JBA
JOURNAL OF BUSINESS ANTHROPOLOGY

Introduction*

Heung Wah Wong

This special issue is devoted to identifying the differences between anthropology and management science in family business studies. Our goal is to enhance the mutual understanding between the two camps of scholars in order to seek for the possibility of collaboration in studying family business. While we do not argue that anthropological studies of family businesses are inherently better than studies by management scientists, we do argue that anthropology contributes a knowledge component that is generally lacking in management science studies of family businesses. Thus, in this issue we wish to identify the anthropological concerns and priorities in the study of family and family business. Secondly, we explore the ways, and the reasons for those ways, in which anthropological approaches to the study of family business differ from those of management science. These two tasks necessarily mean that anthropologists of family business must talk to their counterparts in management science. This also requires that anthropologists consult the literature of family business research by management scientists and address our management science colleagues' concerns in their publications. This seems to be obvious but in reality, not many anthropologists who identify themselves as business anthropologists bother to read the literature published by management scientists. As a result, many business anthropologists only talk to themselves, which I believe is not good for the field of business anthropology.

JBA 10(2): 226-240
Fall 2021

ISSN 2245-4217

www.cbs.dk/jba

10.22439/jba.v10i2.6410

The above undertaking also requires self-reflection on what anthropology is as a theoretical enterprise and method. This short introduction therefore is divided into two parts. The first part is to critically review the relevant literature on family business by management scientists[1]. Management scientists generally do not consider cultural contexts as important in studying family business. For anthropologists, on the other hand, culture is a crucial, indeed an ontological component of human beings. Hence for anthropologists a family business, as a human phenomenon, is necessarily culturally constituted and therefore subject to anthropological analysis.

The anthropological understanding of the family also has implications for how the family business is understood in different cultural contexts. By focusing upon cultural specificity, anthropologists do not consider empirical universals as sufficiently meaningful to understand any human practice. Concomitantly, when anthropologists consider the family as a unit of human organization, they are bound to identify its specific cultural context. Contextualizing the family also requires us to suspend our own cultural assumptions. Wong's paper in this special issue explores the cultural specificity of the Chinese family through several key native kinship terms, arguing that Chinese kinship is notably built into the genealogical relations in Chinese societies. The second part of Wong's paper shows how the cultural specificity of the Chinese family affects the character, form, and nature of familial impacts on family firms. The paper authored by Chau and Wong in this themed issue provides an ethnographic case to exemplify the points made by Wong. In their paper, Chau and Wong argue that professionalisation is a complex, context-specific social process, the nature and character of which are shaped by the specificity of the Chinese family together with various contingent factors. Lai's paper in this issue serves as another ethnographic example that shows how the traditional idea of *jia* (joint account) can still be used to understand the operation and management of a Chinese family tea restaurant in contemporary Hong Kong. The paper by Yau demonstrates how the cultural specificity of the Japanese family shapes the succession in a movie company in contemporary Japan. The key point all these papers make is that the cultural specificity of the family shapes the management, professionalisation, and succession of family firms.

Culture, Where Are You?

Management scientists tend to consider culture as negligible when they study family businesses. This is evident from the history of the discipline

[1] I do not pretend to offer a comprehensive review of the literature on family business by management scientists. I instead selectively highlight those publications that are relevant to the major purposes of this Introduction.

and the definition of the family business that has been part of that history. At the beginning of the campaign for the establishment of family business research as an independent field of study in the 1990s, although there were various views on the nature of the family business, the consensus was that the major difference between a family business and a non-family business lies in a family's involvement in the business. The first major definition of a family business deploys three components: ownership, management, and trans-generational succession. Business researchers at that time generally agreed that these three components could serve as major indicators of the kind and extent of family involvement in a business. The problem, however, is that it is difficult to decide to what extent family involvement measured by these three components can qualify it as a family business (Chrisman, Chua, and Sharma 2003: 8). Some other management scientists have argued that while the family's involvement in the business as indicated by the three components is the necessary condition of the definition of family business, they alone are not sufficient. We still have to know whether the family involvement does *in fact* produce a distinctive kind of business – viz. 'the family business'. Thus, as Chrisman, Chua, and Sharma observe there were two competing definitions being applied by management science – 'the components-of-involvement approach', and the 'essence approach', which evolved through the identification of conundrums arising out of 'the components-of-involvement approach' :

> The components-of-involvement approach is implicitly based on the belief that family involvement is sufficient to make a firm a family business. The essence approach, on the other hand, is based on the belief that some form of family involvement is only a necessary condition. Family involvement must be directed toward behaviors that produce certain distinctiveness based on the vision of the firm before it can be considered as a family firm. Thus, according to the essence approach, two firms with the same extent of family involvement may not both be family businesses because of a lack of vision, familiness, or behavior emanating from family involvement (Chrisman, Chua, and Sharma 2003: 4-5).

But the essence approach to family business raised a further problem. Management scientists at that time argued that there are four parts of the essence of family business. They are '(1) [the] [i]ntention to maintain family control of the dominant coalition, (2) unique, inseparable, and synergistic resources and capabilities arising from family involvement and interactions, (3) a vision set by the family controlled dominant coalition and intended for transgenerational pursuance, and (4) pursuance of such a vision' (Chrisman, Chua, and Sharma 2003: 9). In the 2000s, management scientists realized the heterogeneity of family businesses. The different degrees of family involvement produced different types of family businesses. This made the grouping of different

family firms into a general concept of family business even more difficult. In order to assess the extent of the family's influence on firms, management scientists believed that they needed a quantitative tool to measure the extent of family involvement in any business organization. One famous quantitative tool is the F-PEC scale developed by Astrachan, Klein and Smyrnios (2002). 'P' here stands for the power scale, 'E' for the experience scale, and 'C' for the culture scale. The power scale measures 'the interchangeable and additive influence of family power through ownership, management, and/or governance' (Sharma 2004: 4). '[T]he breadth and depth of dedication of family members to the business through the number of individuals and generations of family members involved in the business' (Sharma 2004: 4) are measured by the experience scale. The purpose of the culture scale is to assess the '[f]amily's commitment to the business and values' (Sharma 2004: 4).

Note that in such studies, the concept of 'culture' in the culture scale of the F-PEC scale is generally restricted to assessing the family's influence on corporate values – it is not about any broader cultural context. It is true that a few management scientists do recognize the importance of culture in shaping the family business. For example, Vipin Gupta and Nancy Levenburg (2010: 166) show that more than half of the cross-cultural differences in organisational practices and values can be attributed to regional cultures. They therefore argue for 'the importance of contextual and cultural differences in the characteristics of family businesses' (Gupta and Levenburg 2010: 166), and they conclude their study by conceding that: 'Anglo-based definitions of family business and the largely Anglo-based underpinnings may be insufficient for truly understanding the family businesses in a global sense (or in a global world). The differences that we find across cultures along the nine family business dimensions suggest that current definitions (e.g., "intent to pass along the business") may not be transferrable globally' (Gupta and Levenburg 2010: 167). Unfortunately, management scientists have generally ignored this observation.

Secondly, most management scientists do not bother to define the 'family' in the family business. Despite the fact that the above definitions of the family business emphasise the family involvement in business, we are never told how the family is defined and understood in family business research. It seems to us that management scientists assume that the concept of the family is cross-culturally the same and thus a constant in their equation of the family's influence on business, thus rendering the definition of the family unnecessary. My survey of the literature on family businesses by management scientists does locate some work that touches upon the definition of the family. For example, Winter, Fitzgerald, Heck, Haynes, and Danes define the family as 'a kinship group that may or may not reside in the same dwelling' (Winter, Fitzgerald, Heck, Haynes, and Danes. They however add that their research only focuses on the family

household 'defined as a group of people related by blood, marriage, or adoption, who share a common dwelling' (Winter, Fitzgerald, Heck, Haynes, and Danes 1998: 242). The concept of the family household obviously cannot be taken as a universal concept. At least, in Chinese societies, co-residence is not an essential element of the definition of the Chinese family (see Wong's paper in this special issue).

While management scientists may recognize the heterogeneity of the family, the fact remains that generally in management science familial differences are always represented in terms of different attributes such as differences in size, the education level, gender roles, and the global awareness of the family members (Gupta and Levenburg 2010: 166). Concomitantly the different expectations, behaviors, pressures etc. that are bound up with cultural meaning are invariably ignored. The understanding of family differences within management science is closely related to the formal quantitative methods adopted by management scientists. As Dyer and Sanchez (1998: 288) report, since the end of the last century the formal quantitative methods have already dominated the field of family business research. Underlying the formal quantitative methods is a mechanistic explanation which stipulates that 'the presence of some phenomenon (a cause) determines the appearance of another phenomenon (an effect)' (Sewell 2005: 347). Embedded in the mechanistic explanation is an ontological assumption: the 'social' is 'made up of stable entities with measurable attributes or variables and a set of causal connections between the variables that can be stated in law-like form' (Sewell 2005: 347). More importantly, the law-like form of the causal connections between variables must not be culture-bound as the law is assumed to be universally applicable. It is a widely held belief among management scientists that the adoption of formal quantitative methods is a critical measurement not only of the sophistication of the discipline but of its scientific nature.

The standard procedure of management science of family business includes two major steps. Firstly, the family and family business understood as stable entities are analytically dismembered into measurable variables. Variables can be further classified into different categories at different levels. As Bird, Welsch, Astrachan, and Pistrui report, of the 148 articles they reviewed that were published prior to 1997, and from 1997 to 2002,

> [s]ome articles included multiple independent variables, and these are counted in every applicable category. Individual variables included satisfaction, relationships, psychological characteristics, perceptions, and demographic variables of individuals. Firm variables included organizational culture, strategy, industry, ownership, organizational size and age, organizational growth and change, performance, policies, and financing. Family variables included family activities, whether the

> business was a family business in comparison with other types, birth order, and issues pertaining to the family-business relationship. Succession variables included circumstances surrounding succession and decisions to join a family business…. Dependent variables fell into multiple categories and often several variables within one category. At the individual level, these included personal development, individual intentions, type of entrepreneur, wealth of individuals, and roles of individuals. Firm-level dependent variables included productivity, morale, growth, board of directors, credit uses, profitability, and the like. Succession as a dependent variable refers to the succession process used, progress in succession, success in intergenerational transfer, and intention to join the family business. Family-level dependent variables included the quality of relationships involving family members, degree of conflict, roles of family members, and childcare (Bird, Welsch, Astrachan, and Pistrui 2002: 341 – 343).

Secondly, management scientists use sophisticated statistical operations to establish causal relationships between these two sets of variables. Ascertaining key variables, both dependent and independent, is therefore the most important first step in formal quantitative methods. As Yu, Lumpkin, Sorenson, and Brigham (2012) argue,

> [I]dentifying dependent variables is critical for the development of theoretical knowledge in the field. In conceptual models and empirical tests, the family business outcomes that researchers investigate are represented by the dependent variables. Unless key dependent variables are set forth and the outcomes that family businesses are striving toward are specified, progress toward theoretical development in family business research will be limited (Yu, Lumpkin, Sorenson, and Brigham 2012: 33-34).

Thus, by identifying the key dependent variables, management scientists assess the influences of the family on business. In doing so, they believe that they are making theoretical progress in the field of family business research.

The standardized procedure described above requires that the identified variables are measurable. However, the meaning of the family is beyond management scientists' concern as it is non-measurable and thus not 'real'. My anthropological reservation with the formal quantitative methods lies not in statistical operations or the mechanistic explanation as such, but in the range of applications that such operations and explanations are suited for. Statistical information may provide useful information about the quantitative behaviours of what groups or members may do. When it comes to cultural practices and expectations, such methods are not very helpful in themselves, and at best could only

serve to answer some kind of ancillary set of questions (such as how many might do x under circumstance y). It still leaves untouched the qualitative components which are operative both at a structural-functional level and a cultural one. But for studying family businesses, the structural-functional level also omits an important component of the problem — the cultural component, which provides more insight into the behaviours and practices of members within the family business.

Culture, Here You Are!

As Clifford Geertz effectively argues, the emergence of Homo Sapiens is the result of the dialectic interaction between the cultural development of man and his physical evolution as there is strong evidence that some cultural activities such as simple toolmaking and hunting are found among pre-sapiens, which is also to say that there was an overlap 'between the beginning of culture and the appearance of man as we know him today' (Geertz 1974: 47). Homo sapiens, Geertz concludes, is the result of the interaction between culture and biology:

> The perfection of tools, the adoption of organized hunting and gathering practices, the beginnings of true family organization, the discovery of fire, and, most critically….., the increasing reliance upon systems of significant symbols (language, art, myth, ritual) for orientation, communication, and self-control all created for man a new environment to which he was then obliged to adapt. As culture, step by infinitesimal step, accumulated and developed, a selective advantage was given to those individuals in the population most able to take advantage of it - the effective hunter, the persistent gatherer, the adept toolmaker, the resourceful leader - until what had been a small-brained, protohuman Australopithecus became the large brained fully human Homo sapiens. Between the cultural pattern, the body, and the brain, a positive feedback system was created in which each shaped the progress of the other, a system in which the interaction among increasing tool use, the changing anatomy of the hand, and the expanding representation of the thumb on the cortex is only one of the more graphic examples. By submitting himself to governance by symbolically mediated programs for producing artifacts, organizing social life, or expressing emotions, man determined, if unwittingly, the culminating stages of his own biological destiny. Quite literally, though quite inadvertently, he created himself (Geertz 1974: 47-48)

Several points should be stressed in light of the above long quotation. Firstly, culture is a critical condition of the emergence of *homo sapiens*. 'What this means is that culture, rather than being added on, so to speak, to a finished or virtually finished animal, was ingredient, and

centrally ingredient, in the production of that animal itself. The slow, steady, almost glacial growth of culture through the Ice Age altered the balance of selection pressures for the evolving *Homo* in such a way as to play a major *directive* role in his evolution (Geertz 1974: 47-8; italic mine). Secondly, culture refers to a symbolic system whereby human behaviors are guided, and human experiences are organized[2]. Without culture, we 'would be unworkable monstrosities with very few useful instincts, fewer recognizable sentiments, and no intellect: mental basket cases' (Geertz 1974: 49). As Geertz points out,

> As our central nervous system—and most particularly its crowning curse and glory, the neocortex—grew up in great part in interaction with culture, it is incapable of directing our behavior or organizing our experience without the guidance provided by systems of significant symbols. What happened to us in the Ice Age is that we were obliged to abandon the regularity and precision of detailed genetic control over our conduct for the flexibility and adaptability of a more generalized, though of course no less real, genetic control over it. To supply the additional information necessary to be able to act, we were forced, in turn, to rely more and more heavily on cultural sources—the accumulated fund of significant symbols. Such symbols are thus not mere expressions, instrumentalities, or correlates of our biological, psychological, and social existence; they are prerequisites of it. Without men, no culture, certainly; but equally, and more significantly, without culture, no men (Geertz 1974: 49)

It follows that human nature cannot be understood as something independent of culture.

Thirdly, culture is a species-specific capacity for *Homo Sapiens* rather than an additive factor to something more fundamental for human behaviors. Culture is a name for, and a term to distinguish, human behaviors as unique phenomena; it is 'the organization of human experience and action by symbolic means. The persons, relations, and materials of human existence are enacted according to their meaningful values - meaning that cannot be determined from their biological or physical properties' (Sahlins 2000b: 158). Anything human must be culturally constituted, which is also to say that everything 'social' or 'commercial' is also cultural because society or business are meaningfully constituted (Sahlins 2000a: 9-32). As Geertz argues,

> Man's great capacity for learning, his plasticity, has often been remarked, but what is even more critical is his extreme dependence upon a certain sort of learning: the attainment of

[2] I have to stress that not every anthropologist agrees with this definition of culture. In the history of anthropology as a discipline, there have been and are various definitions of culture put forward by anthropologists.

> concepts, the apprehension and application of specific systems of symbolic meaning. Beavers build dams, birds build nests, bees locate food, baboons organize social groups, and mice mate on the basis of forms of learning that rest predominantly on the instructions encoded in their genes and evoked by appropriate patterns of external stimuli: physical keys inserted into organic locks. But men build dams or shelters, locate food, organize their social groups, or find sexual partners under the guidance of instructions encoded in flow charts and blueprints, hunting lore, moral systems, and aesthetic judgments: conceptual structures molding formless talents (Geertz 1974: 49-50)

What we can learn from the above quotation is that the constitution of human phenomena necessarily involves three terms: physical acts, meaningful systems, and the mediation between them. Human phenomena are the result of the interpretation of physical acts in terms of alternative meaningful systems. Interpretation here means conceptually 'inserting' a physical act within a classification system that is culturally specific and historical. Hence, the same physical act can have different meanings in different cultural systems. For example, in Chinese societies, a man and his paternal parallel cousins are known as belonging to the same family and share the same surname, while all his paternal cross cousins and both of his maternal parallel and cross cousins belong to different families. But in English-speaking societies, they are all addressed by the same term 'cousin'. I am not suggesting that English-speaking people cannot recognize the difference between the maternal and paternal cousins or between cross and parallel cousins; I am just suggesting that the difference is, if present at all, not culturally *significant enough* in English-speaking societies to be 'stamped' within the language. What is the case for the cultural category of 'cousin' is also the case for the cultural category of the family. The family has different meanings in different cultural contexts and therefore the diverse practices that pertain to it cannot be assumed to exist cross-culturally.

Understanding the Cultural Specificity of the Family

The application of a cultural category in everyday life can sometimes transform the meaning of that category (Sahlins 1981). The human actor as a creative cultural animal can apply a cultural category in a new way that under certain circumstances can transform the meaning of that category. In addition, human beings can reflect on their behaviors and in the course of doing so, create new meanings. The challenging task is to know (a) the operations, practices and meanings constitutive within a cultural category, and (b) how the practice of that category in everyday life may further transform the meaning of the category. Such a task cannot be tackled by adopting a context-free method.

Another major problem of the formal quantitative methods is that individual voices or individual cases are occluded by the presumption of being 'scientific'. Being 'scientific' in management science is ostensibly doing what the natural scientists are doing, viz. searching for or classifying behaviors according to universal laws. Sharma, Chrisman, Chua justify their lack of concern for individual differences among family firms as follows:

> We also recognize that not all family businesses, or non-family businesses, are alike, nor should they be. Thus, we realize the need to acknowledge the legitimate contingencies that cause one family firm to act differently from another. However, *what we propose is nothing more than good science*, because the classification and investigation of homogenous populations of family firms is essential for progress in the field (Sharma, Chrisman, Chua 1997: 5; italic mine).

For them, individual differences among family firms must be sacrificed for the sake of the progress of the discipline. Thus, too, individuals or individual cases have no theoretical importance except as an 'example' or a 'counter example' of a general trend. The cultural specificity of the Chinese family, for instance, is irrelevant unless it constitutes an example or counter example of the universal concept of family. But as Wong shows in his paper of this issue, the Chinese *jia-zu* (family) family is different from its counterpart, the *ie* (family), in Japan. Geertz also argues that attempts to refer to social groups and institutions by resorting to some empirical universal involves 'a logical conflict between asserting that, say, "religion," "marriage," or "property" are empirical universals and giving them very much in the way of specific content, for to say that they are empirical universals is to say that they have the same content, and to say that they have the same content is to fly in the face of the undeniable fact that they do not' (Geertz 1974: 39). In sum, and to paraphrase Sahlins (2017: 157), in anthropology, the family is specific all the way down.

Ethnographic Methods

The necessity of understanding the cultural specificity of the family requires us to situate the family at issue into its own cultural context with its own kinship strictures. For example, as Wong argues in his paper of this special issue, a Chinese man shares the same life substance with his father, who shares the same life substance with his own brothers. Hence, the man shares the same life substance with his paternal parallel male cousins because the latter share the same substance with their own father (the man's father's brother). The Chinese man therefore is symbolically equivalent to his father, his father's brother, and his paternal parallel male cousins in Chinese societies. All of them are the same *kind* of persons

and belong to the same *jia-zu*. On the contrary, a Chinese woman cannot succeed her father's life substance and therefore she is not a member of her father's *jia-zu*. Upon marriage, she obtains the life substance from her husband, as a result of which she shares the same life substance with her husband's brother, her husband's brother's son, and her son because all these men share the same life substance with her husband. Hence, the woman is a member of her husband's *jia-zu*. This is the logic of Chinese agnatic relations.

But how can non-Chinese anthropologists understand this logic? Sahlins (2000a:19–22) makes a very interesting claim about the possibility of understanding the Other. He argues that what the anthropologist does in ethnography is to reproduce in his or her mind the cultural logic displayed in the behavior of the Other he or she observed in the field. This capacity of reproducing the cultural logic of the Other can, Sahlins further argues, be attributed to the common species-specific capacity between us (anthropologists) and the Other: symbolic ability (culture). In other words, for anthropology, the method and the object of study are the same, which is also to say that anthropologists use themselves as instruments to know the Other in the field who has the same ontological status with anthropologists. Hence, ethnography, as Sherry Ortner pointed out, 'has always meant the attempt to understand another life world using the self—as much of it as possible—as the instrument of knowing' (Ortner 1995: 173). Any understanding of human phenomena therefore involves human *subjective* reproduction of the cultural logic of the Other. The general impression we generated from natural science that 'objectivity' is a critical criterion for guaranteeing the 'trueness' of the research output may not be applicable to the study of human phenomena. More importantly, if we agree that by reproducing the cultural logic of the Other, we make the Other familiar and thus understandable, it follows that we should understand the Other *subjectively* from within. This notion of understanding is very different from that in natural science, which tends to do the opposite; that is, understanding natural things objectively from outside. As Sahlins argued:

> Indeed, the more we know about physical objects the less familiar they become, the more remote they stand from any human experience. The molecular structure of the table on which I write is far removed from my sense of it—let alone, to speak of what is humanly communicable, my use of it or my purchase of it. Nor will I ever appreciate tableness, rockiness, or the like in the way I might know cannibalism. On the contrary, by the time one gets to the deeper nature of material things as discovered by quantum physics, it can only be described in the form of mathematical equations, so much does this understanding depart from our ordinary ways of perceiving and thinking objects (Sahlins 2000a: 30)

If we accept Sahlins' argument, then the so-called scientific formal quantitative methods are not the suitable way to understand the family business, in particular, nor human phenomena, in general, because the methods are simply not designed to understand such phenomena. Ethnography, however, is a method that is designed to enhance our understanding of such cultural phenomena as the family business. It is committed to what Geertz calls 'thick description' (1973: 3–30): it '[produces] understanding through richness, texture, and detail, rather than parsimony, refinement, and (in the sense used by mathematicians) elegance' (Ortner 1995: 174). As Ortner has clarified, while 'thickness' of description has had a number of meanings within the history of anthropology, it now generally refers to contextualization. By paying close attention to the context in various domains and at different levels, ethnography tries to reproduce the 'reality' of human phenomena.

Studying the cultural specificity of the family in a cultural context is also inherently to adopt a comparativist approach. For, as Sahlins points out:

> No good ethnography is self-contained. Implicitly or explicitly ethnography is an act of comparison. By virtue of comparison ethnographic description becomes objective. Not in the naive positivist sense of an unmediated perception—just the opposite: it becomes a universal understanding to the extent it brings to bear on the perception of any society the conceptions of all the others (Sahlins 2002: 13).

In other words, understanding the Other requires us to distance ourselves from the Other as we compare the cultural logic of the Other with that of another Other (Sahlins 2004: 4). The reason is very simple. If the meaning of a sign is determined by the similar but not identical signs in the structure, the meaning of the cultural logic of the Other has to be produced by contrasting this Other with similar but not identical Others. Again Sahlins: 'take another culture to know another culture' (Sahlins 2004: 5).

The importance of culture in constituting human phenomena does not necessarily involve being committed to the idea that human behaviour is completely determined by culture. Likewise, knowledge of a culture does not suffice to predict exactly what someone may do in a given circumstance. As Sahlins has argued, '[j]ust because what is done is culturally logical does not mean the logic determined that it be done — let alone by whom, when, or why — any more than just because what I say is grammatical, grammar caused me to say it' (Sahlins 1999: 409), inasmuch as there are many other possible behaviors that are equally meaningful and grammatical. The specific way that individuals choose to behave is heavily informed by both the macro and micro contexts in which they conduct their social life. Hence, any prediction of human behavior has to

be context specific.

Here, I suggest to our colleagues in management science that they reconsider their disciplinary goal of predicting human behavior in the business domain. A more feasible goal for the study of business could be: to help practitioners to understand what a certain behavior means in a particular context; why a certain person does not conform to the cultural system in a specific context; what would be the cultural consequences or effects of a certain management policy; and how people would behave in a certain context. All of this can be achieved only if we understand and study business culturally.

References

Astrachan, Joseph H., Sabine B. Klein, Kosmas X. Smyrnios. 2002. "The F-PEC Scale of Family Influence: A Proposal for Solving the Family Business Definition Problem." *Family Business Review* 15(1): 45 – 58. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-6248.2002.00045.x

Bird, Barbara, Harold Welsch, Joseph H. Astrachan, David Pistrui. 2002. "Family Business Research: The Evolution of an Academic Field." *Family Business Review* 15 (4): 337 – 350. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-6248.2002.00337.x

Chrisman, James J., Jess H. Chua, and Pramodia Sharma. 2003. "Current Trends and Future Directions in Family Business Management Studies: Toward a Theory of the Family Firm." Coleman White Paper Series.

Dyer, Gibb W. and Marcelino Sanchez. 1998. "Current State of Family Business Theory and Practice as Reflected in Family Business Review 1988 – 1997." *Family Business Review* 11(4): 287 – 295. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-6248.1998.00287.x

Geertz, Glifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Culture: Selected Essays*. The U.S.: Basic Books.

Gupta, Vipin, and Nancy Levenburg. 2010. "A Thematic Analysis of Cultural Variations in Family Businesses: The CASE Project." *Family Business Review* 23 (2): 155 – 169. https://doi.org/10.1177/089448651002300205

Ortner, Sherry. 1995. "Resistance and the Problem of Ethnographic Refusal." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 37(1): 173–193. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417500019587

Sahlins, Marshall. 1999. "Two or Three Thing that I Know about Culture." *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 5(3): 399–421. https://doi.org/10.2307/2661275

Sahlins, Marshall. 2000a. "Introduction." In *Culture in Practice: Selected*

Essays, edited by Marshall Sahlins, pp. 9–31. New York: Zone Books.

Sahlins, Marshall. 2000b. "Sentimental Pessimism and Ethnographic Experience, or Why Culture Is Not a Disappearing 'Object'." In *Biographies of Scientific Objects*, edited by L. Daston, pp. 158–202. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Sahlins, Marshall. 2002. *Waiting for Foucault, Still*. Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press, LLC.

Sahlins, Marshall. 2004. *Apologies to Thucydides: Understanding History as Culture and Vice Versa*.

Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Sahlins, Marshall. 2017. "In Anthropology, it's Emic All the Way Down." *Hau*: *Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 7(2): 157-163. https://doi.org/10.14318/hau7.2.020

Sharma, Pramodita, James, J Chrisman, Jess H. Chua 1997. "Strategic Management of the Family Business: Past Research and Future Challenges." *Family Business Review* 10(1): 1 – 35. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-6248.1997.00001.x

Sharma, Pramodia. 2004. "An Overview of the Field of Family Business Studies: Current Status and Directions for the Future." *Family Business Review* 17(1): 1 – 36. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-6248.2004.00001.x

Sewell, William H. 2005. *Logics of History: Social Theory and Social Transformation*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Winter, Mary, Margaret A Fitzgerald, Ramona K. Z. Heck, George W. Haynes, Sharon M. Danes. 1998. "Revising the Study of Family Businesses: Methodological Challenges, Dilemmas, and Alternative Approaches." *Family Business Review* 11(3): 239 – 252. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-6248.1998.00239.x

Wong, Heung Wah. 2020. "It is Not That All Cultures Have Business, But That All Business Have Culture" in *The Routledge Companion to Anthropology and Business*, edited by Raza Mir and Anne-Laure Fayard, pp. 453 – 472. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003052456-24

Yu, Andy, G. T. Lumpkin, Ritch L. Sorenson, and Keith H. Brigham. 2012. "The Landscape of Family Business Outcomes: A Summary and Numerical Taxonomy of Dependent Variables." *Family Business Review* 25 (1): 33 – 57. https://doi.org/10.1177/0894486511430329

* This Introduction is a substantial development of my two previous articles. They are "Taking Culture Seriously: The Role of Culture in the Study of Business" (2015), *Journal of Business Anthropology* 4 (1): 144 – 150 and "It Is Not That All Cultures Have Business, But That All Business

Have Culture", in *The Routledge Companion to Anthropology and Business*, edited by Raza Mir and Anne-Laure Fayard, pp. 453 - 472, 2020, London: Routledge. Parts of this paper are adopted from these two articles. I apologize for the repetitions.

Heung Wah Wong currently is the Acting Head of the School of Modern Languages and Cultures at The University of Hong Kong. Wong is also the founder of Global Creative Industries program at The University of Hong Kong. His research interest lies in business anthropology, globalization of Japanese popular culture, and Chinese kinship. His major publications include *Japanese Bosses, Chinese Workers: Power and Control in a Megastore in Hong Kong* (Hawaii University Press and Curzon Press 1999), *Japanese Adult Videos in Taiwan* (co-authored with Hoi-yan Yau, Routledge 2014), *The Japanese Adult Video Industry* (co-authored with Hoi-yan Yau, Routledge 2017), *Tradition and Transformation in a Chinese Family Business* (co-authored with Karin Ling-fung Chau, Routledge 2020), and various journal articles.