Erratum to: An introspective examination of single-unit versus multi-unit franchisees

Rajiv P. Dant · Scott K. Weaven · Brent L. Baker ·
Hyo Jin (Jean) Jeon

Published online: 8 January 2013
© Academy of Marketing Science 2012

Erratum to: J. of the Acad. Mark. Sci.
DOI 10.1007/s11747-011-0265-2

Table 2

We would like to clarify that per the first footnote (a) the metric variables, strictly speaking, were compared using MANOVA-ANOVA procedures rather than MANOVA-t-test procedures as currently stated even though in a two group context, t-test is conceptually equivalent to ANOVA.

Table 6

We would also like to clarify that the means and standard deviations for MUFees are identical between Tables 5 and 6. These tables both report the importance of franchisor strategies, financial benefits and franchisor experience to MUFees during their initial unit purchase, albeit in different contexts. The correct numbers appear in Table 5. Also, added are the substantive interpretations of the MANOVA results in the amended Table 6.

Table 7

The substantive interpretations of the MANOVA results have now been added in the corrected Table 7.

The online version of the original article can be found at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11747-011-0265-2>.

R. P. Dant (✉) · H. J. (Jean) Jeon
Michael F. Price College of Business,
The University of Oklahoma,
307 West Brooks, Suite 1-K,
Norman, OK 73019-4001, USA
e-mail: rdant@ou.edu

H. J. (Jean) Jeon
e-mail: jeanjeon@ou.edu

S. K. Weaven
Griffith Business School, Gold Coast Campus, Griffith University,
PMB 50 Gold Coast Mail Centre,
Brisbane, Queensland 9726, Australia
e-mail: s.weaven@griffith.edu.au

B. L. Baker
College of Business and Public Administration,
University of North Dakota,
Gamble Hall, Room 175E, 293 Centennial Drive,
Grand Forks, ND 58202, USA
e-mail: bbaker@business.und.edu

Table 2 Respondent Profiles of MUFees versus SUFees on Selected Demographic Variables

			N=98 MUFees	MUFees	N=225 SUFees	SUFees	Z-Test for proportions	
Demographic Variable		Response	Counts	Percent	Counts	Percent	Z-value	p-value
1	Whether inquired about future MUFee status at the time of purchase?	Yes	22 of 36	66.11%	98 of 170	57.65%	0.20	> 0.15
2	Gender	Male	69 of 96	71.88%	160 of 215	74.42%	0.33	> 0.25
3	Average Age of the Respondent (years) ^a	Means ->	44.64	SD-> 10.28	45.36	SD-> 10.44	F= 0.75	> 0.57
4	Average Annual Sales Turnover (in Australian dollars) ^b	Means ->	755,000	SD-> 487,904	661,565	SD-> 1,082,329	NA	NA
5	Average Age of Association with the System (years) ^a	Means ->	5.93	SD-> 2.66	5.47	SD-> 4.75	F= 1.12	> 0.21

^a These being metric variables were compared using MANOVA-ANOVA procedures to contain the experimentwise error rate to 0.05.

MANOVA yielded an equivalent $F=0.79$ ($df=2,298$) which was non-significant ($p > 0.45$). The follow-up ANOVA results are presented in the Table.

SD refers to standard deviations.

^b Only two MUFees answered this question. Hence, a meaningful inferential comparison was not possible.

Table 6 Considerations During Buying: Differences Between the INITIAL versus SECOND Franchise Purchase (MUFees N=98)

		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F (df=1,94)	Effect Size ^a	Statistical. Power	p-value	Substantive Conclusions
t-test: Dependence	Initial Unit Purchase	98	3.21	0.52	t _(df=98) 8.275	1.182	0.999	0.000	Dependence concerns become <i>less</i> important during the Second Unit Purchase
	Second Unit Purchase	98	2.38	0.86					
Franchisor Strategy	Initial Unit Purchase	98	5.17	0.74	78.358	0.94	0.999	0.000	Franchisor Strategy becomes <i>more</i> important during the Second Unit Purchase
	Second Unit Purchase	98	5.91	0.81					
Financial Benefits	Initial Unit Purchase	98	4.99	1.05	69.890	1.11	0.999	0.000	Financial Benefits concerns become <i>more</i> important during the Second Unit Purchase
	Second Unit Purchase	98	6.04	0.75					
Franchisor Experience	Initial Unit Purchase	98	4.85	0.53	46.813	0.95	0.999	0.000	Franchisor Experience concerns become <i>more</i> important during the Second Unit Purchase
	Second Unit Purchase	98	5.98	1.56					
Multivariate (MANOVA) Summary									
Wilks' Lambda Converted to					F _(df=3,94)	Effect Size ^b η ²	0.999	0.000	The Initial versus Second purchase dichotomy has a large and significant effect.
					65.886	0.40			

^a Effect sizes are reported using the d statistics. Cohen (1977, pages 22–27) provides the following benchmarks for d statistics: values of about 0.20 signify "small" effects, values of 0.50 denote "medium" effect, and values of 0.80 or higher denote "large" effect size

^b η^2 or η^2 , used to estimate the effect size associated with MANOVA, can be interpreted as analogous to R^2 . η^2 values over 0.138 are deemed to be large by Cohen (1977, page 287)

Table 7 The Effect of Single Versus Multi Unit Status on Relational Sentiments

		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F (df=1,321)	Effect Size ^a	Statistical Power	p-value	Substantive Conclusions
Trust	Single Unit Franchisees	225	5.33	0.55	578,210	3.07	0.999	0.000	SUFees characterize the relationship as trusting while the MUFees disagree with this sentiment
	Multi Unit Franchisees	98	3.27	0.77					
Commitment	Single Unit Franchisees	225	4.86	1.50	73,737	0.91	0.999	0.000	SUFees characterize the relationship as exhibiting commitment while the MUFees disagree with this sentiment
	Multi Unit Franchisees	98	3.80	0.70					
Relationship Satisfaction	Single Unit Franchisees	225	4.70	0.97	164,199	1.38	0.999	0.000	SUFees characterize the relationship as satisfactory while the MUFees disagree with this sentiment
	Multi Unit Franchisees	98	3.62	0.54					
Multivariate (MANOVA) Summary									
Wilks' Lambda Converted to		F _(df=3,319)			263,285	Effect Size ^b η ²	0.999	0.000	The SUFees/MUFees dichotomy has a large and significant effect.

^a Effect sizes are reported using the d statistics. Cohen (1977, pages 22–27) provides the following benchmarks for d statistics: values of about 0.20 signify "small" effects, values of 0.50 denote "medium" effect, and values of 0.80 or higher denote "large" effect size

^b η^2 or η^2 , used to estimate the effect size associated with MANOVA, can be interpreted as analogous to R^2 . η^2 values over 0.138 are deemed to be large by Cohen (1977, page 287)