
Does social capital improve labour productivity in Small and Medium Enterprises?

Fabio Sabatini

University of Cassino, Department of Economics, Italy

University of Rome La Sapienza,
SPES Development Studies Research Centre, Rome, Italy
E-mail: Fabio.Sabatini@uniroma1.it

Abstract: This paper reports the findings of an empirical study on the relationship between social capital and labour productivity in Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) in Italy. By means of Structural Equations Models (SEMs), the analysis investigates the effect of different aspects of the multifaceted concept of social capital. Bonding social capital of strong family ties and bridging social capital shaped by informal ties connecting friends and acquaintances are proved to exert a negative effect on labour productivity, economic performance and human development. On the contrary, linking social capital of voluntary organisations positively influences the stated outcomes.

Keywords: labour productivity; Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs); social capital; social networks; Structural Equations Models (SEMs).

Reference to this paper should be made as follows: Sabatini, F. (xxxx) 'Does social capital improve labour productivity in Small and Medium Enterprises?', *Int. J. Management and Decision Making*, Vol. x, No. x, pp.xxx-xxx.

Biographical notes: Fabio Sabatini holds a PhD in Economics from the University of Rome La Sapienza and he is currently Research Fellow at the Department of Economics of the University of Cassino and at the SPES Development Studies Research Centre of the University of Rome La Sapienza. He is the Author of more than 20 papers, mainly addressing the role of social factors in economic development, and the editor of the *Social Capital Gateway* (www.socialcapitalgateway.org), web site providing resources for social sciences acknowledged by the *Journal of Economic Education* as an exemplary material for teaching and learning economics.

1 Introduction

Finally, the award ceremony has come. Five guys, quite self-conscious and not exactly gifted with athletic frames, are standing on the stage. Together with them is a popular, statuesque, television showgirl. She is awarding them a cup. The recipients, besides being electrical engineers, are members of an amateur football team and they have just won the Edison's Annual Soccer Competition. The company has afforded the tournament costs; players' kits, soccer balls, renting of fields, referee payments, besides others. And now it has organised the award ceremony, offering a rich buffet to all employees and paying for

the showgirl's presence at the venue. Why does the First Italian Electric Company carry out such an extravaganza? Just for fun? Certainly not. In fact, the management has just made another investment. This time it has not bought new equipment or hired a warehouse. This investment is to improve the quality of interpersonal relationships inside the workforce. The management knows that this investment would foster labour productivity and thereby generate more profits.

Most studies show that enterprises devote an ever more share of their financial resources to activities which are not directly related to their production processes. Nurturing a cooperative climate inside the workforce and building trustworthy relationships with external partners generally constitute a key task for management. Employee satisfaction depends upon, over and above the traditionally well-recognised factors like wage and job conditions, the quality of human relationships among colleagues. According to Gui (2000) relational assets contribute to firms' economic performance just like new investments in physical capital. The claim is that better quality of social interactions inside and outside the firm, which is generally referred to as a form of social capital, can improve productivity and, therefore, further economic performance.

The aim of this paper is to investigate the relationship between social capital and labour productivity in SMEs in Italy. Study of the influence of cultural and social factors on economic growth, particularly in Italy, has attracted much attention since the publication of the famous study on the topic covering Italian region by Putnam et al. (1993).

Correspondingly the importance of SMEs and their contribution to economic growth, social cohesion, employment and regional and local development is widely recognised. In OECD economies SMEs account for over 95% of enterprises and 60–70% of employment and generate a large share of new jobs. As globalisation and technological change reduce the importance of economies of scale in many activities, the potential contribution of smaller firms is enhanced.

The study reported in this paper is based on data collected by the author that includes 35 indicators of social capital. This data has been used, through factor analyses, to generate synthetic indicators for three core dimensions of this multifaceted concept:

- *bonding social capital*, shaped by strong family ties
- *bridging social capital*, shaped by weak informal ties among friends and neighbours
- *linking social capital*, shaped by the formal ties connecting people within the boundaries of voluntary organisations.

Due to lack of data, it has not been possible to relate labour productivity to internal social capital 'possessed' by firms, as manifested, for example, by bridging ties connecting employees, the quality of the organisational structure and norms and values shared within the workforce. The study here examines the relationship between labour productivity and the 'environmental' social capital. The claims are that:

- the socio-cultural context within which firms are embedded may have spill-over effects affecting labour force's social norms and values
- social networks involving employees from different firms may act as powerful means to foster the diffusion of trust and knowledge, as it has been widely shown by the voluminous literature on 'learning regions', a key example being that of Silicon Valley (Florida, 1995).

The relationship between social capital dimensions and labour productivity is analysed using PCA. The analysis shows a positive and significant association of productivity with latent indicators measuring bridging and linking social capital. The form and direction of the causal nexus linking these variables is then analysed through a simple SEM and some refinements.

The use of SEMs presents a wide range of advantages compared to multiple regression analysis, among which, for example, are the work with more flexible assumptions, the possibility to account for unknown phenomena affecting the model's variables' behaviour, the attraction of SEM's graphical modelling interface (see for example Figures 2 and 3), the desirability of testing overall models rather than individual coefficients and the ability to test models with multiple dependents.

The empirical analysis shows that different types of social capital exert diverse effects on labour productivity in SMEs and on the economic performance. Bonding and bridging social capital negatively affect labour productivity and economic performance. This is different from linking social capital which exerts a positive influence on these outcomes. Such structure of relationships among variables is confirmed even if when controlled for the stock of physical capital, as expressed by the capital – labour ratio. The claim is that the presence of dense and cross-cutting formal networks is associated with the diffusion of social norms of trust and reciprocity which in turn may exert a positive influence upon workers' effort and motivation. In more general terms, the results here provide a new confirmation of the multidimensional, dynamic and context-dependent nature of social capital.

The outline of the paper is as follows. Section 2 introduces the concept of social capital and presents a brief review of the literature that deals with the relationship between social capital and labour productivity and firm performance. Section 3 carries out a critical discussion on relevant measurement issues and points out the main weaknesses of the empirical literature in the field. Section 4 provides a brief description of the adopted methodology and presents the synthetic indicators built by means of Principal Component Analyses (PCA) for each social capital dimension. Synthetic indicators resulting from the analysis are then used within SEMs for the empirical investigation of the relationship between social capital and labour productivity. Details of the analyses are provided in Sections 5–7. Section 8 provides the results of a preliminary exploration to examine how physical capital mediates the relationship between social capital and performance. In the final section, concluding remarks and pointers for further researches are provided.

2 Social capital and labour productivity

The concept of social capital has a long intellectual history in the social sciences, but has gained celebrity only in the 90s, due to the seminal studies of Bourdieu (1980, 1986), Coleman (1988, 1990); Putnam et al. (1993) and Putnam (1995b). Bourdieu identifies three dimensions of capital each with its own relationship to the concept of class: economic, cultural and social. Bourdieu's idea of social capital puts emphasis on class conflicts. According to this view social relations are used to increase the ability of an actor to advance her interests and social capital becomes a resource in the social struggles. Here social capital is 'the sum of the resources, actual or virtual, that accrue to an individual or group by virtue of possessing a durable network of more or less

institutionalised relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition' (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p.119, expanded from Bourdieu (1980, p.2)). Social capital thus has two components. It is, first, a resource that is connected with group membership and social networks.

"The volume of social capital possessed by a given agent ... depends on the size of the network of connections that he can effectively mobilize."
(Bourdieu, 1986, p.249)

Secondly, it is a quality produced by the totality of the relationships between actors, rather than merely a common 'quality' of the group (Bourdieu, 1980).

Towards the end of 1980s, Coleman gave new relevance to Bourdieu's concept of social capital. According to Coleman,

"Social capital is defined by its function. It is not a single entity, but a variety of different entities, with two elements in common: they all consist in some aspect of social structures, and they facilitate certain actions of actors within the structure." (Coleman, 1988, p.98)

In the early 1990s, the concept of social capital finally became a central topic in the social sciences debate. Putnam et al. (1993) carried out the now famous research on local government in Italy. This concluded that the performance of social and political institutions is powerfully influenced by citizen engagement in community affairs, or what, following Coleman, the authors termed 'social capital'. In this context, social capital is referred to as "features of social life-networks, norms and trust that enable participants to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives" (Putnam, 1995b, p.1). Like other forms of capital, social capital is productive, making possible the achievement of certain ends that in its absence would not be possible. But, in Coleman's words,

"unlike other forms of capital, social capital inheres in the structure of relations between actors and among actors. It is not lodged either in the actors themselves or in physical implements of production." (Coleman, 1988, p.98)

The role of social capital as a collective resource serving the achievement of macro outcomes is explained by the new economic sociology perspective (Granovetter, 1973, 1985).

Granovetter identifies social capital mainly with social networks of weak bridging ties. According to him

"Whatever is to be diffused can reach a larger number of people, and traverse greater social distance, when passed through weak ties rather than strong. If one tells a rumour to all his close friends, and they do likewise, many will hear the rumour a second and third time, since those linked by strong ties tend to share friends." (Granovetter, 1973, p.1366)

Social networks can thus be considered as a powerful mean to foster the diffusion of information and knowledge, lowering uncertainty and transaction costs. The cited perspectives on social capital are markedly different in origins and fields of application, but they all agree on the ability of certain aspects of the social structure to generate positive externalities for members of a group, who gain a competitive advantage in pursuing their ends.

Empirical research has widely shown that informal interactions developing inside the firm's workforce improve the diffusion of information and foster the creation of a stock

of knowledge which constitutes an asset for future production processes. Different from Becker's (1975) notion of "specific human capital", such a stock is relational in nature, and exists only as long as it is shared among workers. Summarising, we may identify two main channels through which social capital may affect labour productivity.

Firstly, social capital fosters the diffusion of knowledge and information among workers, "making possible the achievement of certain ends that would not be attainable in its absence" (Coleman, 1990, p.302). Managers and employees constantly experience the need to mobilise others' support and advice, well beyond the hierarchical structure of the firm. When formal organisational routines and the knowledge of individuals fail to produce a desired outcome, it is necessary to consult with others who may or may not be part of the formal organisation or the work group. Every worker may be considered as part of an informal structure whose resources improve his problem solving ability. This structure may also extend across organisations, such as professional networks, friends, and colleagues from earlier jobs. Secondly, social interactions may affect workers' effort and motivation. In their famous study on organisations, March and Simon (1958) argued that, even if managers are authoritative and the enterprise's hierarchy is definite and well functioning, employees are able to influence tasks' achievement in different ways, like delaying order executions and, more generally, displaying opportunistic behaviours. Many studies show that, if human interactions within the workforce are trustworthy and relaxed, employees are more inclined to do their best at work, and are more likely to sanction shirking behaviours through peer monitoring (Kandel and Lazear, 1992; Osterloh and Frey, 2000; Huck et al., 2001; Rees et al., 2003; Carpenter and Seki, 2005; Minkler, 2003). As argued by Bowles and Gintis:

"Monitoring and punishment by peers in work teams, credit associations, partnerships, local commons situations, and residential neighbourhoods is often an effective means of attenuating incentive problems that arise where individual actions affecting the well being of others are not subject to enforceable contracts." (Bowles and Gintis, 2002, p.427)

3 The problem of measuring social capital

Despite the immense amount of research on it, definition of social capital has remained elusive. Conceptual vagueness, coexistence of multiple definitions and chronic lack of suitable data have so far been the major impediments to both theoretical and empirical research on social capital, or more generally, on those phenomena in which social capital may play a significant role. In this regard it may be noted that the problems suffered by empirical studies on social capital are, at some level, endemic to all empirical work in economics. Heckman (2000) states that establishment of causal relationships is intrinsically difficult.

"Some of the disagreement that arises in interpreting a given body of data is intrinsic to the field of economics because of the conditional nature of causal knowledge. The information in any body of data is usually too weak to eliminate competing causal explanations of the same phenomenon. There is no mechanical algorithm for producing a set of 'assumption free' facts or causal estimates based on those facts." (Heckman, 2000, p.91)

However, according to Durlauf

“the empirical social capital literature seems to be particularly plagued by vague definition of concepts, poorly measured data, absence of appropriate exchangeability conditions and lack of information necessary to make identification claims plausible.” (Durlauf, 2002, p.22)

In his paper, the author reviews three famous empirical studies, concluding that they do not help in understanding the socioeconomic outcomes of social capital, which, according to him remain unclear. Durlauf’s critique is one step forward in respect to the position of some prominent economists who had earlier doubted the ability of the econometric analysis to investigate social capital’s supposed outcomes. In more general term, they do not believe that it is possible to provide credible measures of Social capital stock and question its role as a useful analytical construct in economic analysis. In his critique to Fukuyama, Solow writes:

“If ‘social capital’ is to be more than a buzzword, something more than mere relevance or even importance is required ... The stock of social capital should somehow be measurable, even inexactly.” (Solow, 1995, p.36)

In response it is possible to observe that, during the last ten years, developments in the field have proposed a great variety of methods for measuring social capital and testing its ability to produce relevant social, economic, and political outcomes. However, the empirics of social capital still continue to suffer from a definite difficulty to address macro outcomes in a convincing way. On this regard we can identify two main problems.

The first is the use of macro indicators not directly related to social capital’s key components. Such indicators – e.g., crime rates, teenage pregnancy, blood donation, participation rates in tertiary education – are quite popular in the empirical research, but their use has led to considerable confusion about what social capital is, as distinct from its outcomes, and what the relationship between social capital and its outcomes may be. Research predicated upon outcome of social capital as an indicator of it will necessarily find social capital to be related to that outcome. Social capital becomes tautologically present whenever an outcome is observed (Portes, 1998; Durlauf, 1999; Stone, 2001). In order to avoid such shortcomings, this study focuses only on the ‘structural’ dimensions of social capital, as identified by social networks.

The second main problem facing the empirical literature is ‘aggregation’. A good deal of existing cross-national studies on the economic outcomes of social capital is based on measures of trust drawn from the *World Values Survey*. Trust measured through surveys is a ‘micro’ and ‘cognitive’ concept, in that it represents the individuals’ perception of their social environment. Such perception is related to the particular position that the interviewed persons occupy in the social structure. Aggregation of such data to create a measure of what can be called ‘macro’ or ‘social’ trust loses its linkage with the social and historical circumstances in which trust and social capital are located. As pointed out by Foley and Edwards (1999), empirical studies based on cross-country comparisons of trust may be a ‘cul de sac’ because of their inability to address macro outcomes, in view of the absence of the broader context within which attitudes are created and determined. Fine argues that

“if social capital is context-dependent – and context is highly variable by how, when and whom – then conclusions are themselves illegitimate as the basis for generalisation to other circumstances.” (Fine, 2001, p.105)

This research rejects trust as a suitable social capital indicator and uses data on people’s effective behaviour as collected by the Italian National Institute of Statistics (Istat) in its multipurpose surveys.

4 Measuring social capital in Italy (Sabatini, 2005b)¹

The point of departure of the empirical analysis carried out in this paper is the acknowledgment of the very multidimensionality of the concept of social capital, which cannot be represented by a single indicator. This study is therefore based on a dataset collected by the author including 35 indicators of three main social capital dimensions: strong family ties, informal ties among friends and acquaintances, and formal ties connecting people within the boundaries of voluntary organisations. Data are drawn from a set of multipurpose surveys carried out by the Istat on a sample of 20000 households between 1998 and 2002 (see Istat, 2000, 2001a, 2002a, 2002b, 2002c, 2002d, 2003, 2004a, 2004b). PCAs are performed on each of the four groups of variables, in order to build synthetic, latent, indicators of each social capital ‘structural’ dimension. I do not want to go into the details about the computational aspects of PCA here, which can be found elsewhere (see for example Lebart et al., 1984; Johnson and Wichern, 1992). Briefly, PCA explains the variance-covariance structure of a dataset through a few linear combinations of the original variables. Its general objectives are data reduction and interpretation. Although p components are required to reproduce the total system variability, often much of this variability can be accounted for by a small number, k , of principal components. If so, there is (almost) as much information in the k components as there is in the original p variables. The k principal components can then replace the initial p variables, and the original dataset, consisting of n measurements on p variables, is reduced to one consisting of n measurements on k principal components. An analysis of principal components often reveals ‘latent’ relationships that were not previously suspected and thereby allows interpretations that would not ordinarily result. This approach is considered ‘exploratory’ – as opposed to great part of the other empirical analyses, which constitutes confirmatory approaches – in that it explores the underlying relations existing in data without having the claim to explain causalities in such relations. Analysis units can be reclassified according to the new ‘composite measures’ provided by underlying factors, and factor scores can then be used as the raw data to represent the independent variables in a regression, discriminant, or correlation analysis. In this study, factor scores are the Italian regions’ coordinates on the first principal components representing the three social capital dimensions taken into consideration. For the region i , the factor score is given by the sum of scalar products between the p variables describing i and versor u_α corresponding to the α th principal component. It therefore constitutes a new variable measuring region i , resulting as a linear combination of the initial p variables, whose weights are given by the α th factorial axis. Formally, the α th principal component is expressed as a new variable c_α by:

$$c_{\alpha} = Xu_{\alpha} \text{ or } \{\dots c_{\alpha i} \dots\} = \left\{ \dots \sum_j^p x_{ij} u_{\alpha}^j \right\}, \quad (1)$$

where X is the data matrix and x_{ij} are its elements.

4.1 *Bonding social capital*

The family household, as a place in which social relations characterised by trust and reciprocity operate, is generally referred to as a form of bonding social capital. In this paper, I measure family social capital through 18 indicators (see Annexure 1, Table A1) representing the family composition (e.g., COPFIG and FAMSING), the spatial distance between family members (e.g., MUM1KM and FIG1KM), the relevance of other relatives (e.g., INCPAR2S), and the quality of relationships both with family members and with the other relatives (e.g., CONTPAR and SODDPAR). Adopted variables are used to run a PCA, which provides a valuable indicator of the bonding social capital shaped by strong family ties. In particular, lower factor scores are associated with a higher frequency of family contacts and with a higher spatial proximity between family members, but also with a lower satisfaction for the quality of familiar relationships. It is noteworthy that the variable CONTPAR, expressing people propensity to count on parents in case of need, is weakly correlated with the first two axes. The synthetic indicator provided by the PCA is therefore an expression of the strength of family ties, but does not take into account their quality. Southern regions exhibit higher levels of family social capital and lead the ranking based on strong family ties, while Northern regions lie at the bottom.

4.2 *Bridging social capital*

Putnam (1995a) identified neighbourhood networks – something he described as ‘good neighbourliness’ – as promoting social capital. In contrast, the leisure activity of bowling alone, rather than in an organised club activity, is presented by Putnam as evidence of ‘social disengagement’. Since Putnam’s (1995a) analysis, a number of studies have measured networks of friends, neighbours and acquaintances somewhat more precisely. In this the focus is on 11 indicators of people social engagement or, in other terms, of what can be referred to as, ‘relational goods’, like ASSPORT and BAR2S (see Table A2). According to a good part of the literature, social capital is accumulated not only through standard mechanisms of individual investments, but also through simultaneous production and consumption of relational goods taking place in the context of different kinds of social participation. It is noteworthy that the relationship between (production and consumption of) relational goods and the accumulation of social capital has a double direction. On the one side, a higher social capital increases the returns to the time spent in social participation. For instance, it is easier and more rewarding to go out with friends in a context that offers many options for socially enjoyed leisure (e.g., MUBAR and CENAF2S). In other words, social capital may be seen as an improvement in the technology of production of relational goods. On the other hand, a higher social participation brings about social capital accumulation as a by-product. For instance, trust (or empathy) may be reinforced and generalised through social interactions (Antoci et al., 2002).

The first principal component obtained from a PCA (on the variables considered) provides a synthetic indicator of the bridging social capital given by weak ties connecting friends and acquaintances. The new, synthetic, indicator represents a higher level of contacts with other people in informal contexts like sport circles, bars, restaurants and music clubs, and also, but weakly, with a higher propensity to talk with neighbours. In respect to the familiar dimension of social capital, the ranking of the Italian regions is upturned: Northern regions now lead the classification, while Southern regions lie at the bottom.

4.3 Linking social capital

Following Putnam (1993, 1995a), great part of the literature has used membership in voluntary associations as an indicator of social capital, assuming that such groups and associations function as ‘schools of democracy’, in which cooperative values and trust are easily socialised.

Most empirical studies on the effect of voluntary associations have shown that their members exhibit more democratic and civic attitudes as well as more active forms of political participation than non-members. Membership in associations should also facilitate the learning of cooperative attitudes and behaviour, including reciprocity. In particular, such membership increases face-to-face interactions between people and create a setting for the development of trust. In this way, the operation of voluntary groups and associations contributes to the building of a society in which cooperation between all people – not just within the groups themselves – for all sort of purpose is facilitated (Almond and Verba, 1963; Brehm and Rahn, 1997; Hooghe, 2003; Seligson, 1999; Stolle and Rochon, 1998). The claim is that in areas with stronger, dense, horizontal, and more cross-cutting networks, there is a spillover from membership in organisations to the cooperative values and norms that citizens develop. In areas where networks with such characteristics do not develop, there are fewer opportunities to learn civic virtues and democratic attitudes, resulting in lack of trust.

However, there are several reasons to doubt the efficacy of social capital measures simply based on the density of voluntary organisations. Firstly, even though individuals who join groups and who interact with others regularly show attitudinal and behavioural differences compared to non-joiners, the possibility exists that people self-select into association groups, depending on their original levels of generalised trust and reciprocity. Secondly, the group experiences might be more pronounced in their impact when members are diverse and from different backgrounds. This type of group interaction, which is called ‘bridging’, brings members into contact with people from a cross-section of society and, as a result, gives a more relevant contribution to the ‘socialisation’ of norms of trust and reciprocity. The ‘heterogeneity argument’ has been used to criticise the empirical literature on social capital. According to some authors, if diversity matters for socialisation of cooperative values, then voluntary associations might not be the measure to take into account, as such groups have been found relatively homogeneous in character. Voluntary associations indeed generally recruit members who have already relatively high civic attitudes (Popielarz, 1999; Mutz, 2002; Uslaner, 2002).

Finally, face-to-face interactions inside voluntary organisations could be modest and may not necessarily imply the sharing of information and values. This is particularly true in advanced economies, where participation in voluntary organisations is often limited to an annual subscription related to the payment of a membership fee. This kind of civic

participation may have limited spill over effects, scarcely contributing to the diffusion of trust. In the light of the arguments summarised above, indicators of social capital as civic participation might take into account different variables measuring not only the density of voluntary organisations (i.e., the number of organisations in which a mean citizen is involved, or the so-called ‘Putnam’s instrument’), but also the heterogeneity of members, and the degree of their involvement into the associational life. In this paper, the linking social capital of voluntary organisations has been measured through their number and through several indicators capturing the degree of members’ involvement in the associational life, like the frequency of meetings, and the practice of carrying out unpaid work and volunteering activities in the field. Adopted variables are described in detail in Table A3. The first principal component obtained from the PCA explains about 67% of the variation of the data, and provides a synthetic indicator associated with a higher propensity to join meetings and funding associations and also, but weakly, with the propensity to carry out volunteering activities, as expressed by AIUTOVOL. This variable more powerfully loads on the second principal component. This suggests that civil society is a complex phenomenon with at least two major dimensions. The first one is shaped by people propensity to carry out light forms of participation, like joining meetings and giving money to associations. The second one is given by people propensity to carry out volunteering activities ‘on the field’, with the aim to give concrete help to disadvantaged people. As for the bridging dimension of social capital, the Italian regions’ ranking is led by Northern regions. Herein too the Southern regions lag the rankings.

5 Relating social capital to SMEs’ productivity in Italy

Indicators of the three types of social capital are then used, together with measures of labour productivity in SMEs and human development, to run a new exploratory analysis aimed to shed light on the correlation among the variables. Labour productivity is computed by the Istat (2001b, 2005) as the corporate added value per employee in SMEs (those with 1–99 employees). Human development has been considered in the analysis for two main reasons. Firstly, for its professed ability to improve labour productivity; it would be useful to treat this as a control variable. The argument is that, besides the income effect, human development may affect productivity through its ability to capture workers’ endowments of human capital and health (Deolalikar, 1988; Black and Lynch, 1996; Cörvers, 1997; Glick and Sahn, 1998; Anand and Sen, 2000; Ranis et al., 2000; Arora, 2001). Secondly, it allows a first, exploratory, evaluation of the role of social capital in economic development. The human development index has been adjusted according to our need to carry out a comparison between the Italian regions, and not between countries at different stages of the development process. The adult literacy rate has therefore been replaced by enrolment rate in high schools, while dimensional indexes representing per capita income and life expectancy at birth have been computed on the basis of adjusted minimum and target values (see Annexure B for further details). The correlation matrix is presented in Table 1.

Table 1 Correlation matrix

	<i>Bridging social capital</i>	<i>Linking social capital</i>	<i>Labour productivity</i>	<i>Human development</i>	<i>Bonding social capital</i>
Bridging social capital	1	–	–	–	–
Linking social capital	0.827	1	–	–	–
Labour productivity	0.641	0.662	1	–	–
Human development	0.689	0.398	0.546	1	–
Bonding social capital	–0.638	–0.480	–0.650	–0.830	1


From Table 2 we learn that bridging and linking social capital, labour productivity in SMEs and human development powerfully load on the first principal component, which is also associated with low levels of bonding social capital. The first factor therefore provides an interesting index of system competitiveness for the Italian regions. The second principal component represents, even if weakly, high levels of linking social capital. The analysis provides new evidence of the diverse correlations between different types of social capital, on the one hand, and various economic outcomes, on the other. The presence of bonding social capital is associated with lower levels of human development and labour productivity, while bridging and linking social capital exhibit a strong positive correlation with such economic outcomes.

Table 2 Loading of variables on the first three axes

<i>Label variable</i>	<i>Axis 1</i>	<i>Axis 2</i>	<i>Axis 3</i>
Human development	0.82	–0.49	0.17
Bonding social capital	–0.86	0.41	0.08
Bridging social capital	0.90	0.21	0.31
Linking social capital	0.80	0.56	0.11
Labour productivity	0.83	0.15	–0.52

The correlation circle (Figure 1) highlights the negative and significant correlation between bonding social capital and human development, and a positive and significant correlation between the other two types of social capital and labour productivity.

Simplifying, the correlation circle shows a projection of the initial variables in the factors space. When two variables are far from the centre, then they are significantly positively correlated if they are close to each other, and not correlated if they are orthogonal. If they are on the opposite side of the centre, then they are significantly negatively correlated. When the variables are close to the centre, it means that some information is carried on other axes and that any interpretation might be hazardous.

Figure 1 Correlation circle resulting from the PCA on social capital, labour productivity and human development

6 Beyond correlation: a structural equations analysis

Relationships connecting considered variables are then investigated by means of a SEM. A SEM is “A stochastic model where each equation represents a causal linkage, rather than a simple empirical association” (Goldberger, 1972, p.979). SEMs are composed by regression equations, which are included in the model only so far as it is possible to interpret them as causal relationships, theoretically justifiable and not falsified by data. The use of structural models instead of regression models implies a complete revision of the parameters’ estimation mechanism. In the regression model, parameters can be estimated through the Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) method. In a model including two or more structural equations, where the same variables are independent within an equation and dependent in all the others, the estimation process is remarkably more complicated. Instead of equations estimates, we have to compute ‘system estimates’. Another peculiarity of SEMs is the possibility to account for other parameters in addition to structural β linking endogenous and exogenous variables. More in particular, it is possible to account for variances and covariances among errors e . A careful specification of the matrix Ψ of covariances among errors ζ allows us to account for variables which, although not explicitly considered within the model, may play a role in the real scenario described by observed data. When a model is perfectly specified, i.e., when it includes all

the variables effectively interacting in the real world, and correctly accounts for their dynamics, then each equation's stochastic error component is just a negligible detail. However, generally, this component includes all those factors that in the real world impact the model's dependent variable, but that we have not accounted for in the model's design because they are unknown or not measurable. If one of these unknown variables affects two of the model's endogenous variables at the same time, for example, bridging social capital and human development, and if we do not explicitly consider this possibility within the model, then the empirical investigation will necessarily find a spurious correlation between bridging social capital and human development, which could be without any true relationship in the real world. On the contrary, if we explicitly consider a correlation between the errors respectively related to social capital and human development, then the effect of the unknown variable will be included in the model, thereby reducing the probability to find misleading and spurious correlations (Goldberger, 1972; Jöreskog and Sörbom, 1979; Bollen, 1989).

Let ξ_1 be bonding social capital, η_1 , bridging social capital, η_2 linking social capital, η_3 labour productivity in SMEs, and η_4 the adjusted human development index. β_{ij} are the coefficients of the relationships between endogenous variables, and γ_{ij} define the relationships between endogenous and exogenous variables. In each equation, the first parameter's deponent refers to the dependent variable, and the second to the independent variable. In order to avoid indetermination problems connected with negative numbers of degrees of freedom, reciprocal influences among variables have not been tested all together in the same model, but have been distributed to different sets of structural equations.

In the model with the best goodness of fit, bridging social capital is influenced by human development:

$$\eta_1 = \beta_{14}\eta_4 + \zeta_1. \quad (2)$$

Linking social capital is influenced by bonding social capital:

$$\eta_2 = \gamma_{21}\xi_1 + \zeta_2. \quad (3)$$

Labour productivity is affected by the three types of social capital:

$$\eta_3 = \beta_{31}\eta_1 + \beta_{32}\eta_2 + \gamma_{31}\xi_1 + \zeta_3. \quad (4)$$

Adjusted human development is affected by the three types of social capital:

$$\eta_4 = \beta_{41}\eta_1 + \beta_{42}\eta_2 + \gamma_{41}\xi_1 + \zeta_4. \quad (5)$$

Errors ζ_1 and ζ_2 are correlated. This assumption aims to synthesise the action exerted on dependent variables η_1 and η_2 by all the other (potentially infinite) variables neglected by the model. This implies the need to estimate, besides parameters β and γ , also covariances ψ between errors. In fact, if the same independent variable has been omitted both, for instance, for η_1 and η_2 , then the corresponding errors ζ_1 and ζ_2 will be correlated, and we have to pose the hypothesis that the covariance between errors, ψ_{21} , is different from zero and has to be estimated.


Other assumptions, carried out to achieve simplicity, are as follows: independent variables and errors are not correlated in the same equation: $E(\xi\xi') = 0$; structural equations are not redundant; this condition means that η -equations are independent

between them, and each endogenous variable η cannot be a linear combination of the others; finally, we have supposed that all variables have been measured without errors, therefore there is a perfect identity between latent and observed variables. This allows us to omit the measurement models for endogenous and exogenous variables and to focus exclusively on the SEM and on the explanation of the causal relationships linking variables. Combining equations (2)–(4) with the errors’ covariances matrix, Ψ , the specification of the model is as follows:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \eta_1 \\ \eta_2 \\ \eta_3 \\ \eta_4 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \beta_{14} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \beta_{32} & 0 & 0 \\ \beta_{41} & \beta_{42} & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \eta_1 \\ \eta_2 \\ \eta_3 \\ \eta_4 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \gamma_{21} \\ \gamma_{31} \\ \gamma_{41} \end{bmatrix} \cdot [\zeta_1] + \begin{bmatrix} \zeta_1 \\ \zeta_2 \\ \zeta_3 \\ \zeta_4 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & & \\ & \psi_{21} & & \\ & 0 & 1 & \\ & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (6)$$

Figure 2 provides a graphic representation of model (6). The graphic representation of SEMs follows the path analysis symbology. It reports the variables, their errors and the linkages connecting variables. Such connections are represented both graphically, by arrows, and numerically, by regression coefficients. In the use of Linear Structural Relationships (LISREL), graphic representation is based on the following criteria: latent variables are inscribed in an ellipse, while observed variables in a rectangle. In the models presented in this chapter, all variables are inscribed in ellipses, due to the hypothesis that variables have been measured without errors. The causal nexus between two variables is represented by a straight arrow moving from the independent variable to the dependent variable. The association (covariation or correlation) between two variables is represented by a bidirectional curved arrow connecting them. The absence of arrows means the absence of linkages between variables.

Figure 2 Graphic representation of model (6)



The model has five degrees of freedom and exhibits a satisfactory goodness of fit. Measures of the model's ability to fit data are in fact a function of the residual, i.e., the difference between the empirical variance-covariance matrix and the model-created variance-covariance matrix. It is possible to show (Bonnet and Bentler, 1983), that, if the model is correct, the fitting statistic follows a χ^2 with df degrees of freedom, where

$$df = \frac{1}{2}(p+q)(p+q+1) - t,$$

p is the number of endogenous variables, q is the number of exogenous variables, and t is the number of estimated parameters. In order to evaluate the goodness of fit, the residual function for the model must be compared with critical values reported in χ^2 distribution tables with a probability $P = 0.100$. Since the value for this model is significantly lower than the critical value for a χ^2 with five degrees of freedom ($\chi^2 = 5.39 < 9.25$), we can state that the difference between the two variance-covariance matrixes is stochastic in nature, and is not due to the inappropriateness of the theoretical model. All the other goodness of fit indexes exhibit satisfactory values (see Annexure C for further details).

The empirical analysis shows that different types of social capital exert diverse effects on labour productivity in SMEs. Bonding social capital negatively affects productivity, while bridging social capital seems to be quite irrelevant, thereby contradicting the idea that, in Italy, informal social networks of friends can constitute a channel fostering the diffusion of information and knowledge benefiting workers' problem solving ability. On the contrary, linking social capital exerts a positive influence both on labour productivity and on human development. Moreover, the effect of social capital's various dimensions on human development proves to be different: strong ties connecting relatives and friends seem to hamper development, differently from the linking social capital of voluntary organisations, which instead exerts a positive effect. Parameters estimates are presented in Table 3.

Table 3 Maximum likelihood estimates of parameters β and γ of the model (6)

Variables η and ξ		Bridging social capital	Linking social capital	Labour productivity	Human development	Bonding social capital
Bridging social capital	η_1				0.92 (0.19) 4.94	
Linking social capital	η_2					-0.59 (0.18) -3.31
Labour productivity	η_3	-0.04 (0.46)	0.48 (0.42)			-0.45 (0.30)
		-0.09	1.14			-1.46
Human development	η_4	-1.18 (0.36)	0.79 (0.36)			-1.20 (0.29)
		-3.25	2.19			-4.09

The positive developmental effect of linking social capital seems to confirm Putnam's (1993) claims on the role of voluntary organisations, therefore contradicting part of the economics and political science literature in the field. According to Putnam et al. (1993), associations function as "schools of democracy", in which cooperative values and trust are easily socialised. The claim is that in areas with stronger, dense, horizontal, and more cross-cutting networks, there is a spillover from membership in organisations to the cooperative values and norms that citizens develop. In areas where networks with such characteristics do not develop, there are fewer opportunities to learn civic virtues and democratic attitudes, resulting in lack of trust.

According to a prominent school of sociological thought, the determinant of workers' effort is the "norm of the work group" (Mayo, 1949). This approach has been modelled by Akerlof (1982), who states that, above a certain minimum effort, the workers' performance is freely determined. According to the author: "The norm ... for the proper work effort is quite like the norm that determines the standards for gift giving at Christmas" (Akerlof, 1982, p.549), in the sense that it is determined by shared values and social norms. A social environment rich of linking social capital and participation opportunities, allowing people to meet frequently, is a fertile ground for nurturing shared values and social norms of trust and reciprocity, that may exert positive spill-over effects on the behaviour of workers, making them more motivated and less inclined to develop shirking attitudes.

The empirical analysis in this paper is thus the umpteenth confirmation of the multidimensional, dynamic and context-dependent nature of social capital. As argued by Coleman

"Social capital is defined by its function ... Like physical capital and human capital, social capital is not completely fungible, but may be specific to certain activities. A given form of social capital that is valuable in facilitating certain actions may be useless or even harmful for others." (Coleman, 1988, p.98)

On the other side, models in this section and in Section 8 suggest that weak ties connecting friends and acquaintances may join to strong family ties in determining the perverse developmental effects that Banfield (1958), just referring to the Italian context, ascribed to the 'amoral familism'. More in particular, the models suggest that, in the Italian regions, informal social networks may configure themselves as forms of 'amoral friendships', hampering development as well as the bonding social capital of strong family ties. Another interesting hint provided by the empirical analysis is the ability of human development to foster relational goods' consumption, thus leading to the creation of bridging social capital.

7 Model's refinement

A slight refinement provides a test for the analysis' reliability and improves the model's goodness of fit. Omitting the consideration of the influence exerted by bridging social capital on labour productivity – which, according to the previous model, is quite irrelevant – significantly increases the probability that the difference between the empirical variance-covariance matrix and the model-created variance-covariance matrix is stochastic in nature, and is not due to the inappropriateness of the theoretical model. The new chi-square is significantly lower than the critical value for a χ^2 with six degrees of freedom: $5.39 < 10.64$, and the new formulation of the model is as follows:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \eta_1 \\ \eta_2 \\ \eta_3 \\ \eta_4 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \beta_{14} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \beta_{32} & 0 & 0 \\ \beta_{41} & \beta_{42} & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \eta_1 \\ \eta_2 \\ \eta_3 \\ \eta_4 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \gamma_{21} \\ \gamma_{31} \\ \gamma_{41} \end{bmatrix} \cdot [\xi_1] + \begin{bmatrix} \zeta_1 \\ \zeta_2 \\ \zeta_3 \\ \zeta_4 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & & \\ \psi_{21} & 1 & & \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (7)$$

All the other goodness of fit measures are reported in Annexure C. Parameters estimates are reported in Table 4 and are quite identical to those presented in the previous paragraph.

Table 4 Maximum likelihood estimates of parameters β and γ of the model (7)

Variables η and ξ		Bridging social capital	Linking social capital	Labour productivity	Human development	Bonding social capital
Bridging social capital	η_1				0.92 (0.19) 4.94	
Linking social capital	η_2					-0.59 (0.18) -3.31
Labour productivity	η_3		0.45 (0.24) 1.93			-0.43 (0.27) -1.58
Human development	η_4	-1.18 (0.36) -3.25	0.79 (0.36) 2.19			-1.20 (0.29) -4.09

It is noteworthy that, in both the models, the negative influence of bonding social capital on labour productivity and human development must be taken with a certain caution: strong family ties could be considered as an indispensable asset for the production of some dimensions of well-being that we are still not able to measure, and that economists usually neglect within their analyses.

8 Social capital vs. physical capital: a first exploratory analysis

All relationships found in the previous section are confirmed if controlling for physical capital. The analysis in this section is intended to be a mere exploration, since it suffers from the considerable shortcoming that data on total gross capital stock are available only for the period 1974–1994 and do not account for firms size, while the other data on social capital and well-being generally refer to 2001–2002. The capital-labour indicator is built drawing on CRENoS² data as the ratio:

$$K/L = \frac{K_{AG} + K_I + K_{MS} + K_{NMS}}{L_{AG} + L_I + L_{MS} + L_{NMS}} \quad (8)$$

where K_{AG} , K_I , K_{MS} and K_{NMS} are the total gross capital stock respectively used in agriculture, industry, market services and non-market services, while L_{AG} , L_I , L_{MS} and L_{NMS} are the units of labour employed in the same sectors.

In order to carry out a more specific assessment of the role that different social capital dimensions play in the economic performance, this section adopts also an index of per capita income in spite of the adjusted human development index. The new index has been computed as:

$$\text{index} = \frac{\text{effective value} - \text{minimum value}}{\text{target value} - \text{minimum value}}$$

where the minimum value is 5.000 € and the target value = 40.000 €. The index can thus be expressed as follows:

$$\text{Income} = \frac{\log(\text{effective value}) - \log(5.000)}{\log(40.000) - \log(5.000)}.$$

Let ξ_1 be bonding social capital, ξ_2 the K/L ratio, η_1 , bridging social capital, η_2 linking social capital, η_3 labour productivity in SMEs, and η_4 per capita income.

In the model with the best goodness of fit, bridging social capital is influenced by income:

$$\eta_1 = \beta_{14} \eta_4 + \zeta_1. \quad (9)$$

Linking social capital is influenced by bonding social capital:

$$\eta_2 = \gamma_{21} \xi_1 + \zeta_2. \quad (10)$$

Labour productivity is affected by the three types of social capital and by physical capital:

$$\eta_3 = \beta_{31} \eta_1 + \beta_{32} \eta_2 + \gamma_{31} \xi_1 + \gamma_{32} \xi_2 + \zeta_3. \quad (11)$$

Income is affected by the three types of social capital and by physical capital:


$$\eta_4 = \beta_{41} \eta_1 + \beta_{42} \eta_2 + \gamma_{41} \xi_1 + \gamma_{42} \xi_2 + \zeta_4. \quad (12)$$

Errors ζ_1 and ζ_2 , and ζ_1 and ζ_2 are correlated. Combining equations (9)–(12) with the errors' covariances matrix, Ψ , the specification of the model is as follows:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \eta_1 \\ \eta_2 \\ \eta_3 \\ \eta_4 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \beta_{14} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \beta_{32} & 0 & 0 \\ \beta_{41} & \beta_{42} & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \eta_1 \\ \eta_2 \\ \eta_3 \\ \eta_4 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \gamma_{21} & 0 \\ \gamma_{31} & \gamma_{32} \\ \gamma_{41} & \gamma_{42} \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \xi_1 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \zeta_1 \\ \zeta_2 \\ \zeta_3 \\ \zeta_4 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & & \\ \psi_{21} & 1 & & \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \\ 0 & 0 & \psi_{43} & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (13)$$

Figure 3 provides a graphic representation of the model:

Figure 3 Graphic representation of model (13)



The analysis confirms that different social capital’s dimensions exert diverse effects on labour productivity and the economic performance. Bonding and bridging social capital exert a negative influence, differently from linking social capital. Parameters’ estimates are presented in Table 6.

Table 6 Maximum likelihood estimates of parameters β and γ of the model (13)

Variables η and ξ	Bridging social capital	Linking social capital	Labour productivity	Per capita income	Bonding social capital	K/L ratio
Bridging social capital				1.07 (0.24)		
Linking social capital				4.52	-0.69 (0.22)	
Labour productivity	-1.55 (0.43)	1.49 (0.41)			-0.89 (0.34)	0.08 (0.27)
Per capita income	-3.64 (0.39)	3.62 (0.39)			-2.62 (0.34)	0.28 (0.27)
	-3.91	3.28			-3.35	0.95

8 Concluding remarks

Overall, the empirical evidence in this paper shows that different dimensions of social capital produce diverse economic outcomes. Bonding social capital shaped by strong family ties and the bridging social capital of strong and weak ties connecting friends and acquaintances exert a negative effect on labour productivity, the economic performance and human development. On the contrary, linking social capital of voluntary organisations positively influences such outcomes. The positive developmental effect of linking social capital sounds as a proof of Putnam's theses on the role of voluntary organisations, therefore contradicting part of the economics and political science literature in the field. According to Putnam et al. (1993), associations function as "schools of democracy", in which cooperative values and trust are easily socialised. The claim is that in areas with stronger, dense, horizontal, and more cross-cutting networks, there is a spillover from membership in organisations to the cooperative values and norms that citizens develop. In areas where networks with such characteristics do not develop, there are fewer opportunities to learn civic virtues and democratic attitudes, resulting in a lack of trust. A social environment rich of participation opportunities, allowing people to meet frequently, is a fertile ground for nurturing shared values and social norms of trust and reciprocity. Where such values and norms develop, the likelihood of cooperative behaviours is higher, and workers may be more motivated and not inclined to shirking behaviours.

This study is a new confirmation of the multidimensional, dynamic and context-dependent nature of social capital. An additional finding here is that weak ties connecting friends and acquaintances seem to join strong family ties in determining perverse impact on development, the latter having been termed by Banfield (1958), referring to the Italian context, as 'amoral familism'. The models in this paper suggest that, in the Italian regions, informal social networks may configure themselves as forms of 'amoral friendships', hampering development just as bonding social capital of strong family ties seem to do.

Acknowledgements

I am deeply indebted to Claudio Gnesutta, Benedetto Gui, Eric M. Uslander and three anonymous referees for their accurate and helpful comments on a previous version of this paper. I wish to thank Massimo Giannini and Enrico Marchetti for precious methodological hints. I am grateful to Daniele Lamotta Genovese for enlightening me on Edison's workforce management strategies. Elisabetta Basile, Cherylynn Bassani, Claudio Cecchi, Roberta De Santis and Robert Leonardi provided helpful notes and suggestions. Needless to say, all views and errors are mine.

References

- Akerlof, G. (1982) 'Labor contracts as partial gift exchange', *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 97, No. 4, pp.543–569.
- Almond, G. and Verba, S. (1963) *The Civic Culture*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Anand, S. and Sen, A. (2000) 'The income component of the human development index', *Journal of Human Development*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp.83–106.
- Antoci, A., Sacco, P.L. and Vanin, P. (2002) 'On the possible conflict between economic growth and social development', in Gui, B. and Sugden, R. (Eds.): *Economics and Social Interaction: Accounting for Interpersonal Relations*, Cambridge University Press.
- Arora, S. (2001) 'Health, human productivity and long-term economic growth', *Journal of Economic History*, Vol. 61, No. 3, pp.699–749.
- Banfield, E. (1958) *The Moral Basis of a Backward Society*, Free Press, New York.
- Becker, G. (1975) *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis with Special Reference to Education*, Columbia University Press, New York.
- Black, S.E. and Lynch, L.M. (1996) 'Human-capital investments and productivity', *American Economic Review*, Vol. 86, No. 2, pp.263–267.
- Bollen, K. (1989) *Structural Equations with Latent Variables*, Wiley, New York.
- Bonnet, D.G. and Bentler, P.M. (1983) 'Goodness-of-fit procedures for the evaluation and selection of log-linear models', *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 93, pp.149–166.
- Bourdieu, P. (1980) 'Le capital social', *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales*, Vol. 31, pp.2, 3.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986) 'The forms of capital', in Richardson, J.G. (Ed.): *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, Greenwood Press, New York, pp.241–258.
- Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L. (1992) *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*, Polity, Cambridge.
- Bowles, S. and Gintis, H. (2002) 'Social capital and community governance', *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 112, No. 483, p.419.
- Brehm, J. and Rahn, W. (1997) 'Individual-level evidence for the causes and consequences of social capital', *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 41, No. 3, pp.999–1023.
- Carpenter, J. and Seki, E. (2005) *Do Social Preferences Increase Productivity? Field Experimental Evidence from Fishermen in Toyama Bay*, IZA Discussion Paper No. 1697, Institute for the Study of Labour, Bonn, Germany.
- Coleman, J. (1988) 'Social capital in the creation of human capital', *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 94, pp.S95–S120.
- Coleman, J. (1990) *Foundations of Social Theory*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Cörvers, F. (1997) 'The impact of human capital on labour productivity in manufacturing sectors of the European union', *Applied Economics*, Vol. 29, pp.975–987.
- Deolalikar, A.B. (1988) 'Nutrition and labor productivity in agriculture: estimates for rural South India', *Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 70, No. 3, pp.406–413.
- Durlauf, S.N. (1999) 'The case against social capital', *Focus*, Vol. 20, No. 3, pp.1–4.
- Durlauf, S.N. (2002) 'On the empirics of social capital', *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 112, No. 483, pp.459–479.
- Fine, B. (2001) 'Social capital versus social theory', *Political Economy and Social Science at the Turn of the Millennium*, Routledge, London and New York.
- Florida, P. (1995) 'Towards the learning region', *Futures*, Vol. 27, No. 5, pp.527–536.
- Foley, M.W. and Edwards, B. (1999) 'Is it time to disinvest in social capital?', *Journal of Public Policy*, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp.199–231.
- Glick, P. and Sahn, D.E. (1998) 'Health and productivity in a heterogeneous urban labour market', *Applied Economics*, Vol. 30, No. 2, pp.203–216.

- Goldberger, A.S. (1972) 'Structural equations models in the social sciences', *Econometrica*, Vol. 40, pp.979–1001.
- Granovetter, M. (1973) 'The strength of weak ties', *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 78, pp.1360–1380.
- Granovetter, M. (1985) 'Economic action and social structure: the problem of embeddedness', *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 91, pp.481–510.
- Gui, B. (2000) 'Beyond transactions: on the interpersonal dimension of economic reality', *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, Vol. 71, No. 2, p.139.
- Heckman, J.J. (2000) 'Causal parameters and policy analysis in economics: a twentieth century retrospective', *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 115, No. 1, pp.45–97.
- Hooghe, M. (2003) 'Participation in voluntary associations and value indicators', *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, Vol. 32, No. 1, pp.47–69.
- Huck, S., Kübler, D. and Weibull, J. (2001) *Social Norms and Optimal Incentives in Firms*, Stockholm School of Economics, Working Paper Series in Economics and Finance, No. 466.
- Istat (2000) *I Cittadini e l'ambiente. Indagine Multiscopo Sulle Famiglie 'Aspetti della vita Quotidiana'*, Anno 1998, Istat, Rome.
- Istat (2001a) *Parentela e reti di Solidarietà. Indagine Multiscopo sulle Famiglie 'Famiglia, Soggetti Sociali e Condizioni dell'infanzia'*, Anno 1998, Istat, Rome.
- Istat (2001b) *Indicatori Regionali per la Valutazione delle Politiche di Sviluppo*, Istat, Rome.
- Istat (2002a) *I Cittadini e le Tecnologie della Comunicazione. Indagine Multiscopo sulle Famiglie 'I Cittadini e il Tempo Libero'*, Anno 2000, Istat, Rome.
- Istat (2002b) *Le Attività del Tempo Libero. Indagine Multiscopo sulle Famiglie 'I Cittadini e il Tempo Libero'*, Anno 2000, Istat, Rome.
- Istat (2002c) *Lettura e Linguaggio. Indagine Multiscopo sulle Famiglie 'I Cittadini e il Tempo Libero'*, Anno 2000, Istat, Rome.
- Istat (2002d) *L'offerta di Servizi Sportivi in Italia*, Istat, Rome.
- Istat (2003) *Famiglia, Abitazione e Zona in Cui si Vive. Indagine Multiscopo Sulle Famiglie 'Aspetti della vita Quotidiana'*, Anno 2002, Istat, Rome.
- Istat (2004a) *Cultura, Socialità e Tempo Libero. Indagine Multiscopo sulle Famiglie 'Aspetti della vita Quotidiana'*, Anno 2002, Istat, Rome.
- Istat (2004b) *Le Organizzazioni di Volontariato in Italia*, Anno 2001, Istat, Rome.
- Istat (2005) *Indicatori di Contesto Chiave Regionali QCS 2000-06*, Roma, Istat, Novembre, Disponibile online all'indirizzo, http://www.istat.it/dati/db_siti/contesto/.
- Johnson, R.A. and Wichern, D.W. (1992) *Applied Multivariate Statistical Analysis*, Prentice-Hall, New York.
- Jöreskog, K.G. and Sörbom, D. (1979) *Advances in Factor Analysis and Structural Equation Models*, Abt Books, Cambridge, Ma.
- Kandel, E. and Lazear, E.P. (1992) 'Peer pressure and partnerships', *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 100, No. 4, pp.801–817.
- Lebart, L., Morineau, A. and Warwick, K.M. (1984) *Multivariate Descriptive Statistical Analysis. Correspondence Analysis and Related Techniques for Large Matrices*, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- March, J.G. and Simon, H.A. (1958) *Organizations*, Wiley, New York.
- Mayo, E. (1949) *The Social Problem of an Industrial Civilization*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.
- Minkler, L. (2003) *Managing Moral Motivations*, Department of Economics, Working Paper Series, University of Connecticut, Working Paper No. 2003-06, Storrs, CT.
- Mutz, D. (2002) 'Cross-cutting social networks: testing democratic theory in practice', *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 96, No. 1, pp.111–126.

- Osterloh, M. and Frey, B.S. (2000) 'Motivation, knowledge transfer, and organizational forms', *Organization Science*, Vol. 11, No. 5, pp.538–550.
- Popielarz, P.A. (1999) '(In)voluntary association: a multilevel analysis of gender segregation in voluntary associations', *Gender and Society*, Vol. 13, No. 2, pp.234–250.
- Portes, A. (1998) 'Social capital: its origins and applications in modern sociology', *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 24, pp.1–24.
- Putnam, R.D. (1995a) 'Bowling alone: America's declining social capital', *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. VI, pp.65–78.
- Putnam, R.D. (1995b) 'Tuning in, tuning out: the strange disappearance of social capital in America', *PS: Political Science and Politics*, Vol. XXVIII, pp.664–683.
- Putnam, R.D., Leonardi, R. and Nanetti, R.Y. (1993) *Making Democracy Work*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Ranis, G., Stewart, F. and Ramirez, A. (2000) 'Economic growth and human development', *World Development*, Vol. 28, No. 2, pp.197–219.
- Rees, D.I., Zax, J.S. and Heries, J. (2003) 'Interdependence in worker productivity', *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, Vol. 18, No. 5, pp.585–604.
- Sabatini, F. (2005b) *Social Capital as Social Networks. A New Framework for Measurement*, Department of Public Economics, University of Rome La Sapienza, Working Paper No. 83.
- Seligson, A.L. (1999) 'Civic association and democratic participation in Central America', *Comparative Political Studies*, No. 32, pp.342–362.
- Solow, R.M. (1995) 'But verify', *The New Republic*, September 11, pp.36–39.
- Stolle, D. and Rochon, T.R. (1998) 'Are all associations alike? Member diversity, associational type, and the creation of social capital', *American Behavioural Scientist*, No. 42, pp.47–65.
- Stone, W. (2001) *Measuring Social Capital*, Australian Institute of Family Studies, Research Paper No. 24.
- Uslaner, E.M. (2002) *The Moral Foundations of Trust*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Bibliography

- Carley, K.M. (1986) 'An approach for relating social structure to cognitive structure', *The Journal of Mathematical Sociology*, Vol. 12, pp.137–189.
- Golden, M.A. (2003) 'Electoral connections: the effects of the personal vote on political patronage, bureaucracy and legislation in Postwar Italy', *British Journal of Political Science*, No. 33, pp.189–212.
- Greve, A. and Salaff, J. (2001) 'The development of corporate social capital in complex innovation processes', in Gabbay, S.M. and Leenders, R.T. (Eds.): *Research in the Sociology of Organizations: Social Capital of Organizations*, JAI Press, Amsterdam.
- Mutti, A. (2000) 'Particularism and the modernization process in Southern Italy', *International Sociology*, Vol. 15, No. 4, pp.579–590.
- Osterloh, M., Frey, B.S. and Frost, J. (2001) 'Managing motivation, organization and governance', *Journal of Management and Governance*, Vol. 5, Nos. 3–4, pp.231–239.
- Sabatini, F. (2005a) 'Resources for the study of social capital', *The Journal of Economic Education*, Vol. 36, No. 2, Spring, p.198.
- Walston, J. (1988) *The Mafia and Clientelism: Roads to Rome in Post-war Calabria*, Routledge, London and New York.

Notes

¹For a in-depth explanation of the adopted measurement method and of its results, see Sabatini (2005b).

²CRENoS (*Centro Ricerche Economiche Nord Sud*, Centre for North South Economic Research) is a section of the inter-universities consortium CIREM, Center on Economic and Mobility Research, in collaboration with CRiMM (Center for Research on Mobility Models, University of Cagliari), and with DiESiL (Center for the Local Systems Economic Dynamics, University of Sassari).

Annexure A: Basic variables for the measurement of social capital**Table A1** Indicators of family social capital

<i>Label</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>St. dev.</i>
CONTPAR	People aged 14 and more particularly caring relatives other than parents, children, grandparents and grandchildren, or counting on them in case of need, for every 100 people of the same area	1998	Istat (2001)	3.905	1.037
COPFIG	Couples with children, for every 100 families of the same area	2001–2002	Istat (2003)	18.470	4.861
COPNOFIG	Couples without children, for every 100 families of the same area	2001–2002	Istat (2003)	71.500	5.424
FAM5COMP	Families with 5 components and more for every 100 families of the same area	2001–2002	Istat (2003)	10.990	3.995
FAMSINGL	Singles-families for every 100 families of the same area	2001–2002	Istat (2003)	72.790	5.022
FIG16KM	People aged 15 and more with children living 16 kilometres away or more (in Italy or abroad) for every 100 families with children of the same area	1998	Istat (2001)	10.225	3.958
FIG1KM	People aged 15 and more with children living within 1 kilometre (cohabitants or not) for every 100 families with children of the same area	1998	Istat (2001)	86.245	3.594
FRATELTG	People meeting their brothers and/or sisters everyday for every 100 people with brothers and/or sisters of the same area	1998	Istat (2001)	6.955	3.199
GIOBAM2S	People aged 6 and more playing with children once a week or more for every 100 people of the same area	2000	Istat (2002b)	32.11	2.33
INCPARTG	People aged 6 and more meeting family members or other relatives everyday for every 100 people of the same area	2000	Istat (2002b)	59.735	5.448

Table A1 Indicators of family social capital (continued)

<i>Label</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>St. dev.</i>
MUM16KM	People up to 69 having their mother living 16 kilometres away or more (in Italy or abroad) for every 100 people with an alive mother of the same area	1998	Istat (2001)	28.595	5.408
MUM1KM	People up to 69 having their mother living within 1 kilometre (cohabitant or not) for every 100 people with an alive mother of the same area	1998	Istat (2001)	46.055	9.139
NOGIOBAM	People aged 6 and more never playing with children for every 100 people of the same area	2000	Istat (2002b)	36.22	4.19
NOINCPA	People aged 6 and more never meeting their family members and other non cohabitant relatives for every 100 people of the same area	2000	Istat (2000b)	10.790	4.937
NOPARENT	People aged 6 and more having neither a family nor other non cohabitant relatives for every 100 people of the same area	2000	Istat (2000b)	23.075	4.900
SODDPAR	People aged 14 and more declaring themselves satisfied of relationships with their relatives for every 100 people of the same area	2002	Istat (2004a)	36.27	6.34
VFIGTG	People meeting their children everyday for every 100 people with non cohabitant children of the same area	1998	Istat (2001)	43.245	4.176
VMUMTG	People meeting their mother everyday for every 100 people with non cohabitant mother of the same area	1998	Istat (2001)	17.075	3.253

Table A2 Indicators of the informal networks of friends and neighbours

<i>Label</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>St. dev.</i>
ASSPORT	Non profit sport clubs for every 10,000 people of the same area	2002	Istat (2002d)	11.440	4.829
BAR2S	People aged 6 and more attending bars, pubs, and circles at least once a week for every 100 people of the same area	2000	Istat (2002b)	21.500	4.076
CENAF2S	People aged 6 and more having dinner outside more than once a week for every 100 people of the same area	2000	Istat (2002b)	5.045	1.198
INCAMI2S	People aged 6 and more meeting friends more than once a week for every 100 people of the same area	2002	Istat (2004)	28.735	1.485
MUBAR	People aged 14 and more attending pubs and bars to listen to music concerts for every 100 people of the same area	2000	Istat (2002b)	18.620	2.411
NOBAR	People aged 6 and more never attending bars, pubs and circles for every 100 people of the same area	2000	Istat (2002b)	47.865	6.513

Table A2 Indicators of the informal networks of friends and neighbours (continued)

<i>Label</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>St. dev.</i>
NOCENF	People aged 6 and more never having dinner outside for every 100 people of the same area	2000	Istat (2002b)	17.265	4.954
NOPARLCO	People aged 6 and more never talking with others for every 100 people of the same area	2000	Istat (2002b)	8.510	1.269
NOPARVIC	People aged 6 and more never talking with neighbours for every 100 people of the same area	2000	Istat (2002b)	25.585	3.314
PARCON2S	People aged 6 and more talking with others once a week or more for every 100 people of the same area	2000	Istat (2002b)	46.965	6.074
PARVIC2S	People aged 6 and more talking with neighbours once a week or more for every 100 people of the same area	2000	Istat (2002b)	22.940	3.328

Table A3 Indicators of social capital as voluntary organisations

<i>Name</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>St. dev.</i>
AIUTOVOL	People aged 14 and more who have helped strangers in the context of a voluntary organisation's activity, for every 100 people of the same area	1998	Istat (2001)	5.080	1.407
AMIVOL	People aged 6 and more who, when meeting friends, carry out voluntary activities for every 100 people meeting friends of the same area	2002	Istat (2004a)	3.920	1.287
ORGANIZ	Voluntary organisations for every 10.000 people	2001	Istat (2004b)	4.195	3.284
RIUASCU	People aged 14 and more who have joined meetings in cultural circles and similar ones at least once a year for every 100 people of the same area	2002	Istat (2004)	8.485	3.862
RIUASEC	People aged 14 and more who have joined meetings in ecological associations and similar ones at least once a year for every 100 people of the same area	2002	Istat (2004)	1.755	0.458
SOLDASS	People aged 14 and more who have given money to an association at least once a year for every 100 people of the same area	2002	Istat (2004)	15.635	6.250

Annexure B: The Adjusted Human Development Index (AHDI) for Italy

The AHDI is the simple average of three indexes representing income, schooling and health. Schooling is represented by the enrolment rate in high schools of the population aged 14–18. Dimensional indexes regarding income and life expectancy at birth are represented by the ratio:

$$\text{index} = \frac{\text{effective value} - \text{minimum value}}{\text{target value} - \text{minimum value}}$$

Life expectancy at birth is estimated adopting 50 and 85 years as minimum and target values, while the income index adopts log 5.000 as the minimum value and log 40.000 as the target.

Annexure C: Models' goodness of fit measures

The model (6) has five degrees of freedom and $\chi^2 = 5.39 < 9.25$: the model is not falsified by data.

The Goodness of Fit Index (GFI):

$$\text{GFI} = 1 - \frac{T}{\max(T_i)}$$

is equal to 0.85. This means good fit.

The Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI) takes into account also the model's number of degrees of freedom, i.e., its parsimoniousness:

$$\text{AGFI} = 1 - \left(\frac{k}{df} \right) (1 - \text{GFI})$$

where df are degrees of freedom, and k is the number of variances-covariances in input; k is given by:

$$k = \frac{1}{2}(p+q)(p+q+1).$$

The AGFI of model (6) is equal to 0.54, indicating perfect fit.

The Root Mean squared Residuals (RMR) is:

$$\text{RMR} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{k} \sum (s_{ij} - \sigma_{ij})^2}$$

is equal to 0.26.

Model (7) has six degrees of freedom and $\chi^2 = 5.39 < 10.64$: the model is not falsified by data.

GFI for model (7) is equal to 0.85, RMR = 0.26 and AGFI = 0.62.

Model (8) has six degrees of freedom and $\chi^2 = 6.74 < 9.25$: the model is not falsified by data.

GFI for model (8) is equal to 0.87, AGFI = 0.55, and RMR = 0.22.