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Abstract

The aim of the paper is to analyze the features and the changes in the personal income distribution in a region of Italy within a structural framework.

In this paper the attempt is made to provide a method of analysis that can give a further insight into the interactions among industries and institutional sectors. An application that relies on a regional data base, inspired by the Social Accounting Matrix, illustrates how macro-multipliers ruling the multi-sector multi-industry interactions can be defined and evaluated. This feature greatly helps in showing the impact of the structure of macroeconomic variables since all the possible behavior of the economy are determined by those multipliers: either those patterns that have emerged, because have been activated by the actual shock, and those that have kept latent.

The identification of macro multipliers allows for the consistent definition of forward and backward dispersion, a tool especially efficient in the study of propagation since it is not confined to predetermined structures of macroeconomic variables and still allows for the determination of “summary” measures of dispersion through industries and sectors.
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1 Introduction

Some decades ago national accounts suffered from a fundamental dichotomy between income-final demand accounts and output-interindustry flows accounts. As Richard Stone pointed out (Stone, 1979) we faced two different and separated accounting systems which acted independently with almost no information exchange.

In the last decades the national accounting schemes have completely realized the integration of the two aspects and one side provides the information support to the other, causing the progressive integration in the actual accounting practice. Though integrated, the accounting scheme remains flexible and open. Its matrix representation (National Accounting Matrix) constitutes a consistent nucleus that can be extended according the aims of the research. The Social Accounting Matrix is the result of this expansion that can be moved forward to include a greater set of economic and social phenomena at a substantial degree of detail.

From the SAM approach emerges a model of circular income flow which is more articulated than the usual one: each macroeconomic flow variable, conveniently disaggregated, generates a second flow variable through the use of a structural matrix and progressively so until the loop is closed. Final demands determine total outputs and value added by industry; the latter generates domestic incomes by factor which compose disposable incomes by institutional sectors; these give rise to final demands closing the loop (Miyazawa, 1970).

For facing these progresses in the design of a data base which provides meaningful sectorization of the major macroeconomic variables, flexible tools of analysis are needed, to get a deeper insight in the propagation phenomena characterizing sectoral and industrial interactions. In these phenomena the scale, but especially, the structure of macroeconomic variables play a major role. The traditional tools for studying propagation are those provided by impact multipliers and linkage analysis. These tools, however, design procedures that do not give a complete account of the effects of the changing structures of macro-variables.

The propagation analysis we propose is based on a decomposition that allows for the identification and quantitative determination of aggregated macro multipliers, which lead the economic interactions, and the structures of macroeconomic variables, that either hide or activate these forces. The analysis will be applied to an extended income-output loop that can be quantitatively tested forwarding a shock on a given macro-variable and observing the effects on another macro-variable within the loop. It will identify the most efficient struc-
Some considerations on multiplier and linkage analysis

The original Input-Output (I-O) problem consists in the search for an equilibrium output vector for the \( n \) I-O sectors of the economy. Since in the following section income will be disaggregated by institutional sectors, in order to avoid misinterpretation, we will use the term industries for producing sectors, and the sector for institutional sectors. Such vector conveniently faces the predetermined final demand vector \( f \) by industries, and the induced industrial demand. The equilibrium output vector is given by

\[
x = R \cdot f
\]  

where \( R = [I - A]^{-1} \) and \( A \) is the technical coefficients matrix, and generally exists, as in general the technology can be expected to be productive, i.e. the technology is such that a part of total output is still available for final uses, after the intermediate requirements have been satisfied. In this case, \( A \) satisfies the Hawkins-Simon conditions. The
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Figure 1: Inter-industry output flows

\[ \mathbf{R} \] matrix is usually referred to as the Leontief multipliers matrix and its elements, \( r_{ij} \), show the direct and indirect requirements of industry output \( i \) per unit of final demand of product at industry \( j \). Extensive use is made of matrix \( \mathbf{R} \) within the traditional multipliers analysis and a substantial part of linkage and key sectors analysis is based on it. \( \mathbf{R} \) matrix provides, in fact, a set of disaggregated multipliers that are recognized to be most precise and sensitive for studies of detailed economic impacts. These multipliers recognize the evidence that total impact on output will vary depending on which industries are affected by changes in final demand. The \( i^{th} \) total output multiplier measures the sum of direct and indirect input requirements needed to satisfy a unit final demand for goods produced by industry \( i \). Input-Output multipliers can be derived from either an open I-O model and a partially closed I-O model. The first set includes type I and type II multipliers. For the determination of type I multiplier all components of final demand are treated exogenously. Type I multiplier will then represent the ratio of direct and indirect output changes to the initial direct change in final demand.

Multipliers can however be determined taking one or more components of final demand as endogenous. If the only final demand component to be treated endogenously is personal consumption expenditures, the multipliers are referred to as type II. In this case the model is said to be partially closed with respect to households. Each type II multiplier will then represent the ratio of the direct indirect and induced changes to the initial direct change. If another final demand component such as state and local government expenditure is also treated endogenously the multiplier is referred as type III (Lee,
1986).

When a final demand component is made endogenous the corresponding part of value added must also be treated endogenously; consequently, personal consumption expenditures have counterpart in value added referred to as wages and salaries; state and local government expenditures a counterpart referred to as taxes etc. The inverse coefficients of the augmented matrix reflect the induced effects of changed incomes on final outputs. Finally income and employment multipliers, type IV multipliers, can be obtained by premultiplying the matrix of output multipliers by a row vector of wage to output ratios in the case of income, and employment to output ratio in case of employment (Polenske and Jordan, 1988).

Research on linkage analysis dates back to the definitions elaborated by Rasmussen of "summary measures for the inverse matrix" (Rasmussen, 1956). Developments in research have provided various definitions of linkage (Hirschman, 1958) which have led to the indicators called nowadays "forward linkages" and "backward linkages". These indicators are applied to the technical coefficients matrix, to the Leontief inverse or to the matrix of constant market shares (Ghosh, 1958) according the purposes of the research. However, from a modeling viewpoint, the fixed technical coefficient assumption is conflicting with the constant market shares hypothesis, since a model based on fixed technical coefficients will imply non constant market shares, and a model with constant market shares will imply varying technical coefficients.

This is the reason why we will confine ourselves to the leontievian approach based on the concept of fixed technical coefficients and refer to the origins through the Rasmussen definitions. He noted that the sum, \( r_{ij} \), of \( i^{th} \) column elements

\[
r_{ij} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} r_{ij}
\]

(2)

corresponds to the total increase in output from the whole system of industries needed to match an increase in the final demand for the product of industry \( j \) by one unit. Similarly the sum, \( r_{i.} \), of row elements i.e.

\[
r_{i.} = \sum_{j=1}^{m} r_{ij}
\]

(3)

gives the increase in output of industry \( i \) needed, in order to cope with a unit increase in the final demand for the product of each industry.
We can take the average, of $r_{j}$, and they will represent an estimate of the (direct and indirect) increase in output to be supplied by an industry chosen at random if final demand for the products of industry $j$ expands by one unit:

$$\left(\frac{1}{m}\right) \cdot r_{j} \quad (j = 1, 2, .., m) \quad (4)$$

Similarly

$$\left(\frac{1}{m}\right) \cdot r_{i} \quad (i = 1, 2, .., m) \quad (5)$$

can be regarded as the average increase in output to be supplied by industry $i$ if the final demand for the products of an industry chosen at random is increased by one unit.

For performing consistent interindustry comparisons, we need to normalize these averages by the overall average defined as

$$\frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} r_{ij} = \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{j=1}^{m} r_{j} = \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{i=1}^{m} r_{i} \quad (6)$$

and thus consider the indices

$$\pi_{j} = \frac{\frac{1}{m} \cdot r_{j}}{\frac{1}{m^2} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{m} r_{j}} \quad (7)$$

and

$$\tau_{i} = \frac{\frac{1}{m} \cdot r_{i}}{\frac{1}{m^2} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{m} r_{i}} \quad (8)$$

The aim of the direct and indirect backward linkage index $\pi_{j}$, the power of dispersion in the Rasmussen definition, is to measure the potential stimulus to other activities from a demand shock in any industry $j$. If $\pi_{j} > 1$ an industry will need a comparatively large production increase to meet a unit increase in final demand for the products of industry $j$. When $\pi_{j} < 1$ industry $j$ relies heavily on the system of industries and vice versa. $\pi_{j}$ can be considered an index of the power of dispersion for industry $j$. This index describes the relative extent to which an increase in final demand for the products of industry $j$ is dispersed throughout the system of industries. The index also expresses the extent of the expansion caused in the system of industries by expansion in industry $j$.

---

1 Rasmussen (1956) ibidem p.130.
2 Rasmussen (1956) ibidem p.135.
The forward linkage τᵢ, the sensitivity of dispersion in the Rasmussen definition, measures the degree at which on industry output is used by other industries as an input. In the case of τᵢ > 1, for given increases in demand, industry i will have to increase its output more than other industries. Index τᵢ is an index of sensitivity of dispersion for the industry i. This index expresses the extent to which the system of industries relies on industry i and the degree to which industry i is affected by an expansion in the system of industries.

It has to be stressed, however, that the Rasmussen definitions were of statistical nature, since both measures were mean values of either outputs or final demands of industries chosen at random. For each of these measures, in fact, he elaborated a coefficient of variation in fact a standard deviation. In particular, for the power of dispersion we get

\[
\sigma_j = \sqrt{\frac{\frac{1}{m-1} \sum_{i=1}^{m} (r_{ij} - \sum_{i=1}^{m} r_{ij})^2}{\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} r_{ij}}} \quad (j = 1, \ldots, m) \quad (9)
\]

and for the sensitivity of dispersion:

\[
\sigma_i = \sqrt{\frac{\frac{1}{m-1} \sum_{j=1}^{m} (r_{ij} - \sum_{j=1}^{m} r_{ij})^2}{\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} r_{ij}}} \quad (i = 1, \ldots, m) \quad (10)
\]

Nevertheless the original statistical approach of the Rasmussen analysis progressively disappeared and the interpretation of his measures have definitely become deterministic.

It has to be stressed however, that all these measures, built starting from matrix R, are not independent of the structure of the either total output vector, neither which we observe the effects, nor of the structure of final demand vector on which we impose the unit demand shock.

The column sum of the R matrix in equation [1] implies the consideration of a set of final demand vectors of the type:

\[
f^1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, f^2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \ldots, f^m = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (11)
\]
while the sum of row elements in equation [1] implies the consideration of a final demand structure of the type:

$$f = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (12)$$

We can expect that these measures hold for demand vectors of varying scale but with the same structures of equations [11] or [12]. However neither the demand vector nor its changes will ever assume a structure of this type. This is why some authors come to the drastic conclusion that "linkage should be never used" (Skolka, 1986).

On the other hand it is a common opinion that the structure of final demand produces the most different effects on the level of total output (Ciaschini, 1988c). Given a set of non zero final demand vectors, whose elements sum up to a predetermined level, but with varying structures, we will have to expect that the corresponding level of total output will also vary considerably.

For these reasons we cannot confine our knowledge of the system to the picture emerging from measures which can only show what would happen if final demand assumed a predetermined and unlikely structure.

3 The data base: Towards a Social Accounting Matrix for Marche

The basic organization of the data base that has been built, is inspired by social the accounting matrix scheme and follows the matrix presentation of regional economic accounts. The income circular flow is quantified and connects data on the production process (final demand, total output and value added generation) gathered by branches which play the role of industries, with data on the distribution process (factor allocation of value added, primary and secondary distribution of incomes) collected by institutional sectors.

The main attempt is that of integrating data on income distribution and final demand by income classes considered as sub-sectors of households. The scarcity of official statistics at the local level implies the reference to heterogeneous data sources and the attempt to solve problems connected with the definition of aggregates and the data gathering methodology.

For this aim a hierarchy of the data sources has been determined for constructing the accounting table. This hierarchy implies the
definition of a reliability scale of the organizations in charge of data collection, such as the Central Statistical Office and Central and local Administration, which will reveal useful in the phase of data balancing. Balancing, in fact has been obtained through the method of constrained generalized Least Squares (Stone, 1979), that requires the exogenous definition of a variance covariance matrix of observed data.

The accounting arrangement of the data flows goes through the construction of a National Accounting Matrix, bi-regional NAM, which is a presentation of the $T$ accounts in table form, based on the bi-regional Input-Output Table (TEI) of Marche by IRPET for 1996 and the regional economic accounts, provided by ISTAT 1996, (ISTAT, 1996). On this basis the disaggregation into institutional sectors (and sub-sectors) of income distribution has been performed. In this way a first version of a simplified bi-regional Social Accounting Matrix for Marche (M) and the rest of Italy ($rI$) has been obtained which constitutes the basis for further developments and extensions. These extensions will concern the further integration of social information which is not included in National Accounts.

The Matrix can be broken up into quadrants which can be further divided into blocks. A brief sketch of blocks in each of the six sub-matrices, as shown in Table [1], can be easily described as follows:

- **quadrant I** - production, primary allocation, secondary distribution and capital formation blocks in region $M$;
- **quadrant II** - production, secondary distribution of incomes entering in region $M$;
- **quadrant III** - production, secondary distribution of incomes entering in region $rI$;
- **quadrant IV** - production, primary allocation, secondary distribution and capital formation blocks in region $rI$;
- **quadrant V** - production, primary allocation, secondary distribution and capital formation blocks referred to Public Administrations;
- **quadrant VI** - operations with the rest of the world block.

Accounts are given in rows and columns corresponding to eight denominations namely Output, Wage and Salaries, Other Incomes, Households, Corporations, Capital formation, Public Administrations and Rest of the World.

The accounting reconciliation of the flows in the NAM implies various problems connected to the lack of detail in the economic accoun-

---

3See SNA’94 chapter XX, p.464 (United Nation, 1994).
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Table 1: Biregional NAM table for the whole economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area M</th>
<th>Area I</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Output</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages &amp; Salaries</td>
<td>Wages &amp; Salaries</td>
<td>Wages &amp; Salaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other incomes</td>
<td>Other incomes</td>
<td>Other incomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>Households</td>
<td>Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporations</td>
<td>Corporations</td>
<td>Corporations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Formation</td>
<td>Capital Formation</td>
<td>Capital Formation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Households Income Class are disaggregated for disposable income.
The extended output income circular flow

Table 2: Simplified version of Sam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Industries 11</th>
<th>Va components 3</th>
<th>Sectors 7</th>
<th>Rest of Italy 1</th>
<th>Rest of World 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industries</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Va components</td>
<td>V^{IO}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectors</td>
<td>V^{SI}</td>
<td>T^{SI}</td>
<td>T^{vI}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Italy</td>
<td>M^{vI}</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of World</td>
<td>M^{RoW}</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

shown in appendix B.

4 The extended output income circular flow

The results attained in social accounting encourage the attempt of building an extended version of the income circular flow where the interactions between industries and institutions could be specified and evaluated.

Figure 2: Interindustry and intersectoral flows

As shown in figure [2], with the dotted arrow, the income distribution process creates a feedback loop between industry outputs and final demand. This loop is built through various logical phases. The production process, that takes place at industry level, generates total output, \( x \), and gross value added by the 11 I-O industries, \( v(x) \),
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(Gross value added generation). Value added by I-O industry is than
allocated to the 3 value added components (factors), $v^e(x)$ (Gross
value added allocation). Value added by components is then allocated to
the 7 institutional sub-sectors, $v^e(x)$ (Primary distribution of income).
Value added by institutional sectors is then redistributed among them
through taxation to generate disposable incomes by the 7 institutional
sub-sectors, $y(x)$ (Secondary distribution of income). Finally dispo-
sable income will generate final demand by institutional sub-sectors
which will be transformed into final demand by IO industries, $f(x)$
(Final demand formation).

On this logical sketch of the extended circular flow, we can define
the structural parameters representing the distribution matrices. Of
course we know that a simple model is hard to be accepted in these
times of computable general equilibrium. However we think that a
simple one, sometimes, might let an easier data interpretation and we
are encouraged by Leontief recommendations: the model conceptually
placed near the data base and no econometrics, if possible.

Our distributive structural matrices will be given by

$Gross\ value\ added\ generation$(by industry)

$v(x) = L \cdot x$  \hspace{1cm} (13)

where $L_{[11,11]}$ gives the value added by industry starting from the
output vector and technical coefficients matrix.

$Gross\ value\ added\ allocation$(by VA components)

$v^e(x) = V \cdot v(x)$  \hspace{1cm} (14)

where $V_{[3,11]}$ represents the distribution of value added to the factors
(components).

$Primary\ distribution\ of\ income$(by Institutional sub-sectors)

$v^{si}(x) = P \cdot v^e(x)$  \hspace{1cm} (15)

where $P_{[7,3]}$ represents the distribution factors’ value added income
to the sectors.

$Secondary\ distribution\ of\ income$(by Institutional sub-sectors)

$y(x) = (I + T) \cdot v^{si}(x)$  \hspace{1cm} (16)

where $T_{[7,7]}$ represents net income transfers among sub-sectors.

$Final\ demand\ formation$(by industry)

$f(x) = F^0 \cdot y(x) + K \cdot y(x) + f^0$  \hspace{1cm} (17)

where $F^0$ provide the consumption demand structure by industry and
is given by the product of two matrices, $F^0 = F^1 \cdot C$, where $F^1_{[11,7]}$
The extended output-income circular flow transforms the consumption expenditure by institutional sector into consumption by industry and $C[7,7]$ represents the consumption propensities by institutional sector.

$K$ represents the investment demand and is given by $K = K1 \cdot s \cdot (I - C)$ where $K1[11,7]$ represents the investment demands to I-O industry and scalar $s$ represents the share of private savings which is transformed into investment i.e. ”active savings”; $f^0$ is a vector of 11 elements which represents exogenous demand.

If we put $F = [F^0 + K]$ equation [17] becomes

$$f(x) = F \cdot y(x) + f^0$$ (18)

substituting through the equations [13][17] in 18 we get

$$f(x) = F \cdot [I + T] \cdot P \cdot V \cdot L \cdot x + f^0$$ (19)

We now turn to the output generation process which is ruled by the Leontief model.

*Output generation*

$$x + m = A(x) + f(x)$$ (20)

where $m$ represents imports, $A$ the technical coefficients matrix, $f(x)$ represents the demand vector.

Imports can be modelled according its main components, intermediate consumptions, endogenous demand and exogenous demand:

*Import*

$$m = A^m \cdot (x) + F^m \cdot (I + T) \cdot P \cdot V \cdot L \cdot x + f^m$$ (21)


Substituting the equations [19] and [21] in [20] we finally get:

$$x = [I - (A - A^m) - (F - F^m) \cdot (I + T) \cdot P \cdot V \cdot L]^{-1} \cdot (f^0 - f^m)$$ (22)

Figure 3 shows a diagram where the fundamental mechanism of production and distribution is shown in terms of interaction between industries, sectors and factors (value added components).

In Figure [3] each arrow identifies an expenditure flow while each box a matrix transformation of a flow variable into another. In the upper part the inter industry demand loop in Figure [3] can be recognized.

The extended output-income circular flow emerging in Figure [3] allows for an extension of the study of the propagation. We can choose, in fact, on which flow variable to act with a unit shock and on which
variable to observe the effects. For each flow variable we need to specify an order of magnitude, i.e. the scale and a composition, i.e. the structure. If we want to impose a unit shock on final demand and observe its propagation on domestic output we need to refer to equation [22], but other arrangements of structural matrices are easily found if we need to impose a shock on, say, income redistribution and observe it on value added by factor.

5 Searching for the most effective demand change: The decomposition of the structural relationship between final demand and output

The direct and indirect effects of final demand on total output are then quantified in our structural matrix $R$.

$$R = [I - (A - A^m) - (F - F^m) \cdot (I + T) \cdot P \cdot V \cdot L]^{-1}$$  (23)

Its numerical determination is shown in Table [3]. Each cell shows the growth of the $i^{th}$ industry output, $x_i$, caused by a demand impulse of 1, $f_i$, in the demand of goods produced by the $i^{th}$ industry. The
twelfth column shows the row sum which represent the total effect on the $i^{th}$ industry output of a unitary final demand shock, $x$, shown in column thirteenth, $f$. The last row presents the column sums of the table and gives the effect on all the industry on outputs of a unit change in demand of goods produced by the $i^{th}$ industry.

Table 3: Direct and indirect effects of final demand on total output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$f_1$</th>
<th>$f_2$</th>
<th>$f_3$</th>
<th>$f_4$</th>
<th>$f_5$</th>
<th>$f_6$</th>
<th>$f_7$</th>
<th>$f_8$</th>
<th>$f_9$</th>
<th>$f_{10}$</th>
<th>$f_{11}$</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>$f$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>10.29</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>17.10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>58.97</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table [3] can be easily decomposed in a sum of 11 different tables through the singular value decomposition. The decomposition is such that each sub table is "ruled" by a single scalar which shows the aggregated effect on the output vector of a demand vector of predetermined industry structures (see appendix section A). Matrix $R$ in fact can always be written as

$$R = U \cdot S \cdot V^T$$

where $U$ and $V^T$ are two unitary matrices of convenient dimensions and $S$ is a [11,11] diagonal matrix whose diagonal elements consist of the 11 scalars $s_i$. Scalars $s_i$ are all positive and can be ordered in decreasing order. If we denote with $u_i$ the columns of matrix $U$ and with $v_i$ the rows of matrix $V^T$ we can express matrix $R$ as

$$R = \sum_i s_i u_i v_i$$

each of the 11 elements of the summation represents a table composing [3].

If the demand impulse is chosen so that its structures is equal to, say, vector $v_i$ all the elements of the summation, other than $s_i \cdot u_i \cdot v_i$ would become equal to zero, since vectors $v_i$ ($i = 1, \ldots, 11$) are orthogonal, and matrix $R$ would reduce to

$$R = s_i \cdot u_i \cdot v_i$$

Singular values $s_i$, then, determine the aggregated effect of a final demand shock on output. For this reason we will call them macro multipliers. These macro multipliers are aggregated, in the sense that each
of them applies on all components of each macroeconomic variables taken into consideration, and are consistent with the multi-industry specification of the model\(^5\).

We can than say that, given our matrix \(\mathbf{R}\), we are able to isolate impacts of different (aggregate) magnitude, since that macro multiplier present in matrix \(\mathbf{R}\), \(s_i\), can be activated through a shock along the demand structure \(v_i\) and its impact can be observed along the output structure \(u_i\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Macro-multipliers in (\mathbf{R})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(s_1) &amp; 7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s_2) &amp; 1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s_3) &amp; 1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s_4) &amp; 1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s_5) &amp; 1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s_6) &amp; 1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s_7) &amp; 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s_8) &amp; 0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s_9) &amp; 0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s_{10}) &amp; 0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s_{11}) &amp; 0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table [4] shows the multipliers which are present in matrix \(\mathbf{R}\). Macro multiplier 1 (7.35) is the dominating one for its order of magnitude. This means that a final demand vector change produces a change on the output vector 7.35 times greater. Macro multipliers from 2 to 6 amplify the effect of the shock, while the last four macro multipliers reduce it.

In the graphs in Figure [4(a)] we have reported, with the black histogram, the input structure \(v_1\) able to activate macro multiplier \(s_1\), and, with the white histogram, the corresponding effect on industrial outputs given by \(s_1 u_1\). While in Figure [4(b)] and [4(c)] the same is done for \(v_2, s_2 u_2\) and \(v_3, s_3 u_3\).

The information emerging from Figures [4] can help in designing demand policies which are consistent with the observed structure of the interindustry interactions indicating the structure which are easiest to control. As an example let us refer to Table [5].

Table [5] has been built on the basis of matrix \(\mathbf{R}\) multiplying it by a vector of final demand which has the same modulus of \(f\) in Table [3] but of composition equal to \(v_1\).

Each cell shows the growth of the \(i^{th}\) industrial output, \(x_i\), caused by a demand impulse of \(f_j\), as described in \(j^{th}\) row of the column \(f\) of

\(^5\)Given the problems connected with aggregation in multisectoral models, this feature of singular values \(s_i\) is not of minor relevance. They are aggregated multipliers consistently extracted from a multisectoral framework and their meaning holds both if we speak in aggregated or disaggregated terms.
Figure 4: Demand shocks structures and their impact on output composition

The table. The last four columns show, respectively, the total output vector change, $x$, and the final demand shock, $f$. Here two columns, $x^2$ and $f^2$, have been added in order to calculate the squares of the industry values of vector $x$ and vector $f$. This will facilitate the determination of the modulus of each vector, which will be done by taking the square root of the sum of each column. In fact when dealing with a vector representing a change it is convenient to refer to the commonly accepted measure of vector change which is the modulus of the vector. This is especially true if we want to take into consideration the possibility of considering also negative changes in some components of the vector.

From the last two values we can appreciate that the final demand
vector in Table [5] has the same module of that in Table [3] which are both equal to

$$\text{mod}(f) = \sqrt{\sum_i f_i^2}$$

hence $\sqrt{11} = 3.317$. While the output vector module is equal to

$$\text{mod}(x) = \sqrt{\sum_i x_i^2}$$

hence $\sqrt{593.7} = 24.36$.

The ratio between the two modules is equal to $\text{mod}(x)/\text{mod}(f) = 24.36/3.317 = 7.347$ which is the value of multiplier $s_1$. This corresponds to a change in output of 60,674 which is higher than that obtained by chance in Table [3] that amounted to 58,975, and it is the highest performance the economy can attain. No higher performance can be attained.

Table [6] shows a similar application made with reference to the second multiplier $s_2=1.5695$. Here $\text{mod}(x) = \sqrt{27}, \sqrt{10} = 5.2057$, $\text{mod}(f) =$

$\sqrt{11} = 3.317$ so that the module ratio is $\text{mod}(x)/\text{mod}(f) = 1.5695.$
Searching for a "summary" approach

Here, as we could expect from the results shown in Figure [4(b)] the shock slows down industries 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 10 and expands industries 2, 3, 7 and 11. A shock with reverse sign would produce a reverse effect on the same industries. Revealing that the interactions in our economy create privileged sets of industries.

We have shown, through the use of numerical examples, that the parametric structure suggests the most effective demand policy, since whatever composition in the demand change other than \( e_1 \) causes less relevant results in terms of magnitude of the changes observed on industrial outputs. While the traditional Leontief multipliers analysis doesn’t warrant that the results shown are the largest attainable.

6 Searching for a "summary" approach: The decomposition of the structural relationship between institutional sectors and industries

In this section we will explicitly consider the interaction between industries and institutional sectors operating on the structural matrices composing the loop in equations [13-22]. We will also utilize the singular value decomposition in the attempt of finding a "summary" measures of propagation (see section 2).

The interactions among industries and institutional sectors can be appreciated if one considers the direct and indirect effects of disposable incomes on industry outputs. From the extended income output circular flow we determine the structural matrix \( \mathbf{R} \) that links a unit change in disposable income by institutional sectors to total output by industries:

\[
\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{R} \cdot \mathbf{F}
\]

where \( \mathbf{F} = [\mathbf{F}^0 + \mathbf{K}] \) gives the link between disposable income and final demands shown in equation [18] and \( \mathbf{R} \) is given in equation [23]. The loop disposable income total output will be given

\[
x = \mathbf{R} \cdot y
\]

Its numerical determination is given in Table [7]. Two additional rows and columns show totals and quadratic moduli of the row (column).

We can perform the singular value decomposition of data in the table and determine the macro multipliers

Considering that matrix product \( \mathbf{R}^T \cdot \mathbf{R} \) is the matrix of the deviations from zero of the effects of a unit shock and that the square roots of its eigenvalues are the singular values of matrix \( \mathbf{R} \), we can
conclude that each singular value in Table [8] can be interpreted as the share of the deviations related to the associated eigenvectors. If we determine the cumulated percentage shares, we see that the first two singular values cover the 89 per cent of total deviations. This means that we can confine our analysis of intersectoral and interindustry interactions to the first two macro multipliers to get results valid for the 89 per cent of the cases. Rather than considering matrix $R$, which can be decomposed into the sum of seven "impact" components each one determined by a macro multiplier:

$$ R^0 = s_1 \cdot \mathbf{u}_1 \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 + s_2 \cdot \mathbf{u}_2 \cdot \mathbf{v}_2 + \ldots + s_7 \cdot \mathbf{u}_7 \cdot \mathbf{v}_7 $$  \hfill (31)

we can refer to matrix

$$ R^0 = s_1 \cdot \mathbf{u}_1 \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 + s_2 \cdot \mathbf{u}_2 \cdot \mathbf{v}_2 $$  \hfill (32)

where components greater than 2 have been neglected with the aim of obtaining "summary" measures. Now the economic interactions are completely determined by the first two aggregated macro-multipliers $s_1$ and $s_2$.  

---

**Table 7: Direct and indirect effects of disposable incomes on industry outputs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Moduli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$x_1$</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_2$</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_3$</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_4$</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_5$</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_6$</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_7$</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_8$</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_9$</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td>11.49</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_{10}$</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_{11}$</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moduli</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8: Macro multipliers and cumulative percent sum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macro multiplier</th>
<th>Cumulative percent sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Searching for a "summary" approach
We note that in matrix $\mathbf{R}^0$, vectors

$$
\mathbf{s}_1 \cdot \mathbf{u}_1 = 
\begin{bmatrix}
\mathbf{s}_1 \mathbf{u}_{1,1} \\
\mathbf{s}_1 \mathbf{u}_{2,1} \\
\mathbf{s}_1 \mathbf{u}_{3,1} \\
\vdots \\
\mathbf{s}_1 \mathbf{u}_{11,1}
\end{bmatrix},
\mathbf{s}_2 \cdot \mathbf{u}_2 = 
\begin{bmatrix}
\mathbf{s}_2 \mathbf{u}_{1,2} \\
\mathbf{s}_2 \mathbf{u}_{2,2} \\
\mathbf{s}_2 \mathbf{u}_{3,2} \\
\vdots \\
\mathbf{s}_2 \mathbf{u}_{11,2}
\end{bmatrix}
$$

are the result of splitting the two macro multipliers into the eleven output sector. These two vectors represent both how each of the macro multipliers affects outputs and how each industry output is affected by the two macro multipliers, which quantify the magnitude of industry-sector interactions: As we stressed in section 2, the aim of the sensitivity of dispersion in the Rasmussen definition, $\tau_i$, -which generated the concept of the forward linkage- measures the extent to which industries draw upon industry $i$ and the degree of relevance of each industry as a supplier.

As we see from Table [9], the expansion of the $i^{th}$ industry output is quantified by vector $[s_1 \mathbf{u}_{1i}, s_2 \mathbf{u}_{2i}]$ and its module. It is to be noted that the industry expansion effect is measured with reference to the two macro multipliers independently from the fact that such multipliers have been activated by a change in final demand or a change in disposable incomes influencing final demands. This feature allows for a generalization of the sensitivity of dispersion concept. This concept can be used both in the case that the model is limited to the Leontief inverse and to case were a larger output/income model is used that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>x1</th>
<th>x2</th>
<th>x3</th>
<th>x4</th>
<th>x5</th>
<th>x6</th>
<th>x7</th>
<th>x8</th>
<th>x9</th>
<th>x10</th>
<th>x11</th>
<th>Modules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>6.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Forward dispersion i.e. impacts on industry outputs of intersectoral interactions, in terms of macro multipliers
Searching for a "summary" approach

includes also the income distribution process. In order to avoid misinterpretation we will define the forward dispersion, \( f_d_i \), as the change in the value of the sales by industry \( i \) (to face a demand vector generated by an increase in disposable income in all sectors). The percent forward dispersion can be easily obtained dividing forward dispersion by its total value.

Table [9] produces an ordering of industries according the forward of dispersion: Industry 9 Transport and Trade (31.3%), 8 Manufacturing (23.2%), 5 Machinery and Cars (12.6%), 11 Service non market (11.2%), 4 Metal & chem. Products (7.1%), 6 Food (4.6%), 10 Service market (4.1%), 2 Oil (2.4%), 1 Agriculture, (1.7%), 3 Energy (1.0%), 7 Tobacco and Alcoholic Beverages (0.8%).

On the other hand vectors

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{s}_1 \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 &= [s_1 \cdot v_{1,1}, \ldots, s_1 \cdot v_{1,7}] \\
\mathbf{s}_2 \cdot \mathbf{v}_2 &= [s_2 \cdot v_{2,1}, \ldots, s_2 \cdot v_{2,7}]
\end{align*}
\]  

split the same two macro multipliers into the seven institutional sectors and represent how the change in sectoral disposable income influences the two macro-multipliers.

Again from section 2, the aim of index \( \pi_j \), the power of dispersion in the Rasmussen definition -which generated the concept of backward linkage- was that of measuring the extent to which an increase in final demand for products of industry \( j \) is dispersed throughout the system of industries.

If we introduce in the interindustry model, institutional sectors and income distribution, final demand will no more be exogenous but explained by income distribution. Whatever multisectoral macro variable will it be, the index will quantify the degree of relevance of each component of such macro variable in stimulating the multipliers.

If the model under analysis had been the loop between final demand and output vectors [34] would have well represented the backward linkage i.e. the expansion caused by an expansion in industry \( j \). By analogy we can define backward dispersion, \( b_d_j \), as the change in the value of the purchases by those industries that produce goods according the consumption patterns of income sector \( j \). Backward dispersion can be also determined in percent terms as in Table [10].

We note that the fourth column of Table [9] corresponds to the modules of the rows of table \( \mathbf{R}^0 \) and that the same column in Table [10] gives the modules of the columns of table \( \mathbf{R}^0 \), which at his turn approximates to be \( \mathbf{R} \).

We can give a graphical representation of each element in the four vectors. We will define the axis of the first macro multiplier, on which we measure the elements of vectors \( s_1 \mathbf{u}_1, s_1 \mathbf{v}_1 \) and the axes of the second macro multiplier, where we measure the elements of vectors \( s_2 \mathbf{u}_2, \)
Table 10: Backward dispersion i.e. impacts of a unit disposable income shock on economic interactions, in terms of macro multipliers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First impact component</th>
<th>Second impact component</th>
<th>Backward Dispersion (Modules)</th>
<th>Percent backward dispersion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-Income class households</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-Income class households</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-Income class households</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV-Income class households</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-Income class households</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI-Firms</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII-Administration</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modules</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then we will represent the couples \((s_1v_{1,i}, s_2v_{1,i})\) \(i=1, \ldots, 7\), with seven arrows, showing how the change in disposable income impacts on intersectoral interactions (backward dispersion), in terms of the two macro multipliers; and couples \((s_1u_{1,i}, s_2u_{1,i})\) \(i=1, \ldots, 11\), with eleven dots, showing how intersectoral interactions impact on industry outputs (forward dispersion).

Figure 5: Sector and industry interactions - Backward and forward dispersions (absolute levels)

Figure [5] shows that, in addition to the information based on the modules of the vectors, some further information can be achieved referring to the directions of each vector. In order to perform consistent
comparisons, independently from the unit measures effects of outputs and incomes, we need to standardize data in Table [7] taking the deviations from the mean values and dividing by the standard deviations. We note that the singular value decomposition of standardized data will result in the eigenvalue decomposition of matrices $R^T R$ and $RR^T$ which represent the correlation matrices of sectoral incomes and industry outputs respectively. We will then get the diagram in Figure [6]:

Figure 6: Sector and industry interactions -Backward and forward dispersions standardized

![Diagram showing sector and industry interactions](image)

Figure [6] allows for the identification of clusters of industries that move together, i.e. respond linearly, to intersectoral interactions as quantified by the two macro multipliers. This is done considering that the angular distance of two dots will represent the correlation coefficient since:

$$
\text{Corr}(x_i, x_j) = \cos \beta = \frac{x_i \cdot x_j}{|x_i||x_j|}
$$

in fact, if two industries “move together”, we have to expect that they will be located on the same line, relative to the two macro multipliers. From data in Figure [6], a correlation table is derived as shown in Table [11]. For correlation coefficients greater than 90 per cent we can identify a set of six industries clusters:

1st cluster: Positive correlation characterizes industry 1 Agriculture with respect to 8 Manufacturing and 9 Transport and Trade; 2nd cluster: Positive correlation between industry 2 Oil and 6 Food, 7
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Table 11: Correlation coefficients between industries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>x1</th>
<th>x2</th>
<th>x3</th>
<th>x4</th>
<th>x5</th>
<th>x6</th>
<th>x7</th>
<th>x8</th>
<th>x9</th>
<th>x10</th>
<th>x11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x2</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x3</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x4</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.88</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x5</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x6</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x7</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x8</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>-0.83</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x9</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x10</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x11</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tobacco & Alcoholic Beverages: 3rd cluster: Negative correlation is observed between industry 3 Energy, and 5 Machinery and Cars, 10 Service market, 11 Service non market; 4th cluster: Negative correlation between industry 4 Metal and chemical Products and 6 Food; 5th cluster: Negative correlation between industry 7 Tobacco and Alcoholic Beverages and 9 Transport and Trade; 6th cluster: Negative correlation between industry 7 Tobacco and Alcoholic Beverages, 9 Transport and Trade. Other four clusters are implied by the previous as x5, x10 and x11; x6 and x7; x8 con x9, x10 and x11.

For what concerns the backward dispersion, the modulus of each vector labelled I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, represent the stimulus forwarded to the interindustry interactions by a unit change in disposable income by institutional sector. From Figure [6] we note that in our example the effects of disposable incomes of institutional sectors from I to VI are highly correlated, more than 90 per cent in terms of correlation coefficient. Only sector VII, Administration, seems to exhibit a different pattern. Its correlation with the other sectors is of decreasing order from 80 per cent with sector I to 53 per cent with sector VI.

Figure [6], in addition, allows for a cross comparison sectors/industries which can identify the “strength” of the link between sectors and industries in terms of cross correlation coefficients.

Table [12] shows high positive correlations between sector I and industry 9; sector II and industries 8 and 9; sector III and industries 8 and 9; sector IV and industries 8 and 9; sector V and industries 1, 8 and 9; sector VI and industries 1, 8 and 9; sector VII and industries 4.

While high negative correlations are observed between sector I and industries 6 and 7; sector II and industries 2 and 7; sector III and industries 2 and 7; sector IV and industry 7; sector V and industry 7; sector VI and industry 7 Tobacco and Alcoholic Beverages; sector VII and industries 2 and 6.
Table 12: Cross Correlation coefficients between industries and sectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.96</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>-0.88</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>-0.83</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>-0.96</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among sectoral and industrial interactions these emerge as the strongest. Here it seems that sectoral disposable income has a direct influence on industrial output. In these cases the structure of backward dispersion is equal to that of forward dispersion since the sectoral disposable-income change activates the macro multipliers in the same combination in which industrial outputs are stimulated.

7 Conclusions

The origin of linkage analysis, in the study of propagation phenomena through industries, was that of finding "summary" measures of dispersion and of applying them on interindustry data in a statistical way. However, in later developments, the original statistical approach has been progressively abandoned and the interpretation of these measures have definitely become deterministic. Further developments have proposed problem specifications, such that based on the assumption of constant market shares, conflicting with the hypothesis of fixed technical coefficients. On the other hand developments in national accounts have provided a consistent data base for the enlargement of the traditional Leontief framework to problems of income distribution on the lines explored by Miyazawa.

Our attempt has been that of taking inspiration from some of these developments to design measures of dispersion, either "summary" and "statistical", that can be applied both to a traditional Leontief framework and to an enlarged model, where income distribution can be also taken into consideration. The results have been discussed on the basis of a specific regional model whose data base we have tried to render consistent, having in mind a social accounting scheme.

The emerging enlarged income flow has been analyzed identifying the macro multipliers that "rule" the flow. Once identified these multipliers, that represent the potential scale of all the possible ty-
pes of dispersions through industries and sectors, we evaluated both backward and forward dispersions with reference to them. This procedure generates a set of indices -in absolute and percent values- for the industry-forward-dispersion and sector-backward-dispersion which quantify, respectively, the change in the value of the sales by industry \( i \) to face a demand vector generated by an increase in disposable income in all sectors, and the change in the value of the purchases by those industries that produce goods according the consumption patterns of income sector \( j \).

An extension of the method has also been provided in terms of a ”summary” graphical representation. The standardization of data, in fact, produces a representation, explainable in terms of correlation analysis, which allows for an immediate interpretation of the strength of the mutual links among and between the disaggregated components of total output and disposable income. A synthetic picture of the working of sector-industry-interactions is then attained in graphical and quantitative terms.
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A Spectral Decomposition

The decomposition proposed can be applied both to square and
to non-square matrices. Here the general case of non-square matrix \( \mathbf{R} \)
will be shown. The square matrix case is easily developed along the
same lines.

Let us consider matrix \( \mathbf{W} \), the square of our \([11,7]\) structural ma-
trix \( \mathbf{R} \):

\[
\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{R}^T \cdot \mathbf{R}
\]

Matrix \( \mathbf{W} \) has a positive definite or semi definite square root. Given
that \( \mathbf{W} \geq 0 \) by construction, its eigenvalues \( (\lambda_i) i = 1, \ldots, 7 \) shall be
all real non negative (Lancaster and Tiesmenetsky, 1985).

The non zero eigenvalues of matrices \( \mathbf{R}^T \mathbf{R} \) and \( \mathbf{R} \mathbf{R}^T \) coincide.
The system of eigenvectors \([\mathbf{u}_i i=1,\ldots,11]\) for \( \mathbf{R}^T \mathbf{R} \) and \([\mathbf{v}_i i=1,\ldots,7]\)
for \( \mathbf{R} \mathbf{R}^T \) are orthonormal bases.

We get then

\[
\mathbf{R}^T \cdot \mathbf{u}_i = \sqrt{\lambda_i} \cdot \mathbf{v}_i \quad i = 1, \ldots, 7
\]

and

\[
\mathbf{R}^T \cdot \mathbf{u}_i = 0 \quad 8 \leq i \leq 11
\]

We can construct the two matrices

\[
\mathbf{U} = [\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \cdots, \mathbf{u}_{11}] \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{V} = [\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \cdots, \mathbf{v}_7]
\]

Since by definition \( s_i = \mathbf{v}_i \) with \( i=1,\ldots,11 \) we get

\[
\mathbf{R}^T \cdot \mathbf{U} = [s_1 \cdot \mathbf{v}_1, s_2 \cdot \mathbf{v}_2, \ldots, s_7 \cdot \mathbf{v}_7, 0, \ldots, 0] = \mathbf{V} \cdot \mathbf{S}
\]

Strucutral matrix \( \mathbf{R} \) in equation [30] can be then decomposed as

\[
\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{U} \cdot \mathbf{S} \cdot \mathbf{V}^T \cdot \mathbf{y}
\]

\( \mathbf{V} \) is an \([7,7]\) unitary matrix whose columns define the 7 reference
structures for disposable income:

\[
\mathbf{v}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} v_{1,1} & v_{1,2} & v_{1,3} & \cdots & v_{1,7} \end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
\mathbf{v}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} v_{2,1} & v_{2,2} & v_{2,3} & \cdots & v_{2,7} \end{bmatrix}
\]

\[\cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \]

\[
\mathbf{v}_7 = \begin{bmatrix} v_{7,1} & v_{7,2} & v_{7,3} & \cdots & v_{7,7} \end{bmatrix}
\]
Spectral Decomposition

\( U \) is an \([11,11]\) unitary matrix whose columns define 11 reference structures for output:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
    u_{1,1} \\
    u_{2,1} \\
    u_{3,1} \\
    \vdots \\
    u_{11,1}
\end{bmatrix},
\begin{bmatrix}
    u_{1,2} \\
    u_{2,2} \\
    u_{3,2} \\
    \vdots \\
    u_{11,2}
\end{bmatrix}, \ldots,
\begin{bmatrix}
    u_{1,11} \\
    u_{2,11} \\
    u_{3,11} \\
    \vdots \\
    u_{11,11}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

and \( S \) is an \([7,7]\) diagonal matrix of the type:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
    s_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
    0 & s_2 & 0 & 0 \\
    0 & 0 & s_3 & 0 \\
    \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
    0 & 0 & 0 & s_7
\end{bmatrix}
\]

Scalars \( s_i \) are all real and positive and can be ordered as \( s_1 > s_2 > \ldots > s_7 \). Now we have all the elements to show how this decomposition correctly represents the macro multipliers that quantify the aggregate scale effects and the associated structures of the impact of a shock in disposable income on total output.

In fact if we express the actual vector \( y \) in terms of the structures identified by matrix \( W \), we obtain income demand vector, \( y^0 \), expressed in terms of the structures suggested by the \( R \):

\[
y^0 = V \cdot y
\]

On the other hand we can also express total output according the output structures implied by matrix \( R \):

\[
x^0 = U^T \cdot x
\]

Equation [35] then becomes through equations [36] and [37]:

\[
x^0 = S \cdot y^0
\]

which implies:

\[
x_i^0 = s_i \cdot y_i^0
\]

where \( i=1,\ldots,7 \). We note that matrix \( R \) hides seven fundamental combination of the outputs. Each of them is obtain multiplying the corresponding combination of incomes by a predetermined scalar which has in fact the role of aggregated macro multiplier.

The complex effect on the output vector of income shocks can be reduced to a multiplication by a constant \( s_j \).
The structures we have identified play a fundamental role in determining the potential behavior of the economic system, i.e. the behavior of the system under all possible shocks. We can in fact evaluate which will be the effect on output of all income possible structures. This is easily done imposing in equation [35] a vector whose modulus is constant, say equal to one, but whose structure can assume all possible configurations. If vector $y$ in equation [35] is such that

$$\sqrt{\sum_j y_j^2} = 1$$ (40)

then geometrically we mean that the income vector describes a sphere of unit radius: the unit ball. It rotates around the origin, as in Figure [7(a)], assuming all the possible structures, including those implied by the columns of matrix $V$. Correspondingly the vector of total output will describe an ellipsoid with semi-axes of length $s_1, \ldots, s_7$, oriented according the directions designated by the columns of matrix $U$, as in figure [7(b)]. This ellipsoid is sometimes called the isocost of income control.

When income vector crosses a structure in $V$, the vector of total output crosses the corresponding structure in $U$ and the ratio between the moduli of the two vectors is given by the corresponding scalar $s$.

Figure 7: Unit ball and corresponding ellipsoid for disposable income

(a) Unit ball for disposable income

(b) Corresponding ellipsoid
B Social Accounting Matrix data

The total output data base comes directly from the regional multisectoral accounting which is articulated into 11 I-O branches. Flows are given by the amount of intermediate goods \( (B_{M,M}) \) used in production process evaluated factory-gate.

The availability of a national table of intersectoral flows for the same period (TEI96) helps in the acquisition of information on intermediate consumptions and final demand components. In our case we do not have a table elaborated by ISTAT for Marche but a table constructed by IRPET within a bi-regional structure. TEI has been used as data base for reconstruction non available information following a methodology proposed in (Miller and Blair, 1985). Operations on the first block refer to the estimation of imports of intermediate and final goods by origin industry of region rest of Italy and industries and institutional sectors of region Marche as users. The estimation has been performed using import coefficients from bi-regional SAM 1995 North-Center and South-Isles. Flows are net from imports from region \( rI \).

| Table 13: Intermediate consumption (billions of Italian 1996 liras) |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                | 1               | 2               | 3               | 4               | 5               | 6               | 7               | 8               | 9               | 10              | 11              |
| Agriculture    | 626.8          | 0               | 0               | 11              | 3               | 1214            | 155             | 222             | 169             | 4               | 66              |
| Oil            | 61.2           | 95              | 12              | 321             | 272             | 43              | 60              | 16              | 261             | 102             | 92              |
| Energy         | 34             | 11              | 99              | 59              | 122             | 34              | 36              | 7               | 159             | 174             | 36              |
| Metal & chem. Products | 227.7       | 11              | 46              | 3131            | 2001            | 120             | 103             | 4066            | 227             | 174             | 289             |
| Machinery and Cars | 40.6         | 1               | 39              | 115             | 1999            | 1435            | 1            | 946             | 253             | 7               | 954             |
| Food           | 460.2          | 0               | 0               | 738             | 0               | 811             | 52              | 894             | 3379            | 12              | 168             |
| Tobacco & Alc. Beverages | 9.6         | 0               | 0               | 1                | 0               | 5               | 2               | 1               | 806             | 0               | 22              |
| Manufacturing  | 37.6           | 12              | 79              | 606             | 560             | 142             | 77              | 7504            | 1771            | 139             | 666             |
| Trasp & Trade  | 431.7          | 48              | 83              | 1656            | 1998            | 649             | 185             | 3001            | 7018            | 681             | 1041            |
| Service market | 6.1            | 4               | 12              | 29              | 620             | 3               | 19              | 1               | 7               | 14              | 9               |
| Service non market | 0             | 0               | 0               | 0               | 0               | 0               | 0               | 0               | 0               | 0               | 0               |

The production block closes with endogenous final demand (households consumption). The information comes from TEI and regional accounts articulated into 11 branches.

The disaggregation of consumption according five income classes has been performed using data on consumption by the Bank of Italy (Indagine sul Bilancio delle Famiglie (BF) 1995, (Banca d’Italia, 1995). We needed to build a bridge matrix linking durables and non durables with I-O consumption by households.

In the value added generation block value added is articulated into the two components which are present in the original table: value added at factors’ cost, \( Va \), and net indirect taxes \( (I.I.n) \). A greater detail is reached through data of the regional accounts: Wages-Salaries and Other Incomes \( (AR) \). The residual value added at factors’ cost gives the Gross Operating Surplus \( (va_{2,j} ) \) producing the table.
Table 14: Final domestic Consumption of Households Income Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income class</th>
<th>II Income class</th>
<th>III Income class</th>
<th>IV Income class</th>
<th>V Income class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>1598</td>
<td>993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>3757</td>
<td>1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1209</td>
<td>2388</td>
<td>7370</td>
<td>4581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>1555</td>
<td>966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ V_{d}^{IO} = \begin{bmatrix} v_{a1,1} & \ldots & v_{a1,m} \\ v_{a2,1} & \ldots & v_{a2,m} \end{bmatrix} \]  

This further component gives an aggregate which changes in its composition according the industry: it represents in fact: profits, capital incomes and income independent, with capital consumptions.

Table 15: Value Added by industry sectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Va_1)</td>
<td>626.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Va_2)</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third component that exhausts the allocation of value added to components is Indirect taxation which has been conveniently introduced in Table 15. Value added by components is then attributed to the factors’ owners. The block completes the primary distribution process and shows the amount of value added components to be attributed to institutional sectors. Wages and Salaries will represent an exclusive inflow of households, we need to make here the assumption that Employers’ social on are attributed to households. This fact would imply a further assumption of outflows from households in the secondary distribution towards public administration and firms. The accounting of institutional sectors and sub-sectors needs the identification of the sectoral inflows. The ownership of the factors represents the main selection criterion. A new table is then constructed for value added by institutional sectors (\(Va^{SI}\)), where rows a represent institutional sectors \((i=1,..,s)\) and columns \(va\) components (factors):
\[
V_a^{SI} = \begin{bmatrix}
va_{1,1} & va_{1,2} \\
. & . \\
. & . \\
. & . \\
va_{s,1} & va_{s,2}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(42)

In this table the second component, Other Incomes, presents some difficulties deriving from the fact that we need to refer to accounting for macro regions in order to determine how Mixed Incomes, that appears in regional accounting, can be splitted into the share due to Public Administration and in that flowing to households and individual firms.

Once subtracted the Operating Surplus gross \((AR^{PA})\), the rest is splitted on the basis of two coefficients:

\[
\sum_j va_{2,j} - AR^{PA} = AR
\]

(43)

The allocation of the residual to the sectors is given by:

\[
AR^F = g \cdot AR \quad \text{and} \quad AR^I = (1 - g) \cdot AR
\]

(44)

where \(g\) is a function of the structure of small and medium size firms in the region, having in mind the structure of the distribution of the Operating Surplus gross to the whole economy’s sectors. Given the amount \(AR^F\) it was possible to disaggregate the flow through the inflows structure in BF, for the 5 Households Income classes.

Table 16: Primary distribution of Income by institutional sectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income class</th>
<th>Va_1</th>
<th>Va_2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Income class</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Income class</td>
<td>3086</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Income class</td>
<td>10379</td>
<td>5303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Income class</td>
<td>6998</td>
<td>6244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Income class</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>1451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firms</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The allocation of this aggregate among institutional sectors requires further information on capital incomes in order to determine primary incomes balance and then the gross regional income. The operating surplus gross in this phase is correct by capital income flows between institutional sectors. Hence it is needed to find the interests, dividends, surplus, insurance policy holders and rents. A single flow needs of the sectoral and sub sectoral institutional accounting regional, but without the local accounting imposes the to use the new criterion
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by the imputation. It is based on a framework to the capital income distribution between institutional sectors at macro-regional level, taking that the survey data, when are disposable, must be applied, also it is to non official font and relative to the single aggregated.

The capital income to the domestic sectors \(K\) can be represented by Gross Operating Surplus and the structure of the matrix \(B\) \([3,3]\) (Households, Firm and out of the quadrant Public Administration):

\[
K = B \cdot AR
\]

from which we can determine the value of the capital income by Households Income Class, applying the BF framework.

The standard economic aggregated (Gross Regional Income and Gross Domestic Product) is not still determinable because it needs to insert the outside flows of the quadrant (Value Added, capital income and Indirect Tax), that we describe at the next part. The quadrant finish with the block of the secondary income distribution, with all sectoral transfers that doesn't increase the GDP. We record in this block the flow that are added to others just insert above when we build the income distribution to owner of primary factors. The determination of domestic flows to be attributed to various cells is based on the structure that can be determined from BF and from its integration with the regional social accounting matrix. The determination of the redistribution accounts needs the reconstruction of a set of sub matrices which regard the items accounted for in secondary distribution accounts. In this way we insert all available information that regional accounts do not provide.

In the block the flows regarding public administration are much easier to be determined with respect to transfers internal to institutional sectors. The aggregation of sub blocks leads to the determination of the matrix of transfers: row and column related to households are disaggregated by sub sectors with a framework given to the BF. No information to the side of entries induces us, in this working progress, to attribute this flows to the relative sub sectors, under assumption of balance spending, because we know the gross saving.

Table 17: Secondary distribution of Income among institutional sectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I_Income class</th>
<th>II_Income class</th>
<th>III_Income class</th>
<th>IV_Income class</th>
<th>V_Income class</th>
<th>Firms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I_Income class</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II_Income class</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III_Income class</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV_Income class</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V_Income class</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firms</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section I of the SAM, through Tables [13 - 17], has been disaggregated to allow the introduction of institutional sub-sectors.

We now refer to the flows among domestic and non domestic operators. The first case is given by the regional in and outflows which involve Public Administration. The vast majority of the in flows in this block are all type of taxes either direct and indirect, contributes, unilateral transfers and social security. As to outflows subsidies, social security and transfers to households and firms, interests on public debt. Indirect taxes on output come from industrial accounting where we find Indirect taxes on products, on imports and VAT.

Table 18: Government Indirect and Import Tax

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Tax</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Tax</td>
<td>-309</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>2048</td>
<td>1569</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From primary distribution of income, other than the value added share we have already described, we have also a residual Gross Operating Surplus flow to be referred to the activity developed by Public Administration within the region. The primary distribution block develops with the flows related to capital incomes by other institutional sectors determined with reference to the consolidated account of Public Administration.

The secondary distribution block shows the redistributive effect of transfers and is determined in connection with the construction of the sub matrices of income account integrated with information from BF. In particular, as to inflows, we register direct taxes on income and wealth (Irpef, Iperg) Social contributions and other current taxes.

The Irpef inflow has been disaggregated by income classes on the basis of the structure given in BF through elaboration of individual data for Marche according the fiscal legislation 1996. Within each class has been determined an average income, on which the progressive taxation and deductions could be applied by income classes.

The tax structure has been then applied to the Irpef inflow as indicated by the Income Agency (Ministry of Finance) for Marche. The same procedure has been utilized for Ilor (local tax on incomes) considering that in 1996 this tax was applied only on other incomes considering consistent deductions.

The amount of benefits outflows was determined as an aggregated amount from regional accounts (ISTAT, 1996) and other information (Inps), while the decomposition by income classes was done according the amount of average deductions. The Irpeg inflow of Marche has been attributed to Firms together with the Ilor residual.
### Table 19: Government flows from others institutional sectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income class</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>Firms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>5344</td>
<td>4042</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>2585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Tax on Income</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>2205</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>2242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social transfers</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>3126</td>
<td>2108</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In column of section V we register collective consumption expenditures, as IO final demand component (TEI), interest transfers from Public Administration to households, social security benefits, and direct transfers to corporations. (Inps and BF).

### Table 20: Government transfers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income class</th>
<th>Public Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I, Income class</td>
<td>1272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, Income class</td>
<td>2534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III, Income class</td>
<td>6653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV, Income class</td>
<td>3400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V, Income class</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firms</td>
<td>5720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section VI shows one row and column which illustrate the inflows and outflows of the rest of the World the output block imports and exports that are given in TEI: In the primary income distribution the net value added flows and capital incomes determined by the construction of the blocks in section I; for secondary distribution block we get all direct transfers form and towards the rest of the world.

We have concentrated on sections I, V and VI, but a similar procedure has been adopted for determining also sections II, III and IV in order to obtain the bi regional Social Accounting Matrix, whose scheme is shown in Table 1.