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Abstract

Within the family business literature, research unequivocally focuses on the impact of the family entity on the business entity (e.g. Bennedsen, 2015). This thesis is aligned with several earlier studies (e.g. Ram, 2001) which place the family unit at the heart of the analysis. Such approaches have been successful in demonstrating that family relationships can have an impact on work relations (e.g. Fletcher, 1997), though the influence of family relationships in the context of next generation employment preferences has yet to be explored. Whilst the succession literature accounts for offspring who assume a role within the family business, those who seek opportunities beyond its remit have been ignored. Where the next generation have been the subject of empirical work in related fields of study (e.g. ethnic entrepreneurship, see Kourtit and Nijkamp, 2012), it is frequently assumed that their motivations are rational economic ones i.e. better employment prospects than the previous generation. Furthermore, it is also assumed that these can only be found beyond the remit of the family business. This thesis answers a call from Masurel and Nijkamp (2004), who highlight that previous attempts to understand the differences between first and second generation employment preferences have yet to pay specific attention to family relationships and whether these encourage the next generation towards the family business, or deter them from it.

The research framework was explored among five Italian families, each of which were involved in the catering sector. Multiple family members from each family were interviewed and combined to produce a narrative of each family. In some cases, the next generation were now responsible for the family catering business, leading it to new heights. In other cases, the next generation had forged successful careers beyond the remit of the family business. Not all of the stories, however, were happy ones. In one family, next generation family members were forced to work at the family business from as young as eight years old and, in doing so, considered themselves to have been robbed of their childhoods. Whilst some of the siblings fled the UK at the earliest opportunity, others were less fortunate and their father dictated their entire lives, including who his daughters married.

The strongest theme to emerge was that of family obligations to supply labour. It is owing to these family obligations that the next generation often considered themselves 'already in' the family business. Rather than a decision to become involved in the family business, the next generation are instead confronted with the reality of exiting the family business, which some offspring find challenging. The thesis demonstrates that family relationships are no less important that other (often rational economic) influences. As such, when family relationships breakdown they can provide the key driver for the next generation to seek opportunities beyond the family business. However, the drivers behind next generation decision making are numerous and the thesis provides a typology of next generation employment preferences to complement the typology of retirement styles developed by Sonnenfeld (1998).
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1. Introduction

This thesis features the following: a mother who placed the needs of her husband before that of her children; an unruly child who despite his father’s best intentions, failed to achieve academically and was left with no alternative but to become a chef; a household who lost everything and became bankrupt when the patriarchal figure gambled away their newfound fortune; a father who controlled his children’s entire lives, including who his daughters married; and a century old business whose legacy is under threat through a lack of involvement from the next generation. Only in the domain of the ‘family’ can such rich and remarkable narratives be unearthed, and it is with the family that this thesis is chiefly concerned.

This thesis addresses next generation employment preferences within family businesses. The purpose of the research is to pay explicit attention to family relationships in exploring the employment preferences among next generation family members. The thesis therefore seeks to better understand the decision faced by the next generation and how and in what ways family relationships steer the next generation towards involvement in the family business or away from it. As much of the literature surrounding the next generation is founded upon rational economic assumptions, exploring the influence of family relationships can provide an understanding of how and in what ways non-economic motives can be powerful drivers for this decision. My personal interest in the topic stems from a lineage of family business ownership spanning several generations and this is explored in due course.

The chapter begins by positioning the research among the extant literature regarding family businesses and states the rationale for the approach adopted in exploring next generation employment preferences. The chapter then outlines the thesis aims and objectives and my own personal interest in the research. The chapter concludes with a brief summary of how the thesis is structured.

1.1. Rationale

Family businesses are fundamentally different to any other form of business (Astrachan and Shanker, 2003; Sorenson, 2000) as they witness the interaction of two separate but connected realities: the family; and the business (Bowman-Upton, 1991; Dyer and Handler, 1994). However, family business research is unequivocally interested in the impact of the family on the business rather than vice versa. This is evident among research on family involvement which has adopted several economic measures such as business growth (e.g. Schulze et al., 2001), stock market performance (e.g. Bennedsen et al., 2015) and value creation (e.g. Bennedsen et al., 2007) to examine the impact that family members have on family business' financial performance indicators. The thesis counters a trend within family business research by adopting the 'family' as the unit of analysis. The thesis is not alone in placing the family at the heart of the analysis. Notable contributions include the works of Ram (1994; 2001) among others (e.g. Baines and Wheelock, 1998; Fletcher, 1997; Holiday, 1995) who have explored family or 'household' relationships and their impact on work
relations. However, family relationships have yet to be explored within the context of next
generation employment preferences.

The employment preferences of the next generation have received attention within the
succession literature. This stream of literature is concerned with how family businesses
achieve strategic renewal and survive the transition process to the next generation. As such,
much research has focused on the survival rates of family businesses across generations
(e.g. Stamm and Lubinski, 2011) and a variety of prescriptions have been offered to assist
the ease the process of generational change (e.g. Sardeshmukh and Corbett, 2011). As
family business involvement is a pre-requisite for succession, the next generation has
received limited attention in this context i.e. extending to those who share an appetite for
employment in the family business. By implication, those who seek opportunities beyond
the remit of the family business have been neglected within the family business literature.

The next generation have received attention within the context of ethnic entrepreneurship.
This is due to the correlation of self-employment that has been noted among migrant
entrepreneurs and their offspring which continues to outstrip that of their native counterparts
(Andersson and Hammarstedt, 2011). This is often attributed to the improved
opportunity structures enjoyed by the next generation, suggesting that they are voluntary
entrepreneurs as opposed to resorting to self-employment out of economic necessity i.e. a
last resort (Baycan-Levent et al., 2002; Ram, 1992). A plethora of research which explores
the sector preferences and business entry motives of the next generation has emerged since
(Kourtit and Nijkamp, 2012). Small business ownership is not universally desired, however,
as Metcalf, Modood and Virdee (1996) note how some cultural groups have encouraged
their offspring into the professions and salaried careers. Regardless of the destination at
which the next generation arrive, the field of study assumes that offspring are motivated by
a rational economic motive i.e. better employment prospects than their parents. Furthermore,
it assumes that the next generation have to search elsewhere for such
prospects (e.g. in new and non-traditional sectors, see Baycan, Sahin and Nijkamp, 2012) as
these cannot be found within the remit of the family business. This thesis answers a call
from Masurel and Nijkamp (2004) who highlight that previous attempts to investigate the
differences between first and second generation employment preferences have yet to pay
specific attention to the relationships between these generations (parent-child). In doing so
the thesis adopts a sociocultural approach to exploring next generation preferences and is
one which lies in stark contrast to the much of the research which has gone before it which
is founded upon rational economic assumptions. Whilst positive advances have been made
in trans-generational research (e.g. Getz and Petersen, 2004), these advances are yet to
place family relationships at the heart of the decision making process.

Birley (2001) reports that family businesses are interpreted differently across cultures. In
addition, Astrachan, Klein and Smyrnios (2002) stress that a definition of ‘family’ is often
absent within most family business definitions. This is particularly problematic in an
international context, where cultural understandings of family are likely to differ across
geographical boundaries. In a similar manner to how universal definitions of what
constitutes a family business are deemed inappropriate, it would seem equally misguided to
assume that the concept of family is universally understood. In response to this criticism, the research framework was explored on a single cultural group i.e. Italians, to strengthen the contribution of the thesis. It is argued that participants belonging to a common national culture will have a common understanding of the term 'family', thus allowing the relationships within this family unit to be explored without the interference of cultural variations.

In total, 20 participants were interviewed across five Italian families. The interpretative approach adopted is concerned with how the accounts of these five families can improve understanding of how family relationships serve to influence next generation decision making, rather than whether or not these families are representative of families per se (Italian or otherwise). It is necessary, however, to acknowledge the ways in which this Italian influence amplifies the complexity of studying next generation decision making as there are numerous influences at work including those that are cultural, migratory and industry specific. Any thesis which contributes towards understanding family relationships needs to be clear about how and in what ways these context specific factors serve to encourage the next generation towards involvement in the family business, or deter them from it.

1.2. Aim

To explore the influence of family relationships on next generation employment preferences in family businesses.

1.3. Objectives

1) Establish a conceptual framework from which next generation decision making can be explored.

2) Conduct semi-structured interviews among multiple family members in multiple Italian families operating in the catering sector

3) Critically evaluate the influence of family relationships on next generation decision making and discuss whether family harmony serves to encourage family business involvement, or discourage it.

4) Develop a typology of next generation employment preferences.

1.4. My story

My experience in the realm of family businesses stems from a lineage of self-employment which is central to the Telling family history. Whilst previous generations had endeavoured
in the butchery trade, more recently, my grandfather - Alfred John Telling (or Jack, as he is commonly known) bucked this trend by entering the building industry. Jack was a joiner by trade and had been self-employed in the building industry since 1952, initially by himself and later building houses with a business partner. When this partnership separated in the years that followed, my grandfather founded the business A.J. Telling which employed a host of labourers and tradesman whose primary task was building houses. Among his employees was his eldest son, my father John Telling, who had joined the business as a bricklayer and in doing so, a family business was forged. In 1983, my father was gifted an ownership stake in the family building business and the name was amended to A.J. Telling & Son. In 1990, my grandfather retired leaving the family business to my father (who now owned the business entirely), though the core business was now general building work rather than building houses. This is the family business (i.e. in its post-1990 form) that I recall from my youth.

I do not recall the precise age at which my involvement in the family business commenced, however, it was well-established by the time I reached secondary school (aged 12). I was introduced to helping my father at weekends when my parents decided to extend the family home after they had acquired a piece of land adjacent to it. This was a project lasting several years as the work could only be performed at weekends. The tasks I performed were menial ones such as digging foundations, mixing concrete and moving bricks and other building materials from place to place. As I progressed through secondary school I was invited to join my father at building sites, typically at residential properties though occasionally at business properties. For example, I recall undertaking much work at hospitals and medical centres due to the contacts which my father had at the time. I only ever joined my father after school, at the weekend or during school holidays, thus my involvement never interfered with my education. Furthermore, my labour was rewarded in the form of pocket money which I recall being my primary motivator at the time. On reflection, however, working under the close supervision of my father gave me time with someone who was otherwise a busy man. My father often spent the evenings invoicing for work completed or estimating for future work, and busied himself at the weekend extending our family home.

As I progressed to sixth form college (aged 17), the nature of my responsibilities evolved. My parents had purchased a laptop computer to support my further studies and this proved to serve the family business also. Unlike my father, I was computer literate and my responsibilities therefore came to include invoice and estimate preparation. Through my efforts my father was able to save costs on the administrator which he employed on an ad hoc basis. Furthermore, being personally responsible for such documents arouse my curiosity in the financial aspects of the business and led to this partly inspiring my choice of degree upon reaching university. The above discussion has served to highlight that involvement in the family business is something that I can relate to personally. Whilst the nature of the work was physically tiring, it was an 'obligation' of sorts that I undertook voluntarily. This was evident to me at the time because similar obligations were bestowed upon my elder brother throughout his youth and despite being eight years my senior, on
rare occasions, we were all present on a job together. My sister, the eldest of three, was always exempt from this.

A future within the family business was never an employment prospect which I contemplated. This was due to a number of reasons. First, I was actively discouraged from the building trade by my father. On numerous occasions, he iterated that the working hours were long and that working outside during the cold winter months could be particularly unpleasant. Put simply, it was not a life that he recommended for his children. Second, my parents always encouraged me to aim high in education instead. Third, I had personally witnessed the negative aspects of small business ownership on my father’s health and well-being. For example, I recall that my father was hospitalised for a week during my 11th or 12th birthday, a result of the stress that accompanied running his own business. In sum, involvement in my father’s business did not discourage me from seeking opportunities outside of its remit. However, my passion for researching family businesses perhaps stems from the involvement described above. The indirect influences of family business involvement are equally evident in the case of my elder brother, Jonathan, who continues to work in the construction industry, albeit as a quantity surveyor.

1.5. Structure of the thesis

Chapter 2 reviews the family business literature with particular focus on the effects of family involvement in the business as well as the heavily researched topic of succession. The chapter also reviews related fields of study to explore the cultural and structural forces which are understood to influence next generation decision making. A conceptual framework is developed which captures the possible drivers at work among the next generation and whether these encourage offspring towards the family business, or deter them from it.

As the thesis places the family at the heart of the analysis, it is necessary to consider the literature surrounding the sociology of the family which is the focus of chapter 3. Furthermore, as the research framework was explored among Italian families in the UK, a number of factors serve to amplify the complexity at work. Therefore, chapter 4 discusses these factors within the context of next generation decision making. Attention is given to three factors, namely: Italian culture; a history of migration; and a history in catering.

Chapter 5 reviews the methodological approaches which have gained primacy within the family business literature and how a qualitative approach was preferred as a result. The merits and demerits of the interview process, which included participants drawing a family tree and a timeline, are discussed in detail. Furthermore, the ethical challenges encountered are discussed with particular attention given to how pseudonyms were developed to ensure anonymity and how participants were safeguarded from emotional harm. In total, 20 participants were interviewed and their accounts were combined to create five narratives, one per Italian family.

Chapter 6 is the first of such narratives and introduces a husband and wife who operated an Italian restaurant business for almost two decades. This restaurant became their life.
Fortunately, the restaurant was purchased by their youngest son in 2005 who has extended the family’s tenure at the restaurant taking it to dizzying new heights. However, their eldest son’s preference for paid employment as an IT professional lies in stark contrast. The chapter demonstrates that whilst the employment paths of their sons differ remarkably, the brothers share a common upbringing in which they were totally immersed in their father’s business dealings.

Chapter 7 introduces the Falsone family and a restauranteur turned property magnate who amassed a fortune in student accommodation. Envisioning a career in the professions for his only son, the restauranteur was disappointed when he opted to make it as a chef instead. Two generations of restaurant ownership later, the family’s spell in the restaurant business is now under threat as the next generation view restaurant work merely as a back-up plan to their ambition for a career in the performing arts.

Chapter 8 outlines a family who lost everything when the patriarchal figure squandered the wealth he had accumulated in the restaurant business. The Frusciante family were only able to rebuild their fate through the involvement of his wife at their new restaurant BBs which the couple have operated since 1997. However, the restaurant’s labour supply relied heavily on the couple’s three daughters and whilst two of these now operate restaurant businesses of their own, the paths that have led them to restaurant ownership have often been to the detriment of family harmony.

Chapter 9 features the Galetta family whose accounts reveal that family business involvement can occur at a very young age. These next generation family members consider themselves to have been robbed of their childhoods and family relationships suffered as a result. The chapter illustrates that it was owing to this breakdown in family relationships that the next generation sought opportunities beyond the remit of the family business, thus allowing them to escape their fate at their father’s restaurant business.

Chapter 10 consists of the Maroni family whose family business is a larger concern than those found in previous chapters and is one that is steeped in a rich history. In the 1950s, the family were the largest ice cream producers in Europe though later generations have since steered the business towards retail catering and the business now employs 2,000 people across 130 sites. The narrative reveals a tendency to follow in parental footsteps which lead towards the family business, even among those of the next generation who are well educated.

Chapter 11 illustrates that the strongest theme to emerge from the five Italian families was that of family obligations to supply labour. As family obligations often predate next generation decision making, understanding of this topic (as implied in related fields of study) is inaccurate and is therefore reconceptualised accordingly. At the heart of this reconceptualisation is the influence of family relationships, which can play a key driver in next generation decision making. The chapter also offers a typology of next generation employment preferences to account for the different types uncovered within the narratives.

Chapter 12 considers how the thesis has contributed to knowledge within the family business literature and related fields of study. The limitations of exploring the research
among Italian families involved within the catering sector are reviewed. Avenues for future research are identified and practical recommendations are made to the family business community.
2. Family Businesses

2.1. Introduction
The following chapter reviews the family business literature in order to understand how involvement in the family business provides one of three employment options for the next generation. The narrative reveals that employment options beyond the remit of the family business include paid employment elsewhere or self-employment. These three employment options are central to the conceptual framework advanced later in the chapter and the possible drivers for each option are discussed in detail.

The chapter demonstrates that within the family business literature (and related fields of study), a rational economic approach often underpins much of the work in this area. This assumes that the next generation are lured towards the employment option they deem to be the most lucrative one available among alternatives. Whilst researchers exploring non-economic drivers have provided interesting lines of enquiry, these do not yet extend to the influence of family relationships itself. As a result, it is currently unknown to what extent family relationships serve to encourage the next generation to become involved in the family business, or deter them from it.

2.2. Definitions and prevalence rates
Family businesses have “long existed before the genesis of historians and economists” (Wang, Ahmed and Farquhar, 2007: 173). Despite this observation, it is only in the last few decades that academic interest towards the family business has grown and a body of literature and research has emerged as a result. Handler (1989) states that family businesses represent the dominant form of business in society. Bhattacharya and Ravikumar (2001) agree with this sentiment, though offer some reservations. The authors conceptualise the family business as a household performing a specific business skill. As such, each generation faces the choice of bequeathing this business skill to the next generation, or selling the business. Payne (1983) notes that this particular form of business organisation led to the accomplishment of Britain’s Industrial Revolution and in doing so, highlights the historical specificity in viewing the family business from this particular standpoint. Consequently, Bhattacharya and Ravikumar (2001) bestow family businesses with a degree of importance, but limit their significance to the early stages of a nation’s economic development and as markets develop, their dominance diminishes resulting in family businesses representing the exception rather than the rule in developed economies.

The importance bestowed upon family businesses has not been ignored. Researchers have put forward that it is owing to their economic and social impacts that they warrant study in their own right (Churchill and Hatten, 1997; Heck and Trent, 1999). Englisch (2016) claims that family businesses provide a vehicle through which the family can live out its family values and realise their ideals. Evidence from 525 family businesses across 21 countries suggests that with each successive generation, families increasingly seek to perpetuate the founder’s values (Englisch, 2016). Therefore, this suggests that the commitment to the
family’s heritage grows stronger over time. Importantly, this distinguishes family businesses from their non-family counterparts. Research on family businesses often deals with the topic of long-term survival (e.g. Stamm and Lubinski, 2011). This, Casson (1999) argues, is because dynastic motives (i.e. to keep the business in the family) often prevail. Habbershon and Pistrui (2002) note the wealth creation function of family businesses in their approach and highlight how this wealth often spans generations. It is for this reason that family businesses have often been researched in the context of macroeconomic indicators. Family businesses are deemed to be a significant force in the US economy and worldwide (Gomez-Mejia et al., 2007; Sardeshmukh and Corbett, 2011). Astrachan and Shanker (2003) estimate that family business in the US contribute 57% towards employment numbers and a similar proportion of total Gross Domestic Product. Other research has reported similar figures, namely, that family businesses account for between 40% and 60% of USA Gross Domestic Product and upwards of 50% of employment (Getz, Carlsen and Morrison, 2004; Wang, Ahmed and Farquhar, 2007). Furthermore, Astrachan and Shanker (2003) estimate that in most economies, family businesses represent two-thirds of all enterprises. However, Beckhard and Dyer (1983a) report that 90% of all businesses in the US are family businesses, whilst other estimates are much more conservative (Heck and Trent, 1999). This variation is because prevalence rates are contingent upon the definition of family business adopted.

The difficulty in quantifying family businesses and their economic impact stems from the lack of a universally agreed upon definition as to what constitutes a family business (Astrachan and Shanker, 2003). Various criteria have been employed by researchers including: the percentage of family ownership; strategic control; the involvement of multiple generations; and the intention for the business to remain in the family. Litz (1995) offers that use of the term ‘family business’ is likely to stir considerable confusion and Astrachan and Shanker (2003) attribute this to the private nature of family businesses which makes them elusive. As a consequence, accurate information about them is not readily available. Handler (1989) pointed out that family businesses often appear in a variety of forms. For instance, family businesses range from small, informal shops to large, formal, public corporations. Any definition, therefore, “needs to be specific in how it accounts for these various forms” (Handler, 1989: 258).

Litz (1995) claims that whilst some businesses are clear examples of family businesses, others are less obvious. Inevitably, academics became critical of the family versus non-family dichotomy. Instead of one inclusive definition, a range of family definitions were deemed more appropriate (Sharma, 2004). Such definitions, it is argued, should capture the varying extent and mode of family involvement in these businesses. Among the first to adopt this new paradigm were Astrachan, Klein and Smyrnios (2002), who agreed that the qualities and characteristics which constitute family businesses were more appropriately measured via a continuous scale, rather than a dichotomous one. Of importance is not whether a business is family or non-family, “but the extent and manner of family involvement in and influence on the enterprise” (Astrachan, Klein and Smyrnios, 2002). Building on their earlier work, Astrachan and Shanker (2003) created a range of definitions from a broad, inclusive definition to a narrow, more exclusive definition. The level of inclusiveness is bound to the perceived degree of family involvement in the business. A
‘broad’ definition encompasses family businesses with little direct family involvement, though control of strategic direction is maintained and family participation exists on some level. Occupying a ‘middle’ ground is the definition which captures ‘some’ family involvement. Typically, a founder or descendant runs the company with the intention for it to remain in the family. Finally, a ‘narrow’ definition is offered to account for those businesses with high family involvement. This definition embraces multiple generations with more than one member of the owner’s family with management responsibility. Using this framework, Astrachan and Shanker (2003) were able to extrapolate the number of family businesses based on their range of definitions. Findings suggest that the broad, middle and narrow definitions represent 89%, 39% and 11% respectively, of all businesses operating in the US according to a sample of 2000 business tax returns. Naturally, Astrachan and Shanker (2003) concluded that the more restrictions imposed (i.e. the narrower the definition), the lower the prevalence rate.

On a critical note, though the terms ‘family business’ and ‘business family’ are potentially used synonymously, academic research is unequivocally granted to examining the impact of the family on the business rather than vice versa. Consequently, there is a paucity of research which advances with the family as the unit of analysis and this is precisely where the thesis seeks to contribute. As such, whether the family businesses included in this thesis constitute family businesses according to the various definitions on offer is of little concern to this thesis. Moreover, the thesis is chiefly tasked with exploring the influence of family relationships on (the decision regarding) next generation employment preferences. For the purposes of this thesis, the fact that a family business exists represents one employment option among several for next generation family members.

2.3. Family involvement

Dyer and Handler (1994) stress that the capital required to fund a business venture is likely to come from personal or family wealth. Therefore, the extent to which the family is willing to support the venture is of critical importance. Dyer (1992) asserts that the financial uncertainty that accompanies entrepreneurship is often deemed as too much of an encumbrance for the family to bear. As such, another family member may come forward at the start-up stage of the new business venture to offer the following advantages: initial costs and early losses may be shared; later success is of benefit to the wider family; the family can be together; and trust. Ward and Aronoff (1990) add other advantages including control over the growth strategy pursued, a long term outlook on the business and a buoyant labour supply can be found within the family unit. As such, family businesses have long since involved a range of family members – both immediate and extended – from multiple generations and in a variety of roles from non-working shareholders to front-line employees (Carlock and Ward, 2010)

However, it is this family involvement that presents a conundrum for family business scholars. Whilst some researchers highlight the trust, perseverance and commitment of family members that are pivotal to the venture’s success (Dyer, 1992; Ward and Aranoff, 1990), others deem that family involvement is “antithetical to effective business practice”
(Dyer and Handler, 1994: 75). Academics have offered that this leads to irrational behaviour and corruption (Dyer, 1994; Perrow, 1972) which hinders family business survival and growth (Kets de Vries, 1996; Schulze et al., 2001).

Family businesses are fundamentally different to any other form of business (Astrachan and Shanker, 2003; Sorenson, 2000) as they witness the interaction of two separate but connected realities: the family; and the business (Bowman-Upton, 1991; Dyer and Handler, 1994). Conflicts often begin due to the overlap of these two entities (Miller and Le Breton Miller, 2005; Sorenson, 2000). Managing the inherent conflicts that the intersection of these two entities present has proven fertile ground for academics. As such, scholars have researched complex family business issues such as primogeniture (i.e. when responsibility for the business falls to the eldest son), sibling rivalry, the recruitment and retention of non-family employees, special treatment of family members and the qualifications of family members who assume roles in the business (Bowman-Upton, 1991; Levsin, 1971; Sciascia and Mazzola, 2008; Shepherd and Haynie, 2009; Sorenson, 1999; Sorenson, 2000; Ward, 2004). When areas of potential conflict (see table 2.1) are not properly managed, marital conflict, neglect of children and divorce are all possible outcomes (Dyer and Handler, 1994).

Table 2-1 - A comparison of family systems and business systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Conflict</th>
<th>Family Systems</th>
<th>Business Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Development and support of family members</td>
<td>Profits, revenues, efficiency, growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Deeply personal, of primary importance</td>
<td>Semi personal or impersonal, of secondary importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules</td>
<td>Informal expectations - “that’s the way we’ve always done it”</td>
<td>Written and formal rules, often with rewards and punishment spelled out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Members rewarded for who they are; effort counts; unconditional love and support</td>
<td>Support conditional on performance and results; employees can be promoted or fired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succession</td>
<td>Caused by death or divorce</td>
<td>Caused by retirement, promotion, or leaving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dyer and Handler (1994)

The notion that family involvement impedes business performance has been supported by empirical work demonstrating that family appointments impact negatively on a variety of economic indicators including stock market performance (Bennedsen et al., 2015; Smith and Amoako-Adu, 1999), return of sales and assets (Morck, Stangeland and Yeung, 2000), value creation (Bennedsen et al., 2007; Villalonga and Amit, 2006) and positive abnormal returns (Perez-Gonzalez, 2006). Furthermore, this empirical work was conducted across several nations including Canada (Smith and Amoako-Adu, 1999; Morck, Stangeland and Yeung, 2000), the United States (Perez-Gonzalez, 2006; Villalonga and Amit, 2006), Denmark (Bennedsen et al., 2007), Thailand (Bertrand et al., 2008), and Hong Kong, Singapore and
Taiwan (Bennedsen et al., 2015) and therefore quashes concerns surrounding cultural specificity. Other criticisms have arisen, for example, that the destruction in business value that accompanies family involvement might be symptomatic of the market driven economies featured in each of the studies mentioned above (Xu et al., 2015).

Whilst the literature generally agrees that family involvement destroys value, McConaughy et al. (1999) represent a minority of studies which found that family involvement drives efficiencies and business value among family businesses. In a similar vein, O’Boyle, Pollack and Rutherford (2012) performed a meta-analysis of previous empirical work and found no relation between family involvement and business financial performance. Furthermore, the authors examined multiple moderating influences, none of which were statistically significant. Kim and Gao (2013) explored family involvement among a sample of 158 Chinese businesses, chosen due to the country’s strong familial culture, but found no direct effect on performance. The authors did reveal that a business’s family longevity goals positively moderate the relationship between family involvement and performance. Noting that family business succession studies seldom account for Chinese businesses (interesting given the strict one-child policy), Xu et al. (2015) found that second generation involvement enhances business performance. On a critical note, empirical work has yet to investigate the extent to which a potentially better educated second generation is responsible for increases in family business performance.

The majority of studies concerning family involvement have been conducted among large, corporate, family businesses often floated on the stock exchange market (e.g. Villalonga and Amit, 2006). As such, there is a paucity of research which focuses specifically on family involvement in smaller businesses. In sum, it appears that the negative aspects of family business operations are numerous including those impacting on the ‘business entity’ and those impacting on the ‘family entity’. Interestingly, research by Olson et al. (2003: 639) concluded that "the family had a greater effect on the business than the business had on the family". However, it is owing to a lack of rational economic motives from the outset that family businesses often enjoy limited economic success.

2.4. Family business motives
Figure 2.1 (page 13) demonstrates a variety of plausible motivations for owning a family business. Whilst the goal “to make money” appears to conform to the traditional, economic goal of the entrepreneur i.e. to profit maximise, other motivations appear to be non-economic in their origin. These include autonomy motivations to be one’s own boss, the pursuit of a desired lifestyle and the desire to achieve family goals. This distinction is substantiated by Katz (1995) who distinguished between ‘growth and profit’ entrepreneurs who measure their success by business size and growth, and ‘autonomy seeking’ entrepreneurs who are entertained at the prospect of being their own boss. Much of the literature on family businesses implies that motivations for growth do not exist in such businesses (Vesper, 1980). Donckels and Frohlich (1991) offer that their owners are ‘all-rounders’ and ‘organisers’ rather than ‘pioneers’, and for this reason their strategic behaviour is often more conservative. Indeed, Getz and Petersen (2005: 221) state that
“family businesses in particular are frequently assumed to be risk averse because they must place family security ahead of potential growth”. This desire to minimise risk can often impede the economic development of family businesses (Gomez-Mejia et al., 2007), with this conservatism being linked to a lack of growth (Zahra, 2005). It appears that this concern for family altruism (i.e. attending to the welfare of the next of kin) might lead family businesses to make decisions which lack a rational economic basis (Schulze, Lubatkin and Dino, 2003). Increasingly, family businesses are conceptualised according to the degree to which they exhibit a ‘business first’ or ‘family first’ orientation (see Leenders and Waarts, 2003). In sum, the literature indicates that some family businesses neither desire nor achieve growth (Getz and Petersen, 2005). Instead, growth aspirations are superseded by the desire for a consistent living (Smith, 1967). Of interest is the prevalence rate of this tendency to place lifestyle or family-first (see Getz, Carlsen and Morrison, 2004) motives ahead of economic motives, and in particular, how this plays out across different industries.

Figure 2-1 - Motivations for family business ownership

- To keep the family together
- To be financially independent
- To avoid unemployment for family
- To make money
- To be own boss
- To provide retirement income
- To achieve lifestyle desires

Source: Getz and Petersen (2005)

Middleton (2001) argues that micro businesses employing fewer than ten people, represent 95% of all tourism businesses in Europe, many of which do not wish to grow their businesses as they are formed for lifestyle reasons. Lashley and Rowson (2010) report that Blackpool’s tourism sector is dominated by small businesses employing few staff. These comprise the efforts of owner managers who enlist the help of family members and friends (Walton, 1994) to operate their hotels. Getz, Carlsen and Morrison (2004: 4) define a family business as “any business venture owned and/or operated by an individual, couple(s) or family”. The hotels described above, like many British seaside resorts (Clegg and Essex, 2000; Coles and Shaw, 2006), can be considered family businesses according to such a definition. Such businesses are dominated by personal or lifestyle motives (Getz and Carlsen, 2000; Lashley and Rowson, 2010; Thomas et al., 2000), which are twice as prevalent in rural areas as in urban areas (Bransgrove and King, 1996). Classical entrepreneurial motives are found to exist in just one in eight small businesses in this sector (Lashley and Rowson, 2007). From a survey of 200 family owned hospitality and tourism related businesses in Australia, Getz and Carlsen (2000) found that the principal motive for establishing a business pertained to lifestyle enhancement and the desire to reside in a rural area. In a similar vein, Getz and Petersen (2005) confirm that lifestyle and autonomy goals predominate small hospitality and tourism businesses in their study of two resort areas in Canada and Denmark. The
authors further offer that ‘growth oriented’ entrepreneurs existed as a minority and preferred a certain type of business (i.e. accommodation and restaurants), presumably those perceived to offer the best profit and growth potential.

Economists have long since acknowledged that "individual economic agents may have conflicting goals" (Radner, 1975: 254) over the lifecourse of a business and these goals may not always involve seeking maximum profits. Radner (1975) draws on optimal search theory to explain how entrepreneurs search for profits can be 'adjusted' according to their aspiration levels. Once this aspiration level of profits has been achieved, some entrepreneurs will stop searching for profits beyond this level. This is a process known as 'satisficing', a term first introduced by Simon (1956) which blends the words satisfy and suffice (see Manktelow, 2000). The satisficing entrepreneur will therefore cease their search for additional profits once the acceptability threshold or aspiration level has been achieved. This is because they are not willing to put in the effort to search for optimum profits, presumably due to the priority they have attached to other goals. The small hospitality and tourism businesses discussed above then, and the lifestyle entrepreneur discussed within them (see Ateljevic and Doorne, 2000; Hall and Rusher, 2004; Morrison, Baum and Andrew, 2001) can be understood as 'satisficers'. It is precisely these lifestyle goals that serve as the non-economic motivators that are of equal or greater importance than purely economic reasons for running a business. As Lynch (2011: 509) notes, understanding these “life aspirations is critical to explaining the economic performance of the commercial organisation”. The commercial homestay hosts that formed part of Lynch’s (2011) in-depth study in New Zealand, were tolerant of highly seasonal business and a ‘take-it-or-leave-it’ approach was often adopted to allow family life (presumably deemed to be more important) to continue as normal with minimal interruption. Some academics have questioned whether such small business operators are worthy of the title 'entrepreneur' since their behaviour (i.e. acceptance of sub-optimum profits) cannot be regarded as sufficiently entrepreneurial (see Morrison, Rimmington and Williams, 1999). Such individuals were likely considered entrepreneurial at the outset of their ventures, for instance, alert to opportunities, assuming risk, assembling resources, though have since settled into a situation where other non-economic goals assume priority. Whilst the above discussion has served to illustrate that the profit goals of small hospitality and tourism businesses are often sub-optimum, a parallel stream of literature has emerged suggested that the skill sets of such operators are also far from optimum.

Lashley and Rowson (2010) report that many of those operating in the small accommodation sector lack hotel management or business experience and few have worked in the hospitality industry previously. Rather, these operations are often fuelled by the owner manager’s lifelong ambition of hotel ownership, the greater autonomy this will afford, or the perceived lifestyle that hotel ownership provides. As such, the skills required for effective business performance (including but not limited to marketing, people management, cost management and general business strategy) are often not implemented in businesses of this nature (Lashley and Rowson, 2007). Instead, those operating small accommodation businesses draw on the parallels between commercial and domestic hospitality in realising their hotel ownership ambitions (Lashley and Rowson, 2010). Put
simply, an ability to produce a small scale dining or accommodation experience for family and friends convinces those aspiring towards a lifestyle change that they are possessed with the skills required to reproduce this experience on a commercial scale for paying guests. However, empirical research suggests that seaside resorts like Blackpool witness 20% of their hotels transfer ownership each year (Clegg and Essex, 2000; Coles and Shaw, 2006; Lashley and Rowson, 2007), indicating that the aforementioned naivety can be costly. Parsa et al. (2005) report similar figures from the catering sector, that one in five restaurants fail within the first year of trading. Despite the importance that some have attributed to small, family owned businesses in hospitality and tourism in terms of job creation (Middleton, 2001), others have questioned the economic contribution of such businesses to local communities (Harrison and Leitch, 1996) stating that lifestyle entrepreneurship can negatively impact on the economic health and social fabric of the communities in which they operate (Dewhurst and Horobin, 1996).

In summary, the low entry barriers offered by tourism and hospitality sectors have been successful in attracting those seeking lifestyle change and a better quality of life. However, the traditional goals of entrepreneurship, to profit maximise and grow the business, often proves absent among these family businesses. Instead, these micro business owners are better understood as lifestyle or autonomy seeking. Despite often risking a great deal in their efforts to make their dreams a reality, research has demonstrated that those operating small hospitality and tourism businesses are often ill-equipped for the task. Inevitably, a high failure rate accompanies such efforts in this regard. Nevertheless, when small, family owned businesses do find the recipe for success and are able to enjoy longevity, their long-term survival becomes threatened by what has been termed the ‘biological imperative’ and the widely researched issue of succession.

2.5. Succession
Churchill and Hatten (1997) refer to the 'biological imperative' as the inevitability of human mortality. In the context of owner-manager businesses, the longevity (or fate) of the enterprise is inextricably bound with the life of the founder. The assumption being that upon the death or retirement of the founder, the enterprise would cease to exist unless ‘succession’ has taken place. In general management literature, succession is understood as the process of replacing one leader with another (Bass, 1990) for the purpose of achieving organisational and strategic renewal (Haag, Helin and Melin, 2006). In family businesses, the death or retirement of the founder threatens the ability of the business to endure hence the appointment of a successor presents a viable solution. However, Churchill and Hatten (1997) assert that besides the involvement of family members which characterise family businesses, they are further distinguished from their non-family counterparts due to non-market based transfers of power. This means that successors are often appointed due to biological and familial impulses rather than market driven, arms-length transactions. It appears then, that family business succession employs a different logic which explains why “CEO succession in family businesses often coincides with ownership succession” (Haag, Helin and Melin, 2006: 4). Nevertheless, scholars argue that succession is a top priority for family
businesses (Barach and Ganitsky, 1995; Chua, Chrisman and Sharma, 2003; Handler, 1992; Ibrahim, Soufani and Lam, 2001; Lee, Lim and Lim, 2003) and the issue of their long-term survival is among the most researched topics in the family business literature (Stamm and Lubinski, 2011).

Researchers are reluctant to view succession as a one-off event, preferring instead to conceptualise succession as a process which takes time (Handler, 1994; Gersick et al., 1997; Sharma, Chrisman and Chua, 2004). This process begins at the initiation phase when the founder expresses wishes to retire from their position of power, through a partnership or joint management phase, to the final phase which witnesses the founder retire and power transferred to the successor (Cadieux, Lorrain and Hugron, 2002; Churchill and Hatten, 1997; Murrey, 2003). However, successful succession is far from a simple exercise. Barach and Ganitsky (1995) observe that succession is often problematic as it can be a lengthy, strategic process during which operational and educational challenges are faced by the succeeding generation. In order to prosper, successors must understand the family values, exploit special competencies as well as develop their own set of expertise. Miller, Steier and Le Breton-Miller (2003) offer that at the heart of problematic succession is an inappropriate relationship between the organisation’s past and present. This, the authors argue, is the fault of the successor who fosters a strong attachment with the past and either completely rejects the present or fails to effectively blend the past tense with the present. In contrast, Dyer and Handler (1994) lay blame on the founding generation, offering that it is the founding entrepreneurs reluctance to plan for succession that ultimately results in the business’ downfall. Furthermore, Barach and Ganitsky (1995) provide that succession involves a variety of stakeholders and maintain that successful succession rests upon the mutual compatibility of these stakeholders.

Regardless of accountability, “academia and industry mourn the demise of the family business with each successive generation” (Janjuha-Jivraj and Woods, 2002: 77). Ward (1997) notes the widespread perception that family businesses struggle to survive over the long term. Transition to the next generation, it appears, is a feat achieved by few family businesses (Sardeshmukh and Corbett, 2011) with critics sceptical of survival beyond the founding generation (Lansberg, 1988; Lee, Lim and Lim, 2003). Stamm and Lubinski, (2011: 118) warn of the rise and decline of family businesses in three generations and the similar adage “from clogs to clogs in three generations”. This is the idea that the founding generation (e.g. grandfather) establishes the family business, the next generation develops it (i.e. son or daughter) and the generation that follows destroys the business (e.g. grandchild). However, the authors reviewed literature from 114 peer-reviewed journal articles and dissertations and observed the oft cited formula: “only 30% of family businesses survive into the second generation, and even less than 10-15% make it to the third generation” (Stamm and Lubinski, 2011: 118). Similar survival rates – and exact wordings – are reported in 28 of the articles/dissertations. However, none of the contributions presented evidence from their own empirical investigations. Rather, they relied on quoting the famous figures from other authors, principally Beckhard and Dyer (1983a, 1983b). This gives the impression of a well-documented empirical base when scant evidence exists. Furthermore, the figures have been quoted well beyond their original context creating the
impression that family business survival rates are consistent across country, business size, and other factors.

Employing a different approach, Ward (1997) argues that family owned businesses allow themselves to be destroyed over time due to the inaction of their owner-managers. For long established family businesses, growth is often difficult to achieve as the markets, competition and technologies now faced are in stark contrast to those encountered upon founding the business. The author offers that when growth is achieved, this may not be sufficient to satisfy the economic wishes of a family growing in both size and lifestyle expectations. Ward (1997) further asserts that the failure to deviate from once successful paradigms adopted by the founding entrepreneur may also constrain growth and eventually destroy the business. To add further complexity, as the family acquires new additions (e.g. in-laws) each with their own goals and aspirations, this dilutes the decision making power and commitment to business ownership within the family and jeopardises future success. In reviewing ownership configuration, Ward and Dolan (1998) report that US family businesses conform to the owner-managed and sibling partnership type, 54% and 41% respectively, whilst the cousin collaborative type is represented by only 5% of the total population. Though each new generation presents additional complexity for the family business (Lambrecht and Lievens, 2008), the figures provided by Ward and Dolan (1998) suggest that this particular issue is not one faced by the majority of US family owned businesses. On a critical note however, Ward and Dolan (1998: 306) ask “when is a sibling partnership really a cousin collaborative, and when is a cousin collaborative really a sibling partnership” suggesting that of significance is not the familial relationship but the effect on the ownership structure and collective voting power.

The perspective of the next generation is a vibrant theme within succession literature. Barach and Ganitsky (1995) assert that the next generation assumes responsibility for both the leadership and direction required by the family business, whilst ensuring the character of the business is preserved. During this process, the successor will confront various operational and education challenges. Therefore, succession poses a steep learning curve for those who wish to assume the mantle. Sardeshmukh and Corbett (2011) examined the inertia of family businesses and the resulting lack of growth by surveying 615 manufacturing businesses in the US, and in doing so draw parallels with Ward’s (1997) notion of inaction on the part of founders. However, Sardeshmukh and Corbett (2011) extend that opportunity recognition is central to the survival of family businesses with new generations at the helm. They offer that both business specific and general human capital is required in order to identify and exploit opportunities to revive the family business. General human capital is required to develop knowledge and apply management principles in new organisational contexts, whilst business specific capital can be developed through experience working within the family business. The authors conclude that internal successor grooming is necessary to produce fertile organisational conditions under which strategic opportunity recognition can flourish.

Barach and Ganitsky (1995) note that succession involves multiple stakeholders and its success rests upon the mutual compatibility of key participants. Lansberg (1988) provides
that suppliers and customers who have cultivated strong business relationships with the founding owner may resist forging new relationships with the next generation. Fortunately, much of the extant literature on succession offers various frameworks and prescriptions regarding how to administer this thorny process successfully including: adopting a ‘family as investor’ mindset (Habbershon and Pistrui, 2002); acknowledging goal incongruence between generations, achieving fulfilment of needs (career, psychosocial and life-stage) and achieving mutual respect with the predecessor (Handler, 1992); introducing simplicity into ownership and daily management in a process described as ‘pruning the family tree’ (Lambrecht and Lievens, 2008); multiple interventions to address resistance from stakeholders (Lansberg, 1988); and the development of structures such as a family council or succession task force (Lansberg, 1988; Miller, Steier and Le Breton Miller, 2003).

The above narrative serves to highlight that much of the literature on succession has been discussed within the context of large scale organisations where management succession is often equated with ownership succession (see Haag, Helin and Melin, 2006). This is represented by segment 7 of Tagiuri and Davis’ (1982) model (see figure 2.2, page 19), reserved for family members who are both employed within the business and have an ownership stake. However, the thesis is not solely concerned with successors. The remit of the thesis extends to all family members (regardless of whether they have an ownership stake in the business or are employed within it) and therefore focuses on segments 4, 5, 6 and 7. The thesis is not concerned with segments 1, 2 and 3 as these segments do not belong to the family. The thesis focuses on all manner of next generation family members employed within the family business, from those performing menial tasks to those with a more executive function. The umbrella term of 'involvement' will be used hitherto when referring to this broad spectrum of employment within the family business.

Much of the literature regarding succession implies that those who become involved do so willingly, preferring that problematic succession can be explained by poor planning (Dyer and Handler, 1994), inaction (Ward, 1997) and skills shortages (Sardeshmukh and Corbett, 2011) and solved by implementing prescriptions such as those discussed above (see Lambrecht and Lievens, 2008; Lansberg, 1988; Miller, Steier and Le Breton Miller, 2003). It is therefore implied within such prescriptions that the successor shares the same rational economic objectives as those found within business, the solution therefore being a rational economic one. Fewer studies have considered that problematic succession is non-economic in origin. Of notable mention are the works of Handler (1992) who offers that need fulfilment, goal incongruence between generations and lack of mutual respect between founder and successor are chief among the reasons why succession is often problematic. Put simply, the literature does not entertain the prospect that involvement in the family business is an act entered into involuntarily. However, when considering involvement (rather than exclusively succession) it is not so difficult to imagine circumstances whereby a family member assumes an employment role within the family business due to parental pressure/expectation to continue the family dynasty or to reduce the reliance on (paid) non-family labour. In this circumstance, next generation employment preferences have been driven by non-economic motives (e.g. to help the family) rather than traditional rational economic motives (e.g. to make money via a viable employment option). This is a
fundamental starting point for the thesis as never before has the influence of family relationships been considered in the context of next generation decision making.

Figure 2-2 - The three circle model of family business

2.6. A typology of retirement styles
Dyer and Handler (1994) offer that the resistance of founders to plan for succession is chief among the reasons for why family businesses fail to survive beyond the founding generation. The authors argue that the very act of succession planning contradicts many of the characteristics necessary for entrepreneurship to thrive in the first instance. This includes the entrepreneur’s need for achievement, control, power and meaning. Dyer and Handler (1994) state that entrepreneurs do not relish the prospect of retirement as this entails that power must be relinquished. As such, succession is conceptualised as a change in the power relationships (Dyer and Handler, 1994) or a series of role adjustments (Handler, 1990) between the founder and next generation family members. When founders are reluctant to relinquish their power, this can be to the detriment of their business. Based on interviews with 350 retired (often publicly well-known) chief executives, Sonnenfeld (1988) established a typology of retirement styles:-
As Sonnenfeld (1988) notes, the challenge of retirement has little to do with industry or management style and everything to do with the concept of self. Monarchs and Generals fail to plan for succession, deny or obstruct it, whilst Ambassadors and Governors enjoy a much healthier relationship with their previous employer as they are able to embrace the world outside of the workplace. Gilky (1989) notes the following:

“Among the lessons to be learned is that corporate heroes are considerably more vulnerable and dependent than we might have thought. For those who achieve heroic stature by cultivating their public image at the expense of their private self, retirement becomes tantamount to exile, and holding on is equivocal to survival”

Unable to depart from their businesses, Monarchs and Generals threaten to destroy the very thing they sought desperately to retain: their dignity, admiration by others and heroic stature. This is because their self-concept is over-reliant on their workplace and they struggle to forge new identities outside of it. Ambassadors and Governors provide more promising retirement styles as they are better able to deal with the discontinuities of change that retirement presents. Furthermore, their lack of dependence on their previous employer for self-esteem means that they are able to make further contributions to other
organisations down the line. Paradoxically, their ability to relinquish their power and their heroic mission (perhaps moving on to the next challenge) enables them to maintain their heroic stature (Gilkey, 1989). This, for Gilkey (1989) provides a key glimpse at the essence of power, “it is exercised most effectively by leaders who can exist most comfortably without it”.

Whilst a typology of retirement styles exists to account for the exit strategies of founding generations, there is a gap to develop a typology that accounts for the employment preferences of next generation family members (into the family business and otherwise). In a similar vein to how the founding generation are in some cases reluctant to relinquish their power, it is plausible that the next generation may be equally reluctant to enter the family business. However, a typology that accounts for the potentially varied appetites for employment in the family business is yet to be developed within the family business literature. Furthermore, the retirement style of the founder may have influence on the decision of the next generation family member, particularly within the context of small, family businesses. Carland et al. (1984: 358) provide that the small business owner "perceives the business as an extension of his or her personality" and state that this will consume the majority of the owners time and resources. With the lines between work, home and family life already blurred (Ward and Aronoff, 1990), it is possible that the nature of family businesses, namely, the immersion that often accompanies such businesses, makes departure even less appealing for small business owners. Put simply, it is possible that the retirement style of the founding generation may influence whether the family business is viewed as an appealing option by the next generation. As figure 2.3 (page 22) demonstrates, where high levels of family harmony exist, this may prove appealing for next generation family members who decide to become involved at the family business as a result. On the contrary, where an element of family discord exists involvement in the family business proves unappealing and family members seek employment opportunities elsewhere.
2.7. Next generation decision making

Naturally, involvement in the family business is likely to be one of several employment options available to next generation family members. In accounting for the family business concept, Tagiuri and Davis' (1982) three circle model provides for both non-family employees and family members who are not actively involved in the business either as employees or owners. Given that this thesis concerns itself with how and in what ways family relationships influence next generation employment decisions, the matter of how non-family employees arrived at the family business is of little interest. Segments 1, 2 and 3 of Tagiuri and Davis' (1982) three circle model (see figure 2.2, page 19) are therefore of no relevance to this thesis. However, family members who pursue an employment path beyond the family business are of great interest to this thesis, specifically, the extent to which this is attributable to family relationships. Therefore, the thesis adopts a more focused conceptual framework, outlined in figure 2.4 (page 23), to explore family influences on next generation decision making. The framework provides for three employment options: involvement in the family firm; self-employment; and paid employment elsewhere. In doing so, the framework draws parallels with Zellweger, Sieger and Halter's (2011) study of career choice intentions among next generation family members with family business backgrounds. Whilst the employment options/career choice intentions conceptualised in this study are alike, the influence of family relationships on this process were exempt from the authors investigation.
Assuming that the family business continues to operate when offspring reach working age, involvement in the family business provides one option of employment (not necessarily a default option) for next generation family members. As aforementioned, the term 'involvement' is preferred as scholars have noted that family members (both immediate and extended) can assume a variety of roles in the family business including shareholders, board members, working partners, advisors and front line employees (see for example, Carlock and Ward, 2010). The use of the term involvement therefore captures a range of activity in the family business rather than that limited to full time paid employment but implies that the individual family feels 'involved' and part of proceedings. Involvement in the family business represents the most widely researched employment option available to next generation family members as family involvement is a pre-requisite to succession, which remains a top priority for family businesses (Barach and Ganitsky, 1995; Chua, Chrisman and Sharma, 2003; Handler, 1992; Ibrahim, Soufani and Lam, 2001; Lee, Lim and Lim, 2003; Stamm and Lubinski, 2011).

The second employment option available to next generation family members is one which harnesses the family's flair for enterprise, albeit beyond the remit of the family business. Put simply, the next generation can opt to pursue self-employment by launching a new venture. Whilst this option has been neglected in the domain of family business literature, the correlation of self-employment across generations has received attention in related fields of study, particularly where ethnic minority businesses are concerned (for example, see Sahin and Nijkamp, 2012). The tendency of next generation ethnic minority groups to move away from traditional areas of economic activity (see Baycan, Sahin and Nijkamp, 2012) and
pursue entrepreneurship voluntarily rather than as a last resort (see Ram, 1992) are among the issues considered in the following section.

The third and final employment option available to next generation family members is the more traditional avenue of employment i.e. paid employment in an organisation elsewhere. This has received the least attention in academic literature, save for an interest in how some cultural groups encourage their offspring into professional and salaried careers rather than towards enterprise (see Metcalf, Modood and Virdee, 1996).

To recap, the thesis considers the influences of family relationships (between the parent generation and the next generation) on next generation decision making. Within the family businesses literature, family relationships have received scant attention in the family business literature and are therefore due for a closer inspection. The thesis will explore the role of family relationships alongside other contextual factors to consider whether the current conceptualisation of next generation decision making (i.e. a choice of three employment options) as implied in related fields of study, is an accurate one. While the issue of family involvement has received considerable attention in the narrative thus far, employment options beyond the family business have yet to be considered and will now be discussed in turn.

2.8. Ethnic entrepreneurship

As the research framework was explored among Italian families, it is important to acknowledge any sociocultural drivers which may influence the employment preferences of the next generation. In order to do so it important to discuss the topic of ethnic entrepreneurship which Valdez (2008) defines as business ownership among immigrants, members of an ethnic group, or both. The historical conditions giving rise to ethnic entrepreneurship have been noted by Waldinger, Howard and Ward (1990) who point to the influx of migrant workers in Western economies in the years following the Second World War. As these migrants began to settle, an ethnic community evolved creating demand for specific ethnic goods and services, some of which could only be supplied by co-ethnic individuals privy to the tastes and preferences of their own community. Thus, ethnic entrepreneurship emerged as an attempt by members of these ethnic communities to service this co-ethnic demand. However, Kesteloot and Mistiaen (1997) suggest that over time ethnic minority businesses extend their clientele beyond the ethnic niche and begin to service demand which originates from outside of the ethnic group.

Barrett, Jones and McEvoy (1996) argue that ethnic minorities have been over-represented in small business ownership figures when compared to members of the indigenous population. The situation at present appears to be largely unchanged as Moules (2014) reports that migrants are responsible for one in seven business start-ups in the UK. Furthermore, the business created by these migrant entrepreneurs are responsible for 14% of new job creation. A similar situation has been reported in the United States by Fairlie (2012: 2):-
“Over the last 15 years, while native-born Americans have become less likely to start-up a business, immigrants have steadily picked up the slack. Immigrants are now more than twice as likely as the native-born to start a business and were responsible for more than one in four (28%) US businesses founded in 2011, significantly outpacing their share of the population (12.9%).”

Since these observations, a plethora of research has emerged comparing entrepreneurship levels of ethnic minority groups (Altinay and Altinay, 2008; Basu and Altinay, 2002; Smallbone et al., 2003; Whitehead, Purdy and Mascarenhas-Keyes, 2006). More recently, ethnic groups outperform the native population in the UK as – despite their minority status – they are responsible for one in seven business start-ups (Moules, 2014). Table 2.3 clearly demonstrates that in comparison, White life-long residents are the least entrepreneurially active group in the UK, though the group leads numbers in terms of established business ownership.

Table 2.3 - Distribution of Engagement in Entrepreneurial Activity Levels among UK Working Age Population by Ethnicity and Origin (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White life-long resident</th>
<th>White regional migrant</th>
<th>White immigrant</th>
<th>Non-white life-long resident</th>
<th>Non-white regional migrant</th>
<th>Non-white immigrant</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>83.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intenders^</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nascent*</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New¥</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established¥</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^ Intenders = Those with an intention to start a business in the next three years but no activity
* Nascent entrepreneurs = Those whose businesses have been paying wages for not more than three months
¥ New business owners = Those whose businesses have been paying wages for more than three months but not more than 42 months
¥ Established business owners = Those whose businesses have been paying wages for more than 42 months


Several large scale quantitative studies have suggested that ethnicity plays a significant but small role in explaining the propensity to start-up a business, whilst one’s country of origin might account for some of the variance (see for example, Levie, 2007). However, such studies relied on very broad ethnic groups (e.g. White and non-White or White Mixed, Asian, Black or Other) which combine vastly different cultural groups (e.g. Pakistani and Chinese in the ‘Asian’ category) (Levie and Hart, 2011). These cultural groups often employ different acculturation strategies and have different views on their entrepreneurial outlook. For example, Borooah and Hart (1999) found that Indians males are less assimilated than Black Caribbean males and therefore view the UK as a ‘workplace’ rather than a ‘home’. Other work has found that Black Americans are over-optimistic in assessing the likeliness
that they will realise their self-employment aspirations in the future (Kollinger and Minniti, 2006).

An explanation would suggest that the offspring of migrant families, assuming that they are born in the UK, are no more likely to engage in entrepreneurship than other life-long residents. However, they may be privy to cultural influences based on the family's cultural profile. Researchers are therefore interested in the role played by culture, with Ram (1997: 149) asking the following:-

“...is ethnic minority enterprise a routinely rational economic activity no different from other small-scale business endeavours? Or is it a distinctive small business phenomenon, demonstrating the importance of ‘cultural’ resources in fuelling entrepreneurial activities?”

Traditionally, the business entry decision is motivated by the status, rewards and independence (pull factors) that self-employment and small business ownership affords, or by the lack of alternative options for employment (push factors). Ram (1992) alternatively theorises this decision in terms of ‘necessity entrepreneurship’ and ‘opportunity entrepreneurship’. In accounting for the tendency towards small business ownership among migrant groups, opinion falls into two broad camps: culturalism; and structuralism. Culturalism highlights that certain ethnic groups have culturally determined features resulting in a propensity to favour self-employment over paid employment (Masurel, Nijkamp and Vindigni, 2004). Such features might include dedication to hard work, a strong sense of community, thrift, acceptance or risk, compliance with social value patterns, solidarity and loyalty, and an orientation towards self-employment. Ethnic groups equipped with such features enjoy a strong cultural resource which facilitates entry into self-employment and small business ownership. In contrast, structuralism points to the external factors (the opportunity structures) encountered in the host environment (Masurel, Nijkamp and Vindigni, 2004). This approach draws heavily on social disadvantage theory which suggests that upon arrival in their migration destination, immigrants encounter unfavourable circumstances which steer them into self-employment, as few viable alternatives prevail. Examples of unfavourable circumstances include the experience of racism in the work place (see Grant and Sweetman, 2004; Pendakur and Pendakur, 2000; Picot, 2004; Reitz, 2001) and barriers to entry in the labour market posed by language deficits or the devaluing of foreign credentials and work experience (see Basran and Zong, 1998; Grant and Nadin, 2007; Krahn et al., 2000). Consequently, self-employment arises as the solution to unemployment.

As researchers look to entrepreneurship levels among the next generation, the extent to which “the cutting edge of this entrepreneurial drive has been blunted” (Dhaliwal and Kangis, 2006: 92) is of great academic interest. The melting pot approach (in its extremity suggests that ethnic groups are ‘melted down’ and stripped of their native culture and traditions, replaced instead with the cultural features and traditions of their host society (McDonald, 2007). Others argue that ethnic groups are able to remain distinct (in some aspects) from members of the indigenous population (Fuchs, 1990; Jacoby, 2004). The reality depends on the acculturation strategy employed by the migrant population (see...
Berry, 1994) and the accultruation orientation adopted by the host society (see Berry, 2001) For example, there is evidence to suggests that certain Asian groups in the UK “closed ranks” (Dhaliwal and Kangis, 2006: 94) as opportunities for integration with the wider host population were either lacking or unwanted. As such, these groups were successful in maintaining the culture and traditions reminiscent of their country of origin whilst taking advantage of the fertile economic landscape that the UK economy afforded. However, should the next generation begin to identify with the values and anchors of the host society than acculturation is said to have occurred. Indeed, research suggests that second generation migrants tend to identify more strongly with their host culture and participate more in mainstream society than in their host culture activities, compared with their parents (e.g. Grant, 2007). From a culturalist standpoint, the cultural resource which second generations rely on to fuel their entrepreneurial endeavours is therefore diluted.

Whilst the migrating generation is frequently assumed to undertake ‘forced entrepreneurship’ opting for self-employment out of necessity, later generations are thought to undertake ‘voluntary entrepreneurship’, initiating business ownership to exploit an opportunity (Baycan-Levent et al., 2002). Ram (1992) supports this notion arguing that for later generations, the decision to initiate entrepreneurship is out of choice rather than as a last resort. Therefore, it can be inferred that the opportunity structures confronted by the next generation are more favourable for later generations, particularly where education is concerned. Dhaliwal and Kangis (2006: 94) stress that “the educated second generation has probably graduated from British universities and often achieved professional status”. During the period 1989 to 1997, which witnessed the 1992 transition of many polytechnics into universities, the higher education student population doubled (O’Leary, 2007). Given that higher education numbers increased significantly, of interest is the extent to which ethnic minorities are represented in these figures. A recent study of 50,000 UCAS applications across ethnic groups in the UK commented that “it is well established that black and ethnic minority groups go to university in good numbers” (Noden, Shiner and Modood, 2014: 1)”. However, the report concluded that applications by some black and ethnic minority groups were less likely to yield an offer when compared with their White British counterparts (controlling for range of variables including academic attainment). The study also revealed that candidates from some groups tend to be concentrated in less-prestigious institutions. Despite the apparent shortcomings of the UK higher education system, an education does appear to be a viable choice for black and ethnic minority groups. Once again this signals the existence of more favourable opportunity structures when compared with the migrating generation. For parents, Chiswick and Miller (1994) note that the age at arrival varies negatively with post migration educational attainment. Put simply, the younger a migrant on the age of arrival, the more promising is his/her educational attainment.
Table 2.4 captures the employment outlook for migrant generations compared with their offspring. From a culturalist standpoint, migrant generations identify strongly with their heritage culture thus providing them with a strong cultural resource with which to launch their entrepreneurial endeavours. On the other hand, structuralists would argue that it is the poor opportunity structures encountered that account for their prevalence in small business ownership figures. Regardless of which school of thought one subscribes to, this suggests that migrant generations are more likely to pursue small business ownership than traditional avenues of paid employment. By comparison, offspring are thought to have a diluted cultural resource to draw on and more favourable opportunity structures (e.g. better access to education), therefore one would expect the next generation turn away from self-employment and small business ownership and towards paid employment. On the contrary, it has been noted that the next generation of migrant families continue to be well-represented among entrepreneurship levels (Andersson and Hammarstedt, 2011; Baycan, Sahin and Nijkamp, 2012; Deakins, 1999; Kourtit and Nijkamp, 2012). However, they appear to have forsaken areas of ‘marginal economic activity’ (see Deakins, 1999) once occupied by their migrant parents in favour of new and non-traditional sectors including ICT and financial services (Baycan, Sahin and Nijkamp, 2012). This has marked the advent for research into the business entry motives and sector preferences of the next generation as they look to achieve modern break out strategies beyond traditional markets (Kourtit and Nijkamp, 2012). As the above discussion has illustrated, next generation family members must consider these two employment options against perhaps the most familiar option, involvement in the family business.

### 2.9. Early experiences

Whilst research on the influence of family relationships on next generation employment preferences is scant, research has developed on how early childhood experiences can lay the groundwork for entrepreneurship in later life. Dyer and Handler (1994) observe that research on entrepreneurship focuses mainly on two questions: who is an entrepreneur; and how he/she is able to create a viable enterprise. This often precludes an understanding of the environments (including family circumstances) that give rise to entrepreneurship. Family business research tends to concentrate on the end of an entrepreneur’s working life and the often problematic issue of succession. Dyer and Handler (1994) were among the first to draw attention to the relationships between entrepreneurs and their families and how these develop temporally, arguing that the two are inextricably linked. Figure 2.5 illustrates the points in time during which family and entrepreneurial dynamics often overlap:
Research on the entrepreneurial personality has revealed that the family dynamic is central to the development of certain personality traits associated with entrepreneurship. For example, the childhood of the entrepreneurs comprising Collins and Moore’s (1964) study were filled with accounts of poverty, insecurity and neglect. Furthermore, seldom was the father present within the family home. Such a childhood, Kets de Vries (1977) argues, generates a desire for control in these individuals and self-employment and small business ownership therefore arise as a means of gaining mastery over what they perceive to be a hostile and threatening world. This desire for control diffuses beyond the creation of the business and effects how the business functions (e.g. decision making, succession planning).

In a similar vein, McClelland (1965) gives primacy to upbringing in describing how parents who provide a nurturing, supportive yet challenging environment in the home develop children with a high need for achievement. It is this need for achievement that McClelland (1965) argues is required for entrepreneurship to flourish. On a critical note, it is important to highlight that notions of ‘achievement’ and ‘success’ are highly subjective terms. Success for the migrant community is often underpinned by the desire to improve one’s economic circumstances. Should this be done via drug dealing, one might be less inclined to attribute such an individual with the label of ‘success’ due to the adverse effects of the drug trade of others in society. Thus revealing the multi-faceted nature of terms such as achievement and success.

Dalton and Holdaway (1989) report that among the entrepreneurs they interviewed, many were burdened with significant family responsibilities as youngsters. Whilst in some instances this was a product of having little choice but to help the family financially, in other cases this was an attempt by parents to teach their children skills and the acceptance of responsibility. In conclusion, Dyer and Handler (1994) propose that whether one subscribes to psychoanalytical approaches which emphasise the ‘neurotic’ aspects of entrepreneurship (see Kets de Vries, 1977), or the nurturing, supportive parents which ignite entrepreneurial desires in their children (see McClelland, 1965), research must move beyond child rearing practices into the socialisation experiences which facilitate entrepreneurial behaviour.

Song (1997) notes that as children and family labour are notoriously important for the operation of ethnic minority businesses, the decision to initiate entrepreneurship maybe a reflection of this experience. Andersson and Hammarstedt (2011) attribute the correlation of self-employment across generations to the acquisition of informal business experience,

| 1) | Early experiences in the entrepreneur’s family of origin |
| 2) | Family involvement in the entrepreneur’s start-up activities |
| 3) | Employment of family members in the entrepreneurial business; and |
| 4) | The involvement of family members in ownership and management succession |

Source: Dyer and Handler (1994)
since offspring are exposed to a business environment and may develop managerial competencies. Other research has demonstrated that entrepreneurs emerge from homes in which the father or mother was self-employed (Dyer, 1992; Roberts and Wainer, 1968; Ronstadt, 1984) thus highlighting that parental role models seem to encourage entrepreneurial behaviour among children. As such, children with successfully self-employed parents are more likely to be self-employed than children of parents who are not self-employed. However, bequeathing self-employment aspirations to the next generation is not a feat which is universally valued as research by Metcalf, Modood and Virdee (1996) observed that Asian entrepreneurs often encourage their offspring into professional and salaried careers. This again questions the role of the business within the family’s wider aims as this preference for salaried employment by the next generation would entail the failure of the family business (to endure). However, should the next generation rely on the wealth created by the family business in launching their professional and salaried careers, the family business is arguably instrumental in this success. It appears then, that the current paradigm for defining success within the family business extends to the notion that it continues to be family run.

In sum, research focusing on the correlation of self-employment across generations has not ignored the influence of the family. As figure 2.6 (page 31) illustrates, research on family influences on entrepreneurial activity tends to focus on dichotomous accounts (e.g. wealth/poverty, security/insecurity, support/neglect). Where the next generation enjoy wealth, security and supportive parents, entrepreneurial desires emerge owing to a high need for achievement. Where the next generation suffer poverty, insecurity and neglect, entrepreneurial desires are equally likely, though owing to a desire to gain control over their world. However, research on early experiences is subject to two criticisms. First, focusing on extremes such as poverty and wealth implies that those who encounter financial stability (i.e. a middle ground) will have no entrepreneurial desires in later life. Second, such research appears to focus on the family circumstances at the expense of the quality of the family relationships. Therefore, this thesis answers a call from Masurel and Nijkamp (2004) who highlight that previous attempts to investigate the differences between first generation and second generation start-ups have neglected to pay explicit attention to the relationships (e.g. father-son) between these generations.
2.10. Parental influences
Zellweger, Sieger and Halter (2011) highlight that within the context of entrepreneurial career choice, studies focus on comparing founding entrepreneurs with their employees. In terms of family business succession, Birley (2008: 8) notes that there are "no instruments in the literature that deal directly with this particular topic, simply a number of assumptions about, for example, the early involvement of children in the business as a way of training for succession or the timing of retirement of the previous generation". Zellweger, Sieger and Halter (2011) contribute to this gap in understanding by investigating the determinants of career choice among students with a family business background, drawing on theory of planned behaviour to do so. The authors give primacy to factors such as locus of control and entrepreneurial self-efficacy in determining next generation family member's career intentions and their ability to realise them. The issue of how and in what ways parental influence informs this process, however, was not within the remit of the study.

The ability of dynamics within the family (e.g. conflict, attachment) to influence work and career decisions is well documented within the career development literature (Keller and Whiston, 2008), particularly in relation to children's vocational development (Bratcher, 1982; Lopez and Andrews, 1987; Zingaro, 1983). It is argued that adolescence is a pinnacle time for career development (Savickas, 2002), as during this time youngsters explore occupations and develop aspirations (Hartung, Porfeli and Vondracek, 2005), form beliefs about their ability to execute the behaviours required to achieve these (Turner and Lapan, 2005), and firm up their occupational interests (Tracey, 2002). Naturally, relational...
influences on these developments have been noted by researchers who have found that parental attitudes towards the world of work and specific careers may affect several aspects of adolescents' career development (Galambos and Silbereisen, 1987; McMahon, Carroll and Gilles, 2001; Peterson, Stivers and Peters, 1986; Turner, Stewart and Lapan, 2004; Young and Friesen, 1992). Whilst the quality of parent-child relationships has been studied within the context of career development (Hill, Ramirez and Dumka, 2003; Kracke, 1997; Rainey and Borders, 1997), this has been to a lesser extent and results have been less conclusive (Keller and Whiston, 2008).

In sum, the career development literature fully acknowledges the influence of parental relationships on next generation decision making, though this is yet to be the case within the family business literature. Given that parents have a vested interest in cultivating an appetite for family business involvement among the next generation should they wish the business to endure, parental influence on the decision making of next generation family members is therefore due for a closer inspection.

2.11. Conclusion

Figure 2.4 (page 23) demonstrated that the employment options available to next generation were threefold, namely: involvement in the family business; paid employment elsewhere; or self-employment. These are reiterated in figure 2. 7 (page 33) and are supported by a plethora of push and pull factors which have been discussed in the preceding narrative as potential drivers for each employment option presented.

Next generation family members who pursue an employment path beyond the remit of the family business have received scant attention in the family business literature. Instead, this group has been researched within related fields of study including ethnic entrepreneurship and migration studies. Such approaches are often grounded in a rational economic approach which assumes that the next generation enjoy more favourable opportunity structures (Baycan-Levent et al., 2002) and better access to education (Noden, Shiner and Modood, 2014) relative to parent (and in some cases, migrant) generations. As such, this entails that should the next generation engage in entrepreneurship, they are doing so voluntarily as opposed to a last resort or alternative to unemployment (Ram, 1992), the reality often faced by their parents. Similarly, should the next generation seek involvement in the family business or pursue education and salaried employment in the professions, a rational economic approach would assume that these family members are choosing this option because they deem it to be the most lucrative one available among alternatives.
Figure 2.7 - A conceptual framework for next generation decision making

Related fields of study have not neglected sociocultural influences and non-economic motives for pursuing employment both within and beyond the family business. For instance, Lansberg (1999) noted that the next generation often seek options beyond the family business as they do not share their parents' dream. Other accounts have explored how a tough upbringing can lead the next generation to pursue self-employment and small business ownership as a means of gaining mastery over what they deem to be a hostile and threatening world (Collins and Moore, 1964; Kets de Vries, 1977). However, as Masurel and Nijkamp (2004) note previous attempts to investigate the employment preferences of second generations have neglected to pay explicit attention to the relationships between both generations (e.g. parent-child). This thesis seeks to contribute to this gap in the literature by focusing on how family relationships influence next generation family members' decision between the three employment paths. For instance, in cases where family harmony exists, is this cited as a possible driver for becoming involved in the family business? Alternatively, in cases where family discord exists, is self-employment or paid employment elsewhere a preferred option because the family is not encountered in the workplace? At its extreme, do next generation family members seek these employment options as an escape route as this facilitates separation, both geographically and emotionally, from the family unit? The thesis will explore such research questions with a
view to developing a typology of next generation employment preferences to complement Sonnenfeld's (1988) typology of retirement styles for the founding generation.
3. Sociology of the family

3.1. Introduction
Previous chapters have explained how the thesis counters a trend in family business research by adopting the family as the unit of analysis. The thesis is not alone in doing so and previous contributions include the works of Ram (1994; 2001) among others (e.g. Baines and Wheelock, 1998; Fletcher, 1997; Holiday, 1995) who have studied family or 'household' relationships. However, such studies tend to represent the exception rather than the norm within family business research. More recently, there remains a call for research which places the family at the heart of the analysis (Calabra, 2018). As the thesis does precisely this, it is necessary to consider the literature surrounding the sociology of the family which is the focus of the following chapter.

The chapter begins by reviewing attempts to define 'the family' and the related concept of 'the household', before considering variations in family patterns and structure and how social change has come to impact on such things. The chapter then considers what is referred to as the 'dark side' of family life before dealing specifically with the themes of patriarchy, intimacy, family harmony and the moral economy.

3.2. Defining 'the family'
McKie and Callan (2012) argue that families are the oldest and most enduring form of social grouping. The family presents a sphere in which individuals can experience a range of emotions and intimate experiences, from cohabitation, marriage and parenting, to caring for a sick relative and sharing the grief of bereavement. As such, the family can provide a social group in which enjoyment and emotional fulfilment is experienced. By implication, however, families can equally be the source of unhappiness, tension and conflict.

In discussing families and personal life, Smart (2007) places emphasis on the affection and emotions evident in family relationships and asserts that these are often absent or downplayed from definitions of the family. Smart (2007) stresses, however, that emotions such as concern, love, sexual arousal, frustration, fear and excitement, are all present in everyday conversations about the family. Furthermore, Thernborn (2004: 1) explains that "a family is always an outcome of sexual relations past or current: no sex, no family". Whilst the advent of fertility treatments and technologies has allowed reproduction to occur without sexual activity, the author is successful in highlighting that the family serves as a regulator of sexual relations. For instance, the family provides some boundaries in terms of who can and cannot engage in sexual relations without the consequence of legal sanctions or social stigma. Table 3.1 (page 36) captures the various definitions used by sociologists when discussing the family in decades previous, though it should be noted that emotions and sex appear downplayed in such definitions, as Smart (2007) and Thernborn (2004) respectively, have argued.
Table 3.1 - Definitions of the family used by sociologists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murdock (1949)</td>
<td>The family is a social group characterised by common residence, economic cooperation and reproduction. It includes adults of both sexes, at least two of whom maintain a socially approved sexual relationship, and one or more children, own or adopted, of the sexually cohabiting couple.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giddens (1993)</td>
<td>A group of persons directly linked by kin connections, adult members of which assume responsibility of caring for children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldthorpe (1987)</td>
<td>A network of related kin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farlax (2018)</td>
<td>All the persons living together in one household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawson and Garrod (2009)</td>
<td>All the people we are related to by blood or marriage, the family of origin is the family we are born into</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Thatcher (1992)</td>
<td>The family is the building block of society. It's a nursery, a school, a hospital, a leisure place, a place of refuge and a place of rest...it's the preparation for the rest of our life and women run it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concise Oxford Dictionary</td>
<td>A set of parents and children, or of relations, living together or not.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Steel, Kidd and Brown (2012)

The notion that the family is universal is highly contested, however, a few common features are thought to exist (McKie and Callan, 2012; Steel, Kidd and Brown, 2012). First, families offer their members a common identity. This refers to a person's ability to distinguish themselves from others in society through being part of a discrete and separate family grouping. This common identity is able to transcend distance and time as members return to participate in family-focused celebrations (e.g. birthdays, weddings, funerals) where old memories are recalled and discussed and new ones are forged.

Second, economic cooperation is a feature common to most families and refers to the creation and allocation of resources across families. This ranges from earned income, to money from investments, government benefits (e.g. child benefit payments), employer benefits that extend to wider family members (e.g. health insurance for the employee and their family) as well as the provision of no cost care (e.g. childcare) and support. These exchanges link members across generations, for instance, the provision of no cost childcare by grandparents across various different cultures is a good example of this. Furthermore, this is not bound to the lifetime of family members as an estate is often created upon the death of a family member which is then inherited by the next generation.

Third, the birth of children is generally a milestone met with celebration in most families. Once reproduction occurs, the health and well-being of the next generation and rearing them to adulthood becomes a key priority for the family. Several family and non-family members (e.g. friends, neighbours) may participate in this process offering co-residence, the donation of clothing, informal care such as babysitting, help with transport or homework, and various sports activities and leisure pursuits. Reproduction therefore is a common characteristic of most families, challenged only by the decision to remain childless.
A fourth characteristic thought to characterise families is the provision of care work and domestic labour. This is linked to humans’ basic needs for food, sleep and the maintenance of basic hygiene. In times of illness and dependency, family members are often called upon to provide physical and emotional support and domestic labour. Historically, these forms of work have been carried out by adult women and girl children as the required labour has been associated with feminine skills.

Living under the same roof is thought to provide a fifth and final qualification for family membership, however, it is a fluid one. As offspring grow up and move out, perhaps with a view to establishing their own faction of the family, some of them may subsequently move back in. Whilst co-residence is therefore prone to changes over time, it nevertheless illustrates that one residence is usually considered to represent the family home, within which the various facets of family life play out.

A number of living arrangements serve to contradict many of the common features identified above. Migration, for instance, demonstrates how some extended families are able to continue family practices across continents and localities despite the luxury of co-residence being denied. Families can also be separated for other reasons including war, civil strife and natural disasters and the impact of these things on family practices has also been documented (e.g. Kilmer et al., 2009). Steel, Kidd and Brown (2012) note that whilst used interchangeably, the term ‘household’ has been adopted to describe the increasing variety of living arrangements which do not fit with the traditional view of the family. The Office for National Statistics (2017) define a household as “one person living alone, or a group of people (not necessarily) living at the same address who share cooking facilities and share a living room, sitting room or dining area. A household can consist of a single family, more than one family, or no families in the case of a group of unrelated people”. In contrast, the family is defined as “a married, civil partnered or cohabiting couple with or without children, or a lone parent, with at least one child, who live at the same address. Children may be dependent or non-dependent”. This suggests that being ‘related’ is a pre-requisite for family membership, whereas the term household is reserved for looser groupings of people.

3.3. Blood ties and kinship relations

Early definitions of the family (e.g. Murdock, 1949) place emphasis on ‘normal’, biological or natural kinship relations between heterosexual couples and their resultant offspring. Whilst this presents problems for more pluralist family forms (e.g. same-sex partnerships), it is successful in illustrating that much of one’s family is constituted through blood ties and biological membership. The link between immediate family members (e.g. parents and children) and that of grandparents and grandchildren are the most obvious examples of blood relationships and these relations are likely to live together or nearby (McKie and Callan, 2012). Blood ties therefore provide one basis for family membership.

The term ‘kinship’ is an important one in terms of establishing family membership. This term refers to “people who are related to each other by blood, marriage or adoption” (Steel, Kidd and Brown, 2012: 15). It acknowledges the aspects of family that we are ‘born into’ through
blood ties and descent, but also provides for how one’s family can be amplified by their decision to engage in marriage or adoption. Affinal kinship describes the relationship a person has to the blood relatives of a spouse by virtue of marriage or civil partnership. Affinity can exist in a variety of forms. Direct affinity refers to the core, legally recognised relationship (or cohabitation in societies which offer social recognition for durable relationships) between two adults. Collateral affinity, on the other hand, exists between a spouse and the relatives of the other spouse’s relatives (e.g. brother or sister-in-law). Affinity is important in various legal matters, for example, deciding whether to disqualify someone for jury service based on familial relationships and obligations.

Kinship provides a basis for understanding family membership, however, it is not always the determining factor. It is plausible to have kin that are not regarded as forming part of one’s ‘real’ family. For example, children of lone parent families are unlikely to include their absent mother/father in their version of the family. Equally, close family friends are often bestowed family membership through a common practice referred to as ‘fictive kinship’ and may be assigned labels such as aunt, uncle, sister or brother. In sum, defining the family is an inherently difficult process and is a task complicated by the constant changes that impact upon the family unit. Births, deaths and relationship breakdowns suggest that an individual’s family is not fixed, but rather in a constant state of flux (Giddens, 1992) and Gillies (2003) highlights that much of the sociological work on the family has revolved around the theme of change rather than continuity. Opportunities to work elsewhere, among other things, can lead to changes in parenting/living arrangements and this has proven fertile ground for researchers (e.g. Blaikie, 1998). Changes over time and across cultures have further complicated the task of defining the family. For instance, statistics from the Office of National Statistics (2016) suggests that 48% of children born in England and Wales are registered to unmarried parents. This is a noticeable increase from 5% in the mid-1950s during which it would have been considered “unacceptable and potentially stigmatising for the child” (McKie and Callan, 2012: 18). Compare this figure with the 2% of births registered to unmarried parents in Japan (The Economist, 2016) and it becomes clear that there a number of economic, political and socio-cultural forces impacting upon the family. As such, the family is responding to changes over time and varies across cultural groups.

A final word of caution is offered by Coltrane (1998: 5) who notes “we can never be quite sure what family means unless we understand the context in which it is being used”. The author highlights how the question, ‘Do you have a family?’ can be interpreted as an attempt to establish whether or not one is a parent, thus placing emphasis on parenthood. However, should this question be asked by a medical or social service provider it may be interpreted as an attempt to establish whether there is a family member available to contribute to physical, practical and emotional tasks associated with sick and elderly care, thus placing emphasis on love and affection. This demonstrates that depending on the context, notions about family may relate to its functional aspects (e.g. the provision of care) and at other times be more intricately bound with one’s sense of identity (e.g. as a parent).
3.4. The impact of social change on the family

Early views on the family can be described as adopting a functionalist perspective. Such views traditionally argue that the family plays a positive role in society, is a universal feature in society, and serves a number of important functions with that society. For Murdock (1949), the family performs four basic functions: sexual; reproductive; economic; and educational. The sexual and reproductive functions are among the most vital and pertain to providing a society with new members. However, this serves a wider remit of maintaining order and social control by limiting sexual relations to married couples. The economic function requires that a family provides a home, food and warmth to its members. Furthermore, this relies on the division of labour and economic cooperation between husband and wife, the former concentrating on economic production (e.g. work, hunting, farming) and the latter concentrating on domestic activities. Finally, Murdock (1949) stresses that the family is a vehicle through which the individual can learn about various aspects of culture (e.g. language, skills, values, norms). This prepares an individual for life within a certain culture and ensures that it is passed down from generation to generation, therefore adding a sense of social stability and harmony.

Parsons and Bales’ (1955) account of the family draws parallels with Murdock’s (1949) approach in that it acknowledges the socialisation function of the family in society and the division of labour within the home. Parsons and Bales’ (1955) label the husband the instrumental male who works in order to support his family. This world of work is stressful, hence the need for an expressive female who creates a cosy nest, where the husband is cared for, supported emotionally and understood. Parsons and Bales’ (1955) view is distinct from earlier work in that it acknowledges that the family serves as a safe haven – a place where workers can escape the daily toil of work (Steel, Brown and Kidd, 2012). In doing so, Parsons and Bales (1955) highlight the role of the industrial society encountered at the time of writing and as a result other scholars (e.g. Zaretsky, 1976) have since suggested that the family serves to reinforce capitalism by rearing and socialising the next generation of workers.

Steel, Kidd and Brown (2012) offer that conversations about the family often carry with them certain presumptions about the 'normality' of the family, surrounded by positive notions of romantic love and family harmony. Thus, beliefs around what is a normal family is therefore heavily influenced by ideology, the systematic set of beliefs that usually serve the interests of a particular group in society (Lawson and Garrod, 2009). Assumptions about the ‘normal’ family are heavily grounded in the functionalist tradition and usually involve the ‘nuclear’ family in which father, mother and children are all pictured living together, the father going out to work and the mother looking after the home and the family. This image or ideology is often referred to as the ‘Oxo’ family (see Henry, 2011) because it has been consistently used in adverts to sell these products and consists of a happy family consuming a meal together. Dominant ideologies suggest that alternative ways of thinking and behaving are unnatural or unusual. As such, the nuclear family has been encouraged as the ‘normal,’ ‘natural’ family type with other types of families often discouraged as undesirable. However, since the work of early functionalists (e.g. Goode, 1963; Murdock, 1949; Parsons and Bales, 1955) society has witnessed a number of social, economic and demographic
changes that have led to wide-ranging changes in family and household structures. Some of the most prevalent of these changes will be discussed in turn.

One of the most noticeable changes is the position of women in society. The UK has witnessed an increase in the number of women employed with 71.3% of women (aged 16 to 64) now represented in employment rates compared with 52.8% in the early 1970s (Office for National Statistics, 2018). Girls now outperform boys in education making up two-thirds of highest achievers at school (Telegraph, 2017a), with women 35% more likely than men to attend university (BBC News, 2016). As such, there have been considerable changes in women’s expectations as a result of these changes. Furthermore, reliable contraception has enabled women who wish to limit the size of their families the ability to do so (World Health Organisation, 2018) independently of their partner or spouse, human capital accumulation, labour market options and earnings (The Conversation, 2015). A by-product is that older parenthood is becoming a norm across the spectrum in society and not limited to the middle class as has traditionally been the case (The Guardian, 2018). Divorces in England and Wales increased recently for the first time since 2010, with opposite sex couples getting divorced at a rate of 8.9 per 1,000 married people (The Telegraph, 2017b). In sum, the greater choice enjoyed by women relative to decades previous, a trend towards older parenting and the possibility of divorce, mean that individuals may experience a variety of different family and household structures throughout one’s lifetime.

The relationships between generations have also witnessed change. Youth culture, described as the way that adolescents live and the norms, values and practices they share (Rice, 1996), has emphasised an independence of the younger generation to develop without the interference of parents (Steel, Kidd and Brown, 2012) and this brings into question the education (see Murdock, 1949) or socialisation function (see Parsons and Bales, 1955) of the family. The family is therefore no longer the sole means of preparing children for life in a particular culture and the internet, social media and video games have emerged as new, albeit addictive (see The Independent, 2017) vehicles through which children can learn about the society they live in.

The emergence of new and non-traditional family forms has also challenged traditional schools of thought on the family. Non-traditional families stem from parental separation or divorce and the formation of new cohabiting and marital relationships. Examples include families headed by single parents, cohabiting parents or step-parents and the impact on children being raised in such families has proven fertile ground for research (see Golombok and Tasker, 2015). New families refer to “a more fundamental shift from traditional family structures than do non-traditional families formed by relationship breakdown and reformation” (Golombok, 2015: 3). Examples include lesbian mother families, gay father families, families headed by single mothers by choice and families created by assisted reproductive technologies and surrogacy. Golombok (2015) offers that though new families are distinct from their non-traditional counterparts, they are not mutually exclusive. For instance, parents of children born through surrogacy or egg donation can still divorce and remarry to form stepfamilies. In sum, whilst the nuclear family was once heralded as the staple against which other families were measured, authors such as Golombok (2015) warn
that this particular family form is now in the minority. As such, the notion of the family as
the existence of one fixed type of family or household is obsolete with family pluralism, and
the existence of choice and diversity around families, is arguably the new ‘normal’ (Steel,
Kidd and Brown, 2012). Researchers have adapted their definitions of the family in response
to this new paradigm, offering looser definitions such as “a group of people love and care for
each other” (Carrington, 1999: 5). Alongside this there has been a shift in research focus
from understanding ‘being’ in a family to understanding what families ‘do’ and the practices
which they adopt (e.g. Finch, 2007). Regardless, families continue to offer their members
opportunities for long lasting and exclusive emotional bonding (Thernborn, 2004). It is
surprising then, that families play host to such inequality, particularly where women and
children are concerned.

3.5. Patriarchy
Historically, sociological research on the family has treated the concept as a unit, sharing
similar resources and life opportunities. However, Gittins (1993) highlights that feminist
research has been successful in demonstrating that men and women, boys and girls, do not
share similar life opportunities and just as there are difference between families, differences
within families also exist. Men have traditionally been defined in terms of their relationship
to work, hence the origin of many surnames (e.g. Smith, Taylor, Sawyer, Miller), though
women have for centuries been defined through their relationship to the kinship system
(Gittins, 1993). The term ‘family’ originates from the Feudal term ‘paterfamilias’ which can
be described as the male, and specifically paternal, dominance over all others in a
household. As such, Western notions of the family are predicated on the notion of the
husband/father as a patriarch, “the male head of a family or tribe” (Collins Dictionary, 2018).
Patriarchy can therefore be understood in terms of a gender and age relationship, based on
power, and is one central to understanding families (Gittins, 1993).

Implicit within paterfamilias is the notion of dependence. In a Feudal context, a household
was dependent on the lord of the manor (i.e. the male head of an economic, political, social
and religious unit) for his protection, his land, and his goodwill. The lord of the manor was,
in turn, dependent on those whom he ruled over and who worked for him for their services
and labour, but the relationship was not an equal one. The lord of the manor owned and
controlled the land and because his power came directly from the king and from God, it was
therefore economic and ideological. Any disobedience against the lord of the manor was
therefore an act against the sovereign and God, and by extension, the wider social order.
Every subject under the lord’s remit was therefore dependant on him, and the relationship
was seen and defended as a paternal one. This created a state of double dependence for
women and children (Gittins, 1993), in which they were dependent both on the lord and on
their own father/husband, their only ways of escaping being through widowhood (at least
for women). Buoyed by religious movements at the time, women were increasingly
excluded from positions of power and were instead encouraged to serve men and the
family. The concept of marriage is therefore an important one as it was only through
defereence to men that women could enjoy economic stability and social stability. The act of
becoming unattached from a male-headed household was not only economically dangerous, but was against the very essence of womanhood. The substantial minority of women who could not, or would not, live in a patriarchal household (e.g. spinsters, widows, abandoned wives) attracted fear and suspicion and were threatening: economically, sexually and socially. The fear and suspicion of such women led to the mass persecution and execution of ‘witches’ in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (Gittins, 1993). Whilst the last recorded execution of a witch took place in Europe in 1782 (Smithsonian, 2017), the fear of women who live outside of an opposite sex marriage lives on though Gittins (1993) argues that the once popular charges of witchcraft have been replaced with more modern accusations of lesbianism.

To sum up, the essence of patriarchy is most visible through the power relations between women and men, and men and children. As these relations are most visible within the family unit, the family is therefore considered by feminists as a prime site of female oppression (Steel, Kidd and Brown, 2012). Feminist accounts of the family have, among other things, rebutted a natural inclination towards housework, childcare and a subordinate role in the family (e.g. de Beauvoir, 1953), which some authors have likened to the ‘captive wife’ (see Gavron, 1966), imprisoned by marriage and destined for an eternity of domestic chores. Other feminist sociologists have focused on the dark side of family life, for instance, the acts of violence and physical abuse by men against women and children in the family.

3.6. Harmony, privacy and the ‘dark side’ of family life

Early accounts of the family liken it to a safe haven (e.g. Parsons and Bales, 1955) where men can escape the daily toils of work. Combined with romantic notions of love (Steel, Kidd and Brown, 2012) and the ideological function that the nuclear or ‘Oxo family’ (see Henry, 2011) serve, it is easy to associate the family with a degree of harmony. This harmony is evident in the degree of economic stability and social order that the family brings. However, Heidensohn (1996) offers that the family is an institution that exercises a great deal of control over women. For example, Heidensohn (1996) attributes the very low rate of female crime in society to the notion that women’s free movement is limited by family life. Domestic chores and childcare therefore make it difficult for women to engage in crime. This control can also take the form of physical violence and represents a ‘dark side’ of family life that challenges “the cosy image presented by the ideology of the family” (Steel, Brown and Kidd, 2012: 82) making it potentially dangerous for women and children.

“Men for centuries were legally entitled to use violence on both wives and children; this was seen as an essential support to their patriarchal authority” (Gittins, 1993: 37). Despite recent legislation to protect women and children from such violence, it remains a problem. In the UK, an estimated 1.9 million adults aged 16 to 59 experienced domestic abuse in 2017 equating to a prevalence rate of 6 in 100 adults (Office for National Statistics, 2017). According to the data, women (7.5%) are more likely to have experienced domestic abuse than men (4.3%) with migrant women considered at higher risk of abuse (The Guardian, 2017). At its extreme, domestic abuse may result in one family member killing the other and this happened on 454 occasions in England and Wales between the period April 2013 to
March 2016 (Office for National Statistics, 2017). The majority (70%) of victims were female and were killed by their male partner or ex-partner 76% of the time. Research into the backgrounds of male perpetrators of domestic homicide revealed that the men did not come from a background of abuse themselves, but instead sensed they were losing control over the woman and a sense of ‘ownership’ of her (Dobash et al., 2000). Attempts to explain male physical violence towards women take a variety of forms. Pahl (1980) couples physical violence with male economic control, highlighting that female victims of physical violence are also kept in a state of poverty by their husbands thus explaining why they often remain in the marriage as opposed to seeking help or refuge. Feminist accounts often point to violence and the related topic of ‘rape’ as a means of social control used by men to maintain patriarchal authority (e.g. Segal, 1987) with some more radical accounts suggesting that rape is a natural biological drive for all men (see Brownmiller, 1976). Abbot and Wallace (1997) summarise that explanations for male violence against women falls into three camps. Traditionalist accounts highlight that females victims of male violence form a minority in society and therefore are responsible for the crimes inflicted on them, perhaps inciting the sexual excitement of their male perpetrators. Liberal or psychiatric accounts also focus on the infrequency of male violence but acknowledge that it is a serious problem, caused by a minority of ‘sick’ or ‘ill’ individuals. Finally, feminist accounts start by acknowledging that the first two explanations are malestream, defined as “by men, for men and about men” (Abbot and Wallace, 1997), and therefore lack a genuine understanding of female accounts, attempting instead to lay blame on women for the male violence against them.

Male physical violence against women is not only the only example of the dark side of family life. Further examples include: child abuse (including child sexual abuse); forced marriage, a common practice among many ethnic communities; and honour killings, women (and occasionally men) who are assaulted or killed at the hands of their families for bringing shame upon the family, usually by entering into an unsuitable relationship. However, there is a common thread linking each of the above examples aside from the fact that these are socially deviant crimes. Each of the above listed examples occur ‘behind closed doors’ thus giving rise to the ‘private’ nature of family life. Cheal (1991) argues that acts such as domestic violence remain hidden in the family for three reasons. First, the family serves an ideological purpose and it is in everyone’s interest not to bring the family into disrepute. Second, individuals have free will and therefore women who experience abuse are arguably free to leave or seek help in such circumstances. Finally, since the family is private, state interventions into the family should be limited. The private nature of family life presents difficulties not only for researchers who wish to investigate such events, but for state interventions too. In cases of domestic violence, for instance, the perpetrator and the victim are engaged in a close relationship with one another and may not wish to have their lives scrutinised by those who operate in the public sphere (e.g. police, social services). This reinforces McKie and Callan’s (2012) view that family provide a social grouping in which individuals can experience a range of intimate experiences. Therefore, the subject of ‘intimacy’ is discussed in turn.
3.7. Intimacy
Intimacy refers to the idea of ‘being close to’ another person (Jamieson, 1988). According to Kakabadse and Kakabadse (2004), intimacy consists of four different types. Physical intimacy is sensual proximity or touching and ranging from holding hands to other sexual activity. Emotional intimacy involves a certain levels of trust and the establishment of a personal bond and therefore has links to the notion of ‘falling in love’. Cognitive or intellectual intimacy takes place when two people exchange thoughts and share ideas, when this is done in an open and comfortable way it is thought to be intimate. Finally, experiential intimacy is when two people actively involve themselves with each other. This can occur between workers who may not have established a certain level of trust or care, but are instead intimately involved in the task at hand.

Naturally, the family allows individuals to experience intimate relationships, particularly those that are physical and emotional. The close relationships in the family home (e.g. husband-wife, parent-child) provide a sense of belonging and help establish a sense of who we are, and by implication, who we are not (Bauman, 1990). This suggests that family relationships are central to establishing identity and a sense of ‘us’ and ‘them’ and whilst not all families are close as such, this notion reinforces the ideology of the family due to what Bauman (1990) refers to as ‘insider’ and ‘outsider’ groups that emerge as a result. Some researchers (e.g. Roseneil and Budgeon, 2004) have observed that individuals are increasingly looking beyond the ‘heteronormative’ family and towards friendship groups and colleagues for intimate relationships. These are becoming as important, if not more important, than the traditional relationships found within the family home. Regardless of the source of intimate relationships, they continue to play a central role in an individual's life course (Jamieson, 1988; Miller and Perlman, 2008) and rely on dialogue, transparency, vulnerability and reciprocity to flourish.

3.8. The moral economy
The moral economy has received increased academic attention in the social sciences over the past decade and focuses on “the mutual obligations that arise when people interact over time” (Carrier, 2017: 18). A moral economy is one based on goodness, fairness and justice. Such an economy is generally only stable in small, closely knit communities, where the principle of mutuality (i.e. “I will scratch your back if you will scratch mine”) operate to avoid the free rider problem. In theorising the moral economy, Scott (1976) explains that peasants live so close to the subsistence line that it only takes a small act to destroy their livelihoods. Therefore, a moral economy arises as a set of economic principles that it would be rational for those in such a community to live by. Thompison (1991) elaborates on this adding how sanctions are needed in order for the moral economy to function. Thompison (1991) uses the example of how large farmers who achieved a higher price by selling their surpluses elsewhere were often punished when there will still those in need within the village. Carrier’s (2017) more recent interpretation of the moral economy relies on the existence of relationships and obligations, both of which can be found within the family.
Through Finch’s (2007) notion of ‘display’, obligations can be understood as something which family members ‘do’ rather than placing emphasis on understanding the traditional ‘structures’ to which family members belong. An obligation is likened to a duty or commitment (Collins Dictionary, 2018) that a person is morally (or legally) bound to take. In this context, obligations can therefore be understood as the help given family members based on kinship ties. Whilst the nature and extent of family obligations may vary according to ethnicity and other factors (Steel, Kidd and Brown, 2012), the actual help given to family members might take the form of financial aid, emotional or practical support and childcare (Finch and Mason, 1993). One of the key findings of Finch and Mason’s (1993) study is that of ‘reciprocity’, the notion that once obligations are fulfilled there is an expectation that help should be returned at some time and in some way. This help might take the form of direct repayment of the same service or by contrast, an indirect repayment of a different service. However, the question of balance is an important one, so that one family member does not feel dependent, or equally indebted, to the other. The question of how family obligations play out within the context of family businesses, is therefore of great interest to this thesis.

3.9. Conclusion
The above chapter has established that the family is primarily a social grouping, one within which an individual can experience a range of emotions and intimate experiences. Early theorists concerned themselves with defining the traditional family structure that was thought to exist universally and certain images (e.g. the Oxo family) serve to illustrate how this nuclear type has served an ideological function in society. However, significant social changes, chief among which is the position of women in society, have witnessed a rise in new and non-traditional family structures and a more pluralist approach is taken to understanding the family by scholars more recently.

The chapter has also illustrated that patriarchal family structures have facilitated a dark side of family life, which challenge the notions of romance and harmony that often accompany conversations regarding the family. The concept of patriarchy is particularly important given the Italian context found within this thesis, which among things will be discussed in the following chapter.
4. Italian influences

4.1. Introduction
As the research framework was explored among Italian families in the UK, a number of factors serve to amplify the complexity of studying the influence of family relationships on next generation decision making. First, Italian culture is one which is frequently assumed to be a strong familial and patriarchal one. The chapter takes a critical approach to assessing the validity of this claim and how such a culture may influence the decisions of next generation family members. Second, the presence of Italian families in the UK is due to a migration stream of Italians who, in decades gone by, left their homes in Italy. It is frequently assumed that Italian migration is rooted in the "search for a better life" (Burrell, 2006: 26). Of interest is whether this desire to improve one’s socioeconomic status has been bequeathed to the next generation and the consequence of this for involvement in the family business. Third, favourable opportunity structures in the UK meant that a number of Italian migrants were able to realise their economic independence through the establishment of small scale catering businesses. However, catering is essentially a hospitality service scape and one that does not appeal to everyone. Therefore, the chapter concludes by considering industry specific barriers to offspring following their parents into the catering business.

4.2. Culture
Morrison (2006) notes that culture is complex and ethereal and researchers have therefore had difficulty defining it. Garrison (1996) agrees, stating that it is owing to culture’s amorphous, shifting nature that definition is inherently problematic. This poses something of a paradox as whilst the concept is highly polysemic and frustratingly ambiguous, it appears to be used more and more frequently in everyday life (Riley, 2007). Among the first to offer a definition of culture is Tylor (1871: 1) who provides that “culture is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, custom and any other capabilities acquired by man as a member of society”. This observation draws parallels with the more recent work of Tayeb (1988: 42), who views culture as:-

“...a set of historically evolved learned values, attitudes and meanings shared by the members of a given community that influence the material and non-material way of life. Members of the community learn these shared characteristics through different stages of socialisation processes of their lives in institutions, such as family, religion, formal education, and society as a whole”.

A common thread between the two definitions is the need to understand culture in the collective sense as it appears to permeate groups of people, operating at a systemic level. However, Riley (2007) is keen to distinguish culture from the idea of ‘civilisation’ which he argues, relates to the wider human species, whereas culture pertains to the local, the way of life and the world view of a group of people. The concept of culture as a ‘world view’ enjoys support from Trompenaars (1993) who states that culture is the shared way in which groups
of people understand and interpret their phenomenological worlds. The above definitions also highlight that culture is acquired socially, reinforced through exposure to the society in question. This exposure allows new members to ‘learn the ropes’ and understand ‘the way things are done around here’ (Schein, 1968). However, the shared characteristics that culture seems to create are often implicit and taken for granted (Hall, 1959). For this reason, individuals are often unaware of their own culture until they are removed from it, as demonstrated in Trompenaars’ (1993: 21) metaphor:

“A fish only discovers its need for water when it is no longer in it. Our own culture is like water to a fish. It sustains us. We live and breathe through it”

As the concept of culture symbolises the values, attitudes and meanings by which a group of people abide, it would appear to serve a normative function in daily life. Though culture is generally understood in a collective sense, the adherence to cultural norms and value sets would suggest that individual behaviour is also influenced by culture. The extent to which this influence is conscious or subconscious remains questionable. In summary, despite representing such a pervasive concept which infringes on various spheres of life, it is owing to culture’s abstract nature that researchers have found difficulty in pinning it down. The task is further complicated by culture’s multiple representation across different levels (e.g. national, regional, local) and layers of society (gender, age, class, family, religion, occupation).

Italians are often stereotyped as warm, good natured, happy go lucky people (Liu, Volcic and Gallois, 2014) and for this reason are envied for their innocent way of life by others (Parasecoli, 2004). However, Parasecoli (2004) warns widely held stereotypes regarding Italian culture are often romanticised notions and reveal more about the shortcomings of one’s own culture than the reality in Italy. Nevertheless, being ‘family oriented’ is often thought to be the distinguishing cultural trait of Italians (Johnson, 1985; di Leonardo, 1984) among other staples such as religion, libations and cuisine (Lozzi-Toscano, 2004). Italian culture is therefore similar to other Mediterranean cultures in that strong family ties can be found (Litwin, 2010). Whilst this is revered among those whose cultures lack such a family orientation (Parasecoli, 2004), it also causes negative stereotypes regarding Italian culture. This is because the traditional Italian family hierarchy witnesses men as the heads of the household, with females often subservient members of the family (Lozzi-Toscano, 2004). This is epitomised in the recent bestseller which encourages Italian women to ‘Get Married and Be Submissive’ (see Miriano, 2016). Preaching a wifely duty of obedience and submission to husbands, the book has received widespread criticism as being misogynistic and oppressive among various factions of society (Rainey, 2013). In addition, strong familial cultures are accused of breeding a distrust of outsiders and researchers have highlighted that this is characteristic of Italian culture (e.g. Homer, 1991). Of interest is not whether the abovementioned stereotypes are representative of Italian families per se, but how and in what ways do such characteristics influence next generation employment preferences should they prove manifest among the Italian families under study.
4.3. Cultural influences on the next generation

Of immediate interest is whether such resilient family units lead to higher levels of family harmony and whether this harmony encourages involvement in the family business among the next generation, or liberates offspring to pursue employment beyond the family business.

Of further interest is the influence of patriarchal figures. An article suggested that Italian patriarchs are reluctant to surrender control of the companies they have built (The Economist, 2014). Though the article related (in the main) to fashion industry businesses where success is often contingent on their founding visionaries, it provides evidence that patriarchal family structures can have an effect on the retirement style of the founding entrepreneur. This suggests that a prevalence of monarch and general types (see Sonnenfeld, 1988) may be expected among Italian families. Researching whether patriarchal figures who are reluctant to relinquish their power acts as a possible driver for the employment decision of next generation family members is therefore worthy of attention.

4.4. Migration

According to Boyle, Halfacree and Robinson (1998: 34), migration “involves the movement of a person (a migrant) between two places for a certain period of time”. This definition is intentionally problematic as it serves to highlight two fundamental aspects of migration, namely, that it is defined both spatially and temporally. In terms of spatial movement, the above definition would include all manner of journeys ranging from those which traverse national borders at one extreme and everyday trips to the shop at the other. Whilst a migration route from France to Spain may entail a journey of just a few short miles owing to the two nations sharing a national border, migration often requires an overseas journey of much greater distance. Italian migration to the UK is an example of such an overseas journey and constitutes international migration as opposed to internal migration, whereby migrants look to re-settle within their home nations.

Migration is generally assumed to feature a degree of permanence in order to be distinguished from the act of holiday-making and to avoid confusion with those who enjoy lifestyles in which they constantly move around i.e. nomads. However, this is not to assume that migration is undertaken with the intention of remaining in the host nation for the lifespan of the migrant. Migrants who move from developing economies to developed ones in search of employment are labelled ‘economic migrants’ and accumulate the payments exchanged for their labour in the hope that they may eventually return home economically ‘better off’ (King, 1986). When migrants are able to complete the return leg of their migration journey, this process is known as ‘return migration’. However, for several reasons the intention to return often diminishes over time though the individual may continue to espouse views that they wish to one day return home. Researchers frequently refer to this failure to complete the intended migration route as the ‘myth of return’ (e.g. Boyle, Halfacree and Robinson, 1998).
Italian migration to the UK represents an international ‘migration stream’, composed of people who share the same country of origin and migration destination (Boyle, Halfacree and Robinson, 1998). In any case, the route from Italy to the UK is no less than 500 miles and – depending on the method of transport and route taken – may pass through France and other neighbouring countries. The case of Italian migration is therefore a useful example of how migrants often navigate through neighbouring countries before arriving in their migration destination. This illustrates that migrants have a specific destination in mind and the motive for migration is more complex than to simply leave one’s country of origin. Nevertheless, the period between 1946 and 1975 witnessed 7.25 million people leave Italy for predominantly European destinations (Sassoon, 1997).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4-1 - Italian Born Population Resident in Britain, 1951-1991</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Holmes (1988); Compton (1996)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4-2 - Percentage Change in Italian Population, 1951-1991</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Change in Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-1991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compton (1996)

Whilst the UK may not have proved as popular as the nations of France, Switzerland and Germany, who each experienced much higher numbers of Italian migrants (Sassoon, 1997), table 4.1 clearly demonstrates that in 1991 Italians were more prevalent in the UK than in the decades previous. However, table 4.2 signals that over the period 1981-1991 a number of these migrants had left the UK, perhaps on a return migration route to Italy. This was the case in the 1970s when the construction and manufacturing industries in Europe slowed down, forcing many nations to offload their migrant workforces and for the first time in the history of modern Italy, a number of Italians returned home contributing to a gain of almost 68,000 people in the balance of labour (Sassoon, 1997).

Successful migration assumes that migrants complete their return migration projects and are able to buy land or property and live comfortably back in Italy (Zontini, 2015). As such, those who ‘have to’ remain in their migration destination are viewed as having failed because their migration project did not yield sufficient wealth to facilitate their return to Italy (Baldassar, 2007; Zontini, 2010). However, the above notions of success and failure assume that the factors affecting the return migration decision are purely economic ones.
On the contrary, Bolzmann, Fibbi and Vial (2006) report gender differences in the propensity to return to Italy. Baldassar and Gabaccia (2011) attribute this to family ties, arguing that women are reluctant to return to Italy as this would require new separations from children and grandchildren born in the UK. This standpoint, however, discounts the view that Italian born males would be equally reluctant to separate from new family members born in the UK. Zontini (2015) supports the idea that Italian born women are deterred from return migration to Italy. Interviews conducted with Italian born females resident in the UK revealed that they were fearful of a return to the Italian ‘way of life’. Italian women who had been solely responsible for domestic chores were conscious that the appliances (e.g. dishwasher, washing machine) that they relied on to expedite their domestic chores in the UK were less commonplace in the Italy and returning would increase their daily workload. Other accounts were conscious that returning to Italy would be accompanied by unannounced visits from their Italian born husband’s family, thus obligating the women to host a meal with virtually no prior notice. In conclusion, Italian born females in Zontini’s (2015) study were keen to avoid both of these eventualities.

It appears that the decision to return is further moderated by the connections that migrants have retained with those who remain in Italy. Baldassar (2001) argues that annual visits to a migrant’s country of origin are more akin to an obligation and help to foster a sense of belonging which can help to fuel the decision to return (Reynolds and Zontini, 2006). Migrants are granted a license to leave by their families, which often carries with it an obligation to return (Baldassar, 2001). However, migrants are not always welcomed back so eagerly by their wider communities. Palmer (1977) found that upon completion of their return migration projects, Italians were ostracised and labelled the ‘Inglesi’ by their natal community to signify that they were perceived to have absorbed some of the cultural features of their host society. Burrell (2006) reports that this ostracism by the natal community (including family relations) is owing to the levels of affluence that accompanied return migrants which was not received favourably by less affluent relations who remained in Italy.

In sum, whilst migration carries with it an obligation to return and such a return ensures that migration is deemed ‘successful’, migrants are not always welcomed back so eagerly by their natal communities. This is because the migration decision causes a chain reaction of events which reduces the likeliness of returning to Italy as well as how one is perceived should a return migration project be undertaken.

Threats of war, persecution and famine give credence to the view that individuals have little choice but to leave their homes (i.e. forced or involuntary migration) as opposed to the view that individuals move of their own free choice (i.e. voluntary migration). Boyle, Halfacree and Robinson (1998: 38) offer that the most likely explanation lies somewhere between these two extremes as “few people move purely as a result of their own deliberations and an element of free will is apparent in many forced moves”. In terms of Italian migration, it is frequently assumed that the decision to migrate is rooted in a “search for a better life” (Burrell, 2006: 26). Fortier (2000) gives primacy to the severe post-war economic conditions experienced in Italy with King and King (1977) explaining that this was felt more starkly in
southern regions, particularly Campania and Sicily. As a result, the common practice of ‘living off the land’ became unsustainable meaning that migration away from Italy was inevitable. Burrell (2006) provides that those who opted to migrate internally to larger cities were not always successful in their migration projects meaning that international migration was often the outcome nonetheless.

Other accounts of Italian migration are populated with a desire to avoid compulsory military service (e.g. Burrell, 2006). Italian conscription witnessed its final draft in January 2003 (The Telegraph, 2000) and was used previously to forge a sense of nationhood among its members which represented both the northern and southern regions equally (Guardian, 2000). However, migration away from Italy provided a solution for Italian males aged 18-25 who sought to avoid this compulsory military service in the *naja* (The Guardian, 2000). Alternatively, southern Italians looked to escape the ‘othering’ of the south (Burrell, 2006). Since Italy’s unification in 1861, the south had been associated with economic underdevelopment, poverty, backwardness and was subject to racial prejudice (specific to racial thinking in Italy). As a result, outward migration was not uncommon in this part of Italy (Passerini, Labanyi and Diehl, 2012). Empirical work by Burrell (2006: 29) includes the suggestion that, “people that are born [in the North] they don’t like us coming from the south”. Therefore, international migration was the only option for southern Italians who felt that they would not be welcomed by their northern countrymen (Verdicchio, 1997). Other explanations for moving away from Italy include the desire to explore the world and an eagerness to learn English (Burrell, 2006).

Many of the above reasons for leaving Italy (e.g. to avoid conscription, to learn English, to explore the world) suggest that Italian migrants’ residence in the UK would be on a temporary basis with every intention to go back. However, as previously discussed this intention can often prove to be a myth. The view that Italians migrated for economic necessity and therefore had little choice in the matter may hold some validity. However, Burrell (2006) highlights that alongside these notions of forced migration emerged a commitment to improving one’s circumstances. Therefore, migration quickly became an embedded aspect of Italian heritage (Gabaccia, 2000) which was a familiar, ordinary and rational undertaking for Italians of a certain age. Furthermore, with successful migration came the respect of family and friends who remained in Italy and a way of raising one’s personal status. The narrative has thus revealed a contradiction in the literature wherein Italian migration both gains the respect of community one leaves behind (Burrell, 2006), whilst returning to this community has a certain stigma attached to it (Palmer, 1977). It appears that whilst migration and the goal of improving one’s circumstances is widely celebrated within Italian culture, the migrant appears to forfeit their sense of belonging within their natal community as a consequence.

In sum, though the principal reason for Italian migration was to improve economic status, a whole host of complementary factors may also underpin decision, chief among which is the enhancement of status.
4.5. Migratory influences on the next generation
The above discussion serves to highlight that Italian migration is often rooted in the desire to improve one's socioeconomic status. It is plausible that a similar desire has been passed on to migrant’s offspring and may serve as a driver of next generation employment preferences. Of interest is whether this leads offspring towards involvement in the family business or away from it. Naturally, the scale and success of the family business may prove to be a moderating influence in this decision. However, the desire to improve one's economic circumstances may conflict with Italian family ties should this require departure from the family business, and by extension, the family unit. This is of great academic interest, particularly among female members of the next generation who are often expected (Lozzi-Toscano, 2004) or encouraged (see Miriano, 2016) to submit to the will of the patriarchal figure.

4.6. Catering
In reviewing Italian migration to the UK, King (1977) notes three waves. First, the elite group of merchants, businessmen and men of culture from northern Italy that arrived from the Middle Ages to the nineteenth century. Second, the street musicians and ice cream producers that characterised the end of the nineteenth century. Third, a more recent wave of southern Italian migrants, many of whom were employed in labouring jobs following the Second World War (King, 1977). This latter wave of Italian migrants were consigned to industrial work which consisted of hard work, long hours and low pay and this proved a different reality than that which they imagined upon leaving Italy (Palmer, 1977). In contemplating their fate in the UK, Italians arguably faced three options: remain in heavy industrialised work in the UK; return to Italy; or initiate self-employment in the UK catering sector. Catering proved a viable alternative as the success criteria for operating a snack bar shared characteristics with the peasant farming they had grown accustomed to prior to migration, namely: mobilisation of family labour; ability to work long hours; sufficient starting capital (saved during a period of employment); some catering experience; and a rudimentary knowledge of the English language. In addition, a number of other factors served to complement this option:-

Figure 4-1 - Historical conditions for the start-up of small scale catering businesses in the UK

- The economic recovery of the 1950s and 1960s
- The rise of the ‘trattorie’ concept
- The ‘exotic’ appeal of Italian cuisine
- Italian cuisine was inexpensive to produce
- Rise of British ‘eating out’ culture
- The cappacino became fashionable

Source: Palmer (1977)
Figure 4.1 (page 52) illustrates that Italians were buoyed by economic recovery, more cosmopolitan views around the concept of ‘eating out’ and the rise in the fashionable appeal of Italian concepts such as the cappuccino. Furthermore, as pasta was particularly cheap to produce owing to a relatively low meat component, Italians were able to enjoy healthy profit margins. As the food served within these catering outlets were unfamiliar to the majority of the UK population, it also benefitted from the idea of ‘exoticism’ (see Kesteloot and Mistiaen, 1997). Therefore, the prospect of remaining in heavily industrialised work is likely to have provided a sufficient push factor away from such an option and towards the rewards offered in the catering sector. Furthermore, as those returning to Italy no better off were often viewed as failing their migration projects (Zontini, 2015) and those who had successfully changed their fates were subject to stigma (Palmer, 1977), it is likely that return migration failed to prove popular either. It can be argued that the opportunities presented in the catering sector appeared to be far more favourable than to accept the status quo or return to Italy. As Palmer (1977) notes, Italian migrants’ prevalence in the catering sector emerged as a Hobson’s choice, though ultimately a sustainable one.

The catering sector forms part of the wider hospitality industry. Barrows, Powers and Reynolds (2012) argue that hospitality is among the oldest professions in history and originated from the roadside inns and taverns that offered shelter and nourishment to locals and weary travellers alike since as long ago as ancient times (Walker, 2013). Hospitality is defined as “making a guest, client, member, or resident (whichever is the appropriate term) feel welcome and comfortable” (Barrows, Powers and Reynolds, 2012: 4). This is a particularly useful definition as by acknowledging the various users of modern hospitality, it moves away from its origins in accommodation and catering, to encompass the increasing range of service scapes (e.g. casinos, pubs and bars, theme parks, private members clubs, residential care homes) in which hospitality can be performed. Hemmington (2007) refers to the schizophrenia of the hospitality industry to describe how the industry has become increasingly fragmented. Lashley (2000) notes that whilst many of the new and non-traditional service scapes have much in common with the production and service elements of hospitality, others share less of a resemblance and are more akin to those found in the retail industry. Nevertheless, at the heart of these varied service scapes lies an industry that is essentially concerned with people (Wood, 2015). Hospitality work therefore requires a service spirit (Walker, 2013) which is perhaps best encapsulated in the ‘Spirit to Serve’ philosophy (Marriott, 1997) that adopted by the Marriott International hotel chain. The philosophy is founded on traditional values such as dedication to hard work (and having fun while doing it), continuous improvement and always taking care of the guest. This Spirit to Serve continues to lie at the heart of the long established hotel company despite the wider hospitality industry witnessing a paradigm shift more recently from emphasis on service to the creation of memorable experiences (Gilmore and Pine, 2002; Hemmington, 2007; Michelli, 2008).

The hospitality industry is not without its challenges: staff may be required to live on the premises; the majority of staff are low paid and unskilled; staff are expected to work long hours; there is a large portion of young, female, part-time and casual staff; there is also a high proportion of staff from other countries; and there is a high mobility of labour and high
staff turnover (Mullins, 2000; Walker, 2013). Furthermore, as Harris (2012: 30) notes, “unlike Italy, France and elsewhere in Europe, where waiters are regarded as skilled professionals, in Britain the job is hardly regarded as a profession at all”. On the other hand, hospitality work can offer a wide range of opportunities as demonstrated in table 4.3.

Table 4-3 - Motives for a career in hospitality management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Interests</th>
<th>Ambition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal work experience</td>
<td>Enjoy working with people</td>
<td>Opportunity for employment and advancement around the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family background in the industry</td>
<td>Enjoy working with food</td>
<td>Desire to operate own business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with peers already engaged in hospitality management programs</td>
<td>Enjoy dining out, travel, variety</td>
<td>Desire to travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Desire to be independent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Barrows, Powers and Reynolds (2012)

Alongside the above motives, it is the genuine care for the customer, opportunities to shape experiences that will be remembered for a lifetime, and a flair for entertainment and theatre (see Hemmington, 2007) that attracts others to the industry (Walker, 2013). Though importantly, it is not for everyone.

4.7. Industry specific influences on the next generation

As this thesis is concerned with Italian families involved in the catering sector, it is these catering businesses that provide a viable employment option for the next generation. Therefore, of interest is whether the nature of industry stirs within the next generation an appetite for hospitality work and whether this encourages them towards involvement in the family business as a result. Getz and Petersen (2004) offer that in the case of small, family owned hospitality and tourism businesses, many of the generic barriers which deter the next generation from becoming involved are exacerbated (see table 4.4, page 55). For instance, the lifestyle or remoteness of location (i.e. rural areas attract small, hospitality and tourism entrepreneurs) is not desired by the next generation, the seasonality that often accompanies hospitality and tourism industries raises question marks about the viability of the business, or the long hours and customer-oriented work that characterise hospitality jobs does not appeal to offspring. Getz and Petersen (2004) surveyed 184 hospitality and tourism businesses in two resorts areas (Bornholm, Denmark and Canmore, Canada) and found a very low rate of succession. Among the key findings is that lifestyle and location preferences are seldom shared by the next generation and “the more geographically
isolated the business, the more children will want to leave for education and new experiences” (Getz and Petersen, 2004: 272).

Table 4-4 - Generic and industry-specific barriers to succession

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic</th>
<th>Industry-Specific (Hospitality and Tourism)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) There are no (viable) successors</td>
<td>1) In remote and rural areas children are likely to leave for education or careers, so succession is a nonissue for many parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Life stage incompatibilities (e.g. parents too old, children too young) (Davis, 1968; Ward, 1987)</td>
<td>2) Many owners invest later in life (for retirement and as a second career), and their children are already gone i.e. an ‘empty nest’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) The ‘dream’ is not shared (Lansberg, 1999); children prefer to find their own way, follow other preferences, desire autonomy (Blotnik, 1984; Patrick, 1985; Stavrou and Winslow, 1996)</td>
<td>3) Location and lifestyle are not preferred by children (e.g. small towns, peripheral areas offer limited choices)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Founders unwilling to let go, or do not plan for succession (Davis and Harveston, 1998)</td>
<td>4) Rather than not letting go, many founders do not have viable succession options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Children hold negative impressions of the business (Alcorn, 1982)</td>
<td>5) Working conditions perceived to be undesirable (e.g. long hours, messy and hands-on work; high level of contact with customers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Gender (prejudicial treatment of daughters) (Dumas, 1992; Iannarelli, 1992)</td>
<td>6) This industry attracts many female owners, but their businesses tend to be small and often secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) The business is not viable or inheritance taxes/legal issues make it impractical (Bjuggren and Sund, 2001; Handler and Kram, 1988)</td>
<td>7) Profitability is often low; seasonality of demand prevents growth; lack of business assets; or inseparability of business and family assets (especially in home or farm based accommodation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Getz and Petersen (2004)

Getz and Petersen's (2004) work provides some validity for the claim that the nature of hospitality work can deter the next generation from becoming involved in the family business. To recap, of interest is whether families are able to successfully nurture an appetite for hospitality work within their kin, and in doing so, whether this encourages or deters them from involvement in the family business.
4.8. Conclusion

The chapter has thus far discussed three factors relevant to the discussion of Italian families within the context of this thesis, namely: culture; migration; and catering. These factors raise additional research questions (see table 4.5) which serve to amplify the complexity of the thesis as demonstrated in figure 4.2 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ</th>
<th>Generic/Context Specific</th>
<th>Research questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Generic</td>
<td>How and in what ways do family relationships influence next generation decision making?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Context specific</td>
<td>How and in what ways does Italian culture influence next generation decision making?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Context specific</td>
<td>How and in what ways does a history of migration influence next generation decision making?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Context specific</td>
<td>How and in what ways does a family heritage in catering influence next generation decision making?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.2 - Influences of culture, migration and catering on next generation decision making
Of interest is the extent to which these factors act as drivers of next generation decision making and whether these lead offspring towards involvement in the family business, or encourage them to seek opportunities beyond its remit. Designing a piece of research which explores these particular drivers among others is a highly complex task, one which is discussed in the following chapter.
5. Methodology

5.1. Introduction
The following chapter reviews how the family business literature (and related fields of study) are often underpinned by rational economic assumptions. To understand the influence of non-economic drivers on next generation decision making, an interpretative approach is adopted which places the family unit at the heart of the analysis. The chapter outlines how semi-structured interviews were used to explore the accounts of multiple family members and draws attention to some of the ethical challenges posed and how these were minimised. This includes the use of pseudonyms for families who exercised their right to anonymity, as well as how the recall of past traumatic events was dealt with. The chapter concludes by explaining how it was only through interviewing multiple family members of multiple Italian families, that the rich and complex family relationships which influenced next generation decision making, were brought to life.

5.2. Methodological approach
As previously noted (see section 2.2), within the family business literature seldom is the family entity the unit of analysis. Rather, research unequivocally examines the impact of the family on the business rather than vice versa. This is perhaps best exemplified within research which examines the impact of family member involvement. Table 5.1 (page 59) illustrates that research within this particular field often measures the knock on effect of family involvement on several economic measures including business growth (e.g. Schulze et al., 2001), stock market performance (e.g. Bennedsen et al., 2015) and value creation (e.g. Bennedsen et al., 2007). In addition to this field of study is perhaps the most researched topic within the family business literature i.e. succession, which primarily concerns itself with the issue of long term family business survival and generational change. Often measured here is the survival rate of family businesses across generations (e.g. Stamm and Lubinski, 2011). An underlying assumption of research pertaining to both family involvement and succession is a rational economic imperative for the family business to survive. In the case of the latter, this pertains to surviving transition to the next generation. As such, this implies that if a family is able to transfer ownership and management of the family business to an appointed successor, it is considered to be successful. The rational economic view adopted by both of these fields of study equates the success of the business with the success of the family and in doing so precludes the view that the failure of the business (to survive) can ultimately lead to the success of the family.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of study</th>
<th>Focus of research</th>
<th>Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to macroeconomic indicators</td>
<td>Job creation and GDP</td>
<td>Getz, Carlsen and Morrison (2004); Gomez-Mejia et al. (2007); Astrachan and Shanker (2003); Wang, Ahmed and Farquhar (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family involvement</td>
<td>Survival rates and business growth</td>
<td>Schulze et al. (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stock market performance</td>
<td>Bennedsen et al. (2015); Smith and Amoako-Adu (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Return of sales and assets</td>
<td>Morck, Stangeland and Yeung (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value creation</td>
<td>Bennedsen et al. (2007); Villalonga and Amit (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive abnormal returns</td>
<td>Perez-Gonzalez (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efficiencies and business value</td>
<td>McConaughy et al. (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family business motives</td>
<td>Business growth and growth aspirations</td>
<td>Getz and Carlsen (2000); Getz and Petersen (2005); Middleton (2001); Zahra (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succession</td>
<td>Successor appointment</td>
<td>Haag, Helin and Melin (2006); Lee, Lim and Lim (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power transfer</td>
<td>Cadieux, Lorrain and Hugron (2002); Churchill and Hatten (1997); Murrey (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survival rates</td>
<td>Beckhard and Dyer (1983a; 1983b); Janjuha-Jivraj and Woods (2002); Lansberg (1998); Sardeshmukh and Corbett (2011); Stamm and Lubinski (2011); Ward (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risk taking propensity</td>
<td>Miller et al. (2007); Le Breton-Miller and Scholnik (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Characteristics of ethnic minority businesses</td>
<td>Barrett, Jones and McEvoy (1996); Greene and Owen (2004); Volery (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-employment prevalence among migrants</td>
<td>Barrett, Jones and McEvoy (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation of self-employment across generations</td>
<td>Andersson and Hammarstedt (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acculturation identity and employment of offspring</td>
<td>Nekby and Rodin (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity structures for offspring</td>
<td>Baycan-Levent et al. (2002); Dhaliwal and Kangis (2006); Ram (1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business motives &amp; sector preferences of offspring</td>
<td>Baycan, Sahin and Nijkamp (2012); Kourtit and Nijkamp (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early experiences</td>
<td>Poverty, insecurity and neglect</td>
<td>Collins and Moore (1964)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neurotic aspects</td>
<td>Kets de Vries (1977)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need for achievement</td>
<td>McClelland (1965)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant family responsibilities as youngsters</td>
<td>Dalton and Holdaway (1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informal business experience</td>
<td>Andersson and Hammarstedt (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-employed parents / parental role models</td>
<td>Dyer (1992); Roberts and Wainer (1968); Ronstadt (1984)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A further assumption of the family business literature is that families often have dynastic motives regarding the future of the family business i.e. that it will continue to be family owned or family run (e.g. Casson, 1999). However, it is plausible that founding generations (migrant or otherwise) launched and operated a family business precisely so that future generations can avoid a similar fate. For instance, enduring hardship in a particular line of work (perhaps in an area of marginal economic activity, see Deakins, 1999) so that offspring can pursue better employment opportunities than those experienced by their parents. In sum, both dynastic and rational economic assumptions about the family entity have led to a gap in the literature relating to next generation family members because it is currently limited to those who are appointed successors within the family business (as they share dynastic motives and a rational economic outlook).

Interestingly, a parallel stream of research that investigates those who do not assume roles within the family business has yet to emerge. Those among the next generation, however, have received considerable attention in terms of ethnic entrepreneurship. Here, a correlation of self-employment across generations (e.g. Andersson and Hammarstedt, 2011) is chief among research interests. A tendency of second generations to abandon traditional sectors in favour of new and non-traditional sectors such as ICT and financial services has marked the advent of research into the business entry motives and sector preferences of the next generation (e.g. Baycan, Sahin and Nijkamp, 2012; Kourtit and Nijkamp, 2012). However, this type of research is also founded upon the assumption that members of the next generation are fuelled by rational economic motives. As such, there is a paucity of research which explores non-economic and sociocultural influences on next generation decision making. Whilst attempts to focus on the (often neurotic) early experiences and 'upbringing' of offspring (e.g. Kets de Vries, 1977) have produced promising lines of enquiry in this respect, Masurél and Nijkamp (2004) highlight that attempts to investigate the differences between first generation and second generation start-ups are yet to pay explicit attention to the relationships between both generations (e.g. parent-child). Whilst this thesis aims to achieve precisely that, contributing to this gap cannot be achieved through a rational economic approach or quantitative testing.

The methodological approach adopted by this thesis draws parallels with a number of studies which have taken a family or 'household' level of analysis as a starting point (e.g. Baines and Wheelock, 1998; Ram, 2001; Wheelock and Baines, 1998a, 1998b; Wheelock and Oughton, 1996). Such studies have tasked themselves with examining the contribution of the household, rather than the individual entrepreneur, in the formation and development of the business. Researchers have discovered that this particular approach is useful in identifying the vital, though often unrecognised, role played by female family members in small family owned businesses (Fletcher, 1997; Holiday, 1995; Ram, 1994). The common element uniting these studies is that they acknowledge that family relationships can have an effect on work relations. The distinguishing feature of this thesis is the exploration of how and in what ways these family relationships influence whether younger generations of the family enter these work relations, or seek alternative employment arrangements.
The thesis adopts an interpretative approach and therefore faces the question of what can be understood from the experiences of a handful of Italian families. Whereas positivist research concerns itself with statistical generalisation and representativeness, interpretative research is more focused upon the cogency of theoretical reasoning. As such, the five Italian families should be viewed as an 'opportunity to learn' (Stake, 1994: 243) about how family dynamics influence next generation decision making rather than whether these accounts are representative of families per se (Italian or otherwise).

The research mirrors Ram's (2001) in-depth study of households in that it shares the view that family relationships are difficult to detect if a single source is relied upon (Moen and Wetherington, 1992; Roberts, 1994). It is likely that family members have individual interests and aspirations based on their family status, gender and on their generation (Roberts, 1994). Therefore, multiple interactions with multiple family members were preferred compared with relying solely on the accounts of the founding owner and patriarchal figure, which are viewed as problematic (Curran, 1991; Scase, 1995).

5.3. Interviews, timelines and family trees
The research method employed was a qualitative one, drawing on semi-structured interviews to understand the accounts of various family members. The interviews invited participants to speak about family life and in doing so "talk about their life histories in a way that makes sense to them" (Burrell, 2006: 16). As such, there is an overlap between the interview process, personal histories and identity, as in recounting past experiences people tend to describe a version of themselves that they are comfortable with and which reflects who they feel they are. By describing their lives, participants create sweeping narratives about themselves. What is often messy or difficult to explain, once articulated, becomes simple and coherent (Ritivoi, 2002). These narratives further relay the interaction of the individual with their wider phenomenological world and the people in it (Portelli, 1998). As such narratives relate to the participant’s environment, the researcher is able to appreciate what it is like to live in these worlds (Chamberlain and Thomson, 1998).

The interview process is therefore central to the construction of these narratives. Some authors view the interview process as an act or performance (e.g. Portelli, 1998). In doing so, the interviewer defines the parameters of the dialogue and the interviewee responds to this lead. As such, the interviewer is able to exert strong influence on the creation of the narrative. Furthermore, viewing the process as an act or performance denotes that there is an intended audience which Grele (1998) argues that the interviewee is mindful of. Burrell (2006) admits that interviewing is therefore an imperfect science, one which is prone to human influence. Rather than discount its usefulness, Burrell (2006: 17) prefers that “it is exactly this human element which has made interviewing such an important qualitative methodology across academic disciplines”. In sum, the thesis moves away from the mechanistic view of the interview as an act between two people (e.g. Portelli, 1988) during which knowledge is simply 'collected', to an epistemological slant which puts the person asking the questions at the heart of the knowledge constructed. As the person asking the questions, I was therefore conscious that I was the one producing their version of events.
with them as opposed to collecting the truth about the situation. This particular notion is perhaps best demonstrated in my status as a non-Italian, which is discussed later in the chapter (see section 5.10).

The semi-structured nature of the interviews encouraged participants to talk freely about certain aspects of their lives. To facilitate this, family members were often asked questions which began with the phrase, "Tell me about..." (see appendix 1), allowing them to decide what is important and what is unimportant in sharing their accounts. On the whole, participants were very forthcoming in the extent to which they were willing to expose their family lives. This required a relatively unstructured approach as a result, with participants prompted only when they were deemed to stray off topic. During one interview, the participant was very reluctant to elaborate on any of the comments he gave. On this occasion, it was necessary to revert to a more structured questioning approach. For example, "What was the main reason for your migration to the UK?" (see appendix 1 for interview questions). Participants were asked to share their views on four main areas: migration to the UK; cultural identity; catering; and employment decisions. In the case of second generations born in the UK (often with little knowledge of the family’s history of migration), questions focused more on the latter two topic areas with some additional probing as to their sense of cultural identity.

The interviews themselves were supplemented with two additional activities. Before participants were invited to talk freely about their family lives, they were asked to draw a timeline of the significant events that had shaped their lives. An example can be found below:

Figure 5-1 - Example of a timeline drawn by participants
As figure 5.1 (page 62) demonstrates, for most participants this included a mixture of professional achievements alongside personal milestones (e.g. marriage, birth of children). This exercise served the purpose of providing a snapshot as to the chronology of events which would unfold in the interview. This snapshot was then cross-referenced against the accounts of other family members in order to confirm dates and the chronology of events.

Additionally, participants were asked to draw a family tree extending to as many family members as possible. The collection of family history is widely practised within primary health care (Bennett, 1999; Fuller et al., 2010; Reid and Emery, 2006; Rich et al., 2004; Wood, Stockdale and Flynn, 2008; Yoon, Scheuner and Khoury, 2003) where patients are invited to construct a family tree during an interview (Daelemans et al., 2013). Rather than require participants to illustrate the medical conditions that occur within their family, each was asked to ascribe a label (maximum of two words) to the family members identified (including themselves) to describe how each had spent their working life. Whilst the majority of participants selected labels that related purely to the role/job/trade which the family member had performed (e.g. dinner lady, nurse), occasionally the labels ascribed were much more revealing. Figure 5.2 represents part of the family tree drawn by Steven Miccoli and demonstrates that whilst he ascribes himself the label 'entrepreneur', he relegates his father's achievements to that of a self-employed business owner. As chapter 6 illustrates, it was Steven's father who assumed much of the risk involved in starting the family business from nothing and developing it over a 20 year period. The point at which the restaurant was sold to Steven, the family business was an already established one though Steven views himself to be the more entrepreneurial of the two. Interestingly, the family tree drawn by elder brother Ricky Miccoli (see appendix 5.2.1) does not discriminate, preferring the term 'small businessman' to describe both his father and brother equally. Inviting participants to draw a family tree therefore served the purpose of illustrating how they viewed themselves and each of their kin.

*Figure 5.2 - Example of a family tree drawn by participants*
In some cases, participants found this task to be somewhat challenging. Marianna Frusciante was particularly reluctant to ascribe herself with fanciful terms such as 'restauranteur', preferring instead the label of 'waitress'. This is captured in the following quote:

"It's a bit rubbish, isn't it, waitress? But I don't know what word would best describe it, you just do everything...You could use 'restaurant owner' or 'restaurateur' but for me it doesn't really describe what you actually do at all. When you say 'restaurateur' it sounds a bit up yourself for what you do. You end up washing pots because that is what you have to do."

The value of inviting participants to draw a family tree, however, was epitomised in the case of Lucia Galetta. When invited to describe her parents working life, she explains:

"Hmm...it is not going to be very positive for my dad because my dad was very money-minded. He was the boss of us all. And my mum was the skivvy [LAUGHS]. She never got paid for anything she did."

Accordingly, Lucia Galetta's family tree features the labels 'boss' and 'skivvy' to describe her father and mother, respectively. This provided an important initial glimpse at the family dynamics found in the accounts which followed.

5.4. Awkwardness and amusement

As table 5.2 (page 65) illustrates, a total of 20 participants were interviewed during the course of 17 interview sessions, thus highlighting that three interviews consisted of multiple family members present. This was driven purely by convenience purposes, for instance, the merit of interviewing married couples simultaneously rather than return on separate occasions. This proved somewhat awkward for the researcher when deeply sensitive issues were recalled that clearly remained a point of contention within the family. An example here is Vito Miccoli's regret that he might have achieved a better financial return should he have sold the business premises at the market rate, because his failure to do so has resulted in him offering the premises to his son at a discounted rate. His wife, Sally Miccoli, clearly disagrees:

Vito: In one way I think I'm stupid because I could have sold it [the business premises] and made a lot more money. I could have sold the building to somebody else or I could get more rent because it is peanuts what they [my son and his business partner] pay.

Sally: It's not peanuts Vito.

In contrast, disagreements of a more trivial nature proved especially amusing. Of notable mention is the awkward silence which followed Sean Maroni's use of the term 'routine' when describing their home life of late:
Sean: *I think in terms of our home life, we have settled into a routine.*

Favianna: *Have we?* [CLEARLY AGGRIEVED]

Sean: *Well, yeah. We have really.*

Favianna: *What do you mean by that? A routine?*

Sean: *Well I mean what I say.* [PAUSE]

A sample of 20 participants brings into question the issue of sample size. To reiterate, the purpose of the thesis is to produce a theoretically cogent framework for understanding how family relationships influence next generation decision making. Therefore, the five participating families represent a vehicle through which knowledge of this topic can be developed rather than the extent to which they are representative of families per se (Italian or otherwise). As families come in all shapes and sizes, the fact that two of these Italian families yielded just two participants (i.e. the Falsone and Galetta families) is no less useful than those in which numerous family members participated (e.g. the Maroni family). Of greater importance was ensuring that each family had two or more participants. This is because relying on a single family member is deemed problematic (Curran, 1991; Moen and Wetherington, 1992; Roberts, 1994; Scase, 1995). Naturally, every effort was made to source additional participants from the five families, though this was not always possible for a variety reasons such as the generation interviewed being yet to produce offspring of their own (as in the Miccoli family). Alternatively, where offspring did exist they were often mere infants (as in the Frusciante family). In addition, where viable family members were identified some exercised their right to decline participation (as in the Galetta family).

Table 5.2 - Generational characteristics of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Miccoli</th>
<th>Falsone</th>
<th>Frusciante</th>
<th>Galetta*</th>
<th>Maroni*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* denotes pseudonym created

Table 5.2 illustrates that only in the case of the Frusciante family were the accounts of the migrating generation shared (i.e. those who decided to migrate). In the four remaining families, those who had decided to migrate to the UK were now deceased though the length of time that had expired since the migration journey was undertaken varied between families considerably. For instance, Vito Miccoli was himself a migrant - arriving in the UK as a teenage boy - though it was his now deceased father who decided that the family would leave their home in Italy. In contrast, migration to the UK among the Maroni family dated
back to the late 1800s and the family had welcomed five generations since. This did not, however, prevent the research from obtaining the stories of the generations previous. Within the Maroni family, some participants were actively engaged in piecing together the family heritage as the following quote from Matthew Maroni aptly demonstrates:-

"And for some reason and I cannot explain it, I picked up the mantle of researching the family's roots and being very interested in how we got here, what did we do before we got here and all of that information that I wanted to know about...I can't describe my interest in all things Italian but it has led me to create a lot of history for the family that my father and his brothers – most of them are dead now - didn’t know."

On the contrary, other families were less conversant despite migration occurring more recently (when compared to the Maroni family). For example, Olivia Falsone is less familiar with this aspect of her family's heritage:

"Grandad was born in Sicily...I don’t actually know much about it other than that my Grandad lived there for a while and that is where the ethnicity comes from."

It is important to recognise that much of what subsequent generations recall in terms of their family heritage, happened some time ago and in some cases, more than a century ago. It is therefore more likely that the stories which they recall as fact are more akin to family folklore. The interpretative approach adopted is uninterested in whether or not these accounts are accurate, rather it acknowledges that these are often sweeping narratives reinforced from generation to generation.

5.5. Anonymity

The interviews were carried out over a 13 month period, between June 2014 and July 2015. Some months after the final interview had taken place, a letter was written to each of the families to address the issue of anonymity (see appendix 2). Families were offered the following choice: to give consent to be identified by their true family name; or to have a pseudonym to be created to protect the identity of the family and its business dealings from the public. Attached to the letter was a pro-forma (see for example, appendix 5.4) which each family was encouraged to discuss, complete and return. Where various factions of a family existed, it was necessary to send a letter to each of these different factions. Only when a unanimous decision had been reached were families identified by their true family name. Put simply, if one single family member differed, then pseudonyms were created for the entire family. Responses were received from each of the five participating families, three of which agreed by consensus to be identified by their true family names (the Miccoli family, the Falsone family and the Frusciante family). Consequently, pseudonyms were created for the remaining two families (the Galetta family and the Maroni family). As a further measure, first name pseudonyms were created for each family member featured within the family tree as illustrated in figure 5.3 (page 67).
The creation of pseudonyms was not sufficient to guarantee anonymity for the family as interview transcripts often included details of business names, locations and key clients/business associates, all of which could lead the reader to the true identity of these families. To ensure anonymity as much as possible specific details such as these were replaced with [anon], as illustrated in the following example:

"Anyway, going forward my dad was on this trip in America and he was talking to [anon] one night and he was saying “Roberto, what do you do for a living other than show jumping?” And my dad said “oh, we’ve just opened an ice cream parlour in this store” and he said “I’ll give you a store to try one, that sounds a good idea”. And that is how we started working with [anon] in the 1970s."

Whilst this minimised the problem, it did not eradicate it completely. For instance, the Maroni family heritage is so heavily steeped in ice cream production that this provides a very distinctive feature which jeopardises the anonymity of the family. According to Sponza (2017), the street selling of ice cream by Italian migrants was well established by the 1880s and explains how Italian migrant entrepreneurs later became associated with the food industry. Furthermore, Italian ice cream entrepreneurs were not confined to the capital. By 1993, the Association of Italian Ice Cream Vendors recorded a national membership of 4,200 (Kershen, 2017). Migration to the UK among the Maroni family dates back to this period (i.e. the late 1800s) and to remove details of ice cream production from the transcripts would remove a vital aspect of their family heritage indicative of the experiences of early Italian migrant families. This aptly demonstrates that while every effort can be made to protect anonymity, one can only do so much.
5.6. Finding Italian families

Having worked at an Italian family owned restaurant between 2009 and 2015, my own personal network extends to a handful of Italian families. This provided three initial families from which to source participants before the need to look elsewhere. When sourcing additional families for participation, the criteria outlined in figure 5.4 were employed:

**Figure 5-4 - Criteria employed when sourcing Italian families**

- The family must be of Italian descent with a history of migration to the UK
- The family history must include business ownership in the catering sector (regardless of whether the business exists at present)
- Multiple family members must be available for participation

Given the criteria employed, the sampling method was undoubtedly purposive. Palys (2008: 697) argues that this type of sampling method is “virtually synonymous with qualitative research” and offers that the use of purposive sampling, like all sampling methods, represents a strategic choice. Palys (2008) refutes that one best sampling method exists, preferring the view that the sampling strategy employed will depend on the context of the research and the nature of its objectives. Purposive sampling is unlike other sampling methods (e.g. random sampling) in that it takes the view that all participants are not created equally nor are interchangeable. Therefore, as Palys (2008: 697) notes, “one well-placed articulate informant will often advance the research far better than any randomly chosen sample of 50”. The sampling method employed matches closest with the ‘criterion sampling’ type where participants are selected because they have had a particular life experience. In this case, participants were required to be of Italian descent with a history of family business ownership in the catering sector.

When my own personal network of Italian families was exhausted, an internet search for Italian restaurants in the local area returned numerous establishments and contact was made with each of them by way of telephone call. However, in the majority of cases this did not result in participants due to a variety of reasons. In some cases, the restaurant no longer existed. This did not necessarily preclude participation, but creates the challenge of locating members of the family with little means of doing so. In other cases, some restaurant owners fully met the criteria for participation though exercised their right to decline participation. Furthermore, one willing individual who operated an Italian restaurant later disclosed that he was of Albanian descent, thus rendering him unsuitable for participation. Nevertheless, two further individuals (from separate Italian families) were eventually identified to supplement the initial three families from my own personal network. Matthew Maroni’s family business operated in the retail catering sector and following his contribution, six members of his kin participated in the months that followed. Finally, former restaurant owner Valentino Galetta and his sister Lucia Galetta made the sample complete.
5.7. Home or away

All of the interviews were conducted in English. Though interviewing people in a language other than their native tongue can be problematic in terms of communicating the wider cultural and social contexts (see Temple, 1997), the use of English in this context was without difficulty. As table 5.3 illustrates, four participants were Italian born though each spoke English fluently. As Burrell (2006: 20) notes, when dealing with migration research “it should not be overlooked that in many cases English has been the language of the working environment and public life of the respondents for the past 60 years”.

Table 5-3 - Birthplace characteristics of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Miccoli</th>
<th>Falsone</th>
<th>Frusciante</th>
<th>Galetta</th>
<th>Maroni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birthplace</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offspring</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interviews themselves were conducted in a relaxed and informal manner. Interviews typically lasted for one hour with the longest stretching to four hours and the shortest lasting just 40 minutes. The interview time and location was determined by the participant with 9 preferring the interview to take place at home of the participant, leaving the remaining 11 interviews to take place at the workplace. Participants by their own admission were willing to express themselves sufficiently as Jill Frusciante’s concluding remarks attest, “I feel as though I have been quite open”. No differences were observed in the extent to which participants were willing to ‘open up’ between those interviewed at home and those interviewed at their workplace. However, should other family members have been present during the course of the interview, this may have compromised participants' willingness to open up. Fortunately, interviews were mainly conducted in the absence of family members. When relations were present, interviews were recorded in a secluded corner of the workplace beyond earshot. Regarding her husband’s bankruptcy, Jill Frusciante also added that “he found it very hard to go and work for someone else”, Jill warns that “he probably won’t tell you that because he is very proud”. Herein lies the merit in conducting interviews with multiple family members, as in doing so, this particular issue was circumnavigated. After each interview, the recording was transcribed in full.

Interviewing participants at their homes added value as they were able to draw on material possessions to support their life stories. This mainly involved the use of photographs and did not apply exclusively to interviews conducted in the family home. For instance, all five interviews with the Frusciante family were conducted at the family restaurant, the interior of which was adorned with photographs recounting the history of the immediate and extended family. Participants often called upon to bring their stories to life as demonstrated by Antonio Frusciante below:-
"Well, we started a long time ago on Berry Lane called ‘La Taverna’. That is this one here." [POINTS TO PHOTO ON WALL FEATURING ANTONIO, JILL AND MARIANNA AS A BABY]. "That is where I started my first restaurant in Sheffield."

In this context, photographs represented a social artefact (see Babbie, 2008) drawn on by the participant not to demonstrate the accuracy with which the content (e.g. event/scene) is depicted (see Byers, 1964), but to amplify their accounts and explain "what should be attended to and what significances are located in the image, and providing contextual data necessary for understanding them" (Musello, 1980: 39). This is a very different act to photo-elicitation, which involves the use of photographs to provoke a response from participants (Harper, 1984; Heisley and Levy, 1991), or the use of photographs taken during the wider interview process for content analysis afterwards (e.g. McIntosh, Lynch and Sweeney, 2011). Both of these approaches involve entrusting the participant or the interviewer with a camera which was not the case. Participants merely drew on the photographs around them to assign significance and meaning to the topics already discussed.

5.8. Coffee and cake

During the interview process, I was consistently offered a hot beverage and something to eat. This act of hospitality usually took the form of coffee and cake. However, on one occasion I was invited to the family home where I enjoyed a four course dinner and was introduced to the participant’s wife and children, all of whom participated some months later. Only when the meal aspect was complete did the interview with husband and wife commence. On one hand, it might be argued that such acts of hospitality represent an adherence to social protocol which suggests that when accepting strangers into the home, a hot drink beverage should be offered. On the other hand, a cultural influence may be at work as Italians are renowned for their good nature (Parasecoli, 2004) and love of cuisine (Lozzi-Toscano, 2004). Alternatively, this provision of domestic hospitality may be an extension of participant’s daily roles as caterers and ultimately providers of commercial hospitality. Whilst the meal experience may have potentially served to contaminate the interview that followed, it was essential to building trust and rapport with participants. Hennink, Hutter and Bailey (2011) argue that this is vital when recruiting participants for qualitative research.

After each interview was complete, I was often asked to divulge a little of my own family history and explained how I had become interested in researching family businesses and, when requested, I did so. This act of reciprocation was not only gratefully received, but provided an element of idle chat during which participants recalled points which they had neglected to mention or struggled to remember during the interview recording. When this occurred, I requested that this be captured in the recording and the device was switched back on. After several interviews, I learned to leave the device powered until conversations ceased to avoid omitting this important information.

The interviews proved to be a rewarding experience and I often exited the interview with the impression that I had known the participant (and by extension, their family) much
longer than the duration of the interview. As such, I was keen to maintain the relationships forged with the participating families in both a personal and professional capacity. I have since returned to their eateries to enjoy a meal with members of my own family. Furthermore, the Miccoli family requested that I used their accounts to create a narrative which would be included in the menu at E’ Lupo’s restaurant. I understood this to be a bid to share their family heritage with their customer base to which I duly obliged (see appendix 3 for the narrative created). In my teaching capacity at Sheffield Hallam University, I was also able to engage the Maroni family business in some student-led consultancy projects which explored the commercial viability of the Maroni family business returning to their roots in the ice cream business.

5.9. Tissues and issues

Veal (2011) provides that the ethical issues involved in research extend to those found in figure 5.5. The ethical aspects which required the most consideration in production of this thesis were the issues of anonymity (discussed in section 5.5) and the risk of harm to participants, which will be discussed in turn.

Figure 5-5 - Ethical issues in research

Dyer and Handler (1994) caution that marital conflict, neglect of children and divorce are all possible outcomes if business and family issues are not properly managed. Therefore, inviting participants to share past events carried with it the risk that this may prove
distressing for them. Among the topics which appeared to present painful memories for participants were financial ruin and bankruptcy, being forced to labour at the family business as a child, and the need to escape a controlling father. Below is Jill Frusciante's account of how her husband gambled away the family's newfound wealth which led to the financial ruin of the family:

"But unfortunately looking back, it [financial success] came too soon for my husband....It was too much money for him and he wasn’t looking after it basically. As you do when you are in your late twenties/early thirties as he was then. And it was a shame because and then the recession hit – not this one the last one – so basically he went bankrupt on that one...He was like all youngsters with a lot of money what do I do with all this money? Oh, there’s a casino, there’s a betting shop. That is how it was really."

Topics such as these were clearly distressing for participants and on two occasions, participants displayed emotional impacts (i.e. becoming tearful). I was guided by the university's research ethics policy on this matter (see appendix 4), section 2.3 of which states that "concern for the interest of participants must always prevail over the interests of science and society". Worried that recalling such events may have an emotional impact it seemed unethical to force participants to recount memories which were clearly painful. On occasions where I sensed that participants were becoming upset/distressed, I explained that they should only continue if they were willing to do so. The disadvantage of this approach was that the topics which proved distressing were often of the most relevance to the thesis. However, participants were keen to continue and this may be a product of the therapeutic benefits which the recall of past traumatic events can lead to (see Jones, 1998). The following conversation reveals Marianna Frusciante’s eagerness to share her story:-

Richard: You mentioned something about getting away, was that purely because of your relationship and you wanting to move to be with your partner?

Marianna: It was a mixture of that – me wanting to be closer to Paul – and it was about having a change from my dad as well...he would kill me for saying that. [NERVOUS LAUGH]

Richard: Okay, I don’t want to probe you on that if it is a source of...

Marianna: No, it’s alright, I don’t mind love. He knows.

Richard: Okay, can you tell me a bit more?

Marianna: Well, he didn’t want me to go and I said “I’m going” and I went.

Becoming tearful was not confined to the recall of upsetting topics. Occasionally, tears were shed because participants had recalled happy memories as the following example suggests:-

“They [customers] say, ‘this is my favourite restaurant, I want to ask my girlfriend to marry me here’. It’s soppy, isn’t it, but it’s lovely. We make friends with customers. We are shutting for two weeks tomorrow night and we have so many tables of people we
know, they know we are going away [for vacation] and they want to come and see us. Oh, I’m getting emotional”

5.10. Insider/outsider

Burrell (2006) notes that researching migrant communities brings with it the challenges associated with ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’. During the interviews, I was often conscious of my status as an outsider. This was particularly evident when participants used Italian words which they then translated to me:

"And I didn’t fancy doing two years because where we are from you had to do two years in the marina (the navy)."

"Because by the time I was 18, I was already ‘terzo-maitre’, which was third in the tiers of the old restaurant brigade."

"What they call the best man and best woman – they don’t have bridesmaids – they have compare and commare. If you ever hear someone saying “oh this is my compare”, it means they have stood for them when they got married and then normally they would be godparents to their first child."

Whilst scholars have noted that outsiders often faced challenges in sourcing participants (e.g. Burrell, 2006), being an outsider proved advantageous in some respects. Outsiders are able to ask ‘obvious’ questions (Morrissey, 1998) and participants are more inclined to unravel as a result (Burton, 2003). Burrell (2006: 20) provides the example of the challenge presented for “a Greek-Cypriot interviewer to ask a Greek-Cypriot respondent to explain the concepts of honour and shame, as this type of knowledge would already be assumed”. In a similar vein, my status as an outsider allowed me to ask questions about southern Italian life which would be obvious to someone of Italian origin and cause tension if asked by a northern Italian. This is because a deep north/south antagonism is present in Italy (Chancellor, 2013) with those from southern Italy perceived to be an inferior, less civilised race by northern Italians (Burrell, 2006).

I was also mindful of how I was perceived in other ways. During most interviews the dialogue was relaxed and conversational. One particular couple were sound in the knowledge that they were helping me with my studies and often punctuated their stories with advice about relationships, employment, finance, and life in general. In this respect, I was viewed as a student. Most of the remaining interviews achieved the same relaxed and conversational style, though I was wary of how those of a more comparable age (I was aged between 26 and 27 when the interviews took place) viewed me differently. Younger generations often enquired about my academic achievements and fixated on my teaching role within what is arguably an elite social institution. In doing so, I was viewed more as an academic representative, which according to Rose (1997), may intimidate participants therefore distorting their accounts. In reality, I was able to relate to different participants in different ways. On many occasions this proved to my advantage, as Burrell (2006: 21) notes that seldom are interviewers “a neutral entity during the interview process” nor during the
analysis of the data collected. To this end, it is necessary to review my own history which involves links with Italian families.

5.11. A romanticism challenged

In 2009, following a five year tenure with Pizza Hut UK Ltd, I made the transition to a small, family owned restaurant, E’ Lupo’s. The restaurant was a second generation family business and the working environment that resulted was vastly different to that found at Pizza Hut. Where commerciality had governed at Pizza Hut, a more informal approach was adopted at E’ Lupo’s. Where a target orientation was the norm, a more relaxed approach prevailed. Instead of vertical hierarchies, family relationships were found and standardised processes had been replaced with a more *laissez faire* approach. Put simply, the two companies were polar opposites.

Alongside these changes to the working environment I observed an appreciation for freshly cooked cuisine and, above all else, a family orientation. These two key staples are thought to be among the distinguishing cultural traits of Italian families (Johnson, 1985; di Leonardo, 1984; Lozzi-Toscano, 2004). After spending more than six years working for one Italian family, I had clearly developed romantic notions regarding Italian culture based on this single source. As such, I commenced the interviews expecting to find the same virtues across other families of Italian origin. Whilst a capacity to produce and consume foodstuffs was generally consistent across most of the families interviewed, I was surprised to find that a degree of family harmony was not always the norm. Instead, a number of negative aspects of Italian family life were uncovered. Some of these negative aspects had been noted in the literature previously, for instance, that females are often subservient members of the family (Lozzi-Toscano, 2004). However, other accounts extended to forced labour within the family business as children due to a controlling patriarchal figure. In the Galetta family (see chapter 8), the control of this patriarch extended to wider personal life, including the choice marital suitors for his daughters. These elements of Italian family life (previously unknown to me) served to challenge the romantic notions I held about Italian culture. Herein lies the merit of inviting multiple families to participate as relying on a single Italian family would not have uncovered the rich and complex family dynamics found elsewhere. In a similar vein, the merit of inviting multiple family members to participate is demonstrated as seldom were these negative accounts revealed by the perpetrators (i.e. the patriarchal figure), but rather by those who had been subjected to such an upbringing.

It was clear that issues such as forced labour at the family business were still pertinent in later adult life. These issues were often at the root of any family discord evident between generations. However, it was equally clear that conversations about these issues do not transpire between generations. The interview therefore provided participants with a rare opportunity to vocalise their experiences and issues and may explain why participants were willing to expose their family lives in such a candid manner. This lends credence to Jones’ (1998) view that the recall of past events can provide therapeutic benefits.
5.12. Analysing the data

As the interviews were transcribed by me personally, this provided an initial stage of analysis where I began to identify emerging concepts and group them accordingly. Using the software package NVivo, interview transcripts were coded to create first order concepts. Using my own interpretation, I was then able to convert these first order concepts into broader second order themes. For example, data coded "avoid disappointing parents", "helping out" or "involving all of the family" were categorised as part of the second order theme relating to 'family obligations' (see figure 5.6). As the analysis was undertaken by a single researcher (i.e. myself) there was no need to cross-reference, discuss and re-categorise interpretations of second order themes as is often practiced when multiple researchers are involved in the categorisation of interview transcripts (e.g. Altinay, Saunders and Wang, 2014).

![Figure 5-6 - Example data structure](image)

A final stage of analysis involved organising the 33 second order themes into five aggregate groupings (table 5.4, page 76). To recap, the aim of the thesis is to explore the influence of family relationships on next generation employment preferences, therefore the groupings of 'family relationships' and 'next generation decision making' were of the most pertinent interest. Noting from the interview transcripts that some parent-child relationships had broken down whereas others were fine, I therefore returned to the data asking questions such as: What is the basis for the breakdown in parent-child relationships? How and in what
ways do parent-child relationships influence offspring employment preferences? A further analysis of the data revealed that there exists great linkage between next generation involvement, family relationships, and next generation decision making. At the heart of this linkage, is the notion of obligations (discussed in section 11.2.1). Offspring generally feel obligated to labour at the family business and this involvement at an early age means that family members often feel that they are 'already in' the family business. The already in theme provided an important lens through which next generation decision making can be understood and has been reconceptualised accordingly in this thesis (see figure 11.2, page 132). Re-analysing the data in terms of the linkage between obligations, parent-child relationships and next generation employment preferences also paved the way for the typology of next generation employment preferences developed (see figure 11.6, page 149).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5-4 - Aggregating the second order themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimenting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Outlook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Skills-Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succession Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Life Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authenticity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betterment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture Shock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frugal Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian Family Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Generation Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already In Exploitation-Suffering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Obligations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Generation Decision Making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Up-Complacency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynastic Motives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exiting Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following in Father's Footsteps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Nudges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruction of Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envy-Regret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepotism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strict Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.13. Conclusion

The above chapter has demonstrated the merit in adopting a methodological approach which takes a 'household' or 'family' level of analysis as a starting point. Within the five Italian families that participated, the accounts of multiple family members were sought. In some cases, the accounts of seven family members were gained. In other cases, just two family members were willing to be interviewed. The interpretative approach adopted is chiefly concerned with what can be learned about how family dynamics influence next generation decision making rather than whether these accounts are representative of families per se (Italian or otherwise).

The chapter has illustrated that the utmost consideration was given to the ethical issues presented when researching family relationships. As such, great sensitivity was shown when participants found the recall of past events to be upsetting, and anonymity was granted to families who exercised this right through the use of pseudonyms. There were various contacts made with each of the participating families (see figure 5.7, page 77), meaning that the data collection process was an inevitably time consuming one. However, the time
invested gaining the accounts of each family combined with the various contacts afterwards, meant that my relationship with each of the families was a healthy one, something which I have been keen to maintain in both a personal and professional capacity more recently (as discussed in section 5.8 and evidenced in appendix 3).

Figure 5.7 - Contacts with participating families

The wider interview process was supported by participants drawing a timeline of events and a family tree. The chapter has also outlined how participants drew on material possessions about their home/workplace to bring their accounts to life, namely, through the use of photographs. As figure 5.8 illustrates, these added elements proved to be inter-relational and complementary. For instance, participants often alluded to their offspring during the interview while doing one or more of the following: including their son/daughter in the family tree drawn; referencing the birth of their son/daughter in the timeline drawn; and/or drawing my attention to a photograph which depicted their son/daughter. The chapter has illustrated that some of these data collection methods (e.g. use of family trees) are widely practised in other fields of study (e.g. primary health care), though these have yet to be applied within the context of family business research. As such, borrowing from other fields of study in this sense has allowed the influence of family relationships to be explored in depth.

Figure 5.8 - Combined elements of the wider interview process
The combination of the data collection methods outlined in figure 5.8 (page 77) allowed very data-rich accounts to be gained from participating family members. One's upbringing, and the family relationships that result, proved to be a powerful driver in the next generation decision making among those interviewed. The following chapters include the narratives of five Italian families, beginning with the Italian family which I worked alongside for six years, the Miccoli family.
6. The Miccoli Family: “I want to get on in my life”

6.1. Introduction

The narrative of the Miccoli family features the efforts of Italian born, Vito Miccoli, who alongside his wife Sally Miccoli, founded E’ Lupo’s restaurant in 1986. The couple operated the catering business for almost two decades and the restaurant became their life. However, in a unilateral decision by Vito the business was sold in 2005, much to the dismay of his wife Sally. The restaurant remained under family ownership, however, as it was purchased by the younger of Vito and Sally’s two sons, Steven Miccoli, who has operated the restaurant since.

The eatery was not Vito’s first entrepreneurial endeavour, however, as his employment history is dotted with various accounts of small business ownership owing to his desire to ‘get on in life’. This desire has been inherited by Vito’s sons, Ricky and Steven, though this is manifest in two very different employment paths. Through his purchase of the family business, Steven evidently shares his father’s appetite for self-employment. On the contrary, Ricky’s occupation as an IT professional demonstrates a preference for paid employment. Whilst their employment paths differ remarkably, the chapter reveals that the brothers share a common upbringing in which they were totally immersed in their father’s business dealings.

Figure 6.1 maps the Miccoli family tree including Vito and Sally Miccoli, Ricky Miccoli and Steven Miccoli, whose accounts have formed the basis of this chapter. The narrative begins with the migration decision of Vito’s father, Adolfo Miccoli, which gave rise to the family’s presence in the UK.

*Figure 6-1 - The Miccoli family tree*
6.2. Leaving Italy
Adolfo Miccoli (born 1920) worked in a factory in southern Italy. In the years following the Second World War the factory collapsed, killing some and leaving many injured. Adolfo escaped unscathed but at a time when insurance policies were far from commonplace, there were no signs of the factory being rebuilt. Adolfo was without work “doing different jobs where he could get his hands on it...the family was growing and he saw in an advert that in France, Germany and England, they wanted people for work”. Though wife Antonietta (born 1924) preferred France “because it was nearer”, Adolfo was accepted only in the UK and bid his wife and children farewell under the impression that he would be working as an electrical engineer. The reality on arriving in Dover, however, was that Adolfo was destined for factory work once again at Staveley Works. After two years, Adolfo accrued some holiday entitlement and returned to Italy to visit the family only to find that employment prospects in that part of Italy were still confined to “work in the fields”. Vito speculates that by this time his father had also grown tired of “two years on his own, washing, cooking, going to work, etc”, suggesting that male Italians are reluctant to undertaken domestic chores. Adolfo therefore decided that his family would join him in the UK and in 1958, with a fifth child (Piglio) on the way, he returned to Italy to collect the family.

In sum, Adolfo migrated initially as a lone migrant seeking employment, though by 1958 the Miccoli family were united together in the UK.

6.3. Early adjustments
The decision was met with some resistance by eldest son Vito (born 1944), who pleaded with his father to “leave me with my grandma”, who remained in Italy. Aged 14 at the time of migration, Vito resented his father, “I hate you, you have brought me here, I don’t know anybody, I’ve left all my friends in Italy...and now I’ve got to go back to school”. Here, Vito refers to the fact that he had just completed his schooling in Italy but his residence in the UK meant that he would have to return to school owing to compulsory education extending beyond his 14 years. Vito experienced culture shock as posed by a new language and the comparatively poor weather “I’d never seen so much snow in my life...in the classroom I was just a dummy. The teacher was writing things down but I didn’t know what it blinking meant”. Vito’s English soon developed, however, thanks to an English to Italian dictionary and the help of local girl, Gina, who had recently married into a neighbouring Italian family. Though the Miccoli family were destined to move yet again, “I had just got going in Staveley, and met her [Sally] and two years after we moved to Sheffield”. Despite the move, Vito continued his relationship with local girl Sally (born 1944), exposing her to the Italian way of life:-

“Vito’s mum would invite five families (who they were really close friends with) this Saturday. She would have roasted chickens, lasagne, the others would have brought some sort of cake they had made. And you are all in the house, the kids would be in one room listening to music or whatever kids do, the fellas would be in another room playing cards and the women would be nattering in another room. And that was a
regular weekend thing that happened. You would be at my house this weekend but next weekend you would be at someone else’s house. And that was what you did. It didn’t cost you a lot but it meant that you got your family together and friends...they did everything in their home because that was their way of life"

The above quote illustrates that a certain flair for the provision of domestic hospitality can be found among these migrant Italian families. Of interest is whether this underpinned their later success in the catering trade.

6.4. “I want to get on in my life”

Vito’s early encounters with work revolved around helping his father to provide for the family, “he had five kids, another one had just been born, Anna was born in Staveley in 1960”. Vito stresses that “my father he needed help” and being the eldest of six children, Vito was obligated to contribute to the family’s income. As such, Vito spent time down the pit, as a mechanic and as a delivery man, citing the desire to “get on in my life and this money is rubbish” as the rationale for switching between jobs. Frustrated with changes in the management structure Vito admits “I got a bit pissed off and I thought ‘right, I’ll open my own garage’. And I tried and I did open my own garage but people were complaining about the smell (because it was just a lock up garage) of the paint and things like that and they shut me down”. Vito’s commitment to improving his economic circumstances is characteristic of many migrants, though perhaps it was his status as a father and provider that also buoyed his efforts. Vito and Sally married in 1963 and produced two sons in the years that followed, Ricky (born 1964); and Steven (born 1970).

Now with a family of his own, Vito performed multiple jobs simultaneously over the following years in a bid to “put something away for a rainy day”. This included work as a singer in numerous groups alongside others of Italian origin. However, this did not bring Vito the financial relief he hoped for and to complicate matters “my mother and my sister Silvana wanted to go back...because her dad [my grandfather] had died and she was worried about her mother and she missed them”. In 1971, after residing in the UK for more than a decade, Adolfo and Antonietta Miccoli, “like many of the Italians in that community, went back to Italy”. Vito explains that “the reason that me and my brother stayed is because we got married here”. Sally elaborates about Italians:-

“They like to die in their own country with their own family...I know for a fact that when Vito’s mum and dad went back home it was because of their age and because of their family. But I always said to Vito that no matter what we would always go every year to see your parents because they can’t afford the money to come and see us. You need a few thousand pound to go there every year so that thousand pound (or two thousand pound) was never spent on the home...I’ve never been one for fancy furniture and luxury, never... to me it is more important to have the money to go and see the family. So it was not spent on other things...I’ve never wanted fancy things, my family never had anything. It was the same with Vito’s mum and dad, whatever money they got had
to go on one side to be able to travel to see the family...in case anybody was sick or died and then you had to go over straight away”.

It was through Vito’s contacts on the singing circuit that his first opportunity for small business ownership emerged. This involved a ‘swap shop’ trading in guitars, amplifiers, hi-fis and other electrical equipment that Vito purchased from a friend “so I chanced it and took it on for about £1,700 to £2,000”. Ricky remembers that in doing so, his father “became personally responsible for our livelihood...it was a big, big step. And I know there was a lot of consternation at times with my mum because she was always thinking at least with a job you have security of employment and therefore you have a guaranteed income every week”. Vito admits that with paid employment “you know how much you are going to get every month, but in business you don’t know how much that will be week from week to week”. According to Ricky, his father’s self-employment aspirations were fuelled by a “desire to get on whilst realising that you would be limited whilst working for other people and he wanted to be in control of his own destiny”. While the notion of ‘getting on in life’ is somewhat vague it is clearly linked with the pursuit of financial prosperity and this is evident in the accounts of Ricky and Steven Miccoli, albeit later in the chapter.

Ricky recalls the peaks and troughs of the swap shop and how this could be “quite telling really. I recollect a number of times when my father’s temperament changed quite a lot, as did my mum’s”. Vito operated the part exchange shop against the backdrop of the 1980s, “there was no work because the pits shut down and people were stealing stuff”. Therefore, Vito was always alert to other opportunities:-

“So we had this shop buying and selling guitars...and I started talking to my mother about opening a pizzeria or a restaurant. So I went to see one that was already opened in Crooks in Sheffield and something happened and he wanted to sell it and I went and bought it...so I had shop and a pizzeria...it was only 32 seats so it was very small. A small kitchen, one toilet, no wine license”.

Vito enlisted the help of an Italian friend to work in the kitchen and “show me the ways”. Though Vito explains, “the big mistake was I did it with my brother, a partnership”. From the outset, there was concern from Vito about his brother, Giovanni Miccoli, doing equal work. “I was there every night and every day...he was a hairdresser...so he could never be there for opening time”. Vito’s multiple commitments also put a strain on his marriage to Sally:-

“I didn’t see him you know. He used to be in the shop in the daytime (the kids were at school so I used to do jobs cleaning and working in the factory and that) but then he would come home, get changed and he would be straight off to the restaurant. And then sometimes he’d meet friends at night and be going out and I wouldn’t see him. We would’ve been divorced if he hadn’t have sold the restaurant. Also, his brother didn’t do much. It was supposed to be a partnership but he never did much. Vito was doing most of the work and the shopping and everything. It couldn’t have worked”.

Vito trusted Giovanni with running the business while he and Sally enjoyed a holiday. However, he returned two weeks later to find “hardly any food inside for stock, there was no money in the bank”. Ultimately, Giovanni had purchased a house and used the business’
profits to fund the renovation needed. Vito had little option but to “put if for sale straight away”.

### 6.5. The start of something special

During the mid-1980s, Vito was performing at a gig in Rotherham when he spotted the opportunity to purchase the restaurant E’ Lupo’s. Vito recalls the unorthodox layout of the building:

“It was a very small kitchen...when I took it over I was shut down for quite a while to decorate it all, extend the kitchen, put another toilet in. The bar was upstairs which was where we had parties (up to 26 people), downstairs we had 40 people, so it was a trek every time you wanted a drink or starters for the parties”.

Sally reminisces, “it was some laugh...we had some lovely nights there, honest, really lovely nights...when we first started there, the first week we took £350, then the next week/month we took another £50 and gradually we worked it from that, built it up”. By 1986, Vito and Sally had quickly outgrown the limited capacity the building offered and seized the opportunity to purchase the premises adjacent. However, Vito appointed a building contractor who demanded an unconventional payment arrangement:-

“I got some builders, well, they were recommended, but they wanted paying weekly so they were getting paid every day. When we talked about it and I asked him how long it would take, he said ‘roughly about three to four months no more’. After about ten months they were still there. And we were still paying them. I had to pay the rent, the banks, the wages”.

The situation almost proved disastrous for the couple who, at this point, were financially obligated to both the restaurant and the swap shop. Fortunately, when the building work was finally completed E’ Lupo’s reopened at its larger neighbouring site, once again offering diners a taste of southern Italy.

“[My father] saw the opportunities in Italian dining and he got into that, he could see there was money there. It was at a time when opportunity and sustainability in the electrical shop was dipping, it was receding at a point of time when sustainability and growth opportunities in the restaurant business was much more positive...in the 70s and 80s there was increasing affluence and more cosmopolitan views about what was available to eat for example...so there became a point where it was natural to say we should step out or reduce our interest in the shop business and focus on the restaurant. And they were at a point where they couldn’t do justice to both”.

With the restaurant slowly gaining precedence, stewardship of the swap shop was eventually handed over to youngest son Steven. Unlike the swap shop, the restaurant clearly became more than just a place of work for the couple as in Sally’s comments:-

“It’s my life...my second home...I enjoy cooking and I want it to carry on like that...it is a hard life working in a restaurant. To keep it as it is, always right, you have to live there
practically. Everything that wanted doing, all the repairs, it was our home and Vito did it himself. If he could do it, he would do it himself”.

The restaurant proved popular, which Vito attributes to the following:

“It was us that made it E’ Lupo’s for the food, the kindness, the way that we treated the people coming in. When people came in I used to shake their hand, when they go out I used to go to open the door, get their coat, say goodnight and whatever. People, they saw something different (perhaps from the English restaurants) in the way that we treated them…I only advertised once when I took it over to state that it was under new management and since then it has just been through word of mouth. And touchwood, it has been great. We did things that other restaurants didn’t do, as far as I know”.

Here, Vito alludes to the provision of live entertainment on select nights. This took the form of tribute acts, “we did special nights with lookalikes. We had Tina Turner, we had all of them, Elton John, Tina Turner, Julio Iglesias...Inglebert Humperdink...Neil Diamond...Cliff Richard”. Vito claims, “I knew I had something special when I was next door and people were coming in by word of mouth and it was Friday and Saturday and I couldn’t fit them in”.

Despite the restaurant consuming much of the couple’s time resources, the eatery proved to be their main source of socialising, “our friends are there and gradually when you don’t see the older ones you start thinking ‘have they died?’...They were nice people...we have not had many bad customers, everyone has been lovely”. Close relationships were not confined to customers but to staff also, as Sally attests, “we’ve had some wonderful staff...we’ve had a lot of students, some really lovely staff even the older ones, and they would do anything for us. You could talk to any of them and they will only have good things to say about us”. Like many family businesses, the restaurant often relied on the ability to mobilise family labour which provided an income for extended family members. “I have helped my own family, my nieces, I’ve had them all, honestly. They would do anything for me and him. They would come when I needed them, at short notice just like that”.

6.6. Letting go

After almost 20 years of running E’ Lupo’s restaurant alongside wife Sally, Vito reached the age of 65 and had quite simply ‘had enough’. Vito sold the business to youngest son Steven and his lifelong friend and business partner Nino Falsone (see chapter 7). Steven explains that “it was always in their head to try and keep it in the family”. In 2005, the business was sold though the decision was a unilateral one according to Sally:-

“I could’ve killed him when he wanted to sell it. It was like taking half of my life away...and I am glad in a way that Steven has it because at least I know I can still work there. Half of me is glad but then you can never shut off from it. I always thought to myself I’ll be here till I die. I don’t mean that literally but I always thought we would have it until the end because it has been our life. I am not being awful but if we had some grandchildren, we would have another interest in our life. But because we’ve had a business like that, it is very difficult to make another life outside. Really we’ve had a
bit of a miserable life. But if it had been a different person bought it, really it might have been better because maybe then we would have got on and done things with our life. I feel a bit...I can't just shut off”.

The above sentiments reveal an apparent trade-off for Sally, between continuing her involvement in the business (albeit now employed by her son) and the prospect of grandparental responsibilities. On a different note, Sally was clearly opposed to the sale of the business. However, as the following quote demonstrates, she was often subservient to the will of her husband:-

“Honestly, because I was absolutely in love with [Vito] and loved him above everything else. To me, he doesn’t realise, he was above my kids. What he liked, we always did what he wanted. I always looked after the kids, don’t get me wrong. He was the head of the house, I would sort him out first and everything else was after”.

Of interest is whether the subservience highlighted above is unique to the Miccoli family dynamic or can be found among other women and their Italian born husbands. Sally prefers that this is a product of her acculturation into the Italian way of life. “You see me, Richard, from being 14 when I met Vito, I have been more Italian...with Vito being the head, I have been brought up as an Italian, not as an English [person]”. This suggests that being subservient to the will of an Italian husband is not limited to Italian females. Despite being born in the UK, Sally clearly identifies with the characteristics associated with Italian culture and by inclusion, the subservience female family members towards the patriarchal figure.

6.7. Steven: “Following in my father’s footsteps”

Steven Miccoli (born 1970) was in his late teenage years when confronted with his first opportunity to run a business. When Vito purchased E’ Lupo’s, Steven assumed responsibility for the exchange shop and was effectively “given the opportunity to run my dad’s business then as kind of my own...it made me grow up in terms of skills needed in dealing with people and problems”. Previously, Steven had studied a college diploma in electrical engineering and explains the reasons for this:-

“Again it all stems down to kind of following in my father’s footsteps a little bit, because he’d had the retail shop selling music systems and home audio systems...as a young kid I used to go down to the shop and play around with these musical instruments and music, I was fascinated with stuff like that...and that’s what pushed me into that industry”.

With the restaurant taking priority for Vito and Sally, Steven “approached the bank and got some funding and decided to start my own business”. However, Ricky explains that this actually involved Steven taking over his father’s existing business (i.e. the exchange shop), albeit “taking it in a different direction and my father still had an interest in it (if you like) whilst he spent more time with my mum developing the restaurant. It then came to a point where...Steven took it to Ecclesall Road doing very much in-car hi-fi and stuff”. Aged 32 and a recently married man, Steven had been operating the car and home audio business as his
own business for some twelve years. However, two years later Steven’s business endured “a bit of a downturn…I could see the market changing massively in my industry…cars were coming out with things already built-in”. In the same period, his parents’ business had changed significantly. What was once a “small business, almost like a cafeteria/pizza bar” had “moved forward massively”. Steven remembers:-

“It was probably not until my parents had been in the new, bigger premises for several years that I saw the bigger picture. The fact that it was a bigger venue, more clientele and it was more of a professional business and I was a bit envious of that because at the time I only had a small business of my own. I was struggling and obviously they were quite successful. Yeah, I guess there was a time when I thought ‘I wish I had what they had’”

Steven describes how his father contemplated retirement:-

“Initially, they didn’t want to retire, they wanted me to get more involved with it. But I wasn’t prepared to do that really unless they sold it to me because I was scared about running ideas past them and making changes. My parents being old, a bit traditional and stuck in their ways, I knew that we would clash and that we’d end up having family ruts and it just wouldn’t work”.

The business was sold to Steven and his friend (and new business partner) Nino Falsone in November 2005, both of whom were keen to “put our stamp on it”. Steven notes, “for those 20 or so years that they had it, it was in their blood the business itself. So it was very hard for them to let go…as soon as we made changes to the flooring and the décor, straight away their noses were turned up and they disagreed with it all because it was not what they had been used to and what they had seen work for all those years”. With time, however, his parents’ concerns would be quashed. Though different to the car and home audio industry, Steven was well equipped for the restaurant business due to two factors. First, Steven worked at the restaurant extensively in previous years under Vito and Sally’s tenure, providing him with a “taste of what it was to be in the restaurant industry”. Second, the restaurant drew parallels with Steven’s previous occupation in that “you were still dealing with the general public and meeting people face to face”.

Ten years after the purchasing the family business, Steven continues to relish the opportunity “to be my own boss. I’ve always wanted to do that rather than working for someone else”. Steven particularly enjoys “the feedback you get when you’re successful is just great. And I think the restaurant business, like any hospitality business gives you all those chances to interact with people, to provide something, get great feedback and get that feel-good factor (if you like) for what you are doing”. The term ‘success’ appears to be somewhat important to Steven which he equates to “the business running well, making money and providing a nice standard of living from it…success is generally a term for things going well”. Steven was taught by his father to “work hard and put the effort in to get where you want to be basically…it is not given to you on a plate, it is not easy”. This last quote may symbolise Steven’s interpretation of his father’s notion of ‘getting on in life’.
Reflecting on his sense of cultural identity Steven confirms “I would class myself as more of an Italian person than anything because I have had more of an Italian influence ingrained into me from such a young age”. Interestingly, Steven explains “that is probably another reason why I got into the restaurant business because it is presenting who I am and where I have come from and my background”.

6.8. Ricky: “My path is somewhat different to my brother’s”

Reflecting on his youth, Ricky Miccoli remembers:-

“In the evening they [Italians] would as a community, collectively congregate in different people’s houses in the same area...most of the time, in fairness, at my grandparents’ house. They were the focal point...But that all changed in 1970/1 because my grandparents, like many of the Italians in that community, went back to Italy”.

Ricky admits that “I never really understood what my father did until in later life I learnt that he had a number of different jobs at that time. I think it was quite commonplace to switch jobs”. Ricky confirms his father’s efforts to supplement his income, “to help pay the way he would do jobs where people would come and bring the cars and he would check the brakes and that sort of stuff”. Ricky recalls offering his assistance, “I would help out as best as I could do with getting the equipment out and tools and helping him bleed the brakes and that kind of stuff”. This family labour extended to the swap shop Vito purchased and Ricky remembers that “after school and at the weekends I would go and work in the shop”. On one occasion, the ill health of a family member meant that Ricky assumed the reins:-

“I remember that my grandmother suffered strokes on a couple of occasions, quite serious strokes, I was probably about 13/14 and my father had to go out to Italy for several weeks. So I had to run the shop, which I always recollect helped me to grow up in many ways because being in charge of a shop at 13/14, being in charge of the money, deciding whether you were going to buy it and offering people things at a lower price and all that sort of thing was a big responsibility”.

Ricky explains how following earlier bouts of catering in Sheffield, his parents committed fully to a leap into the restaurant business:-

“My dad got the appetite to want to do [catering] and mum clearly because she had been working in catering in the schools clearly enjoyed that. They then got the opportunity to buy the one in Rotherham...The fact was that they knew Sheffield and knew the area particularly well and therefore knew when they could expect trade. To my knowledge they didn’t know Rotherham. So it was, as I understood it, a bit of a gamble, but one that paid off...When they went into the restaurant business, they went full on at it...That was the big, big step for them really. Buying what was a car restoration place and making it into a restaurant. My father had much bigger ideas than it proved to be with what you could do upstairs etc, but as a floor space how that got converted into what it was stood them in really good stead”.
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Contemplating why he was never inclined to join the family business, Ricky confesses:

“I never saw from a personal point of view that I wanted to run the restaurant...Yes I was quite happy interacting with customers, that wasn’t a problem and it wasn’t that I am not entrepreneurial, it just didn’t appeal. I wanted to be something that was more commercially oriented and serving big communities and that is why my path is somewhat different to my brother’s”

Ricky joined Halifax Building Society in 1982, forging a career as an IT professional and only exiting Halifax Bank of Scotland in 2011 to head for the retail sector, where he continues to work as an IT professional. Ricky concedes:

“I didn’t have a career plan. I don’t have a career plan. I’ve never had that...there was no sort of pivotal movement that came to a head at all. When I was leaving school [my parents] were very clear to me about getting a job or further education and they didn’t push me either way, they were just very proud when I got my job...I think they realised it was quite different (what I was doing) to anyone else, to my knowledge, in the family”.

However, Ricky’s obligations to the family did not cease upon his entry into the banking sector. On the contrary, his understanding of finance complemented his parents’ efforts at the restaurant:

“My experience there in some ways complemented my parents because effectively what I became was a bit like financial counsel in terms of how can you go about better utilising your money...I would try to help them understand some of the reasons why things are what they are because they always got wound up about how much tax you pay and VAT...that was something that I tried to guide them through with their accountant”.

6.9. Summary
The above narrative features Italian born migrant, Vito Miccoli, who was instilled with a desire to ‘get on in life’ i.e. the application of hard work in the pursuit of economic success. After experimenting with a variety of small business start-ups, Vito found happiness and financial prosperity at E’ Lupo’s restaurant, which he operated with wife Sally for almost 20 years. Among other things, the chapter has revealed a flair for the provision of domestic hospitality among the Italian community (owing to the social preferences of this migrant group) which may underpin their efforts in commercial catering, and a subservience of British born females towards their Italian born husbands.

The chapter has demonstrated that the two brothers have pursued remarkably different employment paths. Whilst eldest son Ricky forged a successful career as an IT professional, his younger brother Steven purchased the restaurant founded by his parents in 1986. However, both siblings were equally immersed in their parents’ business dealings growing up. This suggests that volunteering one’s labour at the family business as a youngster does not prevent the next generation from pursuing opportunities beyond its remit in later life.
Unlike his elder brother, Steven grew to embrace involvement (and ownership) of the family business whereas Ricky preferred to pursue employment elsewhere.

The next chapter features Nino Falsone (introduced briefly in section 6.6), the lifelong friend and business partner of Steven Miccoli, and explores the factors giving rise to the duo’s ownership of E’ Lupo’s restaurant.
7. The Falsone Family: “Into the restaurant I went”

7.1. Introduction

The narrative of the Falsone family focuses mainly on Nino Falsone, who grew up under the remit of his successful father, Giovanni Falsone, a restauranteur turned property magnate. Giovanni owned three restaurants in the Sheffield area and Nino was made to work at these establishments as a youngster. However, Giovanni never envisioned that his son would become a chef, preferring instead that Nino pursue a career in the professions. Though when Nino failed to achieve academically, he had little choice but to do so. When the need to provide for a family of his own arose years later, Nino switched jobs occasionally in a bid to improve his income though he eventually returned to the restaurant business through his friendship with Steven Miccoli (introduced in chapter 6).

The chapter illustrates two points. First, that Nino Falsone was involved in his father’s restaurants from a young age. Second, that when faced with a lack of alternatives, involvement in the family business is a feasible option. This continues to be the case among the latest generation as whilst Nino’s eldest daughter is intent on a career in the performing arts, she is mindful that a position within her father’s restaurant provides a convenient back-up plan.

The narrative features the accounts of Nino Falsone and Olivia Falsone (see figure 7.1 for family tree) and begins with Nino recalling his father’s efforts in Sheffield’s culinary scene.

*Figure 7-1 - The Falsone family tree*
7.2. Coming out “on top”

Giovanni Falsone (born 1945), "was a restaurateur from day dot really, working in cafes and bars in Italy, travelling through Europe, various hotels, etc.,...he’s been to Switzerland, Portugal, France, Italy, everywhere. You name it and he has been...and eventually he came to England where the work was”. The experience added to Giovanni’s cultural capital as according to Nino, “my dad speaks every language you can think”. Giovanni was well travelled and upon entering the restaurant trade had very specific ideas of the experience he was looking to reproduce:-

"He’d been all the way around Europe and seen French cuisine...he’d had experience of silver service and being a chef and he wanted it like he’d seen it. Basically, a waiter in those days wore black trousers, white shirt, a dickie bow, white towel and a tray. He would never take a drink to a table without a tray and he would never have cutlery on a table because you didn’t know what you were going to eat. Everything was really strict, really strict".

Nino explains that "he had three [restaurants], there was Pizzeria Giovanni, Victoria Wine Bar and Bistro and Dam House Restaurant". This provided a comfortable life for the Falsone family:-

"Well it provided us with clothes on our back, houses, food, my dad sent me to private school. It was a big part of our lives, if it wasn’t the case I wouldn’t be where I am now to be honest...we had good holidays, that was one of my dad's main goals in life. Sunday's too, he wouldn't work on a Sunday. This was due to Sunday being the day of rest in the Catholic way and he would never open on a Sunday. It was the family day, sit down, have Sunday dinner, etc. It was the one day a week where he could relax...because my dad would open daytime and night time and he was there constantly. He would be the first one to open and the last one to leave"

Nino acknowledges that his father was "very, very successful. A great businessman" though explains that the road to success was not a straight forward one, "he took the risks in business when things weren’t so good, interest rates were through the roof and he took chances and basically he got through them and made it". Nino summarises that Giovanni “struggled through life” before he eventually “came out on top”. Of interest is whether growing up within the remit of a successful, hard-working father has served to deprive Nino of the hunger and drive required to forge success of his own.

On a different note, Nino explains that “the restaurants were not really where he made his money...the main thing where he took his money and where he took the risk was in student property”. Over time, Giovanni withdrew completely from the restaurant business and into the property market. This was due to increases in “wages and rent and rates” in the restaurant business. Nino recalls that one restaurant in particular was “costing him money in the end”. Eventually, Giovanni received a “good offer from KFC and off he went”. The sale of the restaurant reveals that Giovanni viewed his restaurants as a means to financial prosperity and this lies in stark contrast to Vito and Sally Miccoli (see section 6.5), for whom the restaurant became their life (work, social and otherwise). Offloading the restaurants
provided Giovanni with the capital that enabled his future success and put Giovanni in a position where “he could basically have what he wanted”. This raises an interesting point regarding the notions of success and failure within the context of family business survival, as it seems in this case that the failure of the business (to endure under family ownership) led to the eventual success of the family (in terms of financial prosperity).

7.3. Italian life
Marie Falsone (born 1951) had never worked throughout her life owing to Giovanni’s bidding, "she met my dad and he wouldn't let her work". Nino attributes this to "the Italian mentality, you know, all you need to do is get tied to the sink and that is it, I am the provider, I am the mister". This provides a second glimpse at gender roles within an Italian household, namely, that males are the ‘providers’ while females undertake domestic tasks. Furthermore, Nino’s comment “he wouldn't let her work” echoes Sally Miccoli’s sentiments (see section 6.6) that the decisions of the patriarchal figure are not to be questioned. Despite ascribing his father’s outlook on life with a certain “Italian mentality”, Nino is much more ambivalent regarding his own sense of cultural identity:

"I am not really an Italian. I am but I am not. I am a bit fiery and a bit loud and use of hand gestures and things. But deep down I am British through and through. And I am, I've lived here all of my life. I have tasted Italian life and I like it, but is it any different to what this is apart from the language, the food and family life. To be honest, being Italian is about family life. You always sit down and have something to eat and you are always in the circle".

With Nino clearly emphasising family life in his account of Italian culture, one might expect a degree of family harmony within his extended Italian family. However, this is not the case:-

"My Italian family life with my dad's brothers, it is not really how it should be...they don't talk to each other and it is all a little bit too male testosterone...but when it was good, it was good. Every Sunday we used to get together. That is the biggest part of being an Italian, the family aspect. It was close knit, it isn't now...all I will say is that they have got a bit of the green monster regarding money. Because my dad has been so successful, they have always asked him for money, money, money, over the years and he has given it to them. But he has never got repaid. So it is a case of once bitten, twice shy. He has basically told them to go forth and multiply and that is why they have argued".

7.4. “Into the restaurant I went”
As a youngster Nino worked at his father's restaurants "I was peeling garlic and doing stuff like that, but at the weekends, every Friday and Saturday I was a waiter in the restaurant. And I had to work, there was no getting out of it". Despite forcing Nino to work at the restaurants, Giovanni never envisioned for his son to follow this career path, "my dad never wanted me to be in the restaurant business. He wanted me to be the big solicitor or
accountant. A profession. But me being me, there was no way. I was never, what’s the word...academically gifted". This illustrates the oft cited role of the migrant enterprise i.e. to facilitate better opportunity structures for the next generation.

Nino admits that during his schooling, he was conscious that there would always be work at the restaurant, "I always knew that when I did leave school I would always have a job and perhaps that is what made me lazy at school...I was a rebel at school and it bit me in the ass". Upon leaving school, Nino commenced work as an assistant pro golfer though the position proved to be "a glorified shop assistant". This led to Giovanni asking, "what are you doing son, you are earning no money, it's time to earn some money' so I had to go and work for my father. He knew I hadn't accomplished anything at school so there was no going forward in that respect. So into the restaurant I went". As such, Nino was forced to become involved in the family business due to a lack of alternative options. The fact that Nino was mindful of how his father's business provided a valid employment option to re-vert to suggests that family businesses provide the next generation with a safety net of sorts. Interestingly, similar reflections are shared by his eldest daughter, Olivia Falsone, later in the chapter (see section 6.6).

A self-professed "hands on sort of kid", Nino describes that "[cooking] came very natural to me" and therefore “with one toe in the door at a time I got my foot in. The chefs grew confident with me and I would do their role". However, Giovanni soon wished to sell the restaurant at which Nino worked, which was "a big step in my life" according to Nino. This is because before the restaurant was sold to KFC, Giovanni presented his son with the opportunity to purchase the restaurant. “I was only young and he did offer it me but he wanted me to buy it...at 17. And I rejected". Given that this would incur considerable debt at a relatively young age, Nino forfeited the opportunity. However, small business ownership awaited him in later life.

Facing unemployment Nino was offered employment "to go and work with [a friend] at Mamma's and Leoni's". The working environment was intense and Nino recalls the chef’s cautionary words "if you change anything here I will kill you". At Mamma's and Leoni’s, "Becky kindly gave me the bomb that she was pregnant with Olivia". Nino was therefore inclined to "up my wages. I wanted to up my salary because of kids and stuff. So I became the head chef in Penistone at T'iamo". Nino recalls the long journey involved, "I had all the travelling to do from Sheffield to Penistone every day and it took its toll. It really did". Furthermore, the owner "worked me like a dog" and so Nino changed jobs again when asked by a friend "if I wanted to sell flowers". Accustomed to work in the restaurant trade, the wholesale of flowers demanded that Nino swap his evening shifts for work in the early hours of the morning. However, this was not the only challenge:-

"I didn't know a daffodil from a tulip. I said yeah and it was the biggest jump of my life. I was scared shitless because I was on thin ice and I didn't have a clue what I was talking about. I had no idea. The maths side of it too, it wasn't just selling flowers it was multiplication and addition and dividing and adding VAT. But you had to do it with no calculator. I was blown away by it but it made me such a better person. It made my
head work. It made my head active with numbers and made me really sharp and 'on it'.

Despite finding the prospect "very refreshing" and continuing with this line of work for "three and a bit years", it was the British weather that proved the deciding factor in the decision to seek employment elsewhere. "I said 'I will never do another winter again' and that was the end of it. Because it killed me. It was just so cold it was ridiculous, it was a joke". Nino's passion for motor vehicles was ignited momentarily as his next position saw him "work for a brief time at Winchester Cars doing high performance stuff" though he declined to comment on this period of employment.

Nino’s employment history is dotted with job switches and thus draws parallels with the accounts of Vito Miccoli (see section 6.4). Whether this desire to improve one’s economic circumstances is subject to a cultural element at work is questionable. Alternatively, this desire may be a reflection of a father’s obligation to provide for his family found consistently across members of different cultural groups.

7.5. A return to the restaurant business

It was through his friendship with Steven Miccoli that Nino made a return to the restaurant trade and in doing so became self-employed:-

"Me and Steven had always been very, very much together. I can't think of a big gap where we hadn't seen each other, from the early days of being 17/18 all the way through til now...Vito had always wanted to sell [E' Lupo's], even before Steven he offered it Shawn ages ago...So we bumped our heads together and started talking about the restaurant. We decided to bite the bullet and the rest is history. We are still here nine years later".

Despite his tenure in the restaurant trade, Nino never aspired to own his own restaurant business though he was attracted by the lifestyle that it affords:-

"I never thought that I would be owning a restaurant and getting back into it again. But for some reason this (the restaurant business) does pull you back in. Once you've done it, it is there. It has got you. And everyone says that it is the least sociable career you could ever think of. How can it be so unsociable when you get to know who's who, what they do...it's a big gossip area isn't it. I love it, especially for me now. I play golf in the day and work at night. It's perfect".

Giovanni offered his son a few words of caution, "even the day we came to buy this business, he said 'don't do it'". Giovanni warned that "the main concern with a restaurant is staff", adding that "if you can't cook you are screwed even more". Giovanni's intuition appears to hold some validity as Nino recalls the efforts of his friends, "basically he is a builder, she is a waitress, they can't cook and so the chef demands everything he wants". Fortunately, Nino learned "every aspect of this job...from book keeping to bar work, from the restaurant to the kitchen" and offers "you need to know the lot to be a successful business owner, if not it will go down the pan". The transition from working with high performance
cars to ownership of his own restaurant was a relatively smooth one thanks to his prior work experience at E'Lupo's. "In between all this time I was still working here [E'Lupo's] a few nights a week, especially when I was doing flowers I was here. Seeing the business and knowing it is what made me come back". However, Nino was not intent on heeding all of his father's advice:-

"The only thing that I do differently to my dad is that I don't cram people in. I make them try to have a peaceful, enjoyable evening whereas my dad would say 'if they've had coffee, give them the bill...if they've had sweets, give them the bill'. We don't rush people here and try to get them in and out, that is one of the things that I do different. I am a lot more relaxed with staff too, whereas I could be like my dad and do the stuff that he used to do. But I do quite a bit different. You have to go with the times and not embrace the old".

Nino explains that his motivations were "to provide some money" and acknowledges that "we are still finding it tough after nine years". In sum, he reveals:-

"I just needed something to do with my life. I needed that step. When I was at Winchester Cars I wasn't going anywhere there. There was no way I was going to climb the ranks, it just wasn't happening...it was like a wedge fitting a gap, and that is what it took up. It was here and we did it. It was a case of 'let's do it', so we did".

With the addition of Nino's daughters, the Falsone family now spans three generations. Of interest is whether an appetite for restaurant work and involvement in the family business is prevalent among the latest generation, to which attention will now be turned.

7.6. A “back-up” plan

Olivia Falsone (born 1996) is the eldest daughter of Nino and Becky Falsone (see figure 7.1, page 90). Olivia is passionate about dancing and the performing arts and currently plans to "audition for a three year degree somewhere, I think in the West End or audition for shows, then after that audition for a company and be in that company". This is merely a "loose outline" and Olivia admits that she hasn't "quite decided what I want to do". Olivia is conscious that her plans are somewhat different to the career trajectories of her parents and observes that "dad is obviously more independent because he has his own restaurant and has to take on his own responsibilities. Mum works for somebody else so she just does what she is told and works for them". Despite these differences, her parents' experiences have taught Olivia that "you have to work hard to live in a big house and provide families and stuff. And to do something that you enjoy because there is no point doing something that you would not enjoy". As such, Olivia aspires to a future which simply provides "a good experience...to have fun and meet people...just have a mad life and not be bored". Olivia is supported by her parents and explain that "they encourage it. They say do something that I enjoy because I don't like anything academic...they didn't force me to do anything". Perhaps the unreserved support received from her parents, is an attempt by Nino and Becky to provide Olivia with choices which they feel they themselves were denied (particularly in Nino’s case).
Olivia views her cultural identity as a simple case of mathematics, “Grandad was born in Sicily, moved over here and had my dad, so he is half. Then I was born, so I am a quarter”. However, she knows little of the family’s Italian roots and when asked if she feels Italian in any way, she responds “my last name and that is about it”.

While Olivia aspires to a career in the performing arts, it appears that the restaurant business has not been completely discarded. "If my dancing career doesn’t go to plan and it ends at a young age, I have thought about it. But it is not something that I’d really want to do, probably more like a back-up. I’d like to do something that I enjoy first". However, Olivia is keen to clarify that "it is not a case of well my dad owns it so I know I can go and work there". Rather, she is of the opinion that "it is a nice environment...it has a nice vibe". Olivia believes to have the skill set required for restaurant work as "I'm quite confident speaking with people, I don't really get shy. I am quite easy going so if I did work there it would probably be front of house". Olivia has experience of "working in two restaurants before" and notes that this was not owing to her father's influence. In sum, she explains that the notion of "keeping it [the restaurant] in the family" is desirable, though this is not an employment option she is willing to consider "before I was 30".

7.7. Summary

The chapter has revealed that whilst Giovanni Falsone envisioned a career in the professions for his son Nino, failing to achieve academically meant that Nino had little alternative but to work in his father’s restaurant. With a family of his own came the impetus to improve his income and this led Nino to change jobs on multiple occasions throughout his working life. However, this ceased in 2005 when he was reunited with his lifelong friend Steven Miccoli, with whom he purchased the restaurant E’ Lupo’s, which the duo have operated since. Among other things, the chapter has illustrated that the failure of the family business (to survive) is not always equated with the failure of the family (in terms of financial prosperity), and has revealed a second example of the next generation being presented with the opportunity to purchase (rather than inherit/be gifted) the family business.

Above all the chapter has demonstrated that Nino was totally immersed in his father’s restaurant business growing up and this featured as his sole option for employment upon leaving school. Furthermore, the chapter has revealed that family businesses provide a safety net when offspring lack alternative employment options (as in Nino's case), and a back-up plan when next generation family members are unable to realise their preferred choice.

On a critical note, Olivia Falsone's accounts of her involvement at her father's restaurant lacks the immersion detailed in the previous chapter (see chapter 5). Perhaps if the next generation are exposed to their parents’ business dealings from an earlier age, their appetite may be greater. The thesis will now turn its attention to the daughters of the Frusciante family, discussed in the next chapter, to assess this claim.
8. The Frusciante Family: “I have never worked anywhere else”

8.1. Introduction

The following narrative features the exploits of Italian migrant Antonio Frusciante. After owning a string of restaurants at a relatively young age, his family was left bankrupt when Antonio gambled away the family’s newfound wealth. The family were only able to rebuild through Jill’s involvement in business matters and the couple found happiness at Sheffield restaurant, BBs, which they have operated since 1997. However, the restaurant’s labour supply relied heavily on the couple’s three daughters and it was no secret that Antonio intended for each of them to remain in the catering business. As adults, two of the daughters operate restaurant businesses of their own. However, the paths that have led them to restaurant ownership have been often been to the detriment of family harmony.

The chapter reveals that when family relationships break down, this can provide the next generation with a strong motive to explore employment options beyond the family business. The chapter also illustrates that while offspring may aspire to alternative employment options, realising such aspirations can be challenging.

The narrative features accounts from husband and wife, Antonio and Jill Frusciante, and their three daughters, Marianna, Gabriella and Carla (see figure 8.1 for family tree). The narrative begins with the migration decision of Antonio, which was a deeply personal one.

*Figure 8-1 - The Frusciante family tree*
8.2. “I wanted to see everything”

Life in southern Italy involved “working in the field...we all do the farms. You look after the land, that is how you eat”. However, it was not agricultural life that caused Antonio Fruscianti (born 1954) to leave Italy, rather the fact that “my dad had got married again and I was not very happy with his new wife”. Evidently, Antonio’s migration decision was not due to a desire to improve his economic circumstances (as the literature suggests), but due to an intolerance towards his new stepmother.

Aged 14, he headed to Switzerland “where a friend’s dad was working...he took me in and guaranteed for me because I was underage”. Despite his youth, Antonio remembers that the feeling was one of excitement rather than nervousness. Having “not done much at school” and in need of employment, Antonio did not relish the prospect of outdoor work in Switzerland’s cold climate and therefore decided to “start washing up and see what happens”. Antonio began work in the restaurant trade citing “it was always easy to get a job. Especially in Italian restaurants, it was no problem”. He ventured further to Germany, Denmark and Belgium, fuelled by his ambition “to see everything” though Antonio was reluctant to return to Italy as he “would have to do military service”. Instead, Antonio visited his Aunt in the UK, “she was always saying ‘come to England, come to England’”. Antonio recalls the language barriers encountered upon arrival, “it was only difficult here [in England]...because when I came here nobody was speaking anything...just English. So I found that to be tough to make people understand me”.

8.3. Part of the community

In 1974, Antonio met Jill (born 1957) and the couple married in 1979. Jill was no stranger to self-employment as since 1947 her father and grandmother had jointly operated a bakery. “I was about 6, 7 or 8 when I used to beg my dad to take me to work. I remember mixing all the mixtures. He used to put three’penny bits in the mixtures so that I would mix it all properly...yes, I used to absolutely love it and from those early days that was all I ever wanted to do”. Initially discouraged from involvement in the family bakery by her mother, Jill explored other options and in doing so attended a secretarial college. This was short-lived, however, as Jill knew from the outset that her future lay within the bakery business. “I loved getting up early in the morning and walking to work. I started off doing the bread and the bread cakes and the rolling out. Eventually I went upstairs...and did all the confectionary”. Jill explains that the required skill set was bequeathed from one generation to the next, “my mum was self-taught from her mum” and admits that a comfortable standard of living was enjoyed by the family. The bakery, however, was clearly of greater worth for Jill:-

“It certainly meant more to me and I know it did for my dad. It was part of the community. People came every day for a loaf of bread and you got to know them...you were there to serve people and you were there for a purpose. My dad was known to go down on a Sunday and open the ovens up and do something for somebody. And I would have done the same if someone needed a cake for tomorrow”.
Jill also enjoyed the sense of “working with your hands and making things” and was employed at the bakery long after having her first child Marianna in 1981, albeit working from home since giving birth. Meanwhile, Antonio’s self-employment aspirations were already in motion as Jill explains, “he just always wanted his own restaurant”. Since meeting Jill in 1976, Antonio had plied his trade as a chef in many of Sheffield’s Italian eateries, conceding that restaurant work “is like a drug”. However, Antonio cautions that “if you don’t find the right woman, it will not work. One who understands that you work at night time”. This suggests that the unsociable hours that hospitality work can demand is problematic for relationships and reveals the need for a partner who is tolerant/understanding of this.

“[Antonio] has a very good eye for things, changing things and seeing the potential in places...not to mention he is very good at being a chef”. In 1983, Jill’s father helped Antonio to open his first restaurant, La Taverna, in Sheffield. “And then from there I moved to Pine Club, then to Torino on West Street, then I went to Burton on Trent to open another restaurant there and then I came back to Sheffield to open The Flying Pizza”. Between 1983 and 1997, Antonio owned a string of Italian restaurants in Sheffield and neighbouring areas. Jill explains that in most cases “he outgrew that one so we moved to a bigger one”. However, Antonio mismanaged the newfound wealth that accompanied his success in the restaurant business and the family lost everything:-

“Unfortunately looking back, it came too soon for my husband. Obviously I had no control at all - and I am good at controlling money - and I think it was too soon for him. It was too much money for him and he wasn’t looking after it basically. As you do when you are in your late twenties/early thirties as he was then. He was like all youngsters with a lot of money, ‘what do I do with all this money? Oh, there’s a casino, there’s a betting shop’...it was a shame because then the recession hit so basically he went bankrupt on that one. And people often say ‘if you were there it wouldn’t have happened’ and I think in a way it wouldn’t have because I am the one here who pays all the bills and controls all the money...the next one, we had to start again basically and he found it very hard to work for someone else. He probably won’t tell you that because he is very proud”.

8.4. A helping hand
Losing the business “was very hard, the kids were small and to be honest if it wasn’t for my family (even my husband’s father sent us some money as well) I don’t know what we would have done”. With more help from Jill’s father Antonio was able to rebuild, “eventually with my dad’s help again he got his own place and started again”. As a result, Antonio’s respect for his father-in-law grew, “not because he helped me or anything like that but the way he looked after the family...I don’t think I ever met a nicer man. A fantastic man”. Reflecting on her sense of cultural identity, Jill comments that “my family are very much like an Italian family. They are very family oriented like the Italians”. Despite residing in the UK since the age of 21, Antonio proudly asserts “I am Italian” though confesses that occasionally “the
words are gone, sometimes they come out in English” suggesting that command of his mother tongue has diminished slightly.

In 1997, Antonio purchased Division Street restaurant BBs, though this time Jill joined Antonio at the helm. Trade at the family bakery had slowed over the preceding years due to two main factors. First, the bakery was located upon the route earmarked for the Sheffield Supertram, “with all the disruption to the roads it killed such a lot of businesses”. Second, the threat of the supermarkets sealed the fate of the bakery “they were selling bread in the supermarket at three times less than what we could afford to sell it at”. Jill evaluates that things soon became “money oriented” and despite the cake section continuing to thrive under her remit, “it wasn’t enough to sustain everything else”. The business folded in 1997 and Jill decided to join Antonio at BBs. Jill was accustomed to early morning shifts at the bakery, therefore the evening work at the restaurant was a difficult adjustment. Furthermore, she recalls the daunting transition of “working at home and not seeing hardly anybody to suddenly being thrust into meeting people again”. This would soon change, however, as after 18 years the opportunities for socialising with long established clientele is the aspect of the job which Jill holds most dear. “We make friends with customers. We are shutting for two weeks tomorrow night and we have so many tables of people we know, they know we are going away and they want to come and see us”.

The aim of BBs “was just to make a living and to make a future for our family”. From the outset, the three children were involved in daily operations at the restaurant, “when we started here, Marianna was only 13 or 14 and it [the restaurant] was doing nothing. So on some days we opened the restaurant with just me, Jill and the girls. Marianna was working with Jill upstairs, with me and the other two working downstairs in the kitchen. One was washing up and one was helping me”. According to Antonio, life in the restaurant is “a good life” and he always intended for his daughters to remain in restaurant work and to eventually “takeover this ship”. Jill confirms that “my husband always hoped we would have a son to take over the family business but obviously we had daughters”. On the contrary, Jill preferred that her daughters pursue a different employment path:-

“I did not want any of them to go into this night time, unsociable work and I suppose I was like my mum in a way, I tried to steer them to train as something else. But it is weird that eventually they have come back to this but they all love food. They can eat for their country and they love making food. The older two (the younger one not so much) they are like their dad. They can’t walk past something without trying it. They have a passion for food so I think they are like their dad that they like to serve the food and see a smile on people’s faces”.

Evidently, Jill attributes her daughters’ flair for the restaurant industry to the passion they share for food, preferring that they have inherited culturally from her husband. In doing so, Jill downplays that each of her children have been involved in restaurant life from an early age and that this might be the source of their appetite for restaurant work. Of interest is the extent to which early involvement in restaurant life served to influence the Frusciante daughters when contemplating their future employment paths.
As adults, Marianna and Gabriella each operate their own restaurant businesses, Pinocchio’s and BBs, respectively. Meanwhile, “Carla is still here with us, hopefully when we retire she will take over this place”. Antonio often expressed his desires for his daughters “to stay in this [line of work]” though claims “I have never interfered in their life, whatever they want to do I was right behind them”. The accounts of Marianna and Gabriella, however, suggest otherwise as chief among the reasons for exploring employment options beyond the remit of the family business was a desire to have a

8.5. Marianna: “It would make my dad really happy”

Eldest of three sisters, Marianna (born 1982), recalls working at BBs under the supervision of her father:-

“I always remember my dad being in the kitchen, always. My mum was still working at the bakery so it was just me and my dad...My dad was a very tough teacher, he was loud and he shouted at me a lot. I never got any praise, it was always “do better” but it was good. I learned a lot. It made me tougher I think”.

Marianna was highly involved at the restaurant, both in the kitchen and front of house, though admits “from a young age, I had already decided that this was what I didn’t want to do”. Marianna states that growing up in a restaurant business was tough, particularly “all of your friends going out and you can’t because you have got to go to work. You can’t let your mum and dad down”. Marianna clearly felt obligated to help her parents at the restaurant. Furthermore, “I had seen how hard it was for my mum and dad. It is quite stressful with everything that goes round it and I thought ‘I don’t want to do that, all that stress, all that responsibility’”. Instead, Marianna aimed simply “to do something that wasn’t [the restaurant]”. Marianna did not excel at school as she “never felt the need to get good grades” and attributes this to a lack of her “never really being ambitious”. Alternatively, perhaps Marianna is characterised by the same complacency exhibited by Nino Falsone (see section 7.4) owing to her awareness that if she failed to achieve academically, she could always rely on employment at the family business, thus giving rise to safety net analogy.

“I was very limited with what I could do because I didn’t get good grades. So I couldn’t really pursue anything that would get me a good job, a well-educated job, a well-paid job, so I had to do something. That’s why I did hotel reception...my dad thought it was a complete waste of time. He would say ‘what do you want to do that for, you should stay and do [the restaurant]’”.

Ultimately, Marianna did not share her father’s appetite for restaurant work, which she likens to “a way of life. Being around this and being around Italians. It is the social aspect of it after work, everybody is here and my dad loves it”. Antonio was adamant that “he wanted us all to do this job. And that is how I ended up moving away really, much to my dad’s dismay”.

Aged 19, Marianna met her future partner Paul (from Liverpool), “we had a long distance relationship for a year or two years and then I decided I was moving”. The decision was
fuelled by a desire “to be closer to Paul”, but equally “about having a change from my dad”. Marianna remembers her father’s views at the time, “he wanted me to stay. Maybe because I was the first as well, that made it more difficult”. However, on reflection “it was the best thing that I did. Definitely, as well for my dad because I think it mellowed him a little bit as well”. After two years in Liverpool though, it was because of her father that Marianna relocated once again. In 2005, Marianna and Paul moved to Burton-upon-Trent to launch, Pinocchio’s, a restaurant formerly owned by her father:-

“Dad started it [the restaurant]. And I said no for a long time. I said ‘I don’t want to do it, I don’t want to do it’ and then Paul was pushing me towards my dad. In the end I agreed to go to Burton and have a look. Then that was it, I had a look round and thought ‘yeah, it would be stupid not to take the opportunity and go for it’. So that’s what I did. We moved down there and it all happened really fast and quick. One minute we were in Liverpool and the next minute we were in Burton”. 

Marianna changed her mind because “I could see it working and I suppose it would make my dad really happy as well”. Despite no previous business ownership and inexperienced at the “financial side of it”, Marianna and Paul were “just ready to crack on and work”. Marianna was grateful that “mum and dad couldn’t help me enough and couldn’t encourage us enough…I tried to make everything the same [as BBs] so that I couldn’t go wrong…and we tweaked things because…we are only an hour down the road but we had to change little bits and bobs as we learned the custom”. In 2007, life would change again for Marianna and Paul, “when I fell pregnant I was working in the kitchen so that was tough”. After giving birth to first daughter, Concetta (born 2007), “I more or less went straight back to work, I was there every day with her…that was the only option…we didn’t have the luxury of family childcare”. Marianna alludes to feeling isolated in Burton-upon-Trent with her own family residing in Sheffield and Paul’s family in distant Liverpool.

The couple’s plan was to operate Pinocchio’s for “five years then we will move on”. However, ten years later “we are still there now”. Marianna attributes this to finding a happy environment in which to bring up her family, which now includes second daughter, Lorena (born 2010).

“I can have the kids there and that is my choice. It is probably not the ideal choice but sometimes it is better than having childcare if you can look after them yourself instead of somebody else...both of mine have grown up in the restaurant, it is their second home...its quite normal to see that in Italy when you go out [to a restaurant]. It is quite normal to see all of the family there, even the kids”.

Marianna’s account reveals that escaping a fate in the restaurant industry is difficult when one is heavily involved in the family business growing up. It appears that the cycle is now repeating for Marianna’s eldest daughter, Concetta, “even now at six she sets tables and clears glasses...she is better than some of the staff I’ve got”. Marianna feels that she can safeguard against this and explains that “I am definitely not like my dad in that sense, pushing it on them. All I have ever said to my eldest is that you have to do what you are happy with...so it is up to her what she wants to do”. However, as Marianna’s experiences
aptly demonstrate, it is questionable whether this is sufficient to counter the influence of years spent working in the family business.

8.6. Gabriella: “It has been my only job”

Gabriella (born 1985) substantiates many of Marianna’s sentiments regarding their involvement at the restaurant as youngsters:–

“I remember it being very quiet here when they only just opened but as they got busier and busier I think my mum thought ‘well, it is not busy every night so there is no need to employ somebody full time so we will just get the girls in and they will help out when we need it’. That’s what families are for. I didn’t feel as though I had to be here…I remember enjoying it and I wanted to come, mainly because you got a bit of pocket money as well. My friend used to come with me and we would be downstairs messing about making the desserts, putting those together and we just pot washed. Quite often it was every weekend. We were too young to go out so it was fun. We got on with everybody and it was like a little job”.

The opportunities for socialising proved something which Gabriella particularly enjoyed, “it was a family and it was good fun. Especially around Christmas I think because everyone is in the party spirit”. However, when Antonio and Jill enjoyed a vacation Gabriella’s responsibilities increased and she realised the behind-the-scenes work required to sustain the restaurant. “Coming to work is one thing, you come home and you go, but the stuff that you have to do on the side (the book work, the shopping, sorting the bookings out, the phone always ringing)...it is hard to juggle everything and I didn’t notice that until much later”.

Compared with Marianna who was ambivalent regarding her future career, Gabriella aspired to a career in childcare and between the ages of 18 and 20, she completed a college course in this subject. Though Gabriella never realised her ambition to work with children:–

“Because I didn’t get such a good mark I think it scared me from going and looking and putting applications forward for jobs. I started back [at BBs] at the weekends after I’d finished (to get a bit of money) and I just never left. I didn’t even send one CV off to any nursery, I never applied for any job. I would have loved to have done it just because I like working with kids but I must’ve known, deep down maybe, that I would end up working at the restaurant. It has been my only job. I have never worked anywhere else”.

Gabriella reverted to employment within the family business and spent the next four years working alongside her parents at BBs. However, she became increasingly frustrated, “I was fed up here. You do the same thing every day, you come to work, you see the same faces every day, I love them to bits, but it does grate on you”. Like Marianna, Gabriella’s discontent seemed to centre on her father Antonio, “I think it was dad a little bit...maybe a lot. We started to clash and I think if we would have carried on, I don’t think we would have the same relationship that we have now, it’s sad to say. He can be hard sometimes”. Along with partner Robert, Gabriella desired a restaurant of their own. Robert had lost his job as a
steelworker and was “up for it and ready for a new challenge”. This proved a sufficient push factor for Robert who began to "work [at BBs] a bit at the weekends" to learn the ropes. Coupled with her own ambition to “prove to myself that I could do it, that I could build a business”, Gabriella and Robert began “looking round for places to become available”.

Chief among the possibilities were two sites in Sheffield and a site in Mansfield, where father Antonio had opened his first ever restaurant in the precisely the same building. Sensing that the situation was somehow “meant to be”, Gabriella and Robert opted for the Mansfield site. The potential Sheffield site “was already up and running”, therefore with less scope to “put my stamp on it”. Furthermore, Gabriella was conscious that “if I was in Sheffield I knew my dad would have more access and more of a say in how we ran the business. I think that is why, in the end, Mansfield won over”. The restaurant was named BBs after her parents’ establishment, a result of Antonio stating “it would be stupid not to call it the same”. Gabriella offered a similar menu to her parents “to make it easier for myself because I learnt to cook at the last minute”. Gabriella acknowledges that if her parents “hadn’t supported us then we would have folded in the first year and a half easy” though she was refreshed to find that “they have not interfered” to the extent that she imagined. Since opening in 2009, Gabriella enjoys “the sense of accomplishment when people notice the effort and the work that you have put in”, as well as the small group of regulars who have “become part of the family”. Gabriella is also content knowing that her endeavours in the restaurant business are valued by father Antonio:-

“I think my dad especially is very happy that we are all in the same business and that we have all branched out, in the end anyway, and made a go of it. He is the kind of person that likes people to think that he is doing well, that his family is doing well, that the business are all busy and doing well. I think he does think a lot about what other people think of him”.

However, a crude interpretation might suggest that she has merely produced a carbon copy of her parents’ business, which shares a name with her parents’ establishment and continues to rely heavily on its input (e.g. Gabriella admits to having to “borrow staff from my parents”). This questions whether she has realised the independence that she desired or whether she continues to work under the watchful eye of her father Antonio.

8.7. Carla: “I am just going to wait for this one”

Carla (born 1987) is the youngest sibling though her involvement at her parents’ restaurant was similar to that of her older sisters:-

"They just had me here because no-one else could look after me [LAUGHS]. I would work and do little things. I used to do desserts and they would get me drying cutlery, they loved doing that to me but I didn’t mind. At the time I thought I was really cool ".

Reflecting on her parents’ success, Carla affords a central role to mother Jill:-

"My dad has always had restaurants...he had loads and loads of them growing up. This is the first restaurant that mum has been involved in and it is obviously the first
restaurant which has done really well for itself so that is probably something to do with my mum working...she does everything and she oversees everything and if anything goes wrong, she is the first one we all call. Even my dad, she is the first one he calls as well".

Carla's early nostalgia for the restaurant quickly vanished and instead "I would always think 'I hate the restaurant, I never want to work in restaurants". To avoid being confined to the restaurant industry, Carla enrolled in further education at a nearby college:-

"I just did it because I wanted something different and I didn't want to work at the restaurant. I was adamant that I didn’t want to work at the restaurant all my life...I did a year or two and I tried but I just wasn’t in the right frame of mind. I was 18/19 and I loved going out and being with my friends and I liked drinking...So college was a bit of a bust up...I think in the back of my mind I probably thought 'it will be alright, I've got BBs"

Carla was clearly mindful that the family business would provide a viable means of employment should her college studies prove unfruitful. This provides another example of how family businesses can provide a safety net function. As Carla recognises, in the case of the Frusciante family, "it has happened with us all hasn’t it".

Reflecting on the departure of both sisters, Carla discloses "to be honest, I think both of them wanted to stay in the restaurant business but they just didn't want to work for my dad". Carla remembers that shortly before her transition to Mansfield, "[Gabriella] hated how things were and she could never do anything because my dad was really stubborn and never wanted to change anything. He was very hard to work with at that point". Carla has the highest esteem for her sisters, "they are both brilliant at what they do. They are both brilliant chefs". However, their relocation has influenced Carla who is now required to “go down to [my sister’s] restaurant to work and obviously stop over”.

With maturity Carla has a refreshed outlook on her choice of employment path "my priorities started to change...I saw this in the sense that it could be mine one day and I wanted to do right by it and do what I can to help out. Almost manage it really because they need a lot of managing really". The Frusciante family’s appetite for the restaurant industry is no secret to customers who frequently ask Carla, "when are you getting your own restaurant?" Carla predicts that "I would probably have the best starting point because I have seen all the mistakes that everyone else has made when they have done things wrong and should've done it another way. So yeah, I should have an easier job really". With no definite plans, however, this can prove "a bit annoying" for Carla who jokes that "I have just learnt to say 'oh, I am just going to wait for this one'".

Carla worries that her parents would "both be a bit lost without this place... I don’t think that there is anything else they would rather be doing ". For this reason, she is reluctant to assume control at BBs, "if one of us took this place over when they retired it would still be my mum and dad's restaurant. He would still come here every day and oversee everything and boss everyone around". Carla’s reservations relate specifically to her father suggesting"
that the patriarchal figure has issues surrounding control. As such, Carla is yet to commit to restaurant ownership of her own and contemplates her future carefully.

8.8. Summary

After gambling away his profits from the restaurant business and losing everything, Italian born restauranteur Antonio Frusciante was able to reshape his fortune only through the help of his British wife, former confectioner Jill, and in 1997 the couple established Sheffield restaurant BBs. Their lengthy tenure at the restaurant relied heavily on input from their three daughters, Marianna, Gabriella and Carla, and Antonio desired for each of them to remain in the restaurant business in adult life. At the crux of the chapter lie three daughters who were totally immersed in their parents’ restaurant business growing up. Each pursued further education as a means of broadening their opportunity structures and when this proved unfruitful, each of the daughters reverted to employment within the family business (in the short term) thus giving rise to the safety net function that family businesses perform.

While Marianna and Gabriella now operate restaurants of their own, the chapter has illustrated that it was a breakdown in the relationship with their father that provided the primary driver for pursuing such an option. The need for “having a change from my dad” features in the accounts of both daughters who sought to escape their overbearing father. Evidence of a controlling patriarchal figure is only more pertinent in the case of the Galetta family, to which attention will now be turned.
9. The Galetta Family: “He ruled us with an iron fist”

9.1. Introduction

The Galetta family includes six siblings forced to work at their father’s restaurant business from as young as eight years old. Whilst some fled the UK at the earliest opportunity, other siblings were less fortunate and their father dictated their entire lives, including even who his daughters would marry. As adults and now business owners themselves, the siblings tread carefully not to repeat the same mistakes with their own children. However, on closer inspection the siblings are more similar to their father than they would care to admit.

The chapter illustrates a number of points. First, involvement in the family business can be involuntary and can occur at a very young age. Second, when confronted with a controlling patriarchal figure, the next generation desire to escape. Third, despite their best efforts some of the siblings appear to have inherited the same desire for control that characterised their father, though this is manifest in different ways.

The following narrative includes the accounts of brother and sister, Valentino and Lucia Galetta (see figure 9.1 for family tree), and begins with some early toing and froing between Italy and the UK. The reader is reminded that pseudonyms have been created for this family.

Figure 9-1 - The Galetta family tree

9.2. “He was the boss of us all”

Mario Galetta Snr travelled to the UK for employment reasons and "worked in the steel industry". It was during his second visit that he met his future wife, Emma. "He married [Emma]...and he went back to Italy where [Valentino] was born, Mario was born and Sofia."
And then we came back to England where the other two [Lucia and Filomena] were born and then we went back to Italy where the last one [Sergio] was born. Mario Sr was attempting to "settle down in a way and find out what he was going to do to keep a family. I mean, he had five kids". As a result, the family was "never in one place very long" though they eventually settled in Sheffield where Mario Sr experimented in the restaurant trade owing to his experience "as a young man working as a chef in a bowling alley". Valentino Galetta was the eldest of six siblings (see figure 9.1, page 107) and explains that the restaurant required input from all of the family:-

"He obviously had plenty staff, which were us [LAUGHS]. In a way, we had no choice, especially me and my brother because we were steered towards working in the restaurant even when we were at school as young boys. I started when I was 12 when he finally settled in Sheffield and he opened a restaurant, I was working in the restaurant with my mum on the floor. Then as soon as my brother (who is a couple of years younger than me) got to the age of 12, he then started working in the kitchen with my father. It was all mapped out basically, where we were going to go. Because school wasn't important, education for my father wasn't important".

Previous chapters have illustrated that adults often reflect on their childhood labours at the family owned restaurant with a degree of affection. However, Valentino is much more resentful of this imposition. "I wasn't the normal school child that had friends and went out and played and whatever. I used to come home and have to work at night". Lucia, the fourth of six siblings, corroborates her brother’s claims:-

"We all worked from a very early age. We were about 8 when we started. We had a restaurant in Worksop and I remember being smaller than 8 being stood on a stool washing pots...my mum and dad didn't want us to have babysitters. Valentino was on the floor, waiting on. And Mario was in the kitchen. So my dad never employed anybody as soon as we got the restaurants".

Lucia describes her father, "he was the boss of us all. And my mum was the skivvy [LAUGHS]. She never got paid for anything she did". The use of the term ‘skivvy’ denotes a female domestic servant performing menial tasks, providing another example of how females are often subservient to their male counterparts within Italian households. Nevertheless, Lucia remembers that the family was very close knit, "we lived above the restaurant. Five children and my mum and dad lived upstairs. There were five children together all the time". Lucia's main recollections, however, pertain to her father’s strictness:-

"The girls were at home all of the time and the boys could do what they wanted to do but the girls had to stay at home. We were allowed friends to come to the house and they could be involved in our family but we were not involved in their family. We were not allowed out, my dad was very, very strict".

Mario Sr "never knew when to close the doors to people" and would open until "four o' clock in the morning and people would still come". Lucia recalls that "it was busy all of the time it was open...everybody knew my dad. He just loved it. He loved serving people". Given the restaurant’s popularity, the family ought to enjoy a good standard of living though Lucia
denies this was the case. Instead, "my dad saved his money so that he could buy a bigger restaurant". Furthermore, the restaurant appeared to become all-consuming for her parents, "that was their social life, everybody became their family. They didn't go out, they didn't go anywhere. They just worked all the time". Lucia clarifies that, "my dad was all about the business. It was not about the family, which was sad...Dad loved his children, but he could never show his love because he was so busy in his business that his children became his business". As a result, "we weren't children anymore".

Despite such an appetite for the restaurant business, Mario Snr "only ever had one restaurant going at a time". Lucia explains that when "you have more than one restaurant you have to leave someone in charge and my dad never trusted anybody. It was the family that had to run the business". The need to “be the boss” extended to his parental duties, though ultimately this would be to the detriment of parent-child relationships. Lucia recalls the departure of younger sister, Filomena, "my dad had got a takeaway at that time. She was working there and he just wanted her to work, work, work. And in the end she left, she left Sheffield". In Lucia’s case, her father controlled even who she married:-

"He was the first boyfriend I had and my dad said I had to marry him. I was married within eight months. My dad was very strict. He summoned him to the house and sat him down and said 'if my daughter is going out with you then you have to put a ring on her finger'. The next one was 'you have to get married to her'. I love my dad, I really love him, but he just dictated our lives. And that's the Italian in him, he controlled everybody. I was 19 and he was controlling me, he was controlling us all".

9.3. Escaping to Italy
Aged 14, Valentino was fearful that "my destiny was just to work for my father". Therefore, Valentino was inclined "to get away...leave home basically".

"I was working for nothing, I wasn’t getting paid. If I was making any money, it was from tips that I had made. I felt that I was being used in a way. So I found out about my godfather being a manager out there [in Italy] and I said to my father 'look, I want to go back to Italy and work in the hotel'. He was fine with that because he knew I would be safe, even though 14 is quite young to be leaving your family...but it wasn’t strange to me because I was born there. They were very good, important four years that I spent there. I had to grow up very quickly".

Valentino fled to work in Italy’s hotel industry where he worked "seven days a week, 13/14 hours a day". He also spent the winters "up in the mountains in the ski hotels there". Valentino remembers that "it was hard work but it was a lot of fun and I gained a lot of experience dealing with different people from all over the world". However, at the age of 18, Valentino’s time in Italy came to an abrupt end. Faced with the prospect of compulsory military service, Valentino reached out to his father. "I didn’t fancy it so I rang my father and said 'look, you need to get me out of here'". Mario Snr attended the Italian consulate in Manchester and "got it done and they gave me a special permit to go back into England". 
Valentino offers that “my father is quite persuasive. When he wants something doing, he will get it done. Either the good way or the bad way, he will get it done”.

Upon returning to the UK, Valentino "went back to work for my father and we opened a couple of restaurants together. They were successful, they did well for the next seven years. We had opened about three restaurants by the age of 25". Of interest is the extent to which working for his father was a voluntary undertaking. Put simply, was Valentino able to view put aside his issues with his father or did Valentino have no alternative employment options? Regardless, in resuming work for his father Valentino fulfilled the very destiny that he was desperate (to the extent that he left the UK) to avoid as a youngster.

Aged 25, Valentino moved to London "to gain some more experience". However, this lasted only one year because Valentino found London to be very impersonal, "nobody has time for anybody, to talk or to look at you. And I am a very social person and I just didn't fit in". Therefore, Valentino returned north to Boston, Lincolnshire, "me and my uncle opened a place". After two years, Valentino moved again to Lancashire where he worked in restaurants for the next five years. In 1990, he received a telephone call from his brother, Mario Galetta Jnr, regarding "a restaurant up for sale".

"Previous to that it had been an English person who was playing at it. He had a beautiful place and it started quite well...after a year this guy was losing loads of money. As soon as I walked in the place I thought 'yeah, we'll take this on, no problem'. It was a beautiful building and by then (at 29) I'd had a lot of experience under my belt. I had been around and I felt quite confident that we could really make a go of it and we did. We were one of the busiest restaurants in Sheffield".

It was through this restaurant that Valentino would meet his future wife, British born Susie, a student at the time. This re-ignited his interest in education, "I was interested in what she was doing and I thought 'you know what, I wouldn't mind a bit of this". Valentino felt deprived of an education owing to his catering background:-

"When you are brought up in a catering business, you are living in a different society, a different culture. You are working in the night time and in the day time you are asleep. You are living in a little bubble. And you don't see anything else so you don't learn anything".

Sensing that an education was "something that was missing", Valentino explains that "I did three years at college then I did a social work degree at university". Now equipped with a degree, Valentino decided "I want to do something different" and notified his brother:-

"I left him the place [the Sheffield restaurant], walked away and took very little from it. I could've took a lot more but that is by the by, that's between me and my brother. So I walked away, became a social worker. After I got out and started working in the field, you come up against so much bureaucracy and so much red-tape. My idea was that I could make a difference, and I wasn't making a difference and I could see that".

Noting the proverb, "a leopard cannot change its spots", Valentino retreated back to catering, this time with a large catering company. "I worked for them in one of their retail
places in Doncaster and then I opened them a place in Sheffield…I was doing well there...they wanted me to go and take over some place down in London and get on their management ladder let's say and become an area manager”. However, Valentino’s future would once again be shaped by his father.

9.4. “The only time he ever helped me”
Valentino was "happy working for [the large catering company]", but was presented with another opportunity for restaurant ownership through his father. "He was trying to run it [a restaurant] with another guy...but they couldn't quite get this place going". Mario Snr preferred to sell his latest restaurant to his son rather than "sell it to a stranger". One viewing was enough to persuade Valentino that "I can make this work", however, with no savings he appealed to his father:-

"I said to him, 'look, after all of those years that I put in for you when I was growing up, helping to make your place a success, now it is my turn...give me something back'. So we came to an arrangement where I paid him so much a week until I'd paid him what he felt it was worth at the that time. So no interest, no loan, no risk".

Valentino clearly feels entitled to some form of financial compensation for his earlier labours at his father's restaurant as a child:-

"The way I see it was more of a selfish way in that he had staff there that he didn't have to pay. He didn't have to put job adverts out there to get people in. He knew that he had his family and he knew he could rule us with an iron fist, 'it is my way' and whatever. The fact that I didn't have a choice is, I believe now, unfair in a way...He was all take, take, take. He had us make the places and then he sold them and whatever he made out of it went to him. The only time he ever helped me was that time that we had the place, but in hindsight again, he never said 'here you go son, I think you will make a go of it, I was going to sell it but here is the key, you have it'. But he didn't do that and I actually paid him over the odds for what it was worth".

Mario Snr failed to offer Valentino any financial relief during the transaction and it is therefore unsurprising that a degree of tension still exists between the two presently. Nevertheless, Valentino excuses his father owing to Mario Snr’s upbringing:-

"I think with him being the eldest in the family he had to grow up very quickly. He was out there selling cigarettes when he was eight years old to the navy...my grandfather didn't manage to pull that much money in, and he had 11 kids to feed so he had to grow up very quickly I think".

Mario Snr "didn't have that relationship with his father and therefore he felt the way he is was a result of the mentality at that time". Valentino referred to his father’s Italian 'mentality' frequently throughout the interview and equates this with the notion that "the wife should be at home cooking and bringing up kids and the man go out and do the work. And then when he came home his tea would be on the table". Lucia supports this view of her father, offering that “English Italians (like my Dad) see Italy like they did in 1940...but the
Valentino concludes that “it is good that it has changed because I don’t see it as a good thing”.

9.5. “The biggest mistake I ever made”

Valentino slowly changed the fate of the restaurant he purchased from his father, "from doing nothing, in nine years I took it to where it was packed every day, every night...and I was happy". In the meantime, Valentino and Susie had married and had their first child, Matteo. Valentino explains that the restaurant trade means "you don't really see your kids, see your wife". Late one night at the restaurant, Valentino was talking to a deli owner who was "thinking of selling up and moving on". Valentino thought that the "delicatessen sounds good. 9 to 5, I would be home in the evening with the kids and the family, be able to have some more children, have more of a normal life. So I bought the place off him". Valentino sold the restaurant to one of his chefs, "I got a really good price for the restaurant" though he reinvested the money into his new Deli. "Looking back now it was the biggest mistake I ever made".

Valentino attributes the demise of his deli to three factors. First, the nearby opening of supermarket chain who were "going down the road of the Deli counter...they were selling stuff cheaper than what I could buy it for so I lost a lot of customer base". Second, "I had some issues with the parking in Broom Hill, they started charging for parking and that cut down my customer base". Finally, owing to the growth of the deli concept, "I had a deli open up across from me". Valentino was irate, "why would you do that? Don't you realise that there is only so much [custom] there. There ain't enough". He recalls how he was able to survive:-

"This guy was there and he was a pain in the arse for six months and he went under. He lost a lot of money...I managed to steer out of it because I came back onto my catering experience and put a few tables in, a coffee bar, started turning it again into more of a restaurant. And that's the only thing how I was able to survive, and did survive, for another seven years was to turn it into a full blown restaurant. The deli slowly went into the back (it was initially in the front but then I turned it into the back) and slowly it just died off and then the fridges when out of the back door or down to the tip. And I managed to stay afloat and then the bloody recession kicked in and the landlady wanted to put the rent up...My wife pushed me and said it was the right thing, 'yeah, just get rid of it'...I am in a really good place now compared to if you had known me five or six years ago when I was not in a good place. When you've got a business that is going down the pan and you've got a mortgage, a family, and I had to sell my house".

9.6. Choice

Valentino never had aspiration for business ownership, "I never thought I was going to be the next Richard Branson or whatever". Instead, "I was happy to go out there and earn a living, work hard and earn a decent wage" though he does acknowledge that "I was in the
right place at the right time when these opportunities came along and I took them". However, his passion for food was inspired by his time overseas:

"The four years I spent in Italy opened my eyes to it and taught me a lot. Because when you are working in Italy, we are passionate about good food and good wine, how to present things...If someone comes to me for a meal I actually get a lot of pleasure in seeing that person enjoy what you have produced for them. And it was the same in the restaurant. It wasn’t just about getting bums on seats and turning the place into where you would have settings and you have people coming in and then you are rushing them out because the next ones are due in. I never did that. I was lucky that I had two relatively small places where I could keep my finger on the trigger and I didn’t have to pack ‘em in and kick ‘em out”.

Valentino admits that "growing up my dad obviously cooked in the home and I was always interested in looking and seeing what he was doing...it is the same with my boys (15 and 10), I have taught them...they will cook their own tea and make me some pasta". Mario Snr "instilled a lot of the passion for food" in Valentino that proved instrumental in his working life, though he cannot overlook the negative aspects of his upbringing and "the fact that I never had a choice in life". Valentino is adamant that he will not make the same mistake with his own children, Matteo and Gianni, "my boys are going to have a choice in life, they will do what they want to do". On the contrary, Valentino concludes that "I have had to do what I have done and I have had to do the best with what I was given basically". Valentino is therefore mindful not to subject Matteo and Gianni to his own experiences, his comment “I could keep my finger on the trigger” suggests that he has inherited his father’s penchant for controlling all aspects of proceedings at the two restaurant businesses he owned and operated for many years.

9.7. Other siblings

Shortly after getting married, Lucia Galetta migrated to New Zealand with her husband before returning to the UK aged 21, albeit in the Mansfield area. Ten years later, Lucia separated from her husband and returned to Sheffield. Lucia appealed to both of her brothers, Mario and Valentino, as she needed "a job that was going to pay the bills". Currently aged 49, Lucia provides childcare for her granddaughter, Alessandra, and therefore "needed a job that would suit my hours so that I could work when I wanted to. Being self-employed means that you have that option to work when you like".

Lucia created a cleaning business as this mirrored her role at the family business decades earlier, "the girls were taught how to clean very well and the boys were taught how to cook". Lucia explains that this choice was "because we had the restaurant" and the roles of younger family members were aligned with the labour requirements of the family business. Valentino confesses that the gender of the child would determine the role they occupied in the Galetta family business. "From his [my father's] era it [catering] was very male dominated. When I worked in Italy there were no females, the females were the ones who cleaned the toilets and the rooms and worked in the laundry, they didn’t work in the
restaurants and bars. So I think that was his mentality as well". Lucia states that her cleaning business "is not a career or anything like that but something that I am good at and I can choose when I want to do it". Furthermore, Lucia contemplates that "I could be extremely busy and make it a proper business and employ people". However, her outlook appears to be somewhat contrasted from her father's. Lucia has inherited her father's work ethic and the concept of giving "100% at everything you do", though she claims to be better at balancing the demands of the business and family life. "What I do I give 100% but I don't work every hour like he did and make my children suffer...to me, my family is everything. My girls are my best friends. Whenever my children need me I am there". As such, Lucia rejected growing her business in favour of "choosing my own hours so that if my family ever need me I am there for them". Even if circumstances were different, Lucia would not grow the business owing to her desire for control:-

"I never felt that I wanted to do something where I couldn't take control of it all...he has taught us that. Not to trust anybody. He didn't trust anybody to do the job, only himself and his children. And I don't trust anybody to the job like I can do it...I am just doing the job to the best of my ability and that has been drilled into me by my dad".

Evidently, Mario Snr has bequeathed a need for control in his children. Furthermore, the roles his children assumed in the family business appear to be mirrored in their choice of employment in later life. This is evident in the case of Valentino and Lucia, though it applies equally to the youngest of the six siblings, Sergio Galetta:-

"At the time that he [Sergio] was born my father had a little corner shop after he had sold all of his restaurants...and my mum worked there. And Sergio, growing up I remember he worked in the shop stocking up and whatever and it has progressed from there. He works in a Co-Op which is an extension of what my father pushed him into".

Valentino claims that his father's influence is most noticeable in his brother, Mario Jnr, who never escaped working for his father:-

"My brother works in an entirely different way to what I did and to what I would do now...he wouldn't be able to work for me because he sees it like my father...he has that mentality because he has always worked for my father. This is where we differ because I left and worked away over in Italy, when I came back I have been in London, Lancashire, I have been around, I've had that experience, I've had other influences from other people who have showed me different ways of working. I am more open minded whereas my brother, he has always worked for my father...even though we have been brought up in the same family and we share the same blood, it is like the old cliché chalk and cheese".

In sum, Valentino concedes that "we all have different views, we all see things (as a lot of families probably do) differently to what the other person sees things". Valentino concludes that “despite the differences between us, we are all blood at the end of the day so it's all good".
9.8. Summary
Children in the Galetta family were forced to assume roles in their father’s restaurant business from an early age. For the boys, this meant cooking and waiting on. For the girls, this meant cleaning the restaurant. Eldest son Valentino Galetta desired to escape this fate and fled to Italy though he returned four years later and resumed work for his father in the restaurant business. Though in the years that followed Valentino studied and became a social worker, he quickly reverted back to the catering sector where he owned and operated two small eateries (one of which was purchased from his father). Other siblings, such as Lucia Galetta, did not escape their controlling father until years later and family harmony has clearly suffered as a result.

The chapter illustrates a number of points. First, involvement in the family business can be involuntary and can occur at a very young age. Second, when confronted with a controlling patriarchal figure, the next generation may desire to escape. Third, the employment pursued in adult life often mirrors the role that individuals assumed within the family business as children owing to the cultural mind-set of their father. Fourth, despite their best efforts Valentino and Lucia appear to have inherited the same desire for control that characterised their father, though this is manifest in different ways.

The next chapter introduces the fifth and final family, the Maroni family, whose involvement in the catering sector is on a considerably larger scale than the operations described in previous chapters. Coincidentally, it is the large catering company within which Valentino Galetta enjoyed a brief period of employment.
10. The Maroni Family: “I had always been in it”

10.1. Introduction
The Maroni family business was one of the largest ice cream producers in Europe during the 1950s, though more recently the business was steered into the retail catering sector by the four brothers now in charge (Matthew, Melvyn, Sean and John). The catering business now employs upwards of 3,000 people across more than 130 sites. However, the four brothers are fast approaching retirement age meaning the family’s stake in the business now relies upon the involvement of the next generation. Whilst a small handful of Roberto’s grandchildren have assumed roles within the catering business in a bid to safeguard its future, others from this generation have no interest at all.

The chapter illustrates that the next generation are often ‘already in’ the family business from a young age and a tendency to downplay parental influences among those of the next generation. The following narrative features the accounts of seven members of the Maroni family across two generations. The reader is reminded that pseudonyms have been created for this family.

10.2. "Born and bred in Yorkshire"
Gianluca and Piera Maroni arrived in the UK from Italy during the early 1900s. “They were farm labourers. They had worked for big land owners in Italy and they were poor peasants”. Given that “Italians are very clannish”, their descendants speculate that:-

“I am almost sure that my great grandfather [Gianluca] left Italy to go to America…but I think what happened was that they knew people from their region who had gone to England and they probably thought ‘well, we’ll go to England and see them and then we will go to America’. They went to England and they thought ‘it’s great here, we will stay here’ and they were probably fed up of the boat journey”.

The eldest of Gianluca and Piera’s five children, Carlo Maroni, was born in the UK and was responsible for the family becoming involved in ice cream production. Carlo and his wife Annalisa had twelve children (see figure 10.1, page 117). Of notable mention is penultimate child, Roberto Maroni, who continued the family’s involvement in ice cream. Despite the prevalence of Italian names among their kin, the Maroni family was far from the typical Italian household. The family went to great lengths to hide their Italian heritage as Matthew Maroni describes:-

“Unfortunately my grandfather Carlo died when my father was nine years old so my father’s recollections of him are minimal. [Roberto] didn’t know much about the history of the family and why they ended up here because my father was born in England as were a lot of his brothers...although my father is a born Yorkshireman as were most of his brothers and sisters, they still had this fear that during the war years they would be interned. So they immersed themselves totally into the English way of life. They never
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spoke Italian in the home…and I think my father is very, very patriotic to England…he is an Englishman, born and bred in Yorkshire and Italy was a past that he knew nothing about”.

Matthew explains that “I am the only one in the family who speaks Italian, I am the only one who really has any empathy with Italy”. As a result, Matthew “picked up the mantle of researching the family’s roots and being very interested in how we got here, what did we do before we got here and all of that information”. Central to these roots is the family’s involvement in ice cream production, to which attention will now be turned.

10.3. Making ice cream
Carlo Maroni’s birth certificate reveals that “he was a street musician”. This generation arrived in the UK without skills and “so what they did is make street barrel organs and went around playing music for money”.

“But it wasn’t lucrative enough, particularly during the winter, so a lot of the families made ice cream…that is how the business started really…the ice cream was made in the cellars of the houses which they lived in…all it would be is a big gas ring with a copper vat and they would put in milk, cream and eggs and they would boil it to custard…then they would freeze it with salt and sell it fresh…ice cream back then [in the early 1900s] was a luxury. It was something that was wanted by a lot of people but it wasn’t readily available and these Italian families capitalised on that. They made ice cream for a living and they made it very successfully”.

However, the Second World War meant that these families were “stopped in their tracks because milk and eggs weren’t available. In fact, ice cream production of every kind, be it one man band operations or companies (which did exist in those days), ceased production until after the war”. When the war was over, ice cream production resumed though Matthew explains that he is most knowledgeable regarding “his father’s generation going forward when the biggest gains were made and that was on the back of a lot of new technologies”.

“There was a lot of new equipment coming from America, plants were very streamlined because before it was mixing by hand in a bowl on a burner, whereas now it was all automated…my father and his cousins and his brothers had put a lot of money into the plant. They had built a purpose built factory with the latest American equipment and were producing by mid-1950s upwards of 5,000 gallons a day, which was a lot of ice cream. By the end of 1954 when they sold the business, they were probably one of the biggest ice cream producers in Europe with those sorts of volumes”.

Roberto was the penultimate child of twelve and his brothers and sisters “had worked in the business all of their lives”. Therefore, when the opportunity presented itself “the others decided to sell the business as on offer from a huge J Line company in London who wanted to buy the manufacturing plant off the family, which they duly sold”. Roberto was younger than his siblings and needing something to move forward:-
“My father stayed on working for them as did a couple of his brothers and took over the retail side of the business which was the ice cream vans, and ran the North of England fleet for them which consisted of depots in Doncaster, York, Wakefield, Chesterfield and Scunthorpe. They ran about 120 vehicles on the road at any one time mobilizing ice cream...Of course, as the years went on [Roberto] saw the writing on the wall that this wasn’t going to last forever”.

Ice cream was becoming a less sustainable business “mainly because of the weather, the cost of running vehicles and the advent of ice cream being readily available in the supermarkets, it was no longer a luxury”. Roberto Maroni was therefore “quite forward thinking in that he saw that was the future and decided that he would move into cafes and restaurants...he wanted me to go with him and help set it up which I did and then of course my brothers followed”. Roberto “opened a couple of cafes in various places” and cemented his debut in catering, yet was through one of his contacts in British sport that the family’s scale of involvement in the catering sector increased considerably.

10.4. The horses and the coffee shops
Sean Maroni describes the family's transition from ice cream production to retail catering:-

"The supermarket boom changed the way that people purchased ice cream because suddenly people were not buying ice cream out of an ice cream van. And so the era of the ice cream van came (I think) to a fairly quick end. It was at that point that I think my father's interest in the ice cream waned dramatically. He didn't see his future in that because that business actually went bust and I don't think he ever really got interested in it again...he lost his enthusiasm for the ice cream business when it went bust...it is not a nice thing is it when you have no money and you owe people money and people are knocking at your door. And I don't think he liked that, he was quite a proud man and to face that it demoralised him...and by that time he had found another avenue and that was the horses".

Roberto's cousin "was a farmer and a big horse dealer". His uncle, Alex Maroni, "had got a big stud farm in Ireland and he used to send hundreds of horses over to England to be sold". During the 1960s, "one of these horses turned out to be Olympic standard and...went to the 1968 Olympics in Mexico". Roberto began to "travel the world with this horse because his cousin had got a big farm and a big horse interest at home and [his cousin] couldn't really leave his core business to just travel round with one horse". Therefore, Roberto assumed the "mantra of travelling round the world and he picked up along the way the job of managing the British show jumping team and that consumed him for the rest of his life really". Sean recalls:-

"I saw that he had retreated from [his other business dealings] in quite a big way to go doing what he wanted to do and he basically left it to Melvyn and a little bit to Matthew...he was going all over the world. The only problem was that it wasn't a paid job so he was actually relying on the business and what we were doing here to fund what he was doing".
Roberto Maroni was “involved in British sport for a number of years at a very high level”, chiefly as Chef d’Équipe of the British show jumping team. During an overseas trip with the team, Roberto chanced across an ice cream parlour housed in a department store. Witnessing that it was “doing massive business”, Roberto was keen to replicate the concept in the UK. His sons were upbeat about the idea though had the following reservations, “we don’t own any department stores, we don’t know anyone who owns any department stores, how are we going to do that?” Eldest Matthew was telling his father’s “bloody daft idea” to a girl who kept her horse at the family’s stables, who commented “my uncle owns a department store...I’ll ask him”. Her uncle gave the concept prime placement “in the front window”, providing Roberto with his first outing in department stores.

“Going forward my dad was on this trip in America and he was talking to [anonymous] one night and he was saying “Roberto, what do you do for a living other than show jumping?” And my dad said “oh, we’ve just opened an ice cream parlour in this store” and he said “I’ll give you a store to try one, that sounds a good idea”. And that is how we started working with [anonymous] in the 1970s. Blackpool first, then Newcastle, we put one in each of those stores and then it just snowballed. He came to us and said “look, we love your concepts but would you be interested in taking over all our store restaurants?” He said “I’ll be perfectly honest with you, we have not put any capital investment into these restaurants, they are there purely doing a service for the customers, we don’t make any money on it, we are losing money hand over fist, but if you are interested in taking them off our hands I’ll let you have them and you can make what you want of them”. And that is what really started our in-store catering division and we are still working with them today”.

By 1980, all four brothers “were working together in the business” and the business has witnessed steady growth since. “We are now classed as one of the top companies in what we call ‘retail catering’. We seem to be well respected, we employ close to 3,000 people, we are operating across 130 odd sites across the UK”.

10.5. “It was part of our education”

Matthew Maroni was like many of his family members in that he was involved in the family business from a young age. “I can remember going and working from eight years old. I would just do menial tasks around the yard”. As well as the ice cream business the family also operated a butchery and bakery and Matthew explains that “as kids we were all expected to do some work in those businesses, be it washing pans in the bakery or going in the bakery from the age of 12 and 13 making pork pies. We would be doing all sorts of menial tasks and it was part of our education”. This provided Matthew with certain values, particularly that “I wouldn’t get anything for nothing. We never got pocket money as kids ever...if you wanted money, you worked”. Matthew elaborates:-

“It was just ingrained in us, it was just what we did and it was accepted and you never questioned it. You were sort of eased into these things, there was no whip cracking ‘get
to work’, it was more of a case of ‘come in, do this, help me with this’ and that sort of thing”.

In adult life, Matthew “went off and did other things occasionally…I had a friend who ran an art gallery in Harrogate. I used to go buying pictures for him, he would send me to auctions”. However, Matthew concedes that “there was something about being in that family business, I don’t know whether it was a comfort thing or it was just where I felt alright”. Reflecting on his involvement in the family business, Matthew states:-

“I had always been in [the family business], therefore it was never a question of did I expect to go in it. I was in it and had been from being very young. Did I want to go and do anything else? Yes, I’m sure there were times when I thought that I did, and I did a few things but I was always more comfortable working in a field that I knew. I knew about ice cream, I could make it, I could go off and sell it. I learnt about coffee shops, I had never worked in coffee shops before I started but I learnt about it. And the skills weren’t much different. It is a people business and I have always been good with people, I can talk to anyone about most things…so no, I didn’t expect to come into the business but I was always in it in some shape or form”.

The above comments suggest that Matthew’s involvement and sense of belonging to the family business predates any choice that he made regarding his future. As such, conceptualising next generation employment preferences as a decision to become involved in the family business may be inaccurate. In a similar vein, Sean Maroni concedes that “I never thought that I would want to go and work for anyone else…when I look at my father’s family, a lot of them worked with or for their father in their family business so I think there is a line to be drawn there”. This suggests that seeking employment elsewhere was never on his agenda as his paradigm was shaped by a long lineage of working for one’s father.

10.6. A family business?
Though the Maroni family business has changed considerably since its inception, Matthew Maroni insists that the business has retained its family-run feel, “we try to treat everyone that works for us as a member of the family”. Matthew remembers:-

"My Uncle Roge, who was in charge of the bakery, he had a team of girls that worked for him in this bakery and he knew all their names. He knew all of their husbands, he knew all of their kids and he knew everything about them. He treated them as though they were his family...It was the same with my Uncle Alan who was in charge of the butchery. It has always been a family thing and in those days you know, my dad’s secretary, her husband worked for us, her son worked for us. It was all very much jobs for everyone that worked there”.

The Maroni brothers have tried to retain the management style described above, though admit this is difficult given that "we employ a lot of people now”. However, some elements of this hands-on approach remain:-
"On Boxing Day [the brothers] will all go and work in a shop because it is one of the busiest days of the year. We know that staff will be under pressure on that day, it is usually the first day of the sale so shops are very busy. And historically, we have always gone in and worked and that work might be washing pots, might be serving coffee, it can be anything. We are not afraid to do anything, we are not ivory tower bosses...Looking at where we came from and where we are today has given me great pleasure and great satisfaction that we have built a business that is well respected in its field, I’d like to think well respected by the people that work in it and I am proud of that. I am very proud of that. And I am proud to think that if they are looking from above, my forefathers would be proud too".

However, the family business faces a precarious time ahead as the brothers approach retirement:

"Melvyn and Steve and John and I wanted to know what our succession planning was going to be. As four brothers we had always worked well together and had different skills which really complemented each other. It was never going to be the same with cousins, it just wouldn’t be. The relationship just wouldn’t be the same. We had to create a family constitution if you like that allowed for shareholders, be them working shareholders or non-working shareholders, to benefit from the business because the four of us were all shareholders and that shareholding would be passed to our kids at some stage and whether they worked in it or not they would have a vested interest. So we needed to create a family constitution. So it was imperative that we found out and got to know who wanted to work in the business and who didn’t and it was quite enlightening really...two of the girls (Donna and Allegra) are already working in [the family business] and are dead keen in seeing it carry on".

Matthew’s vision is to witness "this business keep going down the generations...and the business continue and go forward into other markets". Sean agrees, adding that the worst case scenario would be “to see it not exist anymore or fall into foreign hands”. Despite this eagerness for the family dynasty to endure, the brothers clearly relish the prospect of a comfortable retirement. “It would be nice to get to a stage where we began to be of interest to some of the bigger concerns who might present a takeover. In my time of life that would be great". The most important issue is ensuring that "the Maroni name continues". Content with the prospect that "someone might come along and offer us a boat load of money" in the future, the brothers look to the next generation to safeguard the family dynasty in the meantime. However, whilst a small handful of Roberto’s grandchildren have assumed roles within the catering business, others from this generation have “no interest at all”.

10.7. Parental nudges

Donna Maroni is the eldest of Roberto’s grandchildren (see figure 10.1, page 117) and the first of this generation to assume a role within the family business. She describes how she was first introduced to work at the catering outlets:-
"I was playing outside with my nanna and Sean once said to me 'do you fancy coming for an ice cream'. Bearing in mind I was only 12 at the time I said, 'oh yeah, I will come for an ice cream'. And he said 'well, we need you to go on the pot wash for an hour because we are short staffed'. So we didn't get an ice cream until about four hours later and so next time they asked me if I wanted an ice cream I said 'no'.”

The coffee shops provided Donna and many of her cousins with a first source of employment. “We used to go and help and then we used to work in the coffee shops as we got older”. Donna decided she wanted nothing else from her future but to work in the family business:

"I knew from an early age that I wanted to come into the family business and there was nothing else I wanted to do…I knew that if I did business studies with some marketing modules that it would give me the knowledge that I would need to start in the lower end of the marketing department in this company”.

Donna explains that "our dads felt very strongly that we learnt the business from the bottom”. Being a family member meant that "the bosses would probably come down harder on us than anybody else". As such, Donna feels "a sense of responsibility that obviously it is in our best interest if the company is successful so we give 100 per cent all of the time". From "coming in as an admin person" 15 years ago, Donna was recently appointed as a director and board member and states that "because of the size of the company it is a very good career".

Allegra Maroni, Donna’s cousin and co-worker in the marketing department, prefers that her own involvement in the family business was one free from parental influence. “Our dads made it obvious that we didn’t have to come and work for the company and it was our decision”. Donna agrees, "yeah definitely…it was our decision". However, Donna’s wider revelations reveal parental nudges towards the family business:

"At one point I wanted to be a teacher and so my mum and dad sat me down and asked me why I wanted to become a teacher and the only excuse I could give them was 'because I wanted to have loads of holidays'. And they said 'that's not a good enough reason, come up with something else' and I couldn't. And he said 'you'd be best coming into the business for your career', especially since I'd done business studies. So he kind of advised me to come into the business".

The above quote illustrates that Donna appears to downplay parental influences in accounting for her involvement in the family business.

Robert Maroni is the most recent family member to assume a role in the catering business. Robert states, "if any of [the grandchildren] wanted to go in [the family business], it wouldn’t be because it was an easy option, it would be because that is what we wanted to do and they wanted to carry it on”. His father, Sean Maroni, supported Robert’s decision regardless of whether this leads towards the family business or away from it:

“We have given them the option and said 'look, there are opportunities for you if you want it’ but we have always said if you want to go out and try something that you
Robert’s mother, Favianna Maroni, prefers that the decision was made on his behalf:

"He hasn’t made a conscious decision to go and work for [the family business]. He has always done it from the age of being able to work. They have always helped [Sean] out at Christmas when they were off school. Then when he finished university, straight away [Sean] needed him in Newcastle and that is where he went. And then the manager went back and another manager went, so he went to fill up that gap. Then a manager in Doncaster went, so now he is there. So he hasn’t physically or mentally had the time to think ‘what do I want to do’...he realised that he is working for his father’s business and he had a responsibility and he didn’t want to let you down”.

The narrative reveals two points of interest. First, Robert felt obligated to work in the family business owing to family ties and a reluctance to disappoint his father. Second, Robert had been involved in the business extensively prior to graduating university. In sum, despite reinforcing that “we have given them options”, Favianna’s accounts suggests that Sean has (perhaps unintentionally) committed Robert to involvement within the family business on his behalf.

10.8. Those with “no interest at all”
Matthew Maroni Jnr, the brother of Robert Maroni, experienced a similar upbringing during which he laboured at the catering outlets, “since the age of 15/16 if my dad has needed some staff to cover in the restaurant then he has always sent me”. However, Matthew has no ambition to become involved in the family business. Instead, he wishes to become self-employed and begin trading in the foreign exchange market, something which captured his interest after observing "one of my friends doing a similar sort of thing". Matthew gives primacy to the difference between brothers and cousins in explaining his disinterest in the family business:-

"I didn’t want to share it because I have got a lot of cousins. I’ve seen it with my dad, sometimes it does get hard for him because if him and his brothers have differences of opinions then obviously there is going to be falling out. I have seen how it has affected him and I can see it being ten times worse for me. He has only got four brothers whereas I have got nine or ten cousins who will all have equal shares. So I just don’t see how all of us can work for it especially because a few of my cousins are already in there and established. It put me off quite a bit I think. If it was just me and my brother then I would think differently about it but I think because there is a lot more of us then I think it would be harder and I just don’t think it would be worth it".
Matthew is clearly mindful that working alongside many of his cousins is less lucrative than a sibling partnership, though he does not discount the possibility in the future of "starting a business with my brother...we are going to combine and get into the property business".

Regarding the fate of the family business, Matthew argues that "if my dad wanted to sell it and retire, I would be quite happy for him" adding that "I don't think you should get sentimental about it". In contrast, his elder brother Robert reserves the following esteem for the long established business:-

"It is everybody's wage and it is feeding and watering everybody but it is also something that my grandad, four brothers and four sons have worked all of their lives for and obviously have a massive passion for it. Even if in passing it down to the next generation, they are not going to let it go...it is not just a business to them...they have put everything into it".

Despite sharing an upbringing during which they were both involved in the family business, Robert and Matthew Maroni Jnr hold opposing sentiments about the business' future and aspire to different employment options as a result i.e. one within the family business and one beyond its remit. This suggests that next generation decision making is privy to a number of influences, and not solely influenced by family relationships.

10.9. Summary

Though famed for ice cream production in decades previous, the Maroni family business currently operates in the retail catering sector. While the longevity of the family business was buoyed by a lineage of working for one’s father, the latest generation adhere to a different paradigm as many have pursued employment beyond the remit of the family business. Nevertheless, a small number of grandchildren have assumed roles in the catering business in a bid to safeguard its future.

The chapter has illustrated that involvement in the family business often predates next generation decision making and as a result, can influence future employment. Furthermore, the chapter revealed a tendency for the next generation to downplay the influence of parental nudges towards the family business, preferring instead to view their decision as an independent choice on their part.

The chapter has demonstrated that next generation decision making is influenced not solely by family relationships (though these can occasionally provide a primary driver), but is privy to a number of forces at work (some of which conform to more traditional rational economic motives). The thesis will now critically evaluate such influences and establish whether the current conceptualisation of next generation decision making (as implied in the literature) is an accurate one.
11. Discussion

11.1. Introduction
The following chapter explores how family obligations to supply labour, a theme consistent among all participants, fundamentally changes the way in which next generation decision making is conceptualised. As these obligations are bestowed upon offspring by parents, it is unsurprising that family relationships suffer when these obligations are not undertaken voluntarily. The chapter therefore explores the knock on effect of family relationships on next generation decision making. The chapter concludes with a typology of next generation employment preferences developed to account for the different types encountered among the next generation family members interviewed.

11.2. Next generation decision making conceptualised
11.2.1. Family obligations to supply labour
The ability to mobilise family labour is instrumental to the survival of ethnic minority enterprise (Song, 1997) and family obligations to supply labour provide family businesses with a strong advantage over their non-family counterparts (Ward and Aranoff, 1990). As the following quotes demonstrate, family obligations to supply labour were found consistently across each the Italian families interviewed:

“My father had to go out to Italy for several weeks. So I had to run the shop, which I always recollect helped me to grow up in many ways because being in charge of a shop at 13/14”.

Ricky Miccoli

“From an early age I was peeling garlic and doing stuff like that, but at the weekends, every Friday and Saturday I was a waiter in the restaurant”.

Nino Falsone

“We would be downstairs messing about making the desserts, putting those together and we just pot washed. Quite often towards the end actually, it was every weekend”.

Gabriella Frusciante

“We all worked from a very early age. We were about 8 when we started. We had a restaurant...and I remember being smaller than 8 being stood on a stool washing the pots”.

Lucia Galetta

“I remember going out selling ice cream on the horse and cart from the age of 12. I used to come home from school and they used to send me out with my cousin selling ice cream”.

Matthew Maroni
Family obligations to supply labour are generally understood to be advantageous to family businesses, though they are seldom the focus of empirical work. Through Finch’s (2007) notion of ‘display’, family obligations can be understood as something which family members 'do' and can take the form of financial aid, emotional and practical support and childcare (Finch and Mason, 1993). However, they have yet to be defined within the context of family businesses. Therefore, the following definition is offered to capture this widely adopted practice:

'A moral sense of duty or commitment bestowed upon (often younger) family members typically requiring them to labour at the family business.'

Family obligations to supply labour often present an inconvenience for the younger family members upon which they are bestowed. This is particularly evident in the accounts of Marianna Frusciante (see section 8.5) and Carla Frusciante (see section 8.7) who recall that opportunities for socialising were often compromised owing to an obligation to labour at the family business instead:

"All of your friends are going out and you can't because you have got to work."

Marianna Frusciante

The work was performed nonetheless due to a reluctance to “let your mum and dad down” thus indicating that family obligations are morally binding. Additionally, family obligations typically involve labouring at the family business rather than absolutely. This is because in Carla Frusciante’s case, her early obligations were not confined to working at the family business, but extended to the provision of childcare for members of her kin (see appendix 7.5.3, page 139). While this obligation represents an altogether different task from labouring at the family owned restaurant, it ultimately shares an identical goal (i.e. to allow the family business to function) and supports Finch and Mason’s (1993) findings that obligations can extend to the provision of temporary childcare. In sum, family obligations are both morally binding and typically involve performing some form of menial task (e.g. washing pots, peeling garlic) at the family business. However, the extent to which these obligations were a voluntary undertaking varies considerably among the participants interviewed.

11.2.2. The nature of family obligations
As aforementioned, labouring at the family business can represent an imposition on the otherwise leisure time of the next generation, though one which is undertaken regardless. Table 11.1 (page 128) demonstrates that the nature of this undertaking falls into two broad camps:
### Table 11-1 - Positive and negative experiences of family obligations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| “I remember enjoying it and wanted to come, mainly because you got a bit of pocket money as well. My friend used to come with me...so we would be downstairs messing about”.

   Gabriella Frusciante |
| “You were sort of eased into these things, there was no whip cracking ‘get to work’. It was more of a case of, ‘come in, do this, help me with this’ and that sort of thing”.

   Matthew Maroni |
| “If I wasn’t in the kitchen peeling garlic and stuff in my younger days, I was pot washing. There was no getting out of it. It was one of those things where if [staff] didn’t turn up, I was doing it”.

   Nino Falsone |
| “And you can imagine that at 12 to 14 years old, I wasn’t the normal schoolchild that had friends and went out and played and whatever. I used to come home and have to work at night rather than going out with my friends”.

   Valentino Galetta |

Gabriella Frusciante remembers "enjoying it and wanted to come", suggesting that her undertaking was a voluntary one. Furthermore, her labours were rewarded in the form of "pocket money". However, Nino Falsone and Valentino Galetta are among those who reported an entirely different experience. The use of quotes such as "there was no getting out of it" suggest that these participants had no alternative but to labour at the family business. The wider accounts of Valentino Galetta liken this to a form of exploitation:

"It wasn’t making me happy or anything. I was working for nothing, I wasn’t getting paid. If I was making any money, it was from tips that I had made. I felt that I was being used in a way...The fact that I didn’t have a choice is, I believe now, it was unfair in a way."

It appears that when family obligations are voluntary, they are remembered positively and with a degree of affection and sentiment. Alternatively, when family obligations have been undertaken involuntarily, they are remembered negatively and often with a degree of disdain. Therefore, one’s labours at the family business are not quickly forgotten. Family members who have laboured at the family business often develop assumptions that these obligations will be repaid or reciprocated in the future. Finch and Mason (1993) argue that reciprocation can take the form of direct repayment of the same service or by contrast, an indirect repayment of a different service. As a result, there are examples of how parental support (financial or otherwise) proved instrumental in allowing the next generation to achieve their own self-employment aspirations:

“I couldn’t [run my own restaurant] without my dad’s help...My mum and dad couldn’t help me enough and couldn’t encourage us enough”.

Marianna Frusciante
“I mean [my parents] have helped. I know that if they hadn’t supported us then we would have folded in the first year and a half easy. So they have helped in that aspect”.

Gabriella Frusciante

“I could have sold the building to somebody else or I could get more rent because it is peanuts what [my son and his business partner] pay”.

Vito Miccoli

The above quotes could be interpreted as a simple 'helping hand' illustrative of that offered by any 'decent' parent, rather than an attempt to repay or reciprocate the endeavours of their offspring in years previous. However, the following quote by Valentino Galetta clarifies that his own assumptions stemmed from his earlier labours at the family business:-

"I said to him “look, after all of those years that I put in for you when I was growing up, helping to make your place a success, now it is my turn...give me something back”. So we came to an agreement where I paid him so much a week until I'd paid him what he felt it was worth at that time."

The family provides a social group in which families can experience a range of intimate experiences (McKie and Callan, 2012), the concept of intimacy referring to the idea of ‘being close to’ another person (Jamieson, 1988). However, intimate relationships play a central role in an individual’s life course (Jamieson, 1988; Miller and Perlman, 2008) and rely on, among other things, reciprocity to flourish. When obligations are not reciprocated (as in the case above), this can compromise parent-child relationships in later life, as evident in Valentino comments on his present relationship with his father:-

"There is now and there always has been, but this is because he has his views and I have mine. We weren’t allowed to express them growing up, and having not being able to express views with someone you got that way [GESTURES HANDS PARTING] as you get older. And then it is a lot harder to come back."

In sum, it appears that forced labour at the family business can be detrimental to family relationships. This is a key starting point for the thesis and one which is central to the typology of next generation employment preferences developed later in the chapter (see section 11.4).

11.2.3. Already in

The literature reviewed in chapter two revealed that family involvement has been the subject of much research within the domain of family businesses. Empirical work in this field has therefore measured the knock on effect of family involvement on several economic measures including business growth (e.g. Schulze et al., 2001), stock market performance (e.g. Bennedsen et al., 2015) and value creation (e.g. Bennedsen et al., 2007). However, research has neglected to explore the factors that account for family member’s involvement in the first instance. The previous section has shown that this is often due to family obligations to supply labour at the family business that family involvement occurs. The
tendency of these family obligations to commence at such an early age, however, brings into question whether the way in which next generation decision making is currently conceptualised is an accurate one. Table 11.2 demonstrates the age at which family obligations to supply labour commenced among participants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Supporting quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miccoli</td>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>“I would have been about 19 years old...So I then ran my Dad’s shop”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ricky</td>
<td>13/14</td>
<td>“I was probably about 13/14 and my father had to go out to Italy for several weeks. So I had to run the shop”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsone</td>
<td>Nino</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>“From an early age I was peeling garlic and doing stuff like that”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frusciante</td>
<td>Marianna</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>“From a young age, I had already decided that this was what I didn’t want to do”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gabriella</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>“We were too young to go out so it was fun. We got on with everybody and it was like a little job”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carla</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>“I would work and do little things...I can’t remember how old I was, I was probably 12 actually”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galetta</td>
<td>Valentino</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>“We were steered towards working in the restaurant even when we were at school...I started when I was 12”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lucia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>“I remember being smaller than 8 being stood on a stool washing the pots”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maroni</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>“We all worked from a very, very early age. I can remember going and working from eight years old”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>“I started doing a bit of work clearing tables or washing pots on a Saturday. I was about 14”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>“Since the age of 15/16 if my dad has needed some staff to cover in the restaurant, he has always sent me”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>“I was only about 12 at the time...And he said “well, we need you to go on the pot wash”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allegra</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>“We used to go and help and then we both used to work in the coffee shops as we got older”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While some participants failed to specify the age at which family obligations commenced, evidently, the accounts of other participants reveal that it was not uncommon for the next generation to commence work at the catering business from a young age. Furthermore, this was found consistently across the families interviewed as table 11.2 demonstrates. Specifically, two participants recalled that their obligations at the family business commenced aged eight years old. It is likely that hospitality work facilitates such obligations at a young age due to the nature of the tasks performed. For instance, accounts were populated with memories of peeling garlic, drying cutlery, clearing tables and washing pots. Arguably, these are unskilled tasks and can be performed without a high level of parental
supervision which would be counter-productive. However, as these tasks were performed at such an early age, it is likely that they predated (the decision regarding) next generation employment preferences and this has important ramifications for how next generation decision making is conceptualised.

Zellweger, Sieger and Halter's (2011) study of students with a family business background suggests that next generation family members have three career choice intentions, namely, succession intention, founding intention or employee intentions. These three career choice intentions are captured in the next generation employment preferences presented in figure 10.1, albeit with different labels. While founding intentions and employee intentions draw parallels with the self-employment and paid employment elsewhere preferences identified in figure 11.1, involvement in the family business is distinctive from Zellweger, Sieger and Halter's (2011) notion of succession intention. This is because Zellweger, Sieger and Halter (2011) adopt a rational economic approach in viewing succession as the process of replacing one leader with another (Bass, 1990) for the purpose of achieving strategic renewal (Haag, Helin and Melin, 2006). However, within the small and family businesses included in this thesis, seldom were the next generation employed within the family business owing to a desire to replace their parents at the helm of the family business. On the contrary, next generation family members were often employed within their respective family businesses owing to a lack of alternative employment options (e.g. Nino Falsone, Carla Frusciante) following a failure to achieve academically. For this reason, the term 'involvement in the family business' is preferred as this reflects that employment within the family business is often less strategic.

Next generation decision making therefore consists of the three employment preferences identified in figure 11.1, the first of which represents involvement in the family business. Should the next generation seek employment beyond the remit of the family business, they
may opt for paid employment elsewhere or may attempt to launch their own ventures through self-employment. Family obligations to supply labour, however, fundamentally change the nature of this decision. It is owing to these obligations that involvement in the family business often predates the decision regarding the employment path of the next generation. Put simply, offspring cannot choose to become involved in the family business if they are already part of it and have been for a significant time period. The suggestion that the next generation are 'already in' the family business, is epitomised in the following quote:-

“I had always been in [the family business], therefore it was never a question of did I expect to go in it. I was in it and had been from being very young... so no, I didn’t expect to come into the business but I was always in it in some shape or form”.

Matthew Maroni

The above quotes serve to illustrate that involvement in the family business predates next generation decision making. Rather, the next generation cannot decide to become involved in the family business because they are ‘already in’ it and have been from a young age. Should the next generation wish to pursue an alternative employment path, they are required to exit the family business in the first instance. As such, next generation decision making is re-conceptualised as illustrated in figure 11.2:-

Figure 11.2 - Re-conceptualisation of next generation decision making

Figure 11.2 illustrates that offspring are 'already in' the family business owing to family obligations to supply labour as youngsters. Therefore, offspring can either remain involved in the family business, or pursue employment opportunities beyond its remit (through self-employment or paid employment elsewhere). This is fundamentally different to Zellweger, Sieger and Halter's (2011) model, which includes three employment options, as next generation participants clearly identified with the first of such options (i.e. involvement in
the family business) already and therefore have only two remaining options, both of which require them to forsake the business which they have become accustomed to throughout their youth. Re-conceptualising next generation decision making as such has two important implications, each of which will discussed in turn. First, as offspring are 'already in' the family business those who aspire to opportunities beyond its remit are required to leave behind the comfort and familiarity that accompanies family business involvement. This gives rise to the 'net' analogy which explains why next generation family members often find it difficult to realise opportunities beyond the remit of the family business. Second, seeking opportunities beyond the family business is often accompanied with geographical separation from the family. Therefore, next generation employment preferences can have implications for family relationships.

11.2.4. The net analogy

Next generation family members are not presented with three employment options as argued by Zellweger, Sieger and Halter (2011). Rather, offspring are 'already in' the family business and are therefore confronted with the reality of remaining in the family business or seeking opportunities beyond its remit. However, to realise opportunities beyond the family business, offspring are required to leave it behind. This involves a degree of uncertainty whereas the family business offers familiarity. This is evident in the accounts of Matthew Maroni who explains:-

"Did I want to go and do anything else? Yes, I’m sure there were times when I thought that I did, and as we spoke earlier I did a few things but I was always more comfortable working in a field that I knew."

The above quote is illustrative of the familiarity found within family businesses, thus explaining why offspring can find it difficult to realise opportunities beyond the family business, despite aspiring to do so. However, the net provided by the family business can serve a variety of functions as illustrated in table 11.3:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety net</td>
<td>Alternative to unemployment</td>
<td>Nino Falsone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trap</td>
<td>Makes escape from family business difficult</td>
<td>Carla Frusciante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back-up plan</td>
<td>Pursue preferred employment initially</td>
<td>Olivia Falsone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Family businesses can serve as a safety net. This denotes that involvement in the family business provides a secure option of employment should the next generation lack alternatives options. Employment within the family business therefore provides a degree of economic security in the sense that the individual might be unemployed otherwise. This is particularly evident in the case of Nino Falsone (see section 7.4) who explained how his failure to achieve academically meant that he lacked alternative employment options and as
a result, "into the restaurant I went". In this case and others (e.g. Marianna Frusciante, see section 8.5), the employment prospects of these individuals were not in abundance and the decision was made to resort to the family business as an alternative to unemployment (at least in the short term). As such, the family business performs a safety net function i.e. safeguarding the next generation from unemployment. This does not necessarily prevent the next generation from realising opportunities beyond the family business entirely. For example, Nino Falsone was later employed in a string of different jobs before owning his own restaurant. However, there are clear examples of how escaping the family business is difficult.

Nets are commonly understood to be used as trapping devices and the family business is no exception. While the family business safeguards the next generation against unemployment in the short term, the safety net can prevent them from escaping in the long term. This is because the abovementioned familiarity appears to discourage the next generation from pursuing their preferred employment path in the future. This is best exemplified in the accounts of Gabriella Frusciante, who was never able to realise her ambition of becoming a teacher (see section 8.6). This example, however, is not an isolated one as Marianna (see section 8.5) and Carla Frusciante (see section 8.7) echo their sister’s story. In all three examples, the sisters have pursued further education courses alongside their employment at the family business with the view that this might facilitate a different employment path. However, these courses were often abandoned along the way as instead the sisters grew accepting of their employment at the family business. In sum, pursuing an alternative employment path requires one to sacrifice the familiarity inherent in one’s role at the family business and therefore provides an explanation as to why the next generation find it difficult to escape of family business, thus lending further cogence to the net analogy. The family provides individuals with a range of intimate experiences (McKie and Callan, 2012) and it is perhaps this intimacy which makes it difficult to escape the family business as to do so individuals may be required to forgo these intimacies and risk 'outsider' status (see Bauman, 1990). Furthermore, Roseneil and Budgeon (2004) argue that individuals are increasingly looking beyond the 'heteronormative' family and towards friendship groups and colleagues for intimate relationships, which suggests that this difficulty escaping the family business may be easier for those who wish to broaden their intimate relationships beyond those found within the family unit.

The family business can also provide a ‘back-up plan’ for next generation family members. The term back-up plan has been adopted to denote a situation wherein the next generation has a number of available employment options and intends to pursue at least one of them, though is equally mindful that involvement at the family business provides alternative employment should the preferred option prove unfeasible or unfruitful. This is aptly demonstrated in the case of Olivia Falsone, who wishes to pursue a career in the performing arts whilst conscious that employment at her father’s restaurant business provides a convenient “back-up” should this not come to fruition (see section 7.6). In distinguishing between the functions of the safety net and the back-up plan, the family business serves as a back-up plan for the next generation family members who have feasible employment options, whereas the family business functions as a safety net for those who have none.
The ethnic entrepreneurship literature is dotted with research on the business entry motives and sector preferences of next generation migrants (Kourtit and Nijkamp, 2012). The field of study assumes that offspring are motivated by a rational economic motive i.e. to achieve better employment prospects than their parents. Furthermore, it assumes that the next generation have to search beyond the family business to discover such prospects. For example, Baycan, Sahin and Nijkamp (2012) have noted that offspring prefer new and non-traditional sectors such as ICT and financial services and therefore forsake the family business as an employment option. The family business, however, can provide a convenient back-up plan for next generation family members allowing them to pursue their preferred choice in the knowledge that secure employment awaits them within the family business should this prove unfeasible or unfruitful. This is a very rational economic way of strategising one's future employment options, though no research has explored how family businesses can liberate (or constrict) the next generation in such a way. As such, the net analogy has opened up new lines of enquiry in the family business literature and related fields of study.

11.2.5. The implications of next generation employment preferences for the family

Accepting that the next generation are 'already in' the business due to family obligations to supply labour, carries with it the notion that parents have committed their offspring to this employment path. This is because it is (almost exclusively) one's parents that bestow these family obligations upon their children, as evident in the accounts of Favianna Maroni:

"[Robert] hasn't made a conscious decision to go and work for [the family business]. He has always done it from the age of being able to work. They have always helped [my husband] out at Christmas when they were off school. Then when he finished university, straight away [my husband] needed him in Newcastle and that is where he went. And then the manager went back and another manager went, so he went to fill up that gap. Then a manager in Doncaster went, so now he is there. So he hasn’t physically or mentally had the time to think ‘what do I want to do’...he realised that he is working for his father’s business and he had a responsibility and he didn’t want to let [his father] down”.

Parental influences have been studied within the career development literature, finding that parental attitudes towards the world of work and specific careers may affect several aspects of adolescents’ career development (Galambos and Silbereisen, 1987; McMahon, Carroll and Gilles, 2001; Peterson, Stivers and Peters, 1986; Turner, Stewart and Lapan, 2004; Young and Friesen, 1992). Furthermore, the quality of parent-child relationships has been studied within the context of career development (Hill, Ramirez and Dumka, 2003; Kracke, 1997; Rainey and Borders, 1997), though this has been to a lesser extent and results have been less conclusive (Keller and Whiston, 2008). The findings of this thesis therefore represent a departure from the career development literature, which has focused on how parental influence can shape work ethic and the propensity to pursue specific careers. Instead, the thesis has demonstrated that parents (perhaps unintentionally) commit their offspring to a particular employment path (i.e. involvement in the family owned restaurant)
Family businesses witness the interaction of two separate but connected realities: the family; and the business (Bowman-Upton, 1991; Dyer and Handler, 1994). Should next generation family members wish to pursue opportunities beyond the family business, they are required to leave it behind. Consequently, they are no longer subject to the overlap of these two entities (unlike members of their kin who remain involved in the family business) and belong solely to the family entity. This is best evidenced in the accounts of Ricky Miccoli, who forged a successful career as an IT professional while at no point diminishing from the extent to which he considered himself to be part of the family unit. On the contrary, the pursuit of opportunities beyond the family business may require geographical separation from the family unit. Occasionally, this is the very purpose for which such opportunities are desired in the first instance. For example, Valentino Galetta fled the UK for work in Italy precisely to distance himself from a controlling father. As such, he spent four years working in Italy’s hotel industry to achieve separation from his father (and by extension, the family unit). His departure marked a separation from the business entity, and arguably the family entity. This demonstrates that though the majority of the family business literature focuses on the influence of the family entity on the business entity (e.g. Bennedsen et al., 2007; Bennedsen et al., 2015; Schulze et al., 2001), the employment preferences of offspring (and their resulting departure from the family business) can occasionally have implications for their sense of belonging to the family unit.

11.3. The drivers of next generation decision making
11.3.1. Rational economic motives
The drivers of next generation decision making were plentiful among the participants interviewed, though there was scant evidence of any rational economic motives. It is well established that the next generation are confronted with more favourable opportunity structures compared with their migrant parents, often undertaking entrepreneurship to exploit an opportunity rather than out of economic necessity (Baycan-Levent et al., 2002; Ram, 1992). Research has focused on the tendency to favour new and non-traditional sectors including ICT and financial services (Baycan, Sahin and Nijkamp, 2012) among these latter generations as they look to achieve modern break out strategies beyond traditional markets (Kourtit and Nijkamp, 2012). Naturally, such literature assumes rational economic motives take precedent over non-economic ones.

Research among migrant groups has also focused on the role of education. For instance, Chiswick and Miller (1994) have noted that age of arrival varies negatively with post
migration educational attainment. Other research has focused on the tendency of some cultural groups to encourage their offspring towards education and into professional and salaried employment (e.g. Dhaliwal and Kangis, 2006) and black and ethnic minority students are now well-represented in higher education numbers (Noden, Shiner and Modood, 2014). Such research assumes that education facilitates better opportunity structures among the next generation and is also underpinned by rational economic assumptions regarding the motivations of the next generation. Put simply, higher education is viewed as a route to an employment opportunities beyond the family business. Therefore, this school of thought does not provide for the accounts of those who pursue higher education, only to remain in the family business. Table 11.4 demonstrates the educational attainment among those interviewed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Secondary Education</th>
<th>Further Education</th>
<th>Higher Education</th>
<th>Course/Subject/Vocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miccoli</td>
<td>Ricky</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsone</td>
<td>Nino</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frusciante</td>
<td>Marianna</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hair and Beauty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gabriella</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>Childcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carla</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galetta</td>
<td>Valentino</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lucia</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maroni</td>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>Business Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allegra</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>Business Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>Business and Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are clear examples within the narratives that failing to achieve academically constrains the employment choices available to the next generation. The is best illustrated by Nino Falsone, who recalls:

"I always knew that when I did leave school I would always have a job and perhaps that is what made me lazy at school...I had to go and work for my father...I hadn’t accomplished anything at school so there was no going forward in that respect so into the restaurant I went."

The above quote demonstrates, once again, how the family business can serve as a safety net to safeguard members of the next generation who would find themselves otherwise employed. Those who do pursue higher education, however, do not always pursue paid employment elsewhere as a result. This contrasts with the assumption in the literature. Table 11.4 illustrates that the Maroni family is particularly well-represented in terms of university attendance with four grandchildren completing a degree in business related
subjects. Three of these grandchildren have assumed roles within the Maroni family business, the exception being Matthew Maroni Jnr who aspires to begin trading in the foreign exchange market instead. This suggests that having gained a university degree, this does not necessarily make employment paths beyond the family business more appealing as the literature would suggest. This supports the view that educational attainment does not vary negatively with propensity to remain in the family business. Furthermore, in some instances higher education is pursued for the very purpose of facilitating involvement in the family business. This is evident in Donna Maroni’s account below:

"I knew before I went to university [that I wanted to join the family business] because I had to make a decision of which course to do and which route to take. I knew that if I did business studies with some marketing modules that it would give me the knowledge that I would need to start in the lower end of the marketing department in this company."

In the example above, Donna Maroni is utilising higher education to strategically equip herself with the skills required for involvement in the family business, rather than using higher education to propel herself away from it. The pursuit of higher education is clearly most prevalent among the Maroni family. On a critical note, this may be due specifically to the Maroni family business, which represents a considerably larger concern than other family businesses included in the thesis. As such, opportunities for career advancement may be expedited and/or greater within the family business as opposed to beyond it. This was iterated by Donna Maroni during the interview:

"My dad definitely encouraged me to because he thought it was the best option. My mum certainly didn’t, she was like “do what you want, do what you are going to be happiest at doing”. But my dad definitely did because he could see where my career could go."

It appears that educational attainment does not always discourage the next generation from involvement in the family business, though evidence from the Maroni family suggests that the size and scope of the family business (and by extension, the career advancement opportunities encountered within it) may prove to be a moderating influence. In sum, the accounts of the next generation were seldom driven by rational economic motives. However, the Donna Maroni’s university studies in business suggest that she was keen to employ a more managerial approach to her involvement at the family business. This begs the question as to who is the more entrepreneurial of the two generations.

11.3.2. The entrepreneurial generation
Evidence from the Miccoli family epitomises the debate surrounding which is the more entrepreneurial of the two generations. Table 11.5 (page 139) illustrates the labels ascribed to fellow family members within the Miccoli family:
Table 11.5 illustrates that Vito and Sally Miccoli give primacy to their earlier occupations when describing how they spent their working life. Interestingly, save for Sally Miccoli's mention of the 'restaurant' they do not allude to the ownership of the restaurant which characterised their later years. Ricky is consistently recognised (by both himself and his brother) as an IT professional. However, it is the label of 'entrepreneur' used by Steven Miccoli to describe himself that is most interesting as this is not a view shared by members of his kin as elder brother Ricky prefers the terms 'small businessman' to describe Steven. Carland et al. (1984) were among the first to distinguish the term 'small business owner' from the term 'entrepreneur', arguing that the former is principally driven by the furthering of personal goals while the latter is principally driven by profit and growth. Table 11.5 clearly demonstrates that Steven Miccoli believes that he is the more entrepreneurial of the two generations, relegating his father's achievements to that of a 'self-employed business owner', though it can be argued otherwise.

The narrative of Vito Miccoli is dotted with no less than four instances of self-employment owing to his desire to "get on in life". Each attempt was in a vastly different sector to the one previous (e.g. automobile garage, exchange shop, catering) which Vito often had little experience of prior to assuming ownership. Vito was always alert to more lucrative opportunities and often sold his businesses (twice to his son, Steven) when he deemed opportunities to be more sustainable elsewhere. Sensing the opportunities in catering, Vito invested heavily in his restaurant to expand the premises which he financed in the form of a bank loan. This is arguably an indication of his desire to grow the restaurant business and a willingness to assume risk in order to do so.

Steven Miccoli claims that it was only when his father closed the exchange shop that he "approached the bank and got some funding and decided to start my own business". However, his brother Ricky explains that initially "Steven could keep it going and get some experience of taking it in a different direction and my dad still had an interest in it (if you like)", though eventually "it came to a point where effectively, they moved out from London Road and Steven took it to Ecclesall Road doing very much more in car hi-fi and stuff". This suggests that Steven did not launch his own venture but took over from his father's business, and in doing so, moved the premises to a different location. In the years that followed, however, in the car and home audio sector "things took a downturn". During the same period his parents' restaurant business had grown somewhat, "it was a bigger venue,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label ascribed to</th>
<th>Vito</th>
<th>Sally</th>
<th>Ricky</th>
<th>Steven</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Label ascribed by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vito and Sally in appendix 5.1.1</td>
<td>Pit worker</td>
<td>Shop assistant</td>
<td>Not provided</td>
<td>Not provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanic</td>
<td>School meals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Van driver</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricky in appendix 5.2.1</td>
<td>Small businessman</td>
<td>Chef</td>
<td>IT professional</td>
<td>Small businessman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven in appendix 5.3.1</td>
<td>Self-employed business owner</td>
<td>Dinner lady Restaurant</td>
<td>Banking and IT</td>
<td>Entrepreneur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shaded area = Label ascribed to self
more clientele and it was more of a professional business" and Steven admits that "I was a bit envious of that". When his father Vito wished to retire, Steven once again took over his father's business.

Later generations are frequently assumed to be voluntary entrepreneurs (Baycan-Levent et al., 2002), initiating business ownership to exploit an opportunity, compared with their migrant parents who are assumed to initiate entrepreneurship out of economic necessity (Ram, 1992). However, an alertness to opportunities and an eagerness to exploit them is more prevalent in the migrant generation within the Miccoli family. Furthermore, many of the behaviours associated with entrepreneurship (e.g. profit/growth orientation, risk taking) are exhibited by this generation too. On the contrary, it can be argued that it was only when his father had grown his ventures into a sustainable business did Steven Miccoli take over/purchase the business from his father. This suggests that while Steven ascribes himself with the label of entrepreneur, absent from family accounts is an alertness to opportunities and an assembly of the necessary resources to exploit them which is generally associated with this label. A crude interpretation of his endeavours is that taking over/purchasing his father’s businesses merely provided an easy means of achieving the "good standard of living" which he desired.

According to Stamm and Lubinski, (2011), warn of the rise and decline of family businesses in three generations. This is the idea that the founding generation (e.g. grandfather) establishes the family business, the next generation develops it (i.e. son or daughter) and the generation that follows destroys the business (e.g. grandchild). The Maroni family have defied this notion and are currently in their third generation of family business involvement (in the retail catering sector at least). Though the latest generation (through their university studies) have clearly employed a more managerial approach to the business, it is questionable as to whether this can be considered entrepreneurial. Even in families that have witnessed the next generation launch their own ventures (e.g. the Frusciante family), these have often been 'carbon copies' of their parents' business. Occasionally, these new businesses share an identical name to their predecessors. This questions whether the next generation exhibit an entrepreneurial mind-set or are merely seeking an easy option.

In sum, the term 'entrepreneur' was not one explicitly used by participants, Steven Miccoli being the exception. According to Carland et al. (1984) this denotes individuals who launch ventures principally for the purpose of achieving profit and growth. While this is a very rational economic motive, as the previous section revealed, it is not one common to next generation family members. As such, this thesis opposes the extant literature regarding the opportunity seeking tendencies of the next generation (e.g. Baycan-Levent et al., 2002). This is because among the Italian families interviewed, offspring display a tendency to ride on the success of the previous generations' ability to exploit opportunities, rather than seek out new opportunities of their own.
11.3.3. Parental influence

Parental influence is of great academic interest given that it has been demonstrated that parents commit their offspring to involvement in the family business, specifically the extent to which they encourage their offspring to remain in the family business or discourage them from an alternative employment path. The accounts of Donna Maroni are particularly revealing:

“I remember wanting to become a teacher and I soon changed my mind. My mum and dad sat me down and asked me why I wanted to become a teacher and the only excuse I could give them was because I wanted to have loads of holidays. And [my parents] said ‘that’s not a good enough reason, come up with something else’ and I couldn’t. And [my dad] said ‘you’d be best coming into the business for your career’...so he gave me advice to come into the business and I think it was the right decision’.

Donna Maroni’s reasons for pursuing a career in teaching were not accepted her father and she was encouraged to remain the family business (note that Donna Maroni uses the term ‘come into’ the family business whilst the thesis has demonstrated that the next generation are frequently ‘already in’ it). This represents parental influence to remain in the family business. Parental influence is not exclusive to the Maroni family but can be found within the Frusciante family, where father Antonio was keen for each of his three daughters to pursue a career in restaurant work:

“My dad definitely wanted us all to [work in the restaurant trade]...I was very limited with what I could do because I didn’t get good grades...That’s why I did hotel reception...My dad thought it was a complete waste of time...[Opening my own restaurant] happened really fast and quick...I could see it working and I suppose it would make my dad really happy as well so that was another factor”.

The above quote highlights that Marianna was discouraged from pursuing employment options beyond the family business owing to parental influences. Furthermore, her father’s opinion clearly featured in her decision to launch her own restaurant venture as she was aware that her intended employment path (i.e. restaurant ownership) would be well received by her father. However, in Marianna’s case her initial employment path led her away from restaurant ownership. This is because her father Antonio was overzealous in expressing his wish for Marianna to remain in restaurant work (see section 8.5) and Marianna left for Liverpool. Marianna’s departure can be understood as a ‘boomerang effect’, a concept borrowed from social psychology (see Sensenig and Brehm, 1968). The boomerang effect refers to the unintended consequence of an attempt to persuade resulting in the adoption of an opposing position instead. In the above example, Antonio’s attempt to persuade (i.e. parental influence) his daughter towards a career in restaurant work, resulted in Marianna leaving the family business for alternative employment instead (an opposing position).

In conclusion, next generation decision making is subject to parental influences and this has been well-documented within the career development literature (Keller and Whiston,
This field of study has focused on how parental attitudes towards the world of work and specific career options can influence several aspects of career development among adolescents (Galambos and Silbereisen, 1987; McMahon, Carroll and Gilles, 2001; Peterson, Stivers and Peters, 1986; Turner, Stewart and Lapan, 2004; Young and Friesen, 1992). However, no research has been conducted within the context of family businesses regarding parental encouragement to remain in the family business. Importantly, this thesis has demonstrated that while this can often lead the next generation to do so, occasionally this can often have unintended consequences which inspire the next generation to explore employment opportunities beyond the remit of the family business (due to a boomerang effect).

11.3.4. Escaping

Strong family ties are thought to be the distinguishing cultural trait among Italian families (Johnson, 1985; di Leonardo, 1984), though it has been noted how females are often subservient members of the family (Lozzi-Toscano, 2004). A subservience of female family members towards the patriarchal figure was consistent across each of the families interviewed, as the following quotes confirm:

“What [my husband] liked, we always did what he wanted. He was the head of the house, I would sort him out first and everything else was after”.

Sally Miccoli

“Basically [my mum] met my dad and he wouldn’t let her work...Just the Italian mentality, you know ‘all you need to do is get tied to the sink and that is it’”

Nino Falsone

“My mum was the skivvy...Whatever my dad said went anyway. She never went out, she never had any friends. She was never allowed anything like that”.

Lucia Galetta

The above quotes demonstrate that among the families interviewed, Italian born males represented the patriarchal figure and chief decision maker within the family unit. To recap, ‘patriarchy’ is understood to be a gender and age relationship, based on power, in which women and children and generally oppressed (Gittins, 1993; Steel, Kidd and Brown, 2012). This was generally accepted by their British born wives quoted above whose roles may be likened to the 'captive wife' (see Gavron, 1966) in which females are encouraged to serve the male head of the family, perform domestic chores and care for the children. Of greater interest, however, is the extent to which the patriarchal figure serves to influence next generation decision making. The following accounts reveal how Lucia Galetta's father exerted control over his children, particularly his daughters:-

"He was the first boyfriend I had and my dad said I had to marry him. I was married within eight months. My dad was very strict. He summoned him to the house and sat him down and said 'if my daughter is going out with you then you have to put a ring on
her finger'. The next one was 'you have to get married to her'. I love my dad, I really love him, but he just dictated our lives. And that's the Italian in him, he controlled everybody. I was 19 and he was controlling me, he was controlling us all'.

The term control refers to a situation in which one’s ability to make a decision regarding a particular course of action has been removed. In Lucia Galetta’s case, the particular course of action related to her choice of marital suitor, a decision which was made by her father. In brother Valentino Galetta’s case, this related to his labours as a child at the restaurant owned by his father. Valentino explains that he and each of his siblings were forced to assume roles at their parents’ restaurant, something which he likens to a form of exploitation, the sole beneficiary of which was his father:-

“The way I see it which was more of a selfish way in that he had staff there that he didn’t have to pay. He didn’t have to put job adverts out there to get people in. He knew that he had his family and he knew he could rule us with an iron fist... And you can imagine that at 12 – 14 years old, I wasn’t the normal schoolchild that had friends and went out and played and whatever. I used to come home and have to work at night rather than going out with my friends. So when I got to the age of 14 and coming to the end of my school time, I pushed and wanted to get away as well. I wanted to leave home basically because I felt that if I had stayed there, my destiny was just to work for my father and that was it.”

Valentino Galetta

Remembering that control refers to the removal of an individual’s ability to make a decision regarding a particular course of action, the above quote reveals how Valentino Galetta opted to take the only decision available to him i.e. to escape. Valentino’s decision to escape the family unit can therefore be viewed as an attempt to escape the patriarchal household and the subordinate role in the family (see de Beauvoir, 1953) that tend to accompany such households. Valentino was not alone in his decision to escape, as table 10.6 demonstrates:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valentino</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>“So when I got to the age of 14...I wanted to leave home”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucia</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>“I left and got married and went to New Zealand”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filomena</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>“And in the end she left, she left Sheffield”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The attempts of the Galetta children to escape their controlling father demonstrate that the more one exerts control over the family unit, the more the next generation seek to escape it. However, there are some exceptions. Whilst Marianna and Gabriella Frusciante both cite that the primary driver for starting their own business was to escape their father (see
chapter 8), this desire to escape the family unit does not extend to the experiences of their younger sister Carla:

"[My sisters] hated how things were and [they] could never do anything because my dad was really stubborn and never wanted to change anything. He was very hard to work with at that point".

While Carla acknowledges that her father's approach was not ideal, she did not feel compelled to escape the situation as her sisters had. In explaining this, perhaps it was the very departure of her sisters that led to father Antonio taking a more relaxed approach to the control he exerted over the family unit. This was echoed in Marianna's interview, during which she disclosed the following about her departure:

"It definitely was the best thing that I did. Definitely, as well for my dad because I think it mellowed him a little bit as well."

Interestingly, there is evidence across both the Galetta family and the Frusciante family that those who escape the family unit return only to pursue the very employment path they sought to escape in the first instance. For instance, Valentino Galetta believed that "my destiny was just to work for my father". Yet, when military service loomed in Italy, he returned to the UK only to resume employment under his father. In a similar vein, Marianna Frusicante left Sheffield to seek employment beyond the remit of the family business. However, she returned only to launch her own restaurant two years later and in doing so, drew heavily on support (financial and otherwise) from her parents.

The discussion above has highlighted two important points. First, next generation decision making is complex and subject to a number of influences, many of which are non-economic in origin. Second, that the primary driver for next generation decision making is not the employment path that awaits them beyond the business, but the desire to escape the family unit. As such, family relationships play a key role in next generation decision making.

11.3.5. The influence of family relationships

Figure 11.3 (page 145) revisits the conceptual framework presented in chapter two and illustrates the various drivers for next generation decision making, including employment preferences both within and beyond the family business. The framework assumes that next generation family members face more favourable opportunity structures which favour opportunity entrepreneurship (Baycan-Levent et al., 2002; Ram, 1992), and better access to education (Noden, Shiner and Modood, 2014) relative to parent generations. As such, the framework assumes that next generation family members seek opportunities beyond the remit of the family business due to a rational economic imperative. However, this lies in stark contrast to the accounts revealed among next generation participants.
Figure 11.4 (page 146) summarises the key drivers for next generation decision making among the participants interviewed. Steven Miccoli claims that a key driver for his involvement in the restaurant business founded by his parents some 20 years prior to his takeover, is "because it presents who I am". Steven refers to his ownership of an Italian restaurant as an opportunity to reinforce his cultural identity as an Italian. Nino Falsone explains that the key driver for his occupation in the restaurants owned by his father, was having not "accomplished anything at school" which confined his employment outlook to involvement at the family business. This highlights the aforementioned role of the family business as a safety net. Similarly, Carla Frusciante resigned herself to a future in the family business thinking "it will be alright, I've got BBs". During her interview she explained that she was never sufficiently compelled to seek opportunities outside of the family business and instead grew complacent to remain in the family business. Matthew Maroni Snr refers to the familiarity of "working in a field that I knew", once again highlighting how the familiarity provided in the family business often discourages family members from seeking employment beyond its remit. Finally, Matthew Maroni Jnr insists that with a family heritage spanning 150 years, "you wouldn't want to see that suddenly go to pot". This indicates that a key driver for his involvement in the family business is a desire to protect his
Figure 11-4 - Key drivers among next generation participants

Key drivers to seek opportunities beyond the family firm:

- "I wanted to be part of something that was more commercially oriented and serving big communities"  
  Ricky Miccoli

- "I'd like to enjoy what I wanted to do first rather than do something that I don't enjoy as much as dance"  
  Olivia Falsone

- "It was about having a change from my dad"  
  Marianna Frusciante

- "I wanted to leave home basically"  
  Valentino Galetta

- "I really just want to start my own thing"  
  Matthew Maroni Jnr

Key drivers to remain within the family firm:

- "I got into the restaurant business because it presents who I am"  
  Steven Miccoli

- "I hadn't accomplished anything at school so into the restaurant I went"  
  Nino Falsone

- "I probably thought it will be alright, I've got BBs"  
  Carla Frusciante

- "It is fun, working hard and you are surrounded by your family"  
  Allegra Maroni

- "I was always more comfortable working in a field that I knew"  
  Matthew Maroni Snr

- "You wouldn't want to see [the heritage] suddenly go to pot"  
  Robert Maroni
family heritage, thus giving rise to oft cited dynastic motives within family business literature.

Among those participants employed beyond the remit of the family business, Matthew Maroni’s desire to "start my own thing" bears the closest resemblance to a driver which is rational economic in origin. Above all, he clearly seeks a level of autonomy which is not provided within the family business and this is aligned with traditional entrepreneurial motives. The key driver for Olivia Falsone is pursuing her passion for dancing, though she does acknowledge that her father’s restaurant business provides a sufficient 'back up' plan should she fail to realise a future in dancing. Most interestingly, the accounts of Marianna Frusciante and Valentino Galetta are galvanised by a desire to escape the family. This witnessed Marianna's departure to Liverpool, whilst Valentino fled the UK to Italy. At the heart of each of these narratives of escape is a breakdown in family relationships, specifically between the next generation and the patriarchal figure.

To recap, the interpretative approach adopted by this thesis was intended as an 'opportunity to learn' (see Stake, 1994: 243) about how and in what ways family relationships influence next generation decision making. Therefore, what can be learned from these five Italian families is of greater importance than whether or not they are representative of families per se (Italian or otherwise). Table 11.7 captures the themes to emerge among the next generation participants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11-7 - Emerging themes among next generation participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ricky Miccoli</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Olivia Falsone</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marianna Frusciante</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valentino Galetta</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Matthew Maroni Jnr</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steven Miccoli</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nino Falsone</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carla Frusciante</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allegra Maroni</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Matthew Maroni Snr</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Robert Maroni</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While dynastic motives have received attention within the family business literature (e.g. Casson, 1999) and autonomy motives conform to classical entrepreneurial goals, table 11.7 (page 147) reveals a plethora of emergent themes which have yet to receive academic attention. Some of these themes related to the net analogy (see section 11.2.4), including how the family business can safeguard the next generation from unemployment and how the familiarity found within can act as a trapping device. Other themes relate to a desire to escape. In conclusion, central to each of these emergent themes is the influence of family relationships as when family harmony exists, this can influence the next generation to remain within the family business. However, when family relationships breakdown this provides a key driver for the next generation to seek opportunities beyond the family business.

11.4. Typologies
11.4.1. Sonnenfeld revisited
In reviewing the family business literature, chapter two revealed that a typology of retirement styles existed to account for the decisions of founding generations. This typology was developed through interviews with 350 retired (often publicly well-known) chief executives by Sonnenfeld (1988) and is illustrated below:

Figure 11-5 - Sonnenfeld’s (1988) typology of retirement styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monarch</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leave only when they die or are overthrown in a coup. Fail to prepare for retirement.</td>
<td>Depart but soon undermine their successors and return to glory. Struggle with world once retired.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ambassador</th>
<th>Governor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leave gracefully and do not interfere but remain available to help</td>
<td>Make a clean break and often move on to other companies, government or charity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A typology of retirement styles exists to account for the founding generation, though it seems that a typology which accounts for next generation decision making is yet to be developed.
11.4.2. A typology of next generation employment preferences

The strongest theme to emerge from the accounts of next generation participants was that of family obligations, a moral sense of duty or commitment bestowed upon (often younger) family members. Table 11.1 (page 128) illustrates that obligations to supply labour at the family business can be experienced both positively and negatively. In the event that these family obligations to supply labour were experienced positively, family relationships were not compromised. However, when one's labours at the family business was a negative experience, this chapter has demonstrated how this was often to the detriment of family relationships. Therefore, whether this undertaking was a positive or negative experience is important in conceptualising next generation decision making.

The chapter has also demonstrated that because family obligations often occur at an early age, their involvement in the family business predates any decision regarding their employment. This is because parents have committed them to family business involvement through bestowing upon their offspring family obligations. As the next generation are 'already in' the family business, the only alternative is to seek opportunities beyond its remit. The stay/go decision is also important in conceptualising next generation decision making and the resulting typology is presented below:

![Figure 11-6 - A typology of next generation employment preferences](image)

Carla Frusciante epitomises the 'complacent' type as she explains that despite aspiring to opportunities beyond the remit of the family business, she was never able to realise these:
"I just did it [studied] because I wanted something different and I didn't want to work at the restaurant. I was adamant that I didn’t want to work at the restaurant all my life...I did a year or two and I tried but I just wasn’t in the right frame of mind. I was 18/19 and I loved going out and being with my friends and I liked drinking...So college was a bit of a bust up...I think in the back of my mind I probably thought 'it will be alright, I've got BBs'"

Her sentiments above illustrate the she is keen to avoid restaurant work at the family business, though over time she grows complacent to remain there. Nino Falsone is also representative of the complacent type, reluctantly resorting to employment at his father's restaurant due to a lack of alternatives having not "accomplished anything at school". The complacent type is not associated with negative experiences of family obligations per se, it is equally plausible that an individual could have positive experiences of involvement in the family firm and remain complacent within its remit through a voluntary undertaking

The accounts of Valentino Galetta are indicative of the 'captive' type. Valentino's decision to flee the UK to Italy was owing to a breakdown in his relationship with his father due to forced labour (and therefore a negative experience) at the family business. In doing so, he was able to avoid "being used" at the family business. Marianna and Gabriella Frusciante are also representative of this type, seeking to escape the breakdown in the relationship with their father as an alternative to remaining captive in the family business.

Ricky Miccoli provides an example of the 'instrumental' type. Ricky preferred against involvement in the family restaurant because "it just didn't appeal" and instead used his business understanding to forge a career as an IT professional. In doing so, it was the business understanding developed through years of labouring at the family owned exchange shop that proved instrumental in inspiring his future career. Matthew Maroni is also representative of this type as he intends to pursue self-employment trading in the foreign exchange market. However, he acknowledges that:-

"My dad, he has done quite well out of [the family business]. Well, enough to support me and my brother. He’s okay so I know that if I need any help or whatever he is always going to be there for me and able to back me up, I suppose."

The above quote demonstrates that family wealth has proved instrumental in allowing Matthew to pursue opportunities that lie beyond the family business.

The final type represents those who have 'embraced' the dream and are committed to ensure that the family business endures. Clear examples here include the Maroni grandchildren (Donna, Allegra and Robert) as well as Steven Miccoli who claims "there’s nothing more hearty than having a family business". Figure 11.7 (page 150) illustrates the different employment preferences among the next generation participants interviewed:
The case of several participants serves to illustrate that it is possible to transition between employment preferences. For instance, Marianna Frusciante was unable to tolerate working at the family restaurant alongside her father due to a breakdown in their relationship. She was therefore compelled to escape and provides an example of the captive type. However, in the years that followed she was able to launch her own restaurant. As such, her later endeavours are more akin to the instrumental type. In a similar vein, Steven Miccoli's first taste of business ownership was not within the family business, but in a car and home audio business. However, following a downturn in this business in the years that followed, Steven made the transition that witnessed him assume the mantle at the family business founded by his parents some 20 years earlier. He has now come to embrace the family business and sees it as integral to portraying his cultural identity. This again serves the purpose of illustrating that it is possible to make the transition from one employment preference to another should next generation family members prove sufficiently compelled to do so. Interestingly, the chapter has demonstrated that at the heart of this decision is often family relationships.

It is worth highlighting that a degree of voluntarism appears present in three of the next generation employment preferences, the exception being the captive type. It can therefore be expected that transitioning between the complacent, instrumental and embrace types carries with it an equal degree of voluntarism. The captive type, however, by definition suggests that one is being kept against one's will. It is not anticipated therefore, that individuals would transition from the three other types to become captive as to do so would be placing oneself at the mercy of another person.
11.5. Summary

In sum, the above chapter has demonstrated that family obligations to supply labour at the family business often predate next generation decision making. Therefore, next generation family members often find themselves 'already in' the family business and this has two important ramifications. First, rather than a decision to become involved in the family business, next generation family members are instead confronted with the reality of exiting the family business should they wish to pursue employment beyond its remit. Second, parents are responsible for bestowing family obligations upon their offspring and in doing so, commit them to involvement in the family business. It is unsurprising then that when these obligations are experienced negatively, this is often to the detriment of family relationships.

The chapter also demonstrated that while the influence of family relationships has been neglected within academic literature, they can often be a powerful driver of next generation decision making. When family relationships breakdown, this is often the key driver for next generation family members who wish to pursue employment beyond the family business.

The chapter concluded with a typology of next generation employment preferences to complement the retirement styles of Sonnenfeld (1988). The extent to which this typology is applicable beyond the cultural group and industry sector explored in this thesis forms the subject of the final chapter.
12. Conclusion

12.1. The research gap
Family businesses are fundamentally different to any other form of organisation (Astrachan and Shanker, 2003; Sorenson, 2000) as they witness the interaction of two separate but connected realities: the family; and the business (Bowman-Upton, 1991; Dyer and Handler, 1994). Family conflict often occurs due to the overlap of these two entities (Miller and Le Breton Miller, 2005; Sorenson, 2000) and this is well documented in the family business literature (Bowman-Upton, 1991; Levisin, 1971; Sciascia and Mazzola, 2008; Shepherd and Haynie, 2009; Sorenson, 1999; Sorenson, 2000; Ward, 2004). Though these entities are equally important in giving family businesses their unique identity, research interest is unequivocally granted to examining the impact of the family on the business rather than vice versa.

This is best demonstrated among research which focuses on whether family involvement is financially beneficial to the family business. Research in this area has focused on the knock on effects of family involvement on several economic measures including business growth (e.g. Schulze et al., 2001), stock market performance (e.g. Bennedsen et al., 2015) and value creation (e.g. Bennedsen et al., 2007). The use of economic measures is also prevalent among the succession literature, which primarily concerns itself with the issue of long term family business survival and generational change. As such, the survival rate of family businesses across generations (e.g. Stamm and Lubinski, 2011) is often the key measure adopted. The key concern of succession research is ensuring that the family business survives either through appointment of the most appropriate successor or through a variety of prescriptions that can assist the process (e.g. Sardeshmukh and Corbett, 2011). Of lesser interest are the factors that account for the involvement of next generation family members in the first instance. Furthermore, those who pursue employment beyond the remit of the family business are virtually ignored within this stream of research.

Next generation family members, however, have received significant attention within the context of ethnic entrepreneurship. Noting the cultural and structural forces often at work in influencing migrant entrepreneurship (see Masurel, Nijkamp and Vindigni, 2004), researchers have speculated to what extent "the cutting edge of this entrepreneurial drive has been blunted" (Dhaliwal and Kangis, 2006: 92) among their offspring. Andersson and Hammarstedt (2011) observed that the offspring of migrant entrepreneurs continue to be over-represented in small business ownership figures compared to their native counterparts, just as their parents were historically (Barrett, Jones and McEvoy, 1996; Fairlie, 2012; Moules, 2014). This has marked the advent for research into the sector preferences and business entry motives of this next generation (Kourtit and Nijkamp, 2012). Alternatively, some cultural groups have encouraged their offspring into the professions and salaried careers, education playing a vital role in facilitating this (Metcalf, Modood and Virdee, 1996). Regardless of whether offspring pursue education and a professional career or new and non-traditional sectors in which to locate their own entrepreneurial endeavours (e.g. Baycan, Sahin and Nijkamp, 2012), the field of study assumes that next generation
family members are motivated by a rational economic motive, i.e., better employment prospects than their parents. Furthermore, it assumes that these cannot be found within the remit of the family business.

In accounting for the correlation of self-employment between migrant entrepreneurs and their offspring, a number of explanations have been offered including the acquisition of informal business experience (e.g., Andersson and Hammarstedt, 2011) and the influence of positive parental role models (e.g., Dyer, 1992). This thesis answers a call from Masurel and Nijkamp (2004), who offer that previous attempts to investigate the differences between first and second generation employment preferences have yet to pay specific attention to the relationships between these generations (e.g., parent-child). Relational influences on adolescents' career aspirations are well-documented within the career development literature (Keller and Whiston, 2008), though no research has been conducted within the context of family businesses.

The thesis adopted a sociocultural approach to exploring next generation preferences and is one which lies in stark contrast to the much of the research which has gone before it which is founded upon rational economic assumptions. While positive advances in this regard have been made (e.g., Getz and Petersen, 2004) these are yet to place family relationships at the heart of the decision making process.

12.2. Contribution
The strongest theme to emerge from the research was that of family obligations, a moral sense of duty or commitment bestowed upon (often younger) family members, typically requiring them to labour at the family business. This theme was consistent across each of the Italian families interviewed as participants recalled memories from their youth which witnessed them perform all manner of menial tasks at the family business. As these family obligations to supply labour are often undertaken at a young age (in some cases, from eight years old) the next generation often consider themselves to be 'already in' the family business. Importantly, their involvement in the family business pre-dates any employment decision they have made personally. Therefore, the way in which next generation decision making is conceptualised by Zellweger, Sieger and Halter (2011), is an inaccurate one (see figure 11.1, page 131). Rather than a decision to become involved in the family business, the next generation are instead confronted with the reality of remaining within the family business, or seeking opportunities which lie beyond its remit (as indicated in figure 11.2, page 132).

The idea that next generation family members are 'already in' the family business allows rational economic assumptions regarding the next generation employment preferences to be challenged. For instance, while the next generation might enjoy better opportunity structures compared to their parents, they are not 'opportunity' entrepreneurs as Baycan-Levent et al. (2002) suggests, and the thesis has demonstrated that offspring often ride on the success of previous generations' ability to exploit opportunities instead. Evidently, some offspring are confined to employment within the family business due to a lack of alternative
options or an inability to realise them. This is usually due to a failure to achieve academically which constrains opportunities beyond the family business. In some cases offspring are able (over time) to realise opportunities beyond the family business. In other cases, some appear complacent to remain at the family business. This illustrates that family businesses often perform the role of a safety net, providing a stable means of employment for next generation family members who would be otherwise unemployed. However, the term 'net' can also be used to denote a trapping device and the family business is no exception in this respect. This is because of the familiarity that family businesses offer which, in some cases, prevent the next generation from realising opportunities elsewhere.

Baycan, Sahin and Nijkamp (2012) have noted that offspring prefer new and non-traditional sectors such as ICT and financial services and therefore forsake the family business as an employment option. The family business, however, can provide a convenient back-up plan for next generation family members allowing them to pursue their preferred choice in the knowledge that secure employment awaits them within the family business should this prove unfeasible or unfruitful. Despite this being a very rational economic way of strategising one's future employment options, no research has explored how family businesses can liberate the next generation in such a way. As such, the net analogy and back-up plan themes have opened up new lines of enquiry in the family business literature and related fields of study.

Family obligations are (almost exclusively) bestowed upon the next generation by their parents. Parental influences have been studied within the career development literature, finding that parental attitudes towards the world of work and specific careers may affect several aspects of adolescents' career development (Galambos and Silbereisen, 1987; McMahon, Carroll and Gilles, 2001; Peterson, Stivers and Peters, 1986; Turner, Stewart and Lapan, 2004; Young and Friesen, 1992). The findings of this thesis therefore represent a departure from the career development literature, which has focused on how parental influence can shape work ethic and the propensity to pursue specific careers. Instead, the thesis has demonstrated that parents (perhaps unintentionally) commit their offspring to a particular employment path (i.e. involvement in the family business) and this represents a fundamental departure from extant literature on relational influences.

When family obligations to supply labour are a voluntary undertaking, members of the next generation either embrace this outcome or use the experience to launch professional careers or their own ventures. However, when these obligations are involuntary in nature, this is often to the detriment of family relationships. The key contribution of this thesis is that these family relationships (or a desire to escape them) can provide a primary driver that is no less important than the drivers (rational economic or otherwise) identified in figure 11.3 (page 145). These drivers include non-economic motives such as those relating to the family dynasty (e.g. Casson, 1999) or the sharing of one's parents dream (e.g. Lansberg, 1999), as well as rational economic motives such as being encouraged into education (e.g. Dhaliwal and Kangis, 2004) and the acquisition of informal business experience through the family business (e.g. Andersson and Hammarstedt, 2011). To reiterate, family relationships are no less important than these drivers and can occasionally prove to be the primary driver
of next generation decision making. In sum, when family harmony exists this can influence the next generation to remain within the family business. It is when family relationships breakdown that this provides a key driver for the next generation to seek opportunities beyond the family business, thus giving rise to the theme of 'escape'. The thesis demonstrates that although the majority of the family business literature focuses on the influence of the family entity (see Bowman-Upton, 1991; Dyer and Handler, 1994) on the business entity (e.g. Bennedsen et al., 2007; Bennedsen et al., 2015; Schulze et al., 2001), the employment preferences of offspring (and their resulting departure from the family business) has implications for their sense of belonging to the family unit.

The employment preferences of the next generation are far from homogenous. Nevertheless, the next generation do appear to cluster into four groups according to the whether the nature of the work performed was a voluntary (or involuntary) undertaking and whether this led them to remain within the family business or pursue opportunities beyond its remit. As such, a further contribution of the thesis is a typology of next generation employment preferences to complement the typology developed by Sonnenfeld (1988) which accounts for the retirement styles of founders. This typology consists of four employment preferences: complacent; captive; embrace; and instrumental. The 'complacent' type describes those who remain in the family business due to a lack of alternative options or a lack of motivation to pursue them. The 'captive' type refers to those who are unable to tolerate the family dynamic and therefore seek to escape. The complacent and captive types are similar in that the nature of the work currently performed is involuntary (i.e. they are not happy with their current employment circumstances within the family business), though they differ in that those who are captives aspire (and actively plan) to leave the family business whereas the complacent type do not. The 'embrace' type describes those who share the dream and a commitment to ensuring that the family business endures as they are content with their employment within the family business. Finally, those among the 'instrumental' type are equally content with their employment, though this originates from outside of the family business. The family business is instrumental, however, in facilitating this type to realise the opportunities that lie beyond the business's remit either through the experience gained or the family wealth which the offspring has benefitted from.

The interpretative approach adopted by the thesis has proven pivotal in establishing this typology of next generation employment preferences, which should be explored among other cultural groups and industry sectors going forward.

12.3. Influences on next generation decision making

12.3.1. Family relationships

From the literature review emerged four research questions (see table 4.5, page 56), each of which will be discussed in turn. As the thesis has demonstrated, family relationships can be pivotal influences of next generation decision making. Should family relationships breakdown, this can prove to be the key driver in seeking opportunities beyond the family
business. Therefore, family relationships are no less important than any number of possible drivers identified in the literature previously. A degree of family harmony is therefore conducive to offspring remaining in the family business. It is when family relationships breakdown, that they tend to seek employment elsewhere.

12.3.2. Italian culture
The breakdown of family relationships is not limited to Italian families. Therefore, neither is the explanatory power of the research. However, the narratives included in this thesis confirm that Italian family hierarchy witnesses men as the heads of the household, leading to the view that females are often subservient members of the family (Lozzi-Toscano, 2004). It can be argued that this presents a problem for female offspring whose sense of cultural identity (and by extension their respect for traditional Italian family hierarchy) is different to that of their parents. The thesis has revealed that when parents are overzealous in their wishes for offspring to pursue a particular employment path, this can result in both a boomerang effect (see Sensenig and Brehm, 1968) and a desire to escape among the next generation. Furthermore, this experience is not limited to female offspring.

The above discussion illustrates that the complexity amplified by Italian culture does not mean that the typology of next generation employment preferences is not applicable to other cultural groups. Rather, among Italian families present in the UK a higher prevalence of the 'captive' type may be expected among offspring compared with other cultural groups. If the research was replicated among Italian families in Italy, assuming that respect for Italian family hierarchy is greater, a higher prevalence of the 'complacent' type might be the case. This would represent that the next generation are no less happy regarding the decisions of the patriarchal figure, though they are respectful of this tradition and therefore make no plans to change their fate (unlike captives who conspire to escape).

12.3.3. A history of migration
The thesis found no evidence that next generation family members share the same desire to improve their socioeconomic status which is thought to be characteristic of their Italian migrant parents (see Burrell, 2006). In some cases, offspring are able to recall little of their family's migration history and the factors that accounted for their arrival in the UK. In other cases, the next generation are well-versed in the family folklore surrounding the family heritage and are keen to protect the family business from falling into 'foreign' hands. However, such instances were more akin to a dynastic motive to preserve the family heritage (and therefore remain within the family business) than any spill over effects which led to rational economic motives to pursue opportunities beyond it.

12.3.4. A family heritage in catering
Some next generation family members have no interest in catering. This adds cogence to Getz and Petersen's (2004) work which highlights that seasonality, geographical isolation
and the customer facing nature of hospitality work (among other things) are key barriers which deter the offspring from involvement in the family business. In contrast, some offspring have a great passion for catering and it is central to deriving their sense of cultural identity. Naturally, being the owner of an Italian restaurant reinforced this and they often resembled the 'embrace' type accordingly. This is because alongside religion, libations and family ties, cuisine is a central component of Italian culture (Lozzi-Toscano, 2004). The nature of catering involves food and Italian culture is frequently associated with food. Therefore, this provides the next generation with an opportunity to reinforce their cultural identity through involvement in the family business which would not be present in an organisation elsewhere. This was particularly evident among next generation family members who noted that recognising oneself as an 'Italian' was more socially desirable than recognising that one was merely English. As a result, the catering sector may be one which gives rise to a higher prevalence of the 'embrace' type among those looking to reinforce their cultural identity. This may not be applicable to other industry sectors.

12.4. Limitations of the research
Exploring next generation decision making in the catering sector presents several limitations. First, family obligations to supply labour within the catering sector often begin at a young age because catering consists of numerous menial tasks, many of which can be performed competently by youngsters. It is plausible that family involvement is less prevalent among industry sectors where relatively higher levels of knowledge, skilled work or technical proficiency are required. For instance, it is unlikely that children would be involved in the consultancy businesses which formed part of Ram's (2001: 395) case study, as these businesses are "closely associated with a discourse of 'knowledge', 'expertise' and 'competence'". As such, future research should investigate whether family obligations to supply labour are bestowed consistently across industry sectors. This will determine whether the already in concept and the re-conceptualisation of next generation decision making is applicable to the wider family business community.

Second, catering can provide the next generation with an opportunity to reinforce their cultural identity and in doing so 'embrace' their involvement in the family business. It is likely that this does not apply to other industry sectors. For instance, my own involvement in the building trade as a youngster did not consciously reinforce my identity as a British person. As such, future research should include both catering and non-catering sectors. Within the catering sector, this should explore whether offspring use their involvement within the family business to reinforce their cultural identity among other cultural groups which are frequently associated with cuisine (e.g. Indian, Bangladeshi, Chinese). In non-catering sectors, this should explore those industry sectors which lack opportunities to reinforce one's cultural identity and instead focus on what other aspects of their involvement in the family business the next generation have come to embrace.

Third, the aim of the thesis was to explore the influence of family relationships on next generation employment preferences in family businesses. The thesis has demonstrated that involvement in the family business can be detrimental to parent-child relationships and that
this can influence next generation employment preferences. However, the accounts of those interviewed focused on parent-child relationships at the expense of other familial relationships (i.e. non parent-child ones) and this presents a third limitation of the research. Evidence of how and in what ways other familial relationships influence next generation decision making is therefore worthy of future academic attention. The extent to which shared experiences of involvement in the family business serve to galvanise the bond between siblings and the potential for this to impact on siblings' propensity to remain in the family business are examples of two research questions that may guide future research in this field.

A fourth limitation stems from the migrant status of some of the Italian born males interviewed. In migrating to the UK as young men, the restaurant ventures launched by these individuals fall under the banner of 'migrant businesses' and therefore face challenges unique to this context. Examples of these challenges include the difficulty of operating in a language other than one's native tongue, as well as the challenges associated with operating in areas of 'marginal economic activity' (see Deakins, 1999). Song (1997) notes that children and family labour are notoriously important for the operation of migrant businesses and the prevalence of family businesses around the globe suggests that a large number of parents have the option of involving their own children in their own business at some point (Houshmand, Siedel and Ma, 2017). There are clear examples within this thesis of children being involved in their parents' business as a source of free/inexpensive labour. In these cases, offspring are being involved in the family business primarily out of economic necessity and as an alternative to employing paid labour outside of the family unit. It is plausible that involving children in the family business out of economic necessity is unique to the context of these migrant family businesses. This limits the generalisability of the thesis and begs the question as to whether the findings can be applied to non-migrant family businesses.

12.5. Recommendations
12.5.1. For future research
In addition to exploring the typology of next generation employment preferences on other industry sectors, future research should also explore whether business size serves as a moderating influence on next generation decision making. This is because educational attainment was found to be the greatest among the family whose business was the largest in terms of size and scope. While gaining a university degree does not necessarily make employment paths beyond the family business more appealing, a more critical view would question whether family business size is a moderating influence. This is because opportunities for career advancement may be expedited and/or greater within larger family businesses (as opposed to beyond them). Therefore, future research should explore the effect of family business size when considering whether propensity to remain in the family business varies negatively with educational attainment.
Future research should also explore why those who manage to escape the family unit, occasionally return to pursue the very employment they sought to escape from in the first instance. The thesis included accounts two accounts of offspring who managed to escape the grasp of their controlling father (in some cases by leaving the country), only to return to be employed by them years later. The merit in the typology of next generation employment preferences developed is its ability to account for a change in employment preference, however, future research should explore whether the accounts described above are isolated examples or whether there are more cases of offspring that escape the family business only to return to it. Of interest would be whether a change in circumstances (e.g. a repair of family relationships) accompanies such returns.

From a sociological perspective, paying explicit attention to family relationships has revealed a dichotomy of parental attitudes towards the upbringing of their children. Family obligations to supply labour were consistent among participants, however, the extent to which these were perceived as pleasant experiences varies significantly from family to family. In some cases these were remembered with a sense of fondness and nostalgia, though in other cases these were tantamount to exploitation as a cheap means of labour. This questions the function of children from a parent’s perspective. In the former example, childhood labour served to provide an apprenticeship of sorts. In the latter example, children served as a means to financial gain, the sole beneficiary of which was the patriarchal figure. Therefore, future research should explore parents’ perspectives on the value adding aspect of involving children in the family business, including the extent to which these perspectives vary culturally.

12.5.2. For the family business community

The thesis has something to offer the family business community in terms of practical recommendations. Next generation family members often considered themselves 'already in' the family business as their family obligations to supply labour predate their employment decision. As such, parents (perhaps unintentionally) commit their offspring to involvement in the family business. Should the next generation seek opportunities outside of the family business, they must leave the family business behind. While there are clear examples of next generation family members who leave the family business without problem, there are also clear examples of those who find this more challenging. This is because the family business can prove to be a trapping device in which next generation family members grow accustomed to the familiarity present in the family business and grow complacent to remain in it. In conclusion, parents should avoid bestowing family obligations upon their offspring if they firmly desire for them to pursue opportunities beyond the family business in later life.

The thesis also has practical recommendations regarding the often problematic issue of appointing a successor. Family businesses should not appoint successors who exhibit the 'complacent' type. The complacent type is reserved for those who are not content with their current employment yet are not sufficiently compelled to seek opportunities elsewhere. Put simply, they neither enjoy their involvement in the family business nor find it incumbent to leave it. Arguably, neither of these qualities bodes well for strategic renewal. In contrast, the
'embrace' type represents the desired candidate as they share the dream of the family business and have committed to ensuring that the legacy endures.
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