Gaps in 'Spatial Capital' between Haifa's Neighborhoods

Amnon Frenkel[1] and Moran Aviv[1]

1. Faculty of Architecture and Town Planning, Technion, Israel

ABSTRACT

The study under progress is designed to help identify the level of disparities between neighborhoods through the definition of 'spatial profiles'. Spatial profiles are constructed through categorizing the distribution of goods and services within the local authority, based on the theory of capital assets. These profiles form the basis for a tool to help formulate policy recommendations for effective spatial distribution of urban resources; according to environmental, cultural and social assets. On a spatial level, capital assets are complex, reflecting the capabilities of the city and its neighborhoods in the context of innovation, productivity and development. From the resident's perspective the capital assets reflect the production, accumulation, and transmission of spatial capital.

In order to measure the accumulation of capital assets, a field survey by household interviews using a structured questionnaire specifically built for this purpose was conducted in three neighborhoods in the city of Haifa, Israel. Data on the relevant capital assets was collected and examined at a neighborhood level: social capital, cultural capital, and economic capital. In addition, the living environment was analyzed by observation and classification, in an attempt to better understand the relationship between the different characteristics and opportunities for individuals living in it and their interactions. The data was analyzed to build a spatial profile of each neighborhood thereby understanding the nature, potential and challenges of diversity in contemporary societies and help to formulate urban policy to create neighborhoods' capabilities.

Key words: Social Capital, Diverse Neighborhoods, capabilities

1. Introduction

Spatial equality has become an integral part of the urban planning domain, and in recent years it has played a prominent role in the public and professional discourse alike. It is expressed in the spatial distribution of economic and monetary resources over territory, as well as in the distribution of environmental, cultural and social assets. The Measuring and quantifying the latter assets are complex undertakings; hence, the importance of examining and translating these variables into measurable and comparable values.

The present study examines the relationship between the allocation of goods and the distribution of capital assets over space, and the opportunities this allocation and distribution create for both the individual and the household. The neighborhood is examined as the living environment that links the physical space, the community and the network connections and opportunities that characterize it. On a larger scale, the neighborhood unit creates the latitude for civil activities, economic opportunities and the positioning of the individual's status and social role (Kearns & Parkinson, 2001). Despite the changes in lifestyle resulting from technological and transportation changes and despite the rise of different communities that are not based on geographical location, the neighborhood unit still remains influential and plays a meaningful role in the individual's affiliation and involvement in the economic and social fields (Atkinso & Kintrea, 2004). Nevertheless, there is a lack of empirical data on the

allocation of resources among neighborhoods in the city and on the role of the neighborhood unit in the accumulation and distribution of different capital assets (Kearns & Parkinson, 2001).

In order to measure the accumulation of capital assets, a field survey was conducted in which data were collected on relevant capital assets at the neighborhood level. A residential area in each of three neighborhoods in the city of Haifa, Israel's third-largest city, was sampled. The contribution of the study lies in its investigation of social and economic phenomena relating to the heterogeneous population of small geographical units in order to obtain an in-depth social-spatial picture of these neighborhoods' capital assets.

2. Background

2.1 The Forms of Capital

The theory on forms of capital developed by leading thinkers in the social sphere and the area of planning (Friedmann, 2002; Bourdieu, 2001) serves the present study as a basis for estimating the level of resources and their distribution across residential neighborhoods. This approach extends the debate that usually focuses on purely economic capital to other forms of capital, whose accumulation and then transfer to future generations may have a great impact on well-being, in both the spatial and the private sphere.

Capital forms have spatial substance, as they express human interactions that exist in a certain place and at a specific time. Their aim is to produce advantages in a series of fields of life that could be transferred to other fields in a cumulative and reinforcing process (Savage et al., 2005). At the spatial level, capital forms are the main resources used to create sustainability and the city's productive ability, thereby affecting its inhabitants' life opportunities. At the individual and the household levels, the accumulation of capital forms and the ability to influence their value provide power and reflect the ability to capture social and economic positions. Thus, an injury to the ability to accumulate these resources may harm the principle of equal opportunities (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). Life chances are affected by patterns of the spatial distribution of resources. According to the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu (1996), three forms of capital constitute the social space: economic, cultural and social.

Economic capital—refers to income, monetary assets and other forms of financial resources (Bourdieu, 1986; Lucas, 1988; Jaeger & Holm, 2007; Becker & Woessmann, 2009). Economic capital promotes outcomes through either direct investment (e.g., payment for activities, products or services) or indirect investment (e.g., financial subsidization of offspring). The effect of economic capital at the neighborhood level is considerable in regard to the physical infrastructure and maintenance of the shared living environment, as well as housing ownership rates, which affect the social involvement of local residents (McCabe, 2012; Forrest and Keams, 2001). In addition, economic capital is conceived as a sort of insurance for material welfare, a facilitator of the procurement of cultural accessories and even a reducer of social deviance, whether crime or psychological morbidity (Lovell, 2002; Gatrell et al., 2004).

Cultural capital—expresses the quality of human resources in the community. This is usually quantified through literacy, employment skills, general knowledge and education level. Friedmann (2002) defines cultural capital according to the urban– spatial configuration, which refers to the built heritage and cultural life of the city. Bourdieu refers to the connection between the built environment and the individual, but his thinking focuses on individuals and the balance of power among them, not on space. Bourdieu expanded the debate on inequality and stratification beyond its physical and economic significance and gave importance to the cultural and social variables as autonomous factors in the relationship among groups. According to Bourdieu (1986), cultural capital comprises not only educational qualifications and achievements, but also tastes, preferences and general "know-how" and knowledge; it affects cognitive skills and the knowledge of normative codes through socialization processes.

Bourdieu (1986) distinguishes three forms of cultural capital: "Institutionalized," "Embodied" and "Objectified." "Institutionalized Cultural Capital" is composed of university degrees, matriculation attainments and dropout rates, which act as antecedent roots in explaining institutionalized credentials (both academic and non-academic). According to Bourdieu (2001), human capital embodies institutionalized cultural capital. Similarly, Friedmann (2002) defines human capital as an embedded value in higher education and vocational training. "Embodied Cultural Capital" relates to both consciously acquired and passively inherited properties of one's self through socialization processes over time. "Objectified Cultural Capital" relates to Embodied Cultural Capital through material objects and visual media, such as paintings, book collections with literary masterpieces, and monuments, and becomes an indicator of visual status. As a material capital, this cultural capital is readily transferable, since it can be purchased materially by economic capital and symbolically by cultural capital.

Social capital—is defined as the total extent and quality of social networks and connections that one uses to promote personal interests (Bourdieu, 1986). Social relationships enhance networking ability and knowledge transfer and also provide support in times of trouble (Adler & Seok, 2001). Social capital is the outcome of the mutual emotions of trust, solidarity and gratitude among members in a social network, expressed in acts of assistance and support for members within the community (Dore, 1983; Coleman, 1988; Putnam, 1995; Adler & Seok, 2001).

Bourdieu suggests that the accumulation of the three last forms of capital (Economic, Cultural and Social) determines a social space that defines class-related inequalities in a variety of spheres of life (Bourdieu, 1989; 1985). In this social space, the different forms of capital enable an individual and his/her respective social peer groups to achieve a variety of social goods in diverse fields of life (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992). These social goods might later be translated into capabilities or life-chances for the social subject (Bowman, 2010).

2.2 Life-chances

An individual's life-chances, created from birth, depend on the circumstances and life events that are beyond one's control, but they have a direct impact on the quality of life. The community in which the individual grew up (e.g., neighborhood) and the status of the person's parents, as well as the social structure and policy and political forces, have decisive influences on the individual's circumstances and choices (Blacksher, 2002).

Amartya Sen (1992) defined two concepts in this context: Capabilities and Functionings. According to his approach, capabilities will be equal only when all individuals have the same opportunity to function well in different social fields. This opportunity stems from the ability to convert services and goods (i.e., education, money, health and social relations) into real functioning (Nussbaum, 2006; Sen, 1992).

The two terms, Capabilities and Functionings, signify the opportunities (or life-chances) that enable people to choose the kind of lifestyle they wish to pursue and to function effectively in fields of life that they value (Robeyns and Brighouse, 2010). In clarifying this definition, Sen argues that ""a functioning is an achievement, whereas a capability is the ability to achieve. Capabilities… are notions of freedom, in the positive sense: what real opportunities you have regarding the life you may lead" (Sen, 1987: 36). As such, capabilities and functionings together define the life-chances of the individual and determine the equality of opportunities in a given space and at a given time.

Life-chances may be influenced by the living environment (e.g., the neighborhood) where different forms of capital are accumulated. A mix of capital forms may reflect the ability to achieve social positions. Therefore, the individual's exposure to life- chances in different living environments may have a direct impact on that person's ability to fill positions and roles in society.

Many studies have pointed to the neighborhood as the most significant influential unit on access to goods and, accordingly, on the individual's choices and life opportunities (Akom,

2011; Atkinson & Kintrea, 2004). Kleit (2001) found that neighborhoods with a diverse mix of incomes have the potential to increase an individual's life-chances. This is due to the benefits that result from better access to institutions, such as better schools, civil service and public agencies, and to better-quality and more stable jobs. These benefits lead to lower rates of crime and violence, compared to neighborhoods with concentrations of poverty (Galster, Andersson & Musterd, 2010).

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Hypotheses

This study aimed to assist in identifying the gaps among different neighborhoods from their spatial capital profiles. The study hypothesizes the existence of a relationship between this profile and the exposure of a neighborhood's residents to a set of life-chances.

Hypothesis H1*:* Social space consists of different accumulations of capital forms within the physical space of a city's different residential neighborhoods.

Living environments that reflect a class topography consist of capital profiles describing social stratification in space and exhibiting the unique capital profile of a particular residential neighborhood.

Hypothesis H2*:* The characteristics of the social space (i.e., the way in which capital forms are accumulated) affect an individual's life-chances in various spheres of life.

The amalgam of capital forms characterizing each individual in the social space enables identifying interpersonal differences that affect the conversion of capital forms into "capabilities" and "functionings" in different social fields.

Hypothesis H3*:* Households in different neighborhoods in a city exhibit differences in the accumulation of capital forms

Residential neighborhoods differ in the characteristics of the physical environments affecting the urban living space, as well as in the ability to regenerate, recover and attract a population with a high level of accumulative capital. This difference is reflected in gaps among neighborhoods in the accumulation of economic, social and cultural capital. The accumulation of these capital forms provides a more sensitive measure of social-spatial stratification.

Hypothesis H4*:* As the level of the accumulation of capital assets increases, the extent of an individual's exposure to life-chances will also increase.

The individual's accumulation of capital forms has an impact on exposure to life- chances. Given the assumption that differences in the characteristics of accumulated capital characterize a city's residential neighborhoods, it is conceivable that a gap also exists in the life-chances of the different individuals residing in the city's neighborhoods.

3.2 Research Methods

In order to examine the first and the second research hypotheses, which deal with the existence of a social space associated with the physical living environment, Explanatory Factor Analysis (EFA) was employed to serve as a Data Reduction procedure (Robson and Sanders, 2010; Cattel, 1965). The justification for this step is that the concept of social space is a general idea that is difficult to describe using one variable or a simple and direct measurement (Bourdieu, 1986). It requires a multivariate setting and the use of quantitative analysis of numerous measures. This is true, too, of the concept of life-chances relating to a set of capabilities and functionings, which are measured in the present study using quantitative analysis that involve a wide set of indicators.

EFA was employed on a set of variables derived from the literature and collected through a field survey that represented the concepts of social space and life-chances. It enabled a grouping of the variables in each capital form and in selected life-chances into major factors.[1] Each factor comprises a linear combination of all measures in each relevant

[1] Main factors were defined by eigenvalues >1.

field of knowledge and contributes to the total explanation of the variance (Kim and Muller, 1978). The dominant variables in each factor enabled a categorization and labelling of the unique "identity" of the factor[2]. Thus, it was possible to examine whether the variables chosen are indeed logically related to the typology proposed by the literature. The EFA created a capital profile through latent variables obtained from the analysis, thereby defining the social space as well as the profile of opportunities that denoted capabilities and functionings in the study area.

The results obtained from the EFA were also used to test the third and fourth hypotheses regarding spatial variation among the city's neighborhoods. In order to do this, the factor scores ascribed to each observation through the EFA model were employed. These scores indicated the accumulated capital that characterized the household: the higher the score, the higher was the household's accumulated capital, and vice versa. Similarly, higher factor scores for the life- chances factors identified were indicative of a greater level of a household's exposure to life- chances, and vice versa. These standardized scores were then used to examine whether a significant difference in accumulated capital and exposure to life-chances existed among a neighborhood's inhabitants. The examination was conducted by analysis of variance through the Mann-Whitney a-parametric test.

4. Data Collection

4.1 Population and Research Area

The empirical study took place in the city of Haifa, which is located in northern Israel and serves as the core of the Haifa metropolitan region. The city is Israel's third largest, with a population of 273,000 (CBS, 2014). Haifa was selected for the empirical study, since it presents the qualities of a medium-size city exhibiting great variety in its neighborhoods in terms of average apartment size, density (persons/sq km), age distribution, occupations, education level, and other demographic variables. In addition, the city's population is heterogeneous, 24.5% of its residents being former residents of what was the Soviet Union, who came to Israel with the great wave of immigration from that country during the early 1990s and 10.3% of its residents being Arabs. Because of this diversity, we can assume that there are differences in the level of accumulation of capital forms among the city's neighborhoods. For the empirical study, three neighborhoods were selected to represent the diversity of the city's social class: Hadar, Ramat Sapir and Ramat Golda.

The Hadar neighborhood, located on the northern slope of Mount Carmel, is the middle step between Haifa's downtown and Central Carmel atop the mountain. It offers nearby commercial centers, public institutions and access to public transportation service. In addition to historical and architectural textures, many of the city's cultural institutions, such as the Municipal Theater, Al-Midan Theater, Museum of Art and Science Museum, are also located in this neighborhood. The residential area in the Hadar neighborhood that was sampled is characterized by residential buildings of 3-4 stories that were constructed in the 1920s and 1930s. The area contains 1,700 households and Haifa's largest concentration of immigrants from the former Soviet Union.

Ramat Sapir is located in the eastern part of the city. The neighborhood, purely residential, was built in the early 1980s. Saturated building characterizes the neighborhood, with structures of 8 stories and taller. The population of the residential area in this neighborhood that was sampled has 1,100 households and an ethnically homogeneous, most belonging to the middle class.

Ramat Golda also purely residential is located on the Carmel Mountain adjacent to the main transportation route of the mountain. The neighborhood, built in the 1980s and populated in the 1990s, is characterized by detached houses and low-density buildings, as

[2] Dominant measures were defined as those with an absolute value of a component coefficient greater than 0.5. These measures were taken from the Rotated Component Matrix table produced from the Principal Components procedure by the Varimax method of rotation.

well as almost no public spaces or intensive open space. The neighborhood's residential area that was sampled has 900 households and an ethnically and economically homogeneous population.

The three residential areas were chosen for the empirical study based on an analysis of the socio-economic characteristics of Haifa's population. The main differences that served for their selection related to the labor force participation rate, level of education, occupation, means of getting to work, home ownership rate and housing density as shown in Table 1.

Table 1

A field survey was conducted in 2013 among households in the three residential areas selected; this survey provided the research population for an examination of social space and exposure to life-chances.

4.2 Questionnaire Design

Data were collected by means of a four-part questionnaire that was constructed for the purpose of this study. The first part, which was devoted to education and cultural characteristics, enabled characterizing the accumulation of cultural capital by household heads, their parents and their children. The second part related to characteristics of the production and accumulation of social capital; i.e., social relationships. The third part addressed the material aspects of economic capital. The fourth part asked respondents to indicate their exposure to life- chances, such as the ability of the household head to find alternative work in the event of a loss of employment (whether through resigning or being fired) and to finance the children's academic study. Finally, residents were asked about housing ownership, residence choices and the living environment.

Most of the data collected were converted into categorical variables. Some of these variables demanded redefinition and the construction of complex variables to represent the common accumulation of capital by household heads and their common exposure to life-chances. The new variables created indices that represented both of a family's household heads (in households with two heads) effectively as a single unit (i.e., a household).

5. Results

5.1 Characteristics of the Sample

Data were collected through personal interviews conducted with the heads of households in the residential areas selected. A total of 170 completed questionnaires were received, representing 4.6% of the total households in the three residential areas. The sample was representative in terms of the economic and educational characteristics of the population in the study area, but less so insofar as demographic characteristics (there was greater representativeness of an aging population in the sample in both Ramat Sapir and Ramat Golda; CBS, 2008). The respondents' socio-economic characteristics are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

The majority of households consisted of two or fewer persons (60%), but the differences among the three residential areas are not statistically significant. Ramat Sapir's population is characterized by young household heads relative to the two other neighborhoods and the differences are statistically significant. The income level of households in Ramat Golda is significantly higher than that of households in Ramat Sapir and particularly of those in Hadar. This gap also applies to educational level. The percentage of household heads with an academic degree in Ramat Golda and even in Ramat Sapir is significantly higher than among household heads in Hadar. This last finding was reflected in the significant differences in respondents' occupations. The rate of household heads employed in academic professional positions and as associate professionals, technicians and

managers in Ramat Golda and Ramat Sapir is more than double that of household heads in Hadar. Housing density also showed a significant difference: the rate of households with more than two rooms per person in Ramat Golda and even in Ramat Sapir is significantly higher than in Hadar.

5.2 Extraction of Capital Forms and Life-chance Concepts

As explained in Section 4.2, the existence of social space at the neighborhood level and the concept of life-chances were obtained by means of factor analyses of instrumental variables collected in a field survey. The data were used to construct compound variables representing the common value attributed to both heads of a household (the investigation unit). A total of 25 variables measuring economic, cultural and social capital, based of Bourdieu's theory, and 9 variables measuring capabilities and functionings, based on Amartya Sen's approach (and representing life-chances), were employed in the models. Table 3 presents the 34 variables and their means and standard deviations.

Table 3

The relative high standard deviations indicate in general a large variance around the average. This may reflect the heterogeneity of the population that lives in the various neighborhoods in the city. It thus supports the assumption of this study regarding the existence of spatial disparities among neighborhoods in the city of Haifa and can assist in mapping and understanding these gaps.

Tests of internal consistency and sample adequacy constituted the necessary preliminary conditions for conducting EFA and obtaining meaningful results. The Spearman correlation matrix among the indicators provided the input for both the tests and the factor analyses. The activity-pattern items obtained in the survey demonstrate good internal consistency(Cronbach's alpha = 0.726-0.831) and appropriate sampling adequacy for performing EFA according to the overall Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure (KMO = 0.760-0.771). The Spearman correlation matrix contains correlations with absolute values of 0.001-0.740, and the value of its determinant is 0.001; hence, the existence of correlations without multi-collinearity is established. The result of the Bartlett's sphericity test rejects the null hypothesis that the correlation matrix is an identity matrix ($p = 0.000$).

Exploratory principal axis factor analysis with orthogonal rotation (Varimax rotation with Kaiser normalization) produced seven factors (in the case of capital forms) and three factors (in the case of capabilities and functionings). These results, derived from a combination of scree-plot analysis and the Ricolfi measure, aimed at conveying as much information as possible while maintaining the parsimony of the model (see Prato et al., 2005). The factor loadings are presented in Tables 4 and 5. A factor loading threshold of 0.43 served for retaining the items for factor analysis and for factor labeling (although most of the variables received factor loading higher than 0.64).

5.3 Social Space

Seven concepts together explaining 64% of the variance and representing capital forms were obtained from employing the EFA procedure on the 25 observed variables (Table 4). These concepts are consistent with Bourdieu's theory on capital forms, thereby confirming our hypothesis, which underlies the social space concept of the study area.

Table 4

The first three factors, each explaining about 11% of the variance, are the dominant concepts representing the social space of the residential areas examined. The first factor, loading six variables, relates to fondness for various literature genres, along with the number of books read by heads of household. This factor may represent "Embodied Cultural Capital,"

because these variables are related to investment and self-learning, which over time are embedded in the individual, and to the socialization process, which affects the evaluation and integration of certain genres over others.

The second factor also relates to cultural capital. It associates with Institutional-symbolic Cultural Capital, referring to academic degrees and diplomas, which have social and economic importance in the society. The three dominant variables, representing a common foundation for heads of household, are built on a hierarchy of capital, in which the highest category is a situation in which all heads of household earned a Master's degree or Ph.D. They received the degree in professions or fields most in demand in the employment market and at academic training institutions and acquired it from one of the elite academic institutions in Israel or other Western country. The fact that the first two factors represent cultural capital indicates their significant effect on social stratification.

The third factor, loading two variables, indicates cumulative material capital: a household's income level and the number of privately owned cars. This factor allows one to identify neighborhoods having a significant proportion of wealthy residents, with economic strength and power-monetary material. This factor also includes frequency of participation in conferences, which indirectly can also be seen as an input contributing to positioning the employment status of household heads and, therefore, belonging to economic capital.

The results regarding the first three dominant factors support Bourdieu's theory. They allow the identification of households that enjoy a high accumulation of Institutional-symbolic Cultural Capital. As such, they represent institutional training and academic achievements, which compose as part of the individual's cultural abilities and are converted into economic capital and vice versa.

The following three factors represent Social Capital through their defining of three circles (different scales) of relationships that build trust among community members in the study area. Each of the factors explains 8%-9% of the variance. The fourth factor, Support and Social Control, belongs to Social Bonding Capital (Putnam, 2000), which characterizes pattern of participation and relationships within social units having a shared identity. This concept relates to variables that support the living environment (i.e., the neighborhood): volunteering in the neighborhood, shared values and mutual help among neighbors. The dominance of this factor (over the following two social capital factors) reinforces the concept of the present study regarding the meaning of the neighborhood as the arena where capital is accumulated and strengthened or, alternatively, eroded.

The fifth factor identifies the second circle in Social Bonding Capital – Family Cohesion. The dominant variables under this concept indicate the social contextual family circle. The sixth factor, which marks the third circle by creating social cohesion, relies on the existence and empowerment of a wide circle of friendships. According to Bourdieu's approach, personal friendships constitute an important element in creating social capital. Therefore, measuring the extent to which the individual enjoys a relationship with friends is an important component of Empowerment and Social Bridging. Through these relationships, for example, the individual may promote personal affairs (Robson and Sanders 2010).

Finally the seventh factor can imply the existence of Objectified Cultural Capital through fostering cultural inputs, but it is also an integral part of the investment and long-term learning embedded in the individual (see Embodied Cultural Capital above). The factor explains only 7.5% of the variance; however, with respect to social capital factors, it may indicate a connection between fostering cultural input investment by heads of households and empowering their social capital through social bridging alongside family cohesion.

5.4 Life-Chances

Three concepts, together explaining 60.1% of the variance and representing capabilities and functionings, were obtained from employing the EFA procedure on the nine observed variables (Table 5). These concepts represent the life- chances of household heads in the study area, based on Sen's approach.

Table 5

When capabilities and functionings are constructed into principles of life-chances, they are treated as complementary principles, since functionings are, in effect, the capabilities that the individual chooses to implement in practice. In this study, four variables represented the functionings of household heads in three social fields, employment, housing and academic-professional training, from an intergenerational perspective. Along with the five variables defining capabilities, the nine variables formed the foundation for an operational definition of life-chances (see Table 3). The choice of variables was dictated by the need to focus on consensual areas of action regarding the individual's definition of a "worthy" life in a liberal-democratic society.

The first factor obtained, explaining about 24% of the variance, is the dominant concept and represents the social-economic ability to stabilize the nuclear family. The variables loaded in this concept represent stability and constitute the social conditions promoting the individual's dignity and development. These variables are capabilities relating to the ability to raise children and maintain a stable family (household size) and to upgrade and ensure educational resources for the next generation, along with functionings in the housing field (home ownership and the existence of a second home).

The five variables that are dominant in this factor are positively related and represent a hierarchy of opportunities for improving the household's living conditions, which are associated with homeownership. The potential of higher education and the capability of the heads of households to finance it (the first variables in this factor) represent the economic stability of the household, even if this capability has not yet been realized. The next three variables relate to economic stability as reflected in the housing field. The last variable in this factor refers to the number of persons in the household, and the sample data indicate that these are families consisting of 3-5 persons that enjoy a high capability of funding academic studies for the next generation. These families represent stable nuclear cells, since it is assumed that households of this size allow their children to develop a healthy and stable lifestyle (Maralani, 2008; Demo and Cox, 2000).[3]

The second factor, the ability to feel control over one's life and material environment, is also a dominant concept, explaining 21% of the variance. The factor represents the individual's ability in the job market, based on the person's subjective assessment. The two variables loaded in this factor represent the individual's assessment regarding an ability to find alternative employment, thus reflecting a feeling of job security and an assessment of the ability to improve one's working conditions. As such, this factor serves as a significant element in the assessment of the exposure to life-chances. The literature refers to the ability to work and earn a living, to attain fair employment conditions and to seek employment on an equal basis as a universal capability in regard to all the capabilities that make up the individual's access to life-chances (Robeyns, 2010; Nussbaum, 2006).

The third factor, functioning in the field of employment and academic training, explains 14.2% of the variance. This concept consists of two variables, the first of which has a higher loading value and refers to functioning in the field of academic and professional training when examined from an inter-generational perspective. This variable represents the actual performance of the individual in the academic field. The second variable relates to the prestige of the jobs held by the heads of the household and reflects the ability to engage in high- status professions, thereby achieving positions and duties in the upper rank of the employment field. According to Sen (1992), these variables present the conversion of individual capabilities into real functionings, which the individual wants and respects, and assist in the mapping of equal opportunity in space.

[3] Confirmation is found in the field survey, which showed that 83% of households with 3-5 persons are households with two heads. Moreover, the finding regarding income groups showed that households belonging to the upper class (tenth decile) are those with a relatively large household size (average of 3.4 persons).

5.5 Inequality among neighborhoods

Factor scores obtained from the EFA were used to examine spatial differences among households in the three Haifa neighborhoods surveyed in regard to social space components, as well as to their exposure to life-chances. This examination was undertaken by means of a Mann-Whitney a-parametric analysis. The dependent variable was the factor scores that each observation received from the EFA model, while the spatial location (neighborhoods) served as the independent variable. The results are presented in Tables 6 and 7.

Social Space Inequality

High standard deviations exist for most of the capital forms in each of the three neighborhoods (Table 6). This indicates that the population in each neighborhood is quite heterogeneous with respect to accumulated capital forms. Still, interesting significant differences among the neighborhoods were found in some of the capital forms.

Table 6

The most diverse form of capital is Economic Capital, which indicates the existence of a polarized spatial structure. Material capital inputs held by households in Ramat Golda were higher than those in Ramat Sapir, and the latter was higher than households in Hadar. These differences, which are highly statistically significant, point to deep gaps in the social space of all the capital factors identified (Z value of -4.5 - -7.0). This result was expected because we had selected the three neighborhoods in the sample based on differences in their economic and social characteristics; at the same time, however, significant differences were also found in other accumulated capital forms.

In part, these differences are reflected in the field of higher education as expressed in their Institutional-symbolic Cultural Capital accumulation. In this sense, the institutional training and academic qualifications of the household heads in Ramat Golda surpass those in the two other neighborhoods (the differences between those two neighborhoods were not significant). It seems that households in Ramat Golda manage to transform their institutional cultural capital into economic capital. Similarly, though probably in the opposite direction, households in Ramat Golda manage to convert the economic capital they accumulated into Objectified Cultural Capital. That Ramat Golda households received a higher average factor score in fostering cultural inputs suggests that their investments in long-term learning were larger than those of the two other neighborhoods, and the differences are statistically significant. No significant differences were found, however, between households in Ramat Sapir and Hadar in this context. The difference between the Ramat Golda and Hadar neighborhoods in this capital is interesting, since it relates to the frequency of visits to the theater, museums, exhibitions and galleries, many of which are located in Hadar. This finding suggests that Hadar's residents do not consume culture from their neighborhood's cultural institutions despite the physical accessibility. The explanation for this is probably due to the low level of economic capital of these residents. In contrast, no significant differences were found among the three neighborhoods in the average factor score relating to Embodied Cultural Capital. The reason for this is probably very little dependence by any of them on self-learning through various genres of literature on economic capital.

Finally, interesting findings regarding differences in the accumulation of Social Capital were found among the three neighborhoods in the sample. Of the three spheres of social capital that were obtained from the factor analysis, Social Bonding Capital was found to be of prominent importance. Highly and statistically significant differences were found among the three neighborhoods in the average factor score for the Support and Social Control concept, which contribute to the living environment. However, the results are inconsistent with the findings in relation to economic capital and cultural capital (see above). The level of volunteering in the neighborhood, shared values and mutual help among neighbors are most prominent in Ramat Sapir, with Ramat Golda far behind and Hadar even further back.

Hadar in this case represents a mixed residential area with a relatively high immigrant population rate. As a result, households in this neighborhood not only demonstrate low level of economic and cultural capital, they also fail to produce neighborhood cohesion. On the other hand, the prestigious neighborhood of Ramat Golda is a good example confirming the argument over the difficulty in converting economic capital into social capital, unlike the ability to convert economic capital into cultural capital and vice versa (Savage et al., 2005), which has been shown empirically in this study.

With respect to the two other circles of social capital, Family Cohesion and Empowerment and Social Bridging, statistically significant differences were found only among some of the neighborhoods in the sample and at a moderate level. Households in Hadar maintain social cohesion, built on the existence and empowerment of friendship relationships, to a greater extent than do households in Ramat Golda. On the other hands, family cohesion characterizes households in Ramat Sapir to a greater extent than households in Hadar.

Life-Chances Inequality

The interesting question is whether the differences among the three neighborhoods in the accumulation of these capital forms (described above) are expressed in the ability of households to translate these forms into capabilities and functionings in various social fields so as to enhance their life-chances as hypothesized. The results obtained from employing the Mann-Whitney test on the life-chances factor scores largely validate our hypothesis. Neighborhoods where households have a high level of accumulated capital forms that significantly differ from those of households in other neighborhoods benefit from more exposure to life-chances.

Statistically significant differences were found among the three neighborhoods in the social-economic ability to stabilize the nuclear family factor (Table 7). The ability of the nuclear family to ensure stability for household heads, as well as for their offspring, is significantly higher in Ramat Golda than in the two other neighborhoods. And it is significantly higher among households in Ramat Sapir than in Hadar.

Table 7

In regard to the second concept (Table 7), it seems that households in Ramat Golda are characterized by a heightened ability to feel a sense of control over their lives. These households have a better chance to ensure continuity of income inputs than do households in Ramat Sapir and Hadar; this advantage holds, as well, in regard to Ramat Golda households' having the mental capability to change their workplaces while achieving effectiveness and economic well-being, even in the event of an involuntary loss of job. The finding in regard to Ramat Golda is striking in light of the ageism phenomena, which is common in the Israeli labor market, given the high percentage of residents aged 41-65 in Ramat Golda relative to the two other neighborhoods. These components, which are significant parameters in estimating the exposure to life-chances, point to a polarization among the three neighborhoods and may indicate the existence of spatial inequality in the urban space.

The third life-chance concept relates to the individual's freedom of occupation and the ability to obtain social positions, which reflect functionings in one's field of academic-professional training when examined from an intergenerational perspective. Household heads in both Ramat Sapir and Ramat Golda received higher prestige jobs on the upper social ladder than did household heads in Hadar, and the differences are statistically significant. The gaps in this concept that relate to intergenerational mobility in the household are consistent with the literature, which shows that the living environment continues to affect inter-generational mobility and life-chances even in the Global Era (Atkinson & Kintrea, 2004). The spatial patterns of reproduction may thus be transferred to the next generation in the absence of an adjusted urban policy.

6. Conclusions

Most of the studies that examined and measured spatial inequality have done so from the perspective of economic growth. Many scholars use economic indices in their measurement of spatial–social gaps and costs, primarily income, employment and education data, in order to assess their effect on urban and regional economic growth.

In the present study, we suggest extending the spatial inequality examination by looking at the allocation of different capital forms. We based our analysis on Bourdieu's sociological theory of the three forms of capital: Economic, Social and Cultural. A field survey provided data to allow us to build a large number of complex variables that measured the level of accumulated various capital forms possessed by household heads in the three neighborhoods sampled. Seven concepts of capital forms, obtained from employing an explanatory factor analysis on the measured variables, confirmed the existence of social space in the study area. The social space identified comprises one form of economic capital, three forms of cultural capital and three forms of social capital. Based on Sen's approach (1992), we also collected data on capabilities and functionings through our field survey. Three factors were obtained from employing EFA on those variables that exhibit life-chances concepts: a social-economic ability to stabilize the nuclear family, an ability to feel control over one's life and material environment, and functioning in the field of employment and academic training.

The analysis showed statistically significant differences in various forms of capital among the three neighborhoods examined. Household heads in Hadar are at a great disadvantage in most forms of capital compared to the two other neighborhoods in the sample. In contrast, household heads in Ramat Golda benefit from accumulated capital to a larger extent than do household heads in Hadar in terms of Economic, Institutional-symbolic Cultural and Objectified Cultural Capital. Of the three forms of social capital the most striking differences were obtained for the concept of Social Bonding Capital through Support and Social Control at the neighborhood level; household heads in Ramat Sapir enjoyed significant accumulated social capital compared to the two other neighborhoods.

Consistent with previous studies on the subject (Kearns & Parkinson, 2011), the living environment (neighborhood) was found to be a significant factor in social reproduction, an arena to gain or erode capital accumulation. Spatial variance in creating trust, cohesion and social control strengthens the argument that a neighborhood is a function of economic and social fields and capital accumulation.

As a result, it became clear that significant gaps existed in household heads' exposure to life-chances among the neighborhoods sampled. Residents of Hadar, who do not have a high level of capital accumulation of various types, are inferior in relation to residents in the two other neighborhoods in their exposure to life-chances that would improve their social and employment mobility. That households in Ramat Golda and also in Ramat Sapir enjoy greater exposure to life-chances is probably the result of the different types of capital accumulated by household heads in these neighborhoods. The interpretation of these findings suggests that the ability to use different forms of capital in order to build capabilities that can be translated into life-chances does not necessarily rely on economic capital.

Thus, household heads with a high level of different capital forms may benefit from exposure to similar life-chances as reflected in their functionings in the field of employment and academic training. It was expected that a significant accumulation of economic and institutional cultural capital, such as that characterizing household heads in Ramat Golda, would allow them to perform better in the field of employment and academic mobility than would household heads in Ramat Sapir and Hadar. However, our data indicate that household heads in Ramat Sapir benefited, too, from this kind of life- chances. In this sense, they used their significant social capital rather than economic or institutional cultural capital to gain support and social control. The findings of the present study can be helpful in formulating policy recommendations that will deal more effectively with the spatial and equal distribution of forms of capital within urban areas.

References

Adler, P. S. & Seok-Woo, K. (2001) Social capital: Prospects for a new concept, *The Academy of Management Review*, 27: 17-40.

Akom, A. (2011) Eco- apartheid: Linking environmental health to educational outcome" Teachers College Record, 113: 831- 859.

Atkinson, R. & Kintrea, k. (2004), Opportunities & despair, it's all in there's: Practitioner experiences and explanation of area effects and life chance**.** *Sociology*, 38 (3): 437- 455.

Becker, S. O. and Woessmann, L. (2009) Was Weber wrong? A human capital theory of Protestant economic history, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 124: 531-596.

Blacksher, E. (2002) On being poor and feeling poor: low socioeconomic status and the moral self. *Theoretical medicine,* 23: 455-470.

Bourdieu, P. (1985) The Social Space and the Genesis of Groups. *Theory and Society*, 14: 723-744.

Bourdieu, P. (1986), The forms of capital. In John G. Richardson, editor, *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. New York, NY: Greenwood Press, 241-258.

Bourdieu, P. (1989) Social Space and Symbolic Power. *Sociological Theory*, 7: 14-25.

Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L.J.D. (1992), *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P., (2001), The Forms of Capital, in Granovetter, M., and Swedberg, R., (eds.), *The Sociology of Economic Life*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press, pp. 96-111.

Bowman, D. (2010) *Sen and Bourdieu: Understanding Inequality*, *Social Policy Working Paper No. 14*. Brotherhood of St Laurence and Centre for Public Policy University of Melbourne.

Cattel, R. B. (1965) Factor analysis: an introduction to essentials I: the purpose and underlying model. *Biometrics* 21: 190-215.

Central Bureau of Statistics (2008) *Population Census* Jerusalem. http://www.cbs.gov.il/census/census/main_mifkad08_e.html 1.4.15

Central Bureau of Statistics (2014) *Statistical Abstract of Israel 2014*, No.65, Jerusalem. http://www.cbs.gov.il/reader/shnatonenew_site.htm 1.4.15.

Colman, J. S. (1988) Social capital in the creation of human capital, *American Journal of Sociology*, 94: pp. 95-120.

Demo, D. H. and Cox, M. J. (2000) Families with Young Children: A Review of Research in The 1990's. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62: 876–895.

Dore, R. (1983) Goodwill and the spirit of market capitalism, *British Journal of Sociology*, 34: 459-482.

Forrest, R., and Kearns, A., (2001) Social Cohesion, Social Capital and the Neighborhood, *Urban Studies*, 38(12): 2125–2143.

Freidmann, J. (2002), *The Prospect of Cities*, Minneapolis-London: University of Minnesota Press.

Galster, G., Andersson, R. and Musterd, S. (201). Who is affected by neighborhood income mix? Gender, age, family, employment and income differences. *Urban Studies***,** 47(14): 2915-2944.

Gatrell, A. C., Popay, J. & Thomas, C. (2004) Mapping the determinants of health inequalities in social space: can Bourdieu help us? *Health and Place*, 10: 245-257.

http://www.bsl.org.au/pdfs/Bowman_Sen_and_Bourdieu_understanding_inequality_2010.pdf . 1.4.2015.

Jaeger, M. M. and Holm, A. (2007) Does parents' economic, cultural, and social capital explain the social class effect on educational attainment in the Scandinavian mobility regime? *Social Science Research*, 36: 719-744.

Kearns, A. & Parkinson, M. (2001) The significance of neighborhood. *Urban studies,* 38: 2103-2110

Kim, J. and Mueller, C. W. (1978) *Introduction to Factor Analysis: What It Is and How to Do It, Paper 13*. London, UK: SAGE Publications.

Kleit, R. G. (2001) The role of neighborhood social networks in scattered-site public housing residents' search for jobs. *Housing Policy Debate*, 12(3): 541-573.

Lovell, A. M. (2002) Risking risk: the influence of types of capital and social networks on the injection practices of drug users, *Social Science and Medicine*, 55: 803-821.

Lucas, R. (1988), On the mechanics of economic development*, Journal of Monetary Economics*, 22: 3–42.

Maralani, V. (2008), "The Changing Relationship between the Family Size and Educational Attainment over the course of Socio-Economic Development: Evidence from Indonesia", *Demography*, 45(3): 693-717.

McCabe, B. J. (2012) Homeownership and social trust in neighbors. *City & community***,** 11(4): 389-407.

Nussbaum, M. (2006) *Frontiers of Justice: Disability, Nationality, Species Membership*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Prato, C.G., Bekhor, S. and Pronello, C. (2005) Methodology for exploratory analysis of latent factors influencing drivers' behavior *Transportation Research Record* 1926: 115-125.

Putnam, R. D. (1995) Bowling alone: America's declining social capital, Journal of Democracy, 6: 65-78.

Putnam, R.D. (2000) *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, New-York: Simon and Schuster.

Robeyns, I. and Brighouse, H. (2010) Introduction: Social Primary Goods and Capabilities as Metric of Justice. In Harry Brighouse, H. and Robeyns, I (Eds), *Measuring Justice Primary Goods and Capabilities*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1-13.

Robson, K. and Sanders, C. (2010) (Eds.) *Quantifying Theory: Pierre Bourdieu*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.

Savage, M. W., Warde, A. and Devine, F. (2005) Capitals, Assets, and Resources: Some Critical Issues. The British Journal of Sociology, 56(1): 31-47.

Sen A. (1992) *Inequality Reexamined*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Sen, A. (1987) The Standard of Living. In Geoffrey Hawthorn (Ed) *The Standard of Living.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1-38.

Table 1: The socio-economic characteristics of the population in the three residential areas

Variables	Hadar	Ramat Sapir	Ramat Golda
Number of residents	3,820	2,800	2,280
% of 15+ year olds who studied 16+ years	20.8	39.3	56.8
% of 15+ year olds with an M.A. or Ph.D.	12.4	13.9	30.5
% of 15+ year olds by participation in the annual civilian labour force	53.6	71.0	68.7
Arrived by car to work (%)	19.7	73.1	85.3
% of scientists, academics, and other professions of the total number of employed individuals	19.8	52.3	63.8
Average number of persons per household	2.2	2.6	2.7
Home ownership (%)	38.0	64.2	81.2
Average housing density (rooms per person)	0.9	0.7	0.6
Migration - rate per 1000 inhabitants (1996-2008)	-13.9	8.6	1.0

Source: C.B.S, Census 2008**.**

Table 2. Respondents' socio-economic characteristics

Variable	**CATEGORIES (%)**						
Household size	**<2**	**3-5**	**6+**	**Total**	**N**		
Hadar	73.0%	25.4%	1.7%	100.0%	59		
Ramat Sapir	50.8%	47.5%	1.7%	100.0%	59		
Ramat Golda	55.8%	42.3%	1.9%	100.0%	52		
Total	60.0%	38.2%	1.8%	100.0%	170		
Statistical test	χ^2=6.6, df=4 p≤ 0.153						
Age of household's heads*	**18-40**	**41-64**	**65+**	**Total**	**N**		
Hadar	34.5%	41.4%	24.1%	100.0%	58		
Ramat Sapir	45.6%	33.3%	21.1%	100.0%	57		
Ramat Golda	7.7%	50.0%	42.3%	100.0%	52		
Total	30.0%	41.3%	28.7%	100.0%	167		
Statistical test	χ^2=20.4, df=4 p≤ 0.000						
Income level NIS	**Up to 8,000**	**8,001-14,000**	**14,001-21,000**	**21,001-35,000**	**35,000 +**	**Total**	**N**
Hadar	70.2%	24.6%	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	57
Ramat Sapir	17.2%	29.3%	36.2%	12.0%	5.1%	100.0%	58
Ramat Golda	0.0%	8.5%	31.9%	31.9%	27.7%	100.0%	47
Total	30.9%	21.6%	24.1%	13.6%	10.0%	100.0%	162
Statistical test	χ^2=106.66, df=8 p≤ 0.000						
Housing Density (room per person)	**<1**	**1-1.5**	**1.5-2.0**	**2+**	**Total**	**N**	
Hadar	79.7%	1.7%	16.9%	1.7%	100.0%	59	
Ramat Sapir	62.7%	18.6%	6.8%	12.0%	100.0%	59	
Ramat Golda	34.6%	17.3%	30.8%	17.3%	100.0%	52	
Total	60.0%	12.4%	17.6%	10.0%	100.0%	170	
Statistical test	χ^2=33.89, df=6 p≤ 0.000						
Level of education	**Did not Study**	**High School**	**B.A.**	**M.A. or Ph.D.**	**Total**	**N**	
Hadar	19.5%	26.8%	29.3%	24.5%	100.0%	82	
Ramat Sapir	11.3%	17.9%	51.0%	19.8%	100.0%	106	
Ramat Golda	2.0%	17.0%	35.0%	46.0%	100.0%	100	
Total	10.4%	20.0%	39.2%	30.0%	100.0%	288	
Statistic test	χ^2=51.1, df=6, p≤ 0.000						
Occupation	**Academic professional and associate professionals**	**Pedagogy, Art and Humanities**	**Clerical, Agents, Sales & Service Workers**	**Unskilled Workers**	**Total**	**N**	
Hadar	21.3%	18.7%	36.0%	24.0%	100.0%	75	
Ramat Sapir	48.5%	14.0%	36.6%	1.0%	100.0%	101	
Ramat Golda	53.5%	32.3%	13.0%	1.0%	100.0%	99	
Total	43.0%	21.8%	28.0%	7.3%	100.0%	275	
Statistical test	χ^2=71.65, df= 6, p≤ 0.000						

* At least one of the household heads is in the older age category.

Table 3. Variables used in the Explanatory Factor Analyses*

Concept	Capital Form	Variable Name	Mean	S.D.
Social Space	Cultural Capital	Average number of books read by heads of household per month	2.59	2.63
		Fondness for fiction literature	2.49	1.69
		Fondness for romance literature	3.59	1.86
		Fondness for historical, biographical and autobiographical literature	3.27	1.81
		Fondness for reference books and popular science books	2.82	1.63
		Fondness for self-instruction books and DIY	2.05	1.43
		Frequency of attendance at conferences and professional workshops	2.28	1.29
		Frequency of going to the theater	2.48	1.41
		Frequency of visits to coffee shops	3.67	1.68
		Frequency of attendance at performances of a concert/opera/ballet	2.22	1.34
		Frequency of visits to galleries, exhibitions and museums	2.46	1.26
		Highest academic degree obtained by the heads of the household	2.94	1.46
		Prestige of academic certificate as determined by the extent of the demand for the department/faculty in which household heads earned their highest academic degree	3.84	1.92
		Prestige of academic institution where household heads acquired their highest academic certificate	4.12	2.13
	Social Capital	Frequency of indirect social contacts with family (i.e. cell phones and internet)	4.52	0.95
		Frequency of direct social contacts with family (i.e. face to face meetings)	3.71	0.94
		Frequency of indirect social contacts with friends (i.e. cell phones and internet)	4.30	0.89
		Frequency of direct social contacts with friends (i.e. face to face meetings)	3.61	1.03
		Scope of the social network used for counseling on major issues	2.86	0.74
		The extent to which neighbors share similar values	4.52	1.61
		Neighbors' willingness to help	3.71	1.33
		The extent to which adult neighbors are responsible and serve as a source of authority for young people in the neighborhood	4.30	1.68
		Frequency for volunteer activities in the neighborhood	3.61	1.10
	Economic Capital	Household's income level	2.50	1.32
		Number of privately owned cars	1.05	0.79

Table 3. Continue

Concept	Attribution	Variable Name	Mean	S.D.
Life Chances	Capabilities	Ability to find a job in the event of a need for change	1.48	0.58
		Ability to find new job in the event of involuntary loss of job	1.96	0.82
		Household's financial ability to improve housing conditions	2.74	1.38
		Household's ability to fund academic studies for children	3.60	1.39
		Number of persons in household (indicating the ability to raise children and maintain a stable family)	2.49	1.28
	Functionings	Social-academic mobility between household heads and their parents' generation	3.01	0.89
		Prestige of the jobs of household heads	1.82	0.81
		Residence tenure (homeowner/renter)	1.61	0.61
		Second home ownership	0.37	0.67

* The variables in the social space and life chances were built on ordinal scales in order to express the value of the variable common to both heads of household. Mean and standard deviation of each variable were calculated according to the ranking that the observations received in the sample.

Table 4. Factor analysis of capital forms: major factors[1] and factor loading

Factors	Variables	Component (groups of factors)[2]						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Embodied Cultural Capital	Fondness for historical, biographical and autobiographical literature	**.794**	.100	.103	.089	.069	.008	.133
	Fondness for romance literature	**.644**	.031	.284	.321	.148	-.030	.083
	Fondness for reference books and popular science books	**.635**	.304	.078	.132	-.271	.082	.121
	Fondness for fiction literature	**.586**	.019	.251	.021	.247	.052	-.061
	Average number of books read by heads of household per month	**.578**	-.009	-.152	-.266	.150	-.026	.394
	Fondness for self-instruction books and DIY	**.525**	.119	-.061	.326	-.262	-.063	.028
Symbolic-Institutional Cultural Capital	Prestige of academic certificate as determined by the extent of the demand for the department/faculty	.109	**.919**	.168	.062	.000	-.068	.057
	Highest academic degree obtained by the heads of the household	.189	**.887**	.105	-.057	-.106	-.006	.095
	Prestige of academic institution	.053	**.785**	.370	.113	.108	.013	.105
Economic Capital	Number of privately owned cars	.062	.207	**.822**	.213	.075	-.044	.022
	Household's income level	.121	.272	**.744**	.179	.162	-.016	.145
	Frequency of attendance at conferences and professional workshops	.202	.132	**.679**	-.006	-.017	.207	.051
Support and Social Control	Neighbors' willingness to help	.152	.035	.020	**.790**	.102	.081	.064
	The extent to which adult neighbors serve as a source of authority for young people in the neighborhood	.198	.067	.295	**.724**	.165	.010	.065
	The extent to which neighbors share similar values	.102	.013	.237	**.681**	.157	.068	-.076
	Frequency for volunteer activities in the neighborhood	-.146	.009	-.161	**.443**	.117	.021	.422
Family Cohesion	Frequency of indirect social contacts with family	.044	-.051	.115	.107	**.832**	.074	-.021
	Frequency of direct social contacts with family	.116	-.052	-.010	.216	**.788**	.009	-.050
	Scope of the social network used for counseling on major issues	-.062	.224	.168	.144	**.429**	.206	.188
Empowerment and Social Bridging	Frequency of direct social contacts with friends	.002	-.041	.018	.021	-.107	**.891**	.051
	Frequency of indirect social contacts with friends	.038	.008	-.011	.061	.207	**.887**	.040
	Frequency of visits to coffee shops	-.018	-.036	.400	.094	.191	**.490**	.044
Fostering Cultural Inputs	Frequency of visits to galleries, exhibitions and museums	.144	.025	.052	.049	.002	.077	**.777**
	Frequency of attendance at performances of a concert/opera/ballet	.156	.131	.170	-.014	-.052	.035	**.767**
	Frequency of going to the theater	.078	.216	.415	.087	-.014	.004	**.433**

[1] Major factors were defined by eigenvalues>1.

[2] Dominant measures were defined as those with an absolute value of the component coefficient greater than 0.5. In order to facilitate labeling the factors, the dominant items are marked in bold.

Table 5: Factor analysis of capabilities and functionings: major factors[1] and factor loading

		Component (groups of factors)[2]		
Factors	Variables	1	2	3
Social-economic ability to stabilize the nuclear family	Household's ability to fund academic studies for children	**0.731**	0.365	0.227
	Household's financial ability to improve housing conditions	**0.662**	0.409	0.030
	Second home ownership	**0.660**	0.166	-0.170
	Residence tenure (homeowner/renter)	**0.559**	-0.022	0.336
	Number of persons in household (indicating the ability to raise children and maintain a stable family)	**0.495**	-0.362	0.219
The ability to feel control over life and material environment	Ability to find a job in the event of losing the present job	0.116	**0.879**	0.086
	Ability to find new job in the event of involuntary loss of job	0.246	**0.794**	0.217
Function in the field of employment and academic training	Social-academic mobility between household heads and their parents' generation	-0.031	0.137	**0.873**
	Prestige of the jobs of household heads	0.419	0.148	**0.483**

[1] Major factors were defined by eigenvalues>1.

[2] Dominant measures were defined as those with an absolute value of the component coefficient greater than 0.5. In order to facilitate labeling the factors, the dominant items are marked in bold.

Table 6: Capital forms – disparities among the three neighborhoods

Factor/ Concept	Neighborhood	N	Mean	S.D.	Mann-Withney U test
Embodied Cultural Capital	Hadar	54	-0.187	1.301	Z= -0.256
	Ramat Sapir	58	0.003	0.904	
	Hadar	54	-0.187	1.301	Z= -0.954
	Ramat Golda	46	0.217	0.610	
	Ramat Sapir	58	0.003	0.904	Z= -0.995
	Ramat Golda	46	0.217	0.610	
Institutional-Symbolic Cultural Capital	Hadar	54	-0.330	1.117	Z= -1.328
	Ramat Sapir	58	0.037	0.921	
	Hadar	54	-0.330	1.117	Z= -2.469**
	Ramat Golda	46	0.341	0.833	
	Ramat Sapir	58	0.037	0.921	Z= -1.944**
	Ramat Golda	46	0.341	0.833	
Economic Capital	Hadar	54	-0.724	0.680	Z= -5.113***
	Ramat Sapir	58	0.010	0.783	
	Hadar	54	-0.724	0.680	Z= -7.013***
	Ramat Golda	46	0.838	0.905	
	Ramat Sapir	58	0.010	0.783	Z= -4.575***
	Ramat Golda	46	0.838	0.905	
Support and Social Control	Hadar	54	-0.677	0.977	Z= -6.306***
	Ramat Sapir	58	0.586	0.827	
	Hadar	54	-0.677	0.977	Z= -4.177***
	Ramat Golda	46	0.056	0.709	
	Ramat Sapir	58	0.586	0.827	Z= -3.613***
	Ramat Golda	46	-0.056	-0.709	
Family Cohesion	Hadar	54	-0.303	1.285	Z= -1.858*
	Ramat Sapir	58	0.189	0.826	
	Hadar	54	-0.303	1.285	Z= -1.176
	Ramat Golda	46	0.118	0.713	
	Ramat Sapir	58	0.189	0.826	Z= -0.877
	Ramat Golda	46	0.118	0.713	
Empowerment and Social Bridging	Hadar	54	0.042	1.312	Z= -0.955
	Ramat Sapir	58	0.020	0.917	
	Hadar	54	0.042	1.312	Z= -1.923*
	Ramat Golda	46	-0.075	0.623	
	Ramat Sapir	58	0.020	0.917	Z= -1.165
	Ramat Golda	46	-0.075	0.623	
Fostering Cultural Inputs	Hadar	54	-0.155	0.860	Z= -0.332
	Ramat Sapir	58	-0.125	1.154	
	Hadar	54	-0.155	0.860	Z= -2.780***
	Ramat Golda	46	0.339	0.875	
	Ramat Sapir	58	-0.125	1.154	Z= -2.657***
	Ramat Golda	46	0.339	0.875	

*** Significant at the 1 % level, ** significant at the 5 % level, * significant at the 10 % level

Table 7: Life Chances – disparities among the three neighborhoods

Factor/ Concept	Neighborhood	N	Mean	S.D.	Mann-Withney U test
Social-economic ability to stabilize the nuclear family	Hadar	50	-0.790	0.886	Z= -4.892***
	Ramat Sapir	59	0.076	0.726	
	Hadar	50	-0.790	0.886	Z= -6.711***
	Ramat Sapir	51	0.686	0.829	
	Ramat Sapir	59	0.076	0.726	Z= -3.767***
	Ramat Golda	51	0.686	0.829	
The ability to feel control over life and material environment	Hadar	50	-0.330	0.912	Z= -1.529
	Ramat Sapir	59	-0.044	1.075	
	Hadar	50	-0.330	0.912	Z= -3.668***
	Ramat Golda	51	0.374	0.878	
	Ramat Sapir	59	-0.044	1.075	Z= -2.005**
	Ramat Golda	51	0.374	0.878	
Function in the field of employment and academic training	Hadar	50	-0.600	0.896	Z= -5.117***
	Ramat Sapphire	59	0.389	0.926	
	Hadar	50	-0.600	0.896	Z= -3.777***
	Ramat Golda	51	0.138	0.917	
	Ramat Sapir	59	0.389	0.926	Z= -1.328
	Ramat Golda	51	0.138	0.917	

*** Significant at the 1 % level, ** significant at the 5 % level, * significant at the 10 % level