

# Indicator Problem in Measuring Social Capital: the Relationship between Human Capital Indicators and Social Capital

Ali Erbasi

Department of Management and Organization, Social Sciences Vocational School, Selcuk University, Konya, Turkey  
Email: aerbasi@selcuk.edu.tr

**Abstract**—The purpose of the present study is examining the relationship between human capital indicators and social capital in reference to indicator problem in measuring social capital. For this purpose, the relationships between some human capital indicators and social capital index values in districts of Konya and Karaman provinces, which were defined as TR52 NUTS 2 Region according to Turkish Statistical Institute, Classification of Regional Units. Since all 31 districts of Konya, and 6 districts of Karaman were involved in the present study, no universe-sample distinctions were made. Data obtained from 37 districts were tested on SPSS 19.0 software package in accordance with the research hypotheses. Pearson Correlation Analysis was used to test the hypotheses. Research findings revealed that, there were statistically significant correlations between highly trained population rate, proportion of dropping out of school to total population, and literacy rate indicators and social capital. No statistically significant correlations were detected between the number of doctors per thousand and social capital. The findings obtained in the present research provide local administrators in the region and academicians studying in the field of intangible capital with important results.

**Index Terms**—social capital, human capital, indicator

## I. INTRODUCTION

Literature presents various opinions on the components of intellectual capital. Some sources suggest that intellectual capital consists of human capital, organizational capital, and relational capital components (e.g. [1]), while some others claim that these components are human capital, organizational capital, and customer capital (e.g. [2]). Some sources classify intellectual capital as human capital, organizational capital and social capital (e.g. [3]), and some sources classify it as human capital, organizational capital, and relational capital [4]. These sources generally study social capital and customer capital under relational capital. Some sources (e.g. [5]) on the other hand, define intellectual capital components as human capital, organizational capital, customer capital, and social capital. In addition to these, there are some studies that classify social capital in different ways.

Studies in the literature frequently use concepts of human capital and social capital interchangeably. However, these two concepts have completely different meanings. Main argument of human capital conception is that more skilled and talented agents are more successful, whereas social capital theoreticians, unlike human capital theoreticians claim that more successful agents are better-connected agents [6].

Most studies on social capital in the literature include human capital indicators while measuring social capital. For instance; higher education rate [7], demographic features of the society [8], high quality population rate, proportion of dropping out of school to total population [9], number of doctors per hundred thousand, literacy rate [10] etc. Even these indicators have been used as social capital indicators in those studies; they are actually human capital indicators. Moreover, human capital and social capital are quite different concepts.

The present research examines the correlations between some above-mentioned human capital indicators and social capital. First, these two concepts are defined briefly, then the correlations between some human capital indicators and social capital index values of a total of 37 districts of Konya and Karaman provinces. The last section presents the conclusion.

## II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

### A. Social Capital

The notion of social capital was first used by Hanifan [11] in the literature, and it started to be used in the field of management due to some important researches such as Putnam, Coleman and Fukuyama. According to Putnam [12], social capital is social life features that enable participants work more efficiently together in order to attain shared objectives. According to sociologist James Coleman [13] social capital is a concept that consists of obligations and expectations, information channels and social norms. Additionally, Coleman defined social capital as the ability to work together in a group [14]. According to Fukuyama [15], social capital is informal norms that encourage cooperation between two or more people. Fukuyama [14] also claims that social capital is shared norms and values that encourage social cooperation.

---

Manuscript received December 19, 2014; revised April 18, 2015.

Various components of social components are present in the literature. However, the most frequently used classification was made by Putnam. According to Putnam [16], social capital is, "...the features of social organization such as trust, norms, and relations networks that increase the efficiency of society by enabling the coordination and cooperation of activities for mutual interests". Accordingly, components of social capital are; social networks, social norms and trust.

Related literature provides various social capital indicators, but the indicators for measuring the social capital level of a district in general can be listed as; number of new entrepreneurs per thousand, women employment rate, tax collection/accrual rate, number of movie theatres per ten thousand, daily local newspaper circulation per thousand, monthly local magazine circulation per thousand, illegal electricity usage rate, suicide rate, crime rate, women representation rate in central administration, women representation rate in local administration, trust rate, rough divorce rate, number of unions per thousand, number of foundations per thousand, net migration rate, voter turnout in local elections, and voter turnout in general elections [17].

#### B. Human Capital

When capital is studied in terms of economic perspective, human is a component that assumes the responsibility for all production activities such as production, consumption, and process. In accordance with this perspective, human capital can be claimed to be a production factor that provides organizations with added value [18]. Human capital can be defined as the whole of features such as the talents, experience, education, and knowledge of individuals.

The notion of human capital was coined in early 1960s by Schultz who explained the increases in agricultural production with the contributions of investments made on education [19]. As of this period, there have been many researches conducted on human capital. An important part of these researches focused on human capital as a component of intellectual capital (e.g. [20]-[21]), while another important part focused on the relationship between human capital and economic growth (e.g. [22-24]).

Studies in the related literature used various indicators that determined human capital. For instance Guthrie [25] defined human capital indicators as know-how, education, professional qualities, knowledge of the job, qualifications related to the job, entrepreneurialism, creativity, proactive and reactive skills, and changeability. Yıldız [26] used employee talents, developing new ideas, being intelligent and creative, leadership, share of knowledge, manager support, teamwork, and employee responsibility as human capital indicators; on the other hand, according to Marimuthu *et al.* [27] training, education, knowledge and skills are the components of human capital. UNCTAD [28] uses the indicators of literacy rate, rate of people in secondary education, and rate of people in vocational-technical training to measure the human capital development level.

### III. MATERIAL AND METHOD

According to Classification of Statistical Region Units in Turkey, there are two provinces (Konya and Karaman) defined as TR52 NUTS 2 Region. There are 31 districts of Konya, including central districts, and there are 6 districts of Karaman. The present research examines the correlations between some human capital indicators and social capital index values at districts level. All 37 districts of Konya and Karaman provinces were included in the scope of the present research. For this reason, no universe-sample distinction was made.

As social capital index values, 2013 data obtained by Erbaşı [17] in his research funded by Selçuk University Scientific Research Projects Coordination Unit were used. As human capital indicators, indicators that were used social capital indicators in some researches in the literature, but we thought should be used as human capital indicators were used. All data are from 2013.

### IV. RESEARCH FINDINGS

TABLE I. SOCIAL CAPITAL INDEX VALUES OF DISTRICTS

No	District	Social Capital Index Value
1	Selçuklu	19.04640993
2	Karatay	18.79781078
3	Sarıveliler	14.37319286
4	Meram	14.23186394
5	Yalıhüyük	9.60905205
6	Kulu	9.11526143
7	Beyşehir	8.18905503
8	Karaman Merkez	8.03250834
9	Taşkent	7.13888506
10	Ereğli	6.89513925
11	Altınekin	6.78443641
12	Çumra	5.79654380
13	Karapınar	5.19316394
14	Sarayönü	4.26994745
15	Ermenek	3.40908796
16	Akşehir	2.7755567
17	Seydişehir	2.52520481
18	Kazımkarabekir	1.82965576
19	Kadınhanı	0.88247304
20	İlgin	-1.52213446
21	Çeltik	-1.66322012
22	Ayrancı	-3.17772185
23	Tuzlukçu	-3.68847966
24	Güneysinır	-4.06035095
25	Emirgazi	-4.28331946
26	Cihanbeyli	-4.43722536
27	Derbent	-4.95634424
28	Ahırılı	-6.71375393
29	Akören	-7.15499649
30	Bozkır	-7.81624025
31	Hüyük	-7.81757808
32	Yunak	-8.05660173
33	Başyayla	-8.16774808
34	Doğanhisar	-11.81209723
35	Halkapınar	-13.17844393
36	Derebucak	-20.23439303
37	Hadim	-24.23665726

Source: Ali Erbaşı, *The analysis of social capital structure in Konya and Karaman centre and their districts*, Research Report, Selçuk University Scientific Research Projects (BAP) Coordination Unit, Project No. 14401012, 2015, pp. 44.

Within the scope of the present research, 4 hypotheses were developed. These hypotheses were developed based on social capital indicators used in the related literature. These indicators are highly trained population used by Blassio and Nuzzo [7] and Woodhouse [9], proportion of population dropping out of school to total population used by Woodhouse [9], number of doctors per hundred thousand used by Filiztekin [10], and literacy rate. Purporting that these are not social capital indicators, but human capital indicators, 4 hypotheses were developed.

Common point of all hypotheses; social capital index values of districts used in analyses are presented in Table I.

Within the scope of the present research, we examined the correlation between social capital index and the indicator first used by Blassio and Nuzzo [7] with the name higher education rate, then by Woodhouse [9] with the name high qualified population rate as social capital indicators, but we thought should be not a social capital indicator but a human capital indicator. The concept of highly trained population rate was used for this indicator in the present research. Highly trained population rate is the proportion of number of college, faculty, master and doctorate graduates to the 15+ population in the district. Table II presents the highly trained population rate and the data used to access these rates.

TABLE II. HIGHLY TRAINED POPULATION RATE OF DISTRICTS

District	Highly Trained Population*	15+ Population*	Highly Trained Population Rate
Selçuklu	70.879	416.268	0.170273
Karatay	16.893	200.549	0.084234
Sarıveliler	618	9.884	0.062525
Meram	33.585	242.642	0.138414
Yalıhüyük	69	1.578	0.043726
Kulu	1.821	37.688	0.048318
Beyşehir	4.981	54.312	0.091711
Karaman Merkez	15.574	132.848	0.117232
Taşkent	379	5.489	0.069047
Ereğli	10.499	103.653	0.101290
Altınekin	311	10.471	0.029701
Çumra	2.915	46.867	0.062197
Karapınar	2.299	34.500	0.066638
Sarayönü	1.275	20.256	0.062944
Ermeneke	1.893	23.566	0.080328
Akşehir	7.424	73.941	0.100404
Seydişehir	4.886	49.447	0.098813
Kazımkarabekir	252	3.442	0.073213
Kadınhanı	1.236	24.493	0.050463
Ilgın	3.072	43.608	0.070446
Çeltik	330	7.745	0.042608
Ayrancı	333	7.157	0.046528
Tuzlukçu	189	5.738	0.032938
Güneşsınır	310	7.506	0.041300
Emirgazi	249	6.320	0.039399
Cihanbeyli	1.886	41.067	0.045925
Derbent	116	3.785	0.030647
Ahırılı	138	3.727	0.037027
Akören	324	5.355	0.060504
Bozkır	1.304	22.010	0.059246
Hüyük	729	13.847	0.052647
Yunak	841	18.641	0.045116
Başyayla	196	3.157	0.062084
Doğanhisar	864	15.287	0.056519
Halkapınar	181	3.727	0.048565
Derebucak	304	6.336	0.047980
Hadim	632	10.603	0.059606

\* Data were obtained from Turkish Statistical Institute (TÜİK) database.

The hypothesis developed to test the correlation between social capital index values and highly trained population rates in the districts is as follows:

$H_1$ . There is a correlation between highly trained population rate and social capital index.

Pearson Correlation analysis was conducted in order to test  $H_1$  hypothesis. Values obtained in the analysis are presented in Table III.

TABLE III. PEARSON CORRELATION ANALYSIS FOR HIGHLY TRAINED POPULATION AND SOCIAL CAPITAL

	Social Capital Index	Highly Trained Population
Social Capital Index	1.000	0.553** (p=0.000)
Highly Trained Population	0.553** (p=0.000)	1.000

Table III shows that, correlation coefficient for social capital index values of districts of Konya and Karaman and the highly trained population rate was found as 0.553 and a statistically significant correlation at %1 significance level was found between these variables. According to these findings, social capital index levels for Konya and Karaman districts and highly trained population rate show parallelism. Even there are no cause and effect relationships between these two variables, we can interpret that social capital index values and highly trained population rate increase and decrease at the same time.

Table IV shows the rates of proportion of population dropping out of school to total population that was used as social capital indicator by Woodhouse [9] (but we think it is a human capital indicator) for Konya and Karaman districts. The number of people dropping out of school was determined based on the number of literate people who didn't graduate from any schools.

TABLE IV. PROPORTION OF POPULATION DROPPING OUT OF SCHOOL TO TOTAL POPULATION

District	Population Dropping Out of School*	Total Population*	Proportion of Population Dropping Out of School to Total Population
Selçuklu	13.675	565.093	0.024200
Karatay	11.349	286.355	0.039633
Sarıveliler	777	12.876	0.060345
Meram	9.765	333.988	0.029238
Yalıhüyük	153	1.830	0.083607
Kulu	3.165	51.314	0.061679
Beyşehir	3.607	70.297	0.051311
Karaman Merkez	5.337	177.685	0.030036
Taşkent	521	7.094	0.073442
Ereğli	4.719	137.837	0.034236
Altınekin	689	14.528	0.047426
Çumra	2.716	64.619	0.042031
Karapınar	1.857	48.665	0.038159
Sarayönü	1.104	27.059	0.040800
Ermeneke	1.569	30.064	0.052189
Akşehir	3.575	93.883	0.038079
Seydişehir	3.659	63.628	0.057506
Kazımkarabekir	172	4.278	0.040206
Kadınhanı	2.329	33.382	0.069768
Ilgın	3.550	56.452	0.062885
Çeltik	617	10.396	0.059350
Ayrancı	562	8.934	0.062906

Tuzluk çu	641	7.111	0.090142
Güneysınır	496	9.928	0.049960
Emirgazi	754	9.324	0.080867
Cihanbeyli	3.781	56.234	0.067237
Derbent	665	4.783	0.139034
Ahırlı	503	4.765	0.105561
Akören	449	6.740	0.066617
Bozkır	2.973	28.152	0.105605
Hüyük	1.503	16.769	0.089630
Yunak	1.958	24.919	0.078575
Başyayla	155	4.102	0.037786
Doğanhisar	1.461	18.193	0.080306
Halkapınar	358	4.739	0.075543
Derebucak	849	7.576	0.112064
Hadim	799	13.572	0.058871

\* Data were obtained from Turkish Statistical Institute (TÜİK) database.

The hypothesis developed to test the correlation between social capital index values and the proportion of population dropping out of school to total population in the districts is as follows:

$H_2$ . There is a correlation between the proportion of population dropping out of school to total population and social capital index.

Pearson Correlation analysis was conducted in order to test  $H_2$  hypothesis. Values obtained in the analysis are presented in Table V.

TABLE V. PEARSON CORRELATION ANALYSIS FOR PROPORTION OF POPULATION DROPPING OUT OF SCHOOL TO TOTAL POPULATION AND SOCIAL CAPITAL

	Social Capital Index	Proportion of Population Dropping Out of School to Total Population
Social Capital Index	1.000	-0.565** (p=0.000)
Proportion of Population Dropping Out of School to Total Population	-0.565** (p=0.000)	1.000

Table V shows that, correlation coefficient for social capital index values of districts of Konya and Karaman and the proportion of population dropping out of school to total population was found as -0.565 and a statistically significant correlation at %1 significance level was found between these variables. According to these findings, there is a negative correlation between the proportion of population dropping out of school to total population and social capital index for Konya and Karaman districts. Even there are no cause and effect relationships between these two variables, we can interpret that while social capital index values increases, the proportion of population dropping out of school to total population decreases; or the vice versa at a significant level.

Table VI shows the number of doctors per thousand that was used as social capital indicator as number of doctors per hundred thousand by Filiztekin [10] (but we think it is a human capital indicator) for Konya and Karaman districts. Considering the population of the districts, the rate was calculated as number of doctors per thousand in the present research.

TABLE VI. NUMBER OF DOCTORS PER THOUSAND IN THE DISTRICTS

District	Number of Doctor*	Total Population*	Number of Doctors per Thousand in the District
Selçuklu	608	565.093	1.07592909
Karatay	92	286.355	0.32127953
Sarıveliler	7	12.876	0.54364710
Meram	402	333.988	1.20363606
Yalıhüyük	3	1.830	1.63934426
Kulu	38	51.314	0.74053864
Beysşehir	69	70.297	0.98154971
Karaman Merkez	211	177.685	1.18749472
Taşkent	5	7.094	0.70482098
Ereğli	105	137.837	0.76176933
Altınekin	5	14.528	0.34416299
Çumra	52	64.619	0.80471688
Karapınar	30	48.665	0.61645947
Sarayönü	15	27.059	0.55434421
Ermeneek	31	30.064	1.03113358
Akşehir	82	93.883	0.87342756
Seydişehir	65	63.628	1.02156283
Kazımkarabekir	1	4.278	0.23375409
Kadınhanı	21	33.382	0.62908154
Ilgın	38	56.452	0.67313824
Çeltik	8	10.396	0.76952674
Ayrancı	4	8.934	0.44772778
Tuzluk çu	6	7.111	0.84376318
Güneysınır	6	9.928	0.60435133
Emirgazi	7	9.324	0.75075075
Cihanbeyli	44	56.234	0.78244478
Derbent	4	4.783	0.83629521
Ahırlı	3	4.765	0.62959076
Akören	6	6.740	0.89020771
Bozkır	20	28.152	0.71042909
Hüyük	19	16.769	1.13304312
Yunak	19	24.919	0.76247040
Başyayla	1	4.102	0.24378352
Doğanhisar	18	18.193	0.98939152
Halkapınar	3	4.739	0.63304494
Derebucak	8	7.576	1.05596621
Hadim	15	13.572	1.10521662

\* Numbers of doctors; were obtained from Konya and Karaman Provincial Boards of Health, Public Hospitals Unions Provincial Office of Secretary General and Provincial Boards of Public Health. Data on populations were obtained from Turkish Statistical Institute (TÜİK) database.

The hypothesis developed to test the correlation between social capital index values and the number of doctors per thousand in the districts is as follows:

$H_3$ . There is a correlation between the number of doctors per thousand and social capital index.

Pearson Correlation analysis was conducted in order to test  $H_3$  hypothesis. Values obtained in the analysis are presented in Table VII.

TABLE VII. PEARSON CORRELATION ANALYSIS FOR NUMBER OF DOCTORS PER THOUSAND AND SOCIAL CAPITAL

	Social Capital Index	Number of Doctors per Thousand
Social Capital Index	1.000	-0.21 (p=0.900)
Number of Doctors per Thousand	-0.21 (p=0.900)	1.000

Table VII shows that correlation coefficient for social capital index values of districts of Konya and Karaman and the number of doctors per thousand was found as -

0.21 and no statistically significant correlations were found between these variables.

Table VIII shows the literacy rate that was used as social capital indicator by Filiztekin [10] (but we think it is a human capital indicator) for Konya and Karaman districts.

TABLE VIII. LITERACY RATES IN THE DISTRICTS

District	Number of Illiteracy*	6+ Population*	Literacy Rate
Selçuklu	7.719	502.952	0.984653
Karatay	6.625	250.658	0.973570
Sarıveliler	186	11.788	0.984221
Meram	5.896	296.542	0.980117
Yalıhüyük	82	1.743	0.952955
Kulu	2.152	45.519	0.952723
Beyşehir	2.294	64.202	0.964269
Karaman Merkez	4.302	159.832	0.973084
Taşkent	336	6.517	0.948443
Ereğli	4.926	125.285	0.960682
Altınekin	357	12.890	0.972304
Çumra	1.615	57.867	0.972091
Karapınar	1.584	43.119	0.963264
Sarayönü	660	24.453	0.973009
Ermenek	1.092	27.565	0.960385
Akşehir	3.473	86.485	0.959843
Seydişehir	1.847	58.257	0.968296
Kazımkarabekir	180	3.951	0.954442
Kadınhanı	962	29.957	0.967887
Ilgın	2.531	51.857	0.951193
Çeltik	579	9.506	0.939091
Ayrancı	250	8.348	0.970053
Tuzlukçu	289	6.634	0.956437
Güneşsınır	313	9.021	0.965303
Emirgazi	440	8.215	0.946439
Cihanbeyli	2.355	50.222	0.953108
Derbent	352	4.458	0.921041
Ahırılı	207	4.417	0.953136
Akören	260	6.264	0.958493
Bozkır	980	25.852	0.962092
Hüyük	735	15.701	0.953188
Yunak	1.378	22.657	0.939180
Başyayla	137	3.724	0.963212
Doğanhisar	959	17.201	0.944247
Halkapınar	116	4.424	0.973779
Derebucak	594	7.110	0.916456
Hadim	512	12.549	0.959200

\* Data were obtained from Turkish Statistical Institute (TÜİK) database.

The hypothesis developed to test the correlation between social capital index values and literacy rates in the districts is as follows:

*H<sub>4</sub>. There is a correlation between literacy rate and social capital index.*

Pearson Correlation analysis was conducted in order to test H<sub>4</sub> hypothesis. Values obtained in the analysis are presented in Table IX.

Table IX shows that, correlation coefficient for social capital index values of districts of Konya and Karaman and literacy rate was found as 0.561 and a statistically significant correlation at %1 significance level was found between these variables. According to these findings, social capital index levels for Konya and Karaman districts and literacy rate show parallelism. Even there are no cause and effect relationships between these two variables, we can interpret that social capital index values and literacy rate increase and decrease at the same time.

TABLE IX. PEARSON CORRELATION ANALYSIS FOR LITERACY RATES IN THE DISTRICTS AND SOCIAL CAPITAL

	Social Capital Index	Literacy Rate
Social Capital Index	1.000	0.561** (p=0.000)
Literacy Rate	0.561** (p=0.000)	1.000

## V. CONCLUSION

The importance placed on physical and financial capital components has shifted towards intellectual assets such as human capital and social capital recently. Frequent use of these concepts resulted in the confusion between them. Of the intellectual capital components, especially human capital and social capital concepts are frequently used interchangeably in the literature. However, these two concepts are completely different from each other in meaning. While human capital concept emphasizes more qualified agents, social capital concept emphasizes agents with stronger relationship networks.

Studies on social capital in the literature generally focus on social capital analyses at organizational, regional or country levels. A few number of studies analyzed the relationships between social capital and some other components. However, we couldn't find any studies that examined the relationships between social capital and some human capital indicators in reference to the problem of using these concepts interchangeably in the related literature. Yet, indicators used in social capital measurements such as higher education rate, proportion of population dropping out of school to total population, number of doctors per hundred thousand, and literacy rate were used as social capital indicators in these studies, these are actually human capital indicators. Considering that human capital and social capital concepts are quite different concepts, researches on the subject field should pay attention to these components. The confusion between these two concepts, and the indicators used in the measurement of these are worrisome for the sake of literature.

Based on these worries, the purpose of the present research was examining the relationships between highly trained population rate, proportion of population dropping out of school to total population, number of doctors per thousand and literacy rate and social capital values for 37 districts in Konya and Karaman provinces. Since all districts (a total of 37 districts) of Konya (31) and Karaman (6) provinces defined as TR52 NUTS 2 Region in accordance with Classification of Statistical Region Units by Turkish Statistical Institute (TÜİK) were included in the research, no universe-sample distinction was made. Based on before mentioned 4 human capital indicators, 4 hypotheses were developed in the research. The limitations of the study are that it was conducted in only one region of Turkey, and it was based on only some of the human capital indicators. It can be suggested that further studies be conducted on larger samples involving all human capital indicators.

Pearson correlation analysis was used to test the hypothesis developed to find out whether there was a

significant correlation between social capital values of the districts in TR52 NUTS 2 Region and highly trained population rate. The correlation coefficient was found as 0.553 in the analysis, which showed a statistically significant correlation between these variables at %1 significance level. Accordingly, “H<sub>1</sub>. There is a correlation between highly trained population rate and social capital index” hypothesis was confirmed. According to these findings, social capital index levels for Konya and Karaman districts and highly trained population rate show parallelism. Even there are no cause and effect relationships between these two variables, we can interpret that social capital index values and highly trained population rate increase and decrease at the same time.

Pearson correlation analysis was used to test the hypothesis developed to find out whether there was a significant correlation between social capital values of the districts and the proportion of population dropping out of school to total population. The correlation coefficient was found as -0.565 in the analysis, which showed a statistically significant correlation between these variables at %1 significance level. Accordingly, “H<sub>2</sub>. There is a correlation between the proportion of population dropping out of school to total population and social capital index.” hypothesis was confirmed. According to these findings, there is a negative correlation between the proportion of population dropping out of school to total population and social capital index for Konya and Karaman districts. Even there are no cause and effect relationships between these two variables, we can interpret that while social capital index values increases, the proportion of population dropping out of school to total population decreases; or the vice versa at a significant level.

Pearson correlation analysis was used to test the hypothesis developed to find out whether there was a significant correlation between social capital values of the districts and the number of doctors per thousand. The correlation coefficient was found as -0.21 in the analysis, which showed that there wasn't a statistically significant correlation between the variables. Accordingly, “H<sub>3</sub>. There is a correlation between the number of doctors per thousand and social capital index” was rejected.

Pearson correlation analysis was used to test the hypothesis developed to find out whether there was a significant correlation between social capital values of the districts and the literacy rate. The correlation coefficient was found as 0.561 in the analysis, which showed a statistically significant correlation between these variables at %1 significance level. Accordingly, “H<sub>4</sub>. There is a correlation between literacy rate and social capital index” hypothesis was confirmed. According to these findings, social capital index levels for Konya and Karaman districts and literacy rate show parallelism. Even there are no cause and effect relationships between these two variables, we can interpret that social capital index values and literacy rate increase and decrease at the same time.

Examination of the relationships between social capital and human capital indicators is of great importance for a better understanding of intellectual capital components, revealing the differences between concepts, and raising awareness on a more careful use of the concepts. Additionally, from a micro perspective, obtained findings provide local administrators with guiding information. It can be suggested that, similar studies are conducted to enable comparisons. Considering the findings of the present research, it can be claimed that social capital and human capital components usually act correspondingly, and an administrator who wants to make improvements in any of these components should focus on other capital components as well.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors wish to thank Selçuk University Scientific Research Projects Coordination Unit (BAP). Social capital index values used in the present research were obtained from a research project conducted by the author and funded by this unit.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] M. C. Suci, L. Picioruş, and C. I. Imbrişcă, “The intellectual capital, trust, cultural traits and reputation in the Romanian education system,” *Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 223-235, 2012.
- [2] N. Bontis, W. C. C. Keow, and S. Richardson, “Intellectual capital and business performance in Malaysian industries,” *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 85-100, 2000.
- [3] M. Sağsan, R. Yücel, and C. Sözen, “An alternative way in overcoming global crisis: Information acquiring in the social capital and capacity usage,” *Journal of Bilgi Dünyası*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 140-154, 2010.
- [4] H. N. Rudez and T. Mihalic, “Intellectual capital in the hotel industry: A case study from Slovenia,” *Hospitality Management*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 188-199, 2007.
- [5] J. Swart, “Identifying the sub-components of intellectual capital: A literature review and development of measures,” *Working Paper Series No. 5*, University of Bath School of Management, 2005.
- [6] S. Başak and N. Öztaş, “Trust networks, social capital and gender,” *Gazi University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences Journal*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 27-56, 2010.
- [7] G. de Blassio and G. Nuzzo, “Historical traditions of civiness and local economic development,” *Journal of Regional Science*, vol. 50, no. 4, pp. 833-857, 2009.
- [8] P. Bullen and J. Onyx, “Measuring social capital in five communities in NSW,” *Working Paper Series No. 41*, Centre for Australian Community Organisations and Management, Australia, 1998.
- [9] A. Woodhouse, “Social capital and economic development in regional Australia: a case study,” *Journal of Rural Studies*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 83-94, 2006.
- [10] A. Filiztekin. (2009). *A competitiveness index for Turkey*. EDAM and Deloitte Turkey Broadcast Partners. [Online]. Available: [edam.org.tr/document/trkiye%20icin%20bir%20rekabet%20endeksi.pdf](http://edam.org.tr/document/trkiye%20icin%20bir%20rekabet%20endeksi.pdf)
- [11] L. J. Hanifan, “The rural school community center,” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. 67, pp. 130-138, 1916.
- [12] R. D. Putnam, “Tuning in, tuning out: The strange disappearance of social capital in America,” *Political Sciences and Politics*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 664-683, 1995.
- [13] J. S. Coleman, “Social capital in the creation of human capital,” *The American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 94, pp. 95-120, 1988.
- [14] F. Fukuyama, “Social capital and development: The coming agenda,” *SAIS Review*, vol. XXII, no. 1, pp. 23-37, 2002.

- [15] F. Fukuyama, "Social capital, civil society, and development," *Third World Quarterly*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 7-20, 2001.
- [16] R. D. Putnam, "The prosperous community: Social capital and public life," *The American Prospect*, vol. 4, no. 13, pp. 35-42, 1993.
- [17] A. Erbaşı, *The Analysis of Social Capital Structure in Konya and Karaman Centre and Their Districts*, Research Report, Selçuk University Scientific Research Projects (BAP) Coordination Unit, Project No. 14401012, 2015.
- [18] D. B. Kwon, "Human capital and its measurement," in *Proc. the 3rd OECD World Forum on "Statistics, Knowledge and Policy,"* Busan, Korea, 27-30 October 2009, pp. 1-15.
- [19] M. Şimşek ve C. Kadılar, "A causality analysis of relationship among human capital, export and economic growth for Turkey," *Cumhuriyet University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences Journal*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 115-140, 2010.
- [20] W. Rehman, C. A. Rehman, H. U. Rehman, and A. Zahid, "Intellectual capital performance and its impact on corporate performance: An empirical evidence from modaraba sector of Pakistan," *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, vol. 1, no. 5, pp. 8-16, 2011.
- [21] R. G. Ahangar, "The relationship between intellectual capital and financial performance: An empirical investigation in an Iranian company," *African Journal of Business Management*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 88-95, 2011.
- [22] G. S. Becker, K. M. Murphy, and R. F. Tamura, "Human capital, fertility and economic growth," *Journal of Political Economy*, vol. 98, no. 5, pp. 12-37, 1990.
- [23] J. Benhabib and M. M. Spiegel, "The role of human capital in economic development: Evidence from aggregate cross-country data," *Journal of Monetary Economics*, vol. 34, pp. 143-173, 1994.
- [24] S. J. Goetz and D. Hu, "Economic growth and human capital accumulation: Simultaneity and expended convergence tests," *Economics Letter*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 355-362, 1996.
- [25] J. Guthrie, "The management, measurement and the reporting of intellectual capital," *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 24-41, 2001.
- [26] S. Yıldız, "A proposal of intellectual capital activity report: A survey of private-owned commercial banks," *Journal of Bankacılar*, vol. 75, pp. 34-50, 2010.
- [27] M. Marimuthu, L. Arokiasamy, and M. Ismail, "Human capital development and its impact on firm performance: Evidence from developmental economics," *The Journal of International Social Research*, vol. 2, no. 8, pp. 265-272, 2009.
- [28] UNCTAD, *World Investment Report*, Geneva, 2005.



**Ali Erbaşı** was born in Ankara in Turkey in 1982. He got his bachelor's degree in 2005 at Kirikkale University, Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences, Department of Business Administration. He got his master's degree in 2007 at Kirikkale University, Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Business Administration with his master's thesis entitled "From Performance Management System to Performance Based Budgeting in Organization: Example of Kirsehir Municipality". He got his doctoral degree in 2011 at Selçuk University, Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Business Administration with his doctoral thesis entitled "Use of Balanced Scorecard in Performance-Based Budgeting System and A Model Approach". His major field of study is strategic management and performance management. He got his associate professor in 2014.

He worked as a consultant at Kirsehir Municipality in 2005-2007. He worked as a lecturer at Selçuk University, Vocational School of Seydisehir in 2007-2011. He became an Assist. Prof. Dr. in 2011 and became an Associate Prof. in 2014. He is still working as a Associate Prof. and Head of Department of Management and Organization at Selçuk University, Vocational School of Social Sciences. He has many articles published in various journals about management and organization.

Associate Prof. Erbaşı is a member of IACSIT and IEDRC.