

Entrepreneurial Passion for Working with Family: scale development and validation

RIK VANHEES

Doctoral student, Research Center for Entrepreneurship and Family Firms (RCEF),
Hasselt University, Agoralaan building D, 3590 Diepenbeek

Rik.vanhees@uhasselt.be

PROF. DR. JELLE SCHEPERS

Assistant-professor, Research Center for Entrepreneurship and Family Firms (RCEF),
Hasselt University

PROF. DR. PIETER VANDEKERKHOF

Associate-professor, Research Center for Entrepreneurship and Family Firms (RCEF),
Hasselt University

PROF. DR. ANNELEEN MICHIELS

Associate-professor, Research Center for Entrepreneurship and Family Firms (RCEF),
Hasselt University

Introduction

The concept of passion originated in research fields such as educational psychology, sports psychology, or organizational behavior and has since made its way to entrepreneurship literature. Ever since the introduction of the concept of entrepreneurial passion, defined as “consciously accessible, intense positive feelings experienced by engagement in entrepreneurial activities associated with roles that are meaningful and salient to the self-identity of the entrepreneur” (Cardon, Wincent, Singh, & Drnovsek, 2009, p. 517), it has become a well-researched construct in the entrepreneurship literature.

Entrepreneurial passion has been researched from several different theoretical perspectives (Lee & Herrmann, 2021). For example, Chen et al. (2009) explored *perceived passion* whereas Baum, Locke, and Smith (2001) studied *passion for work*. Subsequently, Vallerand et al. (2003) proposed the *dualistic model of passion* as a framework to define passion. Cardon, Gregoire, Stevens, and Patel (2013) further specify their definition to the context of entrepreneurship and explicitly consider identities herein.

The definition of entrepreneurial passion, according to Cardon et al. (2009), includes three aspects. First of all, passion has to incorporate the experience of intense positive feelings. Second, the intense positive feelings are sustained for activities that are fundamental or central to the self-identity of the person in question. Third, the intense positive feelings and identity centrality are directed at three entrepreneurial domains: founding, inventing, developing (Cardon et al., 2009).

The definition of Cardon et al. (2013) refers to the aforementioned intense positive feelings as “consciously accessible”, meaning that individuals might reflect on the intensity of these feelings. As such, it is important to report respondents’ intensity of their positive feelings towards relevant activities within an entrepreneurial context when measuring EP (Cardon et al., 2013). Cardon et al. (2013) thus agree with Vallerand et al. (2003) and Perttula (2004), as they emphasize passion’s implication of both intense positive feelings and a deep identity connection, and specifically focus on three entrepreneurial roles (i.e., passion for founding, - inventing and – developing) that entrepreneurs may experience differently.

Cardon, Glauser, and Murnieks (2017) later extended these findings and explored additional sources of entrepreneurial passion. In their study, Cardon et al. (2017) suggest six additional major sources, one of which being passion for people. This object of passion encapsulates working with family, building meaningful relationships with vendors, employees or affiliates and satisfying customers

(Cardon et al., 2017). According to the authors, this object of passion, derived from the interaction with people (i.e. family), has not yet been studied nor operationalized. While we know that working with family members is often an important aspect of entrepreneurship in family firms, the experience of entrepreneurial passion for working with family members is noticeably absent from the current literature. This empirical and conceptual absence raises an important research question, such as “Is there such a thing as passion for working with family members and if so, how do we measure this?”.

Cardon et al. (2013) previously tested the validity of their measures by examining the relationship between their measure of entrepreneurial passion (and its dimensions individually) and other relevant concepts. The authors hereby establish conceptual and empirical differences from harmonious or obsessive passion (Vallerand, 2008; Vallerand et al., 2003) and passion for work (Baum & Locke, 2004; Baum et al., 2001).

By developing a quantitative academic scale measuring entrepreneurial passion for working with family, the present study further elaborates on the domain-specific work of Cardon et al. (2013). In doing so, we extend the literature on entrepreneurial passion beyond sources such as being an entrepreneur (e.g., Murnieks, Mosakowski, & Cardon, 2014) or for work (e.g., Perrewé, Hochwarter, Ferris, McAllister, & Harris, 2014). In this paper, we answer Cardon et al.’s (2017) call and go beyond the three most commonly used entrepreneurial roles (i.e. founding, inventing, and developing) by employing a family firm focus, which is currently missing in the entrepreneurial passion literature. In doing so, we answer recent calls in the passion literature (e.g. Cardon et al., 2017) to further unravel different sources of entrepreneurial passion as entrepreneurs may feel passion for multiple objects, above and beyond the ones already identified in existing passion literature (e.g., Cardon et al., 2009; Clarysse, Van Boxtael, & van hove, 2015; Huyghe, Knockaert, & Obschonka, 2016). The remainder of this study is structured as follows. First, we explain the theoretical background along with a conceptualization of entrepreneurial passion for working with family. Second, we elaborate on the methodological procedures, including item development, data collection and scale validation. Finally, this study ends with a discussion of our findings, its contributions or implications and future research opportunities for applying the passion for working with family scale.

Theoretical background

Entrepreneurial passion

Research on passion originally emerged from research fields such as educational or sports psychology and organisational behaviour, where results indicate influences on individuals’ cognition, motivation and behaviour (Perrewé et al., 2014; Stoeber, Childs, Hayward, & Feast, 2011; Vallerand & Miquelon, 2007). Ever since, entrepreneurship researchers have had increased attention for passion and their results ultimately find many individual and firm-level implications as it contributes to behaviour and outcomes for entrepreneurs/employees and ventures (de Mol, Cardon, de Jong, Khapova, & Elfring, 2020; Vanhees, Schepers, Vandekerckhof, & Michiels, 2023). Entrepreneurial passion appears to be an important factor for entrepreneurs to remain successful by persevering in volatile, demanding and adverse environments (e.g., the COVID-19 pandemic), as opposed to other work actions (Baron, Franklin, & Hmieleski, 2016; Foo, Uy, & Baron, 2009). Because of these important positive implications, research on entrepreneurial passion (EP) has strongly increased in recent years (Schwarte, Song, Hunt, & Lohrke, 2023). This surge in publications with regard to EP has resulted in both methodological and conceptual diversity (Schwarte et al., 2023). This subsequently resulted in the highly needed emergence of literature reviews (e.g., Lee & Herrmann, 2021; Newman, Obschonka, Moeller, & Chandan, 2021) that summarize the different theoretical perspectives. As such, four major conceptualisations arise: passion for work (Baum et al., 2001), perceived passion

(Chen, Yao, & Kotha, 2009), the dualistic model of passion (Vallerand et al., 2003), and entrepreneurial passion (Cardon et al., 2009).

Schwarte et al. (2023) aimed to remedy this conceptual diversity and developed an interpersonal process model for entrepreneurial passion. Based on extant EP literature, the authors identify three perspectives of EP (i.e., identity, regulation and expression). The identity-based perspective conceptualises entrepreneurial passion as “focusing on the process of passion experience, including how it is activated and internalized”, the regulation-based perspective subsequently “focuses on the process of passion experience, with a strong emphasis on the internalisation process of this experience” and the expression-based perspective lastly focuses on expression of EP whereby it “emphasizes that entrepreneurs express intense emotions with visible cues observable by others” (Schwarte et al., 2023, p. 9).

This identity-based perspective embodies Cardon et al.’s (2009) approach in conceptualising EP. Cardon et al. (2009) use two theoretical logics as a foundation for conceptualising EP: the identity theory and the affect control theory. Cardon et al. (2009) cite Burke and Reitzes (1991) as they define identity as “internalized expectations about those characteristics individuals hold as central, distinctive, and enduring about them and that are at least partially reflected in the roles they enact” (Cardon et al., 2009, p. 516). The authors argue that identities result in a certain motivation for activities or actions that lead to social validation of self-meaning (Cardon et al., 2009). The affect control theory subsequently states that “people behave within the framework of their identities; they attain experiences that confirm their fundamental sentiments about identities” (Burke & Reitzes, 1991, p. 242). In line with the affect control theory, engagement in actions or activities that validate salient identities arouse positive affect (Burke & Reitzes, 1991). In their 2009 study, Cardon and colleagues elaborate that continued and repeated engagement in these activities is likely to cause an association with intense positive feelings over time given their reliable and strong support to the salient identity of an individual.

In line with their study and in order to combat the conceptual pluralism as well, this study follows Cardon et al. (2009) and define EP as “consciously accessible, intense positive feelings experienced by engagement in entrepreneurial activities associated with roles that are meaningful and salient to the self-identity of the entrepreneur” (Cardon et al., 2009, p. 517). By doing so, we align with the identity-based perspective of EP and limit the diversifying trend in EP-conceptualisation and maintain conceptual precision (Murnieks, Cardon, Sudek, White, & Brooks, 2016; Schwarte et al., 2023).

As conveyed in their definition of EP, the first requirement of measuring entrepreneurial passion is to measure the intense positive feelings (Cardon et al., 2013). Congruent with Cardon et al. (2013), Vallerand et al. (2003) consider EP as an effective experience resulting from engagement or thoughts about certain activities. The definitional implication that these intense positive feelings are consciously accessible suggests that individuals are able to critically think about the intensity of their feelings toward certain activities (Cardon et al., 2013). The second requirement of measuring entrepreneurial passion is the understanding that the intense positive feelings are sustained for activities that are fundamental or central to the self-identity of the person in question (Cardon et al., 2013). In accordance with the aforementioned definition of identity, an individual’s self-identity regularly consists of several identities (Farmer, Yao, & Kung-McIntyre, 2011; Murnieks, 2007) that are organized hierarchically based on how salient or central the activity is to the self-identity of the individual (Cardon et al., 2013; Stryker & Burke, 2000). A third requirement of measuring entrepreneurial passion is a consideration of relevance with regard to the activities and actions for which an entrepreneur experiences intense positive feelings that are central to their identity (Cardon et al., 2013; Cardon et al., 2009). To refrain from using an object of passion that might be too broad (e.g., being an entrepreneur), the authors put forth a more specific or nuanced approach. Cardon et al. (2013) suggest three entrepreneurial roles for which might experience passion: the inventor role, the founder role and the developer role. Passion for inventing refers to the arousal of passion when engaging in

“activities that involve seeking out new ideas, tinkering with new product development, or scanning the environment for market-disruptive opportunities” (Cardon et al., 2009, p. 517). Passion for founding subsequently refers to the experience of passion when engaging in “activities that involve assembling the resources necessary to create a firm, including financial (e.g., VC funding, human (e.g., employees) and social (e.g., board members) capital” (Cardon et al., 2009, p. 517). Passion for developing finally refers to the passion one experiences “when they engage in activities related to market development (e.g., attracting new customers) and financial growth (e.g., value creation and appropriation)” (Cardon et al., 2009, p. 517).

Differences between related concepts

As previously noted, literature review studies (Lee & Herrmann, 2021; Newman et al., 2021) distinguish four major conceptualisations of passion: passion for work (Baum et al., 2001), perceived passion (Chen et al., 2009), the dualistic model of passion (Vallerand et al., 2003), and entrepreneurial passion (Cardon et al., 2009). The conceptualization of passion by Chen et al. (2009) uses cognitive and behavioural manifestations of passion to measure observed passion. Cardon et al. (2013) do, however, not fully agree with this conceptualization as it “may not accurately reflect experienced passion, and instead may simply be a function of impression management by the presenting entrepreneurs” (Cardon et al., 2013, p. 3). The passion conceptualization of Cardon et al. (2013) does build on Chen et al.’s (2009) theoretical focus on the affective aspects of entrepreneurial passion. The authors, however, focus on the entrepreneurs’ experience of EP and consider the behavioural and cognitive manifestations as outcomes, as opposed to a part of it (Cardon et al., 2013). Vallerand et al. (2003) subsequently define passion as “a strong inclination toward an activity that people like, that they find important, and in which they invest time and energy” (Vallerand et al., 2003, p. 756). In their dualistic model of passion, Vallerand et al. (2003) distinguish two types of passion: harmonious passion and obsessive passion. Elaborating on the self-determination theory of Deci and Ryan (1985), Vallerand et al. (2003) refer to harmonious passion as “an autonomous internalization that leads individuals to choose to engage in the activity that they like”, whereas they define obsessive passion as “a controlled internalization of an activity in one’s identity that creates an internal pressure to engage in the activity that the person likes” (Vallerand et al., 2003, p. 756).

The dualistic model of passion (Vallerand et al., 2003) and entrepreneurial passion (Cardon et al., 2009) are thus in agreement about affect and identity being core components of passion (Lee & Herrmann, 2021). The differentiating factor between these frameworks lies in the internalization and the approach toward entrepreneurship (Collewaert, Anseel, Crommelinck, De Beuckelaer, & Vermeire, 2016; Ho & Pollack, 2014). Vallerand et al. (2003) more specifically elaborate on the internalization (i.e. autonomous or controlled) to make a distinction between harmonious and obsessive passion whereas Cardon et al.’s (2009) approach is domain-specific (Lee & Herrmann, 2021). In doing so, Cardon et al. (2009) move beyond extant entrepreneurial theories or notions which claim that wealth creation and maximization are an entrepreneur’s main source of motivation and open the door to measuring entrepreneurial passion in previously unexplored domains.

The need for a new outlook on entrepreneurial passion

Family business

As argued by Vanhees et al. (2023) and Newman et al. (2021), it is important to explore the concept of entrepreneurial passion in different research domains, such as the family business context. Family businesses, defined as a firm where the family owns at least 50 per cent of the shares, has an active participation in management or board and even behaves or defines themselves as a family firm (Zellweger, Eddleston, & Kellermanns, 2010), are the most prevalent organisational form worldwide (Bloom & Van Reenen, 2007). They account for 33 per cent of Belgium’s gross domestic product (GDP) and 45 per cent of its employment (FBN Belgium, 2023). Moreover, they possess unique

characteristics (e.g., family dynamics, non-economic goals) that can have a positive influence on their performance. Family business literature, for example, shows that some family businesses excel in terms of performance, more effectively deal with difficult crisis situations (e.g., COVID-19 pandemic) or remain successful over multiple generations (Bertrand & Schoar, 2006).

Passion for working with family

In line with Cardon et al.'s (2013) remarks, we conceptualise passion for working with family as more than the sole experience of strong emotions. The experience of emotions, which is also central in SEW literature, is however different from the experience of passion (Wincent, Cardon, Singh, & Drnovsek, 2008). The authors highlight the importance of recognizing this distinction as the experience of intense positive feelings for something important to the entrepreneur is more lasting in comparison to the experience of emotions. Wincent et al. (2008) argue that emotions might shift or alter more quickly when confronted with external stimuli. Our conceptualization encapsulates the intense positive feelings an entrepreneur has for working with their family members, which is central and meaningful to their self-identity (Farmer et al., 2011). By not only doing so but also by providing a specific EP measurement in the family business context, we ensure that our measurement of EP for family is different from other variables (cognitive or affective) in the entrepreneurship context and highlight potentially new antecedents of successful entrepreneurship.

The prevalence, uniqueness and economic significance of family businesses highlight the importance of academic research regarding this context. On top of that, several scholars have previously called for the exploration of the entrepreneurial passion construct in a different research context (e.g., Newman et al., 2021). Cardon et al. (2017) provide a first step in exploring other domains or activities for which an entrepreneur might be passionate. Their qualitative research identifies six alternative domains of passion. One of the major domains these results uncovered, is the passion for people (Cardon et al., 2017). According to the authors, this object of passion, derived from the interaction with people (e.g. family members), has not yet been studied nor operationalized. While we know that working with family members is often an important aspect of entrepreneurship in family firms, the experience of entrepreneurial passion for working with family members is noticeably absent from the current passion literature. This empirical and conceptual absence forms the basis for this research.

A quantifiable scale measuring the entrepreneurial passion for working with family could serve as a starting point to bridge the gap between EP and family business research (Vanhees et al., 2023). This scale could furthermore provide assistance in the quest to disentangle the complexity of family businesses; a possible way to explore why some family firms are more successful than others. In conclusion, the development, testing and validation of this scale can be viewed as a valuable undertaking in the family business research field.

Methods

In this section, we briefly specify the data collection and the sample that was used to empirically validate our scale. Subsequently, we describe the scale validation procedure, which is in line with the psychometric standards of management literature (Hinkin, 1995; MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Podsakoff, 2011).

Item development

Item development was conducted in five steps. First, a thorough literature review was conducted to identify relevant content and afterwards refine this into questionnaire items. Secondly, the wording of the eventually obtained items was tested with five experienced family CEOs from private Belgian family businesses and within the group of authors itself. Next, we conducted interviews with these same five experienced family CEOs in order to devise additional questionnaire items. Fourth, the wording of all items was analysed with ten family CEOs from different private Belgian family

businesses. Additionally, the wording was also tested with several experienced family business scholars to ensure quality on one hand and both practical and academic relevance on the other hand. Finally, the questionnaire items were pretested.

In order to demonstrate the distinction of this EP measurement from other variable that cognitively and affectively influence entrepreneurship, we carefully integrate the two dimensions of EP (i.e., intense positive feelings and identity centrality), as recommended by Cardon et al. (2013). In doing so, we adhere to the theoretical backdrop of Cardon et al.'s (2013) conceptualization of EP and aim to shed a new light on the processes and variable that promote entrepreneurship.

The intense positive feelings dimension measures how the engagement in several activities related to working with family members induce the experience of intense positive feelings. Family businesses experience some activities in a different way given the overlap between the business sphere and the family sphere (Arijs & Michiels, 2021). This overlap enables families to exchange resources (e.g., the ability to provide a true understanding and emotional support) between both spheres in order to sustain times of disruption and ultimately experience intense positive feelings (Arijs & Michiels, 2021). We operationalized these intense positive feelings for working with family by combining the rephrased items from extant related literature (to fit the context of our study) with the questionnaire items obtained by conducting interviews with Belgian family CEOs. Results are realised on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (totally disagree) to 7 (totally agree). A sample item for this dimension is "Working with my family members is one of the most rewarding things I do". See Appendix for an overview of all items.

The identity centrality dimension is shaped by the notion that working with family members (which induced the intense positive feelings) is a role or activity that is central to the self-identity of the individual. Higher levels of identity centrality will eventually result in higher levels of EP for working with family. Identity centrality was measured using a combination of rephrased measures from extant literature of related concepts (to fit the context of our study) and the additional items resulting from qualitative interviews. In accordance with the intense positive feelings dimension, results are realised on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (totally disagree) to 7 (totally agree). A sample item for this dimension is "Working with my family members in an important part of who I am". See Appendix for an overview of all items.

Data collection and sample description

Initially, the scale was empirically tested in two pre-tests in order to iteratively revise the questionnaire. The first pre-test comprised the on-site visitation and interview of five family CEOs of private Belgian family businesses. By conducting these interviews, two goals were achieved. First and foremost, the wording of each item of the questionnaire was carefully discussed to prevent any ambiguities. Secondly, the interviews served as a foundation for additional questionnaire items.

In the second pre-test, an electronic version of the questionnaire will be sent to and filled in by 150 family members from private Belgian family businesses. In doing so, the clarity of the essence/meaning of each item will be checked. In both steps, no linguistic alterations should be required but can be executed if deemed necessary. The final questionnaire will then be used in a main study. The data collection procedure for this study will be executed by applying a targeted sampling method and a snowball sampling method respectively.

The targeted sampling method is defined as "a purposeful, systematic method by which controlled lists of specified populations within geographical districts are developed and detailed plans are designed to recruit adequate numbers of cases within each of the targets. While they are not random samples, it is particularly important to emphasize that targeted samples are not convenience samples. They entail, rather, a strategy to obtain systematic information when true random sampling is not feasible and when convenience sampling is not rigorous enough to meet the assumptions of the research design"

(Watters & Biernacki, 1989, p. 420). Targeted sampling thus fits within the context of this study as Belgian private family businesses with a family CEO (excluding lone-founder firms), is quite specific. This method encapsulates a general Internet search and a thorough exploration of recognised dedicated family business magazines. This process should result in a target sample of 500 family businesses. Thanks to the nature of this sampling method, duplicates and obvious non-family businesses will be non-existing. From this point on, the snowball sampling technique will be applied. This technique refers to the sampling method whereby “a few identified members of a rare population are asked to identify other members of the population, those so identified are asked to identify others, and so on, for the purpose of obtaining a nonprobability sample or for constructing a frame from which to sample” (Thompson, 2012, p. 183). This should result in a random total target sample of 2000 family CEOs.

At this point in time, we do not yet possess the data to make any further conclusions.

Scale validation procedure

A multi-step procedure was implemented iteratively to evaluate the validity of the *passion for working with family* construct (Frank, Kessler, Beck, Suess-Reyes, & Fuetsch, 2022).

- **Split halves**

In order to increase the robustness, the total sample will haphazardly be divided in two halves. The first half will be used for the exploratory factor analysis whereas the other half will be used to confirm the validity and measurement quality of the *passion for working with family* construct.

- **Exploratory factor analysis (EFA)**
- **Validity of higher order construct**
- **Content validity and predictive validity**
- **Iterations**

As previously mentioned, we do not have any further data at this stage and therefore cannot make any additional claims. Data collection is set to take place shortly after the submission of this research to the IRMBAM conference. Once this data collection phase is completed, the aforementioned steps will be executed taking into account extant literature on this matter (e.g., Cardon et al., 2013; Frank et al., 2022; Frank, Kessler, Rusch, Suess-Reyes, & Weismeier-Sammer, 2017; Gómez-Mejía & Herrero, 2022; Hauck, Suess-Reyes, Beck, Prügl, & Frank, 2016; Hinkin, 1995; MacKenzie et al., 2011).

References

- Arijs, D., & Michiels, A. (2021). Mental health in family businesses and business families: a systematic review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(5), 2589.
- Baron, R. A., Franklin, R. J., & Hmieleski, K. M. (2016). Why entrepreneurs often experience low, not high, levels of stress: The joint effects of selection and psychological capital. *Journal of management*, 42(3), 742-768.
- Baum, J. R., & Locke, E. A. (2004). The relationship of entrepreneurial traits, skill, and motivation to subsequent venture growth. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(4), 587.
- Baum, J. R., Locke, E. A., & Smith, K. G. (2001). A multidimensional model of venture growth. *Academy of Management journal*, 44(2), 292-303.
- Bertrand, M., & Schoar, A. (2006). The Role of Family in Family Firms. *The Journal of economic perspectives*, 20(2), 73-96. doi:10.1257/jep.20.2.73
- Bloom, N., & Van Reenen, J. (2007). Measuring and explaining management practices across firms and countries. *The quarterly journal of Economics*, 122(4), 1351-1408.

- Burke, P. J., & Reitzes, D. C. (1991). An identity theory approach to commitment. *Social psychology quarterly*, 239-251.
- Cardon, M. S., Glauser, M., & Murnieks, C. Y. (2017). Passion for what? Expanding the domains of entrepreneurial passion. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 8, 24-32.
- Cardon, M. S., Gregoire, D. A., Stevens, C. E., & Patel, P. C. (2013). Measuring entrepreneurial passion: Conceptual foundations and scale validation. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 28(3), 373-396.
- Cardon, M. S., Wincent, J., Singh, J., & Drnovsek, M. (2009). The nature and experience of entrepreneurial passion. *Academy of management Review*, 34(3), 511-532.
- Chen, X.-P., Yao, X., & Kotha, S. (2009). Entrepreneur passion and preparedness in business plan presentations: a persuasion analysis of venture capitalists' funding decisions. *Academy of Management journal*, 52(1), 199-214.
- Clarysse, B., Van Boxstael, A., & van hove, j. (2015). *A Tale of Two Passions: A Passion for the "Profession" and a Passion to "Develop the Venture"*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Proceedings.
- Collewaert, V., Anseel, F., Crommelinck, M., De Beuckelaer, A., & Vermeire, J. (2016). When passion fades: Disentangling the temporal dynamics of entrepreneurial passion for founding. *Journal of Management Studies*, 53(6), 966-995.
- de Mol, E., Cardon, M. S., de Jong, B., Khapova, S. N., & Elfring, T. (2020). Entrepreneurial passion diversity in new venture teams: An empirical examination of short-and long-term performance implications. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 35(4), 105965.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). Conceptualizations of intrinsic motivation and self-determination. In *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior* (pp. 11-40): Springer.
- Farmer, S., Yao, X., & Kung-McIntyre, K. (2011). Social roles, identities, and entrepreneurship: A three-nation study in the US, China, and Taiwan. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35, 245-273.
- FBN Belgium (n.d.) Titel. Retrieved on April 10, 2023, from <https://www.fbnbelgium.be/en/>
- Foo, M.-D., Uy, M. A., & Baron, R. A. (2009). How do feelings influence effort? An empirical study of entrepreneurs' affect and venture effort. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(4), 1086.
- Frank, H., Kessler, A., Beck, S., Suess-Reyes, J., & Fuetsch, E. (2022). The enterpriseness of business families: Conceptualization, scale development and validation. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 100522.
- Frank, H., Kessler, A., Rusch, T., Suess-Reyes, J., & Weismeier-Sammer, D. (2017). Capturing the familiness of family businesses: Development of the family influence familiness scale (FIFS). *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 41(5), 709-742.
- Gómez-Mejía, L. R., & Herrero, I. (2022). Back to square one: The measurement of Socioemotional Wealth (SEW). *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 100480.
- Hauck, J., Suess-Reyes, J., Beck, S., Prügl, R., & Frank, H. (2016). Measuring socioemotional wealth in family-owned and-managed firms: A validation and short form of the FIBER Scale. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 7(3), 133-148.
- Hinkin, T. R. (1995). A review of scale development practices in the study of organizations. *Journal of management*, 21(5), 967-988.
- Ho, V. T., & Pollack, J. M. (2014). Passion isn't always a good thing: Examining entrepreneurs' network centrality and financial performance with a dualistic model of passion. *Journal of Management Studies*, 51(3), 433-459.
- Huyghe, A., Knockaert, M., & Obschonka, M. (2016). Unraveling the "passion orchestra" in academia. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 31(3), 344-364.
- Lee, Y., & Herrmann, P. (2021). Entrepreneurial passion: A systematic review and research opportunities. *Journal of Small Business Strategy*, 31(3), 122-147.
- MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2011). Construct measurement and validation procedures in MIS and behavioral research: Integrating new and existing techniques. *MIS quarterly*, 293-334.

- Murnieks, C. Y. (2007). *Who am I? The quest for an entrepreneurial identity and an investigation of its relationship to entrepreneurial passion and goal-setting*. University of Colorado at Boulder,
- Murnieks, C. Y., Cardon, M. S., Sudek, R., White, T. D., & Brooks, W. T. (2016). Drawn to the fire: The role of passion, tenacity and inspirational leadership in angel investing. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 31(4), 468-484.
- Murnieks, C. Y., Mosakowski, E., & Cardon, M. S. (2014). Pathways of passion: Identity centrality, passion, and behavior among entrepreneurs. *Journal of management*, 40(6), 1583-1606.
- Newman, A., Obschonka, M., Moeller, J., & Chandan, G. G. (2021). Entrepreneurial passion: A review, synthesis, and agenda for future research. *Applied Psychology*, 70(2), 816-860.
- Perrewé, P. L., Hochwarter, W. A., Ferris, G. R., McAllister, C. P., & Harris, J. N. (2014). Developing a passion for work passion: Future directions on an emerging construct. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(1), 145-150.
- Perttula, K. H. (2004). *The POW factor: Understanding and igniting passion for one's work*: University of Southern California.
- Schwarte, Y., Song, Y., Hunt, R. A., & Lohrke, F. T. (2023). Passion as process: Three perspectives on entrepreneurial passion and an integrated path forward. *Journal of Business Research*, 156, 113474.
- Stoeber, J., Childs, J. H., Hayward, J. A., & Feast, A. R. (2011). Passion and motivation for studying: predicting academic engagement and burnout in university students. *Educational Psychology*, 31(4), 513-528.
- Stryker, S., & Burke, P. J. (2000). The past, present, and future of an identity theory. *Social psychology quarterly*, 284-297.
- Thompson, S. K. (2012). *Sampling* (Vol. 755): John Wiley & Sons.
- Vallerand, R. J. (2008). On the psychology of passion: In search of what makes people's lives most worth living. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie Canadienne*, 49(1), 1.
- Vallerand, R. J., Blanchard, C., Mageau, G. A., Koestner, R., Ratelle, C., Léonard, M., . . . Marsolais, J. (2003). Les passions de l'ame: on obsessive and harmonious passion. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 85(4), 756.
- Vallerand, R. J., & Miquelon, P. (2007). Passion for sport in athletes. *Social psychology in sport*, 9, 249-262.
- Vanhees, R., Schepers, J., Vandekerckhof, P., & Michiels, A. (2023). The effect of CEO entrepreneurial passion on family firm entrepreneurial orientation: does generational stage matter? *Management Decision*.
- Watters, J. K., & Biernacki, P. (1989). Targeted sampling: Options for the study of hidden populations. *Social problems*, 36(4), 416-430.
- Wincent, J., Cardon, M. S., Singh, J., & Drnovsek, M. (2008). Entrepreneurial affect: The distinction between emotion and passion. *Presented at the Academy of Management Conference*.
- Zellweger, T. M., Eddleston, K. A., & Kellermanns, F. W. (2010). Exploring the concept of familiness: Introducing family firm identity. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 1(1), 54-63.

Appendix

Scale items – passion for working with family (Dutch version)

Identity centrality

1. Als ik werk met mijn familieleden, kan ik echt mezelf zijn.
2. Ik identificeer mezelf met de mensen en het beeld van het werken met mijn familieleden.
3. Als ik met mijn familieleden werk, hoef ik me geen zorgen te maken over hoe ik eruitzie.
4. Het werken met mijn familieleden is een belangrijk deel van wie ik ben.
5. Ik denk vaak aan het werken met mijn familieleden.
6. Als ik denk aan wie ik ben, is een belangrijk aspect van mijn identiteit dat ik met mijn familieleden werk.
7. Het werken met mijn familieleden staat centraal in hoe ik mezelf definieer.
8. Ik zie mezelf als iemand die met familieleden werkt.
9. Ik zou een verlies voelen als ik het werken met mijn familieleden zou moeten opgeven.
10. Een evenwicht vinden tussen de behoeften van de familie en die van het familiebedrijf is heel belangrijk voor mij.
11. Ik heb een sterk gevoel van samenhang wanneer ik met mijn familieleden werk.
12. Ik heb het gevoel dat het succes van mijn familieleden mijn eigen succes is.
13. Werken met mijn familieleden heeft een grote persoonlijke betekenis voor mij.
14. Lid zijn van mijn familie helpt me te definiëren wie ik ben.
15. Ik ben er trots op om anderen te vertellen dat ik deel uitmaak van mijn familie.
16. Bemiddelen en het verbinden van mensen (of familieleden) is een belangrijk deel van wie ik ben.

Intense positive feelings

17. Dat familieleden bij elkaar blijven, geeft mij echt energie.
18. Samen tijd doorbrengen als familie buiten het familiebedrijf is plezierig.
19. Ik ben gemotiveerd om in het openbaar als één familie op te treden.

20. Het is opwindend om te zien dat alle familieleden die in het bedrijf werken het beste van zichzelf geven.
21. Ik vind het spannend dat de familie het bedrijf een gezicht geeft.
22. Ik vind het erg leuk dat het familiebedrijf maatschappelijk actief is in de gemeenschap/regio.
23. Het geeft me energie als werknemers het familiebedrijf hoog waarderen.
24. Werken met mijn familie is zo interessant dat het vaak niet als werk aanvoelt.
25. Werken met mijn familieleden is meer plezier dan werk.
26. Meestal is het werken met mijn familieleden plezierig.
27. Soms kan ik 's morgens bij het opstaat nauwelijks wachten om met mijn familieleden te gaan werken.
28. Ik vind het werken met mijn familieleden leuker dan de meeste mensen.
29. Ik vind zelden iets leuk aan het werken met mijn familieleden. ®
30. Ik werk met mijn familieleden vaker voor het plezier en niet omdat het strikt van mij verwacht wordt.
31. Ik lijk een innerlijke dwang te hebben om met mijn familieleden te werken.
32. Het is belangrijk voor mij om met mijn familieleden te werken, zelfs als ik geen plezier heb in wat ik doe.
33. Ik heb vaak het gevoel dat er iets in me zit dat me drijft om met mijn familieleden te werken.
34. Ik voel me verplicht om met mijn familieleden te werken, zelfs als het niet leuk is.
35. Ik denk vaak aan het werken met mijn familieleden, zelfs als ik er even tussenuit wil.
36. Tussen het werken met mijn familieleden en andere activiteiten waar ik bij betrokken ben, heb ik niet veel vrije tijd.
37. Ik voel me schuldig als ik vrij neem van het werken met mijn familieleden.
38. Ik wou vaak dat ik niet zo toegewijd was aan het werken met mijn familieleden.
39. Ik kijk echt uit naar het weekend - alleen maar plezier, geen werk met mijn familieleden. ®
40. Soms vind ik het zo leuk om met mijn familieleden te werken dat ik moeilijk kan stoppen.
41. Ik vind het werken met mijn familieleden belangrijk en zinvol.
42. Ik ben enthousiast over het werken met mijn familieleden.
43. Werken met mijn familieleden inspireert me.
44. Ik ben trots op het werken met mijn familieleden.
45. Ik vind het werken met mijn familieleden een uitdaging.
46. Het werken met mijn familieleden stelt me in staat om verschillende ervaringen op te doen.
47. De nieuwe dingen die ik ontdek door met mijn familieleden te werken, stellen me in staat het nog meer te waarderen.
48. Door met mijn familieleden te werken, kan ik onvergetelijke ervaringen opdoen.
49. Het werken met mijn familieleden weerspiegelt de kwaliteiten die ik leuk vind aan mezelf.
50. Het werken met mijn familieleden is in harmonie met de andere activiteiten in mijn leven.
51. Voor mij is het werken met mijn familieleden een passie, die ik nog steeds beheers.
52. Ik ben volledig ingenomen door het werken met mijn familieleden.
53. Ik kan niet leven zonder het werken met mijn familieleden.
54. De drang is zo sterk. Ik kan het niet laten om met mijn familieleden te werken.
55. Ik kan me mijn leven zonder het werken met mijn familieleden moeilijk voorstellen.
56. Ik ben emotioneel afhankelijk van het werken met mijn familieleden.
57. Ik kan mijn behoefte om met mijn familieleden te werken moeilijk onder controle houden.
58. Ik heb bijna een obsessief gevoel voor het werken met mijn familieleden.
59. Mijn humeur hangt af van het feit of ik met mijn familieleden kan werken.
60. Ik heb een passie voor het werken met mijn familieleden.
61. Ik geniet meer dan wat ook van het werken met mijn familieleden.
62. Werken met mijn familieleden geeft me een enorme persoonlijke voldoening.
63. Ik zou alles opofferen om met mijn familieleden te kunnen werken.

64. Het eerste waar ik vaak aan denk als ik mezelf aan anderen beschrijf, is dat ik met mijn familieleden werk.
65. Ik zou met mijn familieleden blijven werken, zelfs als ik met ernstige obstakels te maken zou krijgen.
66. Ik weet dat het werken met mijn familieleden altijd een deel van mijn leven zal zijn.
67. Ik voel een lotsbestemming voor het werken met mijn familieleden.
68. Werken met mijn familieleden is altijd op de een of andere manier in mijn gedachten.
69. Zelfs als ik niet met mijn familieleden werk, denk ik er vaak aan.
70. Mijn bestaan zou veel minder zinvol zijn zonder het werken met mijn familieleden.
71. Werken met mijn familieleden is voor mij een diep ontroerende en dankbare ervaring.
72. Het werken met mijn familieleden is een van de leukste dingen die ik doe.
73. Het werken met mijn familieleden is erg belangrijk voor mij.
74. Het werken met mijn familieleden is een van de meest bevredigende dingen die ik doe.
75. Ik vind dat veel van mijn leven georganiseerd is rond het werken met mijn familieleden.
76. Het werken met mijn familieleden speelt een centrale rol in mijn leven.
77. Ik krijg er energie van om samen met mijn familieleden lang en veel te werken.
78. Het doorstaan van zakelijk moeilijke periodes versterkt de familieband, wat mij energie geeft.
79. De mogelijkheid om te kunnen werken met mijn familieleden is een belangrijke reden waarom ik voor deze job/functie gekozen heb.
80. Ik vind het erg leuk om te werken met mijn familieleden omdat ik open, eerlijk en vrijuit met hen kan communiceren.