

Lanfranchi, A.G., Strehlau, S., Borini, F.M. and Melo, P.L.d.R. (2021), "Does origin matter? The impact of the institutional environment of the origin country on the internationalization of franchise chains", *Multinational Business Review*, Vol. 29 No. 1, pp. 96-115. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MBR-01-2020-0020>



DOES ORIGIN MATTER?
The impact of the institutional environment of the origin country on the internationalization of franchise chains

Journal:	<i>Multinational Business Review</i>
Manuscript ID	MBR-01-2020-0020.R3
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Franchise chains, Internationalization, Emerging markets, Country of origin, Institutional theory, Institutional environment

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

DOES ORIGIN MATTER?

The impact of the institutional environment of the origin country on the internationalization of franchise chains

Multinational Business Review

ABSTRACT

Purpose: The purpose of this research is to identify the impacts of the country of origin of a franchise chain on its commitment in the destination countries, verifying institutional particularities between the chains from emerging and developed countries.

Methodology: The research is descriptive and quantitative, and involved 724 franchise chains from ten countries of origin (Brazil, Russia, India, South Africa, Argentina, United States, Germany, Australia, Spain and Portugal), spread over 174 destination countries, totaling 3513 cases.

Findings: The results indicate that institutional preferences do not vary according to the country of origin, but rather according to the destination country.

Research implications: The article contributes to institutional theory by identifying a set of characteristics that explains the selection of international markets and the commitment of franchise chains.

Practical implications: The results obtained can help managers of franchise chains to make decisions related to the selection of destination countries for international expansion based on the institutional characteristics of the markets and their compatibility with the objectives of the franchise chains.

Originality/value: Companies in emerging countries internationalize according to different management logics from those of companies from developed countries. Thus, it is possible that the process of selecting countries for internationalization is also based on different criteria, reflecting different institutional preferences. The thesis defended in the article is that market potential is more important to franchisees from emerging markets while contract enforcement is more important to franchisees from developed markets.

Keywords: Franchise chains; Internationalization; Emerging markets; Country of origin; Institutional theory; Institutional environment.

1 INTRODUCTION

The present article is dedicated to investigating the conditions of countries of origin and their impacts on international franchise chains. The international market selection will be explored from the institutional theory perspective (Dunning and Lundan, 2008; Peng, *et al.*, 2008; Rocha and Ávila, 2015; Zoogah *et al.*, 2015). Companies in emerging countries internationalize according to different backgrounds and management logics from those of companies from developed countries (Cuervo-cazurra and Genc, 2008; Hoskisson *et al.*, 2013). Thus, it is possible that the process of selecting destination countries for internationalization is also based on different criteria that reflect different institutional preferences. Therefore, the purpose of this research is to investigate the impacts of the origin of a franchise chain on the chain's commitment in the destination countries of internationalization, identifying the differences between the institutional preferences of franchise chains from emerging countries and franchise chains from developed countries.

Two institutional dimensions are essential for attracting international investment from franchise chains: (1) Laws and regulations; and (2) Market potential (Aliouche and Schlenrich, 2011; Alon, 2006; Baena, 2013; Shane, 1996). These are considerations made in order to reduce risks and increase opportunities for expansion in the relationship with the franchisee and the consumer public. The legal requirements stem from the legal nature of the franchise chain system based on the franchise agreement, which must be honored so that the most valuable intangible assets of the franchise chains such as patents and trademarks, are protected and cannot be misused by opportunist franchisees (Alon, 2006; Melo *et al.*, 2019). On the other hand, market potential signals the capacity of the franchise chain to expand through the presence of public consumers (Alon, 2006; Campa and Guillen, 1999).

We argue that franchisees from emerging markets have a different focus compared to those from developed markets with regards to destination countries (Cuervo-cazurra and Genc, 2008; Hoskisson *et al.*, 2013). Specifically, we argue that the market potential is more important to franchisees from emerging markets because once they are already used to precarious judicial systems in their country of origin, they are expected to start operations in foreign countries as the potential and attractiveness of the foreign market increases in relation to those in domestic market (Alon, 2006; Baena and Cerviño, 2014; Campa and Guillen, 1999; Melo *et al.*, 2015); and that the effect of contract enforcement

1
2
3 is more important to franchisees from developed markets because they face difficulties in
4 internationalizing to countries with precarious judicial systems since they are not used to
5 these conditions, which increases their perception of risk (Cuervo-cazurra and Genc,
6 2008; Cuervo-Cazurra *et al.*, 2015; Hoffman *et al.*, 2008).
7
8
9

10 We investigated the internationalization decisions of franchise chains from ten
11 countries: five developed countries and five emerging countries, in a total number of 724
12 franchisee chains and 174 destination countries. The results of this research contribute to
13 studies on internationalization of franchise chains by identifying specific impacts of the
14 country of origin and the institutions of destination countries on the attraction of franchise
15 chains; it thus complements studies on the macro perspective through the use of
16 institutional theory (Aliouche and Schlenrich, 2011; Baena, 2015; Dant and Grünhagen,
17 2014; Dant *et al.*, 2011; Hoffman *et al.*, 2016; Melo *et al.*, 2019, 2015).
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 **2 LITERATURE REVIEW**

26
27
28

29 *2.1. Transaction Costs Theory*

30
31
32

33 Formal governance mechanisms between franchisors and franchisees occur
34 through the execution of contracts. The contracts reduce risks arising from the signed
35 franchise and the control of operating costs, avoiding opportunistic deviations in these
36 transactions. Such exchanges involve the transfer of knowledge and the use of brands
37 from the franchisor. In this way, contracts with longer durations can be beneficial because
38 they allow more time to build value in the face of such operational elements (Gorovaia &
39 Windsperger, 2018; Vargo & Lusch, 2016).
40
41
42
43
44

45 The transaction costs theory (TCT) applies to franchise chains as it is dedicated to
46 understanding the relevance of contracts. The contractual instrument can be approached
47 as a rational organization of the franchise chain, generating greater control of its
48 operations (Gorovaia & Windsperger, 2018; Williamson, 1985; Argyres & Mayer, 2007).
49
50
51

52 According to TCT, the definition of the duration of the contract and its level of
53 detail will depend on transaction values and the level of uncertainty involved in the
54 relationship between the parties involved. TCT has particularly been used extensively
55 in several studies on franchise chains (Gorovaia & Windsperger, 2018; Argyres &
56 Bercovitz, 2015; García-Herrera & Llorca-Vivero, 2010; Lafontaine & Blair, 2009). In
57 general, these studies confirm the assumption that investments risk control during the set-
58
59
60

1
2
3 up of a franchise unit (equipment, marketing actions and franchise fees) can be reduced
4 through longer-term contracts. However, the environment of institutional uncertainty
5 tends to force the establishment of shorter-term contracts (Gorovaia & Windsperger,
6 2018; Garcia-Herrera & Llorca-Vivero, 2010; Brickley, Misra, & Van Horn, et al., 2006).
7
8
9

10 TCT has also contributed to the identification of the importance of informal ties
11 in the relationship between franchisors and franchisees. Building trust in these
12 relationships can mitigate the need to execute contracts as there is a reduction in risk due
13 to the opportunity actions between the parties; this trust facilitates knowledge sharing,
14 increasing network learning (Thorgren & Wincent, 2011; Cao & Lumineau, 2015).
15
16
17
18
19

20 2.2. *Property Rights Theory*

21
22
23

24 Studies on franchise chains frequently explore the theme of property rights.
25 According to the property rights theory, the allocation of residual rights will depend on
26 the contractual coverage capacity of related assets in the franchise chains. From the
27 franchisees' perspective, intangible assets include local know-how, customer relations,
28 quality control of the franchise, and management of the franchise's operational human
29 resources. On the other hand, the franchisor has as intangible assets, the know-how of the
30 business model, including its brands and products (Hussain & Windsperger, 2013; Baker,
31 Gibbons & Murphy, 2008 Brynjolfsson, 1994; Hall, 1993). Therefore, the degree of
32 tangibility of the assets is crucial in determining the residual control rights. The theory of
33 property rights is thus understood to be dedicated to understanding the allocation of
34 property and consequently, decision rights in a relationship involving delegation of
35 powers, in which the franchisor grants franchisees the use of its brand and know-how
36 (Hussain & Windsperger, 2013; Baker, Gibbons & Murphy, 2008).
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 The division between strategic and operational decisions serves as a guide for
47 defining contractual parameters. It is up to the franchisor who is in possession of strategic
48 decisions, to define the operational actions that may be delegated to franchisees; for
49 example, local adjustments to the marketing mix, training and recruitment of employees
50 at points of sale could be some of the delegated activities (Mumdziev & Windsperger,
51 2011; Windsperger, 2004).
52
53
54
55

56 In situations where there is greater dependence on the franchisee's knowledge of
57 local markets, there is a debate on the structure of decision rights considering the degree
58 of formality and contract details. It is recognized that a greater degree of freedom reduces
59
60

1
2
3 contractual details, allowing for greater exploitation of local markets. Thus, the discussion
4 revolves around which decision rights can be delegated to intangible assets in specific
5 situations in the relationship between franchisor and franchisees (Mumdziev &
6 Windsperger, 2011).
7
8
9

10 Property rights theory can be debated alongside transactions costs theory. This is
11 because according to property rights theory, the degree of know-how associated with the
12 franchisee is relevant for the franchisor to determine their choice of ownership
13 (Windsperger & Dant, 2006), while transaction costs influence the choice of ownership,
14 especially when it involves assets that are difficult to contractually secure (Williamson,
15 1985).
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 2.3. Institutional Theory

23
24
25

26 According to North (1990, 1991), institutions provide the societal rules of the
27 game, which are defined as the limits conceived by man to structure political, economic,
28 and social interaction. In establishing and administering the rules of the game, the
29 country's institutions play an important role in organizational behaviors, as they can
30 reduce transaction costs and uncertainty by establishing a stable institutional structure
31 (Buckley *et al.*, 2012; Hoskisson *et al.*, 2000; Meyer, 2001; North, 1990, 1991). Thus, the
32 rules of the game can influence strategies and the way companies enter foreign markets;
33 the rules can create barriers and reduce foreign investments in a country; and can also
34 grant foreign investors access to local resources and partnerships to enable them
35 overcome barriers (Meyer *et al.*, 2009; Meyer and Nguyen, 2005).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Among the various institutions in a country, the legal system is considered the
44 most relevant for the franchise chains business (Aliouche and Schlenrich, 2011;
45 Fladmoe-Lindquist and Jacque, 1995; Shane, 1996). The legal system is one of the most
46 important attributes of a country's infrastructure; it includes laws, rules, regulations, and
47 their application, and is related to the uniform or discretionary application of the rules
48 and rules of the game (Aliouche and Schlenrich, 2011; Arslan and Larimo, 2010; Cuervo-
49 cazurra and Genc, 2008; Rocha and Ávila, 2015). The main variables of the legal system
50 are (1) protection property rights; (2) consistency of judicial decisions; (3) independence
51 of the judiciary; and (4) impartiality and integrity of the courts and judges. Property
52 protection boosts economic growth as it reduces the likelihood of expropriation of assets
53 by other citizens. Alternatively, the government can increase investment incentives and
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 decrease spending on asset protection. Increased consistency of court decisions allows
4 agents to anticipate contractual costs and benefits in order to make more efficient
5 decisions, and reduce transaction costs and contract enforcement with deterrent
6 mechanisms, including litigation and criminal prosecution. Judicial independence (which
7 means that courts should not be subject to governmental or private influence and judges
8 must be independent of all authority except that of the law) together with judicial
9 impartiality and integrity significantly increase the economic benefits due to increased
10 credibility and reduced risks and transaction costs (Fairbairn, 2016; Feld and Voigt, 2003;
11 Fuentelsaz *et al.*, 2018; Melton and Ginsburg, 2014).

12
13 Since the franchise chain system is an organizational form based on a contractual
14 arrangement, the legal system is especially important due to the possibility of enforcing
15 the contract through judicial channels and the protection of property rights. The lack of
16 such characteristics in a market discourages partnerships with local franchisees since
17 there is no guarantee that the company's intangible assets such as trademark and patent
18 will not be misused by opportunistic franchisees (Aliouche and Schlenrich, 2011; Rocha
19 and Ávila, 2015). Opportunistic franchisees can take advantage of the franchise chain's
20 notoriety by appropriating the brand's benefits without following the standards, which can
21 cause damage to the franchisor's brand image and quality standard (Combs *et al.*, 2004;
22 Fladmoe-Lindquist and Jacque, 1995).

23
24 On the other hand, some authors affirm that the market potential of the destination
25 country can override the institutional costs and risks involved in international expansion
26 (Quinn, 1998; Welch, 1989). The market size is one of the most important explanatory
27 factors in a country's attractiveness for international expansion due to its relationship with
28 potential future consumption, attractiveness and market growth rate (Baena, 2015; Berry
29 *et al.*, 2010; Campa and Guillen, 1999; Melo *et al.*, 2015).

30
31 Larger markets have three associated advantages, which make them more
32 attractive to companies: (1) greater return potential; (2) possibility of economies of scale;
33 and (3) greater possibility of coexistence of competing companies (Aliouche and
34 Schlenrich, 2011; Rothaermel *et al.*, 2006). Companies are expected to start operations
35 in foreign countries as the potential and attractiveness of the foreign market increases
36 relative to the domestic market (Campa and Guillen, 1999). In this way, companies may
37 be willing to accept some level of uncertainty due to the institutional instability of the
38 destination country in larger markets (Alon, 2006; Rothaermel *et al.*, 2006).

39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

2.4. *Institutional aspects that impact the business environment*

Many aspects of the institutional environment can influence the process of selecting countries for internationalization besides the size of the market and the effect of executing contracts. The purpose of this study is to explore the effects of these two factors. However, it is important that other aspects including the economy, the ease of doing business, the infrastructure, and the technology, are controlled.

The economy of the destination country can be considered one of the most important determinants of the attractiveness of a country when it comes to selecting a market for international expansion (Aliouche & Schlenrich, 2011; Baena, 2015; Melo et al., 2015). As the franchise chains sector is dominated by services or products associated with services, a viable economy and disposable income are crucial for the growth of commercial activity through franchises. High per capita income is associated with the growth of the franchise network sector because consumers can pay for services instead of performing them on their own (Baena & Cerviño, 2014; Hoffman & Preble, 2001). Contrariwise, an unstable and poorly developed economy increases transaction costs associated with entering a foreign market, increasing the risk perceived by franchisors who are less likely to expand in markets without favorable economic growth, due to possible scarcity of resources (Baena, 2013, 2015; Hoffman et al., 2016).

The ease of doing business is one of the indicators of market efficiency (Meyer et al., 2009), considering the barriers to starting a new business. Barriers consist of officially required or commonly performed procedures, as well as the time and cost to complete the procedures and the minimum capital requirement to start a business. Excessively onerous and bureaucratic procedures impose a disadvantage for formal entrepreneurs in their efforts to formalize their business as future franchisees (de Soto, 2000; Djankov et al., 2002). Likewise, excessive regulations rule out the option of entrepreneurs becoming franchisees because the environment leads them to informality.

Financial regulation and credit policies are also relevant to the ease of doing business in a country as these policies can cause difficulties in raising funds, favoring large companies. Therefore, financial regulations and credit policies affect the availability of credit for franchise chains and possible franchisees in the destination country (Hoffman and Preble, 2003; Hoffman et al., 2016; Klapper et al., 2006). When the cost of starting a new business is relatively high, transaction and agency costs also increase. Consequently,

1
2
3 it is likely that franchise chains prefer to expand internationally to countries with better
4 conditions for doing business (Alon and Welsh, 2002; Asmussen, 2009).

5
6 The infrastructure contributes to the ability to do business and the attractiveness
7 of a country. Infrastructure refers to the tangible and intangible networks that connect
8 institutions and facilitate transactions between them inside and outside national borders,
9 such as communication and transport systems, among others (Hoffman et al., 2016). For
10 the franchise chains' internationalization process, infrastructure is important because it
11 includes the presence of qualified market research companies that provide reliable
12 information about the consumer market, presence of local raw material suppliers that
13 provide inputs of accepted quality, logistics networks for transporting raw materials and
14 finished products and communication infrastructure that allows the development and
15 maintenance of the image and value of the brand (Dumludarg, 2009; Hoffman et al., 2016;
16 Hoskisoos et al., 2013; Melo et al., 2019). When the destination country's infrastructure
17 is deficient, franchise chains take longer to adapt their products to the needs of local
18 consumers and have logistic challenges, which increase information asymmetry and
19 transaction costs (Hoffman et al., 2016; Melo et al., 2019).

20
21 Technology has been an important factor in increasing the productivity of the
22 retail sector in the past two decades (Andonova, 2006; Lafontaine, 2014). Communication
23 technologies include radio, television, and telephone and internet, the latter being the most
24 relevant for franchise chains in the contemporary times (Hoffman & Preble, 2001;
25 Hoffman et al., 2016; Rothaermel et al., 2006). The internet is a dimension used to
26 evaluate a country's level of globalization, as it facilitates communication across borders
27 and contributes to the interdependence between institutions and citizens. The widespread
28 use of the internet is positively associated with economic growth, increased exports,
29 increased brand communication and brand recognition (Hoffman et al., 2016).

30
31 Communications technology is associated with the ability of franchise chains to
32 create market value and increase their market penetration. The internet specifically assists
33 franchisors in managing the supply chain and disseminating communications from
34 headquarters (Hoffman et al., 2016). Therefore, well-developed technological
35 infrastructure reduces the risks perceived by the franchisor, reducing transaction costs
36 (Andonova, 2006; Hoffman et al., 2016). However, as an organizational form, franchise
37 chains present some challenges when it comes to the adoption, diffusion and use of
38 technology, especially linked to the benefits and costs resulting from the use of new
39 technologies, which are different for franchisors and franchisees (Lafontaine, 2014).

40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

3 HYPOTHESIS

3.1 *Franchise chains from developed countries*

American chains in the 1960s were the first to be involved in international expansions targeting Canada, Western Europe, and Australia due to geographic and cultural proximity and political and economic stability. Studies show that the decision to include the emerging economies such as the BRICS and Eastern Europe, whose markets had a higher level of uncertainty but less competition, only came with the saturation of the initial markets in the expansion plan (Baena and Cerviño, 2014; Dant and Grünhagen, 2014; Grünhagen *et al.*, 2012).

This behavior of the American franchise chains is in line with the idea defended by most studies: Franchise chains are attracted to developed economies with institutional similarities to their countries of origin. Franchise chains tend to opt for international markets similar to their domestic markets because these markets provide less resistance, facilitate knowledge transfer, and thus provide less risk and lower transaction costs (Dant and Grünhagen, 2014; Hoffman *et al.*, 2008).

The institutional aspect that most impacts the franchise chains business is the regulations and the effective application of laws (Aliouche and Schlenrich, 2011; Baena, 2015; Hoffman *et al.*, 2016; Melo *et al.*, 2019). This happens because the franchise chain system is based on a franchise agreement, which needs to be honored, so enforcing legal contracts and intellectual property protection laws is especially important for franchise chains as their most valuable assets such as trademarks, patents and trademarks, may be misused by opportunistic franchisees if they are not adequately protected (Aliouche and Schlenrich, 2011; Alon, 2006; Baena, 2013; Shane, 1996). Therefore, acting in an institutional environment without the guarantee of protection is a risk for franchise chains (Alon, 2006; Melo *et al.*, 2019), because dealing with obstacles or unstable legal situations can be costly and can result in problematic relationships with franchisees (Alon, 2006; Melo *et al.*, 2019).

Additionally, an unstable and unreliable legal framework is considered one of the most important factors preventing companies from making investments (Alon, 2006; Baena, 2013; Dumludag, 2009). In an inefficient legal framework, changes in the law may have no impact on the actual operations of companies, institutional uncertainties for

1
2
3 foreign investors are greater and there is an increase in transaction costs due to the
4 difficulty of establishing and executing contracts (Dumludag, 2009; Wu and Chen, 2014).

5
6 Franchise chains in developed countries are accustomed to operating in an
7 environment with a structured independent legal system, with consistent decisions and
8 well-defined rules of the game. They face difficulties in their internationalization in
9 countries with poor judicial systems due to the absence of well-developed regimes of
10 contracts and intellectual property rights, as they are not accustomed to these conditions.
11 This increases the franchisor's perception of risk hence making him more reluctant to
12 invest in a destination country where excessive regulations exist or where regulations may
13 vary inaccurately (Cuervo-cazurra and Genc, 2008; Cuervo-Cazurra *et al.*, 2015). In
14 addition, political and legal differences between countries' markets increase the costs of
15 cross-border monitoring of activities by franchisors, which may also compromise the
16 quality standard of the franchise chain (Hoffman *et al.*, 2008). Based on the preceding
17 insights, the following hypothesis was constructed:
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 H1: The effect of contract enforcement is greater than the effect of market size on the
30 international commitment of franchise chains from developed countries.
31
32
33

34 3.2 *Franchise chains from emerging countries*

35
36
37

38 Companies from emerging countries internationalize according to a different
39 market and management logic from that of companies from developed countries (Cuervo-
40 cazurra and Genc, 2008; Hoskisson *et al.*, 2013). Franchising chains from emerging
41 countries usually come from countries where there is political intervention in the
42 economy in general, which may make regulatory rules excessive or absent; as well as
43 political instability and poor judicial quality. As a result, they are likely to have developed
44 skills to operate in challenging institutional environments characterized by inefficient
45 hiring practices, poorly developed market mechanisms, poor judiciary, and unpredictable
46 regulations (Cuervo-cazurra and Genc, 2008). Thus, franchisors from emerging countries
47 are better prepared than franchisors from developed countries to deal with unfavorable
48 institutional situations in destination countries. Operating in the emerging economy
49 environment can thus become an advantage for franchisors from emerging countries, who
50 are more willing to invest in these markets.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Therefore, even with the franchise chain business being based on contracts, it is
4 expected that the internationalization of franchise chains from emerging countries would
5 not be significantly influenced by the quality of the judicial system, as they are
6 accustomed to precarious conditions in their countries of origin. Therefore, franchise
7 chains from emerging market economies are expected to start operations in foreign
8 countries as the potential and attractiveness of the foreign market increases relative to the
9 domestic market (Campa and Guillen, 1999).

10
11 The institutional theory considers the demographic aspect as one of the key
12 dimensions in companies' internationalization decisions (Berry *et al.*, 2010; Campa and
13 Guillen, 1999). This refers mainly to size and growth characteristics of the market, which
14 may influence the level of competition and consumer behavior, and are related to potential
15 future consumption, attractiveness and market growth rate (Berry *et al.*, 2010; Melo *et*
16 *al.*, 2015). Market size can influence both the level of internationalization of a company
17 in a particular country as well as the sequence of international expansions over time
18 (Campa and Guillen, 1999). The market opportunities provided by foreign countries are
19 key incentives for internationalization, and market size is considered the decisive
20 argument in the final choice to enter a specific international market (Alon, 2006; Baena
21 and Cerviño, 2014). Thus, the following hypothesis was formulated:

22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36 H2: The effect of market size is greater than the effect of contract enforcement on the
37 international commitment of franchise chains from emerging countries.

40 41 **4 METHODOLOGY**

42
43
44
45 The research was quantitative. The sample used included franchise chains from
46 ten countries: five developed countries and five emerging countries. The selected
47 developed countries were the United States, Germany, Australia, Portugal, and Spain,
48 while the emerging countries selected were Brazil, Russia, India, South Africa, and
49 Argentina.

50
51
52
53 International franchise chains were considered to be those with at least one
54 franchised operation abroad in the year 2017. The identification of these chains and the
55 countries where they operated, was done by means of the collection of official secondary
56 data published by franchise associations of the countries studied (Entrepreneur - Top
57 Global U.S. Based Franchises; ABF - Associação Brasileira de Franchising; RFA -

1
2
3 Russian Franchise Association, FAI - Franchising Association of India; FASA - Franchise
4 Association of South Africa; AAMF - Asociacion Argentina de Marcas y Fraquicias;
5 APF - Associação Portuguesa de Franchising; AEF - Asociacion Española de
6 Franquiciadores; FCA - Franchise Council of Australia; DFV - Deutscher Franchise
7 Verband). Table I shows the internationalized franchise chains considered as samples in
8 the study. The dependent variable in this study was represented by the commitment of
9 franchise chains in destination countries. In order to calculate the commitment, we used
10 the percentage of international franchised units in a given destination country in relation
11 to the total number of international franchised units for each franchise chain analyzed
12 (Melo *et al.*, 2019, 2015).
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 ----- Table I -----
23

24
25 The data of the institutional variables came from public databases of international
26 investment support institutions (World Bank, Heritage Foundation, World Economic
27 Forum and Doing Business) for the year 2017. Previous research on the
28 internationalization of franchise chains was carried out using data from these international
29 institutions (Baena, 2012, 2013, 2015; Hoffman *et al.*, 2016; Melo *et al.*, 2019, 2015).
30 These data correspond to the independent variables of the statistical analysis.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 ----- Table II -----
39

40
41 Data from the same public databases were used to compose the control variables.
42 These variables were chosen to represent aspects of the institutional environment that can
43 impact the activities of companies as a whole: economic environment, ease of doing
44 business, infrastructure, and technology.
45
46
47
48
49

50 ----- Table III -----
51

52
53 In order to reduce the number of variables, a factorial analysis was performed,
54 which allowed the extraction of one factor according to the rotating component matrix.
55 Table III presents the factor in the varimax method and with KMO .756 ($p < 0.001$) and
56 total explained variance of 76.07%.
57
58
59
60

----- Table IV -----

A multiple linear regression was performed for each hypothesis; one with the franchise chains from developed countries and another with franchise chains from emerging countries. The country of destination of the franchise chains was used as a control because a series of studies indicate that companies tend to internationalize to countries that present characteristics closer to those of their countries of origin, which would reduce the risks and costs of transaction. Thus, there may be variations in the institutional conditions that impact on the international commitment of the franchise chain depending on the similarities between the country of destination and the country of origin of the franchise chain. Therefore, each analysis is divided between developed and emerging destination countries.

Hence, the analyses are divided into four groups: (1) franchise chains from developed countries operating in other developed countries; (2) franchise chains from developed countries operating in emerging countries; (3) franchise chains from emerging countries operating in developed countries; and (4) franchise chains from emerging countries operating in other emerging countries.

5 RESULTS

Tables IV and V present the multiple linear regression models that test the hypotheses. Model 1 presents the independent variables applied to group (1) - developed country of origin and developed destination country; while model 2 presents the independent variables applied to group (2) - developed origin country and emerging destination country.

----- Table V -----

The results from model 1 show that the factor contract enforcement is positively associated with greater commitment of the franchise chain in the international market ($p < 0.01$); while the market size variable is not significant in the analysis. On the other hand, model 2 shows the opposite result, market size is significantly and positively associated with greater commitment of the franchise chain ($p < 0.01$); and the factor contract

1
2
3 enforcement is significantly but negatively associated with greater commitment of the
4 franchise chain ($p < 0.05$).
5

6 This means that when franchise chains from developed countries internationalize
7 to other developed countries, judicial quality and the possibility of requiring contracts to
8 be legally fulfilled is an important factor in the institutional framework of the destination
9 country, and the greater the facility of execution of contracts the greater the commitment
10 of the franchise chain. Contrarily, when franchise chains from developed countries
11 internationalize to emerging countries, the importance of market size prevails, and
12 franchise chains are willing to sacrifice contract enforcement to operate in a larger market,
13 so the greater the market in the emerging destination country, the greater the commitment
14 of the franchise chain.
15

16 Regarding the control variables, in model 1, GPD ($p < 0.05$), infrastructure and
17 technology level ($p < 0.01$) negatively impact the commitment of the franchise chain. This
18 is an indication that the priority of franchise chains is to operate in an environment with
19 legal efficiency, regardless of the country's other institutional conditions. In model 2, the
20 only significant control variable was the level of technology, which positively impacts
21 the commitment of the franchise chain.
22

23 Model 3 presents the independent variables applied to group (3) - emerging
24 country of origin and developed destination country, while model 4 presents the
25 independent variables applied to the group (4) - emerging country of origin and emerging
26 destination country.
27
28
29
30
31

32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 ----- Table VI -----
42

43
44 The results from model 3 show that the contract enforcement factor is positively
45 associated with greater commitment of the franchise chain in the international market (p
46 < 0.01), while the market size variable is not significant in the analysis. On the other hand,
47 model 4 shows the opposite result, where market size is positively associated with greater
48 commitment of the franchise chain ($p < 0.01$), while the contract enforcement factor is not
49 significant.
50

51 This implies that when franchise chains from emerging countries internationalize
52 to developed countries, the ease of executing contracts through judicial channels is
53 important in the institutional framework of the destination country, and the greater the
54 ease of execution of contracts, the greater the commitment of the franchise chain. The
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 market size is negatively associated, which means that the smaller the market size, the
4 greater the commitment of the franchise chain. The interpretation of these data suggests
5 that when franchise chains from emerging countries internationalize to developed
6 countries, they do so because of the institutional quality of the judiciary even if the size
7 of the market is small. On the other hand, when the franchise chains from emerging
8 countries internationalize to other emerging countries, the execution of contracts is not a
9 relevant factor, since the importance of the market size prevails, and the larger the market
10 in the emerging destination country the greater the commitment of the franchise chain.
11

12
13
14
15
16
17 Regarding the control variables, in model 3 only the technological level was
18 significant in the analysis, being negatively associated with greater commitment of the
19 franchise chain ($p < 0.01$). Gross domestic product (GDP), infrastructure, and goods
20 market efficiency were not significant in the analysis. This indicates that these
21 institutional factors do not have as much impact as the contract enforcement on the
22 commitment of the franchise chains. In model 4, GDP is negatively associated with
23 greater commitment of the franchise chains ($p < 0.01$), this may occur because these are
24 emerging destination countries, which naturally have lower GDP. The level of technology
25 is positively associated with greater commitment of the franchise chains ($p < 0.01$).
26 Infrastructure and Goods market efficiency are not significant in the analysis. Table VII
27 shows the synthesis of the analysis.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 ----- Table VII -----
39
40

41 Thus, hypothesis 1 - The effect of the contract enforcement is greater than the
42 effect of market size on the international commitment of franchises chains from
43 developed countries - and hypothesis 2 - The effect of the market size is greater than the
44 effect of the contract enforcement on the international commitment of franchise chains
45 from emerging countries - were not supported.
46
47
48
49
50

51 **6 DISCUSSION**

52
53
54
55 Our thesis was that franchisees from emerging markets have a differentiated focus
56 regarding destination countries when compared with franchisees from developed markets.
57 Specifically, we argued that market potential is more important to franchisees from
58 emerging markets and that the effect of contract enforcement is more important to
59
60

1
2
3 franchisees from developed markets. Overall, the results do not confirm our thesis. The
4 focus is not the origin but the destination. The results show that franchise chains from
5 emerging and from developed countries behave in the same way and that international
6 commitment is not dependent on the country of origin but on the destination country. The
7 conclusion of the analysis is that when franchise chains, independent of their origin,
8 internationalize to developed countries, the ease in executing contracts is relevant, and
9 when they internationalize to emerging countries, the market size is more important.

10
11 From this scenario, it is understood that when the franchise chains from emerging
12 countries internationalize to developed countries, they are seeking better institutional
13 quality related to the judiciary, even if they have to sacrifice market size for this.
14 Franchise chains from emerging countries seek this feature because the ease of execution
15 of contracts in the judicial sphere is important for the business model of franchise chain
16 (Aliouche and Schlenrich, 2011; Alon, 2006; Baena, 2013; Shane, 1996). Even if they
17 are not accustomed to these conditions in the country of origin and know-how to deal
18 with inefficient judicial institutions (Cuervo-cazurra and Genc, 2008), the results showed
19 that it is important for franchise chains to have a presence in a country where institutions
20 are stable and consolidated. We understand that this is due to two reasons: (1) for the
21 security and stability that an efficient and stable institutional environment in relation to
22 the judicial sphere can offer to the business, which is better than what can be attained in
23 the country of origin of the franchise chain; and (2) because acting in an efficient
24 institutional environment forces the franchise chain to improve their contractual
25 management and improve their governance, so that they can develop their intellectual
26 property rights protection policy and to improve the efficiency of partnerships and
27 monitoring of franchisees.

28
29 On the other hand, the results also showed that when the franchise chains from
30 developed countries internationalize to emerging countries, they are seeking market
31 potential, even if this represents an increase in risk from the institutional point of view.
32 We understand that this is because the franchise chains do not expect to find a stable and
33 developed institutional environment in emerging countries, and they already expect the
34 judiciary to be deficient and institutions to be inefficient. Although the execution of
35 contracts is important for the business model of franchise chains, the decision to enter an
36 emerging country is made due to the market potential, thus accepting to leave favorable
37 institutional conditions in exchange for a large consumer market. Therefore, the ease of
38 execution of contracts is not relevant in emerging destinations because the franchise
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 chains already expect that this institutional aspect is deficient. Also the decision to go to
4 an emerging country is based exclusively on the market potential; this behavior can be
5 exemplified by the American franchise chains, which in recent years have
6 internationalized to countries with great market potential such as China, despite the
7 significant institutional differences and the high risk involved in executing legal contracts
8 (Baena, 2015; Dant and Grünhagen, 2014; Grünhagen *et al.*, 2012; Rothaermel *et al.*,
9 2006). This result is in agreement with authors who argue that the companies accept
10 certain levels of uncertainties and risk due to institutional instability with the possibility
11 of acting in countries with larger market size (Alon, 2006; Quinn, 1998; Rothaermel *et*
12 *al.*, 2006; Welch, 1989).

20
21 The results also differ from recent studies on the impact of the country of origin
22 on the internationalization of multinational companies. Previous research has found
23 evidence that multinational companies from emerging and from developed countries
24 diverge on the internationalization strategies and in their behavior pattern of expansion
25 as a consequence of country of origin factors, highlighting the location strategies of
26 multinationals from emerging countries in search for regional strategic assets. However,
27 the analysis identified that the international commitment of the franchise chains is not
28 dependent on the country of origin but on the destination country (Crescenzi *et al.*, 2016;
29 Oh *et al.*, 2009; Puig *et al.*, 2020; Zhang *et al.*, 2018). We believe that this may indicate
30 that franchise chains do not follow the standard internationalization behavior of
31 multinational companies. Specifically, this can occur because it is a contractual
32 arrangement with local partners, which characterizes an entry mode with lower
33 transaction costs than entry modes typically adopted by multinationals, such as wholly
34 owned subsidiaries and joint ventures (Hoffman *et al.*, 2016).

44
45 Regarding the control variables, the results related to GDP and infrastructure
46 indicate that the search for effective contracts in developed destination countries and
47 market size in emerging destination countries overlaps the search for a prosperous
48 economic situation and for adequate infrastructure. The goods market efficiency variable
49 was not significant in any of the statistical models, which means that the efficiency of the
50 goods and services market has no impact on the commitment of the franchise chain. We
51 understand that this result is due to the fact that the developed destination countries
52 naturally have a more efficient and less bureaucratic markets. The intention of franchise
53 chains is operating in a large market, making the market efficiency and bureaucracy
54 irrelevant.

1
2
3 In addition, tech readiness is relevant in the internationalization of franchise
4 chains from emerging and developed countries to emerging countries. We understand that
5 this result is associated only with the emerging destination country because: (1)
6 Technological dissemination is associated with the franchise chain's ability to increase its
7 market penetration (Hoffman et al., 2016). Since the result of the statistical analysis was
8 that franchise chains internationalize to emerging countries in search of a larger market
9 potential, an emerging destination country with greater tech readiness would be ideal for
10 the franchise chain to achieve the objective of expanding its consumer market more
11 easily; and (2) A well-developed technological infrastructure reduces transaction costs
12 and, consequently, the risks perceived by the franchisor (Andonova, 2006; Hoffman et
13 al., 2016). Therefore, as emerging markets naturally present more institutional risks than
14 developed markets, the search for a country with greater tech readiness would reduce the
15 risks associated with international expansion.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 **7 CONCLUSION**

28
29
30 The purpose of this study was to investigate how the origin of the franchise chain
31 impacts institutional preferences on the commitment in the destination country of
32 internationalization, identifying the differences between franchise chains from emerging
33 countries and franchise chains from developed countries. The results indicate that
34 institutional preferences do not vary according to the countries of origin of the franchise
35 chains, but rather depend on the destination country. The quality of laws, regulations,
36 efficiency and impartiality of the judiciary are considered important factors of
37 consideration in developed destinations; for emerging country destinations on the other
38 hand, market potential is the most important factor.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 The article contributes to institutional theory once it identifies a set of
47 characteristics that explains the selection of international markets and the commitment of
48 franchise chains. The study also contributes to research on the internationalization of
49 franchise chains, specifically from the macro perspective, through the discovery that the
50 institutional factors that interfere in the commitment of franchise chains are not associated
51 with the countries of origin of the franchise chains, but rather with the destination
52 countries of international expansion. The results obtained partially contradict previous
53 studies that measure both internationalization and market penetration, which indicates
54 that companies tend to seek markets institutionally similar to those of their countries of
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 origin to internationalize or to increase their international presence, facing difficulties
4 when in different environments, and that the distance between institutional environments
5 matters more than the absolute level of quality of institutions of the country of destination
6 (Alon and Welsh, 2002; Baena, 2015; Hoffman et al., 2016; Quinn and Alexander, 2002;
7 Rocha and Ávila, 2015; Wong and Merrilees, 2007). On the other hand, the results
8 confirm studies that indicate that the franchise chains of developed countries are willing
9 to accept some level of institutional risk to act in major international markets (Aliouche
10 and Schlenrich, 2011; Baena and Cerviño, 2014; Dant and Grünhagen, 2014). Moreover,
11 franchise chains in emerging countries tend to take into account the quality of the legal
12 environment in the country of destination in addition to market size (Alon, 2004; Melo *et*
13 *al.*, 2019).

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22 Additionally, the contribution of the research should be recognized by the
23 heterogeneity of the sample of countries used (10 countries of origin and 174 countries
24 of destination), the number of franchise chains analyzed (724) and the range of cases
25 analyzed (3513), strengthening the credibility of the results and supplying the need for
26 studies with comprehensive samples (Dant and Grünhagen, 2014; Merrilees, 2014).

27
28
29
30
31 Finally, as a managerial contribution, the results achieved in the study can help
32 franchise chains' managers to make decisions in the selection of countries for
33 international expansion based on the institutional characteristics of the markets, in order
34 to select countries that are most compatible with the objectives of the franchise chains.
35 Moreover, it is important to highlight the managerial contribution in relation to the tech
36 readiness variable, which can help managers to make more assertive decisions when
37 selecting emerging countries for international expansion in order to select countries with
38 characteristics that can favor their growth. Besides, the results also promote a better
39 understanding of the benefits that franchise chains can have in each destination country
40 in which they are present and can help in more efficient management.

41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48 The research limitations are as follows: (1) restricting the sample to franchise
49 chains associated with organizations representing franchises in their respective countries
50 of origin, while disregarding franchise chains not affiliated to the associations; (2) the
51 timeframe of the analysis restricted the institutional situation of the destination countries
52 in 2017 while disregarding the institutional contexts of the destination countries in the
53 year of entry of the franchise chain; (3) the analysis was restricted to the institutional
54 characteristics of the destination country and did not consider specific characteristics of
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 each internationalized franchise chain; and (4) absence of analysis of the effect of
4 institutional distance between country of origin and destination.
5

6 Suggestions for future studies consist of (1) the inclusion of institutional variables
7 different from those used in this research as well as firm level variables; (2) the analysis
8 of different aspects of the institutional environment of the destination country; and (3)
9 studies that consider the institutional condition of the country of origin of the franchise
10 chain and its influence on the internationalization process, considering the institutional
11 distance.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 REFERENCES

- 20
21
22 Aliouche, E. H. and Schlenrich, U. A. (2011). "Towards a Strategic Model of Global
23 Franchise Expansion" *Journal of Retailing*, vol. 87(3), pp. 345–365.
24 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2011.01.004>
25
26 Alon, I. (2004). "Global Franchising and Development in Emerging and Transitioning
27 Markets" *Journal of Macromarketing*, v. 24(2), pp. 156–167.
28 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0276146704269320>
29
30 Alon, I. (2006). "Market Conditions Favoring Master International Franchising"
31 *Multinational Business Review*, v. 14(2), pp. 67–82.
32 <https://doi.org/10.1108/1525383X200600009>
33
34 Alon, I. and Welsh, D. H. B. (2002). "Global Franchising in Emerging and Transitioning
35 Markets" *International Journal of Business and Economics*, v. 2(1), pp. 332–343.
36 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0276146704269320>
37
38 Andonova, V. (2006). *Mobile phones, the Internet and the institutional environment*.
39 *Telecommunications Policy*, 30(1), 29–45. doi:10.1016/j.telpol.2005.06.015
40
41 Argyres, N. and Bercovitz, J. (2015). "Franchise associations as source of bargaining
42 power? Some evidence", *Journal of Economics and Management Strategy*, 24, pp.
43 811-832.
44
45 Argyres, N. and Mayer, K. (2007). "Contract design as a firm capability: An integration
46 of learning and transaction cost perspectives", *Academy of Management Review*, 32,
47 pp. 1060-1077.
48
49 Arslan, A. and Larimo, J. (2010). "Ownership Strategy of Multinational Enterprises and
50 the Impacts of Regulative and Normative Institutional Distance: Evidence from
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Finnish Foreign Direct Investments in Central and Eastern Europe" *Journal of East-*
4 *West Business*, v. 16(3), pp. 179–200.
5
6 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10669868.2010.523370>
7

8 Asmussen, C. G. (2009), "Local, regional, or global Quantifying MNE geographic
9 scope", *Journal of International Business Studies*, 40(7), 1192–1205.
10
11 <https://doi.org/10.1057/jibs.2008.85>
12

13 Baena, V. (2012). "Market conditions driving international franchising in emerging
14 markets" *International Journal of Emerging Markets*, v. 7(1), pp. 49–71.
15
16 <https://doi.org/10.1108/17468801211197879>
17

18 Baena, V. (2013). "Insights on International Franchising: Entry Mode Decision" *Latin*
19 *American Business Review*, v. 14(1), pp. 1–27.
20
21 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10978526.2013.780453>
22
23

24 Baena, V. (2015). "European franchise expansion into Latin America: Evidence from the
25 Spanish franchise system" *Management Research Review*, v. 38(2), pp. 149–165.
26
27 <https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-08-2013-0185>
28

29 Baena, V. and Cerviño, J. (2014). "International Franchising Decision-Making: A Model
30 for Country Choice" *Latin American Business Review*, v. 15, pp. 13–43.
31
32 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10978526.2014.871214>
33

34 Baker, G., Gibbons, R. and Murphy, K. (2008). "Strategic alliances: Bridges between
35 islands of conscious power", *Journal of the Japanese and International Economies*,
36 22 (2), 146-163.
37
38

39 Berry, H., Guillén, M. F., and Zhou, N. (2010). "An institutional approach to cross-
40 national distance" *Journal of International Business Studies*, v. 41, pp. 1460–1480.
41
42 <https://doi.org/10.1057/jibs.2010.28>
43

44 Brickley, J., Misra, S. and Van Horn. (2006). "Contract duration: Evidence from
45 franchising". *Journal of Law and Economics*, 49, pp. 173-196.
46
47

48 Brynjolfsson, E. (1994). "An incomplete contracts theory of information technology and
49 organization", *Management Science*, 64 (2), pp. 1645-1663.
50

51 Buckley, P. J., Cross, A. R., and Horn, S. A. (2012). "Japanese foreign direct investment
52 in India: An institutional theory approach" *Business History*, v. 54(5), pp. 657–688.
53
54 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00076791.2012.683417>
55

56 Campa, J. M. and Guillen, M. F. (1999). "The Internalization of Exports: Firm- and
57 Location-Specific Factors in a Middle-Income Country" *Management Science*, v.
58 45(11), pp. 1463–1478. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.45.11.1463>
59
60

- 1
2
3 Cao, Z. and Lumineau, E. (2015). "Revisiting the interplay between contractual and
4 relational governance: A qualitative and meta-analytic investigation". *Journal of*
5 *Operations Management*, v. 33, pp. 15-42.
6 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jom.2014.09.009>
7
8
9
10 Combs, J. G., Michael, S. C., and Castrogiovanni, G. J. (2004). "Franchising: A review
11 and avenues to greater theoretical diversity" *Journal of Management*, v. 30(6), pp.
12 907–931. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jm.2004.06.006>
13
14
15 Crescenzi, R., Pietrobelli, C. and Rabellotti, R. (2016) "Regional strategic assets and the
16 location strategies of emerging countries' multinationals in Europe", *European*
17 *Planning Studies*, 24:4, 645-667, doi: 10.1080/09654313.2015.1129395
18
19
20 Cuervo-cazurra, A., and Genc, M. (2008). "Transforming disadvantages into advantages :
21 developing-country MNEs in the least developed countries" *Journal of International*
22 *Business Studies*, v. 39, pp. 957–979. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400390>
23
24
25 Cuervo-Cazurra, A., Narula, R., and Annique Un, C. (2015). "Internationalization
26 motives: sell more, buy better, upgrade and escape" *The Multinational Business*
27 *Review*, v. 23(1), pp. 25–35.
28
29
30 Dant, R. P. and Grünhagen, M. (2014). "International Franchising Research: Some
31 Thoughts on the What, Where, When, and How" *Journal of Marketing Channels*, v.
32 21(3), pp. 124–132. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1046669X.2014.917012>
33
34
35 Dant, R. P., Grünhagen, M., and Windsperger, J. (2011). "Franchising Research Frontiers
36 for the Twenty-First Century" *Journal of Retailing*, v. 87(3), pp. 253–268.
37 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2011.08.002>
38
39
40 De Soto, H. (2000), *The Mystery of Capital - why capitalism triumphs in the west and*
41 *fails everywhere else*, Transworld Publishers, London.
42
43
44 Djankov, S., Porta, R. L., Lopez-De-Silanes, F. and Shleifer, A. (2002), "The regulations
45 of entry", *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, CXVII(1).
46
47
48 Dumludag, D. (2009). "An analysis of the determinants of foreign direct investment in
49 turkey: The role of the institutional context" *Journal of Business Economics and*
50 *Management*, v. 10(1), pp. 15–30. [https://doi.org/10.3846/1611-1699.2009.10.15-](https://doi.org/10.3846/1611-1699.2009.10.15-30)
51 [30](https://doi.org/10.3846/1611-1699.2009.10.15-30)
52
53
54 Dunning, J. H. and Lundan, S. M. (2008). "Institutions and the OLI paradigm of the
55 multinational enterprise" *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, v. 25, pp. 573–593.
56 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-007-9074-z>
57
58
59 Fairbairn, W. (2016). "An Examination of Judicial Independence in China" *Journal of*
60

1
2
3 *Financial Crime*, v. 23(4). [https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JFC-12-2015-](https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JFC-12-2015-0068)
4 0068
5

6 Feld, L. and Voigt, S. (2003). "Economic growth and judicial independence : cross-
7 country evidence using a new set of indicators" *European Journal of Political*
8 *Economy*, v. 19, pp. 497–527. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0176-2680\(03\)00017-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0176-2680(03)00017-X)
9

10 Fladmoe-Lindquist, K. and Jacque, L. L. (1995). "Control Modes in International Service
11 Operations: The Propensity to Franchise" *Management Science*, v. 41(7), pp. 1238–
12 1249. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.41.7.1238>
13
14

15 Fuentelsaz, L., González, C., and Maicas, J. P. (2018). "Formal institutions and
16 opportunity entrepreneurship. The contingent role of informal institutions" *BRQ*
17 *Business Research Quarterly*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brq.2018.06.002>
18
19

20 Grünhagen, M., Dant, R. P. and Zhu, M. (2012). "Emerging Consumer Perspectives on
21 American Franchise Offerings: Variety Seeking Behavior in China" *Journal of*
22 *Small Business Management*, v. 50(4), pp. 596–620. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-627X.2012.00368.x)
23 627X.2012.00368.x
24
25
26
27
28

29 Garcia-Herrera, A. and Llorca-Vivero, R. (2010) "How time influences franchise
30 contracts: The Spanish case", "European Journal of Law and Economics", 30, pp. 1-
31 16.
32
33

34 Gorovaia, N. and Windersperger, J. (2018). "The Choice of Contract Duration in
35 Franchising Networks: A Transaction Cost and Resource-Based View", *Industrial*
36 *Marketing Management*, 79, pp. 125-133.
37
38
39
40
41

42 Hall, R. (1993). "A framework linking intangible resources and capabilities to sustainable
43 competitive advantage", *Strategic Management Journal*, 14 (8), pp. 607-618.
44

45 Hoffman, Kincaid, J. and Preble, J. F. (2008). "International Franchise Expansion : Does
46 Market Proximity Matter ?" *Multinational Business Review*, v. 16(4), pp. 25–52.
47
48
49
50

51 Hoffman, R. C., Munemo, J. and Watson, S. (2016). "International Franchise Expansion:
52 The Role of Institutions and Transaction Costs" *Journal of International*
53 *Management*, v. 22, pp. 101–114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intman.2016.01.003>
54

55 Hoffman, R. C. and Preble, J. F. (2001). "Global diffusion of franchising : A country level
56 examination" *Multinational Business Review*, 9(1) p. 66–76
57

58 Hoffman, R. C. and Preble, J. F. (2003). "Convert to compete: Competitive advantage
59 through conversion franchising" *Journal of Small Business Management*, v. 41(2),
60

1
2
3 pp. 187–204. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-627X.00075>

4
5 Hoskisson, R. E., Eden, L., Lau, C. M., and Wright, M. (2000). "Strategy in Emerging
6 Economies" *The Academy of Management Journal*, v. 43(3), pp. 249–267.
7
8 <https://doi.org/10.2307/1556394>

9
10 Hoskisson, R. E., Wright, M., Filatotchev, I., and Peng, M. W. (2013). "Emerging
11 Multinationals from Mid-Range Economies: The Influence of Institutions and Factor
12 Markets" *Journal of Management Studies*, v. 50(7), pp. 1295–1321.
13
14 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2012.01085.x>

15
16 Hussain, D. and Windsperger, J. (2013). "A Property rights view of multi-unit
17 franchising", *European Journal of Law and Economics*, 35, pp. 169-185.
18
19 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10657-012-9366-8>

20
21 Klapper, L., Laeven, L. and Rajan, R. (2006), "Entry regulation as a barrier to
22 entrepreneurship", *Journal of Financial Economics*, 82, 591–629.
23
24 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2005.09.006>

25
26 Lafontaine, F. and Blair, R. (2009). "The evolution of franchising and franchise contracts:
27 Evidence from the United States", *Entrepreneurial Business Law Journal*, 3, pp.
28
29 381-434.

30
31 Lafontaine, F. (2014) Franchising: Directions for Future Research, *International Journal*
32
33 of the Economics of Business, 21:1, 21-25.
34
35 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13571516.2013.864124>

36
37 Melo, P. L. de R., Borini, F. M., and Ogasavara, M. H. (2019). "Latin American franchise
38 internationalization: The impact of institutional environment" *Thunderbird*
39
40 *International Business Review*, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tie.21975>

41
42 Melo, P. L. de R., Borini, F. M., Oliveira Jr., M. de M., and Parente, R. C. (2015).
43
44 "International analysis of the countries where Brazilian franchise chains operate"
45
46 *Revista de Administração RAUSP*, v. 50(1), pp. 26–39.
47
48 <https://doi.org/10.5700/rausp1182>

49
50 Melton, J., and Ginsburg, T. (2014). "Does de Jure Judicial Independence really matter?"
51
52 *Journal of Law and Courts*, v. 612 - September, pp. 186–217.

53
54 Merrilees, B. (2014). "International Franchising: Evolution of Theory and Practice"
55
56 *Journal of Marketing Channels*, v. 21(3), pp. 133–142.
57
58 <https://doi.org/10.1080/1046669X.2014.917013>

59
60 Meyer, K. E. (2001). "Institutions, Transaction Costs, and entry mode choice in Eastern
Europe" *Journal of International Business Studies*, v. 32(2), pp. 357–367.

- 1
2
3 Meyer, K. E., Estrin, S., Bhaumik, S. K., and Peng, M. W. (2009). "Institutions, resources,
4 and entry strategies in emerging economies" *Strategic Management Journal*, v. 30,
5 pp. 61–80. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj>
6
7
8 Meyer, K. E. and Nguyen, H. V. (2005). "Foreign Investment Strategies and Sub-national
9 Institutions in Emerging Markets: Evidence from Vietnam" *Journal of Management
10 Studies*, v. 42(1), pp. 1–36.
11
12
13 Mumdziev, N. and Windperger, J. (2011). "The structure of decision rights in franchising
14 networks: A property rights perspective", *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, v.
15 35 (3), pp. 449-464. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2011.00440.x>
16
17
18 North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. New
19 York: Cambridge University Press.
20
21 North, D. C. (1991). "Institutions" *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, v. 5(1), pp. 97–
22 112. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.5.1.97>
23
24
25 Oh, C. H., Kim, M., and Shin, J. (2019). "Paths and geographic scope of international
26 expansion across industries" *International Business Review*, v. 28, pp. 560-574
27
28
29 Peng, M. W., Wang, D. Y. L., and Jiang, Y. (2008). "An institution-based view of
30 international business strategy: a focus on emerging economies" *Journal of
31 International Business Studies*, v. 39, pp. 920–936.
32
33
34 <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400377>
35
36 Puig, F., Madhok, A., and Shen, Z. (2020). "Investigating firm heterogeneity in country-
37 of-origin cluster location choice decisions" *Multinational Business Review*, v. 28, n.
38 2, pp. 221-244
39
40
41 Quinn, B. (1998). "Towards a framework for the study of franchising as an operating
42 mode for international retail companies" *The International Review of Retail,
43 Distribution and Consumer Research*, v. 8(4), pp. 445–467.
44
45
46 <https://doi.org/10.1080/095939698342751>
47
48 Quinn, B and Alexander, N. (2002). "International retail franchising: a conceptual
49 framework" *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, v. 30(5),
50 pp. 264–276. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09590550210426426>
51
52
53 Rocha, A. D. and Ávila, H. D. A. (2015). "Teoria Institucional E Modos De Entrada De
54 Multinacionais De Países Emergentes" *Revista de Administração de Empresas*, v.
55 55(3), pp. 246–257. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0034-759020150302>
56
57
58 Rothaermel, F. T., Kotha, S., and Steensma, H. K. (2006). "International Market Entry by
59 U.S. Internet Firms: An Empirical Analysis of Country Risk, National Culture, and
60

- 1
2
3 Market Size" *Journal of Management*, v. 32, pp. 56–82.
4 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305277793>
5
6 Shane, S. A. (1996). "Why franchise companies expand Overseas" *Journal of Business*
7 *Venturing*, v. 11, pp. 73–88. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0883-9026\(95\)00110-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0883-9026(95)00110-7)
8
9 Thorgren, S. and Wincent, J. (2011). "Interorganizational trust: Origins, dysfunctions and
10 regulation of rigidities", *British Journal of Management*, v. 22 (1), pp. 21-41.
11 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2010.00717.x>.
12
13 Vargo, S., & Lusch, R. (2016). "Institutions and axioms: An extension and update of
14 service-dominant logic", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44, pp. 5-
15 23.
16
17 Welch, L. S. (1989). "Diffusion of Franchise System Use in International Operations"
18 *International Marketing Review*, v. 6(5), pp. 7–19.
19 <https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000001520>
20
21 Williamson, O. (1985). *The Economic Institutions of Capitalism*. Ed. Simon & Schuster.
22
23 Windsperger, J. (2004). "Centralization of franchising networks: Evidence from the
24 Austrian franchise sector", *Journal of Business Research*, 57 (12), 1361-1369.
25
26 Windsperger, J. and Dant, R. (2006). "Contractibility and ownership redirection in
27 franchising: A property rights view", *Journal of Retailing*, 82 (3), pp. 259-272.
28
29 Wong, H. Y. and Merrilees, B. (2007). "Multiple roles for branding in international
30 marketing" *International Marketing Review*, v. 24(4), pp. 384–408.
31 <https://doi.org/10.1108/02651330710760982>
32
33 Wu, J. and Chen, X. (2014). "Home country institutional environments and foreign
34 expansion of emerging market firms" *International Business Review*, pp. 1–11.
35 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2014.01.004>
36
37 Zhang, Y., Enang, E., and Sminia, H. (2018) "Post-acquisition integration of emerging
38 market multinational corporations: a research agenda", *Multinational Business*
39 *Review*, <https://doi.org/10.1108/MBR-11-2017-0093>
40
41 Zoogah, D. B., Peng, M. W., and Woldu, H. (2015). "Institutions, resources, and
42 organizational effectiveness in Africa" *Academy of Management Perspectives*, v.
43 29(1), pp. 7–31. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2012.0033>
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table I: Internationalized franchise chains

Country	Classification	No. of internationalized franchise chains	No. of destination countries
Brazil	Emerging	108	60
Russia	Emerging	102	48
India	Emerging	59	79
South Africa	Emerging	72	25
Argentina	Emerging	23	14
USA	Developed	171	188
Australia	Developed	66	41
Germany	Developed	62	68
Spain	Developed	45	103
Portugal	Developed	16	24
Total		724	174

Source: authors.

Multinational Business Review

Table II: Independent Variables

Variable	Description	Source
Quality of judicial processes	Measures the adoption of good practices in the judicial system over four areas: judicial structure and procedures, process management, judicial automation, and alternative dispute resolution. The indicator ranges from 0 to 18, the higher the good practices the higher the indicator.	Doing Business
Judicial Effectiveness	Measures the degree to which the laws are respected regarding judicial independence, the quality of the judicial process and the likelihood of obtaining judicial decisions favorable to the protection of the rights of all citizens against unlawful acts of third parties. The greater the judicial effectiveness, the greater the indicator.	Heritage
Property Rights	It assesses the extent to which a country's legal structure allows individuals to freely accumulate private property by measuring the extent to which a country's laws protect private property rights and to what extent these laws are respected. It also assesses the likelihood that private property will be expropriated by the state. The more effective the legal protection of property, the greater the indicator.	Heritage
Judicial Independence	Measures the independence of the judicial system from the influences of government, individuals, and companies in an indicator that varies from 1 to 7. The greater the independence, the greater the indicator.	World Economic Forum
Efficiency of Legal Framework	Measures the efficiency of legal and judicial systems for companies in dispute resolution in an indicator that ranges from 1 to 7. The greater the efficiency, the greater the indicator.	World Economic Forum
Rule of Law	Reflects the perception of the extent to which agents have confidence in the rules of society, the quality of	World Bank

	contract enforcement, property rights, the police and the courts, and the likelihood of crime and violence. The indicator ranges from -2.5 to 2.5.	
Market Size	The market size considers the size of the domestic market in the country, in an indicator ranging from 0 to 7.	World Economic Forum

Source: Authors

Multinational Business Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table III: Control Variables

Variable	Description	Source
GDP per capita	Competitive measure used to compare countries' economies. It is calculated using the value of the Gross Domestic Product and dividing it by the total population of the country.	World Bank
Infrastructure	Measures the quality of infrastructure in each country: It consists of a composition of quality of overall infrastructure, quality of roads, railroad infrastructure, port infrastructure, air transport infrastructure, and electricity supply, coupled with mobile-cellular telephone subscriptions and fixed-telephone lines.	World Economic Forum
Goods Market Efficiency	It measures the efficiency of the goods and services market, considering local competition, the ease of doing business, and the sophistication of consumers. It is an indicator composed of the following indices: intensity of local competition, effectiveness of antimonopoly policy, effect of taxation on incentives to invest, number of procedures required to start a business, time required to start a business, prevalence of nontariff barriers, trade tariffs, prevalence of foreign ownership, imports as a percentage of GDP, degree of customer orientation, and buyer sophistication.	World Economic Forum
Tech Readiness	Measures the agility with which an economy adopts existing technologies to enhance the productivity of its industries. It is an indicator composed of the availability of latest technologies, firm level technology absorption, technology transfer, internet users, internet subscriptions, internet bandwidth, and mobile-broadband subscriptions.	World Economic Forum

Source: Authors

Table IV: Component Matrix

	Component
	Contract enforcement
<i>Quality of Judicial Processes</i>	.483
<i>Judicial Effectiveness</i>	.976
<i>Property Rights</i>	.933
<i>Judicial Independence</i>	.936
<i>Efficiency of the Legal Framework</i>	.861
<i>Rule of Law</i>	.945

Source: Authors

Multinational Business Review

Table V: Regression models 1 and 2

Variables	Model 1		Model 2	
<u>Independent variables</u>	<u>Developed - Developed</u>		<u>Developed - Emerging</u>	
Contract Enforcement	.459	7.902**	-.193	-3.452*
Market Size	.060	1.561	.235	7.111**
<u>Control variables</u>				
GDP	-.082	-2.012*	.001	0.013
Infrastructure	-.168	-3.520**	.030	.439
Goods Market Efficiency	.104	1.740	.048	.914
Tech Readiness	-.219	-3.503**	.105	1.969*
F	19.803**		10.257**	
R ² adjusted	0.102		0.045	
N	1112		1413	

Dependent variable: International commitment

** p<0.01; *p<0.05

Source: Authors

Table VI: Regression models 3 and 4

Variables	Model 3		Model 4	
<u>Independent variables</u>	<u>Emerging - Developed</u>		<u>Emerging - Emerging</u>	
Contract Enforcement	.441	2.689**	-.077	-1.146
Market Size	-.129	-1.344	.177	3.929**
<u>Control variables</u>				
GDP	-.018	-.137	-.239	-3.713**
Infrastructure	-.089	-.858	.018	.189
Goods Market Efficiency	.204	1.044	.115	1.872
Tech Readiness	-.411	-2.636**	.231	2.719**
F	4.630**		10.471**	
R ² adjusted	0.111		0.076	
N	183		805	

Dependent variable: International commitment

** p<0.01; *p<0.05

Source: Authors.

Table VII: Synthesis of results analysis

Hypotheses	Origin Country	Destination Country	Analysis result
H1	Developed	Developed	Contract enforcement positively associated with greater commitment of the franchise chain
	Developed	Emerging	Market size positively associated with greater commitment of the franchise chain
H2	Emerging	Developed	Contract enforcement positively associated with greater commitment of the franchise chain
	Emerging	Emerging	Market size positively associated with greater commitment of the franchise chain

Source: Authors