SUCCESSION PLANNING AND SUSTAINABILITY OF FAMILY BUSINESSES IN LAGOS STATE, NIGERIA.

IMHANRENIALENA BENEDICT
201042700F

DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, FACULTY OF MANAGEMENT SCIENCES, NNAMDI AZIKIWE UNIVERSITY, AWKA.

SEPTEMBER,2016.

TITLE

SUCCESSION PLANNING AND SUSTAINABILITY OF FAMILY BUSINESSES IN LAGOS STATE, NIGERIA.

IMHANRENIALENA BENEDICT
201042700F

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, FACULTY OF MANAGEMENT SCIENCES, NNAMDI AZIKIWE UNIVERSITY, AWKA, IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (Ph.D) DEGREE IN BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION.

SEPTEMBER,2016.

DECLARATION

I, Imhanrenialena Benedict do hereby certify that the work embodied in this dissertation was carried out by me and is original. It has not been submitted in part or in full for any other degree or diploma of this or any other university.

__________________________ __________________________

IMHANRENIALENA BENEDICT Date
201042700F

APPROVAL

Printed and signed already. Please bring it and place it here.

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated through Jesus Christ, my Lord and personal saviour, to the Almighty God for His provision and protection.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

My immeasurable gratitude goes to the Almighty God, from whom every good thing comes. In the same vein, my unflinching appreciation goes to my supervisor, Prof. (Mrs.) H. E. Osisioma for bringing her inestimable academic prowess to bear in the quality of this work. May God bless her.

I wish to equally register my indebtedness to the Head of Department of Business Administration of this institution, Dr. L. O. Orogbu and the following lecturers who taught me in my course work and also rendered constructive criticisms of thiswritten work: Prof. P. Akpan, Prof. E. Nnabuife, Prof. P. Ejiofor, Prof. C. Ikezue, Dr. H. N. Nzewi, Dr. M.O. Chiekezie, Dr. C. Onyeizugbe, as well as Prof. C. Onwuchekwa of blessed memory.

My heart-felt thanks also goes to the owners and Chief Executive Officers of the family businesses in Lagos State for their kindness and the rare cooperation I enjoyed from them during my research mission to their establishments especially the non-family member Chief Executive Officers who even at the risk of incurring the wrath of their employers accepted and completed my questionnaire.

Similarly, I am deeply indebted to my wife; Mrs. Onyekachukwu Benedict for her prayers as well as the loneliness she suffered each time I was out of Abuja in pursuit of this programme. In the same way, my appreciation goes to my parents; Mr. Imhanrenialena Isoah and Mrs. Lady Isoah as well as my siblings; Tony, Ernest, Juliana, Carol and Juliet. I wish to also express my gratitude to my office secretary, Mrs. J. Oluwaseun for typing the work.

ABSTRACT

Family businesses in Nigeria have a long pathetic history of dying with their founders, and thereby impacting negatively on investment, employment, and Gross Domestic Product of the nation. This research therefore seeks to establish the nature of the relationship between succession planning and the sustainability of family businesses in Nigeria with particular emphasis on Lagos State. Breaking this broad objective into achievable form, the following specific objectives were derived: To determine the relationship between delayed-retirement of family business owner-managers and the perpetuity of the business; to determine the relationship between mentoring and successful management transference in family businesses; to evaluate the relationship between the appointment of non-family member Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) as successors in the absence of competent ones in family businesses and the continuous viability of the business; and to ascertain the relationship between family elders' forum's ability to resolve succession crisis and harmonious working relationship in family businesses. Survey Research Design was adopted for the study and Taro Yamane's formula (1964) was used in determining the sample size. A total of 354 respondents drawn from SMEs in Lagos State participated in the study. To ensure the soundness of the research instrument, the Content Validity was used to test for the validity of the instrument while the Split-Halves Method was used in testing for the reliability of the instrument. In testing the research hypotheses formulated in line with the specific objectives, the F-test statistical tool was applied. The findings indicate the following: First, that there is a significant adverse linear relationship between delayed-retirement of family business owner-managers and the business perpetuity as the calculated F-ratio of 58.316 is greater than the F-distribution table value of 3.85 at 0.05 level of significance and at 1 degree of freedom. Second, that significant linear relationship exists between mentoring and successful management transference in family businesses as the calculated F-ratio of 22,170,75.427 exceedsthe F-distribution table value of 3.85. Third, that there is a significant linear relationship between the appointment ofnon-family member Chief Executive Officers as successors in family businesses in the absence of competent family member CEOs and the business continuous viabilityas the calculated F-ratio value of 28,204,57.581 is greater than the F-distribution table value of 3.85. Fourth, that family elders' forum's ability to resolve succession crisis is significantly related to harmonious working relationship in family businessesas the calculated F-ratio of 16,401,86.734 is greater than the F-critical table value of 3.85. These findings imply that failure of family business owner-managers in Nigeria to have a comprehensive succession plan in place will continue to expose their numerous workers to sudden job lose, throwing their families from affluence to poverty, and ultimately negating the nation's GDP as the business will continue to fail to outlive their founders.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title		i
Declaration		ii
Approval		iii
Dedication		iv
Acknowledgments		v
Abstract		vi
List of Tables		vii

Chapter One: Introduction

1.1	Background of the Study	1
1.2	Statement of the problem	6
1.3	Objectives of the Study	9
1.4	Research Questions	10
1.5	Hypotheses	10
1.6	Significance of the Study	11
1.7	Scope of the study	11
1.8	Limitation of the Study	11
1.9	Operationalisation of the Research Variables	12

Chapter Two: Review of Related Literature

2.1	Conceptual Review of Family Business and Succession Planning	13
2.1.1	Family Business	13
2.1.2	Succession Planning	14
2.1.3	Family Business Members and their Impediments to Succession Planning	18
2.1.4	The Founder Reluctance to Plan for Succession and Retirement	19
2.1.5	The Family	23
2.1.6	The Manager	27
2.1.7	The Co-owners	28
2.1.8	The Environment	30
2.1.9	Cultural Dimension to Family Business Succession Planning	31
2.1.10	Succession Planning as a Process	36
2.1.11	Non-Family Member Chief Executive Officers in Family Businesses	40
2.1.12	Family Elders' Forum in Family Businesses	42
2.1.13	Mentoring	45
2.1.14	The Mentee	48
2.1.15	Mentoring as a Relationship	49
2.2	Empirical Review	53
2.3	Theoretical Framework	69
2.4	Summary of the Reviewed Literature	71

Chapter Three: Research Methods

3.1 Research Design 73
3.2 Population of the Study 73
3.3 Sample size and Sampling Technique 75
3.4 Method of Data Collection 76
3.5 Validity of the Instrument 76
3.6 Reliability of the Instrument 77
3.7 Method of Data Analysis 78

Chapter Four: Data Presentation and Analyses

4.1 Descriptive Statistics 81
4.2 Test of Hypotheses 84

Chapter Five: Discussion of Findings

5.1 Discussion of Descriptive Statistics Results 90
5.2 Discussion of hypotheses Results 91

Chapter Six: Summary of Findings, Conclusion and Recommendations

6.1 Summary of Findings 99
6.2 Conclusion 100
6.3 Recommendations 101
6.4 Contribution to knowledge 102

References 103
Appendix A 115
Appendix B 116
Appendix C 155

List of Tables

3.1 Number of Small and Medium Enterprises in Each State of Nigeria 74
4.1.1 Age of Owners/CEOs Family Business 81
4.1.2 Sex distribution of Family Business Ownership 81
4.1.3 Age of the Business 82
4.1.4 Types of Business Ownership 82
4.1.5 Succession Stage in Family Business 83
4.1.6 Management of Family Business 83
4.1.7 Family Business Ownership Structure 83
4.2.1 Model Summary for Test of Hypothesis I 84
4.2.2 ANOVA Table for Simple Regression Result for Hypothesis I 85
4.2.3 Coefficients Result for Test of Hypothesis I 85
4.2.4 Model Summary for Test of Hypothesis II 85
4.2.5 ANOVA Table for Simple Regression Result for Hypothesis II 86
4.2.6 Coefficients Result for Test of Hypothesis II 86
4.2.7 Model Summary for Test of Hypothesis III 87
4.2.8 ANOVA Table for Simple Regression Result for Hypothesis III 87
4.2.9 Coefficients Result for Test of Hypothesis III 88
4.2.10 Model Summary for Test of Hypothesis IV 88
4.2.11 ANOVA Table for Simple Regression Result for Hypothesis IV 89
4.2.12 Coefficients Result for Test of Hypothesis IV 89

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

Family businesses are found virtually in every sector of the world's economies, and they are the most common form of business entities and the oldest in the world (Wayne, the president of Family Business Institute, Inc., 2012). Family-owned businesses around the world play a significant role in emerging and developed economies in terms of GDP growth and employment generation. National Bureau of Statistic, and Small and Medium Enterprises Development Agency of Nigeria collaborative survey(2015) noted that Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs) which is the bedrock of family businesses represents over 90 per cent of the businesses in Nigeria, employing over 84 per cent of the country's labour force.

Although it is difficult to single out a particular family-owned business as the oldest in the world, yet some family-owned businesses enjoy world respect for the number of generations they have survived (Williams, 2013; Balat as cited in Johnmark 2014). For example, Kongo Gumi Construction Company was established by Shotoku Kongo in the year 578 in Osaka, Japan. This family business is at its 40th generation with Toshitaka Kongo as its current president (Williams and Peter 2003). Barovier & Toso Company, a glass making family company was founded by Barovier and Toso families in the year 1295 in Murano Veneza, Italy. This family business is in its 20th generation. Antinori Company, a wine making family business was founded by the Antinori family in Italy in the year 1385, and is at its 19th generation with Piero Antiniro as the current CEO. John Brook & Sons Company was founded by John Brooke in the year 1541 in the United Kingdom. The family business is now in its 15th generation, and is currently owned and managed by Mark Brooke and his brother, Massimo Brooke. Fonjallaz Company was founded by Pierre Fonjallaz in 1552 in Switzerland and it is in its 13th generation while been currently headed by Patrick Fonjallaz. The Von Poschinger Manufaktur Company was established by Joachim Poschinger in Germany in the year 1568 and is at its 13th generation today (Williams et al 2003). In the same way, Eduard Meier Company was founded in the year 1596 by Eduard Meier in Munich, Germany, and it is also in its 13th generation while Peter Eduard Meier and his sister, Brigette are the current owners. Michelin was founded in France in 1888 by two brothers named Edouard and Andre Michelin and this family has continued to run the company till 2012 when Michelin Rollier, a family member, was for the first time in the company's history,

replaced as Chief Executive Officer by a non-family member called Jean Dominique Senard while the family retains the ownership. WalMart, a multinational company was founded in the U.S. in 1962 by Sam Walton. It was quoted on the floor of the New York Stock Exchange in 1972. Sam Walton the founder stepped down as the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) and appointed David Glass, a non-family member in his place and retains the ownership. Similarly, Samsung, a multinational company was founded in Korea in 1938 by Lee Byung-Chun. This family-owned company contributed 1/5 of South Korea's total exports and 17 percent of Korea's GDP in 2012. Again, this company appointed a non-family member Chief Executive Officer upon the death of the founder in 1987. In the same way, Terry Gou founded a multinational company called Foxconn in Taiwan in 1974. In January 2012 the founder retired as the company Chief Executive Officer on health grounds and appointed Chong Cheng in his place but retains the ownership.

Conversely, a brief historical look into the evolution of family business in Nigeria, and Lagos State in particular shows a pathetic story (Johnmark 2014). Nearly all the family businesses in Nigeria were merely operating as micro enterprises (petty businesses) with major interest in petty trade in commodities with little non-family member employees during the pre-colonial and early colonial eras (McMillan et al 2013). Majority of these family businesses had no visible plan of passing the ownership of their businesses to their heirs to perpetuate. As often the case, family businesses at that time automatically died with their founders. However, as time progressed, there were some brave Lagosians who ventured into businesses with interest in the distribution and sales of imported merchandise in the State. In this category was William Akinola Dawodu (1879-1930). He was the pioneer African importer of motor vehicles into Nigeria. He established this personal business in Lagos in 1905. The automobile business grew rapidly and he became the sole agent in Nigeria for American bicycles, firestone tyres and various brands of automobiles including Dodge, Charlotte, Rio, as well as Premier, Hobart and the English Humber. In Lagos and in Oshogbo, in the Western Nigeria hinterland, he established large retailing outlets and workshops where he had as many as fifty employees by the late 1920s. Unfortunately, his health and family life were beset by crises in the late 1920s. After he died intestate in 1930, the business went into liquidation the same year. The late Mrs. Charlotte Olajumoke Obasa also established her business called Anfani Bus Service in 1914 in Lagos.

Towards the end of the colonial era in Nigeria, family businesses began to witness a boost in size, structure and operations as they began to grow from micro enterprise level to small, medium and large organizations providing jobs for Nigerians. For instance, Johnmark (2014) states that from the 1950s, many family businesses sprang up in Lagos, Nigeria which included Balogun Group of companies founded by the late Alhaji Lai Balogun; Sanusi Brothers Group of companies owned by the late Ayodele Sanusi, the late Benson Oshinowo business empire, the late Chief Bashorun M.K.O Abiola business empire; the defunct Irawo Group of companies founded by the late Chief Patrick Ayodele Irawo; Sunrise Group of companies founded by the late Chief Ajibade Falodu; and a host of others which created hundreds of thousands jobs for Nigerians and expatriates. In the same vein, the late Chief Adeola Timothy Odutola also founded his business empire in Lagos in the 1950s. The family business empire spanned several sectors of the economy which included Odutola Nigerian Industries Limited – manufacturers of bicycle tyres and tubes in Ijebu-Ode; Odutola Tyre Soles Company Limited with factories in Lagos, Ibadan, Kano and Onitsha – re-threading automotive tyres; Odutola Tyre & Rubber Company Limited, etc. In this category also was the late Hamzat Adebowale who founded Adebowale Stores in Lagos and Adebowale Electrical Industries Limited in the 1970s.

There were other pioneer notable family businesses that existed in other parts of Nigeria in the past. In this category was the late Omu Okwei who lived between 1872 and 1943. She was a famous indigenous trader in palm kernel in Eastern Nigeria, and as time went on, she ventured into clothing merchandise and carried on with the business till she died in 1943. The late Christopher Tagbo Onyekwelu born in Nawfia in the present day Anambra State, Nigeria founded his commodity trading business in 1920 in Eastern Nigeria and later diversified into merchandise goods before the business went extinct with his demise. The late Alhaji Umaru Sharubutu who lived between 1853 and 1947 was also among the first few Nigerians who moved family business from micro business level to large scale level in Northern Nigeria. He founded the Sharubutu Group of Companies in 1913 with interest in large scale trading in commodities. Another entrepreneur in this category was the late Alhaji Alhassan Dantata who lived between 1877 and 1955. He founded the Dantata Group of Companies which started with trading in commodities in the 1930s in Northern Nigeria. The late Sir Louis Odumegwu Ojukwu who lived between 1909 and 1966 was also among the first few Nigerians who moved family businesses beyond the traditional micro enterprises to large scale family businesses with his famous Ojukwu

Transport Company Limited in the 1940s. In the 1950s, Sir Ojukwu diversified his business interest into real estate. The late Alhaji Khalifa Sheikh Rabiu founded the Isyaku Rabiu and Sons Company in 1952 and moved it to a Limited Liability Company in 1973 with diverse business interests in aviation, construction and manufacturing. In the same way, Abdulmunaf Sarin established the Sani Brothers Group of Companies in 1971. Also, Henry Oloyode Familekun founded the Henry Stephen Group of Companies in the 1950s with interest in shipping, trading and oil prospecting. This very company remains the first indigenous company that secured oil prospecting license in Nigeria.

Today, virtually all these family businesses which once helped to reduce the problem of unemployment and boost the country's Gross Domestic Product (GDP) while they thrived when their founders were alive, have long folded up immediately after the demise of their founders. As such, the problem of succession and continuity occupy great significance in family businesses. Available estimates, (Martins, 2014; Abubakar, and Olaolu, 2013; Abubakar, and Yahaya, 2013; Bola, and Yinka, 2013; Chuba, 2013; Dele, 2014; Obadan, and Ohiorenoya, 2013; Onuoha, 2012; and Ogundele, 2011) indicate that approximately 90 per cent of all family firms go into extinction after the death or retirement of their founders. These studies conclude that failure of these businesses to continue as family firms beyond the tenure of their founders has serious social and economic consequences. The liquidation of a family firm constitutes a loss not only to the proprietary family, which often has most of its assets lost in the firm, but also to the employees and surrounding community, whose economic well-being depends on the survival of the business (Larraza-Kintana, 2010).Family businesses are heavily dependent on their owners not only for their leadership and drive but also for their connections and technical know-how (Dele, 2014). Therefore, failure to plan for succession may needlessly deprive the business of these crucial managerial assets (Chuba, 2013).

It is feared that if succession planning is ignored, the founder's unexpected death can force a major upheaval in the pattern of authority and ownership distribution. In this situation, conflict among the founder's heirs often becomes so intense that they are unable to make the strategic decisions needed to ensure the future of the firm. Failure to plan for succession also threatens the family's financial well- being by leaving many thorny estate issues unanswered; a distressed sale of the firm is often the result (Carraher, and Carraher, 2006; Churchill, and Hatten, 2009).

Lekan (2012), Dele (2014), Aiku (2014) and Onuoha (2015) posit that the poor performance of Nigerian economy could be partly attributed to lack of continuity in family businesses in our society. In an attempt to proffer solutions to the teething problems facing SMEs in Nigeria, which form the bed rock of family businesses the government wrongly assumed that the only major problem facing these family businesses is funding. No wonder some financial agencies of the Federal Government of Nigerian, through various financial interventions provided funding through the following schemes till date: Small and Medium Scale Enterprises Guarantee Scheme of N200 billion (SMECGS), SMEs Restructuring/Refinancing N200 billion Fund(SMEs RRF), the N100 billion Cotton, Textile and Garment (CTG), the N2 billion National Economic Reconstruction Fund (NERFUND) for SMEs, the Dangote N5 billion Fund for MSMEs, the Counterpart Funding Scheme of the Bank of Industry (CFSBI) for MSME sector in Nigeria, and recently, the CBN 220 billion SMEs Intervention Fund (CBN, 2015).

This government's strategy of encouraging family businesses in Nigeria is seen as an incomplete effort in sustaining family businesses as the government has not taken enough concrete steps to find out other reasons why the family businesses that were flourishing in the past in Nigeria have long gone into extinction following the death of their founders (Onuoha2013, and Aiku 2014). The government has forgotten that it is one thing for a family to secure cheap funding provided by its agencies to establish/expand a business, and it is another thing all together for the business to stand the test of time by transiting from founders to successors as any failed family business is a minus to the economy as no amount of funding can save a family business from collapse if it does not have a vibrant succession plan in place before the retirement/death of their founders. Therefore, the failure of the National Orientation Agency to be carrying out enlightenment campaign on the need for family business owner-managers to have a comprehensive succession plan in place is a major issue.

In another dimension to succession planning in family businesses, Onuoha (2015) opines that it is not compulsory that a family member must take over the management of a family business especially when such a member lacks the right competencies. He added that a family business may grow out of its area of competence, yet it can sustain the business by opening up and allowing the right competencies to come into the business.

Again, another hiccup that seems present in family business succession planning in Nigeria is the issue of having "Family Elders' Forum" popularly called Family Council in the developed

World. The major function of this family elders' forum is to handle family issues especially family conflict in the business. Having family elders' forum in place in a family business especially when it involves extended family members may prevent such business from succession crises as Nigeria has a long history of family businesses that have been ruined by family conflict (Chikodi and Ibrahim, 2015).

Family-owned business founders/owners seem not to address succession planning but rather leave it to chance, and this is dangerous for the business continuity across generations (Chuba, 2013; Lekan, 2012; & Dele, 2014). Similarly, scholars in Nigeria have not also given it the needed research attention as exposed by the present researcher's literature review in chapter two of this work. This review of scholarly publications on family businesses reveals that the most frequent researched topics include variables like: family business' effects on job creation/poverty reduction, family business financing, interpersonal family business dynamics, family business performance and growth, gender and ethnicity issues in family businesses, legal and fiscal issues in family businesses, and estate issues in family businesses.

It is based on this absence of succession planning that is driving family-owned businesses into extinction in Nigeria, that the researcher is motivated to embark on this study so as to test the presence or otherwise of succession planning in the sustainability of family businesses beyond the founders in Nigeria.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Evidences abound lending credence to the fact that Nigerian family-owned businesses hardly survive the death of their founders unlike in the developed world where such businesses have survived generations (Lekan, 2012; Abubakar et al, 2013; Bola et al, 2013; Chuba, 2013; and Dele, 2014). Among the very disturbing cases of failed family businesses in the recent past is the late Chief M.K.O Abiola business empire that went into extinction following his demise. He was a business mogul whose business interest spanned publishing, oil and gas, aviation, shipping, media and farming. But these companies that once provided jobs for thousands of Nigerians died with him. Prominent among the companies were Abiola Farms Ltd, Abiola Bookshops Ltd, Radio Communications Nigeria (RCN) Ltd, Wonder Bakeries Ltd, Concord Press Ltd, Concord Airlines Ltd, Summit Oil Int'l Ltd, Africa Ocean Lines Ltd, Habib Bank Ltd, Decca West Africa Ltd, and Abiola Babes Football Club (Lekan, 2012). Workers in these companies were thrown out of jobs when the late Chief MKO Abiola's first son, Kola, inherited the business empire.

Like the late Chief MKO Abiola, the late Chief Adeola Timothy Odutola business empire founded in the 1950s in Lagos which spanned several sectors of the economy died with him. Odutola's fleet of companies included: Odutola Nigerian Industries Limited – manufacturers of bicycle tyres and tubes in Ijebu-Ode; Odutola Tyre Soles Company Limited with factories in Lagos, Ibadan, Kano and Onitsha – re-threading automotive tyres; Odutola Tyre & Rubber Company Limited, Odutola Farms Ltd, Odutola Foods Ltd, and Odutola Stores Ltd. Investigation reveals that the premises which once housed these companies were either abandoned completely or converted to residential buildings. In this category was the late Hamzat Adebowale who founded Adebowale Stores in Lagos and Adebowale Electrical Industries Limited in the 1970s. In the same way, this business empire became history following the death of the founder. The same ugly scenario is true of ACB, West African Pilot, and African Insurance Company which were all parts of the late Nnamdi Azikiwe's business concerns but are now extinct. The late Odumegwu Ojukwu famous Transport Company is not left out to mention but few.

Firstly, it seems that one of the critical issues in family business succession failure in Nigeria is the resistance of owner-managers to completely retire from the management of the business and retains ownership, and allow a successor to take full charge even when it is apparently clear that they are too weak to carry on with the herculean task of running such a business. Often, such aged family business owner-managers spend more time battling old age related health challenges than indulging in creative thinking that perpetuates a business. This refusal may be responsible for the waning and dwindling fortunes of such family businesses in Nigeria. For instance, Chief Gabriel Igbinedion is still presiding over his family business empire at the age of 81 while the very vital parts of the business empire (Aviation and Banking) have collapsed. Olorogun Michael Ibru at the age of 85 is still managing his numerous family business organizations with interest in shipping, aviation, agriculture, and oil and gas. Chief Oba Otudeko, the owner of Honeywell Group of companies is still managing at the age of 72. Chief Rasaq Okoya, the owner of Eliganza Industries in Lagos is still managing his family business conglomerate at the age of 75. Chief Iyayi Efionayi is still the Chairman/CEO of his numerous family businesses at the age of 82. Chief Michael Ade Ojo, who founded Elizade Motors Nig. Ltd in 1971, and Elizade University, is still managing the family businesses at the age of 77. These cases are too numerous and dangerous to be ignored in Nigeria.

Secondly, it seems family business succession failure always happens due to the inability of family business founders to thoroughly mentor a successor that will eventually succeed them at retirement or death.There are many Nigerian family businesses that are currently sitting on a time bomb of succession failure disaster as a result of having the founders' un-mentored first sons at the helm of affairs of their businesses without having those children worked their way up through the ranks, learn the ropes and cut their teeth at the various stages of operations in the businesses. Virtually all the major family business owners in Nigeria have their eldest son in their direct line of succession, without having them work their way up through the ranks in the business. For instance, the Ibru's business empire – the Ibru Organisation, founded by Olorogun Michael Ibru in 1956, is run as an extended family business. Michael's eldest son Oskar is now Group Executive Director, ready to take full charge at the demise of the father while Oba Otudeko's son, Obafemi, is Group Executive Director of Honeywell, on his way to succeeding his father at the helm of the family business. These first sons never worked their way up through the ranks in the organizations in order to gain experience that will help them to function at top management level, and their fathers' business acumen seems to be providing a cover for their sons' management deficiency as they were catapulted straight from the university lecture rooms to executive positions in the business. If urgent step is not taken to address this problem, the demise of their fathers may spell a doom for these family businesses as always the case in Nigeria.

Thirdly, happenings in Nigerian family businesses have suggested that another major problem in succession planning in these family businesses is that the owners seem to always stick to a family member successor particularly their first son, irrespective of the anointed potential successor's interest and capability to carry on with the family business, and thereby ignoring completely the option of handing over the management of their businesses to competent non-family member Chief Executive Officers (professional managers) even when situations demand so. This myth; that their successors must be their first sons or chosen among their children seems to prevent them from having a comprehensive succession plan in place. According to Lekan (2012), this was exactly what happened in the case of the late Chief MKO Abiola business empire where the first son, Kola, took over the business as the heir and the manager of the family business empire without thorough mentoring where his managerial capability could have been sharpened and tested. Quoted companies in Nigeria are not also spared of this serious danger as a single family could acquire a controlling shareholding interest (51 per cent shareholding and

above) in a quoted company and turns it to a family business. For example, in 2014, Chief Raymond Dopkesi, handed over his chairmanship position of DAAR Communications PLC; the owner of African Independent Television, Raypower FM, Faaj FM and DAASAT to his first son, Mr. Raymond Paul Dopkesi Jnr, citing political interest. This present author's interaction with the workers of this DAAR Communication PLC following this development exposed their fears that the decision may be disastrous as it seems that the motive was based on family ties rather than competence.

Fourthly, it is suspected that family business succession failure alwaysoccursin Nigeria due to family/succession crises handling which is characterised by court litigations and injunctions; which bread hatred and the eventualdestruction of harmonious working relationship in the business.The would-be successors of these family businesses always resort to protracted legal tussles to resolve succession dispute which often results in the death of the business instead of first relying on family elder's forum for an amicable resolution. Very recent ones are the late Chief Odumegwu Ojukwu's business empire, and the late Chief Augustine Ejikeme Ilodibe; the owner of Ekene Dili Chukwu Transport Company Ltd. They were very successful businessmen but the incessant and protracted legal battle by their dependants that are struggling to control what they owned is capable of killing what is left of the business. The same legal battle was also present in the business empire left behind by late Chief MKO Abiola, and so many other family businesses in Nigeria (Chikodi et al 2015). Therefore, one could imagine the huge job loss and the drastic drop in GDP these family-owned business failures occasioned by succession issues have caused this nation.

This trend of family business succession failure in Nigeria is quite disturbing considering the huge negative impact the retirement/demise of this crop of present generation business moguls will have on investment, employment and GDP without proper succession planning. This is why it has become pertinent for this researcher to investigate succession planning as it relates to the sustainability of family-owned businesses in Lagos State, Nigeria.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The broad objective of this study is to evaluate the relationship between succession planning and sustainability of family businesses in Lagos State, Nigeria.

Drawn from the broad objective are the following specific objectives:

i. To determine the nature of the relationship between delayed-retirement of family business owner-managers and the perpetuity of the business in Lagos State.

ii. To determine the nature of the relationship between mentoring and successful management transference in family businesses in Lagos State.

iii. To evaluate the nature of the relationship between the appointment of non-family member Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) as successors in the absence of competent ones in family businesses and the business continuous viability in Lagos State.

iv. To ascertain the nature of the relationship between family elders' forum's ability to resolve succession crisis and harmonious working relationship in family businesses in Lagos State.

1.4 Research Questions

i. How does delayed-retirement of family business owner-managers relate to the perpetuity of the business in Lagos State?

ii. What is the nature of the relationship between mentoring and successful management transference in family businesses in Lagos State?

ii. To what extent does the appointment of a non-family member Chief Executive Officer as a successor in the absence of a competent one in a family business relate to the business continuous viability in Lagos State?

iv. In what way does family elders' forum's ability to resolve succession crisis relate to harmonious working relationship in family businesses in Lagos State?

1.5 Hypotheses

To guide the achievement of the research objectives, the following null hypotheses are formulated.

Hypothesis I

Ho: Delayed-retirement of family business owner-managers does not havesignificantadverse relationship withperpetuity of the business in Lagos State.

Hypothesis II

Ho: No significant relationship exists between mentoring and successful management transference in family businesses in Lagos State.

Hypothesis III

Ho: No significant relationship exists betweenNon-family member Chief Executive Officer successors in family businesses and the business continuous viability in Lagos State.

Hypothesis IV

Ho: Family elders' forum's ability to resolve succession crisis has no significant relationship with harmonious working relationship in family businesses in Lagos State.

1.6 Significance of the Study

This study will be of a great benefit to family-owned businesses, their employees who are the major casualties of business failure, and the Nigerian government especially as it affects investment, employment and GDP.

First, it will test family business succession planning exploratory variables that are pivotal to the smooth transference of family-owned business from one generation to another so as to avoid this trend of family-owned businesses not outliving their founders in Nigeria.

Second, its findings will sensitize the employees of family-owned businesses on what to expect in the event that their present employers retire or pass-on, as nobody lives forever.

Third, the findings will galvanize government interest in embarking on aggressive campaign in enlightening family business owners on the need to have a comprehensive succession plan in place.

Fourth, this study will add to the existing literature for further studies in the field of succession planning in family business.

1.7 Scope of the Study

The scope of this study is restricted to the study of succession planning and the sustainability of family-owned businesses operating under the aegis of SMEs in Lagos State, Nigeria. Lagos State is chosen as the area of the study because it has the highest number of SMEs in Nigeria with 17 per cent of the total figure (NBS/SMEDAN 2012). Small and Medium Enterprises in Nigeria are categorized by SMEDAN as follows:

i. Small Enterprise; any business organization that has between 10 and 49 employees and assets that worth 5million naira but less than 50 million naira excluding land and building.

ii. Medium Enterprise; any business organization that has between 50 and 199 employees and assets that worth 50 million naira but less than 500 million naira excluding land and building.

In this study therefore, succession planning exploratory variables in SMEs such as family business owner-managers delayed-retirement, non-family members Chief Executive Officers (CEOs), mentoring, and family elders' forum crisis resolution ability were empirically tested.

1.8 Limitation of the Study

The reluctance of the family business owners/CEOs in disclosing business management information posed a limitation in terms of the number of participants intended to capture in this study. This reluctance was however overcome with rigorous enlightenment.

1.9 Operationalisation of the Research Variables

To establish the relation between succession planning and the sustainability of family businesses, this study statistically specified family business sustainability as a function of succession planning thus:

$Y = f(X)$

Where:

Y= Family Business Sustainability

X= Succession Planning

Decomposing **Succession Planning** into measurable form (exploratory variables or predictors) and expressing the above functional equation (equ 1) in a linear equation, the model becomes:

x_1= Delayed Retirement.

x_2= Mentoring

x_3= Non-family Member Chief Executive Officers

x_4 = Family Elders' Forum's Ability to Resolve Succession Crises

e = Stochastic error terms

Similarly, decomposing **Family Business Sustainability** (Dependent Variable) into measurable form, the researcher has the follow as his **Criteria Variables** or the **Indicators** of sustainability of family business:

y_1 = Family Business Perpetuity

y_2 = Family Business Successful Management Transference

y_3 = Family Business Continuous Viability

y_4 = Harmonious Working Relationship in Family Businesses

CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Conceptual Review

2.1.1 Family Business

Ibrahim, Dumas, and MacGuire (2011) aver that family business is an emerging concept. They argued that the concept is just recently receiving attention in the academic field. However, several arguments on what really constitute family business are still in top gear. Thus, until this time, authors and researchers in the field of family business are yet to agree and strike a balance on a specific definition of family business. Many researchers (Churchill, 2009; Handler, 1999; Lorna, 2011) and a host of others have made frantic efforts to arrive at a certain definition particularly in business management research domain but they still ended up offering different views on the definition of family business.

Barnes & Hershon (2009) see it as a business where controlling ownership is vested in the hands of an individual or members of a single family. Handler (1999) define Family business as an enterprise that is found in proprietorship, partnership, corporation or any form of business association where voting control is in the hands of a given family. Kellermans and Edddleston (2004) define family business as a business system which is characterized by: (a) one family (nuclear family or extended family) is the controlling owner; (b) family and business systems are interacting; and (c) inter-generational transfers (successions) have previously happened, are happening at present, or are anticipated to happen in the future.

In the view of Chua, Chrisman and Sharma (2003), family business is a business governed and/or managed with the intention to shape and pursue the vision of the business held by a dominant coalition controlled by members of the same family or a small number of families in a manner that is potentially sustainable across generations. Lee-Chua (2006) sees family firm as one in which at least 50% of the ownership and management fall within one family, whether related by blood, marriage or adoption. Lorna (2011) defines family business as one that will be passed on for the family's next generation to manage and control. Ogundele, Idris, and Ahmed (2011) define it as a business run by at least one family member. Churchill et al (2009) also see family business as a founder-operated business where there is anticipation that the business will be passed to the next generation. The European Union (2009) views family business as a business entitythat has the following characteristics:

- The majority of decision-making rights are in the possession of the natural person(s) who established the firm, or in the possession of the natural person(s) who has/have acquired the share capital of the firm, or in the possession of their spouses, parents, child, or children's direct heirs.
- The majority of decision-making rights are indirect or direct.
- At least one representative of the family or kin is formally involved in the governance of the firm.
- Listed companies meet the definition of family business if the person who established or acquired the firm (share capital) or their families or descendants possess 25 per cent of the decision-making rights mandated by their share of capital.

In spite of the debates over the precise definition of a family business, most of the definitions revolve around the kinship of family members owning a venture. Indeed, it is the intersection between the family members and the business that is believed to represent the unique features that explain management differences between family and nonfamily businesses.

In light of the forgoing definitions, the one given by Chua et al (2003) is therefore adopted as the **working definition** which defines family business as a business governed and/or managed with the intention to shape and pursue the vision of the business held by a dominant coalition controlled by members of the same family or a small number of families in a manner that is potentially sustainable across generations.

2.1.2 Succession Planning

Several scholars have investigated the concept of succession planning and sustainability of family business (Abubakar and Yahaya, 2013; Ismaila, 2012; Miller, 2005). Abubakar and Yahaya (2013) view family business succession planning plan as the preparations of how and when to pass the leadership baton from the present owner/manager to a successor who will either be a family member or a non-family member (a professional manager) while the family retains the ownership in order to sustain the business across generations. The "leadership baton" is divided into two axes—that of ownership and management (Bird et al, 2005).This suggests that there is a variety of combinations of ownership and management between family and professional managers available to the firm in transition. Handler (1990) sees succession planning in family business as a process of mutual role adjustment between the incumbent and

those of the successor generations. Chrisman et al (2003, 2010) view family business succession planning as process of replacing the founder or current management.

Miller (2005) defines Succession planning as a deliberate and a formal process that facilitate the transfer of management control from one family member to another. Alcorn (1982) explains further that the term "succession" refers specifically to changes in the top leadership, although changes taking place at lower levels may exhibit some of the same symptoms as top-level succession. She suggests that the focus needs to be at the highest level of the organization because the real problem comes when the boss position itself is the place where change is in process.Succession planning is said to be the transference of business leadership that results from the owner's wish to retire or leave the business for some reasons while family business survival is the continuity of business in future from one generation to another (Ibrahim et al 2003).

Lorna (2011) noted that succession planning is important and key to effective succession in family firms. Researchers have of recent examined the impact of succession planning on the survival of family firms in USA (Lee, 2006). The studies found that succession planning includes the quality of the successor, the gradual transfer of power and leadership to the next generation as well as the participation of family and non-family members in the succession process. This process is critical to the continuity and survival of the family firm from generation to generation (Ellis et al, 2006). Handler (1990) cites lack of succession planning as a major cause of the high mortality rate in family businesses and notes that succession planning does not take place in most family firms. Therefore for family business survival to be achieved, family businesses should start thinking about training successors, transferring ownership and managerial responsibility in advance (Dyck et al, 2002; Davis et al, 2012; Sharman et al, 2010). Succession planning helps to ensure the stability and continuity of a business. It is perhaps best understood as any effort designed to ensure the continued and effective performance of an organization, division, department of work group by making provision for the development, replacement of key people over time. Succession planning and management should support strategic planning and strategic thinking, and should provide an essential starting point for management and employee development programmes (Lekan, 2012). McConoughy, Mathews and Fialko (2006) look at succession planning as a process that leads management to define and address talent management strategies as they prepare the organization and people for the future. Succession planning helps family firms to assure continuity by preparing leaders for key executive positions; engaging the senior management team in a disciplined process of reviewing the corporation's

leadership talent; putting the diversity issue on the corporate agenda; guiding the development activities of key executives; re-examining corporate and business unit structure, processes, and systems; aligning with other human resource activities that support the leadership renewal process (Carraher et al, 2006).

Succession planning should not be viewed as a single event. It should be viewed as a process that begins with recruiting and hiring of individuals and then developing them along their career path. Succession planning should be a well-planned and a deliberate process (Matthews et al 2009). The ability to identify and develop strong leaders will ensure the success of organizations and maintain their competitiveness in the market place (Ibrahim, & Ellis, 2004).

In essence, succession planning is about forecasting, managing, and developing family members. McCauley et al (2006) contend that, in order for family businesses to be successful and survive across generations, they must properly assess their current talent, and as part of a succession process, place the right people in the right roles in order to ensure proper development. Ibrahim (2003) sees succession planning as a long term extensive approach towards training and replacement of key individuals in an organization which helps the organization to survive across generations. There is often a fight for power between two generations or between two owners within the same generation (fowler, 2001). This was supported by Meredith (2004) who found that the operations of family enterprises tend to be strongly influenced by family interests. She adds that this influence often faces special problems as relationships between the family members are not always smooth.

In light of the forgoing views of scholars what a family business succession planning is, the researcher adopted as his working definition the one offered by Chrisman et al (2003, 2010) which view family business succession planning as process of determining the replacement of the founder or current management so as to enable the sustainability of the business across generations.

Succession Planning and Socialization: Through socialization the helpless infant becomes a member of the society by taking over the world of the persons that raise him/her (Giddens, 1993). There is both family and business in families business hence socialization concerns family matters as well as business matters. For that, socialization in the context of family business is central. It helps to understand the invisible preparation and training of successors. A new generation of family members engaging in the family business has to some extent learned about it since they were born. This learning is mostly indirect and unintended although also

occasionally intentional. Two major implication of this notion is that it opens new ways of viewing when succession begins and how successors are trained. It points to the taken-for-granted nature of family business practice. Values, routines and traditions learned through socialization since childhood are largely taken for granted as the 'normal' way of being (Brockhouse, 2004).

In family business this creates a special kind of knowing in family members and a special kind of understanding among them. It can also cause confusion, from taking things for granted, or difficulties in understanding why externals cannot see what is obvious to you and other family members. The secondary socialization, when an already socialized person enters new sectors of the society as school and work, is special in the context of family business. This is usually the process when new socializing agents influence the person to develop role-specific knowledge (Brockhouse, 2004). In family business, the people that run your workplace can be the same persons that raised you. In this way, family business is a special case where primary and secondary socializing agents can be the same persons.

The blurring of primary and secondary socialization also plays a role when family hierarchy and business hierarchy are intertwined; especially when the business hierarchy is to change through succession. Socialization can help to understand the complex task of taking over a leadership role from a parent. Floren's (2006) study of strategic renewal in family businesses found family members struggling with their dual need of individuation and belonging. For that reason it is important for family members to be able to develop "their own thing" within the business. Education and work experience from other organizations can be helpful for the individuation process of family business persons. This external inspiration can also enrich the business. Through socialization we learn what constitutes appropriate behaviour in our social context. In a family, this includes how to do business the way the family does it. Learning important business aspects that are necessary for being part of, and eventually taking over, the family business is continuing throughout the family lifecycle. Regardless of situation, socialization is not an option to choose because it is already ongoing. In family business, socialization is particularly present in succession but invisible in a taken-for-granted fashion. In turn, the taken-for-granted nature of things we do as a result of our socialization can help to unfold invisible aspects of succession. Hence, to explore succession a as concept, there need to pay attention to how members of a family business socialize (Obadan et al 2013).

Having made concise conceptual clarifications on family business and succession planning based on the views of scholars; and a working definition of this study established, it is the believe of the researcher that the would-be readers of this study be exposed to the meanings of the major concepts of this study.

2.1.3 Family Business Members and Succession planning

In order to understand the role each family business actor plays in succession planning in a family firm, it is necessary to differentiate the perspectives of the various stakeholders that make up the system. For example, family members often view the firm both as an important part of the family's identity and heritage and as a source of financial security that will enable them to satisfy their life-style expectations. This view of the firm is rooted in their membership in the family and in a symbolic representation of the firm as a "mother" whose function is to provide nurturance and a sense of connectedness among family members Ibrahim et al (2004).

In contrast, those in management see their careers as tied to the firm and tend to regard the business as a vehicle for professional development and economic achievement. From their perspective, the firm's primary goal is not to look after the needs of family members but to generate profits and ensure their continued career growth. Accordingly, those involved in management expect that the firm's resources will be allocated to those who contribute directly to us growth.

Finally, owners view the business predominantly as an investment from which they want to receive a fair return. Their expectations stem from an ownership right that is often difficult to exercise in the context family business. It is also important to note that individuals can belong to more' than one group at the same time in the family business. It is, therefore, possible for the same person to hold conflicting views about the ultimate goals of the firm (Kontinen, and Ojala, (2013). The succession transition imposes a wide variety of significant changes on the family firm: Family relationships need to be realigned, traditional patterns of influence are redistributed, and long-standing management and ownership structures must give way to new structures. To further complicate matters, the timing of the succession transition tends to coincide with life cycle changes in the family as well as with changes in the firm's markets and products (Leslie, Elizabeth, and Tenora, 2007). These changes are anxiety provoking and create a need to resolve some of the uncertainties surrounding the future of the family enterprise. At the same time, resolving these uncertainties makes it necessary to address many emotionally loaded issues that

most people would prefer to avoid or deny. People in family business adopt different ways of coping with their feelings toward succession planning. One common response is to compromise opposing feelings by enacting a number of self-defeating behaviours.

While this author assumes that each actor in the family business will be well disposed toward succession planning, the primary focus will be on the reasons why the constituent members of the family business often times neglect succession planning because that seems the case in Nigeria:

2.1.4 The Founder Reluctance to Plan for succession and Retirement

Throughout the development of the family business, the founder tends to be the only person who is a dominant player in all three constituencies. This position of centrality gives the founder a pervasive influence over the family firm system, making his own strongly felt reluctance toward succession planning and retirement particularly problematic Lorna (2011).

While founders are often aware of many good reasons for developing a succession plan, they also experience strong psychological deterrents to managing their exit. One difficult deterrent to succession planning is the founder's reluctance to face his own mortality. For a founder to plan succession, the founder must come to grips with death. This is not an easy task for anyone (Becker, 1973). An entrepreneur who typically has guided his life in the firm believes that he controls his own destiny (Ibrahim, Dumas, and McGuire, 2011). Succession planning forces founders to go through a kind of premature death ritual. As one founder the present author interviewed commented, "Planning my succession was like being actively involved in all of the arrangements for my own wake."

In his loss and continuity work, Herz (1993) proposes that the process of coming to terms with impending death follows a predictable sequence of stages: denial, rage, depression, negotiation, and finally acceptance. Succession planning requires that founders go through this difficult cycle at a time when they are still feeling strong and vital and when those around them continually remind them that they are the indispensable hub of the family firm. Under these conditions, it is very difficult for founders to move beyond the denial stage. Consider this scenario according to Williams (1984 as cited by Karlan, and Valdivia, 2009):

> Armand Hammer, the ninety-year-old entrepreneur who is legendary for his unwillingness to plan his exit from Occidental Petroleum, the firm he has run for the past thirty-one years. Asked by a New York Times reporter to comment on why he had not chosen a successor, he

> said, “And if I pass’-and here he paused, caught himself, and amended his statement-‘When I pass, the board of directors will pick my successor. They are a good group (Williams, 1984, pp. 1-3, as cited in Karlan et al 2009).

Frequently, founders develop a complex set of rationalizations and compromises that prevent them from engaging in succession planning. The most destructive maneuver is used by the founder who repeatedly goes through the motions of choosing successors only to undermine their authority and fire them alter a given period on some capricious pretext.

Founders also resist succession planning because it entails letting go of their power to influence the day-to-day running of the business. In many cases, founders became entrepreneurs precisely because of a strongly felt need to acquire and exercise power over others. Surrendering power over the firm is thus experienced as the first step toward losing control over life itself. Founders’ strong needs for power and centrality are evident in the way they structure their businesses (Pascual, Cristina, and Luis, 2012). Researchers have documented the tendency of founders to make themselves indispensable to their businesses by resisting the delegation of authority and insisting that they be involved in decisions that would be better handled at lower levels in the organization (Ramona, Hoy, Poutziouris, and Steier, 2008). This self-reinforcing tendency for centrality leads many founders to develop an exaggerated image of the disastrous con-sequences that their retirement would bring. This image is frequently shared by others in the family firm, and it often becomes an integral part of the family firm’s culture (David, Robert, and Shiv, 2006).

The gloomy out- look, in turn, creates a powerful rationale for avoiding succession planning and reinforces the founder’s need to remain involved in day-to-day decisions. While it might well be true that the founder is indispensable at any given point in the life of the family firm, the fact remains that the founder has the power to break the dependency cycle, since he is largely, though not entirely, responsible for perpetuating it.The fear of losing control of the business is often compounded by the thought that retiring from the firm will lead to a demotion from one’s central role within the family. As a successor in one company put it, “‘My father refused to let go because he feared that after retirement he would no longer be Papa the patriarch that all his children would look up to and depend on. He wanted to die ruling the family and the firm, and, unfortunately for all of us, he did.” It is interesting to note, in this regard, that even those founders who do plan their succession out of management of the business often retain ownership

control of the firm until their death. They do so in spite of the considerable estate tax advantages of passing control of stock ownership to heirs while the founder is still alive (Kellermans, and Eddleston, (2004).

In addition to the loss of power, founders also resist succession planning out of fear of losing an important part of their identity. For an entrepreneur, his organization defines his place in the community and in the world at large. Moreover, the firm forms an integral part of his sense of self (David, et al, 2014; Lee, 2006; and Leslie, et al 2007). The business is often his most significant creation. And, unlike his children, possibly, his wife, it is a loved one he can keep. Thus, founders suffering from the empty nest syndrome at home can become even more attached to their businesses (Rogolsky, 1988). At a time in life when the founder is struggling to come to terms with the meaning of his life's work, when there is too little time to redo some of his life choices, the thought of separating from the organization is disturbing and painful. Even founders who have gathered the courage to forge ahead with a succession plan often find themselves disoriented after their plan is made public. In one family company that was studied(Leslie, et al 2007), the founder worried that he would be ignored and cast aside by the financial community and by his business associates after he announced his succession plan. Whether or not he was invited to business gatherings and conventions became a major preoccupation, as did the title that he would put on his business cards. He also worried a great deal about whether he could keep his office in the company's building, even though he was still the sole owner of the firm.

Cristina et al (2013) indicate that founders, struggling with succession often experience powerful feelings of rivalry and jealousy toward potential successors. Some psychoanalytic researchers have suggested that for a male entrepreneur the firm may constitute an unconscious representation of his mother. For example, Cristina et al (2013) says, the son symbolically defeats the father by starting his own business. He simultaneously builds and marries his organization; it represents the mother he could never win away from his father.Succession triggers in the founder the same rivalry he experienced toward his father in the early stages of his life. This time, however, the struggle is reenacted with the successor, a younger rival who waits to take over the founder's place with his beloved organization. Simultaneously, the founder may be experiencing similar displacement in his daughters' affections through their choice of younger male partners (Dickstein, 2003). These feelings become evident in a

persistent distrust of the successor's competence and ability. In one company that was studied (Dickstein, 2003), the founder's mistrust and rivalry with his successor reached a point where the founder spent most of his time minutely documenting every decision the successor made in order to build a convincing case for not retiring. The fact that the company was actually making a sizable profit under the successor's leadership was not sufficient evidence of managerial competence. Instead, the founder argued that until the successor learned to take care of the details (like turning the lights off at night and using good grammar on internal memos) he would not be fit to assume the management of the firm. After a painful struggle for control, the successor left the company, and the founder has since repeated the cycle with two other successor candidates.

Bocatto, Gispert, and Rialp, (2010) fault the founder for committing "corporeuthanasia," which he defines as the owner's act of willfully killing off the business he loves by failing to provide in his lifetime for a viable organization with clear continuity. This disaster occurs because the owner of the business cannot face the fact that at some point he must and will be replaced. If the successful business owner, who had the ability, vision, and guts to build the business from nothing, does not have the courage to face the problems of the future, then his banker and attorney will do it for him on the way back from his funeral—four cars back from the flowers (Bocatto et al 2010).

Bocatto et al (2010) found that there are various types of retirement styles of founders or CEOs. These are:

(i) Monarchs do not leave until they are forced out or die.

(ii) Generals also leave office only when forced out, but plan a return to power often to rescue the company from an "inadequate" successor.

(iii) Ambassadors leave willingly and become advisors to the firm.

(iv) Governors rule for a termand then pursue other ventures.

Furthermore, many founders select successors who are bound for failure (Alvaraz, 2002). Alvaraz uses the terms loyal servant, watchful waiter, and false prophet to describe three types of inadequate successors typically chosen by a founder when he or she is given the chance to choose. The first is a conscientious helper but an incompetent leader, and the second is a star performer from outside, who must wait, sometimes indefinitely, for power to be granted. The

third is the “false prophet”, whose area of competence is not related to the role required and, therefore, is an unrealistic choice for successor.

Another problem of succession occurs as a result of homosocial reproduction (Habbershon, 2013). This is when the owner or senior executive tries to perpetuate the organization's future leader in his or her own image. A number of important factors affecting succession transference can be summarized as follows according to Miller (2005):

The first factor which ensures positive transition experience involves the preparation level of heirs. The level of preparation refers to the extent of which the heirs have the requisite business skills, managerial capabilities, knowledge of company operations and attitudinal predisposition to handle the running of the business (Fenn et al., 2012).

The second factor which requires special care is concerned with personal relationships within the family and non-family employees of the firm. The commonly cited issue here concerns trust and communication among family members (Williams et al 2013). Dysfunctional conflicts, jealousy and sibling rivalries further worsen the relationships and affect business stability.

Thirdly, family values and beliefs which bond the relationship among members tend to affect the continuity of the firms. The most powerful determination concerning values of family firms is the dominant role of founders in the formation process of values. Personality, values and beliefs of the founder are generally essential determinants in the formation of the firm culture (Keller et. al, 2004; Sharma, 2011) and values of the founder closely affect family and job socialization of the second generation as well (Alvarez, 2002). Davis (2006) contends that some cultural configurations created and transferred by founder leaders of the firm play important role in the continuity of the firm. For example, ambition, reliability, responsibility, hard-work, honesty and growth are the entrepreneurs’ values revealing mostly in the foundation of the firm. Values such as openness and ability can be associated with long-term survival and growth of the organization.

Although the founder is unquestionably the critical actor in succession planning in family business, it is important to realize that the founder is not alone in resisting the planning process. The founder’s own family frequently exerts strong pressures to avoid the emotion-laden issues of succession.

2.1.5 The Family:

In order to understand the family’s reaction to succession planning and the reasons why its members might want to avoid the planning process, it is important to consider the stage in the

life cycle at which a family is likely to be at the time of succession. The need to start thinking about succession planning does not typically arise until the founder and his spouse enter the last stage in the life cycle (around age sixty). Family theorists (John, & Veronica, 2000) have described some of the issues confronting married couples at this juncture in their lives. By this time, the last of the children has left home, and the couple is struggling to adjust to the vacuum produced by the empty nest. Unresolved marital difficulties that for years had lain dormant, masked by the continuous pressures of child rearing and business startup reemerge during this period. The death or illness of the couple's parents, who are by now well into old age, exerts additional pressures. The thought of growing increasingly dependent on others is especially difficult for couples who place a strong value on managing for themselves.

Retirement and the changes of status that come with it further exacerbate these difficulties. Couples at this stage, resort to emotional strategies, such as denying the need to deal with succession, refusing to relinquish power, and reasserting their authority and centrality in both the family and the business hierarchies. For the offspring, this is also a time of stress and adjustment, as they are themselves adapting to the multiple demands of the adult world, including marriage and (for many) divorce, careers, and parenthood. In addition, the children are eager to establish their own financial independence and au4onomy at this stage of their lives. These conditions make it unlikely that the offspring will be patient and supportive of the parents' attempts to assert their power over family members. On the contrary, the offspring may resort to displacing their own difficulties with succession onto the founder, who is viewed as the only obstacle to their own advancement within the firm (Hutchinson, 2000). Often, those among the younger generation who most eagerly want to bring about the exit of the founder experience a good deal of unconscious guilt that leads them to sabotage their own chances of being effective successors.

Many of the developmental challenges of this stage interfere with the family's ability and willingness to engage in open discussion of succession issues. For the founder's spouse, the succession transition creates a complex set of challenges and uncertainties. On the one hand, spouses may worry a great deal about the economic and emotional future of the family and continuously work to mediate conflicts that emerge between the founder and the next generation or among the siblings themselves. For this reason, spouses are often supportive of succession planning and in many cases serve as a powerful influence in mobilizing the founder to confront his difficulties in facing the transition. On the other hand, the founder's spouse faces a number

of issues that can deter her from addressing the succession issue. For the spouse, too, the firm constitutes an important center of activity and a major component of her identity (Curimbaba, 2002).

Like the founder, she may be confronted with letting go of many important roles she has played in and around the business over the years. These roles vary significantly from firm to firm and include anything from running a part of the business or managing the company finances to helping employees with their family problems and organizing social activities for clients (Hutchinson, 2000). At times, spouses can discourage succession planning because they fear that a substantive discussion of the future of the family business will disrupt the family's harmony. In one family business that I studied, the founder's spouse played the role of emotional guardian of the family, constantly shielding the family from the emotionally upsetting issues of succession. By actively discouraging any of the children from engaging in discussions about the future of the family business, the spouse enabled the founder to continue procrastinating on development of a succession plan. Sometimes, the founder's spouse resists bringing in an outside consultant because this would violate the privacy of the family and expose the family's dirty laundry to public view.

Many other family factors can interfere with the open discussion of succession. For example, as the result of such factors as gender and birth order, the parents can differ significantly in their preference for the children. These differences have a powerful effect on each parent's assessment of which child should be the founder's successor, and they heighten the chances that the choice will be experienced as preferential treatment. While the emotional response to the choice of successor is often mediated by such factors as the family's ethnic background and traditions (in particular with regard to primogeniture) as well as by the configuration of family coalitions and the developmental stages of the key participants, the decision tends to be emotionally loaded for the majority of business families (Leslie, Elizabeth, and Tenora, 2007). In addition, most Western cultures have norms regulating family behaviour that discourage parents and offspring from openly discussing the future of the family beyond the lifetime of the parents (Leslie et al 2007). This is particularly true of economic and financial matters, such as estate planning, an open discussion of which is typically viewed as a breach of etiquette or as denoting self-interest and a lack of mutual trust. These norms are functional in ensuring that relationships within the family are guided by personal caring, not by such motives as economic opportunism. However,

when businesses are operated by families, the same norms can serve to discourage the necessary discussions of succession planning.

Other investigators have noted that many families have difficulty talking about inheritance and the economic future of the family. For example, Rosenblatt and his associates (Leslie et al 2007) argue that the anxieties about succession and inheritance may also result from the fact that the stakes (financial and otherwise) are high for the founder's heirs: "What people will inherit or fail to inherit is not only something of financial value but also an occupation, a status, and a place in the community." Families fear that an open discussion of these issues might only serve to fuel invidious comparisons among the heirs that could destroy the fabric of the family. The younger generation sometimes avoids succession planning because it arouses strong fears of parental death, separation, and abandonment. In one case, an entrepreneur's adult son told me that "deep down inside" he did not even want to think about what life would be like in the absence of his parents. He feared that addressing succession would be so upsetting that it might actually bring about the death of his father, who, incidentally, was in very good health. Given the anxiety that the succession transition generates, it is not unusual for family members to harbor very negative expectations of what would happen if succession issues were to be openly discussed in the family.

Lam's (2005) survey of one hundred and fifteen sons and daughters focused on individuals' perceptions of satisfaction and their working relationships with their fathers. Her findings suggest that "it is entirely possible to find working in the family business with father as boss to be a satisfying experience." Establishing a good relationship with one's father at work depends on the acceptance of roles, needs, and guidance. Rogoff (2003) suggests that there is a "high resistance among these second-generation owner-managers to being there in the first place". Rogoff (2003) findings, which were based on her study of college students and their decisions about "returning" to the family firm after school, indicate that the responsibility to the family firm does not appear to lie solely with the oldest child. Finally there are many advantages to a delayed entry strategy; gaining experience outside the family firm is often a recommended course of action ((Lam, 2009). Ragoff's (2003) theory describes the need for succession planning and quality decision making regarding one's career. Ragoff believes that assessing fit between the career interests and abilities and the successor role is a critical part of succession planning for the next-generation family member.

Handler (1999) carried out an in-depth interview with thirty two next-generation family members. Handler put together a descriptive framework which is based on the following findings:

i. The more a next-generation family member has achieved fulfillment of three needs (career interests, psychosocial needs, and life stage needs) in the context of the family firm, the more likely it is that the individual will have a positive succession experience.

ii. The more a next-generation family member has the potential or ability to exercise personal influence in the family business, the more likely it is that the individual will have a positive succession experience.

iii. The more a next-generation family member achieves mutual respect and understanding with the predecessor in succession, the more likely it is that the individual will have a positive succession experience.

iv. The more siblings can accommodate rather than conflict with one another regarding the family business, the more likely it is that the individual will have a positive succession experience.

v. The greater the commitment to family business perpetuation as a family value, the more likely it is that the individual will have a positive succession experience (except when the commitment is to business means rather than business ends).

vi. The greater the existence of separation strains due to family involvement in the business; the less likely it is that the individual will have a positive succession experience.

While it is unquestionably true that families differ in their ability to cope with the stress brought about by succession planning, such fatalistic expectations often prevent even the healthiest of families from confronting the need to plan.

2.1.6 The Managers:

The difficulties with succession are not limited to the founder and the family. The firm’s managers are also confronted with difficult emotional issues that lead them to resist planning. This section discusses the senior nonfamily cadre of managers who constitute the upper echelon of the firm. This group is often composed of older managers who have worked with the founder from the start of the firm (Nuradli, 2008). Many senior managers are reluctant to shift from a personal relationship with the founder to a more formal relationship with a successor. In most cases, these managers have developed unique ties with the founder that extends well beyond the

parameters of a contractual work arrangement. Over the years, the founder may have personally managed each senior manager's training, evaluation, and compensation and tendered personal favours to the managers and their families (Miller, and McLeod, 2005). For example, in some family businesses this present author knows, the founder had helped secure loans to the senior managers for the purchase of their homes. For many senior managers, personal ties with the owner constitute the single most important advantage of having worked for a family firm over the years.

The founder's succession may also confront the older managers with the reality of their own aging and retirement. In conflict situations in which the founder and the younger generation are struggling for control, the older managers not infrequently side with the founder in favour of the status quo. The families of senior managers may also have ties to the founder and his family, so that the shifting hierarchy in the founder's family may stimulate changes in the families of senior managers. In many cases, several members of a single family are employed by the firm, so that a change in leadership can threaten the employment of these families as well. In some of the larger family firms, the senior managerial ranks include younger professional managers with shorter tenure in the firm who aspire to formalize the structure of tile firm in the future (Sharma et al 2011). These managers are often eager to purge the firm of relatives (both of the owners and of the other managers) who in their view are not contributing to tile growth and development of the firm.

Regardless of his or her competence and skills, a successor is seldom able to replace the entrepreneur. With the change of leadership, it is not only inevitable but also appropriate and necessary for many of the functions that the founder performed to become institutionalized (Walter, Chung, and Yuen, 2003). Senior managers often expect that formal controls, such as budgets, management information systems, and personnel systems, will restrict their autonomy and influence. These expectations lead them to resist both the planning and the implementation of the succession transition. It is not unusual, therefore, to find the senior managers colluding with the founder and members of the family in avoiding serious discussions about succession.

2.1.7 The Co-Owners:

Besides the family and the senior managers, the owners also encounter difficulties addressing succession planning. In most first-generation businesses, the founder alone has complete control of the ownership. In some firms, the founder has given or sold some ownership interest to older

managers, relatives, or both, either to give them an incentive to further their involvement with the business or to limit estate taxes. In these cases, the founder typically retains ownership control of the business. In larger firms, the founder has often secured the financial backing of outside investors who are given some share of the ownership in return for their investment (Walter et al, 2003). Typically, these outside investors are old friends of the founder and themselves owner-managers of other family firms in the community. Still other family firms are dealerships or franchises in which larger firms have a direct ownership involvement. Like other stakeholders in the family firm, the owners, in whatever capacity they serve, also experience difficulties actively engaging in or mobilizing the succession planning process.

For owners who work in the firm, whether they are family members or not, the difficulties typically stem from the way in which they acquire their share of ownership. Often, the founder has passed along some share of his ownership to these individuals as a paternalistic gesture of goodwill or in recognition of some special contribution that these people either have made or are expected to make. However, tills gift or sale carries with it an implicit expectation of loyalty and allegiance to the founder that makes it very difficult for internal minority owners to raise questions about succession planning without appearing to be disloyal.

Outside minority owners who are old friends of the founder are often themselves involved in resisting succession planning with their own firms and as a result tend to avoid discussions of succession planning altogether (Robert et al, 2004). As one founder whom I interviewed put it, “The moment I announced that I had finally decided to do something about succession, my partners and business colleagues jumped on me and said that I was crazy. They inquired whether I had received bad news from my doctor. It took me a while to figure out that what I was doing confronted them with their own succession anxieties.”Not all founders have the wisdom to separate their own anxiety about succession from that of others. The problem of succession is a generational issue that confronts all members of the same cohort at about the same time. Tile reluctance of the founder’s partners and peers to face up to succession often reinforces the founder’s own resistance to planning his departure from the firm.

Family firms that belong to the dealer network of a larger firm are seldom constructively encouraged to plan for the succession of the founder. At best, large firms deal with the succession issues of their dealer principals by specifying in their contract that a “suitable successor” (suitable is usually left undefined) must be found in order for the franchise agreement

to be renewed beyond the tenure of the dealer principal (Robert et al, 2004). It is evident in many cases that the head office does not have much understanding of how the complex interaction of family and business affects the dealers' ability to cope with succession.

In the parent organization, management succession is typically handled through a formal process that has been institutionalized for a considerable period of time. Often, the parent organization expects that dealers will approach succession with the same degree of bureaucratic rationality that is presumed to be used to handle management succession at headquarters. While the threat that the dealership agreement will be terminated does raise awareness of tile need to do something about succession, the bureaucratic rationality imposed from headquarters actually serves to inhibit consideration of the way in which the personal dynamics of the founder and the founder's family might be interfering with succession planning. In addition, the imposition of vague contractual limitations in the absence of supportive processes and structures serves only to increase the tensions that are characteristic of dealer-headquarters relations (Sareshmukh & Corbett, 2011). Headquarters frequently becomes a target onto which the founder and others in the family firm can displace much of the anxiety and anger that they experience as a result of the succession situation.

2.1.8 The Environment:

Resistance to the succession planning process is not limited to the individual who are directly involved with the family firm system. Environmental forces also create barriers to succession planning. These forces consist of the client's suppliers who have grown dependent on the founder as their primary business contact in the firm. These people know that the founder is the person to whom they must speak when they want action. Although it is clearly in the client's long-term interest that the firm plans for its healthy continuation, clients and suppliers worry about losing their connection to the top and frequently side with the founder in avoiding the effort to plan succession (Sareshmukh et al, 2011). In one company that I studied, the founder had retired and moved a thousand miles away and was still getting and responding to daily calls from clients three years after his departure from the firm. In service businesses, in which the founder's personal network is one of the firm's most critical assets, the founder's connections can become a powerful reason for perpetuating centrality. In many cases, the founder's network results from a lifetime of shared experiences with members of his cohort who do not easily develop links with the successor and others of his or her generation.

It is worth noting here that our cultural values do not generally support leaders who plan their succession. In fact, until fairly recently, management scholars have not paid much attention to the generic problem of leadership succession. Sonnenfeld (1986, p.321) aver thus:

> How a leader leaves office is as important to his or her constituents as how the office is acquired. Nonetheless, our attention is not balanced between these events. We hear regularly of the violent warfare surrounding prominent cases of corporate executive succession struggles, yet that is where the discussion begins and ends. The collective wisdom on leadership departures does not appear in the best- selling management guides, research reports, or classroom texts (1986, P. 321)

The stereotypes that we carry are of legendary leaders who have died in the saddle or gone down with the ship, not of leaders who have thoughtfully planned their exit. Perhaps our own collective ambivalence toward authority interferes with our ability to come to terms with the fact that leaders do not just fade away-they die. In this context, succession planning is viewed more as a sign of weakness or as a deficiency of character than as an essential component of responsible leadership. Since founders view themselves as centrally responsible for the well-being of their families and their firms, they do not take such cultural messages lightly (Sareshmukh et al, 2011).

2.1.9 Cultural Dimension to Family Business Succession Planning

Miller (2005) found that young girls are often treated differently from their brothers during socialization process. Specifically, they spend less time, develop fewer skills, and are encouraged less than their brothers. The choices are often made for them at an early age without their knowledge of the options available. This may help explain why there is still a gap between the number of men and women in leadership roles in family firms. Other studies have focused on specific next-generation family members as especially daughters (David, 2006), younger sons (Iannarelli, 2002), and siblings (Friedman, 1999). David (2006) indicates that daughters and younger sons who become CEOs cannot easily shake off their family ties to the bottom levels of the family hierarchy. As CEOs, they then become key figures in incongruent hierarchies. Their positions in the two hierarchies can lead to discomfort, tension, and agony for all members of the family. Outsiders who see this pain are often at a loss to know how to deal with family members as the problems become public and sometimes tragic.

David's in-depth interviews (2006) with forty family members in eighteen family firms focused on the role of daughters. Most interesting and relevant to the succession literature is his finding that many daughters in her sample "had not originally been seen as potential members, managers, or successors in the business." She uses the term "invisible successor" to describe these daughters. One hundred percent of the fathers interviewed said that they had not considered their daughters as viable successors either before they joined the firm or for long periods of time afterward. Similarly, all the daughters interviewed had never even considered entering the family business, let alone becoming manager or successor, until a crisis or unforeseen circumstances had forced them to consider the family business as a source of employment (David, 2006).

David continues by indicating that sex discrimination is still alive in many family firms. The assumption is still stands that family businesses will be passed to sons. Attitudes are slow to change despite the fact that the numbers have. Friedman's case studies (1999) of five family firms describe three dimensions of sibling relationships that are important to the intergenerational transition process: Bonding versus rivalry; autonomy versus dependency; and leadership versus paralysis. Friedman (1999) suggests that one way to manage the rivalry is to work with siblings as unique individuals with special talents and interests. In this way, they move from being stereotyped to being unique through a process of individuation. Moving from resentment to fairness is another important goal that can be accomplished by developing mutual empathy between siblings.

Imagining reversed roles and discussing what has led to feelings of injustice is two ways in which feelings of resentment can be reduced. Moving from dependency to autonomy requires replacing old ways of handling conflict, which often involve relying on parents. Thinking about how sibling relationships might have been different if their parents allowed them to resolve conflict on their own can be an effective part of the process. Friedman (1999) found that leadership is most effective when siblings are able to take charge, and are not paralyzed by their ties to their parents. Families do differ from other groups of people (Alvarez and opez-Sintas, 2002). A family business is made up of both family and business; still the meaning of family is not adequately dealt with in the family business literature (Dunn, 1996; Dyck, 2012; Rogoff & Heck, 2003; Dyer Jr., 2006; Litz et al., 2011). This neglect of the family dimension is strange given that researching a family business inherently also means researching a family (Handler, 1989). The current status of the family business field shows a narrowing focus on questions regarding the effects of family on business outcomes and a growing disregard of the effects of

business on family outcomes (James, Jennings and Breitkreuz, 2012). Thus, although "family effects" on performance has been measured (e.g. Dyer, 2006) we know much less about any "business effects" on the family. To broaden my understanding of the family concept we try to tap into the knowledge in other disciplines. Family science offers a broad range of family theories of which systems theory, structural functionalism and symbolic interactionism are among the most enduring and commonly used (James et al., 2012).

In sociology, family is one of the main social institutions of interest. A family is a group of persons directly linked by kin connections where the adult members assume responsibility for caring for children (Giddens, 1993). Two adults living together in a household with their children is commonly known as the nuclear family, whereas an extended family is defined as a group of three or more generations living together within the same dwelling or in close proximity to each other (Giddens, 1993). The arrangement of family business may in many cases resemble the extended family although the family members share the workplace rather than the household. From a legal perspective the following is a useful definition of family: "A family is constituted by husband and wife, or cohabitees, and their descendants, including adopted or stepchildren and officially recognized foster children" (Sund, Runhede and Haag, 2010).

Within psychology, three basic family characteristics are acknowledged (Copeland & White, 1991):

(1) A family has a shared history that goes back several generations and involves ethnic and religious values. When a family is studied each member has expectations of the others based on extensive prior experiences.

(2) A family also has a shared future. For better and for worse, family members are pretty much stuck with each other, this must be acknowledged since it influences their behaviour. This complicates family business where if a family member quits the business they do not "quit" the family.

(3) Some of the family members even share biology. Even though the inheritance of traits is uncertain the potential for biological bias is greater in families than in other kinds of groups.

Furthermore, families have a built-in power hierarchy that may or may not fit with the hierarchy of an organization. For this research topic it has a large impact because the family and the business are intertwined and roles are supposed to change through succession.

Family members are interdependent on each other and have their own role and place in the hierarchy. The system is self-preserving through stabilizing feedback loops, and it adapts through

interaction within and between the system and its environment. This systems approach has developed treatments of psychological problems in contrast to the traditional methods based on the individual (Yong, David, Neil and Keith 2011). For this author, this stresses the importance of understanding the new external CEO as a part of the family system, the family as part of the family business, and the business as part of its environment. Although we disagree with a systemic divide between individual and group, as well as system and environment, and instead see them as inherent parts of each other, it stresses the importance of understanding succession in context. The successor and the predecessor constitute an interesting succession component. Who to count as a member of the family is quite a delicate matter, however. People that marry into the family become family members but how far should one extend the "extended family"? In family businesses some employees are treated as if they were family members and members of their family might have been employed at the company for several generations (Yong, David, Neil and Keith 2011).

For the study of family business, where family life and business life are inseparable, it is appropriate to understand socialization because it is a process whereby the helpless infant gradually becomes a self-aware, knowledgeable person, skilled in the ways of the culture into which she or he is born" (Giddens, 1993). The individual is not born a member of society; she/he becomes a member of society through socialization (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). It begins with the individual "taking over" the world in which others already live, Berger and Luckmann (1966) explain. These others are the family members with whom the child interacts. The "taking over" is a creative process where we not only live in the same world but also participate in each other's being. Socialization connects different generations to one another. A child alters the lives of its parents so that they also undergo new learning experiences. Adults remain parents also after they become grandparents and the learning and adjustment go on throughout the whole life-cycle. If the family is intertwined with a business, the business is part of socialization as well.

The family is the main socializing agency of the child during infancy. But at later stages of an individual's life many other socializing agencies come into play" (Giddens, 1993). The difference is primary and secondary socialization:

> Primary socialization is the first socialization an individual undergoes in childhood, through which he becomes a member of society. Secondary socialization is any subsequent process that includes an already socialized individual into new sectors of the objective world of his society. (Berger & Luckmann, 1966: 150)

In the life of business families, both primary and secondary socialization includes dimensions of the family business. Secondary socialization is, simply put, the acquisition of role-specific knowledge where the roles are rooted in division of labour ((Yong, David, Neil and Keith 2011).
This makes family businesses special because the division between primary and secondary socialization is blurred. We have found very few pieces of research where socialization is used to understand family business succession.

Iannarelli (1992) in her dissertation explores the socialization of leaders in family business from a gender perspective. Her findings show that family firms offer a unique setting where family and business socialization coincide and constitute lifelong learning processes. Learning the business culture and values starts in early childhood. None of the thirty children in Iannarelli's study had any planned type of training but learned the trade by "just being around". Different expectations were however placed on the children depending on their sex. Sons generally go to spend more time at the business and thereby developing their natural abilities and as such were seen as leadership material while daughters were expected to take on more domestic chores and prepare for family life (Iannarelli, 1992).

Garcia-Alvarez, Lopez-Sintas and Saldana Gonzalvo (2002) translate the two phases of primary and secondary socialization to the family business context as "family socialization" and "business socialization". They conclude that the outcome of succession can be understood from how well the primary/family and secondary/business socialization of the successor matches. One could however question how much the two can (and should) be separated regarding families in business. Hall (2003) applies and develops socialization in the context of family business although her interest is primarily on strategic renewal and not succession. She elaborates on the dual need of both belonging to and separating oneself from one's family. In the family business context this extends to the business as a means to create your own thing within the business (separation) but at the same time the business is an extension of the family and its core values (belonging).

Westhead (2002) draws on team literature to describe a business family as a special type of team. A business family team is effective when its members share values and norms, have clear role and procedures, and are able to resolve conflicts (Westhead, 2002)). Unlike families in general a business family is considered to be a team when members share the goal of running a business together. In a recent publication, Farrington Venter and Boshoff (2011) study sibling teams in business and interestingly find that role clarity and competence is not as important as previously

assumed. They conclude that family teams differ from other teams, which is why established theories in team literature should be used with care.

Viewing a family business as a hybrid of family and business implies handling of family matters in the business arena as well as dealing with business matters in the family arena. The fact that from birth to death we are involved in interaction with others certainly conditions our personalities, the values we hold, and the behaviour in which we engage. Yet socialization is also at the origin of our very individuality and freedom. In the course of socialization each of us develops a sense of self identity and the capacity for independent thoughts and action (Giddens, 1993). Hence, socialization in one's family means learning the doing of business the "family way" as well as creating one's own individual way from it. This knowledge is not just gained, however, but is constantly used; it is present in each moment of everyday practice. Based on our socialization we make sense of our lives even if we cannot spell out exactly what that involves. It constitutes our background coping skills on which we unconsciously draw to deal with novel situations (Chia, 2004). Through socialization we also develop strong emotional attachments to our family business, and thereby making a family a special group of people.

In sum, this part has addressed how in business families new generations are learning about the family business, through socialization, from the day they are born. This permits new ways of viewing when succession begins and how successors are trained.

2.1.10 Succession Planning as a Process:

Fen's (2010) study of executive succession indicates that succession can be viewed as a process with specific pre-arrival and post-arrival phases. The study adds that it is possible to identify the characteristic problems occurring at various stages in the process. Furthermore, Davis (2012) indicates the importance of personal skills, family, and organizational development in ensuring that family firm progresses from an early stage to a later stage in its growth.

Churchill et al (2009) have developed a life cycle approach to describe the succession process between father and son in a family firm.

They distinguish four stages:

i. A stage of owner-management; where the owner is the only member of the family directly involved in the business.

ii. A trainingand development stage, where the offspring learns the business.

iii. A partnership stage; this is between father and son.

iv. A power transfer stag; where responsibilities shift to the successor.

Yong (2010) broke down the succession process into seven stages, three of which take place before the successor actually enters the business as a full-time employee. This third stage typically ends by age 24 and is followed by four stages of more intensive involvement in the business.

The stages are as follow:

i. The pre-business stage; where the successor may be only passively aware of some facets of the organization.

ii. The introductory stage; where the successor may be exposed by family members to jargon and organization members, although he or she has not worked even on a part-time basis in the business.

iii. The introductory-functional stage; where the successor works as a part-time employee.

iv. The functional stage; where the successor enters the organization as a full-time member.

v. The advanced functional stage; where the successor assumes managerial responsibilities.

vi. The early succession stage; where the successor assumes the presidency.

vii. The mature succession stage; where the successor becomes the "de facto leader" of the organization.

Another way to understand the succession process is to conceive of it in terms of role transition theory. Sharma (2011) defines a role as a psychological process based upon the role-player's construction of aspects of the construction systems of those with whom he attempts to join in a social enterprise or in idiomatic language, a role is a position that one can play on a certain team without even waiting for the signals. Thus, one can conceptualize each phase of the succession process as being associated with particular role behaviour on the part of the founder or next-generation family member, and the transition from one phase to another as a transition in role behaviour. Role behaviour is being used here in the Kuratko et al (2004) sense, and it refers to the recurring actions of an individual, appropriately interrelated with the repetitive activities of others so as to yield a predictable outcome.

Since family firms represent the overlap of various systems (Churchill et al 2009), it is possible to conceptualize the founder's or next-generation family member's role-set as a subset of this overlap. Role-set is defined as the system or stable collective pattern in which people play their parts (Kuratko et al 2004). In other words, one person in the system construes the construction processes of another; he may play a role in a social process involving the other person. This is

Kelly's sociality corollary to his psychology of personal constructs. Kelly (2009) explains in more detail: If we can predict accurately what others will do, we can adjust ourselves to their behaviour. If others know how to tell what we will do, they can adjust themselves to our behaviour and may give us the right of way. This mutual adjustment to each other's viewpoint takes place, in the terms of the theory of personal constructs, because, to some extent, our construction subsumes the construction systems of others, and theirs, in part subsumes ours. Understanding does not have to be a one-way proposition; it can be mutual.

According to Handler (1999), succession represents a mutual role adjustment process between the founder and next-generation family members. Handler’s interviews with thirty-two next-generation family members revealed a multiple stage process by which the predecessor decreased his or her involvement in the firm over time. This role adjustment process typically influences, while lagging behind, the parallel process of the next-generation family member(s), who move through phases of increasing involvement. The lag (the fact that it takes the predecessor longer to move into his roles than the heir) means that the founder or owner may hold onto a former role while the next-generation family member moves into a new role.

All the literature related to family business succession is said to stress succession planning as vital to the succession process (Sharma, et al 2011). Such strong statements signal the perceived view of the importance of planning. The best way to secure a smooth succession is to conduct a strong succession plan (Whetten, 2011). The succession planning process commonly consists of:

(1) Selecting and training a successor,

(2) Developing a vision or strategic plan for the company after succession,

(3) Defining the role of the departing incumbent and

(4) Communicating the decision to key stakeholders (Sharma et al., 2003).

In their thorough review of thirty years of family business research, Miller et al (2005) found succession planning amongst the most vital topics. They however question the tendency of scholars to focus on specific parts of the succession “elephant” instead of approaching the problem holistically. Business-owning families need to be made aware of how time consuming succession planning really is so that preparations are not postponed until it is too late (Dunn, 1996). Thus, most succession literature starts from the idea that succession should be planned for and continues on how that should be done. An important part of preparations and planning is to secure that the unique features of family business, the “familiness” (Habbershon and Williams,

1999) are passed on to the next generation. Those qualities are often the base of a business's competitive advantage. These skills are found to be partly possessed by within-family successors from socialization and experience gained from lower-level positions during their upbringing (Filbeck and Lee, 2010).

Level of preparedness has been found to positively influence the next generation's performance (Sharma et al 2011). The transfer of tacit embedded knowledge to the next generation is identified as a major concern. To prepare successors, Walter, Chung and Yeun (2008) suggest that successors should be included in strategic planning processes of the management team where they can learn both process and content related aspects of strategy work. Experience from working for the family business prior to occupying a managerial position is a success factor but at the same time findings point to the importance of outside work experience for family members (Le Breton-Miller et al., 2004). Perhaps this means that family successors are in need of general business experience while non-family successors need family (business) specific experience. This raises important questions on the skills required by family business managers; formal versus experiential, managerial versus cultural? We know little of the balance between these qualities in practitioners (Whittington, 2003).

Many family business consultants and researchers advised on how to avoid succession problems. One example is Driscoll's (2011) "Ten ways your succession plan can go wrong". The ten points of advice are all sound but our main concern is the overall basic assumption that there is (or should be) a plan to begin with. Studies that investigate if any succession planning is carried out in fact find rather low evidence of such, especially in small businesses (Boccato, Gispert, and Rialp 2010). The general lack of planning for succession should not be mistaken for signs of ignorance but instead shows the complexity of the matter according to Sharma et al (2009). We seem to know a lot about how succession should be planned but in practice lack of planning is prevalent. How well the succession was prepared in terms of issues like successor training and transferring of tacit knowledge will certainly have a large impact on the family business as well as the family. The importance of planning is preached by most scholars interested in family business succession, but the question is, how can that be fruitfully accomplished? A very few researches are available. According to Barnes et al (2009),many entrepreneurs view their business ventures as extensions of themselves, encompassing the vision and passions they have in both their personal and professional lives. For the most part, they welcome their children into the business based on trust and a belief that they have or will develop the same level of passion

as they themselves have. They believe the business will automatically transfer to their children when they are unable to carry on and so feel that planning this transition is not required. Perhaps it is the fear of facing the moment when they are unable or unfit to carry on.

Sadly, few family businesses are able to survive past the first generation and, of these, more fewer are successfully passed on to the second and third generations – often due to ineffective succession planning. In essence, by following an effective succession plan, the entrepreneur will protect the company's culture and enable the implementation of a long-term business strategy that will smooth the transition phase that is required to pass control to the next generation (Westhead, 2002).

2.1.11 Non-family Member Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) in Family Businesses

Here, we are going to present Family Chief Executive Officers versus Non-Family Chief Executive Officers arguments in two perspectives according to some scholars; the one that prefer the use of outside CEOs to family CEOs, and the one that prefers the use of family-CEOs to outside-CEOs in the management of family business.

Proponents of internal succession (family CEOs) stress that the family CEOs have greater knowledge of the firm and the established social networks which will enhance the business continuity across generations (Yong, 2010). Internal CEOs provide a smooth transition and stability because they are well acquainted and have anticipated in developing the existing corporate strategy (Ting, 2009). Internal successions also promote loyalty and reputation, thus, the family CEO has a strong incentive to ensure a firm's profitability (Davis et al, 2012). Dollinger et al. (2000), claim that family-owned and managed firms achieve higher performance than professionally managed family businesses in Malaysia. They found in their study that Owner-managed companies achieve 75% higher profit than outside-CEOs managed companies. A study in the US by Anderson (2013) evidenced that family companies have a higher survival rate when family members serve as the CEO than outside CEOs.

Villalonga et al (2006) conducted a study on the survival rate of family companies and non-family companies across generations in the US. The findings show that family business survives succession transference only when the founder serves as the CEO. The study concluded that family companies that intend to keep the business for future generations perform better than non-family companies. Breton-Miller (2006), in his study concluded that family CEO plays an important role in governing family companies and therefore, family members must serve as

managers to enhance continuity across generations. Based on accounting performance measures, Anderson et al (2013) results indicate that family companies perform better when the founder is the CEO. Founder-CEOs value control over their succession more than non-founders because founder-CEOs want to leave their companies in good shape.

In contrast, some scholars argue, through empirical evidence that companies managed by outside-CEOs survive ownership transference than the founders. Lauterbach et al (2009) distinguish between companies that are managed by their owners and companies being led by outside-CEOs. Their analyses demonstrated that companies managed by their family CEOs fail ownership transference than those run by outside-CEOs. Therefore, the study concluded that family businesses need to be professionalised because of lack of adequate management skills that may be present in the family and the difficult task of preparing a successor. The study added that outside-CEOs possess expert knowledge that is valuable in the mentoring of future-generation leaders needed to fill leadership roles. Also, a study in India by Johl et al. (2010) show that companies led by family CEOs do not add value to firm performance.

A study in Taiwan by Lee (2006) shows that family companies require high managerial skill and that using an outside-CEO can help increases the firm performance and transference, especially if the family has a low cash-flow and weak control. Outside-CEOs are generally prescribed as a remedy for company difficulties (Fenn, 2012). When drastic changes are required, external managers appear to be more promising because he/she is not bound by old policies and implicit contracts of the firm. Christina (2013) emphasizes that an external succession is the most effective cure for internal inefficiency because a new manager brought from outside is more likely to conceive and implement fresh initiatives. In the same spirit, Wee (2013) argue that when an organization performs poorly and needs a “change agent”, an external succession becomes more likely.

Dyer (2005) studied “paternalistic” management culture and style as compared to “professional” style of management. He said Paternalistic management is characterized by hierarchical relationships, top management control of power and authority, close supervision, and distrust of outsiders. Professional management involves the inclusion, and sometimes the predominance, of non-family managers in the firm. McConaughy et al (1999) studied large publicly owned founding-family-controlled companies and concluded that (a) descendent-controlled firms were more professionally run than founder-controlled firms; (b) first-generation family managers are entrepreneurs with the special technical or business backgrounds necessary for the creation of the

business, but the descendents of the founder face different challenges, to maintain and enhance the business, and these tasks may be better performed in a more professional manner, often by non-family members. Both Dyer (2005) and McConaughy et al (1999) found an earlier basis in Schein (1983), who also suggested more professional forms of management with the inclusion of non-family managers.

Besides, many family business researchers have found that management style in younger, first-generation family firms tends to be more informal and subjective. In more mature second and third-generation family firms, management style becomes more formal and objective (Coleman et al 1999; Dyer 2005; Lee 2000; McLeod, 2001). Team management involves parents, children and siblings in the firm all having equality and participative involvement in important decision-making, even if one family member is still the nominal leader of the business. Aronoff (2003) furthermore reported that 42 percent of family businesses are considering professional management for the next generation.

In Malaysian scenario for instance (Wee, 2013), it is challenging to get a potential successor who is capable in managing the family company. Some family companies train their sons or grandsons to be the successors. However, failure occurs when the successors are incapable of handling the tasks. Therefore, sometimes family companies usually include professional management (non-family managers) based on merit rather than family ties. This is to ensure the family companies survival. For example, Public Bank Bhd. is controlled by Teh Sri Hong Piow and it is professionally managed by him and his managers. Although Public Bank Bhd was founded by Teh none of his children hold significant positions in the bank.

Based on the above literatures, we can say that there are mixed findings on the role of family CEOs and outside-CEOs. Thus, based on this conceptual issues discussed above, this study will find out whether family CEO or outside-CEO is better-off in enhancing the firm continuity across generations.

2.1.12 Family Elders' Forum in Family Businesses

The family council is the board of directors for the family circle (Poza, 2009). It can be an all-inclusive, self-appointed, or elected workgroup of family members, whose main tasks are to make decisions about the business of the family and to educate families about the enterprise (Lansberg, 1999; Dickstein, 2003; Jaffe, 2005; Goldbart, 2009). Gersick et al, (1997).define the family council as a group who periodically come together to discuss issues arising from their

family's involvement with a business. The fundamental purpose of a family council is to provide a forum in which family members can articulate their values, needs, and expectations vis-a-vis the company and develop policies that safeguard the long-term interests of the family.

Like boards of directors, family councils have been very widely advocated by family business advisors for decades (Lansberg, 2007, 1999, 2007; Herz-Brown, 1993; Aronoff and Ward, 1996; Gersick et al., 1997; Jaffe et al., 1998; Jaffe, 2005; De-Visscher, reported in Cruz, 2008; Poza, 2008, 2009; Parada et al., 2010).

Lansberg (2007), Moore and Juenemann, (2008) advocated the functions of the family council to include:

- forging family consensus, and counteracting declining family bonds and low identification with the firm, as families grow and spontaneous social contacts among family members decrease (Kets de Vries, 1993; Mustakallio et al., 2002);
- articulating a family strategy for business and wealth management (Goldbart and Di Furia, 2009), including planning, rule setting, and collaborative asset allocation, which are 'not natural activities for families' (Dickstein, 2003);
- limiting family conflicts that could negatively affect the business (Benson et al., 1990; McManus, 1990); supporting succession planning (Handler, 1994; Leon-Guerrero et al., 1998; Lansberg, 2007), particularly in facilitating the family's exploration of their collective dream of continuity (Lansberg, 1997), and in conveying a policy-driven, stewardship culture and enthusiasm for the business (Aronoff and Ward, 1996);
- educating and welcoming younger generations (Lansberg, 2007; Poza, 2009), as 'a forum for lifelong learning' (Aronoff and Ward, 1996: 282).

Many articles include case stories. For example, Lamp presented the case of the first six years of the Eddy Family Council. The Eddy Family framed the role of the Family Council as the caretaker of 'investors' relations'. They believe the family council has 'clearly strengthened the business and the family. The author concludes that the critical conditions for the family council to accomplish its tasks are education and socialization of new family council members, and an independent budget for funding its activities. Daugherty (2009) illustrates a case of a family council that led a transition in both the management and ownership of a family firm. This case portrays the governance functions of the council, fostering and enhancing ties among family members, allowing it to frame the policies of restructuring and redesign.

Other Family Council Arms

1. Family assemblies: Family assemblies are the periodic (typically annual) gathering of an extended family. These events often include formal meetings where information is shared about investments and operating companies, speakers and facilitated discussions, and other recreational activities that are common in family reunions. Ward argues that 'the best practice that is most important to long-term family business growth is the process of holding family meetings (Lansberg, 1997). Other advisors suggest that family meetings can help families achieve consensus regarding family mission, family values, and the reason for the sustainability of the family business over generations (Vilaseca, 2002; Jaffe and Lane, 2004; Montemerlo, 2005; Gimeno et al., 2006). Family Assemblies are often recommended as particularly useful in large family groups with broad geographic dispersal, highly diffused ownership, and a desire to sustain economic interdependence through subsequent cousin generations.

It is a reasonable hypothesis that shared experiences with the extended family will facilitate governance implementation: selection of directors, trustee-beneficiary relationships, capital retention, and broad support for investment and distribution policies.

2. Family constitutions, protocols, and mission statements: Many advisors work with families on creating mission statements or family constitutions and protocols, beyond the shareholder agreements that govern ownership (Lamp, 2007). The recent increase in interest in family constitutions may be in response to the maturation of a large cohort of entrepreneurial post-World War II nuclear families through sibling and multi-generational partnerships to complex, geographically-dispersed family networks (Gersick, 2002). In addition, popular culture presents young adults in these extended families with an unlimited array of alternative value systems and lifestyles. Senior generation leaders who are concerned about the continuity of the enterprise in this 'competitive market' for the family's attention, may use a constitution to articulate their values and culture, to formalize the 'rules of engagement', and to emphasize the obligations and requirements for participation in the benefits of future ownership.

Family constitutions have been seen as a nice-to-have accessory in the USA, and more of a first-choice governance option in Latin America and parts of Europe. Brenes et al. (2011) found them to be very popular in concept in Latin America, although often not implemented or adhered to. In the USA, they received a flurry of attention after Covey identified mission statements as a habit of successful individuals and families (Covey, 1989; McClain, 2006). So far the literature on

family mission statements and constitutions is primarily descriptive; the value is seen as self-evident by the professionals who advocate them (for example, Hauser, 2003; Coombes and Wong, 2004). Some case studies conclude a benefit of formal statements (Lewine, 2006). Other authors discuss the value of protocols to promote particular outcomes, such as 'fair process' (Van der Heyden et al., 2005; Blonde) et al, 2001), or the avoidance of later problems such as 'reputation exposure, wealth entropy, family division and legal costs' (Griffiths, 2011).

2.1.13 Mentoring

The concept, mentor, is usually considered to derive from Greek mythology (Brow, 2010). Roberts et al (2004) consider the work of other mentoring theorists and cites his own contribution to mentoring theory in two ways. Firstly, he cites his work on the requirements of the mentor role, which is viewed as involving empowering, and providing friendship to the mentee. Secondly, he argues that mentoring is a teaching and learning process.

Mentoring was first utilised as a term in the late nineteen sixties in America cites by Ralf who, at that time, viewed the mentor as an ambiguous authority figure. Wider debates on mentoring pondered its pros and cons. From this point, there were various new discussions of mentoring in the late nineteen seventies and early eighties as its use became more widespread (Robert et al 2004). According to Onyeizugbe and Ibe (2013), mentoring programmes are designed to motivate potentials entrepreneurs, raise awareness of entrepreneurship generally and, help promote entrepreneurial learning.

i) Mentoring and Teaching

Since mentoring is a relationship that its purpose is to encourage learning and change, and teaching focuses on learning, then they have something in common. Troy and Dawn (2001) consider teaching as it affects what teachers actually do in the classroom. He suggested that teaching is about proving, demonstrating and instructing with a purpose and cannot exist independently of learning. Although, mentoring is not teaching, it uses a teaching approach as and when appropriate. In the view of Floren (2008), teaching is an activity which involves questioning and telling. They argue that teaching must have a point or purpose with a clear aim and intention. To Floren (2008), the learning involved in teaching, can involve either one–to–one or group activity which can occur over an extended long period of time.

In addition, Floren (2008) sees the aim and end achievements of learning as being new 'states of the person'. Here, we argue that this would be acknowledged as involving a life change. Of

course, this idea that learning brings about a change is shared by mentoring. Although teaching does have some common ground with mentoring, it also differs because mentoring is purely a one-to-one activity. In particular, the learning undertaken in mentoring can be of a generic or holistic in nature. On the other hand, teaching focuses upon learning that is very specific. For example, learning related to the National Curriculum or learning how to drive John and Veronica (2013).

ii) Mentoring and Counselling

Mentoring is often confused with counselling and some professionals view them as the same thing. However, Megranahan (1989, pp. 2) sees counselling as:

> A framework within which different helping strategies are appropriate for different people at different times. The ability to identify what is needed, when and why are integral to the process of counselling. Megranahan (1989, p. 2).

Megranahan (1989) argues that counselling is a process which helps the person work through types of issues, understand them better, identify feelings and ways of responding and see how these are relevant to the problem. In addition, it involves seeing things from the others' point of view through active listening and developing mechanisms for self-reliance. It requires skills such as communication, trust, openness, acceptance, empathy, genuineness, respect and a non-judgemental attitude in a one-to-one setting. Counselling activity is intended to help develop the clients' problem-solving and decision-making skills.

However, its aim is to help the client gain greater understanding of self. Therefore, the counsellor is not directive. Mentoring as a helping strategy, shares with counselling the aim of enabling the other to make appropriate change(s). Megranaham (1989) suggests that counselling does not impose solutions, opinions, values or judgements. It does not minimise, negate or question the worth of what the person wishes to discuss. However, counselling's sympathetic approach is not always required in mentoring. Mentoring differs because it can challenge the mentee, and indeed the mentor, if this is required by the relationship. Mentoring is in part based on the idea that learning is more likely as a result of questioning.

iii) Mentoring and Coaching

Like coaching, mentoring is an activity involving discussion. Boccato, Gispert and Rialp (2010) define coaching as a process that aims to bring out the best in people. Their view is that coaching

involves a discussion to gain commitment to take action leading to a result or 'goal'. They prefer to describe it as a three-stage activity involving demonstration, practice and progress assessment. The coach's task is to plan, do, finish and review on a one-on-one, or group, basis. The role of coach is to instruct and the skills they use involve active listening, questioning, giving praise, building rapport and trust, being non-judgmental, giving encouragement, support and focusing on the possible opportunities. In addition, the coach gives feedback through self-reflection. Coaching is similar to mentoring, but differs because it is not directive in approach. Interestingly, Kalinauckas and King (1994, p. 10) have this view on mentoring:

> Mentoring has been defined as providing individuals with the opportunity, through regular discussion, to look objectively at their performance and future development. Mentors should also be able to share broad awareness of their organisation's business and their professional opportunities (Kalinauckas and King, 1994, p. 10).

Unsurprisingly, Kalinauckas et al (1994) have a view of the mentoring relationship in a formalized programme, as opposed to unformalised, programme. They see it as involving a supporting from a more experienced manager to a junior member of staff from an alternative area of the organisation. In addition, in their view, mentoring is often confused with coaching. Although we agree with their statement, we think that their sense of mentoring is restrictive. They conclude by suggesting that mentoring will ensure that the methods, systems, processes and practices used do not necessarily encourage change, development or growth (Kalinauckas and King 1994). In our view, this indicates a narrow approach and a lack of practical experience of mentoring.

iv) Mentoring and Tutoring

John (1983) sees the tutor as a guide helping to overcome the potential blocks to learning. He lists six components of guidance (Miller 1982, pp. 44):

i. its aims
ii. stages of intervention
iii. the tutors' task
iv. values held
v. skills required
vi. the context

In addition to viewing the tutor as a guide, Miller (2005) includes counselling within the role. He views the guidance role of the tutor as multifaceted. Miller seems to be confusing tutors with mentors, although the roles are distinctly different, even if similar skills may be required.

The roles differ because tutoring is usually a group activity, while mentoring involves a one to one relationship. In addition, mentoring does not usually impose values.

2.1.14 The Mentee

The term 'mentee' is traditionally used in the UK, while in other countries, such as the USA, the term used is protégé. Our view is that, as the purpose of the relationship is learning, the term learning mentee might be more appropriate to the activity of mentoring undertaken by learning mentors (Lorna (2011). He initially describes the mentee as a protégé, but in his more recent work with Wray (2013) he uses the term learner. However, he makes no reference at all to the role or participation of the mentee in the mentoring relationship.

Mathews (2009) introduces the term mentoree to mentoring, describing it as a process whereby mentor and mentee work together to discover and develop the mentoree's latent talents. He argues that the goal of mentoring is not a particular position in the company. Rather it is empowerment of the mentoree by developing his or her ability. In the view of Lorna (2011), mentors are 'helpers'. Importantly, he points out that sound mentoring respects the uniqueness of the mentoree and strives to enhance the special strengths of that person. He goes on to argue that the mentoree's desire to 'do it my way' is critical to a mentoree's sense of self, for it respects that person's specialness. Doing something the mentor's way may lessen mentoree involvement, reducing their sense of responsibility. Indeed, these helpers have their own personal style, which may vary from person to person. Here, there is more focus on the mentee's role and their personal development than in the work considered to date.

Hamilton (1993) argues that mentors use some of the skills of the manager to develop the person (learner) they are helping. He provides perhaps the most explicitly focus upon the mentee, suggesting a range of questions that mentees may find helpful in choosing their mentor and assessing their mentoring relationship as follows (Hamilton, 1993, p. 41):

Is having a mentor a sign of weakness?

Does this mean that they don't really trust me as a responsible person?

Can I trust my mentor?

How much is it safe to reveal?

Will what I say get back to my boss or in some other way damage my prospects?

Do I have the time, or will it undermine my work effort?
How will my boss react – is s/he really in favour of this?
Interestingly, Hamilton observes that it is not the mentor's role to turn the learner into a 'clone', cast in their own image. More importantly, mentors, by their behaviour, provide a standard against which sound judgments can be made. Hamilton (1993) argues that what mentors do is ten times more powerful than what they say.

2.1.15 Mentoring as a Relationship:

It is pertinent to consider the work undertaken by some researchers on mentoring as a relationship, then look at the phases of mentoring relationships, compare the modes of formal and informal mentoring and, finally, consider the issue of transitional mentoring.

Brawn et al (1999) work on mentoring relationships provided the field with some initial insights into the mentoring relationships' processes. He developed a model at a time when mentoring was newly emerging in America and his book was instrumental in generating wide interest in mentoring activities. Indeed, his focus is directly on mentoring as a relationship. They argue that mentor relationship is one of the most complex, and developmentally important, a man can have in early adulthood. They said no word currently in use is adequate to convey the nature of the relationship we have in mind here. He concludes that words such as counsellor or guru suggest more subtle meanings, but they have other connotations that would be misleading (Brawn et al 1999).

Brawn et al (1999) researched on mentoring relationships is focused on employment. However, they suggest the role may also be undertaken by a teacher, boss, editor or senior colleague. They describe formal mentoring here and go on to suggest that mentoring may also be informal, when the mentor is a friend, neighbour or relative. Interestingly, thay emphasize a particularly important point. They said mentoring is defined not in terms of formal roles but in terms of the character of the relationship and the function it serves. According to them, a student may receive very little mentoring from his teacher-adviser, and very important mentoring from an older friend or relative. We have to examine a relationship closely to discover the amount and kind of mentoring it provides.

The National Mentoring Network (NMN) Development Group (2004) wanted to develop a model which identifies the characteristics of a successful mentoring relationship to ensure mentors and mentees be better equipped to undertake successful mentoring. They stress two propositions:

> (1) all one–to–one developmental relationships are based on a set of dimensions and successful relationships are characterised by a particular configuration of these dimensions which is appropriate to the purpose of the relationship; and (2) whatever the configuration of these dimensions, high levels of emotional intelligence are needed in the mentor and the development of the emotional intelligence of the mentee is central to success.” (NMN Newsletter No.20.Feb.2004, p. 6)

Unfortunately, this doesn’t get us very far, especially as the model did not emerge from the working group. In particular, the first proposition is bland and tells us nothing about the ‘particular configuration of these dimensions’ in different types of mentoring. In contrast, the second proposition is more interesting, but may be erroneous. It is fruitful to see mentoring as a relationship. Here, as stated above, we begin with the work of Megginson and Clutterbuck (1995); Clutterbuck and Ragins 2002; and Clutterbuck et al., 2004) who are particularly associated with the focus on mentoring as a relationship. Subsequently, we examine two issues that have received considerable attention in the mentoring literature which sees mentoring as a relationship, the identification of various phases in the process of mentoring and the distinction between formal and informal mentoring. Clutterbuck (1995) refers to mentoring as a relationship which involves learning by the mentee from the mentor. In our view, a contemporary mentor should be a trusted adviser who acts as a teacher, tutor, coach, counsellor and friend within a one-to-one mentoring relationship (Gardiner, 1996). As such, mentoring involves a one-to-one relationship that encourages learning and change for both the mentor and the mentee in their relationship of mutual trust and respect (Clutterbuck et al 2002).

A mentor has responsibility to befriend a mentee and to develop rapport and trust with him/her. Consequently, mentoring creates a particular personal relationship within a general framework for developing people. Indeed, Hamilton (1993) views the mentor as a ‘non-judgmental friend’. In contrast, a mentee is a person who requests expertise, help and support from a willing individual who prepared to take up the chameleon-like mantel of a mentor, which may or may not require her/him to undertake prior training. At the same time, there is no shared common understanding of the purpose and process of mentoring. The actual mentoring relationship process is difficult to explain because each mentoring partnership creates a different set of ideas drawn from its individual participants’ lived experience and consequent understandings. As such, it is not easy to develop a model of mentoring which fits with the various lived experiences of different mentors and mentees.

Despite this, perhaps the key overall point is that, together, the mentor and mentee develop trust and understanding as their relationship grows. Consequently, as we will emphasis below, we see professional friendship at the core of successful mentoring relationships. This is a term used by both Clutterbuck (1991) and Miller (2005), although they do not develop, or fully explain the term.

Mentoring Relationship Phases:

Mentoring relationship, once initiated, undergoes a number of phases (Gray and Gray 1985; Miller 2005). On the basis of an empirical study of mentoring they found that a mentoring relationship has the potential to enhance the career development and psycho-social development of both individuals. Interestingly they see the psycho-social functions of the mentor to include role modelling, acceptance and confirmation, counselling and friendship in developing the protégé's competence, confidence and effectiveness (1985, 2002). In addition, Miller (2005) lists the career benefits as sponsorship, coaching, protection, exposure and visibility, and challenging work projects. The average duration of these relationships is five years and, generally, proceeds through four distinct and predictable phases:

The initiation phase; a period of time during which mentoring sessions are most frequent.

The cultivation phase; during which the friendship between the two strengthens as a high degree of trust and intimacy builds between the mentor and protégé.

The separation phase; which occurs between two to five years when the relationship becomes less important to the protégé as he/she gains greater autonomy.

The redefinition phase; when formal mentoring has finished and the relationship develops into a friendship in which the parties meet on an equal footing.

Miller's periodisation of the mentoring process (2005) is particularly interesting because he emphasises mutual learning as the process develops. He also argues that the relationship can pass through four levels:

1. The mentor acts as a directive teacher because the mentee is limited in experience and competence.
2. The mentor changes her/his approach to act as a guide for the mentee as he/his own expertise and experience grow.
3. The mentee grows further and the role of mentor becomes that of a facilitator and equal.

4. Both mentor and mentee are engaged in learning from each other.

Unsurprisingly, it is the initial phase of the relationship that has received most attention (Miller, 2005). At this stage, mentor and mentee will be matched as a result of either a formal context or an informal process. At this stage, ground rules for dealing with issues of confidentiality will be set. At the initial stage of a formal mentoring relationship, a contract will be drawn up between the mentor and the mentee and sometimes other parties such as the line manager of the mentor or the parent of the mentee depending on the mentoring context.

A contract of some type is important because it helps to set out the rules and boundaries for all the parties involved in mentoring. In addition, guidelines are helpful to show what is 'off-limits' in the relationship. The contract can be recorded in writing, agreed verbally or be tacit.

Of course, there are different types of mentoring contract. The purpose of the contract is both to make explicit a formal undertaking that is clearly understood by the parties and to encourage commitment to its obligations. However, as with any contract, problems can arise, if for example: (a) mentor and mentee do not share the same understanding of it; (b) the contract breaks down and the consequences are not understood (c) the contract has not taken account of confidentiality and (d) a risk assessment is not undertaken (2005).

A contract is a vital component for a successful mentoring relationship in a formalized mentoring programme. There are a number of potential barriers to mentoring relationships that can have a bearing on the contract Miller, 2005):

1. Lack of support. 2. Inflexibility. 3. Lack of interest. 4. Imposed relationship. 5. Imposed relationship values. 6. Lack of commitment. 7. Differing agendas. 8. Lack of empathy. 9. Lack of time. 10. Dependence. 11. Lack of trust. 12. Sexuality. 13. Language. 14. Stigma. 15. Stereotyping. 16. Judgmental attitude. 17. Lack of emotional stability. 18. Lack of goals/targets. 19. Conflict of interest. 20. Perceived lack of power/influence. 21. No network. 22. Body language. 23. Resources.

Gardiner et al (2000) suggest that the mentor and mentee should agree a contract which includes a commitment to: (a) respect each other's differences; (b) be supportive of, and listen to each other; (c) be open and honest; (d) challenge the issue, not the person; (e) respect institutional confidentiality; (f) encourage and build confidence;(g) be willing to learn from each other; (h) share knowledge and resources; (i) actively participate; (j) create a safe, friendly, happy environment; (k) give time to each other; and (k) allow each to finish. A contract may also

specify the number and length of mentoring sessions. However, at all stages of a mentoring relationship there is a need for a flexible and individual approach. During this period, progress is made towards the set goals. Nevertheless, the rapport-building phase is particularly important and essential to a healthy relationship. Failure to build rapport at this early stage will undoubtedly influence the conditions of the contract.

In the view of Gardiner et al (2000), the mentor's role at this point is to be closed to the mentee so as to help the relationship find a firm footing. The mentor should ask open questions, listen respectfully and show interest in the mentee by mirroring their positive body language.

The contract ends when the time comes to end the relationship, and Gardiner et al (2000) offer advice on how to do this by asking and suggesting:

1. Do you both feel you have largely met the set goals at this time?
2. Does the mentee feel he/she can tackle problems confidently without the intervention of the mentor?

Saying goodbye by:

1. Looking back together.
2. Looking forward together as individuals.
3. Sharing positive feedback.
4. Celebrating the success of each other.
5. Wishing each other well for the future.

2.2 Empirical Review of Related Literature

In order to assess the empirical and theoretical relevance of past studies to the proposed framework and to justify the lacuna that informed this entire study, several recent works of researchers in the field of family business were examined as shown below:

Reginald, Allison and Shanan (2012), a group of lecturers in American universities undertook a study to discover the strength of research done so far in the field of family-owned business. The researcher, through a survey, collected input from 80 family business scholars. The study discovered that insignificant progress has been made, and that there is a widespread conviction that there is much work to be done. The study recommends a greater use of family business science research, development of innovative measures, adoption of rich longitudinal methodologies, and inclusion of more diverse subjects and samples in solving the problem of family business.

Ritch, Andy, Keith, and Lumpin (2013), another group of lecturers in universities in the USA, carried out a study titled "The Landscape of Family Business Outcomes: Summary and Taxonomy of Dependent Variables." The aim of the study was to promote theoretical development in family business research. The study identified 325 dependent/outcome variables used in 257 empirical family business studies between 1998 and 2009. In the study, the researcher categorized outcome variables, developed a numerical taxonomy with 7 clusters (performance, strategy, succession, social and economic impact, governance, family business roles, and family dynamics) plotted along two-long dimensions (family-business and short-term/long-term), validated their research, and identified missing outcome variables that deserve more attention. The study concludes that family business role, family dynamics, and performance dominant family business research, and that succession and continuity deserve urgent attention.

Onyeizugbe and Chukwu (2013) carried out a study titled: "Business Mentoring and Entrepreneurship Development in Selected States in Nigeria." The objective of the study was to determine if there was a positive relationship between effective learning and entrepreneurship development in Nigeria. The study adopted the cross-sectional survey research design while a sample size of 131 was used. A structured questionnaire and personal interview were used to elicit responses from the respondents. Pearson Product Moment Correlation was applied in testing the formulated hypothesis. The study found that there is a significant positive relationship between effective learning and entrepreneurial development in Nigeria. Also, that one can acquire entrepreneurial skills through mentoring. However, the gap in this study is that it did not evaluate the relationship between succession planning and the sustainability of family businesses in Nigeria.

Mensah (2012) examined succession planning in small and medium enterprises in the Takoradi metropolis of Ghana. The objective of the study was to find out factors affecting succession planning in Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) in Takoradi Metropolis, and to suggest ways of enhancing succession planning in Small and Medium Enterprises in Takoradi. Descriptive survey was used for the study. Purposive sampling was used in selecting 125 SMEs for the study. A respondent each was required from the 125 SMEs. Convenience sampling was then used to sample the required number. Data was gathered through the use of questionnaire and analyzed using percentages and frequency tables. The major findings of the study are that lack of trust was one of the factors affecting succession planning in SMEs. This was because many SMEs do not

have clear objectives and policies of succession planning for the enterprise. The study found out that succession was not based on merit rather succession was based on the relationship with the founder of the business. The study reveals that good management practices and clear objectives of the SMEs in terms of who would take over or assume position when the owner or founder retires or dies could relate to succession planning. The study recommended that SMEs should train prospective successors for the enterprises. Again there should be succession laws to regulate the smooth transition to new administration. Finally the study recommends that successors for the business should be based on merit to ensure that right and qualified people manage the enterprise. In the view of this present researcher, the study under review did not take into account the role of owner-managers delayed retirement and family elders' forum in succession issues. Again, the study was done in far-away Ghana, therefore considering the cultural variation between Ghana and Nigeria which plays a great role in family business issues; it is pertinent to carry out such study in Nigeria.

Obadan et al (2013) evaluated succession planning in family business in Edo State, Nigeria**.** They believe thatthe rate of failure of family business in Nigeria economy is worrisome. The study examined the process of succession planning in family business in hotel industry in Benin City, Edo State. Two hotels were sampled. Questionnaires were used to elicit information from the chief executives and employees. Their findings show that most of the small business enterprises have no succession plan in place and the ability and competence of the successors are not considered in succession planning. The study recommends that small business enterprises should develop a formal plan for succession, communicate the identity of successor, provide basic business management education, and training/monitoring to the incumbent Chief Executive Officer (CEO) and all stakeholders to help him in planning succession and ensuring that owners are comfortable after disengagement. But disappointingly, this study did not test variables like work-for-life attitude of family business owner-manager, family elders' forum, and external CEOs influence's in family business sustainability. Again, it was only limited to just two hotels in the hospitality industry and thereby shut out other sectors. Therefore, this present researcher found this study inadequate. Therefore, this lacuna informed this present study.

Agbionu et al (2012) evaluated the relationship between mentorship and business performance of Igbo entrepreneurs in Nigeria. The study carried out this task by specifically using selected entrepreneurs in Awka metropolis. A survey design was adopted for the study and this involved the use of structured questionnaire in collecting data from a sample size of 300 respondents who

were selected based on purposive and sampling techniques. Karl Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was applied to analyze the data. They found that entrepreneurs in Eastern Nigeria do not receive adequate mentoring that is capable of impacting on performance significantly. The study recommends that entrepreneurs should mentor prospective entrepreneurs to enable them compete favourably in the global economy. It is clear from the topic that the study under review evaluated mentoring in relation to performance hence this present researcher is motivated to assess the relationship between mentoring and ownership transference in family business which they did not look into. Again, external CEOs, family elders' forum, and owner-manager retirement influence in family business where not also captured in their study.

Ogundele et al (2008) looked into entrepreneurial succession problems in Nigeria's family businesses and the threat it poses to its sustainability. Using secondary data, the study explored the issues involved in succession problems, the sources of the problems and how these have threatened theperpetuity principle in companies with respect to family businesses in Nigeria. The study found that the succession laws of Nigeria (which includes the native law and custom) and the multi-cultural nature of Nigeria creates a myriad of succession problems for family owned businesses in Nigeria. Based on its findings, the paper recommends to indigenous

Entrepreneurs in Nigeria, the crafting of a comprehensive, well thought-out, market-focused and people-centered entrepreneurial succession planning started early enough in the life of the business. The lacuna found in this study is that the variables which this current reviewer of this work wants to empirical evaluated were not captured in this study under review.

Saheed (2013) studied the awareness of family business owners and attitude towards intra-succession as means of business continuity, and how their awareness relate to their preparation for the ownership succession and the continuity of their business in Finland. To achieve the objectives, 17 owners were interviewed with different backgrounds, lines of business and generations of Family Business (FB) in Finland. The findings revealed that the awareness relates to succession preparation and the business continuity. However, in the view of this reviewer, the gap in this study is that it did not subject any succession planning variables like planned retirement, mentoring, External CEOs appointment to empirical review.

Joseph (2013) examined the impact of culture determinants such as age, extended family system, inheritance tradition (preference for sons, marriage, etc) and education (formal training and development) on family business succession with a focal point among small and medium

enterprises in Jos Metropolis, Plateau State. Using a cross-sectional survey, structured questionnaire schedule was administered to 372 SMEs in various sectors. Data from the questionnaire were analysed using summary statistics, binomial logistic regression analysis and Pearson correlation coefficient in establishing preliminary relationships among the study variables. The findings of the binomial logistics indicates that all the determinants of culture have significant impact on the successful succession of family businesses while the result of the Pearson correlation coefficient shows that extended family system followed by inheritance law has the highest magnitude effect on successful succession of family business. It recommended that founders of family businesses should put in place sound policies in business operation and succession plans to forestall any problem that may arise through cultural laws such as extended family system, inheritance law etc as only through this can a long-term functioning of the business operations can be ensured among others. The gaps this reviewer found in this study is that it did not specifically capture the roles of succession planning variables such as work-for-life attitude of family business owners, mentoring, appointment of non-family member CEOs, and family elders' forum in the sustainability of family businesses.

Deloitte (2012) in United States of America examined perspectives in family-owned business in relation to governance and succession planning. The survey captured governance and succession characteristics of mostly mid-sized, family-owned businesses among 222 owners and executives. Approximately, 70 per cent of respondents belonged to companies with revenues of $100 million or more, and 25 percent to companies with revenues of $500 million or more. More than a quarter (28 percent) of respondents from family-owned businesses indicated that they do not have a board of directors. Of the family businesses that have a formal board, only 39 percent are controlled by a majority of non-family CEOs, and non-executive members. Moreover, two-thirds of boards have fewer than 30 percent female membership and 28 percent have no female board members. The survey further reveals that succession planning is another area of governance where many businesses have not been proactive: Close to half (49 per cent) of respondents said that they only review succession plans when a change in management requires it. Similarly, 41 percent do not have leadership contingency plans. Moreover, 42 percent of non-executive family members are unfamiliar with succession plans. The study concludes that family-owned businesses are a huge component of the U.S. economy. Too, that their attention to good governance practices can have an impact on success and failure, and that creating stronger

governance and succession strategy, a family-owned business is much more likely to preserve the founder's long-term vision for generations to come. The major lacuna in this study is that it did not evaluate mentoring. Also, the study was not done in Nigeria.

Kurakto et al., (2004) presented one of the interesting theories of the family business. In the theory, environmental factors were grouped into family-member employees and non-family member employees on one hand, and internal and external on the other hand. The factors were seen as the only factors that affect succession in family business. Although this study has provided crucial factors which are the environmental factors, however, the framework seems to be limited and not comprehensive enough to address the crucial factors that really affect succession plan or process in family business.

Donald and Tage (2012) studied how to identify industry-specific barriers to inheritance in small family businesses. This research explores generic and industry-specific barriers to inheritance among family businesses within the tourism and hospitality industry. Data from comparable surveys of owners of tourism and hospitality businesses in Denmark and Canada reveal a very low rate of inheritance and a number of industry-specific barriers, which include remoteness and small-town settings result in out-migration by children who do not share their parents' lifestyle goal. Secondly, the nature of the work (long hours, high contact with customers, and hands-on labour) make the business unappealing. Thirdly, the viability of the business (seasonality of demand, taxes, or inseparability of business and family assets result in low potential for inheritance), and the life stage of parents and children (many owners are in a second career or preretirement enterprise, and children cannot become involved) were factors. Here succession variables like mentoring and family elders' forum were not addressed.

Matthew et al (2010) of Hofstra University, Hempstead, New York did a comparative analysis of "First-, Second-, and Third-Generation Family Firms Performance." They assert that there has been limited prior research into generational differences among family businesses. The study compared first-, second-, and third-generation family firms. Contrary to much of the current literature, only two significant differences were found when testing 11 hypotheses. As they hypothesized, first-generation family businesses do less succession planning than second- and third-generation family firms, and there are no differences between first-, second-, and third-generation firms with regard to the influence of the firm's founder. Also, first-generation firms had the highest use of equity versus debt financing. Although not tested as a hypothesis, demographic analysis indicated fewer first-generation firms using the corporation form of

ownership. Analysis of covariance indicates no spurious relationships existing in the hypotheses. Again this study looked at succession in relation to performance, and not in relation to continuity and succession in family business.

Sun, Marko, Stefan, and Madan, (2013) investigated the discrimination in selection decision: Integration stereotyping fit and interdependence theories. They integrate stereotype fit and interdependence theories to propose a model explaining how and why decision makers discriminate in selection decisions. Their model suggests that decision makers draw on stereotypes about members of different social groups to infer the degree to which candidates possess the specific ability required for the task. Decision makers perceive candidates having a greater ability required for the task as less (more) instrumental to their personal outcomes if they expect to compete (cooperate) with the candidate, and they discriminate in favor of candidates perceived as more instrumental to them. They tested their theory in the context of racial and age discrimination in selection decisions with all male samples and found evidence consistent with our predictions. By explaining when and why decision makers discriminate in favour of but also against members of their own social group, their research may help explain the mixed support for the dominant view that decision makers exhibit favoritism toward candidates belonging to the same social group. In addition, their research demonstrates the importance of considering the largely overlooked role of interdependent relationships within the organization for understanding discrimination in organizations. From the topic, this present researcher believes that it is clear that the selection decision process evaluated in organizations did not include family business succession.

Jorn (2012) analyzed the optimal compensation contracts of nonfamily managers employed by family firms in the Netherlands using principal-agent analysis. The model shows that the contracts should have low incentive levels in terms of short-term performance measures. This finding is moderated by nonfamily managers' responsiveness to incentives, their level of risk aversion, and measurement errors of effort related to short-term performance. The model allows a comparison between the contracts of family and nonfamily managers. This comparison shows that the contract of family managers should include relatively greater incentives in terms of short-term performance measures. A number of propositions regarding the compensation of nonfamily managers employed by family firms were formulated. The implications of the model for family business research and practice were discussed. However, the study failed to link non-family member commitment to successful succession in family business.

Cristina (2013), a lecturer in Bettinelli University, Bergamo, Italy, carried out a study titled "Boards of Directors in Family Firms: An Exploratory Study of Structure and Group Process." The study used an integrated approach to examine the relationship between board composition and board processes in Italian family businesses. The potential beneficial effects of outside board members on board processes such as effort norms, cohesiveness, and use of knowledge and skills were highlighted. The study used a sample size of 90 family business directors. The study found that boards with outside directors were perceived as more committed to the board's tasks and more cohesive. Too, boards of older companies with outside directors were perceived as more capable of using knowledge and skills. This study did not again capture mentoring and family council as they impact on family business succession issues. Too, it was no not done in Nigeria.

Venter (2013) a lecturer in the Department of Business Administration, University of Port Elizabeth, South Africa empirically investigated the influence of succession-related factors on the succession process in small and medium-sized family business. The study was undertaken in South Africa among 2,458 owner-managers and successors in 1,038 family businesses. These respondents were identified via a snowball sample technique. A total of 332 usable questionnaires were returned. The dependent variable in this study namely the perceived success of the succession process was measured by two underlying dimensions: satisfaction with the process and continued profitability of the business. The empirical results indicate that the successor-related factors that influence satisfaction with the process are on one hand and, the willingness of the successor to take over and the relationship between the owner-manager and successor on the other hand. The continued profitability of the business is influenced by the willingness of the successor to take over the business, the preparation level of the successor, and the relationship between the successor and owner-manager. The relationship between the owner-manager and successor is in turn influenced by the extent to which interpersonal relationship in the family can be described as harmonious. However, this study failed to investigate variable like family council and mentoring in succession process.

Ines (2013), a lecturer in University of Pablo, Italy carried out a study titled "Agency Costs, Family Ties and Firm Efficiency in Family Businesses in Italy. The researcher analyzed agency costs and their effect on efficiency in the context of small family firms. It equally examined the effects of family managers and family employees on firm efficiency. The study used stochastic frontiers to measure and explains efficiency. However, the study focused only on small firms in

the fishing sector which may not be said to be true of other sectors. Too, it did not focus on succession planning but rather on performance.

John and Roberts (2013) of Louisiana State University studied the development of successors from followers to leaders in small family firms.The purpose of this exploratory study was to better understand the development of successors in the small family business, including their approach to the leadership of the firm. It examined variables (and their relationships) that help to explain family business successor leadership. A case study approach was adopted, using grounded theory analysis of qualitative interviews of the top managers of six family businesses. The study provides six propositions for future research concerning positive parent—child relationships. They are: acquiring knowledge, long-term orientation, cooperation, successor roles, and risk orientation. Therefore, this study only gives direction for future study but never itself addressed these issues of succession.

Cater (2010) studied turnaround strategies in established small family firms. This study employs a case-study approach to identify unique characteristics of established small family firms that affect their ability to initiate turnaround strategies when encountering an organizational crisis. In the case studies, he found evidence for family firms employing the standard strategies of top-management changes, infusion of external management expertise, and retrenchment that have been proposed in the general turnaround literature. The implementation of these strategies was, however, moderated by some characteristics generally associated with family firms which include strong ties to the family firm, internal orientation, altruistic motives, and long-term goal orientation. The introduced framework contributes to a more fine-grained understanding of the turnaround challenges of established family firms and how they can be addressed. This study was not done in Nigeria.

Raveendra (2013) examined professionalization of management and Succession performance. He based his study on inductive reasoning—case evidence from Indian family business groups. This study explores the succession performance of nonfamily professional manager as compared to a family member, commonly referred to as professionalization of management. He draws an important distinction between family-owned and family managed businesses and family-owned and professionally managed businesses. Then, drawing from case studies on succession process in three Indian family business groups, the study puts forth five propositions pertaining to the impact of professionalization of management on succession performance. However, these propositions did not include mentoring and family council the present researcher wants to study.

Susanne and Roland (2010) looked into the promotion of family business using a contingency model of family business succession. They establish that succession is a challenge to family businesses for a number of reasons which includes intergenerational handover. The study focuses on one aspect of succession in family business by investigating when family members are preferred as successors. Results from 860 family businesses evaluated indicate that specific (tacit) knowledge characteristics combined with a favourable transaction atmosphere in certain contexts, make a family member the most suitable successor. But this study did not only fail to study succession holistically as the authors have admitted above, but the conceptual model which supposed to outline when inside-family succession is preferred was missing.

Nathanael, Ethan, and Caroline, (2014) carried out a study they titled "Managing to stay in the dark: Managerial self-efficacy, ego defensiveness, and the aversion to employee voice in family business." They believe that soliciting and incorporating employee voice is essential to organizational performance, yet some managers display a strong aversion to improvement-oriented input from subordinates. To help to explain this maladaptive tendency, they tested the hypothesis that managers with low managerial self-efficacy (that is, low perceived ability to meet the elevated competence expectations associated with managerial roles) seek to minimize voice as a way of compensating for a threatened ego. The results of two studies support this idea. In a field study (Study 1), managers with low managerial self-efficacy were less likely than others to solicit input, leading to lower levels of employee voice. A follow-up experimental study (Study 2) showed that: (a) manipulating low managerial self-efficacy led to voice aversion (that is, decreased voice solicitation, negative evaluations of an employee who spoke up, and reduced implementation of voice); and (b) the observed voice aversion associated with low managerial self-efficacy was driven by ego defensiveness. As can be seen from the study, it did not look into succession planning.

Keith and Lumpkin (2012) examined the assumptions about the long-term orientation (LTO) of family firms in Texas. Drawing on prior conceptualizations, this article further develops and validates the LTO construct using content analysis techniques on two separate samples of data. Validation comes through empirical analysis of content validity, external validity, dimensionality, and concurrent validity. They found that family firms are higher than nonfamily firms on all three dimensions of LTO. They also discuss how future research can use this now-validated construct to address key questions in family business research, as well as inform the

broader business literature. The gap in knowledge in this study is that it failed to establish the current state of succession in family business in Texas.

Joshua and Brett (2012) investigated how individuals manage boundaries in family businesses. Using inductive and qualitative approach based on interviews of 44 individuals in four family businesses, they found that organizational members used 13 identity work tactics to collectively labeled social boundary management, and create and manage boundaries for both individual and organizational identities. They illustrate how individuals use identity work tactics to integrate and segment themselves and others between the domains of family and business. They concluded that their findings have implications for family business research, boundary theory, and identity theory. This study again, did not look into succession issues in family business.

Asa and Nigel (2013) carried out a study the emotional ownership and the next generation's relationship in the family firm in United States of America. They state that the next generations in family firms are the key to the survival of the sector but add that gaps remain in the knowledge about their relationship with the firm. This research focuses on the determinants of this relationship. The concept of emotional ownership emerged as an explanatory variable in a qualitative study, followed by a quantitative study, where the authors report the development of a robust measure and identify its key predictors using a large sample. Results include confirmation that emotional ownership is orthogonal to actual ownership. Again, the present researcher is not satisfied with this study as our proposed variables ware not captured.

Wing (2013) studied "Dancing to two tunes: Multi-entity roles in the family business succession process." He asserts that while some studies of family business focus on the succession process, very few have tried to understand it as an interactive and dynamic social process. He states that the multi-entity roles that family business members play simultaneously during the social process have been largely ignored. The findings of this longitudinal study highlight the inconsistency between the expressed attitudes, perceptions, plans and actual behaviours of family business members. His in-depth discourse analysis and observation shed light on their underlying values, needs and hidden agendas, which have a major impact on the operation, success or failure of the business. This study has major implications for business founders and successors to understand their own roles in the succession process. It also has practical value for professional managers to understand the challenges and opportunities in the process of family business succession. It is important for policymakers to understand why family business succession fails, so that

appropriate public policies can be introduced to support family businesses. Unfortunately this beautiful study was not done in Nigeria.

Andrew (2011) studied the duality of internal and external development of successors in family firms in Australia. The study contributes to family business literature by examining the intersection of succession and opportunities and extends an existing line of research on entrepreneurial behaviour in family firms by examining opportunity perception by 119 family business successors. The author investigates the successors' self-efficacy, education, and work experience, together with their perception of entrepreneurial opportunities. The results suggest that successors who perceive new opportunities and combine it with their family firm specific human capital built through experience within the family firm with general human capital built through education and other work experience to generate new ideas will lead to entrepreneurial opportunity realization. Disappointingly, this study was not carried in Nigeria.

David et al (2014) investigated how directors' prior experience with other demographically similar CEOs affects their appointments onto corporate boards and the consequences for CEO compensation. They argue that in recent years, new director appointments have increasingly posed a dilemma for corporate leaders because CEOs prefer individuals who have similar backgrounds to them; therefore they face increased pressure to appoint new directors who have a different demographic profile. They suggest that CEOs may resolve this dilemma by appointing new directors who have prior experiences working with other demographically similar CEOs. They then explain why this tendency is stronger when new directors are demographically more different from CEOs. Moreover, the study posits that new directors' prior experiences with other similar CEOs will reduce the negative effect of their demographic differences from the CEO on CEO compensation. Their longitudinal analysis of fortune 500 companies' new director appointments and subsequent CEO compensation provided support for their study. This study identifies an important new role that interlock ties to other CEOs can play in corporate governance and leadership. In particular, they suggest that such ties are a means by which CEOs evaluate whether a new director will support their leadership and decision making. In explaining the role of directors' ties to other CEOs in influencing director appointments and CEO compensation, this study also highlights the important influence of triads on CEO-director dyadic relations. However, this study did not relate to succession in family business hence the need for this study.

Westhead (2003), in his study, explored both the internal and external environmental factors that affect family business succession decision-making. The study argues on the actual retirement period of the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) and who the CEO nurses in mind to succeed him or take over from him. The study further addressed the need for a succession plan by the CEO. The study found that external environment contributes to the success of succession plan in family business. However, like other previous studies, this study failed to address the issue of succession in relation mentoring.

Sue-Campbell (2001) evaluated work cultures and work/family balance. This study examined the relations between three aspects of work culture (flexibility of working hours, flexibility of the work itself, and supportive supervision) and work/family balance in the context of selected characteristics that can put individuals at risk for work/family imbalance (dual career partnerships, number of children, and hours worked per week). The data came from 179 individuals in a wide variety of family situations and workplaces. Results of the study indicate that the flexibility of the work itself was associated with increased work satisfaction and increased family well-being. Flexibility of work times was unassociated with any work or personal outcome. Supportive supervision was associated only with increased employee citizenship. An examination of interactive effects between aspects of culture and individuals' characteristics showed that work/family balance was lower when employees had a large number of children and supportive supervision. This study failed to relate work culture to succession issues in family business.

Jose (2007) investigated succession in family business in Canada. The study focused on succession process in Molson family business. The study proves that succession is a new area of study in family business. He adopted a longitudinal approach to identify and evaluate the crucial activities and processes that have assisted in facilitating succession in the Molson family business. The study argues that it is only when succession plan is effective that conflict could be avoided in the succession process among the family members that engaged in the succession. However, the relevance of Family Council in the handling of family business conflict was neglected in this study.

Bocatto et al (2010) examined the influence of pre-performance in the nomination of family and non-family members using evidence from Spanish firms. The study specifically focused on the relationship between pre-performance and succession. Using agency and the resource-based view theories, and stepwise logistic regression with a bootstrap procedure, the study posits that

positive firm performance would no doubt lead to the selection of potential successor. While on the other hand, negative performance would indicate otherwise. Finally, the study concludes that performance prior to succession does not affect these nominations, while directive experience does. The gap this study is that it only looked at how performance affects the choice of successor and thereby neglected other factors like the founder, Family Council, mentoring.

Leslie, Elizabeth and Tenora (2007) studied work–family conflict in dual-earner couples and within-individual and crossover effects of work and family. 399 dual-earner couples participated in this field study which examined the effects of work and family variables on work–family conflict. The effects of own (i.e., within-individual) and partners' (crossover effects) work and family involvement, career salience, perceived flexibility of work schedule, and partners' work–family conflict on individuals' work–family conflict were examined. Results indicate significant relationships between the study variables and individuals' work–family conflict. Furthermore, partners' work–family conflict accounted for a significant amount of variance in both males' and females' work–family conflict. Post hoc exploratory analyses further reveals that crossover effects accounted for a significant amount of variance in work–family conflict over and above the within-individual effects, suggesting that future research on work–family conflict use the couple as the unit of analysis. This study again, did not look in succession planning.

Hannu (2010) studied management capabilities and environmental characteristics in the critical operational phase of entrepreneurship with a comparison of Finnish family firms and nonfamily firms in Finland. This study seeks to clarify the factors that are associated with the start-up and critical operational phase of family and nonfamily firms, and the ability of those firms to survive over the critical first three years of their existence. In search of potential differences in the structural characteristics between these two types of firms, this study compares owners of Finnish family and nonfamily businesses in motives for founding the firm, characteristics of the local environment, changes in strategic factors, changes in networks, and differences in style of management. The findings reveal marked differences in individuals' motives for founding a business. For family business owners, the presence of negative situational factors were the more important motivating and precipitating factors in creating a new business. With respect to style of management, in a typical family enterprise, ownership, management, and family are combined in a single entity. In the surviving nonfamily firms, entrepreneurial teams were found to be important in bringing the skills needed for the strategy-development process. Finally, family firms were most commonly located in the capital area, although some were also found in rural

areas, whereas nonfamily firms were most commonly found in service center regions. Again, the present researcher believes that this study neglected succession issues.

Troy and Dawn (2001) investigated the influence of having a mentor on employee perceptions of work–family conflict. Results from a field survey of 502 employees showed that individuals with mentors reported significantly less work–family conflict, particularly family work conflict, than those respondents who did not have mentors. Other important findings indicate that a mentor's support of a protégé's efforts to balance work and family demands has significant effects on reducing protégés' work–family conflict and that the role modeling function of mentoring significantly reduces family-work conflict experienced by protégés. The gap in this study is that it did not relate the issue of mentoring to succession issues in family business.

Cynthia, Thompson and Beauvais (1999) studied the influence of work–family culture on benefit utilization, organizational attachment, and work–family conflict. They developed a measure of work–family culture (i.e., the shared assumptions, beliefs, and values regarding the extent to which an organization supports and values the integration of employees' work and family lives) and examined its relationship to work–family benefit utilization, organizational attachment, and work–family conflict. Using survey data from 276 managers and professionals, they identified three dimensions of work–family culture: managerial support for work–family balance, career consequences associated with utilizing work–family benefit, and organizational time expectations that may interfere with family responsibilities. As predicted, perceptions of a supportive work–family culture were related to employees' use of work–family benefits. Both work–family benefit availability and supportive work–family culture were positively related to affective commitment and negatively related to work–family conflict and intentions to leave the organization. The pitfall in this study is that it was not related to succession planning.

Babara et al (2012) studied the succession transition process in Switzerland focusing on a longitudinal perspective.Based on longitudinal case study analysis, the paper provides a critical view of the succession process as it unfolds during the generational transition periods in family enterprise systems. The results indicate that the transition period contains a sequence of phases, which they called the transition cycle, during which time the system has an opportunity to do the work or tasks required when changing from one archetypal form of ownership and leadership to another. The study states that each phase in the transition period has a distinct task that the system needs to address, and the whole process requires between three to eight years to be completed. Three distinct types of transition “journeys” were identified based on the extent to

which the system was able to make progress with and achieve the tasks required within the transition cycle. One of these journey types was most likely to lead to continuity of the family enterprise, whereas the other two journey types were more likely to lead to disintegration of the system. In our view, this study failed to provide enough empirical evidences to back up its claim. Also, this study was not done in Nigeria.

Ercilia and Jordi (2013) examined the socialization patterns of successors in first- to second-generation family businesses in Spain. The study focuses on the socialization of potential successors in family business and attempts to relate this process to values that founders intend to convey to the next generation. They found that there are two different phases common to all socialization processes. The first stage is characterized by family socialization which comprises of value transmission and training, and this is common to all founders' descendants. The second stage is characterized by business socialization and reserved only for the founder's potential successors. They also identified two models of socialization that pursue two different aims: (a) the Founder Homosocial Reproduction Model and (b) the New Leader Development Model. This study concludes that these socialization models are consistent not only with values that the founder intends to convey to potential successors but also with the founder's own business perception. Again, we identify a gap in knowledge in this research as it did not convey how this socialization impacts on succession planning at retirement/death of the founder. Too, we cannot rely on the findings as the variable was not subjected to empirical evaluation.

Terri and Ethlyn (2004) evaluated mentoring and transformational leadership with special emphases on the role of supervisory career mentoring. They posit that leaders need to serve as mentors to activate transformational leadership and promote positive work attitudes and career expectations of followers. To test this premise, incremental effects of transformational leadership and mentoring over each other were examined using N=275 employed MBAs. Respondents with supervisory mentors reported receiving higher levels of career mentoring than respondents with non-supervisory mentors. Supervisory career mentoring (SCM) and transformational leadership had incremental effects over each other for job satisfaction. SCM had mediating effects over transformational leadership for organizational commitment and career expectations. Career mentoring by non-supervisory mentors was not associated with career expectations but there were incremental effects with idealized influence and inspirational motivation for job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Implications for the changing role of mentorship in organizations are discussed was never related to succession planning in family business.

John and Veronica, (2000) looked into the effects of gender composition of mentoring relationships on protégés' perceptions of the degree of role modeling and psychosocial and career development mentoring functions received. Data from 200 mentor/protégé dyads composed of working professionals from a variety of industries were analyzed using ANCOVA with planned comparisons. Results indicate that mentoring relationships involving female mentors in either homogeneous or diversified relationships provided more role modeling and less career development than relationships involving male mentors. Unexpectedly, male mentors in homogeneous relationships were associated with lower levels of role modeling than female mentors in either homogeneous or diversified relationships. Homogeneous male relationships also offered less psychosocial support than female mentors in diversified relationships with male protégés. Male mentors in diversified relationships with female protégés were associated with more career development than any other gender combination of mentoring relationship. This present researcher observed again in this study under review that mentoring was never related to succession planning in family survival hence the need for this study onsuccession planning.

2.3 Theoretical Framework

(i) Competency Theory of Succession Planning:

This study relies on the competency theory of succession planning (Vathanophas and Thai-ngam, 2007). Competency theory is a framework that identifies a combination of skills, knowledge and behaviours which a successor must possess in order to perform and ensure the survival of a business. It adds that for this model to be respected, the competencies must comply with the job activities of the successor otherwise the business will fail.

This theory specifically supports objective number one (the relationship between delayed-retirement and the business perpetuity) as it strictly means that the owner-manager of a family business should retire from the management position the moment his/her management capability is declining as a result of old age related health challenges otherwise the family business will fail. Also, this theory supports objective number two (the relationship between mentoring and successful management transference) as mentoring equips a mentee with the requisite skills, abilities and experiences that a particular family business needs to survive succession. Interestingly, this theory equally backs objective number three (which seeks to determine the relationship between the appointment of a non-family member CEO in the absence of a competent one in the family business and the business continuous viability) as it emphasizes the

appointment of family business CEO purely on merit basis. This strictly means that if it is a non-family member Chief Executive Officer (CEO) that is capable of managing a family business at the retirement or death of the founder, such person should be given the chance otherwise the business is bound to fail.

(ii) Herz-Brown (1993) Family Firm's Theory of Loss and Continuity:

This study will equally rely on this theory of family firm called Herz-Brown (1993) theory of loss and continuity which sheds light on how a succession process can be disrupted by untimely death of the older generation or a potential successor if a family firm does not have a comprehensive succession plan in place:

> If the death occurs at a crisis point or at a time of intense external pressure, the shock may be enhanced. For example, the sudden death of a family member in the middle of a difficult life transition, such as succession, can leave a lot of unresolved tension and unfinished business. Since entrepreneurs tend to be doers and not planners, there may be also a lack of preparation for the realities of death, such as a will, insurance, or other financial arrangements (Herz-Brown, 1993, pp. 118).

This theory indicates how such a loss can create difficulties for the business and the ownership spheres. Furthermore, when an heir passes away, particularly an heir who has been anointed and accepted into the role of successor, the experience of loss is greatest. Herz-Brown (1993) explains that it is at this time that expectations are at a highest point for everyone. Handler, (1994) lent his voice to this theory by asserting that the low resilience and high failure rate among first generation family firms are as a result of unsatisfactory succession planning and poor organization learning.

Again, in linking this theory to objective number four (the relationship between family elders' forum succession crises resolution ability and harmonious working relationship in family businesses) it follows that a family business that is owned especially by a polygamous family should put in place a formidable family elders' forum to arrest and resolve amicably the envisaged succession crises that the sudden death of the owner-manager may erupts. This is important because court litigations and injunctions breed hatred in family business and threatens harmonious working relationship among family members, and ultimately ruin the business.

2.4 Summary of the Reviewed Literature

The empirical review of researches done so far by scholars in the emerging field of family business succession planning reveals the lacuna it harbours as none of the studies investigated succession planning variables that are pivotal to family business sustainability beyond their founders in Lagos State in particular and Nigeria in general. For example, family business succession planning exploratory variables like family business owner-managers delayed-retirement, mentoring, non-family-member CEOs, and family elders' forum's roles in the sustainability of the business across generations were either not adequately investigated or were not carried out in Nigeria at all. This became the gaps that must be filled by this study.

Another look into the review will further expose and confirm these gaps. For instance, Onyeizugbe et al (2013) evaluated the relationship between effective learning and entrepreneurship development in Nigeria; Joseph (2013) examined the impact of culture determinants such as age, extended family system, inheritance tradition (preference for sons, marriage, etc) and education (formal training and development) on family business succession with a focal point among small and medium enterprises in Jos Metropolis, Plateau State; Ogundele et al (2008) looked into entrepreneurial succession problems in Nigeria's family businesses and the threat it poses to its sustainability; Agbionu et al (2012) studied the relationship between mentorship and business performance of Igbo entrepreneurs in Awka metropolis, Nigeria; Andrew (2011) examined the duality of internal and external development of successors in family firms in Australia; Mensah (2012) examined factors affecting succession planning in small and medium enterprises in Takoradi metropolis of Ghana;Jorn (2012) studied the optimal compensation contracts of non-family managers employed by family firms in the Netherlands; Cristina (2013) carried out a study on boards of directors in family firms in Italy; John et al (2013) studied the development of successors from followers to leaders in small family firms;Nathanael et al (2014) studied a topic they titled "managing to stay in the dark: managerial self-efficacy, ego defensiveness, and the aversion to employee voice in family business;" Matthew et al (2010) did a comparative analysis of first, second, and third generation family firms Performance; Asa et al (2013) carried out a study on the emotional ownership and the next generation's relationship in family firms in United States of America; Wing (2013) studied "dancing to two tunes: multi-entity roles in family business succession process;" Andrew (2011) studied the duality of internal and external development of successors in family firms in Australia. Ercilia et al (2013) studied the socialization patterns of successors in first- to second-

generation family businesses in Spain. John et al (2000) examined the effects of gender composition of mentoring relationships on protégés' perceptions of the degree of role modeling and psychosocial and career development mentoring functions received. Saheed (2013) studied the awareness of family business owners and attitude towards intra-succession as a means of business continuity, and how their awareness relates to their preparation for the ownership succession and the continuity of their business in Finland. Obadan (2013) evaluated succession planning in family business with special emphasis on two hotels in Benin City, Edo State.

The gaps in knowledge identified from the empirical literature review:

From the empirical literature review, it became evidently clear that none of the studies reviewed addressed the under listed succession planning exploratory variables (predictors) and the sustainability criteria variables (indicators) in family businesses in Nigeria:

1. The relationship between delayed-retirement of family business owner-managers and the perpetuity of the business.
2. The relationship between mentoring and successful management transference in family businesses.
3. The relationship between the appointment of a non-family member Chief executive Officer in the absence of a competent one in a family business and the continuous viability of the business.
4. The relationship between family elders' forum's ability to resolve succession crises and harmonious working relationship in family businesses.

Consequently, this present researcher is motivated to embark on this study so as to bridge these gaps and lacuna discovered in the previous studies reviewed in the field of family business. These gaps exist either because the reviewed studies done in Nigeria did not capture or failed to thoroughly deal with the issue of succession that is bedeviling the sustainability of family businesses beyond their founders in Nigeria. Also, the ones that addressed the problems of succession in family businesses were done in other climes in foreign countries.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODS

3.1 Research Design

The researcher adopted the Survey Research Design which is defined as a valuable tool that enables a researcher to assess the opinions, perceptions, thoughts, trends and feelings of respondents towards a phenomenon (De Vaus, 2001; Creswell, 2008; and Gorard, 2013). They added that a survey involves the use of questionnaire which consists of predetermined sets of questions that is given to a representative sample of a larger population. Therefore, this adopted survey research design enabled the opinions and perceptions of family business owners/CEOstowards the roles of delayed retirement, mentoring, non-family member CEOs, and family elders' forum crises resolution ability in succession planning and the sustainability of their businesses to be assessed. The data collected was used in testing the hypotheses and making generalization on the population based on the results from the sample.

3.2 Population of the Study

The population of this study includes all the Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) owners/Chief Executive Officers in Lagos State, Nigeria. Lagos State, which is a South-Western State in Nigeria, was created on May 27th 1967 with its capital in Ikeja. Based on the official census figure (2006), the population of the State is 9,013,534.

SMEs are chosen because they encompass the Private Limited Liability Company, Partnership, and Sole Proprietorship which form the bedrock of family business in Nigeria. Lagos State is chosen as the area of study because it has the highest number (17 per cent) of SMEs in Nigeria according to the National Bureau of Statistics/Small and Medium Enterprises Development Agency of Nigeria Collaborative Survey (2010). This NBS/SMEDAN survey report shows that Nigeria has a total number of 17,284,671 of MSMEs (Micro Enterprises has 17,261,753; the Small Enterprises has 21,264, while the Medium Enterprises has 1,654). Therefore, the total number of SMEs in Nigeria is 22,918 of which 4,535 are located in Lagos as shown in the table below:

Table 3.1 Number of Small and Medium Enterprises in Each State of Nigeria

State	Small Enterprises	Percentage	Medium Enterprises	Percentage	Total
Abia	526	98.62	7	1.38	534
Adamawa	235	95.58	11	4.42	245
Akwa Ibom	275	87.48	39	12.52	315
Anambra	656	89.01	81	10.99	737
Bauchi	497	91.02	49	8.98	545
Bayelsa	134	100.00	0	0.00	134
Benue	357	95.63	16	4.37	374
Borno	131	77.95	37	22.05	168
Cross River	318	87.02	47	12.98	365
Delta	318	87.02	33	5.36	608
Ebonyi	232	94.99	12	5.01	244
Edo	899	96.83	29	3.17	929
Ekiti	280	98.41	5	1.59	285
Enugu	402	93.03	30	6.97	432
Gombe	225	88.02	31	11.98	225
Imo	534	92.97	40	7.03	574
Jigawa	217	93.81	14	6.19	231
Kaduna	1,137	88.72	145	11.28	1,282
Kano	1,740	96.21	69	3.79	1,808
Katsina	464	86.86	70	13.14	535
Kebbi	221	95.13	11	4.87	232
Kogi	328	96.67	11	3.33	340
Kwara	415	93.66	28	6.34	443
Lagos	4,146	91.43	389	8.57	4,535
Nassarawa	387	92.43	32	7.57	418
Niger	433	90.48	46	9.52	478
Ogun	506	92.73	40	7.27	546
Ondo	596	97.13	18	2.87	614
Osun	100	100.00	0	0.00	100
Oyo	1,300	93.26	94	6.74	1,394
Plateau	613	92.56	49	7.44	663
Rivers	662	91.65	60	8.35	723
Sokoto	562	96.68	19	3.32	581
Taraba	242	97.80	5	2.20	247
Yobe	150	96.50	5	3.50	156
Zamfara	341	100.00	0	0.00	341
FCT	427	84.17	80	15.83	507
Total	21,264	92.78	1,654	7.22	22,918

Source: The Small and Medium Enterprises Development Agency of Nigeria/National Bureau of Statistics Collaborative Survey (2010, PP.117).

3.3 Sample Size and Sampling Technique

There are basically two types of sampling techniques. They are probability and non-probability sampling techniques. Hair, Anderson, and Tatham (2006) argue that the choice of any sampling technique is highly dependent on the nature of the population (whether it is definite or indefinite). They conclude that where the population size is definite, a probability sampling design is most appropriate while the adoption of non-probability sampling design is inevitable where the population is not definite. Since this population size is definite based on the findings of the NBS/SMEDAN collaborative survey (2010), the probability sampling technique which gave each item of the population equal and independent chance of being included in the sample was relied on. Therefore, the required sample size was determined using the Taro Yamane (1964) formula shown below:

$$n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2}$$

Where n= sample size

N= population

e = error margin, taken as 5%

1= a theoretical constant.

By substitution, the following sample size was arrived at:

$$n = \frac{4,535}{1 + 4,535\,(0.05)^2}$$

$$n = 367.58$$

$$n = 368$$

Therefore, a sample size of 368 was used.

The following inclusion criteria were applied in selecting the participating family businesses in SMEs in Lagos State in this study:

1. Owned by a family(s).
2. Run either by a family member or a non-family member.
3. A minimum of 5 years of existence as at 2014.
4. Evidence to pass the business to the next generation.
5. Permanent staff strength of 10-199 employees.
6. Assets that worth 5 million naira but less than 500 million naira excluding land and building.

3.4 Method of Data Collection

The primary data used in this study was obtained from the use of structured questionnaire that was administered to the participants in Lagos, Nigeria. Therefore, a drop-off and pick procedure of data collection was applied in this regard (Creswell, 2008).

The questionnaire is divided into two main parts namely: section A, and section B. The section A part of the questionnaire measured the general characteristics of the participants such as gender, age, year of service, number of employees, ownership of the business and succession stage of the business. The section B part is further sub-divided into four sub-sections in relation to the stated objectives, namely; sub-section B1, sub-section B2, subsection B3, and sub-section B4. Accordingly, sub-section B1 elicited responses regarding whether family business owner-managers delayed-retirement has adverse relationship with the business perpetuity. Sub-section B2 elicited responses to determine the relationship between mentoring and successful management transference in family businesses. Again, sub-section B3 elicited responses regarding the role of non-family member Chief Executive Officer successors in family business continuous viability while sub-section B4 elicited responses concerning the relationship between family elders' forum crisis resolution ability and harmonious working relationship in family businesses.

This questionnaire used the five point Likert scale which ranges from Strongly Agree" with the highest score of 5 assigned to it, to "Undecided or Neutral" with the lowest score of 1 assigned to it. The sample of the questionnaire is included in this work as Appendix B.

3.5 Validity of the Instrument

Validity of measuring instrument refers to the ability of the instrument to measure what it is supposed to measure (Cozby, 2001; Martyn, 2008; and Creswell, 2008). In this study the content validity was applied. Content validityrefers to how accurately an instrument taps into the various aspect of the specific construct in question; and it is usually carried out by relying on the experts in the field. Content validity approach is viable because it enables the researcher to determine if the relevant dimensions of the topic have been fully explored, and whether the measuring instrument adequately covers all the dimensions or at least a good representation of all the dimensions of the topic of the research.

Martyn (2008) contends that validity of an instrument can be determined by the designer of the instrument in three ways: First, by ensuring that all the questions asked in the questionnaire fully exhaust all that are implied by the objectives, research questions and hypotheses. Secondly, by employing a panel of independent expert judges who would vet the questions in the questionnaire objectively, by paying sincere attention to the relevance of the questions to their coverage of the entire topic of the study. Thirdly, by making sure that only the questions in the instrument which the entire expert judges independently certify "strongly relevant to the construct" are retained while the questions that fail this test should be dropped (Phelan, et al 2005).

Applying this content validity approach in this study, independent expert judges were carefully selected in the field of statistics and top management level. They were given the instrument and asked to rate the instrument independently as "Strongly Relevant to the Construct" or "Poorly Relevant to the Construct." Then, after collecting the instrument from the judges, the decision rule was applied which states that only the items in the instrument which the entire expert judges independently certify 'strongly relevant to the construct" should be retained while the ones that fail this test should be dropped. This approach enabled the researcher to sieve the opinion of the experts, and therefore certified this instrument fit to elicit the actual responses and measure what it is supposed to measure.

3.6 Reliability of the Instrument

The reliability of a research instrument concerns the extent to which the instrument yields the same result on repeated trials (Cozby, 2001; and Saladana, 2012). The tendency toward consistency found in repeated measurements is referred to as reliability. For accuracy purpose, we adopted the Split-Halves Method. This method provides a unique estimate of reliability for a given test administration.

Split-Halves Method: In this split-halves method, a pilot study involving some respondents was used. The responses of the participants based on the questions from the instrument were divided into two equal halves by assigning the odd numbered items to one half and the even numbered items to the other half of the test. Therefore, it was necessary to correct the correlation coefficient obtained between the two halves of the questionnaire. The Spearman-Brown Prophecy Formula was used to effect the correction. Therefore, the split-halves correlation estimate was corrected in order to estimate the reliability of the whole test.

The **Spearman-Brown Prophecy Formula** may be written as PXX"= 2PXX'/1+PXX'

Where:

PXX" = the reliability coefficient for the whole test

PXX' = the split-half correlation.

The Correlation between the two halves:

$$r = \frac{N\sum H_o H_e - \sum H_o \sum H_e}{\sqrt{N\sum H^2_o - (\sum H_o)^2} \sqrt{N\sum H^2_e - (\sum H^2_e)^2}}$$

$$r = \frac{75(1438) - (233)(318)}{\sqrt{75(1091) - (233)^2} \sqrt{75(2052) - (318)^2}}$$

$$r = \frac{33756}{38121.377}$$

$$r = 0.885$$

Denotations:

Let odd half be denoted as H_o

Let even half be denoted as H_e

Therefore; the split half correlation (PXX') = 0.885

Hence:

$$PXX'' = \frac{2(0.885)}{1 + 0.885} = \frac{1.770}{1.885} = 0.939$$

Since theSpearman-Brown Prophecycorrelation value is 0.939 the instrument is certified reliable as Spearman-Brown Prophecy correlation value of between 0.5 and 1 is considered reliable.

3.7 Method of Data Analysis

To objectively test the hypotheses formulated, the whole analysis was done with SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences). The detailed computer print-outs are attached

inAppendix C. Descriptive statistics was used to analyzing the profile of the respondents in the study.

The Simple Linear Regression Analysis was also used to measure the level of significance of the relationship existing between family business succession planning which is the independent variable which include delayed-retirement, mentoring, non-family member CEOs, family elders' forum crisis resolution ability which are also known as the exploratory variables, and the dependent variable (criterion variables) which is family business sustainability which also include perpetuity, successful management transference, family business continuous viability, harmonious working relationship in family businesses. The simple regression analysis is appropriate for the tests because it is used when the study involves models with just one dependent variable and one independent variable. In simple regression analysis, the variable whose value is to be predicted is known as the dependent variable and the ones whose known values are used for prediction are known as the independent variable (Phelan, et al 2005).

The Simple Regression Used (Bi-variate Analysis): The simple linear regression equation is expressed mathematically thus:

$Y = f(X)$

Where

Y= Family Business Sustainability

X= Succession Planning

Breaking succession planning into measurable variables model becomes:

x_1= Delayed Retirement.

x_2= . Mentoring

x_3= Non-family Member Chief Executive Officer

x_4 = Family Elders' Succession Crisis Resolution Ability

e = Stochastic error terms

Similarly, breaking family business sustainability (dependent variable or criterion variable) into measurable form, it yielded the following variables:

y_1 = Family Business Perpetuity

y_2 = Family Business Successful Management Transference

y_3 = Family business Continuous Viability

y_4 = Harmonious Working Relationship

Interpretation of the Simple Regression Model:

$Y = b_o + bx_1$ is the regression line. Then, b_1 is the slope of the regression line. Thus, this is the amount that the Y variable (dependent) which is the sustainability of family business, will respond to X variable (independent) which, is family business succession planning. The b_0 is the intercept of the regression line with the Y axis.

The techniques that were used for evaluating the overall goodness-of-fit of the regression line to the sample of the observations/the evaluation of the overall explanatory power of the regression equation/model are:

i. The sample Coefficient of Determination (r^2) /Correlation Analysis: The R square (r^2) is the sample coefficient of determination that measures the proportion of the total variation in the dependent variable (family business sustainability) that is explained by the regression line (independent variable; succession planning). For example, an r square(r^2) of 0.70 shows that 70% of the total variation in family business sustainability is explained by family business succession planning.

ii. F-test (through ANOVA): The F-test tests the sources of the variation within the sample data. For the simple regression model, the test is shown to be equivalent to t-test which is used for inference about the population regression coefficients. The F-ratio or test was used to test whether the estimated regression equation explains a significant proportion of the variation in the independent variable (family business succession planning).

Decision Rule: The whole simple regression analyses were done in ANOVA table. Therefore, Reject Ho if the calculated F-ratio is greater F-critical table value at 0.05 level of significance and at 1 degree of freedom, and accept the alternative.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSES

This chapter covers the presentation and analyses of data collected from the field. The presentation is divided into two parts; the first part contains descriptive statistics while the second part contains test of hypotheses.

A total number of 368 copies of the questionnaire were administered to the participants but only 354 were returned to the author for use. The returned 354 copies of the questionnaire represent 96 per cent while the unreturned 14 copies represent 4 per cent.

4.1 Descriptive Statistics

With the aid of simple percentages the researcher presents in tabular form an analysis of data from the fieldwork as shown below:

Table 4.1.1 Age of Owners/CEOs

Age	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
18-30	7	2.0	2.0	2.0
31-50	231	65.2	65.2	67.2
51-65	92	26.0	26.0	93.2
66 and above	24	6.8	6.8	100.0
Total	354	100.0	100.0	

Source: Researcher's computation, 2015.

The table of age distribution above of the owners/CEOs of family businesses in Lagos State who participated in the study shows that those between the ages of 18 – 30 are 7 (2 per cent); those between the ages of 31 – 50 are 231 (65.3 per cent); those in age bracket 51 – 65 are 92 (26 per cent) while ages 66 and above are 24 (6.8).

Table 4.1.2 Sex Distribution

Sex	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Male	317	89.5	89.5	89.5
Female	37	10.5	10.5	100.0
Total	354	100.0	100.0	

Source: Researcher's computation, 2015.

The sex distribution table above shows that 317 (89.5 per cent) of the participants are male while 37 (10.5 per cent) are female. It is clear that the male dominants family business ownership in Lagos State.

Table 4.1.3 **Age of the Business**

Year	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
5 - 20	228	64.4	64.4	64.4
21- 50	126	35.6	35.6	100.0
51 and above	0	0	0	100.0
Total	354	100.0	100.0	

Source: Researcher's computation, 2015.

It can be understood from the table above that the family businesses that have existed between 5 – 20 years are 228 (64.4 per cent); 21 – 50 years are 126 (35.6 per cent) while 51 and above is 0 (0 per cent). This is a pointer to the fact that family-owned businesses do not outlive their founder in Nigeria.

Table 4.1.4 **Types of Business Ownership**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Sole Proprietorship	234	66.1	66.1	66.1
Partnership	15	4.2	4.2	70.3
Private Ltd. Liability Co.	105	29.7	29.7	100.0
Total	354	100.0	100.0	

Source: Researcher's computation, 2015.

This table above indicates that 234 (66.1 per cent) of the studied family businesses operate as Sole Proprietorship; 15 (4.2 per cent) operate as Partnership while 105 (29.7 per cent) operate as Private Limited Liability Company.

Table 4.1.5 Succession Stage

Stage	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Founder-owned	328	92.7	92.7	92.7
First Succession	23	6.5	6.5	99.2
Second Succession	3	8	.8	100.0
Total	354	100.0	100.0	

Source: Researcher's computation, 2015.

The above succession stage table reveals that 328 (92.7 per cent) of the family-owned businesses that participated in the study are still at the founder-owned stage; 23 (6.5 per cent) survived first ownership transference while only 3 (.8 per cent) survived second ownership transference. This is another indication that family-owned businesses do not survive ownership transference.

Table 4.1.6 Management

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Owner- manager	218	61.6	61.6	61.6
Non-family member Manager	64	18.1	18.1	79.7
Co-managed by family & Outside Manager	72	20.3	20.3	100.0
Total	354	100.0	100.0	

Source: Researcher's computation, 2015.

The above table shows that 218 (61.6 per cent) of the family-owned businesses that participated in the study are managed by their owners; 64 (18.1 per cent) are managed by non-family members while 72 (20.3 per cent) are Co-managed by family and non-family members.

Table 4.1.7 Family Ownership Structure

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Nuclear family Ownership	334	94.4	94.4	94.4
Extended family Ownership	20	5.6	5.6	100.0
Total	354	100.0	100.0	

Source: Researcher's computation, 2015.

This above table shows that 334 (94.4 per cent) of the family-owned businesses that participated in the study are in the hands of nuclear families (father, mother and children) while 20 (5.6) per cent are owned by extended families. This is again another pointer that family-owned businesses do not survive ownership transference in Nigeria as the ownership hardly leaves the nuclear family.

4.2 Test of Hypotheses:

The formulated hypotheses were tested with F-test analysis as shown below:

Decision Rule: Reject the null hypothesis (Ho) which says there is no significant linear relationship between the dependent variable (perpetuity, successful management transference, family business continuous viability, and harmonious working relationship in family businesses) and the independent variable (family business owner-managers delayed-retirement, mentoring, the appointment of non-family member CEOs in family businesses, and family elders' forum's ability to resolve succession crisis)if the calculated F-ratio is greater than the F-distribution table value of 3.85 at 0.05 level of significance and at 1 degree of freedom, and accept the alternative.

Interpretation of Decision Rule: if the null hypothesis is rejected, it is conclusive that the regression equation/model does not explain a significant proportion of the variation in the dependent variables.

Hypothesis I

Ho: Delayed-retirement of family business owner-managers does not have significant adverse relationship withperpetuity ofthe business in Lagos State.

Table 4.2.1 Model Summary Result for Hypothesis I

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	STD. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.652[a]	.042	.020	6.18818	1.931

Source: Researcher's computation, 2015.

Table 4.2.1 above is the model summary. It shows how much of the variance in perpetuity of family businesses that is explained by delayed-retirement. In this case the R square value is .042 which means delayed-retirement only explains a paltry 4.2% variance in perpetuity of family businesses (see appendix C, PP. 159). This result shows that delayed-retirement has a significant adverse relationship with perpetuity of family businesses in Lagos state.

Table 4.2.2 ANOVA Table for Simple Regression Result for Hypothesis I

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	318.444	1	318.444	58.316	.004[b]
Residual	13479.333	352	38 .294		
Total	13797.777	353			

Source: Researcher's computation, 2015.

Table 4.2.2 result above indicates that F-calculated value of 58.8316 is greater than the F-critical table value of 3.85 at 0.05 and at 1 degree of freedom (see appendix C, PP. 159). Therefore, the researcher rejects the null hypothesis and accepts the alternative which says delayed-retirement of family business owner-managers has significant adverse relationship with perpetuity of family businesses in Lagos State.

Table 4.2.3Coefficients[a] Result for Hypothesis I

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	16.044	1.905		8.423	.000
	Delayed-retirement	-.628	.114	.152	2.884	.004

Source: Researcher's computation, 2015.

The coefficient table 4.2.3 shows the simple model that expresses how delayed-retirementrelates to perpetuity of family businesses. From this table therefore, the coefficient value ofdelayed-retirement of family business owner-managers in relation to the business perpetuity is -.628. This means that for every 100% increase in family business perpetuity, delayed-retirement contributes a negative value of -62.8%(see appendix C, PP. 159).This shows that delayed-retirement decreases family business perpetuity.

Hypothesis II

Ho: No significant relationship exists between mentoring and successful management transference in family businesses in Lagos State.

Table 4.2.4 Model Summary Result for Hypothesis II

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	STD. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.897[a]	.756	.632	5.09643	1.886

Source: Researcher's computation, 2015.

Table 4.2.4 abovewhich contains the model summary shows how much of the variance insuccessful management transference in family businesses that is explained by mentoring. In this case the R square value is .756 which means mentoring explains 75.6% variance in successful management transference in family businesses(see appendix C, PP. 160). This result indicates that mentoring hugely relates tosuccessful management transference in family businesses in Lagos state.

Table 4.2.5 ANOVA Table for Simple Regression Result for Hypothesis II

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	57585384.8	1	57585384.8362217075.427		.000[b]
Residual	9168.674352		25.974		
Total	57594553.510353				

Source: Researcher's computation, 2015.

Table 4.2.5 result above indicates that F-calculated value of 22,170,75.427 is greater than the F-critical table value of 3.85 at 0.05 and at 1 degree of freedom (see appendix C, PP. 160). Therefore, the researcher rejects the null hypothesis and accepts the alternative which says that significant relationship exists between mentoring and successful management transference in family businesses.

Table 4.2.6Coefficients[a] Result for Hypothesis II

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	15.765	.272		.015	.000
	Mentoring	.681	.001	.001	1488.985	.000

Source: Researcher's computation, 2015.

The coefficient table 4.2.6 shows how mentoring relates to successful management transference in family businesses. From this table, the coefficient value ofmentoring in relation to successful management transference in family businesses is .681(see appendix C, PP. 160). This means that for every 100% increase insuccessful management transference in family businesses, mentoring contributes68.1%. This shows that mentoring decreases successful management transference in family businesses.

Hypothesis III

Ho: No significant relationship exists betweenNon-family member Chief Executive Officer successors in family businesses and the business continuous viability in Lagos State.

Table 4.2.7 Model Summary Result for Hypothesis III

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	STD. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.831[a]	.688	.757	4.51899	1.816

Source: Researcher's computation, 2015.

The table above is the model summary. It shows how much of the variance infamily business continuous viability that is explained by the appointment of non-family member CEO successors in the absence of competent family member CEOs. In this case the R square value is .688 which means that the appointment of non-family member CEO successors in the absence of competent family member CEOs in family businesses explains 68.8% variance infamily business continuous viability(see appendix C, PP. 161). This result indicates that the appointment of non-family member CEO successors in the absence of competent family member CEOs in family businesses highly relates to thebusiness continuous viability.

Table 4.2.8 ANOVA Table for Simple Regression Result for Hypothesis III

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	57597237.218	1	57597237.218	2820457.581	.000[b]
Residual	7208.697	353	20.421		
Total	57604445.915	354			

Source: Researcher's computation, 2015.

Table 4.2.8 result above indicates that F-calculated value of 28,204,57.581 is greater than the F-critical table value of 3.85 at 0.05 and at 1 degree of freedom (see appendix C, PP. 161). Therefore, the researcher rejects the null hypothesis and accepts the alternative which says significant relationship exists betweenNon-family member Chief Executive Officer successors in family businesses and the business continuous viability in Lagos State (see appendix C).

Table 4.2.9Coefficients[a] Result for Hypothesis III

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	20.896	.241		89.456	.000
	The appointment of non-family member Officers (CEOs)	.571	.001	1.000	1679.422	.000

Source: Researcher's computation, 2015.

The coefficient table 4.2.9 shows how the appointment of non-family member Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) in family businesses relates to the business continuous viability. From this table, the coefficient value of family business continuous viability in relation to the appointment of non-family member Chief Executive Officers is .571. This means that for every 100% increase in family business continuous viability,the appointment of non-family member Chief Executive Officerscontributes 57.1%(see appendix C, PP. 161). Thismeans that the appointment of non-family member Chief Executive Officers in family businesses in the absence of competent ones in the family is seriously related to the business continuous viability after the retirement/death of the owner manager.

Hypothesis IV

Ho: Family elders' forum's ability to resolve succession crisis has no significant relationship with harmonious working relationship in family businesses in Lagos State.

Table 4.2.10 Model Summary Result for Hypothesis IV

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	STD. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.798[a].624.8975.926061.882				

Source: Researcher's computation, 2015.

Table 4.2.10 above shows how much of the variance in harmonious working relationship in family businesses that is explained byfamily elders' forum's ability to resolve succession crisis. In this case the R square value is .624 which means family elders' forum's ability to resolve

succession crisis in family businesses explains 62.4% variance inharmonious working relationship in family businesses(see appendix C, PP. 162).This result indicates thatfamily elders' forum's ability to resolve succession crisis in family businesses relates highly toharmonious working relationship in family businesses.

Table 4.2.11 ANOVA Table for Simple Regression Result for Hypothesis IV

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	57600294.077	1	57600294.07	1640186.734.000[b]	
Residual	12396.701	35335.118			
Total	57612690.777	354			

Source: Researcher's computation, 2015.

Table 4.2.11 result above indicates that F-calculated value of 16,401,86.734 is greater than the F-critical table value of 3.85 at 0.05 and at 1 degree of freedom (see appendix C, PP. 162). Therefore, the researcher rejects the null hypothesis and accepts the alternative which says family elders' forum's ability to resolve succession crisis has significant relationship with harmonious working relationship in family businesses in Lagos State.

Table 4.2.12Coefficients[a] Result for Hypothesis IV

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	16.941	.316		342.990	.000
	Family elders' forum's ability to resolve succession crisis	.498	.001	1.000	1280.698	.000

Source: Researcher's computation, 2015.

The coefficient table 4.2.12 shows how family elders' forum's ability to resolve succession crisis relates to harmonious working relationship in family businesses. From this table therefore, thecoefficient value of harmonious working relationship in family businessesin relation to family elders' forum's ability to resolve succession crisis is .498. This means that for every 100% increase in harmonious working relationship in family businesses, family elders' forum's ability to resolve succession crisiscontributed 49.8%(see appendix C, PP. 162).

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

5.1 Discussion of the Descriptive Statistics

The following findings were made in this study after subjecting the responses elicited from the respondents to statistical analysis:

i. The demographic data reveals that the owners/CEOs of the studied family businesses in Lagos State are of the following ages: Owner/CEOs who are between the ages of 18 – 30 are 7 (2 per cent); those between the ages of 31 – 50 are 231 (65.3 per cent); those in the age bracket of 51 – 65 are 92 (26 per cent) while ages 66 and above are 24 (6.8). This revelation lends credence to the researcher's worry that the National Orientation Agency needs to be educating and sensitizing family business owner-managers about the need to discard work-for-life attitude and embrace the retirement age in the nation's civil service and the multinational companies as some of the family business owner-managers are still managing at age 60 and above.

ii. The author found that out of the total number of 354 family-owned businesses studied in Lagos State, 228 (64.4 per cent) have been operating between 5 – 20 years while 126 (35.6 per cent) of them have been operating between 21 – 50 years. But disappointingly, none of the 354 studied family-owned businesses has existed above 51years. This evidence corroborates the fear of this present author (which informed this study) that family-owned businesses do not outlive their founders in Nigeria.

iii. The demographic data equally shows that 218 (61.6 per cent) of the family-owned businesses that participated in the study are managed by their owners; 64 (18.1 per cent) are managed by non-family members while 72 (20.3 per cent) are Co-managed by family and non-family members. This is a pointer that the appointment of non-family member Chief Executive Officers is vital in ensuring family business sustainability beyond their founders if there is a dearth of such quality in a family business.

iv. This study reveals that of the 354 family-owned business studied, 328 (92.7 per cent) are still at the founder-owned stage; 23 (6.5 per cent) survived first ownership transference while only 3 (.8 per cent) survived second ownership transference. This is another indication that family-owned businesses do not survive ownership transference. This finding is backed by other findings by Martins (2014), Abubakar et al (2013) and Obadan et al (2013) which indicate that

approximately 90 per cent of all family firms go into liquidation after the death or retirement of their founders in Nigeria. They conclude that failure of these businesses to continue as family firm beyond the tenure of their founders has serious social and economic consequences.

Larraza et al (2010) posit that the liquidation of a family firm constitutes a loss not only to the proprietary family, which often has most of its assets lost in the firm, but also to the employees and surrounding community, whose economic well-being depends on the survival of the business (Larraza-Kintana, 2010).

5.2 Discussion of Findings from the Test of Hypotheses

i. Result from Test of Hypothesis I: From the test of this hypothesis, the author found that delayed-retirement of family business owner-managers in Lagos State has significant adverse relationship with perpetuity of thebusiness. This is dangerous for family-owned business perpetuity and survival because a manager that is too old in age may not be able to cope with the pressure and competition that come with the management of a profit making business organization like family businesses. This work-for-life attitude of family business owner-managers is one of the reasons why family-owned businesses in Nigeria do not outlive their founders compared to Europe, Asia and America. Family business founders in Nigeria fail to plan their retirement from the business because they have the intention of working for life without minding the fact that death comes to man unannounced. The sudden death of a business owner that does not have a comprehensive succession plan in place has the potential of killing the business.

This finding is in line with one of the earlier stated theories of this study called the **Competency Theory of Succession Planning** (Vathanophas et al., 2007). Competency Theory is a framework that identifies a combination of skills, knowledge and behaviours which a successor must possess in order to perform and ensure the sustainability of a business. It adds that for this model to be respected, the competencies must comply with the job activities of the successor otherwise the business will fail. Therefore in linking this finding to this theory it strictly means that the owner-manager of a family business should retire from the management position the moment his/her management capability begins to decline as a result of old age related health challenges otherwise the family business will fail.

This finding is equally backed by the work of Cristina et al (2013) which aver that founders, struggling with retirement often experience powerful feelings of rivalry and jealousy toward potential successors. These feelings become evident in a persistent distrust of the successor's competence and ability. In the result of one company studied by Dickstein (2003), the founder's mistrust and rivalry with his successor reached a point where the founder spent most of his time minutely documenting every decision the successor made in order to build a convincing case for not retiring. The fact that the company was actually making a sizable profit under the successor's leadership was not sufficient evidence of managerial competence. Instead, the founder argued that until the successor learned to take care of the details (like turning the lights off at night and using good grammar on internal memos) he would not be fit to assume the management of the firm. After a painful struggle for control, the successor left the company, and the founder has since repeated the cycle with two other successor candidates.

Dyck et al (2000) lent their voices by arguing that retirement planning is crucial to the success and continuity of a family business from one generation to another. Similarly, Martins (2014) found that family firms that want to survive across generations and remain successful need to strengthen their retirement plan. Handler, (1994) asserts that the low resilience and high failure rate among first generation family firms are as a result of unsatisfactory retirement planning.

Lorna (2011) avers that the founder of a family business tends to be the only person who is a dominant player with the intent to work for life. He added that this position of centrality gives the founder a pervasive influence over the family firm system, making his own strongly felt reluctance toward retirement planning particularly problematic. While founders are often aware of many good reasons for developing a succession plan, they also experience strong psychological deterrents to managing their exit. One difficult deterrent to succession planning is the founder's reluctance to face his own mortality. For a founder to plan succession the founder must come to grips with uncertainty of life. However, some Nigerian entrepreneurs seem to have a firm belief that they control their own destiny hence their resistance to succession planning (Pascual et al 2012). Frequently, founders develop a complex set of rationalizations and compromises that prevent them from engaging in succession planning and retirement. The most destructive maneuver is used by the founder who repeatedly goes through the motions of choosing successors only to undermine their authority and fire them after a given period of some capricious pretext.

Pascual et al (2012) posit that founders resist retirement because it entails letting go of their power to influence the day-to-day running of the business. In many cases, founders become entrepreneurs precisely because of a strongly felt need to acquire and exercise power over others. Surrendering power over the firm is thus experienced as the first step toward losing control over life itself. Founders' strong needs for power and centrality are evident in the way they structure their businesses in a way that resists succession planning.

Ramona et al (2008) opine that founders make themselves indispensable to their businesses by resisting the delegation of authority and insisting that they be involved in decisions that would be better handled at lower levels in the organization. This self-reinforcing tendency for centrality leads many founders to develop an exaggerated image which breeds disastrous consequences at their demise. This image is frequently shared by others in the family firm, and it often becomes an integral part of the family firm's culture.

The gloomy outlook, in turn, creates a powerful rationale for avoiding succession planning and reinforces the founder's need to remain involved in day-to-day decisions. While it might well be true that the founder is indispensable at any given point in the life of the family firm, the fact remains that the founder has the power to break the dependency cycle, since he is largely, though not entirely, responsible for perpetuating it (David et al 2006).

Leslie (2007) asserts that founders who have gathered the courage to forge ahead with succession planning and retirement often find themselves disoriented after their plan is made public. In one family company that was studied by Leslie et al (2007), the founder worried that he would be ignored and cast aside by the financial community and by his business associates after he announced his succession plan, and retire.

Bocatto et al (2010) fault the founder for committing "corporeuthanasia," which he defines as the owner's act of willfully killing off the business he loves by failing to provide in his lifetime for a viable organization with clear continuity. According to their study, succession disaster occurs because the owner of the business cannot face the fact that at some point he must and will be replaced. If the successful business owner, who had the ability, vision, and guts to build the business from nothing, does not have the courage to face the problems of the future, then his banker and attorney will do it for him after he passes-on. This in most cases leads to the liquidation of the family business.

ii. Result from Test of Hypothesis II: The test of this hypothesis reveals that significant relationship exists between mentoring and successful management transference in family-owned businesses in Nigeria. Based on this empirical fact, it is clear that mentoring a successor to take over the management of a family business at retirement/death of the owner is one of the sure-ways of making sure that family-owned businesses stop dying with their owners in Nigeria.

This finding is in line with one of the theories discussed in the theoretical frame of this study called the **Competency Theory of Succession Planning** (Vathanophas et al., 2007). Competency Model (CM) is a framework that identifies a combination of skills, knowledge and behaviours which a successor must possess in order to perform and ensure the sustainability of a business. It adds that for this model to be respected, the competencies must comply with the job activities of the successor otherwise the business will fail. Therefore, mentoring a mentee-successor will equip the mentee with the requisite skills, abilities and experiences that the family business needs to survive succession. First-generation family businesses are heavily dependent on the founders not only for their leadership and drive but also for their connections and technical know-how. Failure of a family-owned business to mentor a successor will needlessly deprive the business of these crucial managerial assets.

Still backing up this finding (the importance of mentoring to the sustainability of family-owned businesses) with relevant theory; Egwu (2012) posits that modern business mentoring plays a pivotal role in addressing organizational failure accessioned by poor business leadership succession plan as mentoring facilitates the transference of organizational values, cultures and vision from generation to generation. The erudite scholar adds that business mentoring allows a vibrant potential manager to be discovered very early in their career and mentored into a full-blown successful manager. But sadly, family business today in Nigeria seems not to take mentoring seriously as a way of preserving their business beyond the founder (Egwu, 2012).

Again, this finding is also in line with the work of Troy et al (2001) which investigated mentoring in family-owned business. The results from a field survey of 502 employees showed that individuals with mentors reported significantly less work–family conflict, particularly family work conflict, than those respondents who did not have mentors. Other important findings of the study indicate that a mentor's support of a protégé's efforts to balance work and family demands has significant effects on reducing protégés' work–family conflict and that the role modeling function of mentoring significantly reduces family-work conflict experienced by protégés.

iii. Result from Test of Hypothesis III: The result from the test of this hypothesis shows thatthere is a significant relationship between non-family member Chief Executive Officer successors in family businesses and the business continuous viability. This means that in the absence of a competent family member CEO successor at retirement/death of a founder, a non-family member CEO should be appointed to enhance the business well-being.

This finding is again in line with the earlier stated theory called the **Competency Theoryof Succession Planning by Vathanophas et al (2007)** which states that the competencies of a successor must comply with the job activities otherwise the business is bound to fail. This Competency Theory advocates that a successor must possess the relevant skills, knowledge and behaviours in order to perform and ensure the survival of a business. This strictly means that if it is a non-family member Chief Executive Officer (CEO) that is capable of managing the business at the retirement or death of the founder, such professional manager should be given the chance otherwise the business is bound to fail.

Lauterbach et al (2009) distinguish between family companies that restrict the choice of their CEOs to their family members and the family companies that are open to both family-member CEOs and outside-CEOs on merit bases. Their finding reveals that family companies that restrict the choice of their CEOs to their family members are more likely to fail than those that are open to both family-member CEOs and outside-CEOs on merit basis. Therefore, the study concluded that family business needs to be professionalized especially if there is dearth of vibrant management skills in the family business at the death/retirement of their owners. The study added that outside-CEOs possess varieties of expert knowledge that is valuable in the mentoring of future-generation leaders needed to fill leadership roles in family business.

Christina (2013) opines that an external succession is the most effective cure for internal inefficiency because a new manager brought from outside is more likely to conceive and implement fresh initiatives. In the same spirit, Wee (2013) argues that when an organization performs poorly and needs a “change agent”, an external succession becomes more likely. Apart from the available empirical evidences, the development in major family businesses in the developed world is enough to back up this present author’s finding that non-family member CEOs play vital roles in enhancing the survival of family business at retirement/death of their founders.

For example Michelin Company was founded in France in 1888 by two brothers named Edouard and Andre Michelin and this family has continued to run the company till 2012 when Michelin Rollier, a family member, was for the first time in the company's history, replaced as Chief Executive Officer by a non-family member called Jean Dominique Senard when there was management dearth in their family, while the family still remains in control through the Board of Directors (Joseph et al, 2014). Also, WalMart, a multinational company was founded in the U.S. in 1962 by Sam Walton. Sam Walton the founder stepped down as the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) and appointed David Glass, a non-family member in his place. Today, the family remains in control through the company board of directors (Cliffe, 2008). Similarly, Samsung, a multinational company was founded in Korea in 1938 by Lee Byung-Chun. This family-owned company contributed 1/5 of South Korea's total exports and 17 percent of Korea's GDP in 2012. Again, this company appointed a non-family member Chief Executive Officer upon the death of the founder in 1987 (Joseph et al 2014). In the same way, Terry Gou founded a multinational company called Foxconn in Taiwan in 1974. In January 2012 the founder retired as the company Chief Executive Officer on health grounds and appointed Chong Cheng, a non-family member in his place but remains as the board chairman (David, and James, 2014).

In Malaysian scenario for instance (Wee, 2013), it is challenging to get a potential successor who is capable in managing the family company. Some family companies train their sons or grandsons to be the successors. However, failure occurs when the successors are incapable of handling the tasks. Therefore, sometimes family companies usually include professional management (non-family managers) based on merit rather than family ties. This is to ensure the family company's survival. For example, Public Bank Bhd. is controlled by Teh Sri Hong Piow and it is professionally managed by him and his managers. Although Public Bank Bhd was founded by Teh none of his children hold significant positions in the bank.

iv. Result from Test of Hypothesis IV: The result from the test of this hypothesis indicates that family elders' forum's ability to resolve succession crises has a significant relationship with harmonious working relationship in family businesses.

This finding is supported by **Herz-Brown (1993) family firm theory of loss and continuity** which states that a succession process can be disrupted by untimely death of the older generation or a potential successor if a family firm does not have a comprehensive succession plan in place. Relating this theory to this finding it follows that a family business that is owned especially by a polygamous family should put in place a formidable family elders' forum to arrest and resolve

amicably the envisaged succession crises that the sudden death of the owner-manager may erupt. This is important because court litigations and injunctions breed hatred in family business and threatens harmonious working relationship among family members, and ultimately ruin the business.

Goldbart (2009) says that in a family-owned business, the resultant succession conflict among the founder's heirs often becomes so intense that they are unable to make the strategic decisions needed to ensure the future of the firm. This succession crisis also threatens the family's financial well-being by leaving many thorny estate issues unanswered of which a distressed sale of the firm is often the result. Family elders' forum is the board of directors for the family circle in the family business. It can be an all-inclusive, self-appointed, or elected workgroup of family members, whose main tasks are to resolve family conflict, make decisions about the business of the family and to educate families about the enterprise (Lansberg, 1999; Dickstein, 2003; Jaffe, 2005).

Lansberg et al (2007) found in their study that family council is a group who periodically come together to discuss issues arising from their family business with the fundamental purpose of providing a forum in which family members articulate their values, needs, and expectations vis-a-vis the company and develop policies that safeguard the long-term interests and continuity of the family business. The following scolars discovered the following as the functions of the family elders in their studies: Kets et al (2002) found that family elders in a family business forges family consensus, and counteracts declining family bonds and low identification with the firm, as families grow and spontaneous social contacts among family members decrease.

Goldbart et al (2009) posit that family elders articulate a family strategy for business and wealth management including planning, rule setting, and collaborative asset allocation, which are not natural activities for families. Handler (1999) found that family council limits family conflicts that could negatively affect the family business. Secondly that it supports succession planning particularly in facilitating the family's exploration of their collective dream of continuity and conveying a policy-driven stewardship culture and enthusiasm for the business. Thirdly that family council educates and welcomes younger generations into a forum for lifelong learning in the family business. Lamp (2007) presented the case of the first six years of the Eddy Family Council. The Eddy Family framed the role of the Family Council as the caretaker of 'investors' relations'. Lamp found that the family council has clearly strengthened the business and the

family. Lamp concludes that the critical conditions for the family council to accomplish its tasks are education and socialization of new family council members, and an independent budget for funding its activities. Daugherty (2009) discovers in his study of family council that led a transition in both the management and ownership of a family firm. His study reveals the governance functions of the council which includes fostering and enhancing ties among family members, framing policies of restructuring and redesign in the family business.

CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Summary of Findings

From the discussion of findings in the preceding chapter, the following summary is made:

1. Delayed-retirement of family business owner-managers has a significant adverse relationship with the business perpetuity as the F-calculated value of 58.316 is greater than F-critical table value of 3.85 at 0.05 level of significance and at 1 degree of freedom.Again, the R square value of 042 in the model summary result shows that delayed-retirement of family business owner-managers only explains a paltry 4.2% variation in the business perpetuity while the coefficient value of -.628 reveals that for every 100% increase in family business perpetuity, delayed-retirement contributes a negative value of -62.8%.

2. Significant relationship exists between mentoring and successful management transference in family businesses as the F-calculated value of 22,170,75.427 is greater than F-critical table value of 3.85 at 0.05 level of significance and at 1 degree of freedom. Again, the R square value of .756 in the model summary result shows thatmentoring explains 75.6% variation in successful management transference in family businesseswhile the coefficient value of .681 reveals that for every 100% increase in successful management transference in family businesses, mentoring contributes 68.1%. The demographic data corroborates this result as out of the total number of 354 family-owned business studied in Lagos State, 228 (64.4 per cent) have been operating between 5 – 20 years while 126 (35.6 per cent) of them have been operating between 21 – 50 years. But disappointingly, none of the 354 studied family-owned businesses has existed above 51years. This is a fact that mentoring is needed for their sustainability.

3. There is a significant relationship between the appointment of non-family member Chief Executive Officer successors in family businesses and the business continuous viability as the F-calculated value of 28,204,57.581 is greater than F-critical table value of 3.85 at 0.05 level of significance and at 1 degree of freedom. Also, the R square value of .688 in the model summary result shows thatthe appointment of non-family members Chief Executive Officer successors in family businesses when they lack competent family-member CEOs explains 68.8% variation inthe business continuous viabilitywhile the coefficient value of .571 reveals that for every 100% increase in the business continuous viability, the appointment of non-family members Chief Executive Officer successors in family businesses when they lack competent family-member

CEOscontributes 57.1%.The demographic data equally supports this result by showing that 218 (61.6 per cent) of the family-owned businesses that participated in the study are managed by their owners; 64 (18.1 per cent) are managed by non-family members while 72 (20.3 per cent) are co-managed by family and non-family members. This is a sign that the appointment of non-family member Chief Executive Officers cam come to the rescue of family businesses during succession crises.

4.Family elders' forum's ability to resolve succession crisis significantly relates to harmonious working relationship in family businesses as the F-calculated value of 16,401,86.734 is greater than F-critical table value of 3.85 at 0.05 level of significance and 1 degree of freedom.Again, the R square value of .624 in the model summary result shows thatfamily elders' forum's ability to resolve succession crisisexplains 62.4% variation inharmonious working relationship in family businesseswhile the coefficient value of .498 reveals that for every 100% increase inharmonious working relationship in family businesses,family elders' forum's ability to resolve succession crisiscontributes 49.8%.The demographic data reveals that out of the 354 family-owned business studied, 328 (92.7 per cent) are still at the founder-owned stage; 23 (6.5 per cent) survived first ownership transference while only 3 (.8 per cent) survived second ownership transference. This is an indication that family-owned businesses do not survive ownership transference and as such, family elders' forum can strengthen harmonious working relationship among the family members so as to sustain the business for generations.

6.2 Conclusion

From the discussion of findings in the preceding chapter, the following conclusions are drawn:

Nigerian family-owned businesses suffer lack of sustainability beyond their founders because of their work-for-life attitude as their old age usually takes a toll on the fortunes of the businesses and often kills it before the transference of the businesses to their successors. This is true because the founders, struggling with retirement often experience powerful feelings of rivalry and jealousy toward potential successors, and this attitude perpetually keeps the founders in the management of the businesses even at their unproductive old age where the businesses continue to decline and eventually collapse.

Mentoring successors to take over the management of family businesses at the retirement or death of their owner-managers is one of the sure-ways of enhancing successful management

transference in family-owned businesses which will eventually stops them from dying with their owners in Nigeria. Family businesses are heavily dependent on the founders not only for their leadership and drive but also for their connections and technical know-how. Therefore, failure of a family-owned business to mentor a successor will needlessly deprive the business of these crucial managerial assets.

In the same vein, appointing a non-family member Chief Executive Officer (CEO) in a family business if there is a dearth of such capable successor in the family at retirement or death of the owner enhances the business continuous prosperity. This again is true because experimenting with a family-member neophyte CEO is a recipe for disaster as learning the ropes at that level often comes with grievous and irredeemable mistakes.

Family elders' forum plays a significant role in enhancing harmonious working relationship in family-owned businesses in Nigeria by resolving succession crises. This prevents the crises from impacting negatively on the business. Family elders also forges family consensus, and counteracts declining family bonds and low identification with the firm, as families grow and spontaneous social contacts among family members decrease. With the results from this study, it is important to conclude that succession planning is crucial in ensuring the sustainability of family businesses beyond their founders in Nigeria.

6.3 Recommendations

Having discussed the findings extensively, and drawn some conclusions therein, the following recommendations are made:

1. The owner-managers of family businesses in Nigeria should embrace the retirement age in the nation's civil service and the multinational companies and discard their work-for-life attitude so as to prevent old age related challenges from hampering the fortunes and perpetuity of the businesses. This is true because delaying retirement to an unproductive age of the owner could kill the business before transference.
2. Mentoring of potential successors should be encouraged by family business owners in Nigeria in order to ensure successful management transference in the event of retirement or death of their owners. This is important because family businesses are heavily dependent on their owners not only for their leadership and drive but also for their connections and technical know-how.

3. Members of a family business with a dearth of a competent CEO successor among them at retirement or death of the owner-manager should encourage the appointment of a non-family member Chief Executive Officer (professional manager) as a successor to enhance the business continuous viability because experimenting with a family-member neophyte CEO is a recipe for disaster as learning the ropes at CEO level often comes with grievous and irredeemable mistakes.

4. Nigerian family businesses should constitute family elders' forum especially in polygamous and extended family to be amicably resolving family crises that are capable of destroying the business as prolonged court litigations and injunctions in succession crises resolution are counterproductive. This again is essential because family elders tackle family crises and forges family consensus, counteracts declining family bonds and low identification with the firm, as families grow and spontaneous social contacts among family members decrease.

6.4 Contribution to Knowledge

The researcher, having done his literature review, discovered the following gaps in knowledge in the area of family business succession planning and its sustainability across generations in Nigeria: the relationship between family business owner-manager delayed-retirement and the perpetuity of the businesses; the relationship between mentoring and successful management transference in family businesses; the relationship between the appointment of a non-family member Chief executive Officer in the absence of a competent one in a family business and the continuous viability of such business; the relationship between family elders' forum succession crises resolution ability and harmonious working relationship in family businesses in Nigeria.

In closing the above mentioned gaps, the researcher subjecting the succession planning variables in family businesses to empirical study, and consequently made the following contributions to knowledge in four specific areas: that delayed-retirement of family business owner-managers hampers the fortunes/perpetuity of the business; that mentoring in family businesses is ideal in ensuring successful management transference in the business; that hiring of a non-family member CEO (professional manager) in the absence of a competent one in a family business is crucial in averting succession disaster; and that succession crises is better amicably resolved through the engagement of family elders as a prolonged litigation processes over succession crises could hamper the business sustainability while its eventual judgment breeds hatred among family members which is capable of killing off the family business.

REFERENCES

Abereijo, A; & Fayomi, B. (2005). Innovative approach to SMEs financing in Nigeria: A Review of Small and Medium Industries Equity Investment Scheme (SMIEIS*). Journal of Social Sciences, 11, 23-29.*

Abubakar, A. S. & Yahaya, Z. A. (2013).Strengthening small and medium enterprises (SMEs) as a strategy for poverty reduction in North Western Nigeria.*American Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Vol. 1. No. 3, 189-201 DOI:10.11634/232907811301338. Aailable at http://www.worldscholars.org*

Abubakar, S. & Olaolu, O. (2013, January 13th). Generation that squandered, built on their forebearer's wealth. The Leadership Newspaper.*Available @ http//www.leadership.ng/news/130713/ that squandered builtontheirforebearer's wealth.*

Aderonke, J. (2014). Culture determinants and family business succession in Jos Metropolis, Plateau State Nigeria.*Journal of Emerging Trends in Economics and Management Sciences, 5(5), 379-390.*

Agbionu, T. U, & Anazodo, R. O. (2012).Mentorship and business performance among Igbo entrepreneurs in Nigeria.*Faculty of Management Sciences Conference Proceedings, Nnamdi Azikiwe University Awka, Nigeria, pp. 430 - 439.*

Agu R. A. (2010). Frontiers of entrepreneurship: Concepts, theories and practice. Nigeria, Onitsha: Kawuriz and Manilas Publishers Ltd.

Aiku, B. (2014). Professionals, family business and the Nigerian economy.A Paper Presented at Mid-year Meeting/Annual Dinner of the Board of Fellows of the Pharmaceutical Society of Nigerian Nigeria (PSN),Oyo State Chapter.

Alvarez, E. & Lopez-Sintas, J. (2002). Socialization patterns of successors in first to second generation family businesses. *Family Business Review, 15(3), 189-203.*

Astrachan, J. (2010). Strategy in family business: Towards a multidimensional research agenda. *Journal of Family Business Strategy, 1(1), 6-14*.

Ayodeji O. (2002) External Trade Control Policies in Nigeria During the Second World War and Its Aftermath.*International Journal of African Historical Studies, vol. 35*.

Ayres, C.R. (1990). Rough family justice: Equity in family business succession planning. *Family Business Review 31(1), 3-22.*

Barnes, L.B., & Hershon, S.A. (2009).Transferring power in the family business.*Harvard Business Review, 54(4), 105-114.*

Beckhard, R. & Dyer, W.G. (2003). Managing continuity in the family owned business. *Organizational Dynamics 24(3), 5-12.*

Berrone, P., Cruz, C., Gomez-Mejia, L., & Larraza-Kintana, M. (2010). Socio-emotional wealth creation and corporate pressures: Do family-controlled firms pollute less? *AdministrativeScience Quarterly, 55(1), 82-113.*

Bird, B., Welsch, H., Astrachan, J.H., & Pistrui, D. (2002). Family business research: The evolution of an academic field. *Family Business Review, 15(4), 337-350.*

Bocatto, E., Gispert, C. & Rialp, J. (2010). Family-owned business succession in Spanish firms: The influence of pre-performance in the nomination of family and nonfamily members. *Journal of Small Business Management, 48(4), pp. 497–523jsb*

Bola, B. & Yinka, O. (2013, January 9th). Who will restore Chief MKO business empire? The Tribune Newspaper.*Retrieved from www.tribuneonline.com.*

Brahan-Miller, I., Miller, D. & Steier L.P. (2004).Toward an integrative model of effective FOB succession.Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice 28(4), 305 -338.

Brockhouse, R.H. (2004). Family business succession: Suggestion for future research. *Family Business Review 19(2): 165-177.*

Brown, R. & Coverly, R. (1999). Succession planning in family business: A study from East Anglian, UK. *Journal of Small Business Management 37(1), 93 – 97.*

Carraher, S.M. & Carraher, S.C. (2006). Human resource issues among SMEs in Eastern Europe: A 30 month study in Belarus, Poland, and Ukraine. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship, 10, 97-108.*

Central Bank of Nigeria (2015).Creating an enabling environment for micro, small and mediun enterprises (MSMEs) in Nigeria.*Retrieved from www.sunonlinenewspapers on 11/12/2015.*

Central Bank of Nigeria (2011, December 16th). Monetary policy committee disclosure of lending rates and interest rates in deposit money banks to SMEs in Nigeria. The Leadership Newspaper, pp. 9-10.

CBN (2010). Guidelines and procedures for the establishment of microfinance bank in Nigeria. Retrievedfromhttp://www.cenbank.ng.org/out/publications/reports/rd/2007/stabull 2010.pdf

Central Bank of Nigeria (2005).Business expectation survey.Quarterly Publication of the Central Bank of Nigeria, 2nd quarter.

Chikodi, O., & Ibrahim, A.Y. (30th August, 2015). Receding fortunes of family business empires.The Nation Newspapers.*Retrieved from thenationonlinenewspaperng.net.*

Chrisman, J., Kellermanns, F., Chan, K., & Liano, K. (2010). Intellectual foundations of current research in family business review of 25 influential articles. *Family Business Review, 23(1), 9-26.*

Chrisman, J., Chua, J. & Barnett, T. (2010). Family involvement, family influence and family centred non-Economic goal in small firms. *Vol 10, No. 42.*

Chua, J., Chrisman, J., & Sharma, P. (2003).Succession and non-succession concerns of family firms and agency relationships with non-family managers.*Family Business Review, 16(2), 89-107.*

Chuba, O. (2013, January 2nd). Building enduring family business in Nigeria.Sahara Online Reporters.*Retrieved from www.saharaonlinereporters.*

Churchill, N. C, & Hatten K.J. (2009). Non-market based transfers of wealth and power: A research framework for family businesses. *American Journal of Small Business 12: 53-66.*

Cliffe, S. (1998). Family Business: Facing Up to Succession. *Harvard Business Review 76(3) 16-17*

Coghlan, D. & Brydon-Miller, M. (2014).The Sage Encyclopedia of Action Research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Corbetta, G., & Salvato, C. (2004). The board of directors in family firms: One size fits all? *Family Business Review, 17(2), 119-134.*

Cozby, P. C. (2001). Measurement Concepts and Methods in Behavioural Research (7thed.). California: Mayfield Publishing company.

Creswell, J. (2008). Research design: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods approaches. London: sage.

Cristina, B. (2013). Boards of directors in family firms: An exploratory study of structure and process in Bergamo University, Italy. *Retrieved from cristinabettinelli@unibg.it*

Curimbaba, F. (2002).The dynamics of women's roles as family business managers.*Family Business Review, 15(3), 239-252.*

Cynthia, A., Thompson, L., & Beauvais, K.(1999). When Work–Family Benefits Are Not Enough: The Influence of Work–Family Culture on Benefit Utilization, Organizational Attachment, and Work–Family Conflict.*Journal of Vocational Behaviour, Vol. 54, Issue 3, pp 392-415*

David, D., Robert, B; & Shiv, C. (2006). Successful internationalising UK family and non-family owned firms: A comparative study. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development, 13(4), 498-512.*

David, H. Z., & James, D. W., (2014). How directors' prior experience with other demographically similar CEOs affects their appointments onto corporate boards and the Consequences for CEO Compensation. *Academy of Management Journal, 57(3) 791-813; doi:10.5465/amj.2011.0590*

Davis, P. S. & Harveston, P. D. (2012). The influence of family on the family business succession process: A multi-generational perspective. *Family Business Review. 22(4)140-176.*

Dele, S. (2014, January 20th, 27th; & February 3rd). The inheritors: Why Nigeria one-man companies never last. The Vanguard newspaper.*Retrieved from www.vanguardonlineng.com*

Deloitte & Touche (2012).Strategic Succession Planning; Developing and Retaining Talent; Sustaining Vision, Culture and Leadership. Miscellaneous Brochures 94(11), 146-147

De Vaus, D. A. (2001). Research Design in Social science Research. London: Sage.

Dickstein, S. (2003). The family council: A useful adjunct to the functions of the wealth management professional. *Journal of Wealth Management, 5(4): 12-14.*

Drozdow, N. & Carrol, V. (1997).Tools for strategy development in family firms.*Solomon Management Review 39(11), 75 – 88.*

Dunn, B. (1996). Family enterprises in the UK: A special sector. *Family Business Review, 9: 139-155*

Dyck, B., Mauws, M., Starke, F.A., & Mischke, G.A. (2002).Passing the baton: The importance of sequence, timing, technique and communication in executive succession.*Journal of Business Venturing, 17(2), 143-162.*

Egwu, U. E. (2012). Business mentoring & microeconomics development in Africa: Strategies and options. *A lead paper presented at an international conference on business mentoring and microeconomic development in Africa organized by the Department of Business Administration, Nnamdi Azikiwe University Awka, Nigeria.*

Eze, A.N. (2006). Practical approach to research methods and statistics. Onitsha: Onwubiko Printing and Packaging Industry Ltd.

European Commission (2012).Family business review. Retrieved from
http://www.europeanfamilybusinesses.eu/uploads/Modules/Publications/family-business-statistics.pdf Family Firm Institute. Retrieved from http://www.ffi.org/?page=globaldatapoints

Farrell, K., & Whidbee, D. (2000).The Consequences of forced CEO/outside directors in succession on family business.The Journal of Business, 73(4), 597-627.

Fenn, E. D., & Gozde, G.B. (2010).Family and business values of regional family firms.*Journal of Islamic and Middle Eastern Finance and Management, 3(1), 47-64.*

Filbeck, G., & Lee, S. (2010). Financial management techniques in family businesses.*Family Business Review, 13(3), 201-216.*

Floren R. H. (2008). The significance of family business in the Netherlands.*Family Business Review, 11: 121-134*

Gorard, S. (2013). Research Design: Creating Robust Approaches for Social Sciences. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hair, J., Black, B. B., Anderson, R., & Tatham, R. (2006).Multivariate data analysis (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Handler, W.C. (1990). Succession in family business: A mutual role adjustment between entrepreneur and next-generation family members. *Entrepreneurship Theory & practice, vol 15, No. 1, pp 37-51.*

Handler, W.C. (1999). Succession in family business*: A review of the research. Family Business Review, 7(2): 133-157.*

Herz-Brown, F. (1993).Loss and continuity in the family firm.*Family Business Review, 6(2): 111-130. Doi:10.1111/j.1741-6248.1993.00111.*

Hutchinson, S. (2000). Business adviser- succession: Planning a family business to the new generation is a process fraught with challenges. *Financial Planning 1:139-140*

Ibrahim, A. B. & Ellis, W. H. (2004). Family business management: Concept and practices (2nd ed.). Dubuque, TA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing.

Ibrahim, A.B., Dumas, C. & McGuire, J. (2011). Strategic decision making in small family firms: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Small Business Strategy, 12 (1), 1-11.*

Ibrahim, A.B., Soufani, K. & Lam, J. (2001).A study of succession in a family firm.*Family Business Review, XIV (3), 245-58.*

Ifekwem, N. E., Oghojafor, B. E. A., & Kuye, O. L. (2011).Growth, sustainability and inhibiting factors of family business in South East Nigeria.*International Bulletin of Business Aministration ISSN: 1451- 243X Issue. EuroJournals Available at http://www.eurojournal.com.*

Ines, H. (2013). Agency costs, family ties, and firm efficiency, University of Pablo. *Retrieved from www.insherrero@upo.es*

Johnmark, U. (August 2nd 2014). Why family businesses go extinct in Nigeria. *Retrieved from www.mynewswatchtimesng.com*

John, J. S., & Veronica, M. G. (2000).The Role of Gender in Mentoring: Implications for Diversified and Homogenous Mentoring Relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, Volume 57, Issue 1, pp. 102-122*

Josseph, A. (2013). Culture determinants and family business Succession in Jos Metropolis, Plateau State Nigeria.*Journal of Emerging Trends in Economics and Management Sciences*.Retrieved on 13/2/2014 from www.*Journal of Emerging Trends in Economics and Management Sciences*.

Joseph, R., & Jie, F. (2014). Should I quit my day Job?: A hybrid path to entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Journal August 2014 57:4 936-963; doi:10.5465/amj.2012.0522.*

Karlan, D; & Valdivia, M. (2009).Teaching entrepreneurship: Impact of business training on microfinance clients and institutions. *A Review of Economics and Statistics, 5, 10-16.*

Kellermans, F. W. & Eddleston, K. H. (2004). Feuding families: When conflict does a family firm good. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 28(1), 209–28.

Klein, S. B. (2008). Family businesses in Germany: Significance and structure. *Family Business Review, 21, 2: pp. 121-125*

Kontinen, T., & Ojala, A. (2013).Internationalization of family business.*Journal Family Business 1(2) 97- 107.*

Kuratko, D. K., & Hodgetts, R. M. (2004). Entrepreneurship: Theory, Process & Practice (6th Edition). United States of American: Thomson South-Western.

Lam, J. (2009). Succession process in Canadian family business: A longitudinal case study of Molson Family Business. *1786-2007, A Ph.D Thesis Report in Concordia University Montreal, Quebec, Canada.*

Lamp, C. (2007). The Eddy Family Council: meeting and eating since 2000. *Family Business Magazine, Autumn: 40-42.*

Le-breton, M. & Lester, C. (2007). Are family firms really superior performers. *Journal of Corporate Finance, Vol. 13, Issue 5.*

Lee, J. (2006). Family firm performance: Further evidence. *Family Business Review, 19: 103-114.*

Lekan, S. (2012, December 18th). Why Nigerian family business fail. The Punch Newspaper.Retrieved from www.Punchnewspaperonlineng.com.

Leslie, B. H., Elizabeth, A., & Tenora, D. G. (2007).Work–Family Conflict in Dual-Earner Couples: Within-Individual and Crossover Effects of Work and Family.*Journal of Vocational Behaviour, Vol. 50, Issue 2, pp. 185-2003.*

Lorna, C. (2011). Implications for family-owned business successions: A multiple perspectives review and suggestions for further research. *Family Business Review, 18: 93-103.*

Magnus, C., & Mesmer, J. (2009).The role of the coworker in reducing work–family conflict: A review and directions for future research. *Pratiques Psychologiques, Vol. 15, Issue 2, pp. 213-224.*

Mahmud, M. & Segun, O. (2015, December 21st). A paper presented at the inauguration of the national industrial court of Nigeria alternative dispute resolution center, Abuja. The National Mirror Newspaper. Available @ www.nationalmirrornewspaper.ng

Martyn, S. (2008).Validity and Reliability.*Retrieved March 09, 2014 from http://explorable.com/validity-and-reliability.*

Martins, O. (2014, February 18th). Enhancing the family business culture in Nigeria.Peoples Daily Newspaper. *Retrieved from www.thepeoplesdailynewspaper.ng*

Marvasti, M. (2004).Quantitative research. London: Sage.

Matthews, C. H., Moore, T. W & Fialko, A. S. (2009). Succession in the family firm: A cognitive categorization perspective. *Family Business Review, 12: 159-169*

McConoughy, D.L., Matthews, C.H., & Fialko, A.S. (2001). Founding family controlled firms: Performance, risk, and value. *Journal of Small Business Management, 39(1), 21-49.*

Mensah, J. (2012).Succession planning in small and medium enterprises in Takoradi metropolis of Ghana. A Thesis submitted to the Institute of Distance Learning, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana.

Miller, D., Steier, L. & Breton-Miller, I. L. (2003).Lost in time: intergenerational succession, change, and failure in family business.*Journal of Business Venturing. 18, 513–531*

Miller, N., and McLeod, H. (2005).Managing family businesses in small communities.*Journal of Small Business Management 39(1):73-87.*

Miller,W.D.(1998). Siblings and succession in family business.*Harvard Business Review .76 (7) 29-3*

Mitra, J & Sagagi, M.S. (2010).Readings on African Entrepreneurship (Module 6). Kano: Bayero University and Essex Business School publications.

Morris, M.H., Williams, R.O., Allen, J.A. & Avila.R.A. (1997).Correlates of success in family business successions.*Journal of Business Venturing 12(5):385-401.*

Mukhtar, S.M.(1998). Business characteristics of male and female small and medium enterprises in UK: Implication for gender based entrepreneurialism and business Competence development. *British Journal of Management, 9(1), 72-8.*

Musa, B. M., & Semasinghe, D. M. (2014). Leadership Succession Problem: an Examination of Small Family Businesses. *European Journal of Business and Management, 6(34), 301-306.*

Nathanael, J. F., Ethan, R. B., & Caroline, A. B. (2012).Managing to stay in the dark: Managerial self-efficacy, ego defensiveness, and the aversion to employee voice in family business.*Academy of Management Journal, 57(4) 1013-1034; doi:10.5465/amj.2012.0393.*

National Bureau of Statistics, & Small and Medium Enterprise Development Agency of Nigeria (2010).A collaborative survey of MSMEs, pp; 1- 182.

Nnamdi, A. (2004). Research methodology in behavioural sciences (2nd ed.). Nigeria: Longman Publishing Company Ltd

Nuradli, R. S., Hanifah, A. H., Shahida, S., & Hairunnizam, W. (2008). Factors influe.ncing the Islamic credit cards holders satisfaction. *The Business Review, Cambridge, Vol. 11(2).*

Nwana, O. C. (2005). Introduction to educational research. (2nd ed.). Ibadan: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd.

Nworgu, B. G. (2006). Educational research: Basic issues and methodology (2nd ed.). Enugu: University Trust Publishers.

Nwosu, R.C. (2002). Introduction to probability and distribution theory (1st ed). Onitsha: Afrika-link Communications.

Obadan, J. A., & Ohiorenoya, J. O. (2013).Succession planning in small business enterprises in Edo State, Nigeria.*European Scientific Journal vol.9, No.31 ISSN: 1857 – 7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857- 7431 64.*

Obayan, A. O. I. (1995) Changing perspectives in the extended family system in Nigeria: implications for family dynamics and Counselling. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly.8(3).*

Ogbonna C. (2010) Cultural issues about doing business in Nigeria; A case study of Thurmo CY.Unpublished Thesis, Central Oshobo Thria University of Applied Sciences Kokkola, Finland.

Ogundele, O. J. K. (2011). Introduction to entrepreneurship development, corporate governace and small business management. Lagos: Molofin Nominees.

Ogundele, O. J. K., & Idris, A. A. (2008). Entrepreneurial succession problems in Nigeria: A threat to sustainability. *Proceedings of 1st Chike Okoli International Conference on Entrepreneurship and Africa's Quest for Development, Nnadi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria (pp. 396-404).*

Ogunkuye, K. (2004). Problems in transfer of business experienced by Finnish entrepreneurs.*Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development, 11 (1), 130-139*

Olorunshola, F.E.(2003). Building workplace of choice: Using the weak environment to attract and retain top talent. *Journal of Faculty Management, 2(3) 244-257*

Olorunshola, F.E.(2013). Building workplace of choice. European Scientific *Journal, vol.9, No.31 ISSN: 1857 – 7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857- 7431 76*

Olutunla, (2008). An empirical analysis of factors associated with the profitability of small and medium enterprises in Nigeria. *African Journal of Business Onitsha: Onwubiko Printing and Packaging Industry Ltd.*

Onuoha, B. C. (2012). Professionalising family business in South-East Nigeria.*International Journal of Academic Rsearch in Business and Social science Vol. 2. No.9.*

Onuoha, B. C. (2013). Poor Succession Planning by Entrepreneurs: The Bane of Generational Enterprises in South-East, Nigeria. AFRREV IJAH: *An International Journal of Arts and Humanities, 2(2), 270-281.*

Onuoha, B. C. (2013). Wealth Creation, Retirement and Succession Planning of Entrepreneurs in South-East, Nigeria.*International Business and Management, 7(1), 99-105.*

Onuoha, Rosemary (2015, November 25th). Make strategic plan for business sustainability before your death. The Vanguard Newspapers.Retrieved from www.vanguardonline.com.

Onyeizugbe, C. U., & Chukwu, I. B. (2013).Business mentoring and entrepreneurship development in selected States in Nigeria.*Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development.Vol. 4, No. 11 ISSN 2222-2855.*

Pascual, B.,Cristina, C.,&Luis R. G.(2012). Socio-emotional Wealth in Family Firms:Theoretical Dimensions, Assessment Approaches, and Agenda issues.*Family Business Review, 25:258-279; doi:10.1177/0894486511435355*

Ramona, K.Z., Hoy, F., Poutziouris, P.Z., & Steier, L.P. (2008).Emerging paths of family entrepreneurship research.*Journal of Small business Management, 46(3), pp.317-330.*

Phelan, C. & Wren, J. (2005).Exploring reliability in academic assessment.*Available at: www.uni.edu/chfasoa/reliabilityandvalidity.*

Reginald, A. L.,Allison, W. P., & Shanan, L. (2013). Charting the Future of Family Business Research: Perspective Fromthe Field. *Family Business Review. Journal of the Family Firm Institute Inc Retrieved from www.fbr.sagepub.com.*chartingthefutureoffamily businessresearch:perspectivefromthefield.

Ritch, L.S., Andy, Y., Keith, H.B., & Lumpin, G. T. (2013).The Landscape of Family Business Outcomes: Summary and Taxonomy of Dependent Variables. *Retrieved from: www.e-elgar.com/shop/the landscape of Family Business Outcomes: Summary and Taxonomy of Dependent Variables.*

Robert, N. L., & Matthew, C. S. (2004).Family business management activities, styles and characteristics.*American Journal of Business, 19(1), 47 – 54.*

Rogoff, E. G., & Heck, R. K. Z. (2003). 'Evolving research in entrepreneurship and family business: Recognizing family as the oxygen that feeds the fire of entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing, 18(5), 559-566.*

Rose, O. and Friday, O. A. (2015).An appraisal of succession planning in family-owned businesses in Nigeria. *European Journal of Business and Management www.iiste.org ISSN 2222-1905 (Paper) ISSN 2222-2839 (Online) Vol.7, No.12.*

Roth, W. (2005).Doing research: Praxis of methods. Rotterdam: Sense publications.

Saheed, A. G. (2013). Awareness of ownership succession and family business continuity.*International Journal of Business and Management InventionISSN (Online): 2319 ¨C 8028, ISSN (Print): 2319 ¨C 801X www.ijbmi.org Volume 2 Issue 9¡Î September. 2013¡Î PP.72-87.*

Saladana, J. (2012). The coding manual for qualitative research. London: Sage.

Sareshmukh, S. R., & Corbett, A. C. (2011). The duality of internal and external development of successors: Opportunity recognition in family firms. *Family Business Review, 24: 111-125.*

Sharma, P. (2009). An overview of the field of family business studies: Current status and direction for the futures. *Family Business Review, 17 (1) 27-42.*

Sharma, P., Chrisman, J.J., Pablo, A.L. & Chua, J.H. (2011). Determinants of initial satisfaction with the succession process in family firms: A conceptual model. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 25(3), 17-35.*

Sharma, P.,Chrisman, J.J. & Chua, J.H. (2000). Strategic management of the family business: Past research and future challenges. *Family Business Review 17(1) 1-36*

SMEDAN & National Bureau of Statistics. (2012). Survey Report on Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises in Nigeria: 2010 National MSME Collaborative Survey. *Abuja: SMEDAN and National Bureau of Statistics.*

Sonfield, M.C. & Lussier, R. N. (2002). First-generation and subsequent-generation family firms: A comparison. *Proceedings of the National Entrepreneurship and Small Business Educators Conference 153-161*.

Sue-Campbell, C. (2001). Work Cultures and Work/Family Balance. Journal of Vocational Behaviour, Vol. 58, Issue 3, pp. 348-365.

Sun, Y. L., Marko, P., Stefan, T. & Madan, P. (2013). Discrimination in selection decision: Integration stereotyping fit and interdependence theories. *Academy of Management Journal, doi:10.5465/amj.2013.057.*

Sund, L., Runhede, H., & Haag, K. (2010). Divorce and death in the family firm: *A business law perspective. European Business Law Review, 21(2), 101-118.*

Taro, Y. (1967).Elementary sampling theory. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.

Troy, R. N., & Dawn, S. C. (2001).The Supportive Mentor as a Means of Reducing Work–Family Conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour,Vol. 59 (3), 364–381*

Ugwushi, B. (2009). SMEs Key failure-factors: A comparison between the United Kingdom and Nigeria: *Journal of Social Sciences, 18(3),199- 207.*

Ukaegbu, C. C. (2003). Entrepreneurial Succession and Post Founders' Durability: a study of Indigenous Private Manufacturing firms in Igbo states of Nigeria. *Journal of contemporary African Studies Vol. 21, No1, pp. 1-1*

Vathanophas, V. & Thai-ngam, J. (2007).Competency requirements for effective job performance in the Thai public sector.*Contemporary Management Research, 3 (1), 45-70.*

Walter W.C., Chung, K., & Yuen, P. K. (2003). Management succession: a case for Chinese family owned business. *Management Decision Review, 41(7), 643 – 655*

Wayne, R. (2012). Ten things you may not know about family business. *Family Business Institute Inc. Retrieved on 30/11/2015 from www.fbionline*

Westhead, P. (2003). Succession decision-making outcomes reported by private family companies. *International Small Business Journal. 21: 369-401*

Westhead, P., Howorth, C., & Cowling, M. (2002). Ownership and management issues in first generation and multi-generation family firms. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development, 14(3), 247-269.*

William, O. & Peter, M. (2003).The world oldest family companies.*Available at: www.griequity.com/resoures/industry.*

Williams, M. L., & Millan, I. C. (2013).A unified system perspective of family firm performance.*Journal of Business Venturing, 18, 451–465.*

Wing, Y., Watkins, D., Harris, N. & Spicer, K. (2000). Succession issues and business performance: Evidence from UK family SMEs. *11th Annual Family Business Network World Conference, FBN, London, 403-22.*

Yong, W., David, W., Neil, H., & Keith, D. S. (2004).The relationship between succession issues and business performance.*Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour, 10, 55-84.*

APPENDIX A

Department of Business Administration,
Faculty of Management Sciences,
School of Postgraduate Studies,
Nnamdi Azikiwe University,
Awka, Nigeria.

Dear Sir/Madam,

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

I am a postgraduate student of the Department of Business Administration in the above-mentioned institution conducting a research on the topic titled “Succession Planning and the Sustainability of Family Businesses in Lagos, Nigeria.

Attached to this letter is a copy of the questionnaire I have designed to get your responses on issues related to the topic to enable me complete my research successfully. Your responses are for a mere academic exercise and shall be treated confidentially and anonymously.

Thanks for your anticipated cooperation.

Yours Sincerely,

Imhanrenialena Benedict.

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION A:

Please tick (√) in the box provided against the option that seems most appropriate to you.

SUB-SECTION A1: Personal Profile:

1. Age of owner/CEO (A)below 18 ☐ (B) 18 -30 ☐ (C) 31-50 (D) 51-65 ☐ (E) 66 and above ☐
2. Sex (A) Male ☐ (B) Female ☐
3. Years in running the business (A) below 10 ☐ (B) 11-20 ☐ (C) 21-30 ☐ (D)31-50 ☐ (E) 50 and above ☐
4. Educational qualification (A)less than first degree ☐ (B) first degree ☐ (C) above first degree ☐

SUB-SECTION A2: Family Business Profile:

Please tick (√) in the box provided against the option that seems most appropriate to you.

5. Location of business in Lagos, Nigeria (A) Lagos East ☐ (B) Lagos West ☐ (C) Lagos Central ☐
6. Types of business ownership (A) Sole Proprietorship ☐ (B) Partnership ☐ (C) Private Limited Liability Company ☐ (D) Public Limited Liability Company ☐ (E) Co-operative society ☐
7. Age of business (A) Less than 5 years ☐ (B) 5 to 20 years ☐ (C) 21 to 50 years (D) 51 to 100 years ☐ (E) 101 and above ☐
8. Succession stage (A) Founder-owned stage ☐ (B) First succession ☐ (C) Second ☐ succession ☐ (C) Third succession ☐ (D) Fourth succession and above ☐
9. Management (A) Owner-Manager ☐ (B) Non-family Manager ☐ (C) Co-managed by family and non-family members. ☐
10. Family ownership (A) Nuclear family ownership ☐ (B)Extended family ownership ☐
11. Number of employees: (A) Less than10 (B) 10-49 ☐ (C) 50 -199 ☐
12. Business net worth excluding land and building in naira (A) Less than 5 million ☐ (B) 5 million to 49 million ☐ (C) 50 million to 499 million ☐

SECTION B:

Please tick (✓) in the appropriate column that represents your opinion in each statement.
Key words are shown below:
SA- Strongly Agree
A – Agree
U- Undecided
D- Disagree
SD – Strongly Disagree

SECTION B1:

The following statements are meant to elicit responses from family businesses in Lagos so as to determine the relationship between family business owner-managers delayed retirement and perpetuity of the businesses (Objective 1).

S/N	Statement	Response Keys				
		SA	A	D	SD	U
		5	4	3	2	1
	Delayed Retirement (Succession Planning)					
1.	I believe in Nigerian government mandatory retirement age for civil servants.					
2.	If I retire from this my business I will lose my social status in the society.					
3.	People always shift attention from a retired business founder to his successor.					
4	As the owner of this family business, I will manage it as long as I live.					
	Business Perpetuity (Business Sustainability)					
5.	The older the owner is in the management of this family business, the better for the sustainability of the business.					
6.	Work-for-life attitude of family business owner-managers kills the businesses before their transference to their successors.					
7.	Retiring appropriately will allow younger ones with fresh ideas to come into this business and perpetuate it.					
8.	The productivity of family business managers continuously declines as they age above 70 years.					
9.	Old age related health challenges of family business owner-managers hamper the fortune of this business.					

Sub-Section B 2:

The following statements are meant to elicit responses from the respondents so as to determine the role mentoring plays in ensuring successful management transference in family businesses (Objective 2).

S/N	Statement	Response Keys				
		SA	A	U	D	SD
		5	4	3	2	1
	Mentoring (Succession Planning)					
1.	This present family business owner was trained by his/her predecessor in the art of this business.					
2.	This family business owner is always worried if the potential successor is not showing enough interest.					
3.	This family business believes in the ability of a mentored successor to sustain this business beyond the present owner.					
	Successful Management Transference (Business Sustainability)					
4.	Training a successor in a family business will prevent the successor from gaining external experiences needed for the family business survival.					
5.	It is only a successor who is trained in the art of this family business that can manage it properly.					
6.	The vision of this family business can only be sustained by a mentored successor.					
7.	With a trained successor in the operations of this family business, ownership/management transference failure will not occur.					

Sub-Section B 3:

The following statements are meant to elicit responses from family businesses in Lagos so as to evaluate the relationship between the appointment of non-family member Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) as successors in the absence of competent ones in family businesses and the business continuous viability (objective 3).

S/N	Statement	Response Keys				
		SA	A	U	D	SD
		5	4	3	2	1
	Non-Family Member CEOs in Family Businesses (Succession Planning)					
1.	This family business is managed by a non-family member Chief Executive Officer (CEO).					
2.	In the absence of a competent family member owner-manager, a non-family member should be appointed to manage.					
3.	Family ties always prevent family business owners from handing over the management of their business to a non-family member during succession.					
	Business Continuous Viability (Business Sustainability)					
4.	The appointment of non-family member CEOs in family businesses ensures the business continues viability after the death of the founders.					
5.	Any family business that opens its door of succession to non-family member CEOs enjoys sustainability.					
6.	I know a family business, a non-family member CEO rescued from collapsed after the death of the founder.					

<u>Sub-Section B 4:</u>

The following statements are meant to elicit responses from family businesses in Lagos so as to ascertain the relationship between family elders' succession crises resolution ability and harmonious working relationship in the business (objective 4).

S/N	Statement	Response Keys				
		SA	A	U	D	SD
		5	4	3	2	1
	Family Elders' Succession Crisis Resolution Ability					
1.	This family business believes in family elders' forum.					
2	Family elders' forum is ideal when the ownership of a family business rests on more than a person or a nuclear family.					
3.	Family elders' forum handles family conflicts in family businesses.					
4.	Family elders are more suitable in handling family conflicts in a family business.					
	Harmonious Working Relationship in Family Businesses (Business sustainability)					
5.	Family elders are capable of ensuring ownership/management changes are handled without crises.					
6.	Family elders maintain peaceful relationship among family members in family businesses.					
7.	Family elders can regulate family members' involvement in the business in order to forestall succession crises.					
8.	Family elders ensure family business successors uphold the family values in the business.					

APPENDIX B

Data for testing Hypothesis I

S/N	∑X	∑ Y	∑XY	∑ X^2	∑ Y^2
1	20	22	440	400	625
2	15	16	240	225	625
3	16	20	320	256	400
4	10	11	110	100	121
5	15	15	225	225	225
6	12	12	144	144	144
7	20	19	380	400	361
8	16	18	288	256	324
9	20	25	500	400	625
10	16	18	400	256	625
11	12	13	300	144	625
12	15	16	300	225	400
13	16	15	400	320	625
14	20	21	400	400	400
15	16	18	368	320	529
16	20	21	440	200	484
17	15	16	375	225	625
18	12	15	240	144	400
19	20	20	500	400	625
20	16	18	400	320	625
21	20	15	300	400	225
22	16	18	320	320	400
23	12	12	228	144	361
24	15	16	270	225	324
25	18	19	450	324	625
26	20	21	500	400	625
27	18	25	450	342	625
28	16	20	320	256	400
29	15	25	375	225	625
30	20	20	400	400	400
31	20	23	460	400	529
32	12	15	180	144	225
33	15	16	375	225	625

34	14	15	280	196	400
35	16	18	400	256	625
36	12	12	264	144	484
37	20	21	500	400	625
38	16	18	400	256	625
39	20	20	480	400	576
40	16	17	288	256	324
41	12	12	144	144	144
42	15	25	375	225	625
43	18	24	432	324	576
44	20	25	500	400	625
45	18	23	414	324	529
46	16	22	352	256	484
47	15	20	300	225	400
48	20	16	320	400	256
49	20	25	500	400	625
50	12	25	300	144	625
51	15	24	360	225	576
52	14	12	168	196	144
53	16	15	240	256	225
54	15	18	270	225	324
55	20	25	500	400	625
56	20	25	500	400	625
57	15	25	375	225	625
58	16	20	320	256	400
59	20	25	500	400	625
60	15	15	225	225	225
61	12	20	240	144	400
62	20	19	380	400	361
63	16	18	288	256	324
64	20	25	500	400	625
65	16	25	400	256	625
66	12	25	300	144	625
67	15	20	300	225	400
68	16	25	400	320	625
69	20	20	400	400	400
70	6	25	150	36	625

71	11	20	110	121	400
72	20	25	500	400	625
73	20	25	500	400	625
74	15	25	375	225	625
75	20	25	200	400	625
76	11	20	110	121	400
77	20	25	400	400	625
78	6	25	150	136	225
79	15	18	270	225	324
80	18	25	450	324	625
81	20	25	500	400	625
82	18	25	450	342	625
83	16	20	320	256	400
84	15	25	375	225	625
85	20	20	400	400	400
86	20	23	460	400	529
87	12	22	264	144	484
88	15	25	375	225	625
89	14	20	280	196	400
90	16	25	400	256	625
91	12	22	264	144	484
92	20	25	500	400	625
93	16	25	400	256	625
94	20	24	480	400	576
95	16	18	288	256	324
96	12	15	180	144	225
97	15	25	375	225	625
98	18	24	432	324	576
99	20	25	500	400	625
100	18	23	414	324	529
101	16	22	352	256	484
102	15	20	300	225	400
103	20	16	320	400	256
104	20	25	500	400	625
105	12	25	300	144	625
106	15	24	360	225	576
107	14	12	168	196	144

108	16	15	240	256	225
109	15	18	270	225	324
110	20	25	500	400	625
111	20	25	500	400	625
112	12	22	264	144	484
113	20	25	500	400	625
114	16	25	400	256	625
115	20	24	480	400	576
116	16	18	288	256	324
117	12	15	180	144	225
118	15	25	375	225	625
119	18	24	432	324	576
120	20	25	500	400	625
121	18	23	414	324	529
122	16	22	352	256	484
123	15	20	300	225	400
124	20	16	320	400	256
125	20	25	500	400	625
126	12	25	300	144	625
127	15	24	360	225	576
128	14	12	168	196	144
129	16	15	240	256	225
130	15	18	270	225	324
131	20	25	500	400	625
132	20	25	500	400	625
133	15	25	375	225	625
134	16	20	320	256	400
135	20	25	500	400	625
136	15	15	225	225	225
137	12	20	240	144	400
138	20	19	380	400	361
139	16	18	288	256	324
140	20	25	500	400	625
141	16	25	400	256	625
142	12	25	300	144	625
143	15	20	300	225	400
144	16	25	400	320	625

145	20	20	400	400	400
146	16	23	368	320	529
147	20	22	440	200	484
148	15	25	375	225	625
149	12	20	240	144	400
150	20	25	500	400	625
151	16	25	400	320	625
152	20	15	300	400	225
153	16	20	320	320	400
154	12	19	228	144	361
155	15	18	270	225	324
156	18	25	450	324	625
157	20	25	500	400	625
158	18	25	450	342	625
159	16	20	320	256	400
160	15	25	375	225	625
161	20	20	400	400	400
162	20	23	460	400	529
163	12	22	264	144	484
164	15	25	375	225	625
165	14	20	280	196	400
166	16	25	400	256	625
167	12	22	264	144	484
168	20	25	500	400	625
169	16	25	400	256	625
170	20	24	480	400	576
171	16	18	288	256	324
172	12	15	180	144	225
173	15	25	375	225	625
174	18	24	432	324	576
175	20	25	500	400	625
176	18	23	414	324	529
177	16	22	352	256	484
178	15	20	300	225	400
179	20	16	320	400	256
180	20	25	500	400	625
181	12	25	300	144	625

182	15	24	360	225	576
183	14	12	168	196	144
184	16	15	240	256	225
185	15	18	270	225	324
186	20	25	500	400	625
187	20	25	500	400	625
188	16	25	400	256	625
189	20	24	480	400	576
190	16	18	288	256	324
191	12	15	180	144	225
192	15	25	375	225	625
193	18	24	432	324	576
194	20	25	500	400	625
195	18	23	414	324	529
196	16	22	352	256	484
197	15	20	300	225	400
198	20	16	320	400	256
199	20	25	500	400	625
200	12	25	300	144	625
201	15	24	360	225	576
202	14	12	168	196	144
203	16	15	240	256	225
204	15	18	270	225	324
205	20	25	500	400	625
206	20	25	500	400	625
207	12	22	264	144	484
208	20	25	500	400	625
209	16	25	400	256	625
210	20	24	480	400	576
211	16	18	288	256	324
212	12	15	180	144	225
213	15	25	375	225	625
214	18	24	432	324	576
215	20	25	500	400	625
216	18	23	414	324	529
217	16	22	352	256	484
218	15	20	300	225	400

219	20	16	320	400	256
220	20	25	500	400	625
221	12	25	300	144	625
222	15	24	360	225	576
223	14	12	168	196	144
224	16	15	240	256	225
225	15	18	270	225	324
226	20	25	500	400	625
227	20	25	500	400	625
228	15	25	375	225	625
229	16	20	320	256	400
230	20	21	500	400	625
231	15	15	225	225	225
232	12	12	240	144	400
233	20	19	380	400	361
234	16	18	288	256	324
235	20	20	500	400	625
236	16	16	400	256	625
237	12	112	300	144	625
238	15	15	300	225	400
239	16	16	400	320	625
240	20	20	400	400	400
241	16	23	368	320	529
242	20	20	440	200	484
243	15	25	375	225	625
244	12	20	240	144	400
245	20	25	500	400	625
246	16	25	400	320	625
247	20	15	300	400	225
248	16	20	320	320	400
249	12	19	228	144	361
250	15	18	270	225	324
251	18	25	450	324	625
252	20	25	500	400	625
253	18	25	450	342	625
254	16	20	320	256	400
255	15	25	375	225	625

256	20	20	400	400	400
257	20	23	460	400	529
258	12	22	264	144	484
259	15	25	375	225	625
260	14	20	280	196	400
261	16	25	400	256	625
262	12	22	264	144	484
263	20	25	500	400	625
264	16	25	400	256	625
265	20	24	480	400	576
266	16	18	288	256	324
267	12	15	180	144	225
268	15	25	375	225	625
269	18	24	432	324	576
270	20	25	500	400	625
271	18	23	414	324	529
272	16	22	352	256	484
273	15	20	300	225	400
274	20	16	320	400	256
275	20	25	500	400	625
276	12	25	300	144	625
277	15	24	360	225	576
278	14	12	168	196	144
279	16	15	240	256	225
280	15	18	270	225	324
281	20	25	500	400	625
282	20	25	500	400	625
283	16	25	400	256	625
284	20	24	480	400	576
285	16	18	288	256	324
286	12	15	180	144	225
287	15	25	375	225	625
288	18	24	432	324	576
289	20	25	500	400	625
290	18	23	414	324	529
291	16	22	352	256	484
292	15	20	300	225	400

293	20	16	320	400	256
294	20	25	500	400	625
295	12	25	300	144	625
296	15	24	360	225	576
297	14	12	168	196	144
298	16	15	240	256	225
299	15	18	270	225	324
300	20	25	500	400	625
301	20	25	500	400	625
302	12	22	264	144	484
303	20	25	500	400	625
304	16	25	400	256	625
305	20	24	480	400	576
306	16	18	288	256	324
307	12	15	180	144	225
308	15	25	375	225	625
309	18	24	432	324	576
310	20	25	500	400	625
311	18	23	414	324	529
312	16	22	352	256	484
313	15	20	300	225	400
314	20	16	320	400	256
315	20	25	500	400	625
316	12	25	300	144	625
317	15	24	360	225	576
318	14	12	168	196	144
319	16	15	240	256	225
320	15	18	270	225	324
321	20	25	500	400	625
322	20	25	500	400	625
323	15	25	375	225	625
324	16	20	320	256	400
325	20	25	500	400	625
326	15	15	225	225	225
327	12	20	240	144	400
328	20	19	380	400	361
329	16	18	288	256	324

330	20	25	500	400	625
331	16	25	400	256	625
332	12	25	300	144	625
333	15	20	300	225	400
334	16	25	400	320	625
335	20	20	400	400	400
336	16	23	368	320	529
337	16	20	320	320	400
338	12	19	228	144	361
339	15	18	270	225	324
340	18	25	450	324	625
341	20	25	500	400	625
342	18	25	450	342	625
343	16	20	320	320	400
344	12	19	228	144	361
345	15	18	270	225	324
346	18	25	450	324	625
347	20	25	500	400	625
348	18	25	450	342	625
349	16	20	320	320	400
350	12	19	228	144	361
351	15	18	270	225	324
352	18	25	450	324	625
353	20	25	500	400	625
354	18	25	450	342	625
$\sum n=354$	$\sum X=5824$	$\sum Y=7595$	$\sum XY=127304$	$\sum X^2=100082$	$\sum Y^2=171868$

Data for testing Hypothesis II

S/N	$\sum X$	$\sum Y$	$\sum XY$	$\sum X^2$	$\sum Y^2$
1	10	11	110	100	121
2	15	16	240	225	625
3	16	20	320	256	400
4	10	11	110	100	121
5	15	15	225	225	225
6	12	12	144	144	144
7	17	25	425	289	625
8	20	21	420	400	441
9	18	22	398	324	484
10	17	25	425	289	625
11	20	21	420	400	441
12	20	25	500	400	625
13	20	19	380	400	361
14	16	18	288	256	324
15	20	25	500	400	625
16	16	18	400	256	625
17	12	13	300	144	625
18	15	16	300	225	400
19	16	15	400	320	625
20	20	21	400	400	400
21	16	18	368	320	529
22	20	21	440	200	484
23	15	16	375	225	625
24	12	15	240	144	400
25	20	20	500	400	625
26	16	18	400	320	625
27	20	15	300	400	225
28	16	20	320	256	400
29	15	25	375	225	625
30	20	20	400	400	400
31	20	23	460	400	529
32	12	15	180	144	225
33	15	16	375	225	625
34	14	15	280	196	400
35	16	18	400	256	625
36	12	12	264	144	484
37	20	21	500	400	625
38	16	18	400	256	625
39	20	20	480	400	576
40	16	17	288	256	324
41	12	12	144	144	144
42	15	25	375	225	625
43	18	24	432	324	576
44	20	25	500	400	625
45	18	23	414	324	529
46	16	22	352	256	484
47	15	20	300	225	400
48	20	16	320	400	256
49	20	25	500	400	625
50	12	25	300	144	625
51	15	24	360	225	576
52	14	12	168	196	144
53	16	15	240	256	225
54	15	18	270	225	324
55	20	25	500	400	625
56	20	25	500	400	625
57	15	25	375	225	625
58	16	20	320	256	400

59	20	25	500	400	625
60	15	15	225	225	225
61	12	20	240	144	400
62	20	19	380	400	361
63	16	18	288	256	324
64	20	25	500	400	625
65	16	25	400	256	625
66	12	25	300	144	625
67	20	19	380	400	361
68	16	18	288	256	324
69	20	25	500	400	625
70	16	18	400	256	625
71	12	13	300	144	625
72	15	16	300	225	400
73	16	15	400	320	625
74	20	21	400	400	400
75	16	18	368	320	529
76	20	21	440	200	484
77	15	16	375	225	625
78	12	15	240	144	400
79	20	20	500	400	625
80	16	18	400	320	625
81	20	15	300	400	225
82	18	25	450	342	625
83	16	20	320	256	400
84	15	25	375	225	625
85	20	20	400	400	400
86	20	23	460	400	529
87	12	22	264	144	484
88	15	25	375	225	625
89	14	20	280	196	400
90	16	25	400	256	625
91	12	22	264	144	484
92	20	25	500	400	625
93	16	25	400	256	625
94	20	24	480	400	576
95	16	18	288	256	324
96	12	15	180	144	225
97	15	16	240	225	256
98	18	20	360	324	400
99	20	22	440	400	484
100	18	22	398	324	484
101	17	25	425	289	625
102	20	21	420	400	441
103	20	25	500	400	625
104	18	22	398	324	484
105	17	25	425	289	625
106	20	21	420	400	441
107	18	22	398	324	484
108	17	25	425	289	625
109	20	21	420	400	441
110	20	25	500	400	625
111	20	19	380	400	361
112	16	18	288	256	324
113	20	25	500	400	625
114	16	18	400	256	625
115	12	13	300	144	625
116	15	16	300	225	400
117	16	15	400	320	625
118	20	21	400	400	400
119	16	18	368	320	529
120	20	21	440	200	484
121	15	16	375	225	625

122	12	15	240	144	400
123	20	20	500	400	625
124	16	18	400	320	625
125	20	15	300	400	225
126	18	22	398	324	484
127	17	25	425	289	625
128	20	21	420	400	441
129	20	25	500	400	625
130	18	22	398	324	484
131	17	25	425	289	625
132	20	21	420	400	441
133	6	25	150	36	625
134	6	25	150	36	625
135	8	10	180	64	100
136	6	25	150	36	625
137	10	15	150	100	225
138	20	19	380	400	361
139	16	18	288	256	324
140	20	25	500	400	625
141	16	25	400	256	625
142	12	25	300	144	625
143	15	20	300	225	400
144	16	25	400	320	625
145	20	20	400	400	400
146	16	23	368	320	529
147	20	22	440	200	484
148	15	25	375	225	625
149	12	20	240	144	400
150	20	25	500	400	625
151	16	25	400	320	625
152	20	15	300	400	225
153	16	20	320	320	400
154	12	19	228	144	361
155	15	18	270	225	324
156	18	25	450	324	625
157	20	25	500	400	625
158	18	25	450	342	625
159	16	20	320	256	400
160	15	25	375	225	625
161	20	20	400	400	400
162	20	23	460	400	529
163	12	22	264	144	484
164	15	25	375	225	625
165	14	20	280	196	400
166	16	25	400	256	625
167	12	22	264	144	484
168	20	25	500	400	625
169	16	25	400	256	625
170	20	24	480	400	576
171	16	18	288	256	324
172	12	15	180	144	225
173	15	25	375	225	625
174	18	24	432	324	576
175	20	25	500	400	625
176	18	23	414	324	529
177	16	22	352	256	484
178	15	20	300	225	400
179	20	16	320	400	256
180	20	25	500	400	625
181	12	25	300	144	625
182	15	24	360	225	576
183	14	12	168	196	144
184	16	15	240	256	225

185	15	18	270	225	324
186	20	25	500	400	625
187	20	25	500	400	625
188	16	25	400	256	625
189	20	24	480	400	576
190	16	18	288	256	324
191	12	15	180	144	225
192	15	25	375	225	625
193	18	24	432	324	576
194	20	25	500	400	625
195	18	23	414	324	529
196	16	22	352	256	484
197	15	20	300	225	400
198	20	16	320	400	256
199	20	25	500	400	625
200	12	25	300	144	625
201	15	24	360	225	576
202	14	12	168	196	144
203	16	15	240	256	225
204	15	18	270	225	324
205	20	25	500	400	625
206	20	25	500	400	625
207	12	22	264	144	484
208	20	25	500	400	625
209	16	25	400	256	625
210	20	24	480	400	576
211	16	18	288	256	324
212	12	15	180	144	225
213	15	25	375	225	625
214	18	24	432	324	576
215	20	25	500	400	625
216	18	23	414	324	529
217	16	22	352	256	484
218	15	20	300	225	400
219	20	16	320	400	256
220	20	25	500	400	625
221	12	25	300	144	625
222	15	24	360	225	576
223	14	12	168	196	144
224	16	15	240	256	225
225	15	18	270	225	324
226	20	25	500	400	625
227	20	25	500	400	625
228	15	25	375	225	625
229	16	20	320	256	400
230	20	21	500	400	625
231	15	15	225	225	225
232	12	12	240	144	400
233	20	19	380	400	361
234	16	18	288	256	324
235	20	20	500	400	625
236	16	16	400	256	625
237	12	20	240	144	400
238	15	15	300	225	400
239	16	16	400	320	625
240	20	20	400	400	400
241	16	23	368	320	529
242	20	20	440	200	484
243	15	25	375	225	625
244	12	20	240	144	400
245	20	25	500	400	625
246	16	25	400	320	625
247	20	15	300	400	225

248	16	20	320	320	400
249	12	19	228	144	361
250	15	18	270	225	324
251	18	25	450	324	625
252	20	25	500	400	625
253	18	25	450	342	625
254	16	20	320	256	400
255	15	25	375	225	625
256	20	20	400	400	400
257	20	23	460	400	529
258	12	22	264	144	484
259	15	25	375	225	625
260	14	20	280	196	400
261	16	25	400	256	625
262	12	22	264	144	484
263	20	25	500	400	625
264	16	25	400	256	625
265	20	24	480	400	576
266	16	18	288	256	324
267	12	15	180	144	225
268	15	25	375	225	625
269	18	24	432	324	576
270	20	25	500	400	625
271	18	23	414	324	529
272	16	22	352	256	484
273	15	20	300	225	400
274	20	16	320	400	256
275	20	25	500	400	625
276	12	25	300	144	625
277	15	24	360	225	576
278	14	12	168	196	144
279	16	15	240	256	225
280	15	18	270	225	324
281	20	25	500	400	625
282	20	25	500	400	625
283	16	25	400	256	625
284	20	24	480	400	576
285	16	18	288	256	324
286	12	15	180	144	225
287	15	25	375	225	625
288	18	24	432	324	576
289	20	25	500	400	625
290	18	23	414	324	529
291	16	22	352	256	484
292	15	20	300	225	400
293	20	16	320	400	256
294	20	25	500	400	625
295	12	25	300	144	625
296	15	24	360	225	576
297	14	12	168	196	144
298	16	15	240	256	225
299	15	18	270	225	324
300	20	25	500	400	625
301	20	25	500	400	625
302	12	22	264	144	484
303	20	25	500	400	625
304	16	25	400	256	625
305	20	24	480	400	576
306	16	18	288	256	324
307	12	15	180	144	225
308	15	25	375	225	625
309	18	24	432	324	576
310	20	25	500	400	625

311	18	23	414	324	529
312	16	22	352	256	484
313	15	20	300	225	400
314	20	16	320	400	256
315	20	25	500	400	625
316	12	25	300	144	625
317	15	24	360	225	576
318	14	12	168	196	144
319	16	15	240	256	225
320	15	18	270	225	324
321	20	25	500	400	625
322	20	25	500	400	625
323	15	25	375	225	625
324	16	20	320	256	400
325	20	25	500	400	625
326	15	15	225	225	225
327	12	20	240	144	400
328	20	19	380	400	361
329	16	18	288	256	324
330	20	25	500	400	625
331	16	25	400	256	625
332	12	25	300	144	625
333	15	20	300	225	400
334	16	25	400	320	625
335	20	20	400	400	400
336	16	23	368	320	529
337	16	20	320	320	400
338	12	19	228	144	361
339	15	18	270	225	324
340	18	25	450	324	625
341	20	25	500	400	625
342	18	25	450	342	625
343	16	20	320	320	400
344	12	19	228	144	361
345	15	18	270	225	324
346	18	25	450	324	625
347	20	25	500	400	625
348	18	25	450	342	625
349	16	20	320	320	400
350	12	19	228	144	361
351	15	18	270	225	324
352	18	25	450	324	625
353	20	25	500	400	625
354	18	25	450	342	625
$\sum n=354$	$\sum X=5860$	$\sum Y=7399$	$\sum XY=128352$	$\sum X^2 100652$	$\sum Y^2=171945$

Data for testing Hypothesis III

S/N	∑X	∑ Y	∑XY	∑ X^2	∑ Y^2
1	12	12	144	144	144
2	17	25	425	289	625
3	20	21	420	400	441
4	18	22	398	324	484
5	17	25	425	289	625
6	20	21	420	400	441
7	20	25	500	400	625
8	20	19	380	400	361
9	16	18	288	256	324
10	20	25	500	400	625
11	6	25	150	36	625
12	8	10	180	64	100
13	6	25	150	36	625
14	10	15	150	100	225
15	6	25	150	36	625
16	6	25	150	36	625
17	8	10	180	64	100
18	6	25	150	36	625
19	10	15	150	100	225
20	6	25	150	36	625
21	20	15	300	400	225
22	16	18	320	320	400
23	12	12	228	144	361
24	15	16	270	225	324
25	18	19	450	324	625
26	20	21	500	400	625
27	18	25	450	342	625
28	16	20	320	256	400
29	15	25	375	225	625
30	20	20	400	400	400
31	20	23	460	400	529
32	12	15	180	144	225
33	15	16	375	225	625
34	14	15	280	196	400
35	16	18	400	256	625
36	12	12	264	144	484
37	20	21	500	400	625
38	16	18	400	256	625
39	20	20	480	400	576
40	16	17	288	256	324
41	12	12	144	144	144
42	15	25	375	225	625
43	18	24	432	324	576
44	20	25	500	400	625
45	18	23	414	324	529
46	16	22	352	256	484
47	15	20	300	225	400
48	20	16	320	400	256
49	20	25	500	400	625
50	12	25	300	144	625
51	15	24	360	225	576
52	14	12	168	196	144
53	16	15	240	256	225
54	15	18	270	225	324
55	20	25	500	400	625
56	20	25	500	400	625
57	15	25	375	225	625
58	16	20	320	256	400
59	20	25	500	400	625
60	15	15	225	225	225

61	12	20	240	144	400
62	20	19	380	400	361
63	16	18	288	256	324
64	20	25	500	400	625
65	16	25	400	256	625
66	12	25	300	144	625
67	15	20	300	225	400
68	16	25	400	320	625
69	20	20	400	400	400
70	6	25	150	36	625
71	11	20	110	121	400
72	20	25	500	400	625
73	20	25	500	400	625
74	15	25	375	225	625
75	20	25	200	400	625
76	11	20	110	121	400
77	20	25	400	400	625
78	6	25	150	136	225
79	15	18	270	225	324
80	18	25	450	324	625
81	20	25	500	400	625
82	18	25	450	342	625
83	16	20	320	256	400
84	15	25	375	225	625
85	20	20	400	400	400
86	20	23	460	400	529
87	12	22	264	144	484
88	15	25	375	225	625
89	14	20	280	196	400
90	16	25	400	256	625
91	12	22	264	144	484
92	20	25	500	400	625
93	16	25	400	256	625
94	20	24	480	400	576
95	16	18	288	256	324
96	12	15	180	144	225
97	15	16	240	225	256
98	18	20	360	324	400
99	20	22	440	400	484
100	6	25	150	36	625
101	8	10	180	64	100
102	6	25	150	36	625
103	10	15	150	100	225
104	6	25	150	36	625
105	6	25	150	36	625
106	8	10	180	64	100
107	6	25	150	36	625
108	10	15	150	100	225
109	6	25	150	36	625
110	6	25	150	36	625
111	8	10	180	64	100
112	6	25	150	36	625
113	10	15	150	100	225
114	6	25	150	36	625
115	6	25	150	36	625
116	8	10	180	64	100
117	6	25	150	36	625
118	10	15	150	100	225
119	6	25	150	36	625
120	8	10	180	64	100
121	6	25	150	36	625
122	10	15	150	100	225
123	6	25	150	36	625

124	6	25	150	36	625
125	8	10	180	64	100
126	6	25	150	36	625
127	10	15	150	100	225
128	6	25	150	36	625
129	6	25	150	36	625
130	8	10	180	64	100
131	6	25	150	36	625
132	10	15	150	100	225
133	6	25	150	36	625
134	6	25	150	36	625
135	8	10	180	64	100
136	6	25	150	36	625
137	10	15	150	100	225
138	20	19	380	400	361
139	16	18	288	256	324
140	20	25	500	400	625
141	16	25	400	256	625
142	12	25	300	144	625
143	15	20	300	225	400
144	16	25	400	320	625
145	20	20	400	400	400
146	16	23	368	320	529
147	20	22	440	200	484
148	15	25	375	225	625
149	12	20	240	144	400
150	20	25	500	400	625
151	16	25	400	320	625
152	20	15	300	400	225
153	16	20	320	320	400
154	12	19	228	144	361
155	15	18	270	225	324
156	18	25	450	324	625
157	20	25	500	400	625
158	18	25	450	342	625
159	16	20	320	256	400
160	15	25	375	225	625
161	20	20	400	400	400
162	20	23	460	400	529
163	12	22	264	144	484
164	15	25	375	225	625
165	14	20	280	196	400
166	16	25	400	256	625
167	12	22	264	144	484
168	20	25	500	400	625
169	16	25	400	256	625
170	20	24	480	400	576
171	16	18	288	256	324
172	12	15	180	144	225
173	15	25	375	225	625
174	18	24	432	324	576
175	20	25	500	400	625
176	18	23	414	324	529
177	16	22	352	256	484
178	15	20	300	225	400
179	20	16	320	400	256
180	20	25	500	400	625
181	12	25	300	144	625
182	15	24	360	225	576
183	14	12	168	196	144
184	16	15	240	256	225
185	15	18	270	225	324
186	20	25	500	400	625

187	20	25	500	400	625
188	16	25	400	256	625
189	20	24	480	400	576
190	16	18	288	256	324
191	12	15	180	144	225
192	15	25	375	225	625
193	18	24	432	324	576
194	20	25	500	400	625
195	18	23	414	324	529
196	16	22	352	256	484
197	15	20	300	225	400
198	20	16	320	400	256
199	20	25	500	400	625
200	6	8	48	36	64
201	8	10	180	64	100
202	6	25	150	36	625
203	10	15	150	100	225
204	6	25	150	36	625
205	6	25	150	36	625
206	8	10	180	64	100
207	6	25	150	36	625
208	16	22	352	256	484
209	15	20	300	225	400
210	20	16	320	400	256
211	20	25	500	400	625
212	12	25	300	144	625
213	15	24	360	225	576
214	14	12	168	196	144
215	16	15	240	256	225
216	15	18	270	225	324
217	20	25	500	400	625
218	20	25	500	400	625
219	16	25	400	256	625
220	20	24	480	400	576
221	16	18	288	256	324
222	12	15	180	144	225
223	15	25	375	225	625
224	18	24	432	324	576
225	20	25	500	400	625
226	18	23	414	324	529
227	16	22	352	256	484
228	6	25	150	36	625
229	10	15	150	100	225
230	6	25	150	36	625
231	6	25	150	36	625
232	8	10	180	64	100
233	6	25	150	36	625
234	10	15	150	100	225
235	6	25	150	36	625
236	6	25	150	36	625
237	8	10	180	64	100
238	6	25	150	36	625
239	10	15	150	100	225
240	6	25	150	36	625
241	16	23	368	320	529
242	20	20	440	200	484
243	15	25	375	225	625
244	12	20	240	144	400
245	20	25	500	400	625
246	16	25	400	320	625
247	16	22	352	256	484
248	15	20	300	225	400
249	20	16	320	400	256

250	20	25	500	400	625
251	12	25	300	144	625
252	15	24	360	225	576
253	14	12	168	196	144
254	16	15	240	256	225
255	15	18	270	225	324
256	20	25	500	400	625
257	20	25	500	400	625
258	16	25	400	256	625
259	20	24	480	400	576
260	16	18	288	256	324
261	12	15	180	144	225
262	15	25	375	225	625
263	18	24	432	324	576
264	20	25	500	400	625
265	18	23	414	324	529
266	16	22	352	256	484
267	10	15	150	100	225
268	6	25	150	36	625
269	18	24	432	324	576
270	20	25	500	400	625
271	18	23	414	324	529
272	16	22	352	256	484
273	15	20	300	225	400
274	20	16	320	400	256
275	20	25	500	400	625
276	12	25	300	144	625
277	15	24	360	225	576
278	14	12	168	196	144
279	16	15	240	256	225
280	15	18	270	225	324
281	20	25	500	400	625
282	20	25	500	400	625
283	16	25	400	256	625
284	20	24	480	400	576
285	16	18	288	256	324
286	12	15	180	144	225
287	15	25	375	225	625
288	18	24	432	324	576
289	20	25	500	400	625
290	18	23	414	324	529
291	16	22	352	256	484
292	15	20	300	225	400
293	20	16	320	400	256
294	20	25	500	400	625
295	12	25	300	144	625
296	15	24	360	225	576
297	14	12	168	196	144
298	16	15	240	256	225
299	15	18	270	225	324
300	20	25	500	400	625
301	20	25	500	400	625
302	12	22	264	144	484
303	20	25	500	400	625
304	16	25	400	256	625
305	20	24	480	400	576
306	16	18	288	256	324
307	12	15	180	144	225
308	15	25	375	225	625
309	18	24	432	324	576
310	20	25	500	400	625
311	6	8	48	36	64
312	8	10	180	64	100

313	6	25	150	36	625
314	10	15	150	100	225
315	6	25	150	36	625
316	6	25	150	36	625
317	8	10	180	64	100
318	6	25	150	36	625
319	10	15	150	100	225
320	6	25	150	36	625
321	6	25	150	36	625
322	8	10	180	64	100
323	6	25	150	36	625
324	10	15	150	100	225
325	6	25	150	36	625
326	6	25	150	36	625
327	8	10	180	64	100
328	6	25	150	36	625
329	10	15	150	100	225
330	6	25	150	36	625
331	16	25	400	256	625
332	12	25	300	144	625
333	15	20	300	225	400
334	16	25	400	320	625
335	20	20	400	400	400
336	16	23	368	320	529
337	16	20	320	320	400
338	12	19	228	144	361
339	15	18	270	225	324
340	18	25	450	324	625
341	20	25	500	400	625
342	18	25	450	342	625
343	16	20	320	320	400
344	12	19	228	144	361
345	15	18	270	225	324
346	18	25	450	324	625
347	20	25	500	400	625
348	18	25	450	342	625
349	16	20	320	320	400
350	12	19	228	144	361
351	15	18	270	225	324
352	18	25	450	324	625
353	20	25	500	400	625
354	18	25	450	342	625
$\sum n=354$	$\sum X=5027$	$\sum Y=7448$	$\sum XY=109548$	$\sum X^2=80407$	$\sum Y^2=167020$

Data for testing Hypothesis IV

S/N	$\sum X$	$\sum Y$	$\sum XY$	$\sum X^2$	$\sum Y^2$
1	16	20	320	256	400
2	10	11	110	100	121
3	15	15	225	225	225
4	12	12	144	144	144
5	17	25	425	289	625
6	20	21	420	400	441
7	18	22	398	324	484
8	17	25	425	289	625
9	20	21	420	400	441
10	20	25	500	400	625
11	20	19	380	400	361
12	16	18	288	256	324
13	20	25	500	400	625
14	16	18	400	256	625
15	12	13	300	144	625
16	15	16	300	225	400
17	16	15	400	320	625
18	20	21	400	400	400
19	16	18	368	320	529
20	20	21	440	200	484
21	20	15	300	400	225
22	16	18	320	320	400
23	12	12	228	144	361
24	15	16	270	225	324
25	18	19	450	324	625
26	20	21	500	400	625
27	18	25	450	342	625
28	16	20	320	256	400
29	15	25	375	225	625
30	20	20	400	400	400
31	20	23	460	400	529
32	12	15	180	144	225
33	15	16	375	225	625
34	14	15	280	196	400
35	16	18	400	256	625
36	12	12	264	144	484
37	20	21	500	400	625
38	16	18	400	256	625
39	20	20	480	400	576
40	16	17	288	256	324
41	12	12	144	144	144
42	15	25	375	225	625
43	18	24	432	324	576
44	20	25	500	400	625
45	18	23	414	324	529
46	16	22	352	256	484
47	15	20	300	225	400
48	20	16	320	400	256
49	20	25	500	400	625
50	12	25	300	144	625
51	15	24	360	225	576
52	14	12	168	196	144
53	16	15	240	256	225
54	15	18	270	225	324
55	20	25	500	400	625
56	20	25	500	400	625
57	15	25	375	225	625
58	16	20	320	256	400

59	20	25	500	400	625
60	15	15	225	225	225
61	12	20	240	144	400
62	20	19	380	400	361
63	16	18	288	256	324
64	20	25	500	400	625
65	16	25	400	256	625
66	12	25	300	144	625
67	15	20	300	225	400
68	16	25	400	320	625
69	20	20	400	400	400
70	6	25	150	36	625
71	11	20	110	121	400
72	20	25	500	400	625
73	20	25	500	400	625
74	15	25	375	225	625
75	20	25	200	400	625
76	11	20	110	121	400
77	20	25	400	400	625
78	6	25	150	136	225
79	15	18	270	225	324
80	18	25	450	324	625
81	20	25	500	400	625
82	18	25	450	342	625
83	16	20	320	256	400
84	15	25	375	225	625
85	20	20	400	400	400
86	20	23	460	400	529
87	12	22	264	144	484
88	15	25	375	225	625
89	14	20	280	196	400
90	16	25	400	256	625
91	12	22	264	144	484
92	20	25	500	400	625
93	16	25	400	256	625
94	20	24	480	400	576
95	16	18	288	256	324
96	12	15	180	144	225
97	16	20	320	256	400
98	10	11	110	100	121
99	15	15	225	225	225
100	12	12	144	144	144
101	17	25	425	289	625
102	20	21	420	400	441
103	18	22	398	324	484
104	17	25	425	289	625
105	20	21	420	400	441
106	20	25	500	400	625
107	20	19	380	400	361
108	16	18	288	256	324
109	20	25	500	400	625
110	16	18	400	256	625
111	12	13	300	144	625
112	15	16	300	225	400
113	16	15	400	320	625
114	20	21	400	400	400
115	16	18	368	320	529
116	20	21	440	200	484
117	16	20	320	256	400
118	10	11	110	100	121
119	15	15	225	225	225
120	12	12	144	144	144
121	17	25	425	289	625

122	20	21	420	400	441
123	18	22	398	324	484
124	17	25	425	289	625
125	20	21	420	400	441
126	20	25	500	400	625
127	20	19	380	400	361
128	16	18	288	256	324
129	20	25	500	400	625
130	16	18	400	256	625
131	12	13	300	144	625
132	15	16	300	225	400
133	16	15	400	320	625
134	20	21	400	400	400
135	16	18	368	320	529
136	20	21	440	200	484
137	10	15	150	100	225
138	20	19	380	400	361
139	16	18	288	256	324
140	20	25	500	400	625
141	16	25	400	256	625
142	12	25	300	144	625
143	15	20	300	225	400
144	16	25	400	320	625
145	20	20	400	400	400
146	16	23	368	320	529
147	20	22	440	200	484
148	15	25	375	225	625
149	12	20	240	144	400
150	20	25	500	400	625
151	16	25	400	320	625
152	20	15	300	400	225
153	16	20	320	320	400
154	12	19	228	144	361
155	15	18	270	225	324
156	18	25	450	324	625
157	20	25	500	400	625
158	18	25	450	342	625
159	16	20	320	256	400
160	15	25	375	225	625
161	20	20	400	400	400
162	20	23	460	400	529
163	12	22	264	144	484
164	15	25	375	225	625
165	14	20	280	196	400
166	16	25	400	256	625
167	12	22	264	144	484
168	20	25	500	400	625
169	16	25	400	256	625
170	20	24	480	400	576
171	16	18	288	256	324
172	12	15	180	144	225
173	15	25	375	225	625
174	18	24	432	324	576
175	20	25	500	400	625
176	18	23	414	324	529
177	16	22	352	256	484
178	15	20	300	225	400
179	20	16	320	400	256
180	20	25	500	400	625
181	12	25	300	144	625
182	15	24	360	225	576
183	14	12	168	196	144
184	16	15	240	256	225

185	15	18	270	225	324
186	20	25	500	400	625
187	20	25	500	400	625
188	16	25	400	256	625
189	20	24	480	400	576
190	16	18	288	256	324
191	12	15	180	144	225
192	15	25	375	225	625
193	18	24	432	324	576
194	20	25	500	400	625
195	18	23	414	324	529
196	16	22	352	256	484
197	15	20	300	225	400
198	20	16	320	400	256
199	20	25	500	400	625
200	6	8	48	36	64
201	8	10	180	64	100
202	6	25	150	36	625
203	10	15	150	100	225
204	6	25	150	36	625
205	6	25	150	36	625
206	8	10	180	64	100
207	6	25	150	36	625
208	10	15	150	100	225
209	16	20	320	256	400
210	10	11	110	100	121
211	15	15	225	225	225
212	12	12	144	144	144
213	17	25	425	289	625
214	20	21	420	400	441
215	18	22	398	324	484
216	17	25	425	289	625
217	20	21	420	400	441
218	20	25	500	400	625
219	20	19	380	400	361
220	16	18	288	256	324
221	20	25	500	400	625
222	16	18	400	256	625
223	12	13	300	144	625
224	15	16	300	225	400
225	16	15	400	320	625
226	20	21	400	400	400
227	16	18	368	320	529
228	20	21	440	200	484
229	10	15	150	100	225
230	6	25	150	36	625
231	6	25	150	36	625
232	8	10	180	64	100
233	6	25	150	36	625
234	10	15	150	100	225
235	6	25	150	36	625
236	6	25	150	36	625
237	8	10	180	64	100
238	6	25	150	36	625
239	10	15	150	100	225
240	6	25	150	36	625
241	16	23	368	320	529
242	20	20	440	200	484
243	15	25	375	225	625
244	12	20	240	144	400
245	20	25	500	400	625
246	16	25	400	320	625
247	20	15	300	400	225

248	16	20	320	256	400
249	10	11	110	100	121
250	15	15	225	225	225
251	12	12	144	144	144
252	17	25	425	289	625
253	20	21	420	400	441
254	18	22	398	324	484
255	17	25	425	289	625
256	20	21	420	400	441
257	20	25	500	400	625
258	20	19	380	400	361
259	16	18	288	256	324
260	20	25	500	400	625
261	16	18	400	256	625
262	12	13	300	144	625
263	15	16	300	225	400
264	16	15	400	320	625
265	20	21	400	400	400
266	16	18	368	320	529
267	20	21	440	200	484
268	6	25	150	36	625
269	18	24	432	324	576
270	20	25	500	400	625
271	18	23	414	324	529
272	16	22	352	256	484
273	15	20	300	225	400
274	20	16	320	400	256
275	20	25	500	400	625
276	12	25	300	144	625
277	15	24	360	225	576
278	14	12	168	196	144
279	16	15	240	256	225
280	15	18	270	225	324
281	20	25	500	400	625
282	20	25	500	400	625
283	16	25	400	256	625
284	20	24	480	400	576
285	16	18	288	256	324
286	12	15	180	144	225
287	15	25	375	225	625
288	18	24	432	324	576
289	20	25	500	400	625
290	18	23	414	324	529
291	16	22	352	256	484
292	15	20	300	225	400
293	20	16	320	400	256
294	20	25	500	400	625
295	12	25	300	144	625
296	15	24	360	225	576
297	14	12	168	196	144
298	16	15	240	256	225
299	15	18	270	225	324
300	20	25	500	400	625
301	20	25	500	400	625
302	12	22	264	144	484
303	20	25	500	400	625
304	16	25	400	256	625
305	20	24	480	400	576
306	16	18	288	256	324
307	12	15	180	144	225
308	15	25	375	225	625
309	18	24	432	324	576
310	20	25	500	400	625

311	16	20	320	256	400
312	10	11	110	100	121
313	15	15	225	225	225
314	12	12	144	144	144
315	17	25	425	289	625
316	20	21	420	400	441
317	18	22	398	324	484
318	17	25	425	289	625
319	20	21	420	400	441
320	20	25	500	400	625
321	20	19	380	400	361
322	16	18	288	256	324
323	20	25	500	400	625
324	16	18	400	256	625
325	12	13	300	144	625
326	15	16	300	225	400
327	16	15	400	320	625
328	20	21	400	400	400
329	16	18	368	320	529
330	20	21	440	200	484
331	10	15	150	100	225
332	6	25	150	36	625
333	6	25	150	36	625
334	8	10	180	64	100
335	6	25	150	36	625
336	10	15	150	100	225
337	6	25	150	36	625
338	6	25	150	36	625
339	8	10	180	64	100
340	6	25	150	36	625
341	10	15	150	100	225
342	6	25	150	36	625
343	6	25	150	36	625
344	8	10	180	64	100
345	6	25	150	36	625
346	10	15	150	100	225
347	20	19	380	400	361
348	16	18	288	256	324
349	20	25	500	400	625
350	16	25	400	256	625
351	12	25	300	144	625
352	15	20	300	225	400
353	20	25	500	400	625
354	18	25	450	342	625
$\sum n=354$	$\sum X=5537$	$\sum Y=7242$	$\sum XY=119692$	$\sum X^2=92357$	$\sum Y^2=166750$

Appendix B

List of the Sampled Companies in Lagos State

1. **Ajoke Stores Ltd**
2. **A.C Okocha Motors Ltd**
3. **Asuzu Bros. & Company (W.A) Ltd**
4. **P.C. Nlem Ltd**
5. **A.V.I. Services Ltd**
6. **Ade Industrial & Investment Co. Ltd**
7. **Aimash General Merchant Ltd**
8. **Abbng Limited**
9. **Reinagold Ltd**
10. **Dewcort Group**
11. **Adgozo Ltd**
12. **Victory Investment Nig. Ltd**
13. **Abj Consolidated Nig. Ltd**
14. **Abllat Ltd**
15. **Moses Adebayo Enterprises Nig. Ltd**
16. **Abs Nigeria Ltd**
17. **Bedmate Furniture**
18. **Abx Airborne Express**
19. **Gafunk Enterprises Ltd**
20. **Helma Books Integrated Services**
21. **Adecco Nig. Ltd**
22. **Abiok Publicity Ltd**
23. **Adler Products Ltd**
24. **Seda Philips Motain School**
25. **Admiralty Homes Ltd**
26. **Abiok Ltd**
27. **Adonia Petroleum Company Ltd**
28. **Ad-Fabak Holdings Ltd**
29. **Abekogold Ltd**
30. **Deorenik Ltd**
31. **Adspace Communications Ltd**
32. **Adstrat Bmc Ltd**
33. **Olaolu Trading Stores**
34. **Advanced Maritime Transport Nig. Ltd**
35. **Advertange Media Services Ltd**
36. **Aeromaritime Company Ltd**
37. **Aes Nigeria Barge Limited**
38. **Abb Powerlines Limited**
39. **Afrab-Chem Ltd**
40. **Lifemate Furniture Ltd**
41. **Afren Energy Resources Ltd**
42. **Afrex Ventures Ltd**
43. **Afri-Air International Ltd**
44. **African Steel Mills (Nig.) Ltd**
45. **Beloxxi Industries Ltd**
46. **Bemil Nigeria Ltd**
47. **Benchmark Technologies Ltd**
48. **Benod International Ltd**
49. **Benom Gold Communications Ltd**
50. **Ben Rhodes Nigeria Ltd**
51. **A & P Foods Ltd**
52. **Best Foods Global (Nig.) Ltd**
53. **Datacomm Express Enterprises Ltd**
54. **C.N Okoli Investment Co. (Nig) Ltd**
55. **Canal Paper Converters Ltd**
56. **Cannes Ltd**
57. **Capimpex Nig. Ltd**
58. **Capital Assets Ltd**
59. **City Cfa (Nigeria) Ltd**

60. **Cjs Ltd**
61. **Cks International Ltd**
62. **Clair Resources Ltd**
63. **Class Hospitality Services Ltd**
64. **Hamada Enterprises Nig. Ltd**
65. **Clay Industry Nig. Ltd**
66. **Clearline International Ltd**
67. **Compovine Technologies**
68. **Cledop West Africa Ltd**
69. **Dansaki Petroleum Ltd**
70. **Danvic Concepts International Nigeria Ltd**
71. **Daraju Industries Ltd**
72. **Darlez Nigeria Ltd**
73. **Darwin Technology Ltd**
74. **Disco Engineering Industries (Nig.) Ltd**
75. **Datlex Nig. Ltd**
76. **Davof Trading Company Nig. Ltd**
77. **Dayakas Nig. Ltd**
78. **Dazz Motors Ltd**
79. **Dbs Media**
80. **Efosa Express Ltd**
81. **Eghiemai Industries Ltd**
82. **Egypro Nig. Ltd**
83. **Ejix Maritime Ltd**
84. **Eklipps Telephone Systems Ltd**
85. **Megaspice Integrated Services Ltd**
86. **Elbe Pharma Nig. Ltd**
87. **Elchem Ltd**
88. **Elco Industries Ltd**
89. **Eldorado Nig. Ltd**
90. **Hadji Bashy Nig. Ltd**
91. **Stagemakerz Company**
92. **Elf Petroleum Nig. Ltd**
93. **Finepro Manufacturing Ltd**
94. **Finmal Finance Services Ltd**
95. **Fire Resources Technologies (West Africa) Ltd**
96. **Genesis Worldwide Shipping Company Ltd**
97. **Genieng Communications Ltd**
98. **Gentech Power Supply Nig. Ltd**
99. **Genuss Investments Ltd**
100. **Geo-Fluids Group**
101. **Geobi Nig. Ltd**
102. **Geodetic Offshore Services Ltd**
103. **Geoplex West Africa Ltd**
104. **George Andrews Consulting**
105. **Geosciences Solutions Ltd**
106. **Germaine Logistics Ltd**
107. **Ghaddar Machinery & Company Nig. Ltd**
108. **Adept-Quality Printers Enterprises Ltd**
109. **Gidanuniya Investment & Securities Ltd.**
110. **Giffic Ltd**
111. **Gidabyte Systems Nig. Ltd**
112. **Gilola International Agencies Ltd**
113. **Gino Resources Ltd**
114. **Ginpat Aluminum Products Ltd**
115. **I.B.M. Consult Ltd**
116. **I.F Johson Ltd**
117. **I.N. Venantius Nig. Ltd**
118. **I.T.B Nig. Ltd**
119. **Ial Nig. Ltd**
120. **Delson Alluminium Consult**
121. **Abalex Nig. Ltd**
122. **Treasure Park Travels and Travels Ltd**

123. Ibile Holdings Ltd
124. Ibron Ltd
125. Atlantic Infinity Ltd
126. I-Cell Integrated Services Ltd
127. Ideas Imc Ltd
128. Ideke Shipping Ltd
129. Idisystems Nig. Ltd
130. Stevens Luyemi Private School
131. Farkad Impex Nig. Com. Ltd
132. Nuplas Industries Ltd
133. Nzemat Nig. Ltd
134. O.O Int'l Nig. Ltd
135. O'la-Kleen Holdings Ltd
136. Paradigm Geophysical Nig. Ltd
137. Pardise Travels & Tours
138. Century Dyes & Chemicals Ltd
139. Paragon Holdings Ltd
140. Paramount Frozen Food Ltd
141. Parco Enterprises Nig. Ltd
142. Park 'N' Shop
143. Parked Int'l Ltd
144. Parkway Computers Ltd
145. Partnership Invest. Co. Ltd
146. Patco Gino Int'l
147. Pated Nig. Ltd
148. Patmodit Insurance Brokers Ltd
149. Patnas Ventures Global Ltd
150. Rhine Industries Nig. Ltd
151. Rhythex Consulting Ltd
152. Rich-Crystal Nig. Ltd
153. Oag Technologies Nig. Ltd
154. Oak Exclusive Design Ltd
155. Nanshet Ltd
156. Network Microfinance Bank
157. Neverfail Indjusties
158. Izu Chukwu Transport Nig. Ltd
159. J. Irorun Enterprises Nig. Ltd
160. J.C Odins Investment Company Ltd
161. J.E. Okeke Company Nig. Ltd
162. J.F. Aviation & Travels Ltd
163. J.J. Scot Group
164. A Group Properties Ltd
165. Jaagee Nig. Ltd
166. Jaeson Intrbiz Agencies Ltd
167. Jafana Ventures Nig. Ltd
168. Jafco Industries Ltd
169. Jagal Group
170. Ohkman & Dean Ltd
171. Oil & Gas Soft Skills Ltd
172. Jamatal Industries Nig. Ltd
173. Jopan Pharmaceuticals Nig. Ltd
174. Jos. Hansen & Soehne Nig. Ltd
175. Merchant Investors Ltd
176. Jubaili Moukarim Group Ltd
177. Jumbee Ventures Ltd
178. Juno Foods Ltd
179. Justeen Pharmaceuticals Ltd
180. Juwon Investments Int'l Ltd
181. Kabayan Int'l Shipping Ltd
182. Kachifo Ltd
183. Kaeler Technical Services Ltd
184. Kontactpoint Ltd
185. Kopek Construction Ltd

186. Kotco Power Industries Ltd
187. Kresta Laurel Ltd
188. Krisel Investment Ltd
189. Krs Investment Ltd
190. Kruxland Petrogas Nig. Ltd
191. L.M Ericsson Nig. Ltd
192. L.W. Lamborun Nig. Ltd
193. L'escale Hotel & Restaurant
194. La Roche Equipment Nig. Ltd
195. Medreich Nig. Ltd
196. Mega Investment Nig. Ltd
197. Mei Travels Ltd
198. Mekios Ltd
199. Melvyn Nickson Nig. Ltd
200. Memorex Ltd
201. Men's Affair Ltd
202. Mentholatum Nig. Ltd
203. Meridian Freight Services Ltd
204. Emmalesson Group
205. Edwards Private School
206. Eagles Path Ltd
207. Meryt Advertising Ltd
208. N.N. Fems Industries Ltd
209. N.O. John Great Nig. Ltd
210. N'mor Agencies Ltd
211. Naafco Ltd
212. Nadina Industries Ltd
213. Skypoint Merchandise Resources Ltd
214. Nairda Ltd
215. Nalado Nig. Ltd
216. Nubian Nigeria Ltd
217. Nucleus Ventures Ltd
218. Nodal Nigeria Company Ltd
219. Nuel Auto Distributors Ltd
220. Newbisco Ltd
221. Oildata Wireline Services Ltd
222. Newgate Microfinance Bank
223. Officetron Company Ltd
224. Newman Investment Co. Ltd
225. News Engineering Nig. Ltd
226. Process Equipment Parts Ltd
227. Next International Nig. Ltd
228. Nexus Alliance Ltd
229. Nigerianet Technology Services Ltd
230. Odka Nig. Ltd
231. Odogwu Group Of Companies Limited
232. Odufuwa Moder Design Ltd
233. Odusote Bookstores Ltd
234. Oep Int'l Ltd
235. Ofeimu Engineering Nig. Ltd
236. Office Mass Nig. Ltd
237. Newlord Nig. Ltd
238. Offshore Contractors Ltd
239. Ojokoro Microfinance Bank
240. Ok Foods Ltd
241. Panafric Oil Nig. Ltd
242. Harrymag Ventures Ltd
243. Lanrock Nig. Ltd
244. Panar Ltd
245. Panaserv. Nig. Ltd
246. Gem Stores Supplies Inc.
247. Papilon Industry Ltd
248. Weigh-Tech Industries Ltd

249. Welcome Centre & Hotels Ltd
250. Webb Energy Ltd
251. Wellfing Petroleum Ltd
252. Richland Communications Ltd
253. Richmond Foods Nig. Ltd
254. Oil States Industries Nig. Ltd
255. Newdevco Invest. Co. Ltd
256. Oiltest Services Nig. Ltd
257. Ojemai Farms Ltd
258. Richy Gold Int'l Ltd
259. Ric-Ken Merchants Ltd
260. Rickyplex Group
261. Rida National Plastics Ltd
262. Riggs Microfinance Bank
263. Rigidpak Continers Ltd
264. Rinet Ltd
265. Rippcon Nig. Ltd
266. Risk Analyst Insurance Brokers Ltd
267. Radio Audio Visuals
268. Riskguard-Africa Nig. Ltd
269. Risktech Insurance Brokers Ltd
270. Rivtrust Securities Ltd
271. R-Jolad Hospital Nig. Ltd
272. Rmc Consulting Ltd
273. Road Marks Nig. Ltd
274. Folly-Yem System Enterprises
275. Robert-Johnson Nig. Ltd
276. Robins Begg Consulting Ltd
277. Rocana Nig. Ltd
278. Rockpeters Nig. Ltd
279. Silverage Ltd
280. Sconet Nig. Ltd
281. Coolingcare Africa Ltd
282. Scroll Publishing Ltd
283. Sdem Erectors Nig. Ltd
284. Sdv Nig. Ltd
285. Samba Solar Enterprises Ltd
286. Allemande Industries Ltd
287. C & T Enterprises Ltd
288. Seaview Properties Ltd
289. Sebawatch Group
290. Sebaya Group Ltd
291. Second Adams Int'l Ltd
292. Secuphone West Africa Ltd
293. Security Technologies Ltd
294. Vesa Food Agencies Ltd
295. Vetiva Capital Management Ltd
296. Vettal Mega Services Ltd
297. Veepee Industries Limited
298. Vic Lawrence & Associated Ltd
299. Vicbol Nig. Ltd
300. Adam & Eve Enterprises Ltd
301. Victoria Crown Plaza Hotel Ltd
302. Image Furniture & Interior
303. Vidac Equipment Nig. Ltd
304. Vigeo Holdings Ltd
305. Viju Industries Nig. Ltd
306. Vik Industries Ltd
307. Vimba Int'l Nig. Ltd
308. Vina Int'l Ltd
309. Vinek Investments Ltd
310. Vintage Press Ltd
311. Vinz Int'l Nig. Ltd

312. Virgin Print Ltd
313. Vision Trust & Invest. Ltd
314. Vista Int'l Ltd
315. Visual Logistics Nig. Ltd
316. Vitabiotics Nig. Ltd
317. J. Bush & Company Nig. Ltd
318. W.S.T.C. Financial Services Ltd
319. Wadof Software Consulting Ltd
320. Wadoye Express Ltd
321. Wafo Nig. Ltd
322. Sixsense Nig. Ltd
323. Wahum Packaging Ltd
324. Wale Adenuga Productions Ltd
325. Walter Smith Petroleum Oil Ltd
326. Walvis Nig. Ltd
327. Wandel Int'l Ltd
328. Warm Spring Waters Nig. Ltd
329. Warner Lewis Ltd
330. Weaver's Private School
331. Warry-Gee Group
332. Washaman Drycleaners Nig. Ltd
333. Waskar Petroleum Ltd
334. Zartech Ltd
335. Water Services Engineering Ltd
336. Wateford Group
337. Watertch Nig. Ltd
338. Waterworld Salvage Services Ltd
339. Zanetti Marble & Granite Ltd
340. Wayne (West Africa) Ltd
341. Wellcare Home Medicals Ltd
342. Webcom Ltd
343. Webster Information Services Ltd
344. Weco Systems Int'l Ltd
345. We-Deliver.Com Ltd
346. Wellstocked Nig. Ltd
347. Wemabod Estates Ltd
348. Zematch Nig. Ltd
349. Zabadne & Com. Ltd
350. Watson & Sons Nig. Ltd
351. Zafo Global Links Ltd
352. Zamson Global Resources Ltd
353. E.L.O Ngado Enterprises Nig. Ltd
354. Emtab Interior Ltd

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Frequencies

Statistics

		Age of Owner/CEO	SEX	Years in running the business	Educational Qualification	Location of Business in Lagos, Nigeria	Type of business ownership	Age of business	Succession stage	Managem ent	Fa Own
N	Valid	354	354	354	354	354	354	354	354	354	
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Mean		3.38	1.10	2.74	1.86	2.10	1.64	2.36	1.08	1.59	
Std. Deviation		.641	.306	.943	.593	.529	.909	.479	.304	.807	
Sum		1195	391	971	659	742	579	834	383	562	

Frequency Table

Age of Owner/CEO

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	18 – 30	7	2.0	2.0	2.0
	31 – 50	231	65.3	65.3	67.2
	51 – 65	92	26.0	26.0	93.2
	66 and above	24	6.8	6.8	100.0
	Total	354	100.0	100.0	

SEX

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	317	89.5	89.5	89.5
	Female	37	10.5	10.5	100.0
	Total	354	100.0	100.0	

Years in running the business

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below	28	7.9	7.9	7.9
	11 – 20	127	35.9	35.9	43.8
	21 – 30	110	31.1	31.1	74.9
	31 – 50	86	24.3	24.3	99.2
	50 and above	3	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	354	100.0	100.0	

Educational Qualification

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than first degree	90	25.4	25.4	25.4
	First degree	223	63.0	63.0	88.4
	Above first degree	41	11.6	11.6	100.0
	Total	354	100.0	100.0	

Location of Business in Lagos, Nigeria

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Lagos East	34	9.6	9.6	9.6
	Lagos West	252	71.2	71.2	80.8
	Lagos Central	68	19.2	19.2	100.0
	Total	354	100.0	100.0	

Type of business ownership

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Sole Proprietorship	234	66.1	66.1	66.1
	Partnership	15	4.2	4.2	70.3
	Private Limited Liability Company	105	29.7	29.7	100.0
	Total	354	100.0	100.0	

Age of business

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	5 to 20 years	228	64.4	64.4	64.4
	21 to 50 years	126	35.6	35.6	100.0
	Total	354	100.0	100.0	

Succession stage

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Founder-manageed stage	328	92.7	92.7	92.7
	First succession	23	6.5	6.5	99.2
	Second succession	3	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	354	100.0	100.0	

Management

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Owner-manager	218	61.6	61.6	61.6
	Non-family manager	64	18.1	18.1	79.7
	Co-managed by family and non-family members	72	20.3	20.3	100.0
	Total	354	100.0	100.0	

Family Ownership

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Nuclear family ownership	334	94.4	94.4	94.4
	Extended family ownership	20	5.6	5.6	100.0
	Total	354	100.0	100.0	

Number of employees

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	10 - 49	226	63.8	63.8	63.8
	50 - 199	128	36.2	36.2	100.0
	Total	354	100.0	100.0	

Business net worth excluding land and building

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	5 million to 49 million	243	68.6	68.6	68.6
	50 million to 499 million	111	31.4	31.4	100.0
	Total	354	100.0	100.0	

Hypothesis oneresults

Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.652[a]	.042	.020	6.18818	1.931

a. Predictors: (Constant), Delayed-retirement of family business owner-managers
b. Dependent Variable: Perpetuity of family businesses

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	318.444	1	318.444	58.316	.004[b]
	Residual	13479.333	352	38.294		
	Total	13797.777	354			

a. Dependent Variable: Perpetuity of family businesses

b. Predictors: (Constant), Delayed-retirement of family business owner-managers

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	16.044	1.905		8.423	.000
	Delayed retirement	-.628	.114	.152	2.884	.004

a. Dependent Variable: Perpetuity of family business

b. Predictors: (Constant), Delayed-retirement of family business owner-managers

Hypothesis two results

Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.897	.756	.632	5.09643	1.886

a. Dependent Variable: Successful management transference

b. Predictors: (Constant), Mentoring

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	57585384.836	1	57585384.836	2217075.427	.000[b]
	Residual	9168.674	353	25.974		
	Total	57594553.510	354			

a. Dependent Variable: Successful management transference

b. Predictors: (Constant), Mentoring

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	15.765	.272		.015	.000
	Mentoring	.681	.001	1.000	1488.985	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Successful management transference

b. Predictors: (Constant), Mentoring

Hypothesis three results

Model Summaryb

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.831[a]	.688	.757	4.51899	1.816

a. Predictors: (Constant), Appointment of non-family member CEO as successors

b. Dependent Variable: Familybusiness continuous variability in Lagos State

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	57597237.218	1	57597237.218	2820457.581	.000[b]
	Residual	7208.697	353	20.421		
	Total	57604445.915	354			

a. Dependent Variable: Family business continuous viability in Lagos State

b. Predictors: (Constant), Appointment of non-family member CEO successors

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	20.896	.241		89.456	.000
	Appointment of non-family member CEOs Successor	.571	.001	1.000	1679.422	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Family business continuous viability in Lagos State

b. Predictors: (Constant), Appointment of non-family member CEO Successors

Hypothesis four results

Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.798[a]	.624	.897	5.92606	1.882

a. Predictors: (Constant), Family elders' forum's ability to resolve succession crisis

b. Dependent Variable: Harmonious working relationship in family businesses in Lagos State

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	57600294.077	1	57600294.077	1640186.734	.000[b]
	Residual	12396.701	353	35.118		
	Total	57612690.777	354			

a. Dependent Variable: Harmonious working relationship in family business in Lagos State

b. Predictors: (Constant), Family elders' forum's ability to resolve succession crisis

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	16.941	.316		342.990	.000
	Family Elders' Forun's ability in resolving succession crisis	.498	.001	1.000	1280.698	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Harmonious working relationship in family business in Lagos State

b. Predictors: (Constant), Family elders' forum's ability to resolve succession crisis