Investigate the relationship between value creation activities in intellectual capital with different business models in Isfahan carpet manufacturing companies

Alborz Abbasi[1&2] and Forough Heirani[3*]

1Department of Accounting, Yazd science and research branch, Islamic Azad University, Yazd, Iran.
2Department of Accounting, Yazd branch, Islamic Azad University, Yazd, Iran.
3Department of Accounting, Yazd branch, Islamic Azad University, Yazd, Iran.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research is to investigate the relationship between value creating activities and different models of business. This research from the prospect typology is an applied research and from the prospect of data collection and data analysis is descriptive. Information, and from the view point of hypothesis analysis is correlational and from the view point time span the current study is cross sectional. Statistical population in this research had done between about 200 top and general managers in carpet productive companies in Esfahan province. This research used Kokran formula for estimating sample size and at last chooses 120 managers with method of sampling random. This research had done by Bontis (1998) intellectual capital questionnaire for collecting data and variables of research. In fact in this research used Bontis (1998) intellectual capital questionnaire for measuring intellectual capital considering subject and content of research. The credibility factor of this questionnaire estimated based on Cronbach's alpha 84 percent that shows much credibility of measurable tools. This research included two primary hypothesis and seven secondary hypothesis that explain results of affection of type of business on activities of value creation. Also this research shows the positive and significantly relation between society and intellectual capital.

* Corresponding author: *Forough Heirani*

INTRODUCTION

The type of business is primary core of competitive reply of every companies to market, definition of value proposition, demand activities, source and partnership and customer's knowledge, cost or profit linked in operation of company. (Ltiao and his coworkers, 2013)

The appearance of communications technology is cause of communication facilities, companies associate, and creation networks value and hide increasing border of industry and superseded the concept type of business unit analyses instead of industry (Storewalder & et.al, 2005)

Companion business is important business that could create content of chance jobs and income, if necessary technology, society and economy infrastructure of country get ready (Niromand and Ranjbar, 2012),

Considering on continuous changing place business, they emphasis on achieve advantage of stable competition, and this is necessary that parallel with changing technology and rules of market, because of survival, and the companies who choose better type of business than their competition could be continues and assessment considering on stability and development of market.

The type of business recognizing and comply different demands of customers, and determinate the station of company with the other network companies, and getting ready value continuum and the process of incoming distribution between them, and this is being necessary for those companies to explained.(copers,2002)

As we said, this research is going to find a solution to show how different kinds of business could effect on activities of value creation?

Ghayori Moghadam (2012) searched about affections of intellectual capital on performance as criterion of business operation. The results of these research shows: Also intellectual capital had negative affect on the operation in all forthcoming industry that this affect just usable for production of car part in car industry.

Concerning on achieve results in different industries; we can concluded that in the type of an industry, an intellectual capital couldn't effects a lot on operation.

Jigal and Malol (2010) pay attention on an intellectual capital with index of value added and checking results of financial and economical and value market in 300 English companies. They used the model factor of intellectual value added to measuring intellectual capital.

The results of exam show that the operation of intellectual capital have positive relation with economical and financial operation, but in case of operation value market just relation is important in technology industry and also employed capital (material and financial) has negative relation with economical operation, but employed capital has positive relation with value market and financial operation.

Research process: This research had done in 2015 until 2016 in manufacturing carpet companies in Esfahan province. Also the subject of the research is about affection of different kind of business on activities of value creation in intellectual capital.

At last the research is going to be usable, and the research is descriptive and from type of solidarity in process of research, and the research is qualitative in type of data.

Whereas one of the companies that intellectual capital can lead to useful achievements are manufacturing carpet companies in Esfahan province.

We are going to read the method of collecting information is documentary-library in chapter 1 and 2. The method of collecting information is fieldwork.

First, necessary information had collect from documentation in archive. Then the information of theoretical foundations and history of research had collect from library. Also necessary information had collect from Internet. And also the intended information had collect by visiting manufacturing carpet companies in Esfahan province.

In this research, Bontis questionnaire had use because of measuring intellectual capital. The Bontis questionnaire is containing 52 question-reply packages with Licoot 5 degrees scale included very little=1, little=2, average=3, much=4, very much=5, that because of some similar question decrees to 42 questions. This questionnaire has three Component included human capital, structural capital and Relationship (customer) capital.

They use descriptive and Inferential Statistics for analyzing data. Frequency table, average and standard deviation are using in descriptive Statistics. Simple variable linear regression and multi variable linear regression and T exam are using in Inferential Statistics. The credibility factor of this questionnaire estimated based on Cronbach's alpha 84 percent that shows much credibility of measurable tools.

Results:

Frequency and percentage of participants, who answered the questionnaire, were categorized according to the variable associated to each occasion, where showed in table 1.

Table 1: Frequency and percentage of participants, who answered the questionnaire, were categorized according to the variable associated to each occasion, where showed in table 1.

cumulative percentage	Percentage of participant	Frequency	options	
55	55	66	male	Gender
100	45	54	Female	
	100	120	Sum	
4.16	4.16	5	Under 30 years old	age
30.82	26.66	32	31-40 years old	
64.98	34.16	41	41-50 years old	

100	35	42	Over 51 years old	
	100	120	Sum	
12.5	12.5	15	1-5 years	work experience
29.16	16.66	20	6-10 years	
72.49	43.33	52	11-15 years	
89.99	17.5	21	16-20 years	
100	10	12	Over 21 years	
	100	120	sum	
25.33	25.33	31	High school dropout & diploma	degree of education
60.33	35	42	Associate Degree	
81.163	20.833	25	BA	
96.996	15.833	19	MA	
100	2.5	3	PhD	
	100	120	Sum	

Data in table (1) shows that 66 participants (managers in carpet productive companies) are (55%) male and 54 participants are (45%) female.

Data in table (1) had shown 5 participants (41/6%) are under 30 years old, 32 participant (26.66%) between 31 to 40 years old, 41 participant (34.16%) between 41 to 50 years old and 42 participant (35%) over 50 years old.

Data in table (1) had shown 15 participants (12/5%) had records between 1 to 5 years old, 20 participants (16.66%) between 6 to 10 years old, 52 participants (43/33%) between 11 to 15 years old, 21 participants (17/5%) between 16 to 20 years old and 12 participants (10%) over 21 years old.

Data in table (1) had shown 31 participants equal to (25/33%) have high school dropout and diploma, 42 participants equal to (35%) have associate degree, 25 participants (20/833%) have BA, 19 participants (15/833%) have MA and 3 participants (2.5%) have PhD.

Chapter two: Inferential Result

Main hypothesis: business models effect on value creating activities to investigate hypothesis with one variable linear regression model was used.

Table 2: representation of regression model

Dorbin Watson test	R^2	R	Options
2.2	0.073	0.27	Model

Considering the value of Dorbin Watson test which is the index of 2.2 and is between 1.5 to 2.5, It has been concluded that linear regression formula is suitable for data and analysis, because the value of R^2 is 0.073, So business models are able to justify 7.2 percent of changes in value creating activities.

Table 3: Regression factor

sig	The amount of T	Beta	Model
0.128	1.531	46.42	Constant amount
0.003	3.043	0.27	Business models

Considering the value Beta which is the index of 0.27, It has

been explained the affection of business models on value creation activities. Because the amount of sig= 0.003 and it is less than 0.05 acceptable mistake, So business models effect on value creating activities.

First secondary hypothesis: main producers of equipment effect on value creating activities.

Table 4: representation of regression model

Dorbin Watson test	R^2	R	Options
2.24	0.079	0.282	Model

Considering the value of Dorbin Watson test which is the index of 2.24 and is between 1.5 to 2.5, It has been concluded that linear regression formula is suitable for data and analysis, because the value of R^2 is 0.079, So main producers of equipment are able to justify 7.9 percent of changes in value creating activities.

Table 5: Regression factor

sig	The amount of T	Beta	Model
0.202	1.284	18.69	Constant amount
0.005	1.332	0.181	Business models

Because the amount of sig= 0.005 and it is less than 0.05 acceptable mistake, so main producers of equipment effect on value creating activities.

Second secondary hypothesis main brand producers effect on value creating activities.

Table6: representation of regression model

Dorbin Watson test	R^2	R	Options
1.53	0.36	0.6	Model

Considering the value of Dorbin Watson test which is the index of 1.53 and is between 1.5 to 2.5, It has been concluded that linear regression formula is suitable for data

and analysis, because the value of R^2 is 0.36, So main brand producers are able to justify 36 percent of changes in value creating activities.

Table 5: Regression factor

sig	The amount of T	Beta	Model
0.202	1.284	18.69	Constant amount
0.005	1.332	0.181	Business models

Because the amount of sig= 0.005 and it is less than 0.05 acceptable mistake, so main brand producers effect on value creating activities.

Results:

The results of statistical analysis shows that 66 participants (managers in carpet productive companies) are (55%) male and 54 participants are (45%) female.

The results of statistical analysis shows 5 participants (41/6%) are under 30 years old, 32 participant (26.66%) between 31 to 40 years old, 41 participant (34.16%) between 41 to 50 years old and 42 participant (35%) over 50 years old.

The results of statistical analysis shows 15 participants (12/5%) had records between 1 to 5 years old, 20 participants (16.66%) between 6 to 10 years old, 52 participants (43/33%) between 11 to 15 years old, 21 participants (17/5%) between 16 to 20 years old and 12 participants (10%) over 21 years old.

The results of statistical analysis 31 participants equal to (25/33%) have high school dropout and diploma, 42 participants equal to (35%) have associate degree, 25 participants (20/833%) have BA, 19 participants (15/833%) have MA and 3 participants (2.5%) have PhD.

The result of this research in line with the result of the research of Jigal & Malol (2010) and also the result of the research of ghayori Moghadam (2012)

Reference

1. Abbasi, Ibrahim -Aman Goldie ,assess the efficiency of intellectual capital on the financial performance of the companies in the Tehran Stock Exchange, The Accounting and Auditing Volume 17, Number 60

2. Anvari Rostami, Ali Asghar -Haasan seraji, article examines the intellectual and the relationship between intellectual capital and market value of stocks / Tehran Stock Exchange reviewed journal accounting and auditing (39)

3. Arenas, Terestia & Lavanderos, Leonardo(2009). Intellectual capital: objects or process?. Journal of Intellectual Capital, No.1. pp77-85

4. Brooking, Annie(1996). Intellectual capital: Core Asset for the Third Millennium Enterprise. Intellectual Thomson Business. Press. New York.

5. Cho, Po Young& et al(2006). Intellectual capital: An empirical study of ITRI. Technological Forecasting & social change, No.73. pp889-903

6. Chang ,W, Hsieh,J,(2011)," The dynamics of intellectual capital in organizational development" African Journal of Business Management Vol. 5(6), pp.2345-2355, 18 March 2011.

7. Dastgir, Mohsen,Kamrn Mohammadi, paper treasure unfailing intellectual capital of the organization, devise Journal number 214

8. Hemmati, Hassan -Amin mehrabi doctor examines the relationship between intellectual capital and financial performance of listed companies in Tehran Stock Exchange,

9. Huang,Ching Choo & Luther, Robert & Tayles, Michael(2007). An evidence-based taxonomy of intellectual capital. Journal of Intellectual Capital, No.3. pp386-403.

10. Johannessen, Jon-Arild & Olsen, Bjorn & Olaisen, Johan(2005). Intellectual capital as a holistic management philosophy: a theoretical perspective. International Journal of Information Management, No.25. pp151-171

11. Lim, Lunn L.K. & Dallimore, Peter(2004). Intellectual capital: management attitude in service industries. Journal of Intellectual Capital, No.1. pp181-194

12. Marr, Bernard & Glay, Diana & Neely, Andy(2003). Why do firm measure heir intellectual capital?. Journal of Intellectual Capital, No.4. pp441-464

13. McGill, Terrene P.(2006). Harnessig Intellectual Capital: A Study of Organizational Knowledge Transfer. Ph.D. Dissertation, Touro Uiversity.

14. Meer-Kooistra, Jetlje van dan & Zijlstra, Siebren(2001). Reporting on intellectual capital. Accounting, Auditing& Accountability Journal,No.4. pp456-476

15. Mojtahedzadeh, Vida - Hossein Alavi Tabari relationship between intellectual capital and performance of the insurance industry, the accounting and auditing (60)

16. Nazari, Jamal A. & Herremans, Irenem(2007).Extended VAIC model: measuring intellectual capital components. Journal of Intellectual Capital, No.4. pp595-609

17. Namazi, Mohammad Ibrahimi, SH, assessing the effect of intellectual capital on current and future financial performance of companies listed in Tehran Stock Exchange, Journal of Financial Research, Winter 1388, Issue IV, p. 10. 7.

18. Poor Zamani, Zahra -AZIta Jahanshad-Ali Mahmoud Abadi effect of intellectual capital on market value and financial performance, reviewing accounting and auditing Volume 19 Number 2

19. Pew Tong, hong & Plowman, David & Hancock, Phil(2007). Intellectual capital and financial returns of companies. Journal of Intellectual Capital, No1 pp76-95

20. Ramirez, Yolanda & et al(2007). Intellectual Capital in Spanish University. Journal of Intellectual Capital, No.4. pp732-747

21. Robinsson, George & Kleiner, Brian H.(1996). How to Measure an Organization's Intellectual Capital. Managerial Auditing Journal. Pp.۳۹-۳۶.

22. Soler, Luis Enrique Valladares & Oro Celestino, Diego Jesus Cuello(2007). Evaluating the scope of IC in firm's value. Journal of Intellectual Capital, No.3. pp470-493

23. Sudarsanam, Sudi & Sorar, Ghulam & Marr, Bernard(2006). Real options and the impact of intellectual capital on corporate value. Journal of Intellectual Capital, No.3. pp291-308

24. BUSINESS MODELS ‹By A V Vedpuriswar ‹Published in 'Gurukul' ‹ (Vol.5 ‹No.3 ‹December 2003) the quarterly journal ofState Bank Academy ‹ Gurgaon

25. Derek F Abell ‹"Defining the Business: The starting point of Strategic Planning ‹" Prentice Hall ‹1980.

26. Clayton M Christensen ‹"Why Great Companies Lose Their Way ‹" Across the Board ‹October 1998 ‹pp. 36 - 41.

27. N. Venkataraman and John C. Henderson ‹ "Real strategies for virtual organizing ‹" Sloan Management Review ‹Fall 1998.

28. Innovation in Industry ‹" The Economist – A Survey ‹February 20 ‹1999.

29. Ranjay Gulati and Jason Garino ‹"Mix of clicks and bricks" ‹Harvard Business Review ‹May - June 2000 ‹pp. 107 – 114

30. Constantinos ‹C Markides ‹"All the Right Moves – A guide to crafting break through strategy ‹"Harvard Business School Press ‹2000.

31. Gary Hamel ‹"Leading the Revolution ‹" Harvard Business School Press ‹2000.

32. Aaron Goldberg ‹"Killer business models ‹ " Upside Today ‹September 12 ‹2000 ‹ www.upside.com

33. Michael E Porter ‹"Strategy and the Internet ‹" Harvard Business Review ‹ March 2001 ‹pp. 62 - 89.

34. Joan Magretta ‹"Why Business Models Matter?" Harvard Business Review ‹May 2002 ‹pp. 86 - 93.

35. David Rosenblum ‹Doug Tomlinson and Larry Scott ‹"Bottom - Feeding for Blockbuster Business" ‹Harvard Business Review ‹March 2003 ‹pp.4 - 11.

36. Patrick Stahler's website ‹www. business - model - innovation.com

37. http://www.shoghian.com/B6.htm http://www.gobignetwork.com/Information/Go – BIG

38. Qelich Lee, B., Moshabaki, A. (2006). The role of social capital in developing intellectual capital of the organization (the two Iranian automobile company). Knowledge Management, Issue 75. S125-147.