

Kamu Sektöründe Beşeri ve Sosyal Sermayenin Çalışan Performansı Üzerindeki Etkisi^a

Şerafettin Erten^{b, c}, İbrahim Türkmen^d

Özet

İçinde bulunduğumuz bilgi çağı ve ekonomisinde beşeri ve sosyal sermaye çalışanların ve örgütlerin performansını belirleyen temel sermaye türlerinden ikisi olarak görülmektedir. Bu bağlamda çalışmanın konusu beşeri ve sosyal sermayenin kamu personelinin performansı üzerindeki etkileridir. Çalışmanın konusunu oluşturan araştırma kesitsel tipte bir saha araştırması olup; bir yerel yönetim kuruluşunda çalışan 377 kamu personeli üzerinde gerçekleştirilmiştir. Araştırmada beşerî ve sosyal sermayenin çalışanların iş performansı üzerinde istatistiksel olarak anlamlı ve pozitif yönde bir etkisinin olduğu sonucuna ulaşılmıştır. Çalışanların iş performansı üzerinde sosyal sermayenin beşerî sermayeden daha fazla etkisi olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Ortaya konulan sonuçlar çerçevesinde, beşerî ve sosyal sermayenin en az özel sektör kuruluşları kadar kamu kuruluşları için de önemli birer kaynak olduğunu ve çalışan ve örgüt performansının geliştirilmesi için mutlaka bu iki sermaye türüne yatırım yapılması gerektiğini söylemek mümkündür.

Anahtar Kelimeler

Beşeri Sermaye
Sosyal Sermaye
Çalışan Performansı
Kamu Yönetimi

Makale Hakkında

Geliş Tarihi: 08.12.2021
Kabul Tarihi: 18.03.2022
Doi: 10.18026/cbayarsos.1034365

The Effect of Human and Social Capital on Employee Performance in Public Sector

Abstract

In the information age and economy we live in, human and social capital are regarded as two of the main types of capital that determine the performance of employees and organizations. In this context, the subject of this study is the effects of human and social capital on the performance of civil servants. This is a cross-sectional field study and it was carried out on 377 civil servants working in a local government institution. It was concluded in the study that human and social capital has a statistically significant and positive effect on the working performance of employees. It was determined that social capital has more effect than human capital on the job performance of employees. Within the framework of the results, it is possible to say that human and social capital is an important resource for public institutions as well as private sector institutions, and it is absolutely necessary to invest in these two types of capital in order to improve employee and organizational performance.

Keywords

Human Capital
Social Capital
Employee Performance
Public Administration

About Article

Received: 08.12.2021
Accepted: 18.03.2022
Doi: 10.18026/cbayarsos.1034365

^a This article is an extended and improved version of the paper published in the proceedings book of 15th International Balkan and Near Eastern Congress Series on Economics, Business and Management on May, 29-30, 2021.

^b Correspondent Author: serafettin.erten@usak.edu.tr

^c Asst. Prof. Dr, Uşak University, Faculty of Health Sciences, Department of Health Management, ORCID ID: 0000-0003-0297-0580.

^d Lecturer, Uşak University, Vocational School of Health Services, Department of Management and Organization, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1558-0736.

Introduction

Measuring and evaluating employee performance and determining the tangible and intangible factors that affect performance have an important place in modern organizational studies. Organizations seek the ways to get the maximum efficiency from their employees, especially through their human resources management systems (Gruman and Saks, 2011; Kaplan and Norton, 1992; Kurunmäki and Miller, 2006). The concept of performance in public organizations has become an important agenda with the effect of the new public management approach (Arnaboldi, Lapsley and Steccolini, 2015; Boland and Fowler, 2000). Performance measurement and performance management practices gained momentum in order to use resources efficiently, increase service quality, and ensure efficiency, effectiveness and accountability (Fryer, Antony and Ogden, 2009; Radnor and McGuire, 2003).

In the current era called as information age, information is now regarded as a production factor on its own. Intangible assets of organizations are considered as a significant capital type at least as much as tangible assets. (Cabrita and Bontis, 2008). In the current situation, organizations have become units that produce, associate, store and transform information into goods and services without distinction of public or private sector (Grant, 1996). Intangible assets conceptualized as intellectual capital are the main sources of the performance, innovation, competitive advantage and survival for organizations (Petty and Guthrie, 2000; Yeh-Yun Lin and Edvinsson, 2011).

Although there are different views on the elements that form intellectual capital, human capital is the common and basic one in all of them (Bassi and Van Buren, 1999; Bontis, 1998; Edvinsson, 1997; Stewart, 1997). More and more organizations each day seek for the ways to employ human resources with a high level of knowledge and skills and improve the current human resources (Drucker and Maciariello, 2008). The level of knowledge, skills and abilities of this new human resource, which is expressed as "information worker" in the words of Drucker (2011, p. 24), is the determining factor in all fields of organizational ecology including performance (Sarnovics, 2010; Schultz, 1993).

The increase in the importance of network structures with the information age featured another type of intangible asset more for organizations. The resource called as social capital emphasizes the networks created by organizations and employees of organizations with others and other organizations and the gains from here (Coleman, 1994; Seibert, Kraimer, and Liden, 2001). Social capital for organizations originates from human capital and it is regarded as an extension of human capital. Social capital is a productive asset and increases the effectiveness and efficiency of other types of capital (Coleman, 1994; Schmid and Robison, 1995). The gains obtained from the network and social relations contribute positively to the performance of both individuals and organizations (Field, 2008; Seibert, et al., 2001).

Human and social capital is accepted as the main source for modern public organizations and it is suggested that these types of capital contribute positively to organizational and employee performance (Bright, 2007; Campos, Salmador and Merino, 2006; Cinca, Molinero and Queiroz, 2003; Tantardini, Guo and Ganapati, 2017). There are numerous studies in literature on the effect of human capital and social capital on organizational and employee performance. However, most of them are for private sector organizations. The studies for public organizations are less in number. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to analyze the effects

of human and social capital in public organizations on employee performance and to contribute to this field.

Literature Review

Employee Performance

Performance is a concept that is in the center of today's organization and management field and studies. All organizations, whether private or public, seek the ways to increase their performance in order to survive and keep their competitive advantage (Becker and Gerhart, 1996; Porter, 1998; Vosloban, 2012). It is accepted that performance has a multidimensional and complex structure (Pradhan and Jena, 2017; Sonnentag, Volmer and Spychala, 2008). However, it is often simply defined as results, i.e. the degree to which assigned goals are achieved (Armstrong, 2006; Dahkoul, 2018; Rainey, 2014). Of course, the most important factor underlying this simple definition is people, in other words, the employees in organizations. Because organizations are complex structures made up of people first of all (Crowther, 2002; Pugh and Hickson, 2007; Rainey, 2014).

Locke (1970, p. 484), regards employee performance as a direct result of an individual's specific task or business objectives. Daryoush, Silong, Omar and Othman (2013, p. 100), state that performance is not just about actions and results, on the contrary, performance itself is an action or behavior. Based on these two approaches, it is possible to define employee performance or employee job performance as "scalable actions, behaviors and results that are involved or produced by employees, associated with and contributing to organizational goals (Viswesvaran and Ones, 2000, p. 216)." Motowidlo and Kell's (2013, p. 82) value-based approach brings a different perspective to the subject. They also accepted performance as a feature of behavior, but attributed it to a value formation process expected by the organization. From this point of view, they defined business performance of employees as "the total expected value for the individual's organization of the individual behavioral segments that an individual carries out over a standard period of time."

Borman and Motowidlo (1997, p. 99), discussed this behavior to create value in two dimensions as task performance and contextual performance. Task performance includes the officially defined activities of employees in organizations and consists of the actions that directly affect the performance of organizations. Contextual performance includes all kinds of activities that affect employee performance other than the official job definition and indirectly contributes to organizational performance (Motowidlo and Kell, 2013; Pradhan and Jena, 2017; Sonnentag et al., 2008). Fluctuation and complexity, which are the main characteristics of today's organizational ecology, necessitated a different perspective on employee performance in order to overcome the problems experienced by organizations (Becker and Gerhart, 1996; Burke and Church, 1992; Corley and Gioia, 2004; Gruman and Saks, 2011). In this context, Pulakos, Arad, Donovan and Plamondon (2000), in their study, developed the classification of "adaptive performance" by considering the adaptation of employees to changing conditions in organizations and asserted a third dimension of employee performance.

Today, employee performance has become a central issue in industrial and organizational psychology (Crook, Todd, Combs, Woehr and Ketchen, 2011; Harari and Viswesvaran, 2018; Motowidlo and Kell, 2013). It is accepted that business performance of employees forms the

basis of team and organizational performance (Crowther, 2002; Harari and Viswesvaran, 2018; J., 2013; Pugh and Hickson, 2007). In the words of Ben-Hador (2019, p. 1037), employee performance represents the "essence of work" in organizations. Organizations seek the ways to have the labor with high performance and therefore, to get the competitive advantage (Porter, 1998; Vosloban, 2012). Performance and human resources management systems are established in order to employ employees and increase their motivations, knowledge and skills and improve their abilities, determine the goals and objectives of organizations, direct employees to these goals and objectives, and monitor and evaluate the obtained results (Aguinis, 2014; Armstrong, 2006; Christensen, Lægveid, Roness and Røvik, 2007; Gruman and Saks, 2011; Marr, 2006; Porter, 1998).

Employee performance is an important topic in the public sector as well as in the private sector. Evaluation of performance in public administrations became a current issue in the 1970s (Boland and Fowler, 2000; Fryer et al., 2009) and with the 1980s, it became an integral part of public administration within the new public management approach (Pollitt, 2008; Van Dooren, Bouckaert, and Halligan, 2018). However, unlike the private sector, performance in public organizations is rather handled within the framework of concluding plans and programs, using public resources effectively and efficiently, and increasing the quality of public service (Arnaboldi et al., 2015; Pudawawan and Sutarlan, 2018; Van Dooren et al., 2018).

In accordance with the transformation experienced, personnel management and performance measurement in the process have become the leading discussion and implementation issues in public performance management systems (Kearney and Berman, 1999). The classical personnel management approach in public administrations evolved into a human resources management approach (Hughes, 2003; Rainey, 2014) and the promotion of employees is handled within a more performance-based career system based on efficiency and productivity within the framework of the managerial approach (Christensen et al., 2007; Ibarra-Colado, 2002).

When considered in terms of the public sector, it is possible to talk about many internal and external factors that affect employee performance, such as organizational culture, business environment, leadership, and reward mechanisms, just like in the private sector (Diamantidis and Chatzoglou, 2019; J., 2013). Human and social capital has been one of the leading factors that affect the performance in public organizations within the framework of the dynamics of the information age and information society.

The Relationship between Human Capital and Employee Performance

Employees of organizations have long been seen only as a tool that affects efficiency and a source of cost (Becker and Gerhart, 1996; Bassi and Van Buren, 1999). However, the developments in resource and value-based theories enabled the concept of people to be handled as a capital element and source to create value for organizations like many other intangible assets (Crook et al., 2011; Marr, 2006; Pugh and Hickson, 2007). It is accepted that human resources called as human capital today (Carkhuff, 2000; Nerdrum and Erikson, 2001) is the most important tool to increase the performance of organizations and get competitive advantage (Armstrong, 2006; Bapna, Langer, Mehra, Gopal and Gupta, 2013; Porter, 1998).

It is accepted that human capital consists of various employee qualifications such as knowledge, abilities, values, experience, enthusiasm and physical qualities (Becker, 1993;

Carmeli, 2004; Weatherly, 2003). This type of capital is closely tied to the person who owns it, thus, it is his or her property. While a person owns some of these qualifications from the birth, he or she acquires some of them throughout the life (Schultz, 1993, p. 14). Bontis (1999, p. 446), states that human capital consists of four main elements as heredity, education, experience and attitudes towards occupation. According to Petty and Guthrie (2000, p. 166), what underlie under these elements are the qualifications such as know-how, professional qualifications, business competence, entrepreneurial spirit, innovation, proactive and reactive abilities, and changeability.

It has three main features that distinguish human capital from other types of capital: it is the primary element of intellectual capital; it is considered the most important source of sustainable competitive advantage; and the most mobile type of capital (Cabrita and Bontis, 2008; Farah and Abouzeid, 2017; Roos, 2008). For that reason, one of the biggest challenges for organizations is to find and hold the employees with such characteristics (Oliver, 2001). Therefore, human capital has become the focus point of modern human resources theory (Cabrita and Bontis, 2008; Weatherly, 2003).

Today, it is clearly accepted that human capital has an effect on both the business performance of the employee and the performance of the organization (Cabrita and Bontis, 2008; Crook et al., 2011; Imran and Atiya, 2020; Rumawas, 2018). Bapna and others (2013), found in their study in information communication technology companies that investment in human capital makes positive contributions to employee performance. Philip and Ikechukwu (2018), obtained similar findings in their study on oil companies. Huang, Yu, Shao, Yu, and Li (2021), revealed in their study on hotel employees that human capital affects employee performance positively. In the study by Muafi, Suwitho, Purwohandoko and Salsabil (2017), in the banking sector in Indonesia, it was determined that human capital makes a significant contribution to the improvement of business performance of employees. In another study conducted in private education institutions, it was found that human capital management practices play a very important role in increasing employee performance (Jain and Ahuja, 2019). Human capital increases organizational performance as well as employee performance (Jocelyne and Kariuki, 2020). In the context of the results of the studies in the literature, the first hypothesis of the research was established as follows:

H1: Human capital significantly and positively affects employee performance.

The Relationship Between Social Capital and Employee Performance

Just like human capital, social capital is one of the leading intangible capital approaches in organizations (Storberg, 2002). Social capital is associated with human capital most and refers to the social or network relations of human capital (Coleman, 1994; Field, 2008; Flap, 2002; Weaver and Habibov, 2012). This concept was developed in order to present the value of the relations in network structures (Shaw, Duffy, Johnson, and Lockhart, 2005). Hence, social capital is regarded as a significant resource type that explains the value of employee social lives for organizations (Ben-Hador, 2019).

It is generally accepted that social capital is a value that exists in social relations and networks and derives from it (Andrews, 2010; Kashefi, 2012; Leana and van Buren, 1999; Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998). Social capital includes both the network and the assets to be activated through this network. In addition, it is seen that social capital is handled and explained as individual

social capital (Coleman, 1988; Putnam, 1993), corporate social capital (Ben-Hador, 2016; Kroll, DeHart-Davis and Vogel, 2019) and common or national social capital (Adler and Kwon, 2002; Bourdieu 1977; Fukuyama, 2001) by looking at the size of relations and networks from micro to macro level.

According to Coleman (1988, p. 98), social capital has two main elements. The first is that it is productive, and the second is that it makes it possible to achieve certain goals that would not be possible without it. Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1998) state that social capital has three dimensions as structural, relational and cognitive. "The structural dimension refers to the connections between the actors, the relational dimension refers to the assets created and utilized through relationships, and the cognitive dimension refers to the resources shared between the parties (p. 243)." Clausen, Meng, and Borg (2019, p. 800) suggest that there are three types of social capital in organizations based on the types of relationships. The first is associative social capital that focuses on the relationships between people in the same group or team, the second is bridging social capital that refers to the relationships between different groups and teams and finally, the third is binding social capital that expresses the relationships between teams and executives.

Social capital fulfills various functions and provides benefits for individuals and organizations. First of all, social capital facilitates access to information. This is important in terms of ensuring the quality, accuracy and currency of the information. Second, it facilitates cooperation. Therefore, solidarity and harmony increase. This helps to increase the promotion possibilities and career success of employees. Finally, social capital decreases the need to control employees in organizations by providing influence, control and power and creates an efficient organizational climate (Adler and Kwon, 2002; Kroll et al., 2019; Shaw et al., 2005).

The conducted studies reveal that social capital also has a positive effect on different types of performance. Clausen and others (2019), in their study presented that social capital has a positive effect on employee performance in workplaces and also increases work commitment and psychological well-being. Ben-Hador (2016) found that there exists a positive relationship between social capital and performance and this relationship is mediated by the enthusiasm of the employee and self-efficacy determines the enthusiasm of employees. Pudawawan and Sutarlan (2018), in the study in a public health organization in Indonesia proved that social capital has a significant effect on employee performance through employee satisfaction. Kroll and others (2019) presented that organizational social capital contributes positively to individual performance by increasing cooperation, trust and organizational commitment. The results of the study by Ellinger, Ellinger, Bachrach, Wang, and Elmadağ-Baş (2011) indicate that organizational social capital is positively related to employees' performance in business, service quality, commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. In the study by Ashraf and Javed (2014) on bank employees, it was determined that social networking of employees positively affects their skills, abilities, knowledge, qualifications, productivity, motivation and performance levels. In the study by Ali, Hussain and Azim (2013) it was concluded that organizational investments on social capital have a positive effect on employee performance. In the context of the studies in literature second hypothesis of the study is established as follows:

H2: Social capital significantly and positively affects employee performance.

Research Method

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to identify the effects of human and social capital in public organizations on work performance of employees.

Population and Sampling of the Study

The study is designed as quantitative and it is a cross-sectional field study. The population of the study consists of the personnel working in a local government institution. Convenience sampling method was used in the study. The purpose of the study was explained to the participants by face-to-face interview method and their consent was obtained. 389 participants voluntarily participated in the study. In the analysis conducted on the questionnaire forms, 12 questionnaire forms were excluded from the analysis and the data obtained from 377 participants were analyzed.

Data Collection Tools

The data of the study were collected through a questionnaire form consisting of 3 parts. In the first part, open-ended questions for the demographic characteristics of the participants were asked about gender, marital status, age, education level and duty. In the second part, there are 5 statements about human capital and 5 statements about social capital in the intellectual capital scale developed by Subramaniam and Youndt (2005). The scale was adapted to the Turkish culture by Özdemir and Taşçı (2007). The third part includes the scale of employee job performance developed by Na-Nan, Chaiprasit and Pukkeeree (2018). The scales used in the study are 5-point Likert (1= strongly disagree to 5= strongly agree) type.

Data Analysis

SPSS 26 program was used in the analysis of research data. The demographic qualifications of participants were analyzed through frequency analysis. The validity of the scales used in the study was evaluated by Explanatory Factor Analysis (EFA) and their reliability was evaluated by the Cronbach's Alpha ($C\alpha$) coefficient. The correlation between the variables of the study was determined by correlation analysis and the effect of human and social capital on employee job performance was determined by regression analysis. Normal distribution of the research data was determined according to Skewness and Kurtosis values. In the evaluation of the findings, 95% of confidence range and $p<0.05$ of significance level were accepted.

Findings

Demographic Qualifications of Participants

Descriptive statistics about the participants of the study are summarized in Table 1. 82,5% of the participants are female and 70,8% of them are married. 52,5% of the participants have bachelor's degree. The age of the participants ranges from 20 to 62, the average age is 37.81 ± 7.39 . Nearly half of the participants (49.9%) are between the ages of 30-39. 52,3% of the participants work as educators.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Participants

Variables	Frequency	%	Variables	Frequency	%
Gender			Age (<i>min=20; max=62; mean=37,81 ± 7,39</i>)		
Female	311	82,5	20-29	46	12,2
Male	66	17,5	30-39	188	49,9
Marital Status			40-49	114	30,2
Married	267	70,8	50 ≥	29	7,7
Single	110	29,2	Profession		
Educational Status			Civil servant	93	24,7
Primary education	10	2,7	Technical staff	14	3,7
High school	79	21,0	Health personnel	17	4,5
Associate degree	58	15,4	Counsellor	42	11,1
Undergraduate degree	198	52,5	Worker	14	3,7
Graduate degree	32	8,5	Educator	197	52,3
Total	377	100	Total	377	100

Validity and Reliability Analysis of Scales

Validity of scales was evaluated by Explanatory Factor Analysis (EFA) and reliability of them was evaluated by $C\alpha$ coefficient. EFA results of the scales are presented in Table 2 and Table 3.

Table 2. Factor Analysis Results for Human and Social Capital Scale

Items	Human Capital	Social Capital
Our employees are creative and bright.	,843	
Our employees are highly skilled.	,841	
Our employees are experts in their particular jobs and functions.	,818	
Our employees develop new ideas and knowledge.	,777	
Our employees are widely considered the best in our industry	,734	
Our employees apply knowledge from one area of the company to problems and opportunities that arise in another.		,874
Our employees partner with customers, suppliers, alliance partners, etc., to develop solutions.		,788
Our employees interact and exchange ideas with people from different areas of the company.		,689
Our employees share information and learn from one another.		,679
Our employees are skilled at collaborating with each other to diagnose and solve problems.		,672
Eigenvalues	6,496	,982
Total Variance Explained (74,781)	64,965	9,816
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin		,934
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	<i>p=0,000; p < 0,05</i>	

Approx. Chi-Square

2935,400

EFA was performed in order to determine the validity of human and social capital scale. Since the KMO sampling sufficiency of the scale is (0.934) and Barlett's sphericity tests are ($p=0.000$; $p < 0.05$), the data set was found to be suitable for factor analysis (Akgül and Çevik, 2005). As a result of the factor analysis, it was determined that the factor loads of human capital dimension consist of 5 expressions ranging from 0.734 to 0.843. The factor loads of social capital dimension consist of 5 statements ranging from 0,672 and 0,874. Total explanatory rate of the scale is 74,781%, with 64,965% of explanatory rate of human capital and 9,816% of explanatory rate of social capital.

Table 3. Factor Analysis Results for Employee Job Performance Scale

Items	JP
Tasks are normally completed on Schedule.	,829
Workers achieve time-related organizational goals.	,818
Tasks are carried out within a reasonable amount of time.	,814
The units of output under my responsibility correspond to my skills and ability.	,813
The quantity assignment is always fulfilled.	,808
The units of output meet organizational expectations.	,785
The delivery of goods or services is conducted in a timely fashion.	,782
The units of output are in sync with the number of employees.	,771
Products or services meet the expectations of customers.	,768
Quality inspection is conducted prior to the delivery of goods or services.	,739
Materials and tools meet the set criteria and standards.	,709
Tasks are performed attentively and correctly	,679
Eigenvalues	7,254
Total Variance Explained	60,448
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin	,941
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	$p=0,000$; $p < 0,05$
Approx. Chi-Square	3169,197

EFA was performed in order to determine the validity of employee job performance scale. Since the KMO sampling sufficiency of the scale is (0,941) and Barlett's sphericity tests are ($p=0.000$; $p < 0.05$), the data set was found to be suitable for factor analysis (Akgül and Çevik, 2005). As a result of the sector analysis, it was determined that factor loads of employee job performance scale consist of 12 statements under one dimension ranging from 0,679 and 0,829. Total explanatory rate of the scale is 60,448%.

Descriptive Statistics for Scales

Min-max, mean, standard deviation, Skewness, Kurtosis and $C\alpha$ values for the variables of the study are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics for Scales (n=377)

Scales	Items	Min-max	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	Ca
Human Capital	5	1-5	3,66	,93	-,604	-,129	,915
Social Capital	5	1-5	3,68	,89	-,879	,603	,898
Job Performance	12	1,33-5	3,69	,80	-,631	,371	,939

The average of the scores given by the participants to the variables of the study are 3.66 ± 0.93 for human capital, 3.68 ± 0.89 for social capital, and 3.69 ± 0.80 for the general average of job performance. Skewness values of the variables range between $-0,879$ and $-0,604$ and Kurtosis values range between $-0,129$ and $0,603$. Since these values are between $\pm 1,500$, it is accepted that the research data have normal distribution (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2013). Ca coefficients of the variables are $0,915$ for human capital, $0,898$ for social capital and $0,939$ for job performance. Since it is $Ca > 0,70$, the scales have high reliability level (Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994).

Correlation Analysis

Table 5. Correlation Analysis for Human and Social Capital and Job Performance Variables

Variables	1	2	3
1 Human Capital	1		
2 Social Capital	,770**	1	
3 Job Performance	,651**	,699**	1

Note: ** $p < 0,01$, * $p < 0,05$

The relationship between human capital and social capital and job performance was analyzed through correlation analysis. According to the correlation analysis, it was determined that there is a positive, moderate and statistically significant relationship between job performance and human capital ($r = ,651$, $p < 0.01$) and social capital ($r = ,699$, $p < 0.05$) (Table 5).

Regression Analysis

Multiple linear regression analysis was conducted in order to determine the effect of human and social capital on job performance. The analysis results are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Regression Analysis Results for the Effect of Human and Social Capital on Job Performance

Variables	Job Performance ²							
	β	p	t	F	R ²	Adj. R ²	Tolerance	VIF
Costant	1.204	.000	9.511					
Human Capital ¹	.238	.000	4.937	202.871	.520	.518	.408	2.454
Social Capital ¹	.438	.000	8.667					

Note: 1: Independent Variable, 2: Dependent Variable

The regression model established for the effect of human and social capital on job performance was found statistically significant ($F=202,871$, $p<0.01$). According to the regression analysis, human capital ($\beta=0.238$, $p<0.01$) and social capital ($\beta=0.438$, $p<0.01$) have a positive and significant effect on job performance. According to these findings, H1 and H2 hypotheses were supported. It was determined that social capital has more effect than human capital on employee job performance. It was determined that human and social capital is important in explaining the job performance, the dependent variable. Human and social capital can explain 52,0% ($R^2=0,520$) of the change in job performance.

Conclusion And Discussion

In this study, in which the effect of human and social capital on the performance of public personnel was investigated, it was concluded that both human capital and social capital positively affected and increased employee performance. In addition, it was determined that positive effect of social capital on employee performance is more than the effect of human capital. The result is in line with the results of other studies in the literature, and also with results of Perera and Weerakkody (2018) and Efendi and Haryati (2021), which investigated the effects of both human and social capital on employee performance in the same organization. Perera and Weerakkody (2018) found that human and social capital increases the performance of employees in their study on small-scale industrial enterprises in the private sector in Sri Lanka. Efendi and Haryati (2021) found that human and social capital contributed positively to both employee and organizational performance in their study on the official postal service in Jakarta, Indonesia, and also work commitment mediated human capital, social capital and intrinsic motivation in increasing employee performance.

The positive contribution of both human and social capital to employee and organizational performance is obvious (Jocelyne and Kariuki, 2020; Ellinger, Musgrove, Ellinger, Bachrach, Elmadağ-Baş and Wang, 2013). The success of organizations in the creation of today's complex goods and service production systems depends on the combination of different types of capital at the optimum point. For that reason, the development of new products and services is achieved through creative cooperation rather than individual efforts (Leonard and Sensiper, 1998). The power of human capital is closely related to social capital. As long as the employees do not share their individual expertise with their colleagues, it is not possible to make sufficient organizational contribution. In other words, unless individual knowledge is networked, shared, and transmitted through relationships, its benefit to the organization will be limited. Therefore, employment, training, job design, and other human resource practices of organizations should focus not only on maintaining their employees' functional or specific technical skills and expertise, but also on improving their ability to network, cooperate, and share (Subramaniam and Youndt, 2005). Organizations and managers should allocate more resources to develop their human and social capital, and invest more in these types of capital, whether tangible or intangible (Cabello-Medina, López-Cabrales and Valle-Cabrera, 2011; Ellinger et al., 2013; Soehari, Budiningsih, Aima and Assauri, 2017).

Public organizations have been trying to transfer private sector practices and experiences to their own bodies for a long time. The approach called as new public management is the dominant paradigm of today despite the debates. Public organizations also get their share of modern developments, just like their private sector counterparts. In addition, considering the

resource size and responsibilities used by public organizations, it is clear that they need to use their existing capital more effectively and efficiently. For that reason, conducting the study in a public institution is important in terms of guiding the study results to public institutions and managers. Because the human resources policies of public institutions such as employment, orientation, training, performance evaluation, personnel empowerment, career and wage management should focus on constantly improving their human and social capital.

The most important limitation of the study is that it is a cross-sectional field study conducted in the public sector. Therefore, it is not possible to generalize the obtained results to all public organizations. In addition, only the situation regarding human and social capital was revealed, and the factors affecting these types of capital were not included in the study. However, the obtained results will be a guide for especially future studies on performance, human capital and social capital in Turkish public administration.

References

- Adler, P. S., & Kwon, S-W. (2002). Social capital: Prospects for a new concept. *The Academy of Management Review*, 27(1), 17-40.
- Aguinis, H. (2014). *Performance management*. Pearson.
- Akgül, A., & Çevik, O. (2005). *İstatistiksel analiz teknikleri: SPSS'te işletme yönetimi uygulamaları*. Emek Ofset.
- Ali, M. A., Hussain, A., & Azim, A. (2013). Organizational investment in social capital (OISC) and employee job performance: Moderation by employee job engagement. *International Review of Management and Business Research*, 2(1), 250-257.
- Andrews, R. (2010). Organizational social capital, structure and performance. *Human Relations*, 63(5), 583-608.
- Armstrong, M. (2006). *Performance management: Key strategies and practical guidelines*. Kogan Page.
- Arnaboldi, M., Lapsley, I., & Steccolini, I. (2015). Performance management in the public sector: The ultimate challenge. *Financial Accountability & Management*, 31, 1-22.
- Ashraf, N., & Javed, T. (2014). Impact of social networking on employee performance. *Business Management and Strategy*, 5(2), 139-150.
- Bapna, R., Langer, N., Mehra, A., Gopal, R., & Gupta, A. (2013). Human capital investments and employee performance: An analysis of IT Services industry. *Management Science*, 59(3), 641-658.
- Bassi, L. J., & Van Buren, M. E. (1999). Valuing investments in intellectual capital. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 18(5), 414-433.
- Becker, B., & Gerhart, B. (1996). The impact of human resource management on organizational performance: Progress and prospects. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 39(4), 779-801.
- Becker, G. S. (1993). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis with special reference to education*. The University of Chicago Press.

- Ben-Hador, B. (2016). How intra-organizational social capital influences employee performance. *Journal of Management Development*, 35(9), 1119-1133.
- Ben-Hador, B. (2019). Social capital levels, gossip and employee performance in aviation and shipping companies in Israel. *International Journal of Manpower*, 40(6), 1036-1055.
- Boland, T., & Fowler, A. (2000). A systems perspective of performance management in public sector organisations. *The International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 13(5), 417-446.
- Bontis, N. (1998). Intellectual capital: An exploratory study that develops measures and models. *Management Decision*, 36(2), 63-76.
- Bontis, N. (1999). Managing organisational knowledge by diagnosing intellectual capital: Framing and advancing the state of the field. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 18(5-8), 433-463.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 99-109.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). Cultural reproduction and social reproduction. J. Karabel, & A. H. Halsey (Eds.). *Power and ideology in education* (pp. 487-511). Oxford University Press.
- Bright, L. (2007). Does person-organization fit mediate the relationship between public service motivation and the job performance of public employees? *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 27(4), 361-379.
- Burke, W. W., & Church, A. H. (1992). Managing change, leadership style, and intolerance to ambiguity: A survey of organization development practitioners. *Human Resource Management*, 31(4), 301-318.
- Cabello-Medina, C., López-Cabrales, Á., & Valle-Cabrera, R. (2011). Leveraging the innovative performance of human capital through HRM and social capital in Spanish firms. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22(4), 807-828.
- Cabrita, M. d., & Bontis, N. (2008). Intellectual capital and business performance in the Portuguese banking industry. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 43(1-3), 212-235.
- Campos, E. B., Salmador, M. P., & Merino, C. (2006). Towards a model of intellectual capital in public administrations. *Learning and Intellectual Capital*, 3(3), 214-232.
- Carkhuff, R. R. (2000). *Human possibilities human capital in the 21. century*. Possibilities Publishing.
- Carmeli, A. (2004). Strategic human capital and the performance of public sector organizations. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 20, 375-392.
- Christensen, T., Lægveid, P., Roness, P. G., & Røvik, K. A. (2007). *Organization theory and the public sector*. Taylor & Francis.
- Cinca, C. S., Molinero, C. M., & Queiroz, A. B. (2003). The measurement of intangible assets in public sector using scaling techniques. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 4(2), 249-275.
- Clausen, T., Meng, A., & Borg, V. (2019). Does social capital in the workplace predict job performance, work engagement, and psychological well-being? A prospective analysis. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 61(10), 800-805.

- Coleman, J. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, 95-120.
- Coleman, J. (1994). *Foundations of social theory*. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Corley, K. G., & Gioia, D. A. (2004). Identity, ambiguity and change in the wake of a corporate spin-off. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 49(2), 173-208.
- Crook, T. R., Todd, S. Y., Combs, J. G., Woehr, D. J., & Ketchen, D. J. (2011). Does human capital matter? A meta-analysis of the relationship between human capital and firm performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(3), 443-456.
- Crowther, D. (2002). Psychoanalysis and auditing. S. R. Clegg (Ed.). *Management and organization paradoxes* (pp. 227-246). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Dahkoul, Z. M. (2018). The determinants of employee performance in Jordanian organizations. *Journal of Economics, Finance and Accounting*, 5(1), 11-17.
- Daryoush, Y., Silong, A., Omar, Z., & Othman, J. (2013). Improving job performance: Workplace learning is the first step. *International Journal of Education & Literacy Studies*, 1(1), 100-107.
- Diamantidis, A. D., & Chatzoglou, P. (2019). Factors affecting employee performance: An empirical approach. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 68(1), 171-193.
- Drucker, P. F. (2011). *People and performance*. Routledge.
- Drucker, P. F., & Maciariello, J. A. (2008). *Management*. Harper Collins.
- Edvinsson, L. (1997). Developing intellectual capital at Skandia. *Long Range Planning*, 30(3), 366-373.
- Efendi, S., & Haryati, T. (2021). The influence of human capital, social capital, and intrinsic motivation on work commitment and their impact on employee performance at PT. Pos Indonesia Central Jakarta Branch. *ENDLESS: Journal of Futures Studies*, 4(2), 103-116.
- Ellinger, A. D., Ellinger, A. E., Bachrach, D. G., Wang, Y.-L., & Elmadağ Baş, A. B. (2011). Organizational investments in social capital, managerial coaching, and employee work-related performance. *Management Learning*, 42(1), 67-85.
- Ellinger, A. E., Musgrove, C. F., Ellinger, A. D., Bachrach, D. G., Elmadağ Baş, A. B., & Wang, Y.-L. (2013). Influences of organizational investments in social capital on service employee commitment and performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(8), 1124-1133.
- Farah, A., & Abouzeid, S. (2017). The impact of intellectual capital on performance: Evidence from the public sector. *Knowledge Management & E-Learning*, 9(2), 225-238
- Field, J. (2008). *Social capital*. Routledge.
- Flap, H. (2002). No man is an island: The research programme of a social capital theory. E. Lazega, & O. Faverau (Eds.). *Conventions and structures* (pp. 29-59). Oxford University Press.
- Fryer, K., Antony, J., & Ogden, S. (2009). Performance management in the public sector. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 22(6), 478-498.

- Fukuyama, F. (2001). Social capital, civil society and development. *Third World Quarterly*, 22(1), 7-20.
- Grant, R. M. (1996). Towrd a knowledge-based theory of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17(Winter), 109-122.
- Gruman, J. A., & Saks, A. M. (2011). Performance management and employee engagement. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21, 123-136.
- Harari, M. B., & Viswesvaran, C. (2018). Individual job performance. D. S. Ones, N. Anderson, C. Viswesvaran, & H. Kepir-Sinangil (Eds.). *The SAGE handbook of industrial work and organizational psychology* (pp. 55-72). SAGE.
- Huang, S., Yu, Z., Shao, Y., Yu, M., & Li, Z. (2021). Relative effects of human capital social capital and psychological capital on hotel employees' job performance. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 33(2), 448-466.
- Hughes, O. E. (2003). *Public management and administration*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ibarra-Colado, E. (2002). Organizational paradoxes and business ethics: In search of new modes of existence. S. R. Clegg (Ed.). *Management and organization paradoxes* (pp. 165-184). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Imran, R., & Atiya, T. M. (2020). The role of high-performance work system and human capital in enhancing job performance. *World Journal of Entrepreneurship Management and Sustainable Development*, 16(3), 195-206.
- J., A. (2013). Determinants of employee engagement and their impact on employee performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 63(3), 308-323.
- Jain, S., & Ahuja, S. K. (2019). Impact of human capital management practices on employee job performance. *Proceedings of 10th International Conference on Digital Strategies for Organizational Success*, (pp. 268-275). Gwalior, India. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3307706>.
- Jocelyne, S., & Kariuki, M. (2020). Human capital, employee empowerment and organization performance. *International Academic Journal of Human Resource and Business Administration*, 3(9), 319-332.
- Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1992). The balanced scorecard: Measures that drive performance. *Harvard Business Review*, 70(1), 71-79.
- Kashefi, M. (2012). Social capital in high performance work organizations. *International Review of Modern Sociology*, 38(1), 65-91.
- Kearney, R. C., & Berman, E. M. (1999). *Public sector performance: Management, motivation, and measurement*. Westview Press.
- Kroll, A., DeHart-Davis, L., & Vogel, D. (2019). Mechanisms of social capital in organizations: How team cognition influences employee commitment and engagement. *American Review of Public Administration*, 49(7), 777-791.
- Kurunmäki, L., & Miller, P. (2006). Modernising government: The calculating self hybridisation and performance measurement. *Financial Accountability & Management*, 22(1), 87-106.

- Leana, C. R., & van Buren, H. J. (1999). Organizational social capital and employment practices. *The Academy of Management Review*, 24(3), 538-555.
- Leonard, D., & Sensiper, S. (1998). The role of tacit knowledge in group innovation. *California Management Review*, 40(3), 112-132.
- Locke, E. A. (1970). Job satisfaction and job performance: A theoretical analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 5, 484-500.
- Marr, B. (2006). *Strategic performance management: Leveraging and measuring your intangible value drivers*. Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Motowidlo, S. J., & Kell, H. J. (2013). Job performance. I. B. Weiner (Ed.). *Handbook of psychology* (pp. 82-103). John Wiley & Sons.
- Muafi, Suwitho, Purwohandoko, & Salsabil, I. (2017). Human capital in Islamic Bank and its effect on the improvement of healthy organization and employee performance. *International Journal for Quality Research*, 11(4), 849-868.
- Nahapiet, J., & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage. *The Academy of Management Review*, 23(2), 242-266.
- Na-Nan, K., Chaiprasit, K., & Pukkeeree, P. (2018). Factor analysis-validated comprehensive employee job performance scale. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 35(10), 2436-2449.
- Nerdrum, L., & Erikson, T. (2001). Intellectual capital: A human capital perspective. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 2(2), 127-135.
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory*. McGraw-Hill.
- Oliver, R. W. (2001). Real time strategy: The return on human capital. *Journal of Business Strategy*, 22(4), 7-10.
- Özdemir, B., & Taşçı, D. (2017). Entelektüel sermaye ölçeğinin geçerlik ve güvenilirliğinin testi: Türkiye'nin ilk 1000 sanayi kuruluşu'nda ampirik bir araştırma. *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies*, 61, 363-372.
- Perera, K. A., & Weerakkody, W. A. (2018). The impact of human capital and social capital on employee performance: A study of employees in small scale industry enterprises in Western Province of Sri Lanka. Kelaniya. *Journal of Human Resource Management*, 13(1), 38-48.
- Petty, R., & Guthrie, J. (2000). Intellectual capital literature review: Measurement, reporting and management. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 1(2), 155-176.
- Philip, O. O., & Ikechukwu, D. (2018). Impact of human capital development on employee performance: A study of selected oil service firms in Rivers State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Management Research*, 4(3), 56-69.
- Pollitt, C. (2008). *Time, policy, management: governing with the past*. Oxford University Press.
- Porter, M. E. (1998). *Competitive advantage: Creating and sustaining superior performance*. The Free Press.
- Pradhan, R. K., & Jena, L. K. (2017). Employee performance at workplace: Conceptual model and empirical validation. *Business Perspectives and Research*, 5(1), 69-85.

- Pudawawan, B., & Sutarlan, S. (2018). Improving employees' performance through social capital. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 20(8), 65-72.
- Pugh, D. S., & Hickson, D. J. (2007). *Great writers on organizations*. Ashgate.
- Pulakos, E. D., Arad, S., Donovan, M. A., & Plamondon, K. E. (2000). Adaptability in the workplace: Development of a taxonomy of adaptive performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(4), 612-624.
- Putnam, R. (1993). The prosperous community: Social capital and public life. *The American Prospect*, 13, 35-42.
- Radnor, Z., & McGuire, M. (2003). Performance management in the public sector: Fact or fiction? *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 53(3), 245-260.
- Rainey, H. G. (2014). *Understanding and managing public organizations*. Jossey-Bass.
- Roos, C. (2008). *The use of human capital for good governance*. Institute of Social Studies
- Rumawas, W. (2018). The role of human capital to the improvement of employee performance in fisheries companies in North Sulawesi Province. *International Journal of Applied Business & International Management*, 3(2), 71-77.
- Sarnovics, A. (2010). Human resource development in public administration: A case of Latvia. *Human Resources Management & Ergonomics*, 4(1), 1-12.
- Schmid, A. A., & Robison, L. J. (1995). Applications of social capital theory. *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics*, 27(1), 59-66.
- Schultz, T. W. (1993). The economic importance of human capital in modernization. *Education Economics*, 1(1), 13-19.
- Seibert, S. E., Kraimer, M. L., & Liden, R. C. (2001). A social capital theory of career success. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(2), 219-237.
- Shaw, J. D., Duffy, M. K., Johnson, J. L., & Lockhart, D. E. (2005). Social capital losses, and performance. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 48(4), 594-606.
- Soehari, T. D., Budiningsih, I., Aima, H., & Assauri, H. (2017). Strategic factors of human capital for employees performance improvement. *International Journal of Economic Research*, 14(12), 49-67.
- Sonnentag, S., Volmer, J., & Spsychala, A. (2008). Job performance. J. Barling, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.). *The SAGE handbook of organizational behavior* (pp. 427-448). SAGE Publications.
- Stewart, T. A. (1997). *Entelektüel sermaye: Örgütlerin yeni zenginliği*. MESS Yayınları.
- Storberg, J. (2002). The evolution of capital theory: A critique of a theory of social capital and implications for HRD. *Human Resource Development Review*, 1(4), 468-499.
- Subramaniam, M., & Youndt, M. A. (2005). The influence of intellectual capital on the types of innovative capabilities. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(3), 450-463.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics*. Pearson.
- Tantardini, M., Guo, H. D., & Ganapati, N. (2017). Social capital and public financial performance: Lessons from Florida. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 40(3), 480-503.

- Van Dooren, W., Bouckaert, G., & Halligan, J. (2018). *Performance management in the public sector*. Routledge.
- Viswesvaran, C., & Ones, D. S. (2000). Perspectives on models of job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 8(4), 216-226.
- Vosloban, R. I. (2012). The influence of the employee's performance on the company's growth-a managerial perspective. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 3, 660-665.
- Weatherly, L. A. (2003). *The value of people. The challenges and opportunities of human capital measurement and reporting*. Research Quarterly, Society for Human Resource Management.
- Weaver, R. D., & Habibov, N. (2012). Social capital, human capital, and economic well-being in the knowledge economy: Results from Canada's General Social Survey. *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*, 39(2), 31-53.
- Yeh-Yun Lin, C., & Edvinsson, L. (2011). *National intellectual capital*. Springer.