (2007) https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-6248.2007.00088.x	Qualitative	22 family businesses	The family FIRO (fundamental interpersonal relationship orientation) model	n.e.	Only family firms	Conflict & Cohesion
Herrero (2018) https://doi.org/10.1177/0894486518784475	Quantitative	400 firms: 230 family firms and 170 nonfamily firms from Spain's manufacturing sector	Family social capital theory (family business theory rooted in sociology)	Europe	Family versus non-family firms	Conflict & Cohesion
Herrero & Hughes (2019) https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfbs.2019.01.001	Quantitative	163 privately held family firms belonging to the food manufacturing sector in Spain	Family social capital theory (family business theory rooted in sociology)	Europe	Conceptual comparison	Cohesion
Jaskiewicz et al. (2016) https://doi.org/10.1111/eap.12146	Qualitative	21 family firms from Germany belonging to the wine industry	Institutional theory	Europe	Conceptual comparison	Conflict & Cohesion
Jayantilal et al. (2016) https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfbs.2016.10.001	Conceptual	n.a.	Game theory	n.a.	Only family firms	Conflict
Jiménez et al. (2015) https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1941-6	Quantitative	126 businesses from Spain belonging to the car dealerships sectors	Institutional theory and family social capital theory	Europe	Family versus non-family firms	Cohesion
Kaczmarek et al. (2012) https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8683.2011.00895.x	Quantitative	UK firms that constituted the Financial Times and London Stock Exchange (FTSE) 350 Index	Social identity theory (main theory)	Europe	Family versus non-family firms	Cohesion
Kammerlander et al. (2015) https://doi.org/10.1177/0894486515607777	Qualitative	41 family firms from Italy belonging to the wine industry	Organizational (and innovation) theory	Europe	Only family firms	Conflict
Kellermanns & Eddleston (2004) https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2004.00040.x	Conceptual	n.a.	Conflict theory	n.a.	Conceptual comparison	Conflict
Kellermanns & Eddleston (2007) https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2006.12.018	Quantitative	36 family firms from the U.S.	Conflict/social exchange theories	North America	Only family firms	Conflict

Kidwell et al. (2012) https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-1014-7	Quantitative	147 surveys obtained from various U.S. family firms	Leader member exchange and group value model of justice (use of ethical climate and family business literature)	North America	Conceptual comparison	Conflict & Cohesion
Kiong (2005) https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580905049909	Qualitative	96 managers, directors and owners of 43 Chinese family firms. The discussion of findings focuses on 3 cases	n.e. (reference to literature on sociology and family firms)	Asia	Only family firms	Conflict
Konopaski et al. (2015) https://doi.org/10.5465/aml.2014.0244	Qualitative	18 small and medium-sized family businesses from Canada belonging to different industries	Situated learning perspective	North America	Only family firms	Cohesion
Kudlats et al. (2019) https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.12.073	Qualitative	19 firm members from 5 U.S. multi-family firms belonging to different industries	Intergroup theory	North America	Conceptual comparison	Conflict & Cohesion
Lambrecht & Lievens (2008) https://doi.org/10.1177/08944865080210040103	Qualitative	20 individuals from 17 family businesses belonging to different industries	Procedural Justice Theory (social scientists-psychology)	n.e.	Only family firms	Conflict & Cohesion
Le Breton-Miller & Miller (2014) https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2014.907276	Commentary	n.a.	Identity/social identity theories (rooted in social-psychology and organizational behavior)	n.a.	Only family firms	Conflict
Lee (2006) https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-6248.2006.00069.x	Quantitative	88 members of family-owned businesses from China	n.e. (use of family business and family studies literature)	Asia	Conceptual comparison	Cohesion
Levinson (1971)	Conceptual	n.a.	n.e.	n.a.	Only family firms	Conflict
Long & Mathews (2011) https://doi.org/10.5840/becq201121217	Conceptual	n.a.	Social exchange perspective	n.a.	Family versus non-family firms	Cohesion
Marshall et al. (2006) https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2005.06.004	Quantitative	205 family firms from the U.S. belonging to different industries	Leadership theory (rooted in organizational behavior)/conflict management literature	North America	Only family firms	Conflict
Michael-Tsabari & Tan (2013) https://doi.org/10.1515/rj-2012-0018	Qualitative	3 case studies of sports teams from North America and Israel	n.e. (use of family therapy, organizational behavior and family business literature and reference to institutional theory)	North America; Asia	Family versus non-family firms	Cohesion
Michael-Tsabari & Weiss (2015) https://doi.org/10.1177/0894486513497506	Conceptual	n.a.	Game theory	n.a.	Only family firms	Conflict & Cohesion
Miller et al. (2009) https://doi.org/10.1057/jibs.2009.11	Quantitative	170 Korean high-technology firms	n.e. (use of family business and international business literature)	Asia	Family versus non-family firms	Cohesion
Morgan & Gómez-Mejía (2014) https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfbs.2014.07.001	Conceptual	n.a.	Socioemotional wealth perspective/Social Exchange Theory	n.a.	Conceptual comparison	Conflict
Morris et al. (1997) https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026(97)00010-4	Quantitative	177 respondents from the U.S. firms belonging to different industries	n.e. (use of family business succession literature)	North America	Conceptual comparison	Conflict

Nazer & Llorca-Jaña (2020) https://doi.org/10.1080/0076791.2020.1717471	Qualitative	3 family firms from Chile	n.e. (use of family business succession literature)	Latin America	Only family firms	Conflict & Cohesion
Nicholson (2008) https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-6248.2007.00111.x	Literature Review	n.a.	Evolutionary psychology	n.a.	Family versus non-family firms	Conflict
Pardo-del-Val (2009) https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-008-0092-1	Qualitative	1 case study of a Spanish family firm	Change management theory (mainly from an organizational behavior perspective)	Europe	Only family firms	Conflict
Pearson et al. (2014) https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2014.911174	Commentary	n.a.	Team and team processes theories	n.a.	Conceptual comparison	Conflict & Cohesion
Petriglieri & Stein (2012) https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840612448158	Qualitative	1 case study of an Italian family firm belonging to the fashion industry	Systems psychodynamic perspective	Europe	Conceptual comparison	Conflict
Qin & Deng (2016) https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-014-0138-4	Quantitative	296 private firms from China belonging to different industries	Social capital theory (sociology)	Asia	Family versus non-family firms	Cohesion
Rousseau et al. (2018) https://doi.org/10.1177/0894486518790425	Quantitative	149 CEO owners from Germany belonging to different industries	Socioemotional wealth perspective, behavioral agency model, mixed gambles, which are all three grounded in prospect theory	Europe	Only family firms	Conflict
Salvato & Melin (2008) https://doi.org/10.1177/08944865080210030107	Qualitative	Comparative study of 4 cases of multigenerational family firms (2 Italian, 2 from Swiss) from wine and spirits industries	Social capital theory (sociology)	Europe	Conceptual comparison	Cohesion
Samara et al. (2019) https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2018.09.001	Conceptual	n.a.	n.e. (use of family business and corporate governance literature)	n.a.	Only family firms	Conflict & Cohesion
Sanchez-Ruiz et al. (2019) https://doi.org/10.1177/0894486519836833	Quantitative	845 family firms in the 2002 AFBS and 646 family firms in the 2007 AFBS (U.S.)	Family social capital theory	North America	Conceptual comparison	Cohesion
Schjoedt et al. (2013) https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2012.00549.x	Conceptual	n.a.	Behavioral theory of management teams	n.a.	Family versus non-family firms	Conflict
Schmidts (2013) https://doi.org/10.5172/ser.2013.20.2.76	Qualitative	1 family firm from New Zealand	Social identity theory (social psychology)	Oceania	Only family firms	Conflict
Scholes et al. (2016) https://doi.org/10.1002/tie.21729	Qualitative	6 internationally active, small family owned firms from Singapore belonging to different industries	Socioemotional wealth perspective	Asia	Conceptual comparison	Conflict & Cohesion
Sciascia et al. (2013) https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2012.00528.x	Quantitative	199 Swiss family firms belonging to different industries	Upper echelons theory	Europe	Only family firms	Conflict & Cohesion
Sharma & Sharma (2011) https://doi.org/10.5840/beg.201121218	Conceptual	n.a.	Theory of planned behavior	n.a.	Family versus non-family firms	Conflict & Cohesion
Sonfield & Lussier (2009) https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-009-0109-4	Quantitative	593 family firms from 6 different countries	n.e. (relies on family business and conflict literature)	n.a.	Only family firms	Conflict
Spriggs et al. (2013) https://doi.org/10.1177/0894486512468600	Quantitative	199 individuals who must be family member AND manager in U.S. business	Resource based view perspective/agency theory	North America	Conceptual comparison	Conflict & Cohesion

		belonging to different industries				
Sreih et al. (2019) https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-01-2018-0030	Quantitative	98 Lebanese family firms belonging to different industries	n.e. (relies on family business and conflict literature)	Asia	Only family firms	Conflict
Vallejo (2009) https://doi.org/10.1177/0894486508327892	Quantitative	121 Spanish firms belonging to the automobile sector	Institutional/transformational leadership theory	Europe	Family versus non-family firms	Cohesion
Vallejo-Martos (2011) https://doi.org/10.3846/16111699.2011.599407	Quantitative	295 questionnaires for 90 Spanish family firms belonging to the automobile sector	Neo-institutional/transformational leadership theories	Europe	Conceptual comparison	Cohesion
Van der Heyden et al. (2005) https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-6248.2005.00027.x	Qualitative	5 cases of family businesses belonging to different industries	Procedural justice theory (social scientists-psychology)	n.a.	Only family firms	Conflict
Van der Merwe et al. (2012) https://doi.org/10.4102/sajbm.v43i4.479	Quantitative	173 family firms from South Africa	n.e. (use of family business literature)	Africa	Conceptual comparison	Conflict & Cohesion
Venter et al. (2003) https://doi.org/10.4102/sajbm.v34i4.687	Quantitative	332 respondents from small and medium-sized South African family businesses	n.e. (use of family business literature)	Africa	Only family firms	Cohesion
Vollero et al. (2019) https://doi.org/10.1002/res.2548	Qualitative	8 family firms from Italy, Belgium, Germany and France belonging to different industries	Systems theory	Europe	Conceptual comparison	Cohesion
Waldkirch et al. (2018) https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2017.05.006	Conceptual	n.a.	Social exchange perspective	n.a.	Only family firms	Cohesion
Zahra (2012) https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-010-9266-7	Quantitative	741 U.S. manufacturing family firms	Organizational learning/behavioral theories	North America	Only family firms	Cohesion
Zattoni et al. (2015) https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206312463936	Quantitative	421 non-public medium-sized and small firms from Norway belonging to different industries	Process-based view of boards of directors + agency/resource dependence theories	Europe	Family versus non-family firms	Conflict
Zona (2014) https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-014-9587-z	Quantitative	74 non listed Italian family firms belonging to the manufacturing sector	Process-based view of boards	Europe	Only family firms	Conflict
Zona (2016) https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-016-9764-3	Quantitative	104 Italian large manufacturing family firms	Process-based view of boards of directors integrated with upper echelons theory	Europe	Conceptual comparison	Conflict

Notes; n.a. = not applicable; n.e. = not explicit