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1. INTRODUCTION

Human capital (HC) is a concept to which social sciences scholars and researchers are interested since at least a couple of centuries.

The debate that has developed around its definition and measurement has always remained alive, by feeding on new theories and interpretations, as well as on evidence, and still is topical. Indeed, it represents a question at which, besides the traditional, so to say, interest of economists and sociologists, points since long time the attention of statisticians and econometricians.\(^1\)

HC formation, and the related activity, similarly to what occurs as regards the physical capital stock formation, is a question, if possible, even more topical, not to say that it represents one of the points on which it is necessary to think over more, due to its implications on the economic development and on the individual welfare.

In order to try to approach the matter in a general and, in the meantime, useful way to the developments that I wish to give to the paper in what follows, let’s begin with the reflexes on the economic development, i.e., from the macro side, even though the title might drive at once to think of micro behaviours.

I realize that I’m approaching things a bit from afar; but I guess it is useful to clearly frame, although summarily at all, the rather technical treatment I intend to develop later on.

Let’s start from globalization. Either we like it or not – and I admit that the ele-

---

\(^1\) HC is commonly defined as the increasing in education and attitude to work due to education, formation directly received at work and improvement of health and psycho-physical conditions (see, for example, Vittadini et al., 2003a; 2003b, also for a historical-systematic critical analysis of HC theory). HC theory views schooling as an investment in skills and hence as a way of augmenting worker productivity as well (Wolff, 2000).

In 2003, the European Council has pointed out that HC is a great lever for social cohesion and economic growth, by stressing that the achievement within 2010 of the objectives put in Lisbon in 2000 in the fields of education and formation is the essential condition to put the EU social and economic policy into effect.
ments that enliven the discussion about the theme, which in turn basically rests on social-political presuppositions, are difficult to be disentangled – we are however inside it and one cannot think of driving its path with the classic, consolidated and reassuring instruments to which the macroeconomic routine has accustomed us.

It is useless, it seems to me, to think of coming out and solving the problems it presents for the developed economies, first of all on the trade side and then on the whole economic financial one, by going back to tolls and tariffs. Indeed, someone proposes now the customs tariffs, but, after all, without actually trusting them and having he himself the perception that this is a blunt tool, which might also turn into a remedy worse than the evil.

Not even there is a need to deceive ourselves of being in a position to compete with the emerging countries with instruments that, while for the developed countries, with socio-economic structures still much welfare state oriented and basically old, are much blunt, for them are absolutely sharp.

What I mean is that for us, to make resort to the “easy”, low cost and not unionized labour force, is not even thinkable, on the economic side more than on the ethical-social one, and indeed nobody not even speaks about it.

Thus, it is necessary to approach the globalization with new mentality and tools, which after all are not new, but rather old, and to go along ways so far unfortunately little explored, not to say, neglected.

In other words, it is necessary to put the emphasis on the intangible characteristics of western societies and to basically make resort to an instrument, they can have at their disposal: the high level HC formation and by firmly trusting it, that a society like ours, and I refer both to our country and, even more, to the European Union (EU), should be in a position to implement better than any other social context. This, if not because of historical background and substance itself of their development model, based on presuppositions of strong solidarity, wide human content and social equity.

Of personal HC, rather than of the national one, to conjugate, according to Dagum and Slottje (2000) “the endogenous economic development to the efficiency and the social equity, and therefore, to deal with the problems of socially unacceptable poverty and inequality”.

In this way, we come back to micro, by referring to the individual aspects, or even better, to the personal ones, and namely, to the personal income distribution, which goes back to Pareto’s work, who was the first to analyze a personal income distribution model.

Always according to Dagum and Slottje (2000), the theoretical production function implied by this personal income distribution concept includes labour among the arguments. But not a labour measured in man-hours worked, but a HC employed. Hence, the usual specification of the production function, \( Y=f(L,K) \), with \( Y \) the output produced by labour \( L \) and capital \( K \), transforms in \( Y=f(H,K) \), with the HC, \( H \), that substitutes the generic labour stock \( L \), so that the output is produced on the basis of capital and of a set of factors such as experience, formation and education incorporated into the labour.

Hence, the question of production and of its formalization through an ade-
quate neo-classic-fashioned functional form, if one looks at it with eyes not veiled with too much technical schematism, takes just more interesting contours, if not from an ideal point of view, with the intervention, as an input in the production function, of the concept of HC and of a measurement of it.

From this use of the HC as a production factor to the further extension of the theoretical frame up to the production itself of HC, and hence, to the HC as the result of a given production process which uses certain inputs, the step is not short – and we’ll see it later on – but it is almost spontaneous to develop the discussion in this direction.

In this respect, things are not simple at all. Indeed, to try to model HC production by means a production function with arguments represented by proper inputs is an anything but easy operation, first of all, at a conceptual level, and then, as a consequence, at the level of choice and definition of both independent and dependent variables. For instance, Dagum-Slottje (2000) again try to solve the problem by treating HC as a latent variable.

There are problems of a convincing adjustment of the theoretical frame to the neo-classic production theory context which is thought to describe and explain the production of concrete objects and not of an abstract concept such as HC. Solved this problems, others of choice, definition and measurement of the variables do appear.

Once reasonable and consistent solutions to all these problems are found, one can proceed to the estimation of the parameters of the HC production function. Afterwards, one can estimate “how” HC is produced, that is, how much the production process is efficient in producing, and, of such an efficiency degree, to provide a measurement endowed with satisfactory properties.

The latter is the overall objective of this paper. Specific goal is to examine the HC formation at university level that is performed in Italy, by regarding it from the point of view of the technical efficiency, and by taking the case of Florence as an example.

This paper basically reproduces the discussion, the models and the outcomes that have occurred in the framework of the research project on the frontier efficiency concerning the production in textile and in services sectors and in the university education sector, the latter published in a number of papers (Ferrari et al., 2001 and Ferrari and Laureti, 2004a, 2004b, 2005).

Thus, in paragraph 2, the theoretical foundations that are at the basis of the modelling that is convenient to implement in order to proceed in the analysis by making use of the tools provided by the neo-classic theory of production to describe and analyze the production process will be discussed. In paragraph 3, the above technical tools, represented by the production frontiers and by the efficiency measures, properly fitted to the specific case, will be illustrated and discussed. In paragraph 4, the dataset on which the empirical analysis is based will be described. In paragraph 5, a discussion of the main findings concerning individual graduates efficiency, the efficiency due to faculties and the factors that explain the average grade at exams will be carried out, whereas some conclusions will be drawn in paragraph 6.
2. THE HC PRODUCTION PROCESS IN THE ITALIAN UNIVERSITY

2.1 The model

The formation of a graduate is a very complex process, which involves cultural and intellectual elements, such as lectures, tutorials, discussions, seminars, study groups, as long as material and non material goods such as libraries, class rooms, computers, assistance services to students, secretaries and tutors. As such, this formation process can be regarded as a production process.

In fact, a student enters the university with a given background and specific knowledge, mostly deriving from his elementary, intermediate and secondary education and is transformed, after a certain number of years – during which he is submitted to a “cultural transformation” process – in a more educated person (that is, in a person with a higher cultural level).

Thus, one can affirm that, specifically, it is a HC production process in which university, through the education it delivers, transforms a “raw” material in a “refined” one, by means of the utilization of those cultural, intellectual material and non material production factors. In this context, the student who is submitted to the above cultural transformation process can be viewed as a production factor.

Nevertheless, it is evident that the education process is characterized by peculiarities that differentiate it from the “classic” production factors, that is, from those processes in which a set of material and non material factors is transformed in one or more material or non material, and make it a process much complex to conceptually bound.

Among these peculiarities, one should stress the intangible and multiple nature of the product, which is represented by a graduate endowed with a certain amount of knowledge, as well as the heterogeneity of students, who differ each other as regards many exogenous dimensions, such as gender, age, kind of secondary school diploma and, above all, as regards psychological, social, family characteristics. In other words, the process is characterized by a heterogeneity, both in production factors and in product, stronger than that one can see in goods and services production, which makes it a very peculiar case in neo-classic panorama.

A further peculiarity is represented by the fact that the student, besides being the object of the education process, takes part more or less actively in its delivering and influences it result as well.

Notwithstanding the above peculiarity, the analysis of this HC production process can actually be performed, as it has just been anticipated, within the neo-classic production theory.

Nevertheless, it is worth making some further remarks. First of all, in the neo-classic approach it is implicitly postulated that the production process in not affected by “external” conditions represented by the characteristics of the area in which it takes place. It is, of course, influenced by external infrastructures such as roads, ports, transportation means, etc., but the production model assumes that the product only depends on its own specific conditions.

On the contrary, the university education process is heavily influenced by fur-
ther conditions, besides the specific ones, such as the research activity carried out, the overall study and life atmosphere in the university, the socio-economic context of the area in which the university is situated. As a consequence, the condition that the process takes place in a isolated way is violated.

Additional difficulties are represented by the fact that some factors, such as the time devoted to study by the student, his interest, his inborn capacity, teachers’ quality, etc., cannot be easily observed and quantified. Consequently, they cannot be expressed as production factors in the process, which therefore characterizes itself as one in which it is hard to identify, quantify and measure all production factors.

The same remarks can be made as far as the product is concerned. Indeed, it is often represented by qualitative variables difficult to identify and define in the quantitative framework.

In spite of all the above, it is possible to identify a reasonable set of production factors and products that allows to model the production process.

2.2 The production unit

As occurs in neo-classic production approach, there is here too the need of identifying the production unit which, by using a given set of factors, obtains a given set of products.

Let’s set aside at once the intent, reasonable as based on the idea that it is capable of producing graduates by using teachers, class rooms, libraries, etc., of taking a faculty as the production unit. The empirical analysis will be bounded to Florence University, due both to data availability reasons, and to the need to eliminate as much as possible the influence of the above environmental factors. As the faculties are 11, the production space would be too restricted to provide significant results: given the number of production units and that of factors and products, the degrees of freedom would be too few.

Let’s discard the idea to bring ourselves at a lower aggregation level, that of the degree courses, that are about 40, and to consider them as production units, since they present many problems of lack of data about teachers, class rooms, etc.

The question can be solved by approaching the reasoning from a representation given by Catalano and Silvestri (1992), of a production process where the university provides the student with goods and services to be utilized to carry out production activity, which allows to identify the production unit as the student who produces himself as a graduate.

Indeed, in the university education, where the student is in the meantime production factor, protagonist and recipient of the production activity, it seems reasonable to keep him as the production unit which, by utilizing didactic resources and equipment provided by the faculty he attends, produces himself as a graduate.

Thus, the production process is modelled as a factor-products space where the observed points are represented by the students.
2.3 Factors and products

The identification, quantification and measurement of the production factors and of the products associated to the above production process is somewhat problematic.

The first difficulties are met on the production factors side. Indeed, the production process is carried out by referring to a student of a given faculty. Therefore, the factor set is formed by the material and non material goods provided by the faculty and by the student himself. The former are represented by professors, researchers, sits in classrooms, tutorials, textbooks, reviews and papers and by all the assistance services, both bureaucratic and tutorial. The latter are represented by the education level reached by the student before approaching university, that is, by the degree of “accumulated knowledge” and by individual characteristics. As a consequence, at least identification and measurement problems there emerge.

If as for the production factors there are uncertainties, the problems related to the identification, quantification and measurement of proper products are even more complicated.

There are, first of all, noteworthy difficulties in the interpretation of the “exit” of the process, as the graduate is characterized by a set of variables, mainly qualitative, that reflect the level of education he received.

This is, as anticipated in the Introduction, a complex and not easy to be solved question, since actually there is a need of measuring the HC represented by a graduate, even though in an indirect way and without the intent – as this is not an objective of this paper - to deeply enter the many and debated problems that are linked to it.

It is evident that here the problem is approached and solved in a very operational way, by making resort to a reasoning scheme that is finalized to the goal, not to identify a HC production function, but, in a much more restricted way, to identify a production function in which the exits of the process i.e., the products – we will see in a moment that there will be one exit only – are a reasonable and acceptable quantitative representation of the specific production activity that has been modelled.

One can imagine various quantitative representations. A possible, reasonable and available measure of the education level embodied in the graduate is constituted by the average grade at exams. And indeed, this will be the representation of the product that will be used in this paper.

3. THE MEASUREMENT OF THE EFFICIENCY IN THE UNIVERSITY EDUCATION PROCESS: THE FRONTIER EFFICIENCY

3.1 The non-parametric approach

Two are the approaches that one can follow in the construction of production frontiers: the non-parametric and the parametric ones. While the former is essen-
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基本上为一种确定性方法，通常在工程框架中应用，后者进一步具体化为确定性和随机性方法。在这篇论文中，非参数化方法将被使用。

在非参数化方法中，相对生产效率，即前沿效率，是根据生产因素和产品（x,y）的向量集形成的一组观测数据。这组生产因素和产品向量集（也称为净输出向量）由生产过程形成。

前沿效率是使用参考向量集Y0衡量的。这通常采用以生产集Y为基准的假设，生产集Y0由生产因素向量和产品向量（x,y）形成，即生产过程的向量集（也称为净产出向量）由生产因素和产品向量形成。

如果一个过程x是输入效率的，那么它的输入效率将被定义为从原点到x的线。因此，这个距离是一个效率度量。

它显而易见，如果x(143)∈Y输入效率，则x=x*(13)且上述度量等于1。反之，如果F(x,y)＞1，x=λx*＜x*(13)且因此x∉L(y)和(x,y)不是可行过程。因此，0 ≤ λ ≤ 1。

法雷尔效率度量呈现了一个不可忽视的不方便。因为它以等产量集为基准集——作为径向减少（即所有输入的等比减少）——尽管等产量集包含有效的集合，但反之则不一定是必然的。因此，可能会出现等产量集不包括有效集的情况——尽管等产量集包括效率度量的足够集，其逆数不一定是真实的。因此，它可能发生在非参数化情况下，从所有可能的方法中，DEA是最广泛使用的方法之一，因为它具有吸引人的特点。一般来说，它是一种确定性方法——正如在这篇论文中使用的那样——因为假设所有从前沿的差异都是由于效率低下。

然而，有一种研究流派将分析扩展到随机领域，尽管有许多复杂性。

\[ d(x,y) = \min \{ \lambda | \lambda x \in L(y) \} \]

其中||表示一个向量的模长，x*表示输入效率向量，即在L(y)的前缘上由从原点的线标识的向量。因此，这个距离是一个效率度量。

它显而易见，如果x(143)∈Y是输入效率的，则x=x*(13)和上述度量相等。因此，效率度量等于1。反之，如果F(x,y)＜1（即，x=λx*＞x*且因此x∈L(y)）。反之，如果F(x,y)＞1，x=λx*＜x*且因此x∉L(y)和(x,y)不是可行过程。因此，0 ≤ λ ≤ 1。

法雷尔效率度量呈现了一个不可忽视的不方便。因为它以等产量集为基准集——作为径向减少（即所有输入的等比减少）——尽管等产量集包含有效的集合，但反之则不一定是必然的。因此，它可能发生在非参数化情况下，从所有可能的方法中，DEA是最广泛使用的方法之一，因为它具有吸引人的特点。一般来说，它是一种确定性方法——正如在这篇论文中使用的那样——因为假设所有从前沿的差异都是由于效率低下。然而，有一种研究流派将分析扩展到随机领域，尽管有许多复杂性。

在非参数化情况下，常用的等产量集方法之一是DEA，因为它具有吸引人的特点。一般来说，它是一种确定性方法——正如在这篇论文中使用的那样——因为假设所有从前沿的差异都是由于效率低下。然而，有一种研究流派将分析扩展到随机领域，尽管有许多复杂性。
efficient vector is one of the efficient vectors and not the unique. In this case, the condition that a production process is technically efficient if and only if it is impossible to produce more of some product without using more of some production factor, or without producing less of some other product is violated, with the consequence of producing with bigger quantities of some factor, or of obtaining smaller quantities of some product than it would be possible.

This is an anything but theoretical possibility, that can occur in a wide range of specifications of the production technology much utilized.

This drawback can be overcome by making resort to non-radial technical efficiency measures.

The Russell measure, a non-radial generalization of Farrell measure, that has been proposed by Färe and Lovell (1978), and that is not the case to report here, is flexible enough to allow to select a vector from the set of all the efficient vectors as regards to which to calculate the technical efficiency.

In this paper, since some factors are not under the direct control of the student, the Farrell efficiency measure that is used is an output-efficiency, \( \phi = \frac{|y|}{|y^*|} \).

This is a measure defined as a (radial) distance function, or output distance, where \( y^* \) denotes the output-efficient vector, that is, the vector that on the frontier of the sub-set \( P(y) \), defined as the set of all vectors of products affordable from the production factors vector \( x \), is identified by the line from the origin to \( y \).

Looking at the production activity in a wide meaning, one should note that, while in private sector the objective of the production unit is unique and consists of maximizing profit, for the public production unit the objectives are manifold, difficult to quantify and partly irreconcilable among them. According to Pestieau and Tulkens (1969), they can be summarized in: (i) efficiency (both technical and economic), (ii) equity, (iii) financial equilibrium, and, (iv) macroeconomic improvements (as regards unemployment, inflation, etc.). Now, it is clear that they represent as many constraints in the decisions that must be taken by the public entrepreneur, and, furthermore, contradictory constraints, since choices that would be positive from the economic point of view, can be questionable on the equity field, and vice-versa. In the evaluation of the global performance of a public production unit, it is necessary to take account of this circumstance, so that one should be able to establish in which proportion each of the objectives has been achieved, which is decidedly difficult.

A way to overcome the complexity of the problem consists of restraining oneself to evaluate the behaviour of the public production unit from the point of view of the technical efficiency, the only objective whose achievement does not prejudice the achievement of the others, since, as pointed out by Pestieau and Tulkens (1990), to produce too little or to use too many production factors as regards how much is technically possible is surely the consequence of a wrong behaviour that cannot be justified by the pursuing of none of the other above listed objectives.

Since the students who produce themselves as graduates make it in universities
that are for more than 90% public, it seems opportune to conduct the analysis in the framework of the concept of technical frontier efficiency.

The production set \( Y \) which satisfies the hypothesis of variable returns to scale, the assumption that better is justified as it is very general and better fits the data base, can be expressed in the following form:

\[
P = \left\{ (x, y) \left| x_i \geq \sum_{j=1}^{n} \lambda_j x_{ij} \ (i = 1, \ldots, s) \ y_r \leq \sum_{j=1}^{n} \lambda_j y_{jr} \ (r = 1, \ldots, m) \right. \lambda_j \geq 0 \ (j = 1, \ldots, n) \right\}
\]

where \( n \) is the number of units, \( s \) the number of factors and \( m \) the number of output and \( \lambda_j \) is the weight of the \( j^{th} \) unit when the reference point on the frontier is defined. The variable returns to scale imply that the set \( Y \) forms a polyhedron.

The Farrell output efficiency measure, specified as \( F_0(x, y) = \max \{ \phi \mid y \in P(x) \} \), expresses the radial expansion of the output vector \( y \) determined as ratio between observed vector and vector on the frontier.

The measure can be obtained by solving the following linear programming system:

\[
\begin{align*}
\max & \quad \phi_j \\
\text{subject to:} & \\
\sum_{b=1}^{n} A_{b} y_{bh} \geq \phi_j y_{j} & \quad r = 1, \ldots, m; \quad j = 1, \ldots, n \\
\sum_{b=1}^{n} A_{b} x_{bh} \leq x_{ij} & \quad i = 1, \ldots, s \\
\lambda_j & \geq 0; \\
\sum_{b=1}^{n} \lambda_j & = 1
\end{align*}
\]

3.2 The evaluation of the faculty role

The efficiency exhibited by each student in producing himself as a graduate can partially be attributed to the efficiency of the faculty he attends.

In fact, besides the accumulated knowledge and the individual characteristics, individual production factors provided by each student and different case by case, the faculty provides the students with the other factors; as above said, class rooms, furniture, libraries, teachers, just made available to all students in the same quantity and quality.

Now, it is evident that if one would aim to evaluate the efficiency of the students of a faculty, there would be no problem, as the measure would not be influenced by differential factors other those represented by the individual characteristics.
Since, however, one aims at evaluating the production performance of students belonging to different faculties, it is necessary to keep into consideration also the faculty, in order to measure the efficiency independently on the weight represented by the faculty itself.

In other words, it is necessary to decompose the efficiency in the part ascribable to the student and in the part ascribable to the faculty.

This can be done through a procedure called Programme Evaluation (PE), that is, evaluation of the programme or faculty, which allows to decompose the overall efficiency in a within component and in a between component.

In order to better understand this decomposition, it may be useful to refer to the figure below, by imagining, for the sake of simplicity, a production situation with one factor and one product only, relative to students from two faculties, $A$ and $B$.

The frontier of Faculty $A$, based on DEA with the hypothesis of variable return to scale, is represented by the line from $x$ axis and passing through $A_1$, $A_3$, and $A_5$; the frontier of Faculty $B$ is represented by the line from $x$ axis and passing through $B_1$, $B_2$, and $B_5$, both of them are within frontiers (the students’ frontier internal to the faculties). The overall frontier, that envelops all graduates, is represented by the line from $x$ axis and passing through $A_1$, $A_3$, $B'_2$, $B'_4$, and $B_5$.

![Figure 1](image)

**Fig. 1** – Overall and within frontiers under the hypothesis of variable returns to scale.
Consequently, in the output efficiency framework, the student $B_i$ of the Faculty $B$, has an overall efficiency equal to $B_i / B_i'$. 

This measure can be decomposed in: (i) a within efficiency, defined as the ratio $B_i / B_i'$, which represents the portion of efficiency of the student $B_i$ as regards the best results obtained by the students of the Faculty $B$ only ascribable to his individual characteristics; (ii) a between efficiency, represented by the ratio $B_i' / B_i'$, which provides a measure of the impact of the Faculty $B$ on student’s performance.

Conversely, the student $B_3$, always of Faculty $B$, exhibits a within efficiency equal to 1, and a between efficiency equal to $H_B / H_B'$, due to the inefficiency of his faculty.

Finally, the student $A_1$, situated on the global frontier, exhibits both within and global efficiency equal to 1.

Actually, a way to estimate the faculty weight consists of calculating the output efficiency for graduates separately for each of 11 faculties and of bringing the inefficient graduates up to their faculty frontier, so to obtain a new envelop where the inefficiency is eliminated. Then, the significance of the differences among faculties is tested by means of a non-parametric test, usually the Kruskal and Wallis one.

4. DATA USED

The data used in the analysis come from different sources, although all in the framework of the survey conducted at the Department of Statistics of the University of Florence concerning the labour outfall of about 2,500 graduates in 1998 in the University of Florence.

Additional data on didactic production factors of the faculties during the period 1990-98 have been collected at the administrative archives and the Central Library of the University of Florence.

After eliminating 41 outliers as regards the variable “length of study” by using the so-called three-sigma rule, by putting at less than 5% the probability that such a variable is three times greater than the standard deviation, the final group was formed by 2,236 graduates. The following production factors have been selected:

**Human resources:**
1. average number of full and associate professors by student;
2. average number of researchers by student.

**Capital:**
3. average number of sits in class room by student;
4. average number of class rooms by student;
5. average number of books in library by student;
6. average number of reviews in library by student;
7. average number of furniture provided by University by student;
8. average number of instruments provided by University by student.

**Individual factors:**

9. secondary school diploma grade;
10. actual length of degree course.

As regards the product, the average grade at the exams has been chosen to represent it.

5. **EVIDENCE FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORENCE**

5.1 **Overall graduates efficiency**

The output efficiency measures $\phi$, obtained by means of the software DEAP 2.1 (Coelli, 1996), have been grouped by classes, as reported in Table 1.

A brief comment of them is in order (a detailed discussion of the case of constant return to scale can be found in Ferrari and Laureti, 2005. Here, the aim is to outline the main findings under the assumption of variable returns to scale useful to a better understanding of the development given in the following pages).

### TABella 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficiency class</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
<th>% Frequencies</th>
<th>Cumulated % Frequencies</th>
<th>Reverse Cumulated % Frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.70-0.80</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80-0.85</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>98.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85-0.90</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90-0.95</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95-1.00</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,236</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First of all, it is worth noting that no graduate has an efficiency lower than 70%; if 50% efficiency is taken as a turning point for efficiency from low to acceptable level, one can affirm that by far there is no HC formed in an inefficient way, all the more so because more than 90% of graduates exhibits an efficiency greater than 85%.

Full efficiency, that is, $\phi = 1$, occurs in 161 cases, 7.2% out of the total.

Anyway, very satisfactory efficiency, that is, efficiency $\geq 90\%$, is reached by 71.8% of graduates. But also, an efficiency of 80% to 90% is not a despicable level at all and it is reached by 26.8% of graduates.

As the overall average efficiency is 0.925, the unexploited production capacity is 7.5%, that is, the inefficient graduates do not have exploited 7.5% of the production factors. In other words, they could have increased the average grade at exams by 7.5% without augmenting the human resources, capital and individual characteristics factors. This average margin is rather low and testifies that the HC formation in the University of Florence takes place in a satisfactorily efficient
way. The factors are, of course, not fully efficiently employed, but not at a dramatic level at all.

5.2 Efficiency by faculty

Technical efficiency measures by faculty are reported in Tab. 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Number of graduates</th>
<th>Overall average (geometric) efficiency</th>
<th>Within efficiency</th>
<th>Between efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fac1 Agriculture</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac2 Architecture</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>0.946</td>
<td>0.946</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac3 Economics</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>0.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac4 Pharmacy</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.949</td>
<td>0.949</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac5 Law</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>0.927</td>
<td>0.927</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac6 Engineering</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>0.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac7 Literature &amp; Philosophy</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>0.959</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>0.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac8 Medicine &amp; Surgery</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td>0.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac9 Sciences, Mathematics, Physics</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>0.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac10 Political Sciences</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td>0.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac11 Formation Science</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>0.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2,236</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td>0.981</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A look at column 2 shows that graduates in Formation Sciences are the most efficient, with their overall efficiency average level of 0.966, a little bit higher than that of the graduates in Literature & Philosophy (0.959), Pharmacy (0.949), Architecture (0.946), Political Sciences (0.942), and Medicine & Surgery (0.922), against the graduates in Economics, who are the less efficient, with their overall average level of 0.889, which, however, is not dramatically far away from the above levels.

After checking through the Kruskal and Wallis test that the association between faculty and degree of efficiency is significant, the application of the PE procedure has provided the results shown at columns 3 and 4 of Tab. 2.

As has been stressed above, the weight of the faculty in students’ performance is relevant. Also, it varies across faculties, as was easy to expect and as column 4 of Tab. 2 clearly show.

Moreover, there is evidence that the contribution of faculties to the overall efficiency is greater than that ascribable to students’ individual characteristics. In fact, the between efficiency, except that in the case of Medicine & Surgery, is always higher than the within one.

The faculties that more contribute to students’ efficiency are Architecture, Pharmacy and Law, with between efficiency accounting for 1. This also shows that the three faculties are fully efficient, that is, that they do not need to increase the average number of full and associate professors, the average number of researchers for student, the average number of sits in class rooms, the average number of class rooms, and the average number of books in library; a somewhat unexpected result that need to be further investigated in subsequent analyses.

Again, Political Sciences, with a between efficiency of 0.998 and Formation Science, with a between efficiency of 0.997, provide a relevant contribution, vir-
tually equal to 1. All the other faculties show lower contributions, even though in no case lower than 95%.

On average, the faculties contribution to efficiency accounts for 0.981, which means that the students could have increased the average grade at exams by only 1.9% without the faculty should increase the above mentioned human resources and capital factors.

The graduates individual characteristics contribution to efficiency, besides being lower than that provided by faculties, except in the case of Medicine & Surgery, as remarked above, is somewhat lower on average, 0.943 - the students could have increased the average grade at exams by 6.7% without the need of augmenting the individual characteristics factors - ranging from the highest within efficiency exhibited by Formation Science, 0.969, to the lowest efficiency exhibited by Law (0.927). In the latter case, the students’ individual inefficiency is particularly heavy as they do not fully take benefit from the excellent organization of their faculty (between efficiency equal 1).

As a consequence, the Faculty of Law does not need to increase its efficiency, but should take account of the fact that its students have on average more reduced individual capacity and therefore eventually establish preliminary programmes of integration of the education its students have received in secondary school.

More generally, any faculty with a relatively higher between component should behave similarly.

Vice-versa, any faculty with a relatively higher within component should try to improve its own efficiency, by equipping itself with better human resources and capital, such as better teachers, administrative personnel, structures, etc.

5.3 Factors that explain the average grade at exams

Selecting the graduates with within efficiency equal to 1 or nearly 1, whose number total 513, through a regression analysis it is possible to analyse their characteristics.

It is convenient to carry out distinct estimation for each faculty; it is thus possible to analyze the graduates under the same organization conditions and resource endowment.

The dependent variable is represented by the exams average grade. The explanatory variables, which express individual characteristics, are gender and residency, whereas the school background is expressed by type of secondary school diploma (scientific or classic lyceum, or other type of secondary school), elementary, intermediate and secondary school attendance regularity, i.e., whether the graduate has been a regular school path or he had to repeat some year, and whether the graduate has been working during schooling or not.

Results concerning the two most interesting faculties, of course to this respect, are presented at Tab. 3. As for the other faculties, the analysis of results is still under control and discussion and will be globally presented and discussed in a subsequent paper.
Tabella 3
Regression analysis for Law and Literature & Philosophy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Literature &amp; Philosophy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.165</td>
<td>0.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Reference category = Males)</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>0.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence province</td>
<td>-0.523</td>
<td>0.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other province</td>
<td>-1.828</td>
<td>0.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous education</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>0.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>-0.423</td>
<td>0.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Reference category = No Lyceum)</td>
<td>0.592</td>
<td>0.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School regularity</td>
<td>-1.608</td>
<td>0.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Reference category = Regular)</td>
<td>0.669</td>
<td>0.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working during schooling</td>
<td>-1.138</td>
<td>0.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Reference category = No)</td>
<td>0.501</td>
<td>0.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>27.213</td>
<td>28.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.observations</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj.R-square</td>
<td>0.2123</td>
<td>0.1215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If one takes the efficient graduates in the Faculty of Law, which exhibits the lowest level of within efficiency, among the individual characteristics that influence the achievement of high average grades he finds the primary and secondary school regularity, the gender and working activity during the study.

Among the most efficient graduates of the Faculty of Literature & Philosophy, the gender and the kind of diploma show a particular relevance in the achievement of high average grades.

By and large, it should be stressed that the school regularity, that is not significant for the graduates in Literature & Philosophy, takes a special importance in nearly all the other full efficient graduates of Florence University, particularly for graduates in Agriculture, Architecture and Economics Faculties.

6. Conclusions

In the measurement of the technical efficiency of 2,236 graduates in 1998 in the University of Florence, that is to say, in the formation of HC at university level, the starting point has been represented by the modelling of the production process as one in which the student produces himself as a graduate.

This is an original way of looking at the production process which generates HC that allows to operate in a satisfactory technical way in the framework of the production theory, with interesting and promising results, that can provide further useful developments.

The tool that have been used is the DEA methodology, one of the most widely used in the framework of the non-parametric approach to the frontier technical efficiency, chosen for undertaking this analysis, that seemed to be the most adequate to describe and interpret such a production process. Likewise, it appeared most adequate to conduct the analysis under the variable returns to scale assumption.

The factors utilized are a set of human resources and capital provided by faculties, joined to two individual factors represented by the secondary school diploma grade and by the actual length of degree course.
The analysis has been conducted both for all graduates and at faculty level, in order to focus the contribution provided by the latter to efficiency, by disjoining it from the efficiency due to graduates individual characteristics. Moreover, inside the group of 513 graduates with full or nearly full efficiency, a regression analysis has been conducted, with the aim of identifying the factors correlated to the average grade.

Globally, there was evidence that the 2,236 students who graduated in 1998, did it with an average efficiency of 0.925, and therefore, an inefficiency of 7.5%, a not dramatic unexploited production capacity at all. Moreover, the efficiencies are shifted towards 100%, with 71.8% of graduates that shows an efficiency equal or greater than 90%.

At faculty level, the faculty with the most efficiently graduated students was Formation Science; on the contrary, the Faculty of Economics is the one with the less efficient graduates.

The contribution provided to technical efficiency by faculties’ organization (between efficiency) is greater than that provided by the students individual characteristics (within efficiency).

The faculties that most contribute to graduates efficiency are Architecture, Pharmacy, Law, Political Sciences and Formation Science.

There is evidence that among the factors that more explain the efficiency due to individual characteristics, there are primary and secondary school regularity, gender, working activity during university study, and kind of diploma.

Of course, these are initial, somewhat compact results, which deserve further deepening that might allow to reach more detailed and robust conclusions. Nevertheless, they constitute an already very explanatory information material, which allows to get some conclusions and offers indications for further research extension.

Dipartimento di Statistica “G. Parenti”
Università di Firenze
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RIASSUNTO

La modellazione della formazione del capitale umano nell’università e la misura della sua efficienza. Il caso dell’Università di Firenze

In questo lavoro viene effettuata un’analisi dell’efficienza tecnica di 2.236 laureati nel 1998 nell’Università di Firenze, vale a dire, della formazione di capitale umano a livello universitario, attraverso la modellizzazione del processo di produzione come di un processo nel quale lo studente produce se stesso come laureato.

Lo strumento utilizzato è la metodologia DEA, sotto l’ipotesi di rendimenti di scala variabili.

I fattori utilizzati sono rappresentati da un insieme di risorse umane e di capitali forniti dalle facoltà, insieme a fattori individuali rappresentati dal voto di diploma di scuola secondaria e dalla lunghezza degli studi universitari.

L’analisi viene condotta sia per tutti i laureati globalmente, sia a livello di facoltà, allo scopo di evidenziare il contributo fornito da queste ultime all’efficienza.

Si evidenzia che gli studenti si sono laureati con una efficienza media superiore al 90% e, quindi, con una capacità produttiva inutilizzata inferiore al 10%.
A livello di facoltà, quella più efficiente risulta essere Scienza della Formazione; quella più inefficace è Economia.

In generale, il contributo all’efficienza fornito dalle facoltà è superiore a quello portato dalle caratteristiche individuali degli studenti.

SUMMARY

*Modelling university human capital formation and measuring its efficiency. Evidence from Florence University*

In this paper, an analysis of the technical efficiency in the formation of 2,236 graduates in 1998 in the University of Florence, that is, in the university human capital formation, is performed, by modelling the production process as one in which the student produces himself as a graduate.

The tool utilized is the DEA methodology, under the hypothesis of variable returns to scale.

The production factors are represented by a set of human and capital resources provided by the faculties, along with individual factors represented by secondary school diploma score and by the length of university study.

The analysis is conducted both for the overall graduates, and at a faculty level, in order to emphasize the contribution provided by the latter to efficiency.

There is evidence that the students graduated with an average efficiency greater than 90% and therefore with an unexploited productive capacity lower than 10%.

At a faculty level, Formation Science appears to be the most efficient, whereas Economics is the less efficient one.

By and large, the contribution to efficiency provided by faculties is greater than that brought by students individual characteristics.