

Original Research Article

Influence of Corporate Education on Firms' Performance

ABSTRACT

Mechanisms that influence organizational performance of firms, like investments in corporate education, still are not deeply studied when industries and countries are considered in the analysis. The main objective of this paper is study the influence of corporate education on performance of firms from different countries and over time, through a repeated measure multilevel modeling. Using a sample of 242 companies from 9 countries over 8 years (2007-2014), totaling 1,257 observations, it is verified that investments in corporate education are representative to differentiate companies' mean performance and growth rates in recent years.

Key words: corporate education; investment; firm's performance; repeated measure multilevel modeling.

1. INTRODUCTION

Lots of studies try to verify the influence of some variables on other one mostly recognized as performance variable, or dependent variable. In this perspective, this paper uses the technique known as repeated measure multilevel regression, that allows one to explore the effects of corporate education investment, as well as the industry and the country of origin, on firm's performance over time.

In other words, this paper tries to contribute to the study about the source of heterogeneity in company performance over time, specifically in terms of the industry and the country of origin effects. Thus, a three-level approach have to be used, being the first one elated to the time variation (repeated measure), the second to the firms' investment in corporate education and activity sector characteristics and the third to the countries' variables.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The importance of multilevel models has increasing in the past few years, with application in many fields. In social sciences, specifically, seminal publications deserve mention, like Schmalensee (1985), Rumelt (1991), Roquebert, Phillips and Westfall (1996), McGahan and Porter (1997), Brush and Bromiley (1997), Hofmann (1997), Kreft and de Leeuw (1998), Brush, Bromiley and Hendrickx (1999), Bowman and Helfat (2000), Raudenbush and Bryk (2002), Hox (2002), Goldstein (2003), Raudenbush, Bryk, Cheong, Congdon and du Toit (2004) and Soto and Morera (2005).

Some other studies were published to evaluate a specific type of performance, through firms, industries and countries' influences, like Chang and Singh (2000), Ruefli and Wiggins (2003), Adner and Helfat (2003), Hawawini, Subramanian and Verdin (2004), Makino, Isobe and Chan (2004), Makino, Beamish and Zhao (2004), Hough (2006), Misangyi, Lepine, Algina and Goeddeke (2006), Goldszmidt, Brito and Vasconcelos (2007), Gelman (2006), Short, Ketchen Jr., Palmer and Hult (2007), Fávero (2009), Fávero (2010) and Dias, Gonçalves, Muylder and Gonçalves (2012). More recently, Niehaus, Campbell and Inkelas (2014) published an interesting paper discussing multilevel models in the field of education.

In the next section the model itself will be explained.

3. METHODOLOGY

Firstly in this section the model proposed is presented, following what was described by Fávero (2010). Thus, three-level models consist of 3 sub-models, in which there are $t = 1, \dots, T_{ij}$ years at level 1, which are nested in each $i = 1, \dots, n_j$ firms that, in turn, are nested in $j = 1, \dots, J$ countries. Hence, it is given for level 1 that:

$$y_{tij} = \pi_{0ij} + \pi_{1ij} \cdot YEAR_{tij} + e_{tij} \quad (1)$$

Where:

- t : 1,2, ..., T_{ij} (years), $j=1,2, \dots, J$ (countries) and $i=1,2, \dots, n_j$ (firms);
- $YEAR$: variable related to the period of analysis;
- π_{0ij} : expected value of performance variable (mean) of company ij in year 1;
- π_{1ij} is the growth rate of company ij 's performance variable; and
- σ^2 is the variance of ε_{ij} (variance of a specific firm over time).

Each level 1 coefficient becomes a dependent variable in the level 2 model, like presented in equation (2).

$$\pi_{pij} = \beta_{p0j} + \sum_{q=1}^{Q_p} \beta_{pqj} \cdot X_{qij} + r_{pij} \quad (2)$$

Where:

- β_{pqj} ($q = 0, 1, \dots, Q_p$) are the level 2 coefficients;
- X_{qij} is the vector of level 2 predictive variables; and
- r_{pij} is the random effect at level 2.

Likewise, the level 3 model can be written as:

$$\beta_{pqj} = \gamma_{pq0} + \sum_{s=1}^{S_{pq}} \gamma_{pqs} \cdot W_{sj} + u_{pqj} \quad (3)$$

Where:

- γ_{pqS} ($s = 0, 1, \dots, S_{pq}$) are the level 3 coefficients;
- W_{sj} is the vector of predictive variables at level 3; and
- u_{pqj} is the random effect of level 3.

The database of the 500 Best and Biggest Companies issued by Revista Exame was the source for this research. Initially, data were extracted for all sets of companies available in the database for the period from 2007 to 2014. The original database contained companies from 22 countries over 8 years, totaling 7,384 observations. After a treatment that excluded observations with missing values and with less than three periods, as well as countries with less than three firms, in the final database remained 1,257 observations, with 242 firms from 9 countries.

The adopted performance variable was the adjusted profitability disseminated in the above mentioned ranking. The level 2 variable related to the activity sector was obtained from the same database. These and other variables (levels 2 and 3) are displayed in the Chart 1.

Chart 1. Definition of level 2 and 3 variables

Level 2 Variables (Firm)	
Activity Sector (Services, Industry, Warehousing / Retailing)	Dummy Variables: Services: IND = 0 and RET = 0 Industry: IND = 1 and RET = 0 Warehousing / Retailing: IND = 0 and RET = 1
Percentage of Investment in Corporate Education	CORPEDUC
Level 3 Variables (Country)	
Competitiveness of Nations Index	ICN
<i>per capita</i> GDP	PPC
Participation in G8	Dummy: Non Participation in G8: G8 = 0 Participates in G8: G8 = 1

The hypotheses for testing are in line with the logic proposed by Short, Ketchen Jr., Bennett and du Toit (2006) and can be described as follows:

Hypothesis 1: There exists significant variability in company performance over time.

Hypothesis 2: There exists significant variability in performance, over time, among firms from the same country.

Hypothesis 3: There exists significant variability in performance, over time, between firms from different countries.

Hypothesis 4: Companies' performance follows a linear trend over time and there is significant variance among them.

Hypothesis 5: The firms' characteristics, such as investment in corporate education, explain the performance variation over time.

Hypothesis 6: The countries' characteristics, such as the competitiveness ratio, per capita GDP or insertion in the G8 explain performance differences among the companies over time.

To verify each of these hypotheses, the following models have to be applied.

125 **Null Model**

126 *Level 1 (Repeated Measure):*

127 $PERF_{tij} = \pi_{0ij} + e_{tij}$ (4)

128 PERF: performance variable represented by adjusted profitability;

129 $t=1,2, \dots, T_{ij}$ (years), $j=1,2 \dots, J$ (countries) and $i=1,2, \dots, n_j$ (firms);

130 π_{0ij} : expected (mean) PERF of firm ij in year 1 (2007).

131

132 *Level 2 (Firm):*

133 $\pi_{0ij} = \beta_{00j} + r_{0ij}$ (5)

134 β_{00j} : mean of expected PERF'S in 2007 for country j .

135

136 *Level 3 (Country):*

137 $\beta_{00j} = \gamma_{000} + u_{00j}$ (6)

138 γ_{000} : general mean of expected PERF's in 2007.

139

140 **Linear Trend Model without or with Random Effects**

141 *Level 1 (Repeated Measure):*

142 $PERF_{tij} = \pi_{0ij} + \pi_{1ij} \cdot YEAR_{tij} + e_{tij}$ (7)

143 π_{1ij} : growth rate of firm ij 's PERF.

144

145 *Level 2 (Firm):*

146 $\pi_{0ij} = \beta_{00j} + r_{0ij}$ (8)

147 $\pi_{1ij} = \beta_{10j}$ (without random effects)

148 $\pi_{1ij} = \beta_{10j} + r_{1ij}$ (with random effects)

149 β_{10j} : mean of expected growth rates in country j .

150

151 *Level 3 (Country):*

152 $\beta_{00j} = \gamma_{000} + u_{00j}$ (9)

153 $\beta_{10j} = \gamma_{100}$ (without random effects)

154 $\beta_{10j} = \gamma_{100} + u_{10j}$ (with random effects)

155 γ_{100} : mean of growth rates of expected PERF's.

156

157 **Full Model**

158 *Level 1:*

159 $PERF_{tij} = \pi_{0ij} + \pi_{1ij} \cdot YEAR_{tij} + e_{tij}$ (10)

160

161 *Level 2:*

162 $\pi_{0ij} = \beta_{00j} + \beta_{01j} \cdot (IND) + \beta_{02j} \cdot (RET) + \beta_{03j} \cdot (CORPEDUC) + r_{0ij}$

163 (11)

164 $\pi_{1ij} = \beta_{10j} + \beta_{11j} \cdot (IND) + \beta_{12j} \cdot (RET) + \beta_{13j} \cdot (CORPEDUC) + r_{1ij}$

165

166 *Level 3:*

167 $\beta_{00j} = \gamma_{000} + \gamma_{001} \cdot (ICN) + \gamma_{002} \cdot (PPC) + \gamma_{003} \cdot (G8) + u_{00j}$

168 $\beta_{01j} = \gamma_{010} + \gamma_{011} \cdot (ICN) + \gamma_{012} \cdot (PPC) + \gamma_{013} \cdot (G8)$

169 $\beta_{02j} = \gamma_{020} + \gamma_{021} \cdot (ICN) + \gamma_{022} \cdot (PPC) + \gamma_{023} \cdot (G8)$

170 $\beta_{03j} = \gamma_{030} + \gamma_{031} \cdot (ICN) + \gamma_{032} \cdot (PPC) + \gamma_{033} \cdot (G8)$ (12)

171 $\beta_{10j} = \gamma_{100} + \gamma_{101} \cdot (ICN) + \gamma_{102} \cdot (PPC) + \gamma_{103} \cdot (G8) + u_{10j}$

172 $\beta_{11j} = \gamma_{110} + \gamma_{111} \cdot (ICN) + \gamma_{112} \cdot (PPC) + \gamma_{113} \cdot (G8)$

173 $\beta_{12j} = \gamma_{120} + \gamma_{121} \cdot (ICN) + \gamma_{122} \cdot (PPC) + \gamma_{123} \cdot (G8)$

174 $\beta_{13j} = \gamma_{130} + \gamma_{131} \cdot (ICN) + \gamma_{132} \cdot (PPC) + \gamma_{133} \cdot (G8)$

175

176 The coefficients have the same meaning as explained before.

177

4. RESULTS

While Table 1 presents the decomposition of variance among the levels, Tables 2 and 3 display the results of the models, including the trend at level 1, without and with the random effects, respectively.

Table 1. Null Model

Fixed Effect	Coefficient	Standard error	t
General mean PERF (γ_{000})	1.169	1.507	0.776
Random Effect	Variance Component	df	χ^2
Time variation (e_{tij})	8102.459		
Variation among firms (r_{0ij})	785.145**	233	877.242
Variation among countries (u_{00j})	0.098	8	10.778
Decomposition of Variance	% per Level		
Level 1 (time)	91.165		
Level 2 (firm)	8.834		
Level 3 (country)	0.001		

** p<0.01.

Table 2. Linear Trend Model without Random Effects

Fixed Effect	Coefficient	Standard error	t
General mean PERF (γ_{000})	-8.103**	1.392	-5.821
General mean of PERF growth rates (γ_{100})	2.053**	0.317	6.476
Random Effect	Variance Component	df	χ^2
Level 1			
Time variation (e_{tij})	8003.127		
Level 2			
Initial RENT of firms (r_{0ij})	737.594**	233	874.213
Level 3			
Mean RENT of countries (u_{00j})	0.037	8	10.513

** p<0.01.

193
194

Table 3. Linear Trend Model with Random Effects

Fixed Effect	Coefficient	Standard error	t
General mean PERF (γ_{000})	-7.964**	1.396	-5.705
General mean of PERF growth rates (γ_{100})	2.012**	0.348	5.782
Random Effect	Variance Component	df	χ^2
Level 1			
Time variation (e_{tij})	7996.120		
Level 2			
Initial RENT of firms (r_{0ij})	642.743**	233	733.667
Change rate of firms' trends (r_{1ij})	1.247**	233	712.448
Level 3			
Mean RENT of countries (u_{00j})	0.174	8	3,259
Change rate of countries' trend (u_{10j})	0.007	8	2.196

195 ** p<0.01.

196

197 Firstly, one can verify that 8.834% of the performance variability occurred among
198 firms ($\chi^2 = 877.242$, $p < 0.01$) and a relevant percentage of performance variation (91.165%)
199 was due to the time evolution in each firm (Tabel 1). On the other hand, it is verified that only
200 0.001% of variance is due to differences among countries ($\chi^2 = 10.778$, $p > 0.05$).

201 While the model without random effects (Table 2) shows that the variable related to
202 the period (trend) with a fixed effect is significant ($t = 6.476$, $p < 0.01$), through the analysis of
203 Table 3 one can notice that the variance component for the linear trend is also significant (χ^2
204 = 712.448, $p < 0.01$).

205 Thus, the results presented in Tables 1, 2 and 3 support hypotheses 1, 2 and 4, but
206 not hypothesis 3, what makes hypothesis 6 be discarded. In order to verify the validity of
207 hypothesis 5, the model proposed becomes automatically a two-level regression, without the
208 third level presented in equation (12). The new results are now presented in Table 4.

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223 **Table 4. Full Two-Level Model**

Fixed Effect	Coefficient	Std. Error	t
General mean PERF (β_{00})	-10.027**	1.717	-5.839
Influence of industrial sector on general mean PERF (β_{01})	4.127**	0.117	35.273
Influence of retailing sector on general mean PERF (β_{02})	5.478*	2.698	2.030
Influence of corporate education on general mean PERF (β_{03})	7.787**	0.897	8.681
General mean of PERF growth rates over time (β_{10})	3.007**	0.412	7.298
Influence of industrial sector on general mean of PERF growth rates over time (β_{11})	-1.927**	0.478	-4.031
Influence of retailing sector on general mean of PERF growth rates over time (β_{12})	-1.343*	0.696	-1.929
Influence of corporate education on general mean of PERF growth rates over time (β_{13})	0.979**	0.112	8.741
Random Effect	Variance Component	df	χ^2
Level 1			
Time variation (e_{it})	8002.587		
Level 2			
Initial PERF of firms (r_{0i})	667.101**	238	738.558
Change rate of firms' PERF trend (r_{1i})	1.398**	238	717.895

224 * p<0.05.

225 ** p<0.01.

226

227 Through the analysis of the results presented in Table 4, one can notice that
 228 investments in corporate education is representative, and with a positive signal, to
 229 differentiate both mean performance and performance growth rate among firms over time,
 230 what helps to support hypothesis 5.

231

232

5. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This kind of modeling allows researchers to assess important aspects in databases with longitudinal characteristics. The definition of hypotheses and the main objective about what is being investigated is crucial to help researchers reach interesting findings and, in this sense, multilevel models offer new possibilities of testing different and more complicated hypotheses.

The positive relation between corporate education investment and the performance of firms over time demonstrates the importance of the knowledge to bring more quality in firms' operations, what results in better performances and indicators. It's important to emphasize that high administrations of companies are understanding this kind of fact more accurately in the past few years, independently of industry or country of origin of their firms.

Clearly different models can be applied to confirm the findings. The behavior of companies that operate in other countries also can be investigated. Finally, different periods of time could bring different aspects to the analysis, given that the period considered in this paper includes the explosion of the international financial crisis in many countries, what makes people and firms search for more education, as a form of career diversification.

REFERENCES

- Adner, R, Helfat, CE. Corporate effects and dynamic managerial capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal*. 2003; 24(10): 1011-1025.
- Bowman, EH, Helfat, CE. Does corporate strategy matter? *Strategic Management Journal*. 2001; 22(1): 1-23.
- Brush, TH, Bromiley, P. What does a small corporate effect mean? A variance components simulation of corporate and business effects. *Strategic Management Journal*. 1997; 18(10): 825-835.
- Brush, TH, Bromiley, P, Hendrickx, M. The relative influence of industry and corporation on business segment performance: an alternative estimate. *Strategic Management Journal*. 1999; 20(6): 519-547.
- Chang, S, Singh, H. Corporate and industry effects on business unit competitive position. *Strategic Management Journal*. 2000; 21(7): 739-752.
- Dias, AT, Gonçalves, CA, Muylder, CF, Gonçalves, MA. Multilevel modeling of the performance variance. *Revista Ibero-Americana de Estratégia*. 2012; 11(3): 97-118.
- Fávero, LP. Time, firm and country effects on inflation-adjusted return: an examination under the perspective of the random coefficients modeling. *International Journal of Business Research*. 2009; 9(6): 159-173.
- Fávero, LP. The Sao Paulo Stock Exchange: a multilevel analysis of firm and industry effects on profitability evolution and hedge strategies. *International Journal of Financial Markets and Derivatives*. 2010; 1(3): 307-325.
- Gelman, A. Multilevel (hierarchical) modeling: what it can and cannot do. *Technometrics*. 2006; 48(3): 432-435.
- Goldstein, H. Multilevel statistical models. 3rd ed. London: Arnold; 2003.

286
 287 Goldszmidt, RGB, Brito, LAL, Vasconcelos, FC. O efeito país sobre o desempenho da firma:
 288 uma abordagem multinível. In: III ENCONTRO DE ESTUDOS EM ESTRATÉGIA, 2007, São
 289 Paulo.
 290
 291 Hawawini, G, Subramanian, V, Verdin, P. The home country in the age of globalization: how
 292 much does it matter for firm performance? *Journal of World Business*. 2004; 39(2): 121-135.
 293
 294 Hofmann, DA. An overview of the logic and rationale of hierarchical linear models. *Journal of*
 295 *Management*. 1997; 23(6): 723-744.
 296
 297 Hough, JR. Business segment performance redux: a multilevel approach. *Strategic*
 298 *Management Journal*. 2006; 27(1): 45-61.
 299
 300 Hox, J. Multilevel analysis: techniques and applications. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum; 2002.
 301
 302 Kreft, I, de Leeuw, J. Introducing multilevel modeling. London: Sage; 1998.
 303
 304 Makino, S, Beamish, PW, Zhao, NB. The characteristics and performance of Japanese FDI
 305 in less developed and developed countries. *Journal of World Business*. 2004; 39(4): 377-
 306 392.
 307
 308 Makino, S, Isobe, T, Chan, CM. Does country matter? *Strategic Management Journal*. 2004;
 309 25(10): 1027-1043.
 310
 311 McGahan, AM, Porter, ME. How much does industry matter, really? *Strategic Management*
 312 *Journal*. 1997; 18(S1): 15-30.
 313
 314 Misangyi, V, Lepine, JA, Algina, J, Goeddeke Jr, F. The adequacy of repeated-measures
 315 regression for multilevel research. *Organizational Research Methods*. 2006; 9(1): 5-28.
 316
 317 Niehaus, E, Campbell, CM, Inkelas, KK. HLM behind the curtain: unveiling decisions behind
 318 the use and interpretation of HLM in higher education research. *Research in Higher*
 319 *Education*, 2014; 55(1): 101-122.
 320
 321 Raudenbush, S, Bryk, A. Hierarchical linear models: applications and data analysis
 322 methods. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage; 2002.
 323
 324 Raudenbush, S, Bryk, A, Cheong, YF, Congdon, R, du Toit, M. HLM 6: hierarchical linear
 325 and nonlinear modeling. Lincolnwood: Scientific Software International, Inc.; 2004.
 326
 327 Roquebert, JA, Phillips, RL, Westfall, PA. Market vs. management: what 'drives'
 328 profitability? *Strategic Management Journal*. 1996; 17(8): 653-664.
 329
 330 Ruefli, TW, Wiggins, RR. Industry, corporate and segment effects and business
 331 performance: a non-parametric approach. *Strategic Management Journal*. 2003; 24(9): 861-
 332 879.
 333
 334 Rumelt, RP. How much does industry matter? *Strategic Management Journal*. 1991; 12(3):
 335 167-185.
 336
 337 Schmalensee, R. Do markets differ much? *The American Economic Review*. 1985; 75(3):
 338 341-351.

- 339
340 Short, JC, Ketchen Jr, DJ, Bennett, N, du Toit, M. An examination of firm, industry, and time
341 effects on performance using random coefficients modeling. *Organizational Research*
342 *Methods*. 2006; 9(3): 259-284.
343
344 Short, JC, Ketchen Jr, DJ, Palmer, TB, Hult, GTM. Firm, strategic group, and industry
345 influences on performance. *Strategic Management Journal*. 2007; 28(2): 147-167.
346
347 Soto, JLG, Morera, MC. *Modelos jerárquicos lineales*. Madrid: La Muralla; 2005.