



June 2012

Tacit Knowledge Barriers in Franchising: Practical Solutions

Denise Cumberland
University of Louisville

Rod P. Githens
University of Louisville, rgithens@pacific.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/ed-facarticles>

 Part of the [Business Administration, Management, and Operations Commons](#), [Education Commons](#), and the [Organization Development Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Cumberland, D., & Githens, R. P. (2012). Tacit Knowledge Barriers in Franchising: Practical Solutions. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 24(1), 48–58. DOI: [10.1108/13665621211191104](https://doi.org/10.1108/13665621211191104)
<https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/ed-facarticles/100>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Gladys L. Benerd School of Education at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Benerd School of Education Faculty Articles by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact mgibney@pacific.edu.

Tacit Knowledge Barriers in Franchising: Practical Solutions

Denise Cumberland
Rod P. Githens
University of Louisville

An edited version of this paper was published as:

Cumberland, D., & Githens, R. P. (2012). Tacit knowledge barriers in franchising. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 24(1), 48-58.

Abstract

Purpose - This paper identifies barriers that hinder tacit knowledge transfer in a franchise environment and offers a compendium of solutions that encourage franchisees and franchisors to leverage tacit knowledge as a resource for competitive advantage.

Design/methodology/approach - Drawing from the research on franchise organizations there are five barriers to tacit knowledge transfer that present a challenge to both vertical and horizontal information flow in a franchise environment. It is suggested that when specific behaviors and processes are adopted to encourage sharing tacit knowledge it is possible to reduce tension and promote collaboration in the franchise relationship.

Findings – Barriers to tacit knowledge transfer in franchise organizations include: Trust, Maturation, Communication, Competition, and Culture.

Research limitations/implications - The factors identified only partially explain why there may be resistance to sharing tacit knowledge between franchisees and franchisors. Solutions recommended will need further testing to assess their impact on creating cultures that embrace tacit knowledge sharing.

Practical limitations – For franchisors and franchisees to encourage tacit knowledge sharing they will need to recognize and value what each player contributes to the relationship.

Originality/value – The identification of specific barriers to tacit knowledge transfer in franchise environment sets the stage for future work that can expand on solutions in the franchise context that potentially has economic and psychological benefits for both parties.

Keywords - Knowledge transfer, Knowledge Management, Tacit knowledge, Franchising

Paper type – Conceptual paper

Overview of Franchise Systems

Franchising is an \$880 billion economic force in the United States and continues to grow. This business format has shaped the U.S. economy over the last fifty years. Franchise businesses make up 11 percent of the U.S. private-sector economy and there are over 900,000 franchised businesses in the United States (“Economic Impact of Franchised Businesses,” 2005). Despite tight credit markets, franchising continues to attract individuals with entrepreneurial spirit who seek to establish and manage their own business. The importance to the economy is not just in the livelihood of the franchise business owner, but the fact that more than 11 million jobs are created from franchising enterprises.

Franchising has been studied from multiple levels. Included in these reviews are theories as to why firms franchise, why an individual purchases a franchise, debates as to whether franchising is entrepreneurial, as well as how franchise organizations innovate and cope with change (Baucus et al., 1996; Elango and Fried, 1997; Stanworth and Curran, 1999). There is,

however, a more limited pool of data on tacit knowledge sharing ideas that could aid franchising organizations. This paper uncovers new ground in that it not only addresses the systemic barriers to the franchise relationship, but also provides remedies for building a more collaborative franchise system.

On their website the International Franchising Association (2009) defines franchising as “a method of distributing products and services that involves a franchisor who lends their trademark and business system to a franchisee who, in return, pays a royalty for the right to use the franchisor’s trademark and system in their business” (para. 1). Leasing the rights to a brand name, however, is only one part of the franchise equation. The franchisee and the franchisor have an interdependent relationship. At a minimum, franchisees expect training, procedures, technical know-how, and expertise on a host of subjects. In addition, franchisees consider themselves entrepreneurs, not employees, thereby expecting some level of participation in the decision making process. Franchisors, in turn, rely on franchisees to provide local market information, as well as sales and transaction data that helps identify where and how to expand the franchise for future growth.

The vertical sharing of tacit knowledge in the relationship between franchisor and franchisee, as well as the horizontal flow of information between franchisees, reduces risk and improves the opportunity for longer term financial gain (Paswan and Wittmann, 2009). But harnessing and leveraging tacit knowledge requires franchisees and franchisors to develop an environment that fosters trust and overcomes systemic barriers.

This paper emphasizes the intangible asset of tacit knowledge in the franchise relationship and provides a collection of ideas for how to create conditions which diminish the barriers that impede tacit knowledge transfer. This paper is broken into the following sections: a definition of tacit knowledge, a discussion on the importance of tacit knowledge in franchising, a review of five barriers to tacit knowledge sharing, and a range of macro and micro approaches that could help foster tacit knowledge sharing in a franchise relationship.

Tacit Knowledge

The concept of intuitive or uncodified knowledge has been brought forward by several theorists including Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) who suggested that knowledge can be classified as either explicit or tacit. Explicit knowledge is knowledge that is written down and easily transferred from one individual or organization. Because it is in written form, however, it is highly susceptible to being copied by a competitor. Tacit knowledge, on the other hand, is gained through experience and is far more challenging to explain because it exists in peoples’ heads. Often the only way to share this information is through a form of tutelage with the person who possesses the knowledge. Tacit knowledge relies on storytelling, demonstration, and other more abstract means of sharing know how.

Dreyfus and Dreyfus’s (1986) empirical studies of pilots, drivers, chess players, and adult learners of a second language led to their theory of five stages of skill acquisition. They suggest that individuals progress from rule centric knowledge based learning at the novice stage towards the proficient and expert stages when relying unconsciously on past experiences to guide behavior. Their work further highlights the value of employee longevity in Japanese firms as a business advantage over American businesses. Their premise is based on Japanese employees typically staying with one company throughout their career, which provides an intuitive level of knowledge that American firms struggle to duplicate because of high employee turnover (Dreyfus and Dreyfus, 1986). The value of intuitive knowledge was also explored by Boisot

(1998), who maintained that Japan's strong preference for uncodified knowledge aided Japanese manufacturers by reducing the ability of competitors to duplicate their products. The more recent expansion of Japanese manufacturing firms into international arenas, however, resulted in codification which has opened the doors to imitation (Boisot, 1998).

Because tacit knowledge is embedded within individuals versus embedded in training manuals, it is much less susceptible to being exploited by competitors and therefore becomes an even more valuable commodity to capture and protect (Lei et al., 1997). 3M Corporation, widely recognized as one of the most innovative companies in the world, nurtures tacit knowledge sharing by encouraging individuals to share ideas. This company values tacit knowledge based on the belief that the greater good of the company is served when individuals share versus hoard information (Brand, 1998).

Importance of Tacit Knowledge Sharing in a Franchise System

In a global marketplace where speed to market is critical, organizations must be able to transfer knowledge rapidly and effectively to compete. Drucker (1993) argued that knowledge is not just a source for competitive advantage, but rather knowledge outweighs all other production factors in terms of importance. There is documented evidence that when organizations become effective in transferring knowledge they have a longer life span than organizations which are unable to master this process (Baum and Ingram, 1998). Wiig (1997) maintains that business organizations must first identify the knowledge that exists and then create procedures for capturing and sharing that knowledge as a means to boost their "intellectual capital portfolio."

There are multiple methods used in transferring knowledge within organizations. Some of the more traditional approaches include job training, published standards and procedures, online portals, and other websites that provide reference materials. Other knowledge transfer methods that are less obvious, but still critical to knowledge transfer include verbal communication, demonstrations, 1-800 help lines and shared exchanges between colleagues, strategic alliance partners, and suppliers. All of these widely used methods for transferring knowledge utilized by corporations are employed in a franchise environment.

The ability to share information and transfer knowledge from one group to another is central for organizations that are "interconnected" (Argote et al., 2000). Franchise chains qualify as interconnected organizations and have the potential to garner greater rewards because they offer an expanded base of experience when compared to a single business enterprise (Argote et al., 2000). But do franchise systems reap this advantage? Or are these systems plagued by hierarchical cultures that funnel information downward and are not willing to listen to experiences gained in the trenches?

In a study by Szulanski (2000), he argued that knowledge transfer was arduous, time-consuming, and complex to manage in organizations. In a franchise system there is an added level of complexity because knowledge transfer occurs beyond the corporate entity, into separate organizations frequently comprised of many different partners. These interconnected organizations, or franchisees, are typically separated by geography and vary in size, scope, and degree of business experience. In most cases, they have cultures of their own, distinct from the franchisor and other franchisees.

Franchisees often have an abundant amount of tacit knowledge because they are intimately involved in their business. They have a handle on consumer preferences, pricing thresholds, insights on marketing tactics, competitive intelligence, as well as first-hand experience with local ordinances (Dant and Nasr, 1998). When the franchisee provides this tacit

knowledge back to the franchisor it allows the franchisor to evaluate the merit of building out the market through expansion or acquisition, set pricing recommendations, and uncover new solutions to drive greater customer satisfaction and higher sales.

In the fast food franchise sector, franchisees have been credited for generating new procedures and product ideas that create more market value for the franchisor. In an empirical study on learning transfer by Argote, Darr and Epple (1995), researchers learned that fellow franchisees were quick to adopt a cost saving procedure for topping pizza once they saw the process in action. Furthermore, once the franchisor learned of the practice, the process was soon adopted in 90% of the stores across the country. In the arena of new products, KFC's Extra Crispy Strips were developed by a group of franchisees in Texas (Darden, 2002). In the McDonald's system, the Filet-o-Fish Sandwich, the Egg McMuffin, and the Big Mac all bubbled up from franchise operators attempting to improve sales (Shook and Shook, 1993).

How welcomed this type of tacit knowledge is received by the franchisor, however, varies. Franchisors often rely heavily on explicit knowledge transfer mechanisms because they promote consistency and standardization. Traditional training and development helps ensure reproduction of the business model, maintenance of quality control, and survival of the brand (Dant and Gundlach, 1999; Epinox, 2005; Phan et al., 1996). This explicit training is often transmitted in manuals, operating procedures, policy guidelines, and brand standard documentation (Sorenson and Sorenson, 2001). While explicit knowledge should be easier to transfer, the degree to which franchisees welcome these various codes, regulations, and standards varies. Reluctance from franchisees may occur when they assume their own franchisee knowledge is more practical versus corporate procedures that assume ideal conditions, which never exist.

There are numerous factors that determine whether a franchise operation succeeds. Successful business enterprises understand that knowledge is a two-way street requiring those on the front lines and those in the executive suites to share tacit knowledge. The next section of this paper explores five barriers to tacit knowledge transfer in a franchise environment.

Barriers to Tacit Knowledge Transfer in a Franchise System

When the literature on knowledge management, franchising and strategic alliances are pooled five common barriers to tacit knowledge surface: Trust, Maturation, Communication, Competition, and Culture.

The Trust Barrier

In a business environment, much like other social contexts, participants decide whether to share information based on their perceptions of the recipients as a friend or foe. Husted and Michailova (2002) diagnose a condition they term "knowledge-sharing hostility." These scholars maintain that the process of sharing knowledge is messy, complex, and hands-on. It requires both sides to be fully engaged and have a level of trust in one another. A study by Rousseau and Tijoriwala (1999) in the healthcare field found that a high level of trust allows for more acceptance of organizational change and negates the need for continual information seeking. Much like any organization, franchise organizations move through changes in leadership, organizational structure, and processes. If a franchise organization has undergone numerous corporate owners or is plagued by legal issues, there is less chance for collaboration and tacit knowledge sharing (Husted and Michailova 2002; Szulanski, 2000).

Concern about self-serving behavior (Mohr and Spekman, 1994) in a franchise relationship hampers the ability to build a trusting relationship. The franchisor may be concerned that franchisees are falsifying sales information to reduce royalty fees or not following protocol on operational processes. Franchisees, in turn, are concerned about franchisors infringing on their territory, creating monopolistic supply chains that generate additional revenue for the franchisor, and discounting programs that drive sales at the expense of profits (Pisano, 1988).

Some theorists argue that this divergence of goals between franchisees and franchisors is why franchisees form alliances with each other and distance themselves from the franchisor as much as possible (Altinay and Wang 2006). When a relationship is transactional and defined primarily by a legal contract, franchisees may be more likely to fear opportunistic behavior on the part of the franchisor. This form of paranoia is an inhibitor to tacit knowledge sharing.

Conversely, when franchisors and franchisees have successful collaborations, trust emerges (Todeva and Knoke, 2005). To garner trust among franchisees it is incumbent on franchisors to demonstrate good faith efforts to grow franchisees' sales and profit. Likewise, franchisees must prove they are willing to partner and participate actively in the brand building process. This suggests that longer relationships between franchisor and franchisees are valuable because repeated positive experiences generate higher levels of confidence and lessen the concern that the other party is self-serving.

The Maturation Stage Barrier

Organizations in their formative stages have been shown to welcome knowledge sharing (Argote and Ingram, 2000). Conversely, organizations in the mature stage of their life cycle may be less likely to adopt new ideas that require abdication of the old ways of doing things (Szulanski, 2000). This maturation barrier holds true in a franchise system as well. Franchisees new to the organization are willing to learn from the franchisor because they are eager to protect their investment and they are less likely to have created alliances with fellow franchisees. Seasoned franchisees meanwhile are more likely to hold onto the old way of doing things because as the saying goes, "if it ain't broke, don't fix it." In addition, franchisees with longer tenure in the organization are more likely to have experienced the failure of ideas or processes espoused by the franchisor. This may create a jaded point of view about the need for change.

The Communication Barrier

Communication is at the heart of a franchise relationship and the method for how information flows determines the health of the relationship. Open and candid communication without fear of reprisal breeds a healthy franchise partnership (Mohr and Spekman, 1994).

In a franchise system, each party has a role in information exchange. Franchisees are dependent upon corporate offices for clear, timely, and accurate information on operational, marketing and other procedures. Conversely, franchisors need accurate, relevant timely sales, transaction, and customer information from franchisees. But explicit knowledge transfer is only one aspect of organizational learning. The diffusion of tacit knowledge transfer between franchisor and franchisee offers the opportunity to facilitate improvements such as new ideas that drive sales growth, margin improvement, or labor savings.

Several factors are likely to influence the willingness of franchisees to divulge financial information to franchisors. Along with the economic incentive noted earlier, "survivor mentalities" may emerge on both sides. Power on one side, as argued by Galbraith (1956),

creates a natural need for power on the other side. A franchisee may opt to withhold information from the franchisor as part of a larger power struggle between the two players in the relationship.

Single unit franchisees, also known as “mom and pop shops” may simply wish to be left alone and do not want the franchisor meddling in their affairs. Franchisees who own multiple units are in a more powerful position because of their financial resources and their growth orientation which makes them more valuable to the franchisor. These multiple unit operators are more likely to have a closer relationship with the franchisor which may encourage more open communication, feedback, and sharing of ideas (Weaven, 2004).

The Competition Barrier

Belief that the franchisor or other franchisees are competitors discourages sharing of tacit knowledge (Szulanski, 2000). Competitive tension can stem from the franchisor owning corporate controlled units which co-exist in locales with franchisee units or if there are other nearby franchisees in the same trade area. The risk of revealing too much information to another franchisee or to the franchisor creates a paranoia that impedes knowledge transfer (Simonin, 1999).

A factor that can decrease the internal competitiveness in a franchise relationship is an external competitive threat. Studies by Dant and Nasr (1998) have shown that franchisors and franchisees are more likely to “band together and share information” when there is an external competitive threat.

The Culture Barrier

The term “organizational culture” has been defined in multiple ways, but Schein’s definition is well respected in the organization development literature. He defines culture as “a pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that had worked well enough to be considered valid, and therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think and feel” (Schein, 2004, p. 17).

The culture of an organization influences whether knowledge is or is not transferred (King, 2008). In a franchise relationship, the asymmetrical power relationship serves as one barrier to knowledge transfer (Todeva and Knoke, 2005). The franchisor controls the relationship because franchisees must play by the franchisor’s rules and regulations since they are leasing the brand name and do not have ownership rights (Stanworth et al., 1983). In a hierarchical culture which operates in a controlling manner, tacit knowledge transfer will be sacrificed because franchisees will be less willing to share their own innovations (Stanworth et al., 1983).

Subcultures also play a role in franchisee relationships because each franchisee has their own distinct set of beliefs, norms, and practices. The cultures of these units may or may not mesh with the corporate culture of the franchisor. There is a tendency for franchisors to be seen as having bureaucratic cultures which rely on dictating the rules, regulations, and technology down toward their franchisees. Franchisors expect that franchisees will conform and adopt a similar set of beliefs, norms, and practices. Because franchisees are typically a step closer to the customer, they tend to have service-oriented cultures. In service-oriented cultures, the focus is on fulfilling the customers’ needs first (Want, 2003). But focusing on customer needs may create different approaches in various markets that may or may not be shared with the franchisor.

Ideas for Fostering Knowledge Sharing

Before a prospective franchisee moves forward with any contractual agreements, they should learn about the history of the franchisor, visit their offices, talk to employees, visit other franchisees, and come to a deep understanding of the franchisor's organizational culture to determine if he or she will be able to fit and follow that model. In addition, the Organizational Cultural Profile (OCP), developed by O'Reilly (1983) to assess person-culture fit, could be implemented to help investigate fit before contracts are negotiated and signed.

Once franchise relationships have formed, Paswan and Wittman (2009), recommend that franchisors evolve from a traditional franchise approach to a network franchise system to build a higher level of trust. These theorists define a traditional franchise system as being heavily focused around communications and instructions such as training manuals and procedures. They maintain that a network franchise system, on the other hand, embraces horizontal flow of knowledge where everyone participates in a more free flowing exchange.

Paswan and Wittman's work supports Elango and Fried's (1997) conclusion that franchisees are more engaged if they perceive the relationship with the franchisor is more of a partnership where they can participate in the decision making process. The greater the length of time in the relationship the more secure the franchise can become in offering upward flow knowledge to the franchisor.

To build a trusting relationship, both sides must be willing to learn from each other. Franchisors encourage trust by involving franchisees in the decision making process, listening to their ideas, and providing incentives for knowledge sharing. Franchise advisory boards are mechanisms that allow franchisees and franchisors to meet on a regular basis to gain ideas and share input around processes and procedures.

Franchisors can also reward franchisees who serve on franchisee committees, agree to test products, or marketing promotions and provide mentoring to fellow franchisees (Paswan and Wittmann, 2009). One caveat, if there is a hostile situation such as a pending lawsuit, franchisors must first solve that issue before tackling methods that foster shared learning.

To further reduce the trust barrier, the focal point of competition must be geared toward external entities to create a single-minded purpose between franchisor and franchisee. This could be done through education on industry data that identifies external competitor market share growth and highlights competitor activities.

Another possibility to reduce internal competitiveness between franchisees is to align franchisees based on strategic philosophies to facilitate tacit knowledge sharing. A qualitative study by Darr and Kurtzberg (2000) in a pizza franchise discovered that franchisees with similar strategies are more likely to share information. Interviews and observations among franchisees with expansionist strategies found a tendency for these franchisees to share new ideas and information via phone or meetings with other expansion-oriented franchisees. A similar pattern of knowledge sharing was found among franchisees with a cost cutting focus. This research suggests that informal knowledge transfer occurs when franchisees have a similar business strategy. Franchisors could use this information to create franchisee councils based on business strategy, thereby encouraging an environment more prone to tacit knowledge sharing.

Since one aspect of knowledge management is to get as much knowledge out of people's minds and passed to other people's minds or into some type of knowledge reservoir, a franchise system could reward or incent franchisees to share information. A system of reward for

innovative growth ideas would encourage franchisees to step forward. 3M Corporation, for example, holds internal fairs and invites colleagues from around the world to examine ideas, on a confidential basis, to transplant ideas from unit to unit (Brand, 1998). A franchise system could mirror this idea at the annual convention and create a “knowledge fair.” Instead of a typical franchise convention where the franchisor provides trainers to pass on tools and information, franchisees could discuss and demonstrate best practices for fellow franchisees. Franchisees who contribute to the shared learning could be rewarded either monetarily or recognized with an award. By stimulating a level of entrepreneurial thinking and rewarding the sharing of those ideas, a franchise business is more likely to be innovative and thrive in a competitive environment.

Franchise systems must grapple with the unequal balance of power if the goal is to promote tacit knowledge transfer and organic learning. Understanding and overcoming this barrier requires a franchisor to create and promote a culture of know-how that encourages sharing of information. This could take the form of online portals where franchisees can discuss ideas with individuals within the corporation or with other franchisees. Quarterly meetings and interactive knowledge-sharing seminars and workshops may also be worth exploring as a means to reinforce collaborative knowledge and spark bottom-up feedback.

Conclusions

Tacit knowledge is gained by “doing” and is difficult to capture and codify. It is transferred through personal interactions and sharing of experiences versus training manuals and books. Successful transfer of tacit knowledge vertically between franchisor and franchisee, as well as horizontally between franchisees, offers a key strategic advantage to leapfrog the competition and build market share. This paper suggests that leveraging the collective mind power in a franchise organization begins by understanding five barriers that impede tacit knowledge sharing. If these barriers could be eliminated or at least diminished, it could encourage innovation that could lead to new product ideas, accelerate improvements to operating processes, and reduce turnover by creating innovative compensation models.

Franchising remains a viable business enterprise and the barriers that limit tacit knowledge transfer have not inhibited the growth of these strategic alliances around the globe. However, addressing these five barriers could optimize the performance of these cooperative ventures, thereby creating greater returns for both franchisor and franchisee.

This paper provides a framework defining the barriers and offers insights on how to create conditions that diminish the barriers. But, there needs to be more empirical evidence to validate that if these steps are followed, tacit knowledge transfer will be optimized. Future studies in this arena would prove valuable to the long term success of franchise organizations. For example, a mixed methods study could examine the effectiveness of various knowledge management tools employed by franchise organizations to encourage tacit knowledge sharing. A case study of franchisor and franchisee organizational structures could identify best practices that facilitate sharing of ideas, open communication, and cooperation. Another research avenue is an empirical study of franchisor/franchisee cultural fit and the widespread adoption of franchisee ideas. Further research offers the opportunity to provide additional evidence regarding the benefits of tacit knowledge sharing. As we gain additional understanding of how individuals transfer tacit knowledge within these organizations, organizations can adopt practices that help produce greater value.

References

- Altinay, L., and Wang, C. L. (2006), "The role of prior knowledge in international franchising partner recruitment", *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, Vol. 17 No. 5, pp. 430-443.
- Darr, E. D., Argote, L., and Epple, D. (1995), "The acquisition, transfer, and depreciation of knowledge in service organizations: Productivity in franchises," *Management Science*, Vol. 41 No. 11, pp. 1750-1763.
- Argote, L., and Ingram, P. (2000), "Knowledge transfer: A basis for competitive advantage in firms", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 82 No. 1, pp. 150-169.
- Argote, L., Ingram, P., Levine, J. M., and Moreland, R. L. (2000), "Knowledge transfer in organizations: learning from the experience of others", *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 82 No. 1, pp. 1-8.
- Baucus, D. A., Baucus, M. S., and Human, S. E. (1996), "Consensus in franchise organizations: A cooperative arrangement among entrepreneurs", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 11 No. 5, pp. 359-378.
- Baum, J. A. C., and Ingram, P. (1998), "Survival-Enhancing Learning in the Manhattan Hotel Industry, 1898-1980", *Management Science*, Vol. 44 No. 7, pp. 996-1016.
- Boisot, M. (1998), *Knowledge Asset*, Oxford University Press, New York, NY.
- Brand, A. (1998), "Knowledge management and innovation at 3M", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 17-22.
- Dant, R. P., and Gundlach, G. T. (1999), "The challenge of autonomy and dependence in franchised channels of distribution", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 14 No. 1, pp. 35-67.
- Dant, R. P., and Nasr, N. I. (1998), "Control techniques and upward flow of information in franchising in distant markets: conceptualization and preliminary evidence", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 3-28.
- Darden, R. (2002), *Secret recipe: Why KFC is still cookin' after 50 years*, Irving, TX: Tapestry Press.
- Darr, E., and Kurtzberg, T. (2000), "An investigation of partner similarity dimensions on knowledge transfer", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 82 No. 1, pp. 28-44.
- Dreyfus, H. L., and Dreyfus, S. E. (1986), *Mind over machine*, New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Drucker, P. (1993), *Post Capitalist Society*, New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- Elango, B., and Fried, V. H. (1997), "Franchising research: A literature review and synthesis", *Journal of Small Business Management*, Vol. 35, pp. 68-81.
- Epinoux, R. (2005), "Marketing knowledge transfer and management within plural form networks and the potential contribution of information technology" (Center for Research on Economics Management): University of Rennes.
- Galbraith, J. (1956), *American capitalism*, Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Husted, K., and Michailova, S. (2002), "Diagnosing and fighting knowledge-sharing hostility", *Organizational Dynamics*, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 60-73.
- International Franchise Association (2005), "Economic impact of franchise businesses", Retrieved from <http://www.franchise.org>.
- King, W. R. (2008), "Questioning the conventional wisdom: culture-knowledge management relationships", *The Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 12 No. 3, pp. 35-47.

- Lei, D., Slocum Jr., J. W., and Pitts, R. A. (1997), "Building corporate advantage: Managing strategic alliances to promote organizational learning", *Journal of World Business*, Vol. 32 No. 3, pp. 203-223.
- Mohr, J., and Spekman, R. (1994), "Characteristics of partnership success: Partnership attributes, communication behavior, and conflict resolution techniques", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 15 No. 2, pp. 135-152.
- Nonaka, I., and Takeuchi, H. (1995), *The knowledge creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*, London, England: Oxford Press.
- O'Reilly, C. (1983), "The use of information in organizational decision making: A model and some propositions", *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 5, pp. 103-109.
- Paswan, A. K., and Wittmann, C. M. (2009), "Knowledge management and franchise systems. *Industrial Marketing Management*", Vol. 38 No. 2, pp. 173-180.
- Phan, P. H., Butler, J. E., and Lee, S. H. (1996), "Crossing mother: Entrepreneur-franchisees' attempts to reduce franchisor influence", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 11 No. 5, pp. 379-402.
- Pisano, G. (1988), "Innovation through market hierarchies, and joint ventures: Technology, strategy, and collaborative arrangements in the biotechnology industry", Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of California.
- Rousseau, D., and Tijoriwala, S. (1999), "What's a good reason to change? Motivated reasoning and social accounts in promoting organizational change", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 84 No. 4, pp. 514-528.
- Schein, E. (2004), *Organizational culture and leadership*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Shook, C., and Shook, R. (1993), *Franchising: The business strategy that changed the world*. Englewood, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Simonin, B. L. (1999), "Ambiguity and the process of knowledge transfer in strategic alliances", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 20 No. 7, pp. 595-623.
- Sorenson, O., and Sorenson, J. B. (2001), "Finding the right mix: Franchising, organizational learning and chain performance", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 22, pp. 713-724.
- Stanworth, J., and Curran, J. (1999), "Colas, burgers, shakes, and shirkers: Towards a sociological model of franchising in the market economy", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 14 No. 4, pp. 323-344.
- Stanworth, J., Curran, J., and Hough, J. (1983), *Success and failure in small business*, Aldershot, England: Bower Publishing.
- Szulanski, G. (2000), "The process of knowledge transfer: A diachronic analysis of stickiness", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 82 No. 1, pp. 9-27.
- Todeva, E., and Knoke, D. (2005), "Strategic alliances and models of collaboration. *Management Decision*", Vol. 43 No. 1, pp. 123-148.
- Want, J. (2003), "When worlds collide: culture clash: Corporate culture - illuminating the black hole", *Journal of Business Strategy*, Vol. 24 No. 4, pp.14-21.
- Weaven, S. (2004), "Intrapreneurial behaviour within the franchising context", Unpublished manuscript, Griffith University, Australia.
- Wiig, K. M. (1997), "Knowledge management: An introduction and perspective", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 6-14.