MIT Center for Transportation & Logistics

# Behavioral Patterns: Small Firms' Recipe for Growth



**Fadi Abou Chacra, Joshua Rocha Advisors:** Dr. Josué C. Velázquez Martínez and Dr. Cansu Tayaksi



http://genesys.mit.edu

#### Micro & Small Enterprises (MSEs) & LATAM

More than **99%** of the companies are micro, small, or medium firms It is estimated that 2/3 will fail within 42 months in LATAM (GEM)

IT Center for

nsportation & Logistics





Account for 70% of the jobs in most OECD countries

Represent, on average, more than half of total exports in value added terms. (OECD)



#### **MIT GeneSys**



The objective is to provide a framework of managerial insights aimed at improving productivity and competitive advantage in the small firms.

MIT Center for Transportation & Logistics

MIT GeneSys. (2018). Leveraging Supply Chain Management and Business Practices in Micro and Small Firms: Data Collection Guidelines.

What behavioral patterns in supply chain management affect the growth and productivity of micro and small firms (MSEs)?

Identify managerial and behavioral patterns that are associated to the productivity and growth of MSEs

ation & Logistics



**Build** a conceptual framework for future research

Conduct qualitative and quantitative **analysis** of the identified managerial behavioral patterns

![](_page_3_Picture_5.jpeg)

#### Hypotheses

	Literature review		Higher levels of	Are associated with
1	Hanifzadeh, Talebi & Sajadi, 2017	-	Risk tolerance	
2	Sharma & Tarp, 2018	-	Setting and tracking organizational goals	Increased growth and
3	Nunes & Paulino, 2018	-	Delegation	productivity of small mins
4	McKenzie & Woodruff, 2015	-	Adopting new processes and technologies	

![](_page_4_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_4_Picture_3.jpeg)

#### **Methodology Framework**

![](_page_5_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_5_Picture_2.jpeg)

#### **Company Visits**

Visited three companies in Mexico

- Visual observation: assets, processes and human interactions
- Open-ended questioning: business practices that are not immediately apparent through passive observation

![](_page_6_Picture_4.jpeg)

Stationery

Hand-made jewelry

![](_page_6_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_6_Picture_8.jpeg)

#### Cosmetics

![](_page_6_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_6_Picture_11.jpeg)

#### Interactive Workshop

- Conducted in Guadalajara, Mexico
- Twenty five (25) MSE owners participated
- The workshop was divided into three segments:

![](_page_7_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Picture_11.jpeg)

## The Tower Challenge

Adapted from the Marshmallow Challenge

What behaviors do managers exhibit in real-life?

![](_page_8_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Picture_4.jpeg)

#### The Tower Challenge: Objectives & Structure

- Build the tallest tower possible using spaghetti noodles and marshmallows
- Every 1 cm in height earns \$0.10
- Opportunity to purchase additional supplies each round
- 3 Rounds
- The objective of the game is to have the most money at the end of round 3

![](_page_9_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Picture_7.jpeg)

#### Structured Disguised Survey

- Answers to the questions are predetermined (i.e., Multiple Choice)
- Participants do not know the exact purpose/intention of survey but can easily answer questions
- Avoid social desirability bias

I enjoy working with o	thers	I do not enjoy working with others		
Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	

I enjoy working with o	thers	I enjoy working on my own		
Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	

![](_page_10_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Picture_7.jpeg)

#### Qualitative to Quantitative

I enjoy working with of	thers	I enjoy working on my own		
Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	
3	2	1	0	

Goal Oriented	3	2	1	0	Task Oriented
<b>Risk Tolerant</b>	3	2	1	0	<b>Risk Averse</b>
High Delegation	3	2	1	0	Low Delegation
High Adoption	3	2	1	0	Low Adoption

Participant #	Goals	Risks	Delegation	Adoption
18	3.00	1.98	1.80	2.40
1	2.20	1.32	2.40	2.40
13	1.00	1.65	1.00	1.60
27	1.40	1.36	2.20	2.20
3	2.20	1.43	1.80	2.60

![](_page_11_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Picture_5.jpeg)

## Model Structure

- Four model features
  - Risk
  - Goals
  - Delegation
  - Adoption
- Three target variables
  - Revenue Growth
  - Employee Growth
  - Productivity
- High Growth/High Productivity = 1
- Low Growth/Low Productivity = 0

ansportation & Logistics

**MIT** Center for

![](_page_12_Figure_12.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_13.jpeg)

#### **Descriptive Statistics**

	Number of employees in 2018	Avg Annual Rev 2018 USD	Rev Growth	Employee Growth	Productivity
Median	13	\$187,210	0.27	0.20	\$13,570

	Survey Goals	Survey Risk	Survey Delegation	Survey Adoption
Avg	1.90	1.55	1.99	2.05
Median	2.00	1.68	2.20	2.20
Std Dev	0.52	0.52	0.56	0.43
CV	0.27	0.34	0.28	0.21

![](_page_13_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Picture_4.jpeg)

#### Logistic Regression (Linear)

<b>Employee Category</b>			
		1	
Regression Statistics		_	
Chi Square	11.68		
Residual Dev.	31.26		
# of iterations	6		
Observations	31		
	Coefficients	Standard Error	P-value
Intercept	-1.49	2.87	0.60
Survey Goals	-1.50	0.98	0.12
Survey Risk	2.96	1.25	0.02
Survey Delegation	-0.63	0.99	0.53
Survey Adoption	0.41	1.35	0.76
		Probability	
	2.23	0.903	
Survey Goals	3.0		
Survey Risk	3.0		
Survey Delegation	3.0		
Survey Adoption	3.0		

![](_page_14_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Picture_3.jpeg)

#### CART (Non-Linear)

![](_page_15_Figure_1.jpeg)

MIT Center for

**Transportation & Logistics** 

l'Iir

![](_page_15_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Picture_3.jpeg)

#### Leave-One-Out Cross-Validation - ROC Curves

![](_page_16_Figure_1.jpeg)

MIT Center for

Transportation & Logistics

![](_page_16_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_3.jpeg)

#### LOOCV Results

Target Variable	Models	Optimal Threshold	FPR (x)	TPR (y)	Classification Accuracy	Euclidean Distance	LOG/CART %
Revenue Growth	Logistic Regression	0.58	0.38	0.33	0.48	0.76	
	CART	0.60	0.50	0.67	0.58	0.60	27.29%
Employee Growth	Logistic Regression	0.46	0.31	0.80	0.74	0.37	
	CART	0.30	0.38	0.73	0.68	0.46	-19.37%
Productivity	Logistic Regression	0.52	0.31	0.47	0.58	0.70	
	CART	0.03	0.69	0.87	0.58	0.62	13.29%

![](_page_17_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Picture_3.jpeg)

#### Conclusions

- Three of the four behavioral patterns are moderately strong predictors for revenue growth, employee count growth, and productivity
- Adoption of new technologies/processes does not seem to be a strong predictor for target variables
- Our findings for risk, delegation, and goals support past research; behavioral management patterns are associated with business performance.
  - However, the associations are better captured through non-linear models than through linear models

![](_page_18_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_6.jpeg)

#### Limitations & Future Research

- More observations!
- Because our dataset is limited to 31 observations, we do not control for the age of the company or company industry in this research
- There seems to be a difference between adoption for the purpose of advancement versus the adoption for mere survival
- Control for changes in behavioral management patterns over time

![](_page_19_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_0.jpeg)

## Thank You!

![](_page_20_Figure_2.jpeg)

# **Supporting Slides**

![](_page_21_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Picture_2.jpeg)

#### **Revenue Logistic Regression**

<b>Revenue Category</b>			
		-	
<b>Regression Statistics</b>		_	
Chi Square	3.373369206		
Residual Dev.	39.56949233		
# of iterations	5		
Observations	31		
		-	
	Coefficients	Standard Error	P-value
Intercept	-3.07462625	2.422325552	0.204338733
Survey Goals	-0.716418508	0.831790552	0.389074619
Survey Risk	0.806668627	0.791060597	0.307856287
Survey Delegation	0.325326925	0.897425605	0.716969979
Survey Adoption	1.208752052	1.269036788	0.340845658
		Probability	
	1.79836104	0.857949308	
Survey Goals	3.0		
Survey Risk	3.0		
Survey Delegation	3.0		
Survey Adoption	3.0		

![](_page_22_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Picture_3.jpeg)

#### Productivity Logistic Regression

Productivity Category			
		1	
Regression Statistics		_	
Chi Square	4.192290153	_	
Residual Dev.	38.75057138	_	
# of iterations	5		
Observations	31		
		-	
	Coefficients	Standard Error	P-value
Intercept	-1.9285871	2.467121116	0.434381723
Survey Goals	1.631416512	0.896730081	0.068866443
Survey Risk	0.08610581	0.761274602	0.909945389
Survey Delegation	-0.249786431	0.916803033	0.785273143
Survey Adoption	-0.436927569	1.259454406	0.728652825
		Probability	
	1.163837865	0.762029375	
Survey Goals	3.0		
Survey Risk	3.0		
Survey Delegation	3.0		
Survey Adoption	3.0		

MIT Center for Transportation & Logistics

![](_page_23_Picture_3.jpeg)

#### **Revenue Decision Tree**

![](_page_24_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_3.jpeg)

#### Productivity Decision Tree

![](_page_25_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Picture_3.jpeg)

## **Risk Examples**

- Assume that if you buy a lottery ticket, you will have a 10% chance of winning \$1,000 USD. If you had exactly \$1,000 USD in your savings account, how much would you be willing to pay for the lottery ticket? (Personal)
- Your family member wants to start a business and needs a total of \$1,000 USD to start. They are asking for your help and have promised to pay you back in 6 months. Assuming you had exactly \$1,000 USD in your savings account, how much money would you be willing to lend your family member? (Close Relationship)
- Assume one of your long-time customers' needs a new order worth \$500 USD and has asked you to ship it today if possible. This customer has not yet paid the invoice from the last order worth \$500 USD that you shipped them four weeks ago, but they promise that they will pay both invoices in full in 30 days. Would you be willing to ship the new order today? (Business Relationship)

![](_page_26_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Picture_5.jpeg)