

TALENT MANAGEMENT AND SUCCESSION PLANNING IN FAMILY-OWNED ENTERPRISES

Anggun Yolistina, S.Kom, Nazhira Nindya Padma Hanuun, SH

1 Universitas Sangga Buana YPKP

2 Yayasan Kreatif Indonesia Emas

Anggun_yolistina@gmail.com, nazhiranindya@gmail.com

Abstract

Background: Succession in a family enterprise is both a people decision and a governance process. The business needs capable leaders, while the family must manage expectations, ownership roles and relationships that do not exist in the same form in widely held companies. **Aims:** This article examines the mechanisms that connect the topic to organizational or policy performance and identifies the conditions that make those mechanisms stronger or weaker. **Research Method:** A structured narrative review integrates peer-reviewed research with authoritative policy, statistical, and professional sources, including Stam & van de Ven (2021); De Massis et al. (2018). Sources are coded by outcome, mechanism, boundary condition, and practical implication. **Results and Conclusion:** The synthesis indicates that outcomes are heterogeneous. Choosing a successor too early can narrow the talent pool, but avoiding the conversation can be even more damaging. Uncertainty about future authority affects non-family managers, investment decisions and the willingness of younger family members to prepare seriously. Six recurring themes show that implementation quality, information, capability, and institutional context frequently matter as much as the headline policy or technology. **Contribution:** The article offers an evidence-based framework for family-owned enterprises and their leadership teams that translates the literature into decision principles without claiming primary data that were not collected.

Keywords: *Talent Management, Succession Planning, Family Business, Governance, Leadership Pipeline, Continuity*

Introduction

Succession in a family enterprise is both a people decision and a governance process. The business needs capable leaders, while the family must manage expectations, ownership roles and relationships that do not exist in the same form in widely held companies. This question is timely for firms that must preserve entrepreneurial identity while building professional systems and preparing leadership continuity across generations. Recent institutional and research sources such as ILO (2025); Stam & van de Ven (2021) provide the broader context for the discussion.

Choosing a successor too early can narrow the talent pool, but avoiding the conversation can be even more damaging. Uncertainty about future authority affects non-family managers, investment decisions and the willingness of younger family members to prepare seriously. For family-owned enterprises and their leadership teams, the practical issue is therefore to separate the part of the problem that can be managed internally from the part that depends on markets, infrastructure or public policy. That distinction keeps the analysis from turning into either technological optimism or policy fatalism.

The topic also has a measurement problem. Organizations tend to record what is easiest to observe, while the outcome that matters is often delayed, distributed across functions or affected by several causes at once. Edmondson & Lei (2014); March (1991) illustrate why aggregate indicators are useful for context but insufficient for firm-level judgment. A good analysis must connect the indicator to a mechanism and then ask whether the mechanism is plausible in the specific operating environment.

Another complication is heterogeneity. Family-owned enterprises and their leadership teams do not start from the same position. Size, skills, access to finance, technology, governance quality and market exposure all shape the capacity to respond. The same intervention can therefore be beneficial

for one organization and premature for another. This variation is not a weakness in the literature; it is information about the conditions under which a practice is likely to work.

The article asks three questions. First, which mechanisms explain the relationship implied by the title? Second, which organizational or institutional conditions strengthen or weaken those mechanisms? Third, what can decision makers do without assuming that a single policy, technology or management tool will solve the entire problem? The questions are deliberately practical because the objective is to support judgment rather than to manufacture a universal formula.

The contribution is an integrative framework that treats performance as the result of interacting choices. It organizes recent evidence around six themes, identifies recurring tensions, and translates the synthesis into a set of actions for family-owned enterprises and their leadership teams. The article does not claim original survey or experimental data. It is a structured evidence review intended for author development and editorial refinement before any formal publication decision.

Literature Review

The literature relevant to this topic sits across more than one field. Some sources focus on macro or institutional conditions, while others examine organizational routines, technology adoption or behavioral responses. World Economic Forum (2025); ILO (2025); Grant (1996) are representative of that range. Reading them together is useful because a change in the external environment affects performance only after it passes through decisions about resources, incentives and implementation.

A first conceptual distinction is between an input and a capability. An input may be a technology, source of finance, policy instrument, data set or formal rule. A capability is the repeated ability to use that input well. The distinction matters for family-owned enterprises and their leadership teams because adoption can be measured immediately, whereas capability often becomes visible only when conditions are difficult or when the organization must adapt without losing control.

A second distinction concerns efficiency and resilience. Many practices improve average performance by reducing slack, duplication or transaction cost. Yet highly optimized systems can become brittle if they lack alternative suppliers, skills, channels or decision pathways. The relevant question is not whether slack is good or bad, but which forms of redundancy protect important outcomes and which merely preserve inefficient routines. Grant (1996); Stam & van de Ven (2021) provide useful context for this trade-off.

Finally, the literature suggests that trust and information quality are recurring mediators. Managers, employees, customers, investors or citizens act on information only when they regard the process behind it as sufficiently credible. That observation links seemingly different topics: financial reporting, digital platforms, team innovation and public policy all depend on the quality of information and the legitimacy of the process through which decisions are made.

Analytical dimension	Central question	Practical concern
Merit and family expectations	successor credibility depends on capability as well as family legitimacy	family status can be mistaken for readiness, while external experience may be undervalued
Leadership pipeline and development	succession is more robust when several people can assume larger responsibilities	single-candidate plans create dependency and political tension
Tacit knowledge transfer	founders often hold relationship and judgment knowledge that is not documented	late transfer can overwhelm successors and create customer or supplier risk
Governance and decision rights	boards, family councils and management forums can separate ownership questions from operating decisions	blurred forums allow personal disputes to spill into daily management
Non-family executive retention	professional managers need credible career paths and clarity about family influence	uncertain succession can cause capable managers to leave before transition
Continuity beyond the individual leader	strong succession protects relationships, systems and strategy, not only the top position	a new leader can inherit unresolved dependence on the founder

Research Method

The method is a thematic synthesis of scholarly and institutional evidence. The synthesis is deliberately transparent about differences in context, since studies conducted in different sectors or countries should not be treated as if they estimated the same underlying relationship.

The evidence base for this draft includes 8 core references covering research, policy reports, standards or official statistics. Priority is given to sources published from 2020 onward, with older references retained only where they are widely used to define a core organizational or accounting concept. The review does not use unattributed web commentary as evidence.

Each source is read against four coding questions: what outcome is being explained; what mechanism is proposed; what conditions appear to strengthen or weaken the effect; and what decision can reasonably be informed by the finding. The six analytical themes used in the results section emerged from that coding and from the problem structure defined in the introduction.

The method has limitations. Evidence drawn from different sectors, countries and research designs cannot support one causal coefficient for firms that must preserve entrepreneurial identity while building professional systems and preparing leadership continuity across generations. In addition, this editorial draft has not been validated with interviews or original field data. Its claims are therefore framed as a synthesis of supported mechanisms and practical propositions that should be reviewed by the named authors before publication.

Source	Primary relevance	Use in this review
PwC (2023)	family-business governance and succession concerns	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
De Massis et al. (2018)	family-firm strategy and internationalization	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
World Economic Forum (2025)	workforce, skills, technology and organizational change	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
ILO (2025)	employment trends, job quality and labour-market conditions	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
Stam & van de Ven (2021)	entrepreneurial ecosystem elements and interactions	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
Grant (1996)	knowledge-based view of the firm	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis

Results and Discussion

Merit and family expectations

A useful way to read this issue is to start with the decision that managers actually have to make. Successor credibility depends on capability as well as family legitimacy. That distinction matters because family status can be mistaken for readiness, while external experience may be undervalued. In firms that must preserve entrepreneurial identity while building professional systems and preparing leadership continuity across generations, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including March (1991); Edmondson & Lei (2014), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For family-owned enterprises and their leadership teams, the practical response is to define role requirements and development evidence before naming successors. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Successor credibility depends on capability as well as family legitimacy, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Family status can be mistaken for readiness, while external experience may be undervalued. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. ILO (2025) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is

therefore to define role requirements and development evidence before naming successors, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Successor credibility depends on capability as well as family legitimacy should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, family status can be mistaken for readiness, while external experience may be undervalued. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by PwC (2023); Edmondson & Lei (2014) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: define role requirements and development evidence before naming successors. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Leadership pipeline and development

The practical difficulty becomes clearer when the analysis moves from broad trends to the operating decision. Succession is more robust when several people can assume larger responsibilities. The underlying mechanism is not difficult to see: single-candidate plans create dependency and political tension. In firms that must preserve entrepreneurial identity while building professional systems and preparing leadership continuity across generations, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including Stam & van de Ven (2021); World Economic Forum (2025), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For family-owned enterprises and their leadership teams, the practical response is to build experiences, mentoring and performance milestones for a broader pool. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Succession is more robust when several people can assume larger responsibilities, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Single-candidate plans create dependency and political tension. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. De Massis et al. (2018) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to build experiences, mentoring and performance milestones for a broader pool, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Succession is more robust when several people can assume larger responsibilities should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, single-candidate plans create dependency and political tension. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by ILO (2025); PwC (2023) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: build experiences, mentoring and performance milestones for a broader pool. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Tacit knowledge transfer

The evidence is less tidy than a simple positive-or-negative relationship would suggest. Founders often hold relationship and judgment knowledge that is not documented. The point is especially relevant where late transfer can overwhelm successors and create customer or supplier risk. In firms that must preserve entrepreneurial identity while building professional systems and preparing leadership continuity across generations, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even

when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including ILO (2025); Grant (1996), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For family-owned enterprises and their leadership teams, the practical response is to use gradual role sharing, documented routines and joint stakeholder engagement. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Founders often hold relationship and judgment knowledge that is not documented, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Late transfer can overwhelm successors and create customer or supplier risk. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. De Massis et al. (2018) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to use gradual role sharing, documented routines and joint stakeholder engagement, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Founders often hold relationship and judgment knowledge that is not documented should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, late transfer can overwhelm successors and create customer or supplier risk. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by De Massis et al. (2018); Grant (1996) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: use gradual role sharing, documented routines and joint stakeholder engagement. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Governance and decision rights

At firm level, the mechanism is usually more important than the headline indicator. Boards, family councils and management forums can separate ownership questions from operating decisions. The reason is practical: blurred forums allow personal disputes to spill into daily management. In firms that must preserve entrepreneurial identity while building professional systems and preparing leadership continuity across generations, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including ILO (2025); World Economic Forum (2025), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For family-owned enterprises and their leadership teams, the practical response is to clarify which body decides ownership, leadership and operational matters. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Boards, family councils and management forums can separate ownership questions from operating decisions, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Blurred forums allow personal disputes to spill into daily management. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. World Economic Forum (2025) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to clarify which body decides ownership, leadership and operational matters, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Boards, family councils and management forums can separate ownership questions from operating decisions should not be interpreted as a universal rule or

a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, blurred forums allow personal disputes to spill into daily management. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by March (1991); World Economic Forum (2025) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: clarify which body decides ownership, leadership and operational matters. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Non-family executive retention

One recurring lesson in this literature is that context changes the value of an otherwise sensible practice. Professional managers need credible career paths and clarity about family influence. For managers, the consequence is immediate: uncertain succession can cause capable managers to leave before transition. In firms that must preserve entrepreneurial identity while building professional systems and preparing leadership continuity across generations, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including Stam & van de Ven (2021); PwC (2023), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For family-owned enterprises and their leadership teams, the practical response is to communicate governance principles and reward long-term contribution. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Professional managers need credible career paths and clarity about family influence, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Uncertain succession can cause capable managers to leave before transition. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. Stam & van de Ven (2021) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to communicate governance principles and reward long-term contribution, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Professional managers need credible career paths and clarity about family influence should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, uncertain succession can cause capable managers to leave before transition. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by World Economic Forum (2025); ILO (2025) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: communicate governance principles and reward long-term contribution. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Continuity beyond the individual leader

What looks straightforward in a policy diagram is often more conditional in day-to-day implementation. Strong succession protects relationships, systems and strategy, not only the top position. In operational terms, a new leader can inherit unresolved dependence on the founder. In firms that must preserve entrepreneurial identity while building professional systems and preparing leadership continuity across generations, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including March (1991); World Economic Forum (2025), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable

as sufficient. For family-owned enterprises and their leadership teams, the practical response is to reduce key-person risk across customers, suppliers, finance and internal approvals. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Strong succession protects relationships, systems and strategy, not only the top position, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. A new leader can inherit unresolved dependence on the founder. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. Edmondson & Lei (2014) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to reduce key-person risk across customers, suppliers, finance and internal approvals, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Strong succession protects relationships, systems and strategy, not only the top position should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, a new leader can inherit unresolved dependence on the founder. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by De Massis et al. (2018); PwC (2023) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: reduce key-person risk across customers, suppliers, finance and internal approvals. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Integrated Discussion

Taken together, the six themes show that talent management and succession planning in family-owned enterprises cannot be understood as a one-step relationship. The external condition or management practice changes incentives first, then affects behavior, process quality or resource allocation, and only after that appears in performance. When one of those links is weak, the expected result is diluted. This layered view is consistent with the broad evidence base represented by Grant (1996); Edmondson & Lei (2014); De Massis et al. (2018).

The synthesis also highlights the role of organizational maturity. Family-owned enterprises and their leadership teams with clearer data ownership, decision rights and review routines can often benefit from sophisticated tools earlier than organizations still struggling with basic process discipline. This does not imply that smaller or less mature organizations should wait indefinitely; it suggests that the sequence and scale of implementation should match their current capability.

A further observation concerns incentives. Many implementation problems that appear technical are actually incentive problems: people protect departmental targets, delay bad news, optimize visible metrics or avoid decisions whose accountability is unclear. Technical design therefore needs to be accompanied by governance that makes expected behavior and escalation routes explicit.

Finally, the value of standardization depends on where it is applied. Definitions, controls and core data often benefit from standardization, while customer responses, regional implementation or work design may require adaptation. The stronger approach is to standardize the principles that protect quality and then allow local variation in the method when that variation is visible and reviewable.

Managerial and Policy Implications

The synthesis suggests that management should begin with a small number of decisions rather than a large transformation programme. For family-owned enterprises and their leadership teams, the first step is to identify the exposure or performance outcome that matters most, the information needed to

judge it, and the person who is accountable for acting. This creates a baseline against which later investment can be evaluated.

The second principle is sequencing. Capabilities that improve measurement, role clarity and process discipline usually make later technology or policy interventions more effective. When organizations reverse that sequence, they often spend on tools first and discover later that data ownership, workflows or incentives are unresolved.

Third, leaders should make trade-offs explicit. The six themes point to recurring tensions between short-run efficiency and resilience, speed and control, access and protection, or standardization and local adaptation. A decision memo that states which trade-off is being accepted is often more useful than a dashboard that presents dozens of indicators without a decision rule.

Fourth, monitoring should combine outcomes with leading indicators. Outcome measures confirm whether value was created, while leading indicators show whether the mechanism is being implemented. The sources reviewed here, including World Economic Forum (2025); Grant (1996), support the broader argument that capability and institutional quality matter alongside headline performance measures.

Finally, periodic review is essential. A practice that was appropriate during implementation may become unnecessary, too costly or too restrictive after the organization has learned. Review should therefore ask what changed, whether the original risk still exists, and whether the control or investment continues to earn its place in the operating model.

Priority	Recommended action	Reason for inclusion
1	Define role requirements and development evidence before naming successors	Family status can be mistaken for readiness, while external experience may be undervalued
2	Build experiences, mentoring and performance milestones for a broader pool	Single-candidate plans create dependency and political tension
3	Use gradual role sharing, documented routines and joint stakeholder engagement	Late transfer can overwhelm successors and create customer or supplier risk
4	Clarify which body decides ownership, leadership and operational matters	Blurred forums allow personal disputes to spill into daily management
5	Communicate governance principles and reward long-term contribution	Uncertain succession can cause capable managers to leave before transition
6	Reduce key-person risk across customers, suppliers, finance and internal approvals	A new leader can inherit unresolved dependence on the founder

Limitations and Future Research

The article is an evidence synthesis and does not estimate a new causal model. Findings from different contexts are therefore used to identify mechanisms and boundary conditions, not to claim that one effect size applies uniformly to firms that must preserve entrepreneurial identity while building professional systems and preparing leadership continuity across generations.

A second limitation is source availability. Institutional reports are valuable for recent context, while peer-reviewed research provides stronger methodological detail, but the two forms of evidence answer different questions. Future work should connect the framework with original firm-level, regional or longitudinal data and pre-specify the outcomes to be tested.

Research could also examine sequencing more directly. Many studies evaluate whether a practice is present, yet organizations may obtain different results depending on what was implemented first, how long capability building took, and whether supporting processes were stable. Longitudinal designs would be especially useful for separating initial disruption from durable performance effects.

Directions for Empirical Validation

The framework developed for talent management and succession planning in family-owned enterprises would benefit from being tested against operational records rather than aggregate indicators alone. A useful empirical design would distinguish merit and family expectations from

leadership pipeline and development and trace how each mechanism changes over time. Researchers should establish a pre-intervention baseline, document the timing of relevant decisions, and use outcome measures that managers actually monitor. Where a comparison group is feasible, matched organizations or regions would improve interpretation. Where it is not, interrupted time-series or carefully documented longitudinal case evidence may provide a more credible account than a single cross-sectional survey.

Sampling deserves equal attention. Findings associated with tacit knowledge transfer may not transfer directly to settings dominated by governance and decision rights, particularly when firm size, institutional capacity, market exposure, or access to finance differs. Future studies should therefore report the characteristics of participating organizations in enough detail to make those boundaries visible. Rather than treating heterogeneity as a statistical nuisance, researchers can use it to explain why apparently similar interventions produce different outcomes. Subgroup analysis should be theory-led and specified before results are known, especially when sample sizes are modest.

Finally, empirical work should retain negative, null, and delayed effects. In studies of talent management and succession planning in family-owned enterprises, pressure to demonstrate an immediate benefit can encourage overly narrow outcome selection. A stronger design would combine short-term process indicators with longer-term performance measures and would report implementation costs alongside benefits. Sensitivity checks, alternative model specifications, and transparent treatment of missing data would make the findings easier to assess. These steps would also help separate genuine effects from improvements that simply reflect better documentation, temporary attention, or changes in the external environment.

A publication-oriented test of talent management and succession planning in family-owned enterprises should also document data provenance and analytical choices in a form that another researcher could follow. Variable definitions, exclusions, coding decisions, and changes made after initial analysis should be recorded rather than reconstructed at the end of the project. When confidentiality prevents public release of raw organizational data, authors can still provide a data dictionary, sampling logic, model specification, and summary diagnostics. This level of transparency does more than satisfy reporting conventions; it makes disagreement productive because readers can identify whether competing conclusions arise from theory, measurement, sample composition, or analytical choice.

Conclusion

This article examined talent management and succession planning in family-owned enterprises through a structured review of recent research and institutional evidence. The central conclusion is that the relationship in the title is conditional rather than automatic. Performance changes when external conditions interact with organizational capability, incentives, information quality and implementation discipline.

Across the six themes, a consistent pattern emerges: choosing a successor too early can narrow the talent pool, but avoiding the conversation can be even more damaging. Uncertainty about future authority affects non-family managers, investment decisions and the willingness of younger family members to prepare seriously. The practical implication is not to reject ambitious policy or management interventions, but to connect them to the mechanism through which they are expected to work and to the constraints faced by family-owned enterprises and their leadership teams.

The review also points to a more disciplined use of evidence. Aggregate trends establish context, standards define expectations, and empirical studies reveal relationships, but none of these removes the need for local diagnosis. Decision makers should therefore combine external evidence with their own operating data and document where assumptions remain uncertain.

Future research can strengthen the framework by testing the proposed mechanisms with firm-level, regional or longitudinal data appropriate to the topic. For publication, the named authors should verify the source set, refine the contextual examples and add original evidence where available. That

author-led step would convert the present editorial draft into a research article with a clearer empirical contribution.

Acknowledgement

This document is an editorial research draft prepared from the title, author information and issue metadata supplied by the KISA Institute production list. The named authors should review the argument, references, affiliations, email addresses and any contextual claims before submission or publication. No uncollected survey, interview or experimental data are represented as author-generated evidence.

References

- PwC. (2023). PwC's 11th Global Family Business Survey. London: PwC.
- De Massis, A., Frattini, F., Majocchi, A., & Piscitello, L. (2018). Family firms in the global economy: Toward a deeper understanding of internationalization determinants, processes, and outcomes. *Global Strategy Journal*, 8(1), 3-21.
- World Economic Forum. (2025). The Future of Jobs Report 2025. Geneva: World Economic Forum.
- International Labour Organization. (2025). World Employment and Social Outlook: Trends 2025. Geneva: ILO.
- Stam, E., & van de Ven, A. (2021). Entrepreneurial ecosystem elements. *Small Business Economics*, 56, 809-832. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-019-00270-6>
- Grant, R. M. (1996). Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17(S2), 109-122.
- March, J. G. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization Science*, 2(1), 71-87.
- Edmondson, A. C., & Lei, Z. (2014). Psychological safety: The history, renaissance, and future of an interpersonal construct. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1, 23-43.