

Family SME: Strategy and Performance of the Teams

Soumaya DLIMI

Professor, Faculty Of Economic And Social Legal Science, University Hassan II, Casablanca, Morocco

Abstract: *The brutality of the current crisis and the events which knows the Arab world constitute for the companies a real testing period compared to their strategic choices. Family SME (Small and medium-sized enterprise) often suffered from a negative image. But today, its weight is not any more to dispute (Allouche and Aman, 2000, Kenyon –Rouvenez and Ward, 2004). Its raison becomes the research of sustainability, of share the overlap of the sphere “family” and the sphere “undertaken”, which creates dependences and emotional and financial interdependences. However, we have to admit that the sustainability of the family company refers to the strategy, to the capacity to be competitive, and to hold a successful team, which can precisely assure to him this sustainability. The methodology follows is theoretical and empirical study .We visit 140 enterprise and we choose the positivism as epistemological paradigm of our research the objective of this article is to discover the family company and its growing importance, through a review of literature on the various works which were realized on this subject. In addition, we will present the different strategies of family SME which represents a managerial challenge in the service of the performance of the teams.*

Key words: *Family companies, strategy, performance, managerial challenge, Small and Medium Enterprise*

I. Introduction

The weights of the family companies is not to be any more disputed (Allouche and Amann, on 2000, Kenyon-Rouvenez and Ward, on 2004). Their reason for being becomes the research for the sustainability, for the part the interweaving of the sphere “family” and the sphere “company”, which creates dependences and emotional and financial interdependences.

SME(Small and medium-sized enterprise) station wagons often suffered from a negative image, because they made a reference to the slowness, the paternalism, the rigidity, the fear what did not really grant it a competitive advantage. Very fortunately, at present, the vision changed! The family company became careful, thrifty, patient, dynamics, visionary, with in addition « a better management ».

Foa long time, several researches in Management, ignored the family companies. Nevertheless, several families assure the management and the control of companies which dominate the current economic world (La porta et Lopez-de Silanes, 1999; Morck et Yeung, 2003; Shanker et Astrachan, 1996).

Now, who speaks about sustainability of the family company, made a reference to the strategy, to the capacity to be competitive, and to hold a successful team, which can exactly assure it this sustainability.

We focused on the studies, theoretical and empirical of different authors and researchers, who paid their attention on French, Spanish, Italian family companies, etc. Then we tried to discover through our own empirical study, by visiting up to then 140 Moroccan, family and not family companies, in the objective to discover in the Moroccan context, the answers to our questions.

Agrees to underline that our investigation (survey), we deduced that there are particular cultural specificities in Morocco, among them following values : the patience, the consent, and the parental blessing. The objective of this article thus as we note in the abstract, is to discover the family company and its growing importance, through a review of literature on the various works which were realized on this subject. In addition, we will present the different strategies of family SME which represents a managerial challenge in the service of the performance of the teams.

Family Company

Definition : According to Davis and Taguiri (1982), a family company is defined as “an organization where two or several members of vast the family influence the walking (the direction) of the company through family relationships, the executive positions or the property rights on the capital” Let us add to this definition an additional condition, put by Cadieux, Lorraine and Hugron, 2002), Timothy, Mary and William 2010), worth knowing the intention to transmit the family business in the next generation of members of the family. This definition is also the one of Chua, Chrisma and Sharma(1999) for whom “family business is has governed with the intention to shape and pursue the vision of the held by business has dominant controlled by members coalition.

To arrest the family company by means of specific formalities or through specific sizes will be very difficult. In this sense, should we limit the definition to a restrictive design of the family (parents and descendants)? Either as it be had to adopt rather an extensive design (allied...). So, we wonder if the concept of family company has to limit itself to a mono-family control or he can extend in a control bi-family either even multi-family. Can we consider that he undertook station wagon from the first generation of the founders there either we have to consider it a station wagon only after the passage of witness in the second generation?

It is advisable to specify that there are several definitions as different as heterogeneous. We shall present definition mono-criteria and multi-criteria for a better visibility.

Board 1: The definitions of family company

1/ Definitions mono-criteria	Autors	The content
Criteria of property	Barnes L.B., Hershon S.A. (1976), Alcorn, P.B.(1982), Lansberg I. & al. (1988)	The company is the property of an individual, or members of the same family.
Criteria of control	Barry B. (1975), Beckhard R. & al. (1983), Handler, W.C(1989)	The company is checked by a family, more or less widened. The board of directors is the privileged place of this control.
2/ Definitions multi-criteria		
Property and control	Davis J.A. ; Tagiuri R. (1982) ; Davis J., (1985)	The company is at the same time the property of an individual or a family, and is checked by a family, more or less widened.
Property, transmission and control	Churchill N., Hatten .K.J (1987), Ward J.L (1987)	The transmission of the company in another generation was made. The new generation has to keep the control.
Property and domination of the family, the name of the company	Christensen R. (1953)	The domination by the family is translated by the fact that the latter gives its name, soaks it with the traditions and is an owner of a part of the actions.
Entrepreneur's generations and mutual influence	Donneley R. (1964)	At least two generation of members of the family the years the company and an influence mutual family/company.

Importance of the family company: The family companies arouse all the attentions today, with the aim of understanding better their specificities. Since the seventies, the field of the researches on the family companies was born (Levison, on 1971; Schnein, on 1968. From the 80s, (Davis and Tagiuri, on 1982; Holland and Boulton, on 1984; Ward, on 1987) the authors note a little more notable development. Allouche and Amann (2000) , presented further to an analysis of 431 references published in international journal, between 1936 and 1999, the main themes which establish of this field and allowing the understanding of its evolution during this period. Four trends in the figure 1 are presented:

Board 2 : Distribution of the researches on the family companies

Themes	Distributions of the searches
Concepts and definitions Management of the change Relations family/ Company	11°/° - 12°/°
Financing History (Story) Economic role Global vision Structures of property Succession	6°/° - 9°/°
Culture and values Governments of the company Interaction company/ Survival	3°/° - 5°/°
Internal conflicts Internationalisation Programmes d'enseignement	0.3 °/° - 2°/°

Source : Allouch & Amann (2000).

What we notice on the picture, it is that the succession of the family company, establishes a crucial and sometimes fatal stage for these companies, 8.4°/° works dealt with the question.

As for the researches focusing on the economic role of the family companies, they strongly fell (12°/°), whereas those relative to them study of the concepts and the definitions, they clearly increased (+10°/°). The states of progress of the researches (Sharma and al.; on 2003; Sharma, on 2004; Zahra and Sharma on 2004) confirm it.

Theoretical approach based on the resources: To arrest the family companies, Chua and al. 2003, assert that a bigger theoretical variety, borrowing from the theories of the organization, should allow to win in quality while

widening the theoretical perspectives. A more thorough knowledge of the economic objectives pursued by the family companies would allow to understand better how they affect their decisions (Steier and Ward, on 2006) and to clear one in the sources of their specificity. Chrisman and al, (2005) assert in their turn that the family gets involved within the management , within the governance, or within the shareholding, and influences certainly the vision of the company, as a specificity of this type of company.

To conclude, the approach based on the resources thus supports that the family implication leads to the creation of unique resources such as a better information or a knowledge on behalf of the family managers, a “patient” capital which facilitates the survival of these companies, where the costs of agency are more low, as asserts it a lot of authors, such as Anderson and Reeb, (2003), Arrègle (2007), Fama and Jensen, (1983, 1983) etc...

The altruism according to this approach would be positive, and it is what explains the presence of a positive relation between the implication of the family and the performance of the firm, approach which will be questioned in the future chapters.

Theoretical approach based on the theory of the agency: Fama and Jensen (1983) within the framework of the theory of the agency, reveal that for a first family approach, the commitment increases the costs of agency following different problems (nepotism, free-riding, of intergenerational conflicts, implanting of family). The implication of the family and the degree of implication of the family and the degree of implication are negatively correlated in the performance of the family firms.

The societal importance of the family companies Lank (1994) asserts that the number of the family firms testifies of a real ascendancy and the real economic importance. Their competitiveness is major (Westhead, M .Cowlin on 1998).

Novak (1983) and D.T Jaffe (1990) specify that the bases of the analyses of the economy are neither the individual workers, nor the entrepreneurs, nor the companies, but it is well families, that create, check and organize the business.

So, the values different from new owners have an often negative impact, at the same time in terms of the performances but also on the family and the community.

Board 4 : The societal role of the family companies

Autors	Criteria of analysis	Conclusion
Novak (1983), Jaffe (1990)	The family as base of the analyses of the economy	It is the families which create, check and organize the business and not the workers, the entrepreneurs or the companies .
Ward (1987)	The organization of the transition between generations as cause of change of control	The values different from new owners have an often negative impact, at the same time in terms of performances but also on the family and the community.
Astrachan (1988)	The sensibility in the change of control or management	This sensibility pulls the questioning of culture and has fatal effects on the long-term.
Astrachan (1988)	The appropriate values to the family company and their social influence	The family companies are more aware socially, than members of the family accept bigger sacrifices and accept long-term losses to save the company.
Upton (1995)	Financing of the transition	Fatal consequences of the transmission of the family companies in the second generation.
Prokesch (1986), Longenecker eT al. (1989), Lyman , 1991	Attraction of the family companies	They are preferred by the consumers, more implied to their service, offer bigger opportunities to the women, have a better social policy and have a bigger respect for the traditions.

Which are the Moroccan family company?

Basly (2005) asserts that there is really no single definition, or of consensus in sense, as we called back it in the part higher (1.1 definition) , there are definitions mono-criteria and multi-criteria. In Morocco, none of the networks of the family companies (Family Business Network) is implanted there. Two nevertheless contradictory visions according to Bentabaa (2014) remain in the conception of the fact what is a family company. The first one considers that the notion of family company makes reference to the biggest fortunes of Morocco (Group Amhal, Kettani, Akhannouch, Chaâbi, Benjellou, Sefrioui...), which realize to them alone 2°/° in 30°/° of the gross internal product. The second vision advocates that a family company can be a small or very small company. A grocer’s shop, a bakery, a small restaurant, can be family companies, and we want to asset that from the result of our empirical part of this search, realized with the leaders. Also, even if they have a family character, they do not represent the majority of the family companies. Several experts specified that the majority of the family companies are SME (Small and medium-sized enterprise), they plays an essential role

regarding creation of wealth, fight against the unemployment, the poverty and the regional development. In Morocco, and according to the Federation of the SME, 95°/° of companies are SME(Small and medium-sized enterprise) consists at first by the activities of the real estate and the corporate services (22°/°) , and the manufacturing industries (15°/°). Finally, in the Moroccan context, we can hold the definition which considers as family company any company which the capital is mainly detained by the same family, with the active participation of the family in the management team (1st and 2nd generation at least) and the clear will to transmit at the current leader (Bentebbaa, on 2014).

Strategies in the service of the family companies:

Advantages and weak points of the family company: Kats (1982) assert that the family control is traditionally associated with a type of parochial behavior aggravating the informative enclosing which livens up firms under this type of control. This opacity can have deep roots in the family history, dogmatism of the founder and the institutionalization of its faiths. It is surprising to observe that the purposes and the objectives of the family companies, the formulation of the strategy and its contents, as well as its implementation were the object of few researches: less than 6°/° (board 2, quoted higher). The essential difference which allows to distinguish a family company of a not family company , is the behavior of the company in its choices and strategic objectives. The nature of the pursued objectives, the characteristics of the implied actors and the way the strategic process in led which make it , specificity (Sharma and al.1997) If we wish to isolate a variety of factors which can lead the ownership of competitive advantages returning the more competitive firm, and leading her team towards a sustainable performance, we shall make a reference to Board 3 below, from a review of literature, allows us to present the main advantages that the family companies hold unquestionably, and which grant to them a real competitiveness and a performance.

Board 3 : Strategies and advantages of the family companies

Strategies and advantages of family companies	Autors
Strategic Emphasize the growth potential rather than the growth of the short-term sales; less reactive in the more constant , more constant in the orientation.	Hirigoyen (1982,1984) ; Donckels & Frohlich, (1991), Daily & Dollinger (1992), Daily & Thomson (1991)
Lower costs of transaction	Aronoff & Ward (1995)
Cost cuttings of agency	Aronoff & Ward (1995) ; Hoopes & al (2006); Mc Conaughy & al. (1995)
Family member are more productive than the other Implication of the following generations in the strategic processes allowing a successful succession	Levering & Moscovitz (1993) ; Rosenblatt & al. (1985) Mazzola & al . (2008)
Alliances with other family firms develop	Miller & al. (2003) ; Ward (1997)
Reputation of the family and the relations with the external partners are stronger and controls by values	Lyman (1991)
Pay more attention to the development of the brand	Allouch & Amann (1995) ; Craig & al. (2008) ; Dreux (1990) ; Porter (1992)
Better reputation and credibility	Tagiuri & Davis (1996) ; Ward & Aronoff (1991)
More flexible practices of work	Goffe & Scase (1985)
Better attention with the R&D	Ward (1997)
A culture characterizing their vision in connection with the family business which founds their continuation, support the entrepreneurship	Aronoff (2004) ; Carney (2005) ; Denison & al (2004); Lumpkin & al. (2008) ; Zahra & al. (2004)
Investment more in their capacity of development	Hoopes & al.(2006) ; Sirmon & al. (2008)
Financial	
Better management of the structure of the capital and allocation of resource	Astrachan (1998) ; Dyer (1986) ; Monsen (1969)
« Patient » capital, investments in opportunities with long-term profitability without short-term	De Visscher & al. 1995) ; Dreux (1990 ; Sirmon & Hitt (2003)
Cost of the weaker capital	Aronoff & Ward (1995)
More independent financially	Maherault (1998) ; Trehan (2000)
More powerful economically	Anderson & al. (2003) ; Charreaux (1991) ; Miller et al. (2007)
Utilisent plus les contrôles informels, coûts de contrôle et monitoring inférieurs	Daily & Dollinger (1992) ; Mustakallio & al. (2002), Steier (2001)
The competitors have little information on the financial statement of the company	Gallo & Vilascca (1996) ; Johnson (1990)
Humans Ressources	
Costs of recruitment and RH inferiors	Levering & Moscovitz (1993)
Better managerial practices	Prokesch (1986)
Higher confidence, motivation and honesty	Allouche & Amann (1998), Steier, (2001), Sundaramurthy (2008), Tagiuri & Davis (1996), Ward (1998)
Development of the leadership	Fiegenger & al (1994) Handeler (1989), (1992)
Division of values through several cultures	Swinth & Vinton (1993)

Surmont the cultural barriers more effectively	
Place the emphasis on the personal values and of the amily rather than on the values of company Recognized for their integrity and commitment in the relations	Aranoff (2004) ; Denison & al. ; (2004) Lyman (1991)
Maintain a stability of employment during the crisis periods	Lee (2006)
Organisational	
Better creativity	Pervin (1997)
More reactive with the changes of the environment Decision making can be centralized, increasing the effectiveness and efficiency	Dreux (1990) ; Zara & al. (2008) Goffe & Scase (1985) ; Taiuri & Davis, (1996) ; Ward (1997)

Source: Adapted from Arrègle & al. (2004)

However, the family businesses have all the same weaknesses, which can cope with its competitiveness, and to slow down or be lacking for the performance of its teams. Let us quote as example the increase in the costs of agency because of the existence of altruistic behaviors between the family members (Schulze stall; 2000, 2001, 2002); as well as the process of succession to the following generations difficult (Davis and Harveston (1999); Tomas (2002). Also, in the same direction, we find with Gallo and Vilascca (1998) the managerial rooting of the family members which can represent a real brake.

Orientation of the strategic decision making of the family business or “when the heir becomes entrepreneur”. Sirmon and Hitt (2003) draw attention to the difficulty of attracting nonfamily managers of talent, when in Meyer and Zucker (1989), they apply that the principal disadvantage can be the risk of strategic inertia. We can affirm that difficult or slowed down strategic decision making, and the decisions based on noneconomic logics, non-rational can be really disadvantages, which can cope with the strategy, and thus touch the competitiveness of the company negatively. Family SME has its own specificities, we had understood it, and particularism means that decision criteria specific to the family businesses will influence decision makings. For example, the altruism or an intergenerational prospect, supporting a “patient capital”, can direct strategic decision makings of any heir who sees himself gradually becoming a true entrepreneur (Simon & Hitt, 2003) The results partials of our empirical study show that the strategic proximity and strategic persistence form elements founders of the competitive advantage. In fact, when we focus here on the strategic proximity, we indicate a detailed knowledge of the main activity coming from the active and durable implication of the family members. However, strategic persistence corresponds to a continuity of the family presence in the shareholding. Thus, does the latter represent a long-term prospect, a stability and a patience which can be with the competing source of advantage, why? Considering that will represent at the strategic level an undeniable force, and will take part obviously in the competitiveness of the company and its performance.

2.3 Which strategies for family SME?

We will concentrate ourselves on the study of the various strategies which can offer a force impossible to circumvent for the family business: we will call them “the competitive strategies: force of family SME” We will initially choose to categorize them in 4 parts, and to present all the other strategies which we could discover: symbiotic strategies, strategies of concentration (focusing), strategies of differentiation and strategies of organizational flexibility. We will have in this part the results partial of our investigation, for the moment following different “the face to face” realized on the level from 136 companies. Thus, new strategies commonly used in various Moroccan families SME, in search of competitive modernization.

- Strategies of domination by the costs : This strategy consists in reaching in a durable way, unit costs lower than that of the competitors for the same level of quality and this for a broad target (all segments of the market or a large number of between them)
- Strategies of specialization or focusing: The strategy of focusing consists in developing a competitive advantage on a limited segment, even single, so as to create a “niche” on the market.
Conditions to implement it: to select a kind of product / To select a kind of customer or a geographical zone.

The strategy of focusing consists in concentrating on a group of particular customers and cutting custom-tailored its strategy to serve them other than all the other segments.

-Strategy of marketing mix: it concentrates on the policy of the price/product

-Strategy of consolidation: it is a strategy which consists in reinforcing the position of the company with respect to its competitors, by maintaining the same level of sale or seeks to increase it. Approximately the required purpose is to consolidate or increase the market shares of the current products on their existing markets. With this intention the company can reinforce its marketing effort for development of customer loyalty, increase the frequency of purchase, or transform the potential customers into real customers.

-Strategies of Launching: The strategy of launching consists in offering new products on existing markets. These new products will take the place of those existing. With this intention the company proceeds has small innovations on the products, launches new models, new designs or of new forms.

-Strategies of extension: this strategy consists in increasing the sales of the company by introducing the current products on new markets. That can be done either by a conquest of other areas, other countries and the international one (geographical development) , or by new distribution networks (distribution virtual).

- Symbiotic strategies: The symbiotic strategies refer to the whole of the strategies refer to the whole of the strategic behaviors aiming at using a community of organizations to reach a competitive advantage or to protect themselves from the attacks of the competitors.

-Strategies of differentiation: We hear differentiation in his broad direction, this actions which make it to mean that all the strategic actions which make it possible to be distinguished from the possible competitors. The competitive strategies of Porter (1980) distinguish between differentiation and the domination by costs. According to the author, these two strategies can be had on the ends a continuum since the companies have various levels of implication according to the adopted strategy. However, Borch and al. (1999) draw the possibility for the small companies of pursuing a strategy of domination by the costs since they are very often unable to use the economies of scale. This strategy aroused the interest of several researchers, Van Gils and al. (2004) concluded a study near 295 family businesses of which 258 are SME. The authors noted that the companies do not choose a particular strategy but one mix of strategy. Indeed, 39.3°/° of the companies of the sample choose a combination between the strategy of differentiation and domination by the costs, whereas 14.3°/° of the companies choose a strategy of domination by the costs and 18.9°/° a strategy of differentiation themselves. This situation returns so to what Porter described as a median strategy “has stuck-in the middle position”

The results of the study show that the strategy of differentiation seems to be stimulated by the need for internationalization.

The strategy of differentiation consists in implementing other means that the price to do a product or not easily comparable favor of those of the competitors. Generally, one distinguishes two types of differentiation: differentiation by the top and differentiation by the top and differentiation by bottom.

-Strategies of organizational flexibility: to cope with the fluctuations, not anticipated, of the environment, Reix (1979) proposes to set up new variables allowing the company a greater aptitude to be reacted in order to follow the changes of its environment.

This capacity of reaction or reactivity is defined as the capacity to present a modification in answer to an external action. Kalika (1991) estimates that a reactive organization is that which has the capacity to answer stimulations of the environment. The reactivity of a company strongly depends on its organizational flexibility.

-Strategies of diversification: This strategy consists in offering new products on new markets which present opportunities and which leave the usual perimeter of activity of the company. This strategy requires to integrate new competences and to capitalize experiment on the new lines of products and the new target markets. To diversify, the company has several strategic options.

-Strategy of profit: it is based on the diversity of the offer, product quality, and the permanent reduction of the costs with constant volume. The strategies which we presented aim at clarifying the modes of competitiveness which follow family SME to progress and survive in a competing world and into perpetual mobility. These strategies represent the lever of perennially for the family business. This without the shade of a doubt remains a pledge of its competitiveness and performance of its teams.

3. The family business: which managerial challenges for the maintenance of the performance of the teams: Currently, we notice through our empirical study that the view from now on related to the family businesses is more favorable, which for a long time, were comparable with companies “antiquated”, when it was a question of comparing them with companies with managerial governance and dispersed shareholding.

The search of sustainability : warranty of the performance of the teams: The family business must progress, but often it confronts herself like specifies Mignon (2009) with the rather difficult decisional choice: does it have to remain itself? Where does it have to innovate by exploiting existing competences at the same time? Labari (2011) affirms from a sociological point of view which the business history of the companies in Morocco did not have that few attempts at solid and especially empirical research. Between 1956, with the independence of the country and 1973, the Moroccan company changed! It acquired extremely fortunately new dimensions on the level of the operators. (Affaya and Guerraoui 2009). If we base ourselves on a census of the companies in 1984, 2061companies we create (Tangeaoui, 1993). Thus, thanks to the “Morroconisation” a good amount of Moroccan entrepreneurs could be introduced into sectors as finance, the insurance industry and the service (Affaya and Guerraoui, 2009)

The religion

Bourquia (2010) affirms that beside the religious precepts, the traditional Moroccan company has of a set of habits and rights specific to the contexts urban and rural. The religion, the habit, the traditions and the common laws thus are the main sources of values, which govern the appreciation of the individual, and the reports at the community. Islam being the religion of the Moroccan State, the Moroccan company of this fact is impressed by the Moslem vision of the things. The religion thus is the source of the values morals, it is the guaranteeing one of the moral order of the company. And with final, within the companies, we find this rooting of the values, which delimits the moral framework, which dictates the values to be respected, and which takes part undoubtedly in the sustainable of the family business. Thus, each member will be more powerful, because it is bound by a system of membership and shared values.

The family: a node of links crowned

Bargach (2005) affirms that in the Arab culture, the family was always a “crowned” node of links: blood can never betray blood, its sacredness is at the origin of its sustainability. The evolution of the place of the father also played a part in this field of view. Indeed, the authoritative patriarchal model changed! It is not any more the single reference to Morocco.

However, the values on the honor, the respect, the mutual aid, solidarity remain preserved all the same. Bargach considers the father as being the base on which all rest. Person in charge, it has an answer to any situation and any need, because it finally plays of account the part of “guard”. If we adhere to the vision of the author, this role of the father thus confers the power and the authority within the family to him, even with the entry of the woman to the job market, the audio visual, the NTIC....

It is thus advisable to stress that this role “of exemplary man”, can boost the individuals and the teams “to exceed itself”, thus creating a continuous performance of its teams, a competitiveness of the company. The company thanks to him can gain then in sustainability, and can defy competition and time.

Manufacturing of a heir-entrepreneur: real challenges for a sustainable performance?

It is the family business appropriate to wonder in this pole if does gain in performance compared to a company controlled by managers? Hill and Snell (1989) affirm in this direction which the interest of the owner would be characterized by a greater efficiency than those in which the objective is the maximization of the function of utility of management. We are here obviously very close to the theory of the agency, and we refer here to the current centered on the performance analyses.

When we approach this point, we directly evoke the concept of financial performance of the company, which in a general way, is illustrated by a need for fast results, an aversion with debt (Allouch, Aman, 1995) and by a trend with the reinvestment of the dividends (Gallo 1994). When it is about motivation of the owners, it is certainly different from that of the manager, and as a result, that involves effects on the performance of the teams.

Several leaders during the talks which we carried out affirmed that it is not always obvious for a manager. When it is about company under control of the owner, the value of return on investment is definitely higher compared to that of the companies with managerial control. So the presence of a group of a group of owner generates an increase in the attention of management to the interests of the owners. Thus, that takes part undoubtedly in the growth of the performance of the teams.

We encountered at the time of our investigation several cases of company of fourth and fifth generation and complex family, this is reveal that comprising many predecessors and successors resulting from several branches of the same family. The term of factory was retained to insist on the fact that id one is born heir, one becomes family entrepreneur. It is takes place there thus development of certain components “of managing”, which will have the ability to carry out its team towards a sustainable performance.

This transformation is the result of a long process of socialization and testing period which does not have anything naturalness. It appears all the more complex as the family is also. In the case of perennial family businesses, we can affirm on the family” manufactures” the entrepreneurs which it needs, it is a challenge which allows sustainability.

Why manufacture “ a future manager”? able to be the “leit motiv” teams, the guide, the “orientator”, and especially the guard, the strategist who thanks to him, motivation versifies with continuity of efficiency and the effectiveness? The answer is simple, family SME, in disturbed environment, needs the best successor who play the part of the “top manager”.

The good directing “engaged” for maintenance of the performance of the teams:

A testing period is quite necessary, but quite fronts certain stages remains determining: The first step or transition, whereas the company develops and that its founder approaches the retirement step, is that of the transmission of a single owner to his children. During this first phase of transition, the power is held by only one

family member and uncertainty weighs primarily on the choice of the best successor among the sibship of the heirs. The second transition is a transmission with a consortium of cousins. In this particular case, complexity strongly increases because different possibilities are offered as for the choice of the successors.

Gersick, Lansberg, Desjardins and Dunn (1999) model this transmission as being a process where states of homeostasis alternate, and moments of rupture, which make pass the company of a state to another during its life cycle, within the framework of a transition towards a greater complexity from the governance from the family firm.

This complexity is marked by the increase in the size of the family and thus of the fish pond of potential successors, among whom the generation with the power must choose to succeed to him the operational direction. The process of factory of family entrepreneurs, called to take again the reins of the company forms integral part of the transmission.

Within the framework of the factory of the family entrepreneur, the result of the process of socialization, started very early, aims at generating these seven types of commitment. It is through the density of the contacts within the family and near the shareholders of the family business that the heir forges an authorized capital and an identity. It is conditioned to adhere to the values of the family and the company. That generates a commitment attitudinal. The authorized capital acquired by an heir measures at the same time his efforts and what it would lose by leaving the bosom of the system family family-company. This generates an attachment with a policy which aims at maintaining this system, and thus a high degree of familiarisme, which guarantees the sustainability of the family business.

Each commitment recovers on the one hand the membership social to which one is identified as well as the values too, because of significance granted to this point. We speak then about commitment attitudinal. In addition, the commitment also relates to a policy and acts to which one holds, this time because of last efforts. We then qualify this commitment as being behavioral or of continuation. This generates an attachment with a policy which aims at maintaining this system, and thus a high degree of familiarisme, which guarantees the sustainability of the family business.

Sharma and Irving (2005) decomposes the latter into calculation commitment (do not lose the investment already made in the family company and the family, do not feel capable of working except this environment (middle) and in imperative commitment based (established) on the received need to belong to the company. These commitments have a dynamic, mixed and systematic nature. The members of a family make a commitment at the same time in the support to the balance of the family company, because of the commitment of the members of the family which are associated to it. As for the leaders (managers) of the family company, they make a commitment.

So, the commitment of the new leader (manager), leads to the long-lasting (sustainable) performance of the teams, its attachment, its spirit of membership and its motivation echo positively on all the shareholders, and so, maintain the system, by being productive, efficient and guaranteeing the sustainability of the company.

II. Conclusion

The family SME (Small and medium-sized enterprise) was considered for a long time as an old-fashioned shape of company, sent back (dismissed) in the staves of the history, or the same sign of decline announced in the face of a dominant managerial capitalism. This image very fortunately changed, and the family SME today has all the rights, and requires all the attentions, it indeed establishes a real economic strength.

Several authors underlined the specificities of the family SME in terms of centralization of the decisions, the non-formalization of the strategies, the trend to the reduction of the hierarchical levels and the size of the structures (Julien, Marchesnay, on 1998. Julien, on 1994) An epidemiology of analyses was born, due to the particular character of this form of company which mixes trajectory individual, family trajectories and trajectories of companies.

The behavior of the leaders (managers) is specific there. Various authors find the explanation in the behavior differentiated by the family companies there (E.H Schein (on 1968); W.GG Dyer (on 1986); C. Daily, D.R Dalton (on 1992). These behavioral implications allows S.J Harvey (on 1999) to suggest that one of the reasons of the domination is in the fact that the family managers have a horizon much more spread than that of the not family managers, a sometimes good horizon beyond the generation.

From there results their search for the continuity, for the long-lasting existence. Thus the family company makes a heir manager, and prepares him for the succession, and in turn, will have to surpass itself by means of competitive strategies to maintain the performance of his teams. Like a captain of edge, who will watch to manage his team to arrive at the good port, he will also be the conductor who will guarantee the best melody, in any event.

Bibliography

- [1]. Adler P.S., Kwon S.W., "Social Capital : Prospects for a New Concept", *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 27, n° 1, 2002, p. 17-40.
- [2]. Allouche J. et Amann B., *Le Retour Triomphant du Capitalisme Familial, Gestionnaires et Organisations*, Toulouse, Presse de l'Université des Sciences Sociales de Toulouse, 1995.
- [3]. Allouche J. et Amann B., « La confiance : une explication des performances des entreprises familiales », *Économies et Sociétés, série « Gestion », numéro spécial*, n° 25, 1998, p. 124-154.
- [4]. Allouche J. et Amann B., « L'entreprise familiale : un état de l'art », *Finance, Contrôle, Stratégie*, vol. 3, n° 1, 2000, p. 33-79.
- [5]. Anderson R.C. et Reeb D.M., "Founding-Family Ownership and Firm Performance: Evidence from the S&P 500", *Journal of Finance*, 58, 2003, p. 1301-1329.
- [6]. Anderson R.C. et Reeb D.M., "Board Composition : Balancing Family Influence in S&P 500 Firms", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 49, 2004, p. 209-237.
- [7]. Arrègle J.L., Durand R. et Very P., « Origines du capital social et avantages concurrentiels des firmes familiales », *M@n@gement*, vol. 7, n° 2, 2004, p. 13-36.
- [8]. Arrègle J.L., Hitt M.A., Sirmon D. et Very P., "The Development of Organizational Social Capital : Attributes of Family Firms", *The Journal of Management Studies*, 1, 2007, p. 73-95.
- [9]. Aronoff C.E., "Self-Perpetuation Family Organization Built on Values: Necessary Condition for Long-Term Family Business Survival", *Family Business Review*, vol. 17, n° 1, 2007, p. 55- 59.
- [10]. Aronoff C.E. et Ward J.L., "Family-owned Businesses : A Thing of the Past or a Model of the Future", *Family Business Review*, vol. 8, n° 2, 1995, p. 121-130.
- [11]. Astrachan J.H., "Family Firm and Community Culture", *Family Business Review*, vol. 1, n° 2, 1998, p. 165-189.
- [12]. Astrachan J.H. et Kolenko T.A., "A Neglected Factor Explaining Family Business Success: Human Resources Practices", *Family Business Review*, vol. 7, n° 3, 1994, p. 251-262.
- [13]. Bird B., Welsh H., Astrachan J.H. et Pistrui D., "Family Business Research: The Evolution of an Academic Field", *Family Business Review*, vol. 15, n° 4, 2002, p. 337-350.
- [14]. Carney M. "Corporate Governance and Competitive Advantage in Family-Controlled Firms", *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 29, 2005, p. 249-265.
- [15]. Chrisman J.J., Chua J.H. et Sharma P., "Trends and Directions in the Development of a Strategic Management Theory of the Family Firm", *Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice*, 29, 2005, p. 555-575.
- [16]. Chrisman J.J., Sharma P. et Taggar S., "Family Influences on Firms: An Introduction", *Journal of Business Research*, 60, 2007, p. 1005-1011.
- [17]. Chua J.H., Chrisman J.J., Sharma P., "Defining the family business by behavior", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 23, 1999, p. 19-39.
- [18]. Chua J.H., Chrisman J.J., Steier L., "Extending the Theoretical Horizons of Family Business Research", *Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice*, 29, p. 331-338, 2003.
- [19]. Colli A., Fernandez-Perez P. et Rose M., "National determinants of family firm development : Family firms in Britain, Spain and Italy in the 19th and 20th centuries", *Enterprise & Society*, 4, 2003, p. 28-65.
- [20]. Cosier R.A. et Harvey M., "The Hidden Strengths in Family Business : Functional Conflict", *Family Business Review*, vol. 11, n° 1, 1998, p. 75-79.
- [21]. Craig J.B., Dibrell C. et Davis P.S., "Leveraging Family Business Brand Identity to Enhance Firm Competitiveness and Performance in Family Businesses", *Journal of Small Business Management*, vol. 46, n° 3, 2008, p. 351-371.
- [22]. Daily C. et Dollinger M., "An Empirical Examination of Ownership Structure in Family and Professionally Managed Firms", *Family Business Review*, vol. 5, n° 2, 1992, p. 117-136.
- [23]. Daily C. et Thomson S.S., "Ownership Structure, Strategic Posture and Firm Growth : An Empirical Examination", *Family Business Review*, vol. 7, n° 3 ; 1994, p. 237-249.
- [24]. Davis P.S. et Harveston P.D., "In the Founder's Shadow: Conflict in the Family Firm", *Family Business Review*, vol. 12, n° 4, 1999, p. 311-323.
- [25]. Davis P.S. et Harveston P.D., "The Phenomenon of Substantive Conflict in the Family Firm: A Cross-Generational Study", *Journal of Small Business Management*, vol. 39, n° 1, 2001, p. 14-30.
- [26]. Davis J.H., Schoorman F.D. et Donaldson L., "Toward a Stewardship Theory of Management", *Academy of Management Review*, 22, 1997, p. 20-47.
- [27]. Davis J.A. et Tagiuri R., *Bivalent Attributes of the Family Firm*, Santa Barbara, CA, Owner Managed Business Institute, 1982.
- [28]. Debicki B.J., Matherne C.F., Kellermans F.W., Chrisman J.J., "Family Business Research in the New Millenium : An Overview of the Who, the Where, the What, and the Why", *Family Business Review*, vol. 22, n° 2, 2009, p. 151-166.
- [29]. De Visser F.M., Aronoff C.F. et Ward J.L., *Financing transitions : Managing capital and liquidity in the family business*, Marietta, GA, Business Owner Resources, 1995.
- [30]. Denison D., Lief C. et Ward J.L., "Culture in Family-Owned Enterprises : Recognizing and Leveraging Unique strenghts", *Family Business Review*, vol. 17, n° 1, 2004, p. 61-70.
- [31]. Donckels R. et Frohlich E., "Are Family Businesses Really Different ? European Experiences from STRATOS", *Family Business Review*, vol. 4, n° 2, 1991, p. 149-160.
- [32]. Dreux D.R., "Financing Family Business : Alternatives to Selling out or Going Public", *Family Business Review*, vol. 3, n° 3, 1990, p. 225-243.
- [33]. Gomez-Mejia L.R., Haynes K., Nunez-Nickel M., Jacobson K. et Moyano-Fuentes J., "Family owned firms: Risk loving or risk averse?", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 52, n° 1, 2007, p. 106-137.*
- [34]. Grote J., "Conflicting Generations : 'A New Theory of Family Business Rivalry'", *Family Business Review*, vol. 16, n° 2, 2003, p. 113-124.
- [35]. Habbershon T.G. et Williams M.L., "A Resource-Based Framework for Assessing the Strategic Advantages of Family Firms", *Family Business Review*, vol. 12, n° 1, 1999, p. 1-25.
- [36]. Habbershon T.G., Williams M.L. et MacMillan I.C., "A unified systems perspective of family firm performance", *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18, 2003, p. 451-466.
- [37]. Hall A., "Strategizing in the Context of Genuine Relations : An Interpretative Study of Strategic Renewal Through Family Interaction", *JIBS Dissertation Series 018*, Jönköping, Sweden, Jönköping International Business School, 2003.
- [38]. Handler W.C., *Managing the family firm succession process : The next generation family member's experience*, Graduate School of Management, Boston, Boston University, 1989.

- [39]. Hoopes D.G. et Miller D., "Ownership Preferences, Competitive Heterogeneity, and Family controlled Businesses, *Family Business Review*", vol. 19, n° 2, 2006, p. 89-101.
- [40]. Jensen M.C. et Meckling W.C., "Theory of the Firm: Managerial Behavior, Agency Costs, and Ownership Structure", *Journal of Finance Analysis*, 3, 1976, p. 305-360.
- [41]. Johnson S.C., "Why we'll never go public", *Family Business*, vol. 1, n° 4, 1990, p. 16-21.
- [42]. Jorissen A., Martens R., Laveren E. et Reheul A.M., "Real Versus Sample-Based Differences in Comparative Family Business Research", *Family Business Review*, vol. 18, n° 3, 2005, p. 229-246.
- [43]. Kellermanns F.W. et Eddleston K.A., "Feuding Families : When Conflict Does a Family Firm Good", *Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice*, vol. 28, n° 3, 2004, p. 209-228.
- [44]. Kets de Vries M.F.R., "The dynamics of family controlled firms: The good and the bad news", *Organizational dynamics*, 21, 1993, p. 59-71.
- [45]. Klein S.B., Astrachan J.H., Smyrnios K.X., "The F-PEC Scale of Family Influence : Construction, Validation and Further Implication for Theory", *Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice*, May 2005, p. 321-339.
- [46]. Koiranen M., "Over 100 Years of Age But Still Entrepreneurially Active in Business : Exploring the Values and Family Characteristics of Old Finnish Family Firms", *Family Business Review*, vol. 15, n° 3, 2002, p. 175-187.
- [47]. La Porta R., Lopez-de-Salanes F., Shleifer A., "Corporate ownership around the world", *Journal of Finance*, vol. 54, n° 2, 1999, p. 471-517.
- [48]. Lee J., "Family Firm Performance: Further Evidence", *Family Business Review*, vol. 19, n° 2, 2006, p. 103-114.
- [49]. Levison H., "Conflicts that plague family businesses", *Harvard Business Review*, vol. 49, n° 2, 1971, p. 90-98.
- [50]. Levering R. et Moskowitz M., "The Ten Best Companies to Work for in America", *Business and Society Review*, vol. 85, n° 1, 1993, p. 26-38.
- [51]. Litz R.A., "The Family Business : Toward Definitional Clarity", *Proceedings of the Academy of Management*, 1995, p. 100-104.
- [52]. Lumpkin G.T., Martin W. et Vaughn M., "Family Orientation : Individual-level Influences on Family Firms Outcomes", *Family Business Review*, vol. 21, n° 2, 2008, p. 127-138.
- [53]. Lyman A.R., "Customer Service : Does Family Ownership Make a Difference ?", *Family Business Review*, vol. 4, n° 3, 1991, p. 303-324.
- [54]. Maheraut L., « Des caractéristiques financières spécifiques aux entreprises familiales noncotées », *Revue du financier*, 114, 1998, p. 59-75.
- [55]. Mazzola P., Marchisio G., Astrachan J., "Strateging Planning in Family Business : A Powerful Development Tool for the Next Generation", *Family Business Review*, vol. 21, n° 3, 2008, p. 239-258.
- [56]. McConaughy D., Matthews C. et Fialko A., "Founding family controlled firms : Performance, risk, and value", *Journal of Small Business Management*, 39, 2001, p. 31-49
- [57]. McConaughy D.L., Walker M.C., Henderson G.V. et Mishra C.S., "Founding Family Controlled Firms: Efficiency and Value", *European Financial Management Association Meeting*, 1995.
- [58]. McConaughy D., Walker M., Henderson G. et Mishra C., "Founding family controlled firms: Efficiency and value", *Review of Financial Economics*, 7, 1998, p. 1-19.
- [59]. Meyer M. et Zucker L.G., "Permanently Failing Organizations", Newbury Park, CA : Sage. Miller D., Le Breton-Miller I., "Challenge versus Advantage in Family Business", *Strategic Organization*, vol. 1, n° 1, 2005, p. 127-134.
- [60]. Miller D., Le Breton-Miller I., Lester R.H., Cannella A.A., "Are Family Firms Really Superior Performers ?", *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 2007, 13, p. 829-858.
- [61]. Miller D., Le Breton-Miller I. et Scholnick B., "Stewardship vs Stagnation : An Empirical Comparison of Small Family and Non-Family Businesses", *Journal of Management Studies*, vol. 45, n° 1, 2008, p. 51-78.
- [62]. Mitchell R.K., Morse E.A. et Sharma P., "The Transacting Cognitions of Non Family Employees in the Family Businesses", *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18, 2003, p. 533-551.
- [63]. Molly V. et Laveren E., "Goals and Dimensions of Familiness as Driving Forces for the Identification of a Family Firm Typology", *EIASM Family Firm Management Research workshop, Jönköping, 3-5 juin 2007*.
- [64]. Mosen J.R., "Ownership and Management : The Effect of Separation on Performance", *Business Horizons*, vol. 12, n° 4, 1969, p. 46-52.
- [65]. Morck R. et Yeung B., "Agency Problems in Large Family Business Groups", *Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice*, summer, 2003, p. 367-382.
- [66]. Mustakallio M., Autio E. et Zahra S.A., "Relational and contractual governance in family firms: effects on strategic decision making", *Family Business Review*, vol. 15, n° 3, 2002, p. 205-222.
- [67]. Rosenblatt P.C., deMik L., Anderson R.M. et Johnson P.A., *The family in business : Understanding and dealing with challenges entrepreneurial families face*, San Francisco, Josey-Bass, 1985.
- [68]. Salvato C. et Melin L., "Creating Value Across Generations in Family-Controlled Businesses : The Role of Family Social Capital", *Family Business Review*, vol. 21, n° 3, 2008, p. 259-276.
- [69]. Schein E.H., "Organizational Socialization and the Profession of Management", *Industrial Management Review*, vol. 9, n° 2, 1968, p. 1-16.
- [70]. Schulze W.S., Lubatkin M.H., "Exploring the Agency Consequences of Ownership Dispersion Among Inside Directors at Family Firms", *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 46, n° 2, 2001, p. 179-194.
- [71]. Schulze W.S., Lubatkin M.H. et Dino R.N., "Altruism and Agency in Family Firms", *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2000, p. 11-15.
- [72]. Schulze W.S., Lubatkin M.H. et Dino R.N., "Altruism, Agency and the Competitiveness of Family Firms", *Managerial and Decision Economics*, 23, 2002, p. 247-252.
- [73]. Schulze W.S., Lubatkin M.H. et Dino R.N., "Toward a theory of agency and altruism in family firms", *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18, 2003, p. 473-490.
- [74]. Schulze W.S., Lubatkin M.H., Dino R.N. et Buchholtz A., "Agency Relationships in Family Firms: Theory and Evidence", *Organization Science*, vol. 12, n° 2, 2001, p. 99-116.
- [75]. Shanker M.C. et Astrachan J.H., "Myths and realities : Family businesses' contribution to the U.S. economy", *Family Business Review*, vol. 9, n° 2, 1996, p. 107-119.
- [76]. Sharma P. (2004), "An Overview of the Field of Family Business Studies : Current Status and Directions for the Future", *Family Business Review*, vol. 17, n° 1, 2004, p. 1-36.
- [77]. Sharma P., Chrisman J.J. et Chua J.H. (Eds), *A review and annotated bibliography of family business studies*, Assinippi Park, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1996.

- [78]. Sharma P., J.J. Chrisman J.J. et Chua J.H., Strategic “Management of the Family Business : Past Research and Futures Challenges”, *Family Business Review*, vol. 10, n° 1, 1997, p. 1-35
- [79]. Sundaramurthy C., “Sustaining Trust Within Family Businesses”, *Family Business Review*, vol. 21, n° 1, 2008, p. 89-102.
- [80]. Swinth R.L. et Vinton K.L., “Do Family-owned Businesses have a Strategic Advantage in International Joint Venture ?”, *Family Business Review*, vol. 6, n° 1, 1993, p. 19-30.
- [81]. Tagiuri R. et Davis J.A., “Bivalent Attributes of the Family Firm”, *Family Business Review*, vol. 9, n° 2, 1996, p. 199-208.
- [82]. Thomas J., “Freeing the Shackles of Family Business Ownership”, *Family Business Review*, vol. 15, n° 4, 2002, p. 321-336.
- [83]. Trehan N., « Usage de la société holding par des entreprises personnelles et familiale: application aux entreprises de moyenne dimension pratiquant une stratégie de croissance externe », IXe conférence Internationale de Management Stratégique, Montpellier, 2000.
- [84]. Van Auken H. et Werbel J., “Family Dynamic and Family Business Financial Performance: Spousal Commitment”, *Family Business Review*, vol. 19, n° 1, 2006, p. 49-63.
- [85]. Vera C.F. et Dean M.A., “An Examination of the Challenges Daughter Face in Family Business Succession”, *Family Business Review*, vol. 18, n° 4, 2005, p. 321-345.
- [86]. Villalonga B., Amit R., “How Do Family Ownership, Control and Management Affect Firm Value ?”, *Journal of Financial Economics*, vol. 80, n° 2, 2006, p. 385-417.
- [87]. Ward J.L., “Keeping the Family Business Healthy: How to Plan for Continuing Growth, Profitability and Family Leadership”, San Francisco, CA Jossey-Bass, 1987.
- [88]. Ward J.L., “The special role of strategic planning for family businesses”, *Family Business Review*, vol. 1, n° 2, 1988, p. 105-107.
- [89]. Ward J.L., “Growing the family business: Special challenges and best practices”, *Family Business Review*, vol. 10, n° 4, 1997, p. 323-337.
- [90]. Ward J.L. et Aronoff C.E., “Trust gives you the advantage”, *Nation’s Business*, vol. 79, n° 8, 1991, p. 42-45