Sustainable Well-Being in Israel

Report of the Expert Committee of The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities

Culture and the Future Sustainability of Well-Being in Israeli Society

Tally Katz-Gerro • University of Haifa

האקדמיה הלאומית הישראלית למדעים
المجمع الوطني الإسرائيلي للعلوم والآداب
THE ISRAEL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES

This review was commissioned as part of the work of the Expert Committee of The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities on Sustainable Well-Being in Israel.

The full report of the committee is available on the Academy's website:

<https://doi.org/10.52873/Policy.2021.Wellbeing-en>

© The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 2021

This document is publicly available and may be quoted in its original language. Please use the following credit line when citing or quoting this document:

Tally Katz-Gerro (2021). "Culture and the Future Sustainability of Well-Being in Israeli Society," *Sustainable Well-Being in Israel: Report of the Expert Committee of The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities*. Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities.

<https://doi.org/10.52873/Policy.2021.Wellbeing.06-en>

Project Editor: Yarden Niv
Editing: Deborah Greniman
Design: Studio Noam Tamari
Photography: Shutterstock

The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities

Albert Einstein Square, P.O.B 4040, 9104001, Jerusalem

Telephone: +972-25676222

Email: info@academy.ac.il

www.academy.ac.il

Contents

1	Introduction	4
2	Definitions and Operationalizations	6
	A. Conceptual Framework	6
	B. Mapping Cultural Capital Components: Summary of the Main Components and Their Association with Well-Being	12
	C. Measuring Cultural Capital	17
	D. Application and Policy	23
3	Identifying and Analyzing Cultural Capital Components Relevant to Israel	25
	A. A Definition of Cultural Capital in the Israeli Context	25
	B. Correlates of Cultural Capital in the Israeli Context	28
	C. Challenges	29
	D. Measurement	31
	E. Recommendations	35
4	References	37
5	Appendixes	44
	Appendix 1: Indicators of Cultural Participation	44
	Appendix 2. Comparison of Measures of Cultural Participation Discussed in Reports	47
	Appendix 3. Measures of Cultural Participation Used in Surveys	49
	Appendix 4. Summary of Information Included in Reports by the Ministry of Culture, Israel	49
	Appendix 5. Well-Being Themes, Indicators, and Their Association with Sustainable Development Goals	50

Introduction

This document summarizes the capital approach to sustainable well-being in the domain of culture. It provides an overview of the components of cultural capital discussed in the scientific literature, with an emphasis on cultural participation, as this is the single most important indicator whose links to well-being have been evaluated.

The document provides an initial mapping of the critical components of cultural capital specific to the Israeli context, building on previous work conducted in other countries and on social science theory in this area. It presents the theoretical approach to the definition of these components and the international experience of using it for measuring sustainable well-being. The emphasis on cultural participation as one possible operationalization of cultural capital has three motivations. First, research points to a certain set of cultural participation indicators as representing cultural skills that are legitimate and desirable in society. Second, this set of cultural participation indicators has been shown to be associated with returns in the educational system and the labor market. Third, this set has been investigated in relation to indicators of psychological and physical well-being.

Following this short introduction, Section (A) of Chapter 2 identifies the main approaches to defining and operationalizing definitions of culture, identifies three main ways to address cultural capital, and explains why this concept is central to the discussion of sustainable well-being. Section (B) summarizes the main components of cultural capital and their association with physical and psychological well-being. Section (C) summarizes ways to measure cultural capital, and Section (D) discusses application and policy. Chapter 3 moves to the Israeli context. Section (A) points to the relevant components of cultural

capital in Israel, and Section (B) to their correlates. Section (C) reviews the challenges to measuring cultural capital in Israel, and Section (D) discusses existing measures. Finally, Section (E) lists recommendations.

The recommendations summarizing and integrating the different components of this review, resting upon empirical evidence showing that engagement in culture is a source of happiness and well-being, call for public support of the arts and policies designed to facilitate access to culture. Steps taken to equalize access to arts and culture, and social measures aimed at reconciling working hours to allow individuals to undertake more shared cultural activities, have positive effects on well-being. New information and communication technologies can be of particular use here, as they are transforming various aspects of the interface between individuals and culture. While the capital approach, a significant element of the perspective adopted by the committee, originates in and speaks the language of economics, recent research has demonstrated that both material and non-material assets are crucial for the sustainability of well-being for future generations and that ethical and social values should accompany principles fueled by market economy dynamics.

Definitions and Operationalizations

A

Conceptual framework

■ A Definition of Culture

Culture in the broad sense has been given many definitions in the social science literature. These include its conceptualization as knowledge and the accumulation of information; as a body of definitions, premises, statements, postulates, presumptions, propositions, and perceptions about the nature of the universe and the place of humans in it; or as the publicly available symbolic forms through which people experience and express meaning (D'Andrade & Strauss, 1992). More generally, the literature presents culture as values, belief systems, transmitted habits, and a purposeful attempt at creating new systems of meanings and new patterns with aesthetic value (Grossi et al., 2011).

To address the association between culture and well-being, this document follows approaches to culture pioneered in the Declaration of Human Rights (United Nations, 1948) and later adopted by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) (UNESCO, 2009b), which view freedom to participate freely in the cultural life of a community and enjoy

the benefits of culture and the arts as a fundamental right of individuals, and address the link between cultural diversity and the development paradigm. The conceptual approach adopted herein defines culture as entailing a purposeful engagement in expressive and creative activities, relying on received traditions and the conscious involvement of individuals (Sacco et al., 2018). Most importantly, this document emphasizes those aspects of culture that have previously been discussed in the scientific literature in the context of well-being, and for which operationalization and measurement have been proposed and tested. This is in keeping with the goal of the present endeavor, which is to outline policy suggestions. Individual and collective participation in culture affect aspects of **well-being**, such as health and social cohesion. The analysis therefore focuses on levels of **cultural participation**.

■ Cultural Capital: The View from Culture

The concept of cultural capital, introduced by sociologist Pierre Bourdieu (1984), refers to aspects of culture that can be saved, transmitted, invested, and used to obtain other resources, mainly in the economic field. Cultural capital is consumed and transmitted via both active and passive cultural participation – for example, by listening to music or reading a book at home, or by participating in a certain activity, in the audience or as a performer (Brook, 2011). New technologies have created a number of new ways in which people can participate in arts and culture. The digital revolution, by offering a variety of cultural goods and services, has enabled a wide range of cultural behaviors and modes of consumption, to some extent bypassing the difference between active and passive participation to create the “prosumer,” who combines the roles of user and producer. These transformations give rise to a number of questions in relation to cultural participation. Does there have to be intent to participate, or does unintentional participation count? Should the focus in measuring cultural capital be on preference (cultural tastes), behavior (attendance, social media interaction), or their implied impact (identification with the organization, awareness of programs)? Another concept, that of cultural engagement, may be helpful in the digital context. It can refer either to engagement with an organization – for example, by following

it on Twitter or Facebook – or to engagement with the content produced by that organization – for example, by enjoying a virtual or in-person exhibit or learning about a new artist (Mihelj et al., 2019).

In light of these ongoing transformations, cultural participation is perhaps best treated as a fuzzy concept rather than a binary one. It tends to happen in prescribed ways related to norms and lifestyles; it can occur in social contexts or alone; it can be mediated by community affiliation or by the market; it can be linked to social prestige; and it is often mediated by cultural institutions (Brook, 2011).

Cultural capital, in Bourdieu's theory, exists in a social space in which conflicts of power are enacted and social stratification is produced and reproduced by intergenerational transmission in interaction with class resources. It is acquired and transmitted through primary and secondary socialization and in turn has a crucial impact on occupational choices and outcomes (e.g., de Graaf et al., 2000; Sullivan, 2001; Van de Werfhorst, 2010). In particular, parental education and parental cultural participation have an impact on the kind of culture the child consumes (language use, tastes, modes of cultural participation and so forth; Katz-Gerro & Jaeger, 2015). **The cultural capital that is desired in society belongs to the dynamics of social reproduction and has consequences for life outcomes, making it an important factor in improving well-being and in considering the sustainability of well-being.**

As primary agents of cultural transmission, schools play an important role in supporting and acknowledging the dominant culture, thus reinforcing the mechanisms of reproduction of social inequality (e.g., Dumais, 2002). According to Bourdieu, individuals may acquire and possess three different types of cultural capital: *Embodied* cultural capital comprises both the consciously acquired and the passively "inherited" features that characterize ways of being and feeling, such as language, tastes, and patterns of communication and behavior. It is acquired over time, through socialization. *Objectified* cultural capital comprises physical objects that are owned, such as paintings or books. *Institutionalized* cultural capital consists of institutional recognition, most often in the form of academic credentials or qualifications, of the cultural capital held by an

individual. The institutional recognition process eases the conversion of cultural capital into economic capital by serving as an experience-based model that individuals can use to describe their capital. The cultural mismatch between the backgrounds of children from lower-educated families and the values and practices expected in schools has been very influential in educational research (see, e.g., Savage et al., 2005). Education (i.e., the institutional level) thus plays a central role in the transmission of social advantage (Bourdieu, 2010).

Societies need reserves of cultural capital at the individual and societal levels, because those assets make for individual and societal well-being, while their absence is a dimension of social inequality (Sheldon & Hoon, 2007; Saraceno, 2014). At the societal level, cultural capital is expressed in the form of objective assets (such as monuments, libraries, concert halls, and cultural sites) that also constitute a part of society's overall wealth and heritage and a resource for its economy and development. At the individual level, cultural capital is a resource for the development of competencies. This dual – societal and individual – dimension of cultural capital is emphasized in policy documents put forward by the European Union and the United Nations.

Individual cultural capital, its contents, distribution, and the forms of access to it, should be considered when analyzing inter- and intra-generational equity, and it should also be considered a societal asset, from the perspectives both of economic development and of social integration at the national and international levels (e.g., Sacco, 2011).

To understand culture's impact on communities, however, we need a broad definition of social well-being and a multidimensional approach to it, one that takes economy, health, education, and social cohesion into account. At its core, well-being describes the conditions under which people have “the freedom to lead lives they have reason to value” (Sen, 1999). Well-being is constituted by individuals' evaluations of their lives as measured in scientific research. It has mainly to do with frequent pleasant emotion, infrequent unpleasant emotion, and life satisfaction. Well-being is often operationalized as happiness and associated with meaning and purpose in life.

■ Cultural Capital: The View from Economics

An alternative approach to culture as capital, shaped by theories in economics, shares with Bourdieu's view the premise that different types of capital can be accumulated and converted. When extended to the realm of culture and the arts, the economic capital approach recognizes the distinctive features of **cultural goods as capital assets**, contributing to the production of further cultural goods and services (Throsby, 1999). The idea here is that cultural goods are a type of economic goods, and so they behave in a similar way. The difference is that cultural goods involve human creativity, symbolic meaning, and intellectual property.

Another perspective on the definition of culture as capital and its link to the sustainability of society distinguishes between tangible and intangible cultural capital. **Tangible culture** refers to monuments, art works, heritage buildings, and other artefacts. **Intangible culture** refers to the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, and skills that communities, groups, and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage. It also exists in the cultural networks and relationships that support human activity (UNESCO, 2016). Both tangible and intangible culture are transmitted from generation to generation and are also constantly recreated in interaction with the society's environment and history. These cultural assets provide communities with a sense of identity and continuity, thus promoting respect for cultural diversity and human creativity. Both tangible and intangible forms of cultural capital exist as a capital stock that may be assigned an asset value (Throsby, 1999). Cultural assets (such as cultural facilities, buildings, art works, cultural festivals, or cultural landmarks) have value because of their contribution to a community's creativity, knowledge, traditions, and vitality. In theory, this asset value can be defined in both economic and cultural terms and used to justify investment in such assets. In practice, however, the obstacles to identifying and measuring this value are formidable, as elements like their material value, aesthetic quality, symbolic significance, historical importance, and uniqueness may be hard to quantify.

In principle, the interpretation of tangible and intangible cultural assets as capital goods enables the application of standard investment appraisal techniques to their assessment. However, this is a task yet to be operationalized in itself, let alone in relation to the sustainability of well-being. The capital approach to measuring sustainability considers the tangible and intangible assets that contribute to the production of well-being outcomes in the future and are affected by decisions taken today. A very preliminary framework for the evaluation of cultural capital classifies its attributes into three domains wherein culture impacts societal well-being: quality of life (including education/skills and the use of information and communication technologies [ICT] for cultural purposes; health; cultural participation and satisfaction; and environmental quality); social cohesion (e.g., equal opportunities and integration; cultural accessibility and governance; community participation, volunteering and charitable giving; and trust); and material conditions (e.g., income and jobs related to culture; real estate prices; cost of living) (Alonso & Medici, 2012).

In sum, this document emphasizes a capital approach to culture, seeing it as a good that, combined with other inputs, gives rise to further goods. Future attempts at articulating the link between cultural capital and well-being might adopt more comprehensive definitions of culture, taking into account such elements as lifestyles, food, fashion, spirituality, and religion. However, the current iteration of this effort to link culture and well-being recognizes that in practice, the bulk of available data, and consequently current research, mainly enables the measurement of formalized cultural behaviors which the modern state has been interested in subsidizing and promoting and which constitute the cultural capital that carries social and economic returns in everyday life. This means adopting a reductionist meaning of culture, which comes at the expense of addressing a wider range of possible ways in which culture is linked to well-being.

Mapping Cultural Capital Components: Summary of the Main Components and Their Association with Well-Being

The European Expert Network on Culture (EENC) has pointed to cultural participation as particularly important in supporting individual well-being at the micro-level and social capacity for innovation at the macro-level (see Sacco, 2011). Macro-level contextual conditions may facilitate individual access to cultural capital, allowing the simultaneous development of individual capabilities and well-being. At the same time, individual cultural capital, mainly in the form of cultural participation, but also in terms of level of education, may enrich a society both culturally and economically.

Finding indicators that are not simply inventories of all possible spheres of cultural activities and goods, but rather represent strategic assets that mobilize individual and social resources, is no simple endeavor. To address this, we can rely on previous work conducted to identify sites of cultural participation that can be measured, monitored over time, and linked to social outcomes. A main source of information for such knowledge is work conducted by various groups commissioned by the European Council, including the Leadership Group on Cultural Statistics (LEG-Culture) and the European Bureau of Statistics (EUROSTAT). More recently, the European Council commissioned a working group of the European Statistical System Network on Culture (ESSnet-Culture) to develop knowledge on cultural statistics. The report produced by ESSnet-Culture in 2012 (ESSnet-Culture, 2012), which is held up as an international model for harmonized international statistics on culture, builds on an approach that emphasizes practicably obtainable data. This approach, also adopted in the current document, is compatible with the framework proposed by UNESCO in 2009 (UNESCO, 2009b). As a baseline, ESSnet-Culture provided the list of indicators of cultural participation presented in Appendix 1, which sets the stage for the type of measures discussed in the current document. It has served as a

module on cultural participation in European surveys such as the European Union Statistics on Income and Living Conditions (EU-SILC; Falk & Katz-Gerro, 2016).

■ Culture and Well-Being

In recent years, research on the impact of culture on well-being has proliferated, as part of a move to measure and foster the progress of societies in various dimensions by looking at alternative measures that go beyond established economic indicators like Gross Domestic Product (GDP) (OECD, 2007). This emphasis has led to the production of a growing body of studies that have demonstrated the importance of participation in cultural activities and sport to emotional and physical health, social capital, and social cohesion (Bacon et al., 2010). The study of subjective well-being and happiness had long followed utilitarian economic views and was based on analysis of material well-being. The past decade and a half has witnessed the gradual replacement of this line of inquiry by a new direction of “happiness economics” (Frey, 2008), which introduces alternative indicators to those of a country’s material development in order to evaluate policies and the distribution of societal resources. Culture plays a significant role in constructing and consolidating the bases for social cohesion and inclusion and for individual and collective well-being (Ateca-Amestoy et al., 2016). This occurs both at the individual level, in terms of happiness, health, and personal growth, and at the societal level, in terms of integration into plural, reflexive, and inclusive societies.

Evidence shows that cultural participation is associated with psychological and physical well-being (for an overview see Grossi et al., 2011). Empirical evidence for the social impact of culture and the arts has been reviewed and appraised by numerous authors (e.g., Belfiore & Bennett, 2007; Chatterjee & Camic, 2015; Cicerchia, 2015; Oman, 2019). This includes evidence of the impact of engagement in culture in such areas as health (Staricoff, 2004), education (Winner & Hetland, 2000), criminal justice (Hughes, 2004), social inclusion (Simplican et al., 2015), and regeneration (Lees & Melhuish, 2015). Most studies that have demonstrated an association between cultural components and dimensions of well-being

maintain a causal relationship, subject to the usual caveats associated with social science research. While it is quite difficult to prove a causal link, controlling for additional variables that might intervene in these relationships increases the likelihood that the documented associations are indeed causal.

A growing number of studies have depicted a role for cultural participation in improving **subjective well-being**. For example, Grossi et al. (2012), studying Italian society, examined the association of an index of cultural participation comprising 16 measures (concerts, opera, theater, museums, etc.) with the Psychological General Well-Being Index (PGWBI). They found a significant positive effect of cultural participation on well-being and concluded, on the basis of a comparison of two regions in Italy, that there is a correlation between cultural supply, cultural participation, and psychological well-being. In another recent study conducted in the UK, Wheatley and Bickerton (2017) assessed the effects of changing levels of engagement in leisure activities on four measures of subjective well-being: satisfaction with life overall, and with one's amount of leisure time, health, and job. They found that increased cultural engagement was associated with positive changes in all four measures of well-being. Another strand of research looks at how different levels of cultural capital, by allowing one to develop one's own capabilities and life plans, support the attainment of higher levels of psychological well-being (e.g., Zheng et al., 2004). Wheatley and Bickerton (2017), analyzing data from 2010–2011 for the United Kingdom, showed that participation in artistic, cultural, and sporting activities increased the surveyed individuals' sense of life satisfaction and general feeling of happiness. Other studies available in the World Database of Happiness (Veenhoven, 2017) also indicate that cultural consumption makes people happier. Similarly, Fujiwara and MacKerron (2015) estimate the impact of participation in different cultural activities on people's senses of happiness and relaxation and show that being at a theater, dance, or concert has a high impact on happiness. The same study indicates that sharing different cultural activities with others (partner, children, family members, colleagues, work customers, friends, etc.) has a positive effect and makes us happier.

A different line of research focuses on specific arts organizations, such as

museums. Dodd and Jones (2014) have shown that museums play a role in improving health and well-being, by providing positive social experiences, reducing social isolation, offering opportunities for learning and acquiring new skills, decreasing anxiety, and increasing positive emotions (Chatterjee & Noble, 2016). Thomson and Chatterjee (2015) also developed a Museum Well-Being Measures Toolkit to evaluate the well-being benefits of museum and gallery events and activities.

The literature on the effects of culture on **physical well-being** is not highly differentiated in terms of clearly distinguishing between active and passive cultural participation, the direction of the association between participation and health impacts, and the importance of intervening variables. Nevertheless, research demonstrates the health benefits of cultural participation. In a 14-year longitudinal study investigating the possible influence of attending various kinds of cultural events or visiting cultural institutions, Koonlaan et al. (2000) found a higher mortality risk for people who rarely went to cinema, concerts, museums, or art exhibitions, as compared with those who visited them most often. Less beneficial effects were found for attendance at theaters, church services, or sport events as a spectator, and no effect at all for reading or music-making. Hyypä et al. (2006), in a study in Finland of cultural participation as a predictor of survival, observed a lower risk of mortality among frequent attendees. Similarly, Bygren et al. (2009), in a longitudinal study of more than 9,000 participants, found that, in urban areas, those who were rare or moderate attendees at concerts and other cultural events were more likely to die of cancer during the follow-up period than frequent attendees. All these studies suggest the importance of cultural involvement for the physical and psychological well-being of individuals. Those engaged in cultural participation are more likely to participate in sport, walk or cycle, and have a healthier diet (Groeniger et al., 2016). Attending meetings or training in an organization or club and attending sport events are positively associated with higher scores on measures of self-perceived health, life-satisfaction, good self-esteem, and low anxiety and depression symptoms (Hansen et al., 2015). Finally, museums play a role in enhancing well-being and improving health through social intervention (Chatterjee & Noble, 2016) and more (e.g., Vogelsang, 2016; Briguglio & Sultana, 2018).

Moving from the individual to the collective level, scholars have reported a correlation between cultural participation and broader participation in community activities (O'Toole, 2006). One reason for authorities to promote art participation is the supposedly positive effect of art on social cohesion (e.g., Green & Janmaat, 2011; Marlowe et al., 2017; Van der Vaart et al., 2017). Research has demonstrated a particular interest in strategies for neighborhood revitalization, social inclusion, and community well-being. Cultural engagement, by building social connections within groups and across social divides, represents an important dimension of community well-being. The arts provide a resource that people can use to make sense of the world as it is, connect with collective memory, and imagine the future. Neighborhoods with a vital cultural life also enjoy “spillover effects,” including stronger community and civic engagement; better health, schooling, and personal security; and economic revitalization. This is sometimes called *community cultural ecology*, and researchers are looking at the role that public policy and philanthropy can play in encouraging its development (SIAP).

Cultural participation is arguably linked to citizenship and to taking part in the activities, meanings, and symbols of the community and of society more generally (Human Development Report, 2004; Laaksonen, 2010). Various public policies have tried to facilitate the access of less privileged social groups, and particularly of children, to cultural activities traditionally associated with the more privileged social groups. In addition to democratizing access, these policies have a beneficial effect on the perception of well-being (e.g., Koonlaan et al., 2000; Grossi et al., 2011). Cultural engagement conditions experiences of well-being (Biswas-Diener et al., 2005) and affects cultural meanings of happiness and the motivational basis of happiness (Biswas-Diener et al., 2004).

An OECD report on the well-being of nations refers to the potential impact of culture on the economic and social development of countries (Healy & Côté, 2001). Community cultural assets, by way of their economic impact as cultural industries and their contribution to social and cultural revitalization, can support sustainable local development; and cultural participation offers opportunities for women and youth to participate in productive activities, contributing to

gender equality, self-esteem, and social awareness. As the ESSnet-Culture (2012) document observes, there is a growing political interest in quality of life and well-being, calling for broader measures of social progress, including cultural and civic participation. Since cultural practices are an important element of well-being, periodic surveys of participation in cultural activities might be the best way to measure social progress (*ibid.*). Support for these ideas is also expressed in the OECD report (Healy & Côté, 2001).

In a different take on measuring cultural engagement and well-being, a project in New York City looked at a variety of sources to identify more than 4,000 nonprofit cultural providers in the city, in addition to cultural participants and employed resident artists (SIAP, 2017). This information was combined into a single cultural asset index, representing an estimate of the relative concentration of cultural resources in every neighborhood of New York City. Because residents' well-being is influenced by their immediate surroundings, the goal was to assess each of ten dimensions of social well-being at the neighborhood level. This research differed from previous international work in three ways: in identifying cultural resources as intrinsic to social well-being; in examining culture's potential to influence other aspects of well-being; and in the focus on well-being at the neighborhood level, rather than by region or nation-state.

C

Measuring Cultural Capital

One of the great challenges to articulating a methodological framework that links cultural participation to well-being is that of translating the conceptual framework into a set of indicators that can be documented and measured. A number of researchers have called for moving beyond understandings of participation as mere attendance at cultural events and activities, or as participation in a narrow range of activities defined as "cultural." Accounts

of cultural participation need to address differences in the type and quality of cultural participation, as well as the different social circumstances of the individuals involved (Galloway, 2006); they should address the concept of cultural value (Crossick & Kaszynska, 2014); and they must be relevant to forms of consumption in the digital era (Marlowe et al., 2017). The following section details the challenges to measuring cultural capital before proceeding to a discussion of possible ways to overcome these challenges.

■ Challenges to Measuring Cultural Capital

Sustainably measuring engagement with culture is a costly endeavor, especially considering all the factors that affect the availability of reliable, representative data, such as the technical and logistical challenges posed by large-scale periodic surveys, survey costs, and the obsolescence of traditional surveys in the face of the digital revolution. At the same time, new technology and new platforms for data collection have made it more convenient for the public to report its behavior in various ways. This includes the digitalization of records systems of large public and private organizations, making it easier to keep track of activities.

Diverse audiences are becoming more and more interested in such information and analysis. Business, state, and local community stakeholders increasingly depend on timely statistics about their customers, clients, and populations, and consequently there is a need to present evidence that is accessible to large populations and understandable by leaders and decision-makers. Cultural measurement frameworks such as cost-benefit analysis of the social return on investment, which rely on advancements in the area of economics and auditing, are becoming necessary for the work of arts administrators and policymakers. At the same time, existing models have been criticized for prioritizing economic values over aesthetic, spiritual, physical, and other aspects of well-being (Belfiore & Bennett, 2010).

An ideal model for measuring cultural capital would enable discourse around access to and exclusion from participation and would include the following features:

1. Time-series and longitudinal data rather than periodic cross-sectional data collection to learn about public participation.
2. A qualitative data component for in-depth investigation.
3. Diverse definitions of culture and participation to account for the multiplicity of social dimensions.
4. Flexibility of instruments and methodologies to accommodate rapidly evolving art forms and emergent technology platforms, digital cultural engagement, and creative co-production.

■ Accumulated Experience of Measuring Cultural Capital

Cultural participation relates to a number of different areas of national policy. In the mid to late twentieth century, measurement of cultural participation was seen above all as relating to “the Arts” and was treated by most developed countries as a matter of counting visits to museums, galleries, and various kinds of performances. The emphasis was on “high culture,” often as purveyed through “national” institutions. While the concept of “the Arts” still provides a strong rationale for measuring cultural participation, it has widened to include many “informal” and “traditional” activities (UNESCO, 2009b; Throsby, 2010).

Following the development of the concept of “creative industries,” cultural participation measures have seen increased emphasis on participation as economic “consumption.” Several approaches to measuring cultural participation have been suggested in the literature, with varying degrees of international applicability and replicability (Zadka, 2009). These are listed in Appendix 2.

Policy and scholarly documents produced in the past few years reflect a cultural turn in social policy, in the sense that they link investment in culture and the arts to broader social outcomes relating to cohesion, inclusion, and equality. Another expression of this cultural turn is in the discourse linking cultural policy to Sustainable Development Goals (SDG). *Culture / 2030: Indicators*, recently published by UNESCO (2019), lists five areas where congruence between cultural and social phenomena can be observed and monitored: (1) The degree of **respect** accorded to the rights of people from other cultures to

practice and participate in cultural activities, through a measure of intercultural understanding. (2) The degree of artistic **freedom to create** and express, and the nurturance of a sustainable environment for artists and creators. (3) The extent to which all parts of the country and all urban neighborhoods have equal access to the full range of **cultural facilities** for the practice, creation, distribution, and dissemination of cultural knowledge, services, and goods, to ensure that demand for culture is met at the national and urban levels. (4) The degree of **cultural participation**, as expressed in the proportion of people visiting cultural sites, facilities, and events, as well as household reporting on cultural practices at home, including use of the internet for cultural purposes. (5) The opportunities open to civil society and to cultural sector professionals to participate in **decision-making** processes related to cultural activities, including the development of policies, measures, and programs that concern them, both nationally and at the local level (UNESCO, 2019:98).

Generally speaking, scholars agree that the task of articulating a separate measurement with a clear definition of the exact activities included in each cultural domain is needed, yet not readily available. Two major documents have been produced in this regard. The first is the *2009 UNESCO Framework for Cultural Statistics* (FCS), which takes a pragmatic approach to measuring cultural activities by offering a tool for organizing statistics pertaining to a wide range of cultural expressions, both nationally and internationally (UNESCO, 2009b). The second is the above-mentioned Final Report of ESSnet-Culture (ESSnet-Culture, 2012), which took the 2009 UNESCO Framework into account. The recommendations of these documents have not yet been implemented in any major data-collection effort pertaining to cultural statistics.

The 2012 ESSnet-Culture report offers an important systematization of indicators for cultural capital at the societal and individual levels. Its “ICET-model” (ESSnet-Culture, 2012:237, Table 28) distinguishes **four kinds of participation**:

1. **Information:** to seek, collect, and spread information on culture.
2. **Communication and community:** to interact with others on cultural issues and to participate in cultural networks.

3. Enjoyment and expression: to enjoy exhibitions, art performances, and other forms of cultural expression, to practice the arts for leisure, and to create online content.
4. Transaction: to buy art and to buy or reserve tickets for shows.

Although the Europe-wide survey on participation in cultural activities suggested by ESSnet-Culture has not yet been implemented, several Eurobarometers on cultural participation have been carried out using some of the above criteria. Questions concerning cultural participation were included in the 2007 Eurobarometer of European Cultural Values, the 2006 Survey on Income and Living Conditions (SILC), and the 2007 Adult Education Survey (AES); and in Eurobarometer 399 (2014), Eurobarometer 466 (2017), and further Eurobarometers. Similar indicators were used in several waves of the American Survey of Public Participation in the Arts (SPPA) between 2002 and 2017, and in the 2007 International Social Survey Program (ISSP).

The National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) in the United States collects data through multiple mechanisms. Since 1982, the NEA has worked with the U.S. Census Bureau to field the SPPA, the largest nationally representative survey of cultural engagement, conducted around every ten years since its inception. In 2013, the NEA launched the Annual Arts Benchmarking Survey, a shorter version with more generic questions about arts attendance and arts creation. The NEA also assists in efforts to study more specific subpopulations. For example, in the National Children's Study, the NEA asked about arts exposure and learning among children aged 0 to 5. Similarly, questions in the 2014 Health and Retirement Study (HRS) asked older Americans about their engagement with arts and culture (NEA, 2014). For a summary of indicators used in survey research, see Appendix 3.

Work on how to define culture for the purpose of collecting comparable data has been developed systematically mainly in relation to the societal level, driven by several international organizations and authorities, such as the Council of Europe, UNESCO, the OECD, the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), and more recently the EU, first via the Leadership Group on Cultural Statistics (LEG-Culture) and then via ESSnet-Culture (for an overview of this development see ESSnet-Culture, 2012).

Within this broad framework, and in relation to the societal level, ESSnet-Culture identified ten cultural **domains** and six cultural **functions**. The domains – sets of “practices, activities, or cultural products centered on a group of expressions recognized as artistic ones” – are: Heritage, Archives, Libraries, Books and Press, Visuals Arts, Performing Arts, Audiovisual and Multimedia, Architecture, Advertising, and Arts and Crafts. The functions, which are sequenced, follow an economic approach, and may be both market and non-market, are: Creation, Production/Publishing, Dissemination/Trade, Preservation, Education, and Management/Regulation (ESSnet-Culture, 2012:29).

Culture / 2030: Indicators (UNESCO, 2019) built upon UNESCO’s culture conventions and programs to offer a unique means of analyzing the contribution made by culture to the Goals and Targets of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Taking an evidence-based approach, the document discusses the added value of culture for tackling global challenges such as reducing extreme poverty, boosting employment, and ensuring a peaceful coexistence, and for the well-being of communities. These thematic indicators can serve to improve policymaking in the field of culture and other sectors of public policy. They point to the need to widen the range of actors that should be engaged for the sake of achieving long-lasting and sustainable development (UNESCO, 2019:94).

As documented in the list of international case studies of surveys on cultural participation found in the 2009 UNESCO publication *Measuring Cultural Participation*, numerous countries have undertaken surveys on the subject (UNESCO, 2009a:85, Annex 1). Other policy-relevant topics include the measurement of intangible cultural heritage and the valuation of heritage, both of which pose challenges to measurement. All these issues stand to benefit from systematic measurement, which is essential for the effective planning and management of the cultural sector at all levels, from the need to manage specific cultural sites to the regional and national management of cultural infrastructure.

Application and Policy

Cultural participation has been used by Western governments as a measure of economic consumption and an indicator of well-being, as exemplified in national surveys conducted in the United States (Balfe, 2003), the United Kingdom (Bridgwood & Skelton, 2000), and Australia (Australia Council for the Arts, 2000). Cultural statistics support the development of evidence-based cultural policies and can be used to monitor and evaluate their effectiveness over time. They are useful for managing the sector's day-to-day activities, understanding the contribution culture makes to society, and analyzing its importance to sustainable development. Culture is a major determinant of well-being for both economic and non-economic reasons. It is an important component of modern economies and of knowledge-based societies; it enriches development at the local, regional, and national levels; and it is a major contributor to social cohesion and human well-being.

The OECD has published guidelines for measuring subjective well-being (OECD, 2013). Examples of the policy implications of this data include its usefulness in the daily management and planning of cultural infrastructure, such as museums, heritage and natural sites, and cultural centers. As many of these entities are financed publicly, there is a need for data to assess their impact.

The recommendations of UNESCO's *Culture / 2030: Indicators* (UNESCO, 2019) recognize the complexity of a policy environment that now encompasses information technology, the cultural industries, and the need to protect and promote a diversity of cultural expressions. Consequently, many interdependent policy areas are involved, and there is a need to distinguish ultimate, intermediate, and immediate objectives in relation to social cohesion, economic issues, and sustainable development. UNESCO's recommendations pertain to the goals of inclusion and participation and to evaluating the capacity of culture to foster social participation, inclusion, and social cohesion, through the assessment of inclusive access to cultural facilities; the right to participate

in and practice cultural expressions; and the provision of an environment that nurtures and enables artistic freedom and cultural diversity (UNESCO, 2019).

Identifying and Analyzing Cultural Capital Components Relevant to Israel

A

A Definition of Cultural Capital in the Israeli Context

The diversity of cultural expressions within Israeli society is multiplied by the diversity of its population groups, and so the definition and measurement of its cultural capital must account separately for each cultural community (Zadka, 2009; Katz-Gerro, 2017). Israeli society is characterized, first of all, by cleavage along ethnic lines, though that cleavage is in a state of transition (Khazoom, 2008). While largely secular Ashkenazim – Jews of central European background, with Western, modern, secular cultural preferences – were the dominant group in the decades before, during, and after the inception of the state and set the tone in many domains, mapping ethnicity onto types of capital for second and third-generation Israelis is more complex. In contemporary Israel, the Ashkenazi advantage in terms of representation in positions of political power and in the professions, as well as in income and in higher education, is shifting (Smootha, 1993; Yaish, 2004). Still, ethnicity remains central in determining the contours of Israeli society, and it shapes inequality in all of its institutions, including

the educational system, the political system, the military, the labor market, and the cultural field. Significant differences exist between and within ethnic groups in various aspects of lifestyle, including food, aesthetic preferences, artistic canons, and other cultural domains (Regev & Seroussi, 2004).

The cultural hegemony of the “veteran” Ashkenazi residents was challenged by the waves of Mizrahi immigrants who arrived in Israel from the Middle East and North Africa in the 1950s, threatening radical changes in the social and cultural order. Regev and Seroussi (2004; Regev, 2000) use the term **national cultural capital** to refer to cultural capital and habitus that define membership in a specific national culture. In the Israeli case, national cultural capital is viewed as embedded in a wider legitimate culture, which is Ashkenazi culture. Over the years, and especially since the early 1980s, following major political transformations, the old hegemony has lost some of its power. Mizrahi leaders have been increasingly vocal in challenging homogeneous Israeli cultural identity, and the consequences of a significant wave of immigration from the former Soviet Union in the early 1990s have once again transformed the society’s ethnic structure (Kimmerling, 2004). Nevertheless, significant differences still exist between Ashkenazi, Mizrahi, and third-generation Israelis (Sullivan, 1998; Al-Haj, 2002a; Katz-Gerro et al., 2009). Immigrant groups from the former Soviet Union, Ethiopia, and other countries have unique cultural capital characteristics and merit specific attention (Al-Haj, 2002b). Previous research on the cultural lifestyles of these groups may be discussed in future versions of this document.

A second major cleavage shaping cultural participation and cultural capital in Israel divides Jews according to religious observance: broadly speaking, between the ultra-Orthodox, the “modern” Orthodox, the traditional, and the secular (Smootha, 1993). The cleavage between secular and religious Jews in Israel is not dichotomous. It is best represented as shades on a continuum that can be segmented in different places according to different criteria (Horowitz & Lissak, 1990), revolving mainly around voting patterns, choice of children’s schools, degrees and styles of Jewish observance, cultural lifestyles, tendencies toward social and ecological isolation, and degrees of commitment

to the national cultural center. The ultra-Orthodox view strict observance as mandating abstention from listening to female singing voices and watching television while some “traditional” Jews may travel on the Sabbath – anathema to the Orthodox – while strictly adhering to Jewish dietary laws. Differences in a group’s position on the religious-secular continuum are also reflected in the degree to which its social networks are open. For example, many ultra-Orthodox men study canonical texts rather than working, a practice that isolates them from much of society. Members of ultra-Orthodox communities live in largely segregated neighborhoods, and their children attend schools belonging to a separate educational system whose curricula contain few or no secular subjects (Katz-Gerro et al., 2009).

A third cleavage is between Jews and Arabs. Israel’s approximately two million Arab citizens constitute 21% of its population. Around 85% are Muslim, and the rest belong to Christian, Druze, and other groups. In 2016, 43% of Israel’s Arabs were under the age of 19, as compared to 32% of Jews; and only 50% of Muslim and Christian Arab 17-year-olds were eligible for a matriculation certificate, as against 61% of Jewish 17-year-olds (Myers-JDC-Brookdale, 2018:5, Figure 2). The degree to which the Arab population is integrated into the wider Israeli society is low, and inequality prevails in almost every aspect of life. There has been scant research attention to cultural participation, cultural tastes and preferences, and cultural capital among the Israeli Arab population.

In Israel, with its population of only around nine million and an area slightly smaller than New Jersey, place of residence and distance from urban areas is only moderately significant in influencing cultural consumption opportunities (Katz, 1992; Katz-Gerro, 2002). Although most cultural production occurs in the city of Tel Aviv, there is a well-developed system of cultural dissemination to the periphery, partly supported by state agencies, in particular of music, theater, other shows, and cinema.

To sum, membership in one of the myriad groups in Israel implies belonging to a social community with particular cultural norms, the main differentiators being language, country of origin or social background, religion, ethnicity, nationality, and religiosity. The effects of this membership operate through

factors such as family and the power of peer and community influence. In particular, religious beliefs are part of a social system that shapes and places strict limits on cultural preferences and cultural behavior. A reconciliation of the specific cultural affiliations of different groups with a generalized state-supported cultural scheme would be a subject of political discussion.

B

Correlates of Cultural Capital in the Israeli Context

Israeli culture is changing constantly, mainly as a result of the waves of immigration from different cultures. Research on Israeli society is usually cast in terms of ethnicity, nationality, religiosity, and socio-economic characteristics, and these dimensions are also relevant in the cultural domain. The general picture that emerges from the few studies on the social bases of cultural consumption that have been carried out in Israel is that class and education are among the main determinants of patterns of consumption and taste (Katz & Gurevitz, 1973; Katz, 1992; Katz-Gerro & Shavit, 1998); additional studies have dealt with cultural stratification in relation to musical tastes and ethnicity (Benski, 1989; Halutz, 2008); leisure and social networks (Ginsberg, 1975); lifestyle and ethnicity (Katz-Gerro et al., 2007); lifestyle characteristics (Goldman & Kipnis, 2003); and sport and gender (Shamir & Ruskin, 1983; Katz-Gerro et al., 2009).

Very few studies have adopted the cultural capital perspective, among them Katz-Gerro and Shavit (1998) and Katz (1992). Katz (2000) maintained that an interaction between level of education and ethnic origin determines the profile of visitors to classical music concerts, and that frequency of attendance at entertainment shows is associated with age, ethnicity, and education. He further found that listening to popular music mainly fulfills personal needs, but it also plays an integrative social role. Interviewees reported that popular music

helped them feel part of Israeli society or take pride in the tradition of their ethnic group. Katz-Gerro and Shavit (1998) explored the role of social class in shaping highbrow lifestyles, finding that the educational and class-based elite in Israel exhibits an omnivorous cultural taste, and all classes consume popular culture. They also identified a degree of intergenerational continuity in highbrow lifestyles. The influence of Western popular culture was central in challenging the mainstream position that had materialized in the cultural field in Israel. Parallel to the consolidation of Hebrew culture as hegemonic, a thriving cosmopolitan and global culture has been influencing local consumption preferences (Ram, 2013). Finally, senior citizens in Israel exhibit low levels of leisure-time activities as well as low levels of enjoyment of these activities in a way that might significantly contribute to their well-being (Nimrod & Dahan, 2016).

C

Challenges

While arts and culture offer a wealth of positive benefits to society, they are also closely related to a range of social inequalities. Culture and cultural capital and their association with indicators of well-being are a loosely explored subject in Israel. The task of measurement is complicated by the need to respond to the variety of cultural expressions and components in a given society, while developing a feasible system based on existing data sources. In Israel, efforts to develop a framework for cultural statistics have met with only partial success and have been channeled toward finding administrative sources for statistics on culture and leisure activities (Zadka, 2009). Direct data has been collected mainly in one-time efforts carried out for specific purposes, which have not subsequently been duplicated for reasons either of priorities or of methodology. Extracting culture statistics from general data sources typically provides the expenditure elements. A comprehensive system to monitor and

extract data on the production as well as consumption of culture is lacking. As a result, our knowledge of the changes in the culture sector's performance over the years is limited.

An added complication has to do with a key assumption in mainstream economics: that everything can be made commensurate. In the capital approach, favored by many statistical agencies, commensurability means reducing everything to forms of capital (natural, cultural, etc.) that can be traded off for one another. The cost-benefit literature assumes that all impacts can be equated to all investment expenditures. However, in the cultural sphere, attempts to value social change in terms of hypothetical market value are problematic.

An additional challenge is the multiplicity of subcultures and identities in Israel, which cut across the main societal cleavages of nationality, ethnicity, religion, and religiosity. Cultural assets, cultural heritage, and cultural capital in a society are rooted in national traditions and in the social makeup. In Israel, they are specific to national, ethnic, religious, and many other sub-groups and need to be sub-categorized according to group-specific cultural resources (Zadka, 2009). Thus, in the Israeli case, thinking about the relationship between cultural assets and well-being is quite complicated, because of the necessary distinction between group-specific cultural capital and the specific cultural capital that is valued in society and carries returns in the educational system and the labor market. In addition, some cultural assets have values that have no quantifiable application and therefore no expression in measurable outputs or achievements. However, cultural statistics, in Israel as in other countries, relate mostly to governance and management of cultural assets, the promotion of cultural heritage and arts, and the ownership of the organizations engaged in cultural industries.

Another challenge relates to government capacity issues, particularly in the context of budget cuts and the distribution of public funding between local authorities across the country. Decision-making would benefit from learning about programs designed to attract new visitors and change audience demographics, for example by removing entry costs; about whether various programs have had a transformative impact on public attendance at cultural organizations; about

the circumstances under which state intervention disproportionately benefits people who are already engaged in culture; and about the extent to which capacity-building to deliver sustainable local cultural services, such as libraries, museums, and theaters, has an impact on audiences later in life.

The association between the social status of a publicly funded cultural form, or the cultural hierarchy, and inequalities in cultural representations presents another difficulty (Feder & Katz-Gerro, 2012). In other words, the way specific areas of cultural life are funded has consequences for the way individuals and communities are represented (O'Brien et al., 2017). Moreover, rapid changes in audience demographics – for example, in the wake of the wave of immigration from the FSU – are followed by changing interests and demands. There is a need to monitor changes over time in the proportion of various social groups' attendance at various cultural organizations (Feder & Katz-Gerro, 2015).

D

Measurement

Culture statistics in Israel include information about household expenditure and national expenditure on culture, recreation, and sport (Zadka, 2009). Breakdown by domain is also available: cultural heritage, music and performing arts, radio, television, books and printed matter, cinema and photography; sports, games, computers and internet; and plastic art. In addition, there are statistics relating to cultural productions, such as films.

Culture statistics are obtainable through direct data collection from cultural organizations and cultural businesses and are generated as part of Israel's National Accounts reporting system. Statistics on household expenditure on culture, recreation, and sports can be extracted from the Household Expenditure Survey and from occasional "business surveys," which identify businesses whose ISCO (International Standard Classification of Occupations)

code indicates that their main activity is in the realm of “culture, recreation, and sport” (Zadka, 2009), though this excludes non-profit culture, sports, and leisure organizations. The most recent survey of non-profit cultural organizations was conducted in 2004 and hence is largely outdated. Surveys specifically oriented toward culture and leisure statistics and general surveys with culture and leisure components have been carried out in the past: Time Use (1991/2); Books Published in Israel (1996); Daily Newspapers and Magazines Published in Israel (1998); Reading, and Leisure and Sports Activities (1999); and Public Libraries (2000). Since 1990, a report on National Expenditure on Culture, Recreation, and Sports has been produced annually by the National Accounts system. Statistics on non-profit organizations whose main activity is in the culture, recreation, and sports sector can be extracted from the survey results. Additional statistics on various culture and leisure activities are collected at different intervals by the CBS.

Inconsistency in data collection systems and periodicity are the main deficiencies of these statistics (see the Israel Central Bureau of Statistics page on Culture, Recreation, and Sport). Zadka (2009) lists the following definitions and classifications in Israel’s statistics reporting system as pertaining to culture:

1. Cultural heritage – museums, archives, historical monuments, archeological excavations – their restoration and preservation.
2. Literature and other printed matter – libraries, books, newspapers, and magazines (excluding school libraries and textbooks).
3. The performing arts – theater, dance, music, and entertainment; purchase of musical instruments, and equipment for playing and listening to music.
4. Plastic and visual arts – painting, sculpture, and other arts; art galleries.
5. Cultural goods and services – based on the CPC (Central Product Classification) classification.
6. Cultural industries – based on the ISIC (International Standard Industrial Classification of Economic Activities) classification.
7. Intangible heritage – customs and traditions.
8. Traditional knowledge – traditional life skills and ethnic myths and legends.

A particularly valuable source of information is stored at the Center for Cultural Information and Research, formerly coordinated by PILAT and currently by EDUSYSTEMS (<http://www.edusystems.co.il>). This includes remarkably

extensive information on cultural organizations in Israel for the 1999–2019 period, in the following domains: music, festivals, cinema, theaters, dance, and museums. It also reviews activity in exhibition spaces and cultural policy. A detailed list of the indicators available through this resource may be found in Appendix 4. A major shortcoming of this database is that it pertains only to publicly funded cultural organizations. Data was collected systematically until 2017, but since then reports have not been published regularly.

To address gaps in this area, I propose to build on UNESCO's *Culture / 2030: Indicators* (UNESCO, 2019) by linking indicators that policymakers can measure and monitor to specific well-being themes, which in turn feed into the broader framework of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG), as described below (see also Appendix 5).

1. **Expenditure on heritage:** Total expenditure per capita on the preservation, protection, and conservation of all cultural and natural heritage. This indicator illustrates how financial action by public authorities has a direct impact in making cities and human settlements more sustainable, relating it to the UNESCO Environment and Resilience theme and the SDG of Sustainable Cities and Communities.
2. **Open space for culture:** Number and size of open spaces used for cultural purposes, by type of use. Accessible open space in cities is often the basis for cultural activities, including cultural meetings of various ethnic or other minority groups, festivals, music concerts, open air theater, holiday celebrations, heritage activities, including natural heritage (landscapes, wildlife). and built heritage. This indicator relates to the UNESCO Environment and Resilience theme and the SDG of Responsible Consumption and Production. Several potential metrics can be used here, including the area (m², ha) and distribution of “cultural open space” out of all public open space.
3. **Culture in GDP:** Percentage of the Gross Domestic Product attributable to private and formal cultural production. This indicator assesses the overall contribution of the culture sector to the economy. Culture as an element of GDP relates to the UNESCO Prosperity and Livelihood theme and the

SDGs of Reduced Inequalities and Sustainable Cities and Communities. It requires four-digit data according to the International Standard Industrial Classification (ISIC) or compatible business output data. Possible data sources are national accounts, business surveys and censuses, service and commercial surveys, government records, and special cultural surveys.

4. **Cultural knowledge:** This indicator measures cultural education and capacity building, assessing formal school curricula on intangible culture, diversity in curriculum on heritage, educational programs on the protection of cultural and natural heritage, programs to increase the expertise of heritage management staff, and digital literacy programs. This indicator relates to the UNESCO Knowledge and Skills theme and the SDGs of Reduced Inequalities and Responsible Production and Consumption.
5. **Access to culture:** This indicator assesses the overall availability and use of cultural facilities in relation to the population that might be expected to use them. It relates to the UNESCO social Inclusion and Participation theme and to the SDG of Sustainable Cities and Communities. Cultural infrastructure – facilities for cultural creation, production, distribution and dissemination, and training – is crucial in creating supportive environments for the cultural sector, and it is a source of cultural, social, and economic vitality. A possible measure of this indicator is the number of each type of facility (e.g., museums) and the total resident population per administrative unit, regardless of the relative size of different venues or the quality of the service they provide. This simple count makes it easier to compile the data, but their interpretation is difficult.
6. **Cultural participation:** This is a straightforward measure of, for example, cultural site visits, attendance at cultural activities, individual cultural activities, use of the internet for cultural purposes, etc. This indicator assesses trends in engagement of cultural activities and skills, as discussed at length above. It relates to the UNESCO Inclusion and Participation theme and the SDGs of Reduced Inequalities and Sustainable Cities and Communities.

Recommendations

The studies reviewed in this document offer empirical support for public investment in different kinds of cultural participation, for the sake of improving the future well-being of the population, saving on health costs, promoting social cohesion, and addressing social problems. In some countries, local authorities are now setting performance targets for cultural activity in order to justify and account for public funding. This is an interesting approach, also implemented in Israel in some domains, but it should be problematized. In particular, good policy decisions always require clear and relevant objectives – specific, measurable, and consensual. To do that, it is essential to acknowledge the complex and multi-faceted nature of engagement with culture and its cross-cutting meeting points with other dimensions of social stratification.

As we have already seen, there is no consensus among professionals, researchers, and policymakers regarding the definition of culture and cultural capital, and the operationalization of cultural participation. Nevertheless, three main elements may be considered (Zadka, 2009): (a) symbolic values (not necessarily in sync with economic values); (b) the creative aspect; and (c) formal, informal, commercial, and social activities. These aspects pertain to the complete cultural cycle of creation, production, dissemination, exhibition, consumption, preservation, and education.

Any definition of cultural activities included in data collection efforts should be discussed openly with specialists from different fields, including statisticians, experts in qualitative research, and sociologists, and with lay stakeholders from the public. As far as resources and constraints allow, information about cultural participation should be collected regularly, not in one-off exercises but as part of a body of regularly updated information about the general population, upon which consistent policies can be founded.

Culturally sensitive policies can help both to preserve traditional practices

and to address the needs of socially disadvantaged groups that are owners of knowledge, transmit cultural values, and are guardians of cultural particularisms. The bulk of available data, and consequently current research, mainly assists us in measuring formalized cultural behaviors that typify the lifestyle of the Western tradition, rather than representing the wide range of possible meanings of cultural participation today. This Western model of measuring the consumption of cultural products and the material behavior resulting from cultural beliefs can be adapted to include the values and interests of additional social groups whose cultural inspiration resides elsewhere. To summarize the main points presented in this review, I propose several indicators that are linked to the Sustainable Development Goals and to themes in the realm of well-being, as detailed in Chapter 3(D).

The thematic dimensions of physical and psychological well-being discussed above provide a framework for assessing the contribution of culture to building social cohesion, as well as fostering inclusion and participation. They focus on people's abilities to access culture, the right of all people to participate in cultural life and their freedom of cultural expression, the creation of values and skills conducive to social inclusion, and the capacity of culture to stimulate effective engagement of local communities in public life.

References

- Al-Haj, M. (2002a). Multiculturalism in deeply divided societies: The Israeli case. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 26(2), 169–183.
- Al-Haj, M. (2002b). Identity patterns among immigrants from the former Soviet Union in Israel: Assimilation vs. ethnic formation. *International Migration*, 40(2), 49–70.
- Alonso, G., & Medici, M. (2012). UNESCO culture for development indicators suite: A tool to incorporate culture into development strategies. *Culture and Development*, 7, 12–17.
- Ateca-Amestoy, V., Gerstenblüth, M., Mussio, I., & Rossi, M. (2016). How do cultural activities influence happiness? Investigating the relationship between self-reported well-being and leisure. *Estudios económicos*, 31(2), 217–234.
- Australia Council for the Arts (2000). *Arts in a multicultural Australia*. Sydney: Australia Council.
- Bacon, N., Brophy, M., Mguni, N., Mulgan, G., & Shandro, A. (2010). *The state of happiness: Can public policy shape people's wellbeing and resilience?* London: The Young Foundation. http://www.youngfoundation.org/files/images/well-being_happiness_Final_2_.pdf
- Balfe, J. (2003). Public participation in the arts and culture. In V. Morris & D. Pankratz (Eds.), *The arts in a new millennium: Research and the arts sector* (pp. 51–63). Westport: Praeger.
- Belfiore, E., & Bennett, O. (2007). Rethinking the social impacts of the arts. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 13(2), 135–151.
- Belfiore, E., & Bennett, O. (2010). Beyond the “toolkit approach”: Arts impact evaluation research and the realities of cultural policy-making. *Journal for Cultural Research*, 14(2), 121–142.
- Benski, T. (1989). Ethnicity and the shaping of musical taste patterns in an Israeli urban community. *Social Forces*, 67(3), 731–750.
- Biswas-Diener, R., Diener, E., & Tamir, M. (2004). The psychology of subjective well-being. *Daedalus*, 133(2), 18–25.
- Biswas-Diener, R., Vittersø, J., & Diener, E. (2005). Most people are pretty happy, but there is cultural variation: The Inughuit, the Amish, & the Maasai. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 6(3), 205–226.
- Bridgwood, A., and Skelton, A. (2000). The arts in England: Developing a survey of attendance, participation and attitudes. *Cultural Trends*, 10(40), 47–76.
- Briguglio, M., & Sultana, A. (2018). Man cannot live by bread alone: Cultural participation and life-satisfaction in Malta. *Journal of Mediterranean Studies*, 10000(1), 15–36.
- Brook, O. (2011). *International comparisons of public engagement in culture and sport*. London: DCMS.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2010) [1986]. The forms of capital. In I. Szeman & T. Kaposy (Eds.), *Cultural theory: An anthology*, Vol. 1 (pp. 81–93). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

- Bygren, L. O., Weissglas, G., Wikström, B. M., Konlaan, B. B., Grijbovski, A., Karlsson, A. B., Andersson, S. O., & Sjöström, M. (2009). Cultural participation and health: A randomized controlled trial among medical care staff. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 71(4), 469–473.
- Chatterjee, H. J., & Camic, P. M. (2015). The health and well-being potential of museums and art galleries. *Arts & Health*, 7(3), 183–186.
- Chatterjee, H., & Noble, G. (2016). *Museums, health and well-being*. London: Routledge.
- Cicerchia, A. (2015). Why we should measure, what we should measure. *Economia della cultura*, 25(1), 11–22.
- Crossick, G., & Kaszynska, P. (2014). Under construction: Towards a framework for cultural value. *Cultural Trends*, 23(2), 120–131.
- D'Andrade, R. G., & Strauss, C. (Eds.). (1992). *Human motives and cultural models*, Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- De Graaf, N. D., De Graaf, P. M., & Kraaykamp, G. (2000). Parental cultural capital and educational attainment in the Netherlands: A refinement of the cultural capital perspective. *Sociology of Education*, 73(2), 92–111.
- Dodd, J., & Jones, C. (2014). *Mind, body, spirit: How museums impact health and wellbeing*. University of Leicester, Research Centre for Museums and Galleries (RCMG).
- Dumais, S. A. (2002). Cultural capital, gender, and school success: The role of habitus. *Sociology of Education*, 75(1), 44–58.
- ESSnet-Culture (2012). *Final report: ESSnet-culture: European statistical network on culture*. Luxembourg: Eurostat. <https://ec.europa.eu/assets/eac/culture/library/reports/ess-net-report-en.pdf>
- EU-SILC. European Union statistics on income and living conditions (EU-SILC). European Commission-Eurostat. Retrieved July 12, 2020, from <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/microdata/european-union-statistics-on-income-and-living-conditions>
- Falk, M., & Katz-Gerro, T. (2016). Cultural participation in Europe: Can we identify common determinants? *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 40(2), 127–162.
- Feder, T., & Katz-Gerro, T. (2012). Who benefits from public funding of the performing arts? Comparing the art provision and the hegemony-distinction approaches. *Poetics*, 40(4), 359–381.
- Feder, T., & Katz-Gerro, T. (2015). The cultural hierarchy in funding: Government funding of the performing arts based on ethnic and geographic distinctions. *Poetics*, 49, 76–95.
- Frey, B.S. (2008). *Happiness: A revolution in economics*, Cambridge, MA, and London: MIT.
- Fujiwara, D., & MacKerron, G. (2015). *Cultural activities, artforms and wellbeing*. Manchester: Arts Council England. https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/download-file/Cultural_activities_artforms_and_well-being.pdf
- Galloway, S. (2006). *Quality of life and well-being: Measuring the benefits of culture and sport – Literature review and thinkpiece*. Scottish Executive Social Research.
- Ginsberg, Y. (1975). Joint leisure activities and social networks in two neighborhoods in Tel Aviv. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 37(3), 668–676.
- Goldman, A., & Kipnis, B. (2003). Similarity and difference in estimating lifestyle characteristics of Jewish citizens in Haifa. *Bitachon Soziali*, 64, 88–93. (Hebrew)
- Green, A., & Janmaat, J. (2011). *Regimes of social cohesion: Societies and the crisis of globalization*. Berlin: Springer.
- Groeniger, J. O., Kamphuis, C. B. M., Mackenbach, J. P., Beenackers, M. A., & van Lenthe, F. J. (2016). Cultural participation and health-related behavior: A matter of social distinction. *European Journal of Public Health*, 26, suppl. 1, 125–126.

- Grossi, E., Blessi, G. T., Sacco, P. L., & Buscema, M. (2012). The interaction between culture, health and psychological well-being: Data mining from the Italian culture and well-being project. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 13(1), 129–148.
- Grossi, E., Sacco, P. L., Blessi, G. T., & Cerutti, R. (2011). The impact of culture on the individual subjective well-being of the Italian population: An exploratory study. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 6(4), 387–410.
- Halutz, D. (2008). “Shma Israel”: Social stratification and cultural preferences — Music in Israel. MA thesis submitted to the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Tel Aviv University.
- Hansen, E., Sund, E., Knudtsen, M. S., Krokstad, S., & Holmen, T. L. (2015). Cultural activity participation and associations with self-perceived health, life-satisfaction and mental health: The Young HUNT Study, Norway. *BMC Public Health*, 15(1), 544–551.
- Healy, T., & Côté, S. (2001). *The well-being of nations: The role of human and social capital — Education and skills*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development. <http://www.oecd.org/site/worldforum/33703702.pdf>
- Horowitz, D., & Lissak, M. (1990). *Trouble in utopia: The overburdened polity of Israel*. Tel Aviv: Am Oved. (Hebrew)
- Hughes, G. (2004). Crime prevention, community safety, and crime and disorder reduction. In J. Muncie & D. Wilson (Eds.), *Student handbook of criminal justice and criminology* (pp. 169–176). London: Routledge-Cavendish.
- Human Development Report (2004). *Cultural liberty in today's diverse world*. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).
- Hyypä, M. T., Mäki, J., Impivaara, O., & Aromaa, A. (2006). Leisure participation predicts survival: A population-based study in Finland. *Health Promotion International*, 21(1), 5–12.
- Katz, E. (2000). *Culture, communication and leisure in Israel*, vol. 2. Tel Aviv: Open University of Israel.
- Katz, E., & Gurevitz, M. (1973). *Leisure culture in Israel: Patterns of consumption*. Tel Aviv: Am Oved. (Hebrew)
- Katz, E., Haas, H., Weitz, S., Adoni, H., Gurevitch, H., & Schieff, M. (1992). *Leisure culture in Israel*. Jerusalem: Guttman Institute for Applied Social Research. (Hebrew)
- Katz-Gerro, T. (2002). Highbrow cultural consumption and class distinction in Italy, Israel, West Germany, Sweden, and the United States. *Social Forces*, 81(1), 207–229.
- Katz-Gerro, T. (2017). Consumption of culture and lifestyles. In M. Keller, B. Halkier, T.–A. Wilska, & M. Truninger (Eds.), *Routledge handbook on consumption* (pp. 409–420). London: Routledge.
- Katz-Gerro, T., & Jaeger, M. (2015). Does women's preference for highbrow leisure begin in the family? Comparing highbrow leisure among brothers and sisters. *Leisure Sciences*, 37(5), 415–430.
- Katz-Gerro, T., Raz, S., & Yaish, M. (2007). Class, status, and the intergenerational transmission of musical tastes in Israel. *Poetics*, 35, 152–167.
- Katz-Gerro, T., Raz, S., & Yaish, M. (2009). How do class, status, ethnicity, and religiosity shape cultural omnivorousness in Israel? *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 33, 1–17.
- Katz-Gerro, T., & Shavit, Y. (1998). The stratification of leisure and taste: Classes and lifestyles in Israel. *European Sociological Review*, 14(4), 369–386.
- Khazoom, A. (2008). *Shifting ethnic boundaries and inequality in Israel, or: How the Polish peddler became a German intellectual*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.
- Kimmerling, B. (2004). *Immigrants, settlers and natives: Israel between plurality of cultures and cultural wars*. Tel Aviv: Am Oved. (Hebrew)

- Koonlaan, B. B., Bygren, L. O., & Johansson, S. E. (2000). Visiting the cinema, concerts, museums or art exhibitions as determinant of survival: A Swedish fourteen-year cohort follow-up. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, 28, 174–178.
- Laaksonen, A. (2010). *Making culture accessible: Access, participation in cultural life and cultural provision in the context of cultural rights in Europe*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Lees, L., & Melhuish, C. (2015). Arts-led regeneration in the UK: The rhetoric and the evidence on urban social inclusion. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 22(3), 242–260.
- Marlowe, J. M., Bartley, A., & Collins, F. (2017). Digital belongings: The intersections of social cohesion, connectivity and digital media. *Ethnicities*, 17(1), 85–102.
- Mihelj, S., Leguina, A., & Downey, J. (2019). Culture is digital: Cultural participation, diversity and the digital divide. *New Media & Society*, 21(7), 1465–1485.
- Myers-JDC-Brookdale. (2018). *The Arab population in Israel: Facts and figures, 2018*. Jerusalem: Myers-JDC-Brookdale Institute. (Hebrew) https://brookdale.jdc.org.il/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/MJB_Facts_and_Figures_on_the_Arab_Population_in_Israel_2018-Hebrew.pdf
- NEA (2014). *Measuring cultural engagement: A quest for new terms, tools, and techniques*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts. <https://www.arts.gov/sites/default/files/measuring-cultural-engagement.pdf>
- Nimrod, G., & Dahan, D. (2016). The impact of patterns of leisure activities on life satisfaction of Israeli retirees. *Gerontology & Geriatrics*, 43, 63–82. (Hebrew)
- O'Brien, D., Allen, K., Friedman, S., & Saha, A. (2017). Producing and consuming inequality: A cultural sociology of the cultural industries. *Cultural Sociology*, 11(3), 271–282.
- OECD (2007). *Istanbul Declaration*. 2nd World Forum on Measuring and Fostering the Progress of Societies, Istanbul, 27–30 June 2007. OECD. <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/24/58/39637799.pdf>
- OECD (2013). *How's Life? Measuring well-being*. OECD Publishing. https://read.oecd-ilibrary.org/economics/how-s-life-2013_9789264201392-en#page1
- Oman, S. (2019). Re-placing cultural participation and re-viewing well-being measures. In B. Eriksson, C. Stage, & B. Valtysson (Eds.), *Cultures of participation: Arts, digital media and cultural institutions*. London: Routledge.
- O'Toole, F. (2006). *Dismantling the barriers to participation in cultural life*. National Disability Authority, 5th National Research Conference, Dublin, 16th November 2006.
- Ram, U. (2013). *The globalization of Israel: McWorld in Tel Aviv, Jihad in Jerusalem*. London: Routledge.
- Regev, M. (2000). To have a culture of our own: On Israeliness and its variants. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 23(2), 223–247.
- Regev, M., & Seroussi, E. (2004). *Popular music and national culture in Israel*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Sacco, P.L. (2011). *Culture 3.0: A new perspective for the EU 2014–2020 structural funds programming*. European Expert Network on Culture (EENC): OMC Working Group on Cultural and Creative Industries. <http://www.interarts.net/descargas/interarts2577.pdf>
- Sacco, P. L., Ferilli, G., & Tavano Blessi, G. (2018). From Culture 1.0 to Culture 3.0: Three socio-technical regimes of social and economic value creation through culture, and their impact on European cohesion policies. *Sustainability*, 10(11), 2–23.
- Saraceno, C. (2014). Do we need capital accounts for culture? Joint IEA/ISI strategic forum 2014 and workshop of the high level expert group on the measurement of economic performance and social progress on intra-generational and inter-generational sustainability, Rome (pp. 1–21). <https://www.carloalberto.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/no.367.pdf>

- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shamir, B., & Ruskin, H. (1983). Sex differences in recreational sport behaviour and attitudes: A study of married couples in Israel. *Leisure Studies*, 2(3), 253–268.
- Sheldon, K. M., & Hoon, T. H. (2007). The multiple determination of well-being: Independent effects of positive traits, needs, goals, selves, social supports, and cultural contexts. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 8, 565–592.
- SIAP. University of Pennsylvania: Social Impact of the Arts Project. Retrieved on July 12, 2020, from <https://repository.upenn.edu/siap/>.
- SIAP (2017). Cultural and social wellbeing in New York City, 2014–2017. University of Pennsylvania: Social Impact of the Arts Project. Retrieved on July 12, 2020, from https://repository.upenn.edu/siap_culture_nyc/2/
- Simplican, S. C., Leader, G., Kosciulek, J., & Leahy, M. (2015). Defining social inclusion of people with intellectual and developmental disabilities: An ecological model of social networks and community participation. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 38, 18–29.
- Smooha, S. (1993). Class, ethnic, and national cleavages and democracy in Israel. In E. Sprinzak & L. Diamond (eds.), *Israeli democracy under stress* (pp. 309–342). Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Staricoff, R.L. (2004). *Arts in health: A review of the medical literature*. Arts Council England, research report 36.
- Sullivan, A. (2001). Cultural capital and educational attainment. *Sociology* 35(4), 893–912.
- Sullivan, O. (1998). Traditional modernity and religiosity: Time use in Israeli households. *British Journal of Sociology*, 49(4), 619–639.
- Thomson, L. J., & Chatterjee, H. J. (2015). Measuring the impact of museum activities on well-being: Developing the Museum Well-being Measures Toolkit. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 30(1), 44–62.
- Throsby, D. (1999). Cultural capital. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 23(1–2), 3–12.
- Throsby, D. (2010). *The economics of cultural policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- United Nations (1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. New York: United Nations Department of Public Information. <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/UDHR/Pages/Language.aspx?LangID=eng>
- UNESCO (2009a). *Measuring cultural participation*. 2009 UNESCO Framework for Cultural Statistics, Handbook no. 2. Montreal: UNESCO–UIS. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000219213>
- UNESCO (2009b). *The 2009 UNESCO framework for cultural statistics*. Montreal: UNESCO–UIS. http://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/unesco-framework-for-cultural-statistics-2009-en_o.pdf
- UNESCO (2016). *Basic texts of the 2003 convention for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage*. Montreal: UNESCO–UIS. https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/2003_Convention_Basic_Texts-_2016_version-EN.pdf
- UNESCO (2019). *Culture | 2030: Indicators*. Paris: UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000371562>
- Van der Vaart, G., Van Hoven, B., and Huigen, P. P. P. (2017). The value of participatory community arts for community resilience. In: E.-M. Trell, B. Restemeyer, M. M. Bakema, & B. Van Hoven (Eds.), *Governing for resilience in vulnerable places* (pp. 186–204). London: Routledge.
- Van de Werfhorst, H. G. (2010). Cultural capital: Strengths, weaknesses and two advancements. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 31(2), 157–169.

- Vogelsang, E. M. (2016). Older adult social participation and its relationship with health: Rural-urban differences. *Health & Place*, 42, 111-119.
- Wheatley, D., & Bickerton, C. (2017). Measuring changes in subjective well-being from engagement in the arts, culture and sport. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 43, 421-442.
- Winner, E., and Hetland, L. (2000). The arts in education: Evaluating the evidence for a causal link. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 34(3/4), 3-10.
- Yaish, M. (2004). *Class mobility trends in Israeli society: 1974-1991*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press.
- Zadka, P. (2009). *Culture and leisure statistics*. United Nations Secretariat.
- Zheng, X., Sang, D., & Lin, Q. (2004). Personality, cognitive and social orientations and subjective wellbeing among Chinese students. *Australian Psychologist*, 39(2), 166-171.

■ Additional Sources in Hebrew

- אלאור, ת., ורגב, מ. (2017). כינונו של סגנון ישראלי 1967-1973. עמ' 308-333 בתוך: ישראל 67-77: המשכיות ומפנה, בעריכת עופר שיף ואופירה חלמיש (עיונים בתקומת ישראל, 11). אוניברסיטת בן-גוריון בנגב: מכון בן גוריון לחקר ישראל והציונות.
- אלמוג, ע. (1997). הצבר: דיוקן. תל אביב: עם עובד.
- גנאים, א. (2018). האינטרנט בחברה הערבית בישראל: תמונת מצב ראשונית והמלצות למדיניות. ארגון האינטרנט הישראלי.
- ורצברגר, ר., וקפלן, ד. (2019). פתיחות רוחנית בניו אייג' היהודי: היבדלות מעמדית בעידן פוסט-חילוני. סוציולוגיה ישראלית, כ(1).
- חבר, ח., שנהב, י., ומוצפי-הלר, פ. (עורכים) (2002). מזרחים בישראל: עיון ביקורתי מחודש. ירושלים: מכון ון-ליר והוצאת הקיבוץ המאוחד.
- טרבטנברג, ג. (2005). בין לאומיות לאמנות: כינון שדה האמנות בתקופת היישוב ובראשית שנות המדינה. ירושלים: מאגנס.
- יונה, י., ושנהב, י. (2005). רב-תרבותיות מהי? על הפוליטיקה של השונות בישראל. תל אביב: בבל.
- ליאון, נ. (2014). ההתחדשות החברתית של המוזיקה הפופולרית הדתית-יהודית בישראל. סוציולוגיה ישראלית, 16(1), 175-155.
- סעדה, ג. (2000). בין ישראליות ל"מזרחיות": הכלאות מוסיקליות מן העיר שדרות. סוציולוגיה ישראלית, ג(2), 276-253.
- פרשיצקי, א., ורמניק, ל. (2015). הון תרבותי בהגירה: ארגון פישקא של צעירים דוברי רוסית בתל אביב. סוציולוגיה ישראלית, 17(1), 146-121.
- רגב, מ. (2011). סוציולוגיה של התרבות. תל אביב: האוניברסיטה הפתוחה.
- רטנר, ד. (2015). ראפ, רגאיי ו"המשוטטים": טעמים מוזיקליים וזהות בקרב צעירים יוצאי אתיופיה בישראל. סוציולוגיה ישראלית, 17(1), 56-32.
- רם, א. (2005). הגלובליזציה של ישראל. תל אביב: רסלינג.
- שושנה, א. (2013). אתניות ללא אתניות – "אני מעבר לסיפור הזה": סדרי מדינה, כינון וזהויות אתניות חדשות. סוציולוגיה ישראלית, 14(2), 266-245.

■ Additional Sources in English

- Grosplik, R. (2011). Organic hummus in Israel: Global and local ingredients and images. *Sociological Research Online*, 16(2), 1–11.
- Grosplik, R. (2017). Citizen–consumer revisited: The cultural meanings of organic food consumption in Israel. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 17(3), 732–751.
- Leopold, L., and Shavit, Y. (2011). Cultural capital does not travel well: Immigrants, natives and achievement in Israeli schools. *European Sociological Review*, 29(3), 450–463.

Appendixes

Appendix 1: Indicators of Cultural Participation

Source: ESSnet-Culture 2012, Table 32, page 261

Performing arts % of persons who have...

Carried out at least one artistic activity the last 12 months

Played musical instruments

Sung

Danced (dance, ballet)

Made theater

Participated in other artistic activities

Attended live arts performances in the last 12 months

Attended theater performances in the last 12 months

Attended opera performances in the last 12 months

Attended ballet/dance performances in the last 12 months

Attended live music concerts in the last 12 months

Attended classical concerts in the last 12 months

Attended pop rock concerts in the last 12 months

Attended other concerts in the last 12 months

Attended direct broadcasts outside the home of cultural performances in the last 12 months

Listened to or viewed recordings of artistic performances

Listened to or viewed recordings of theater performances in the last 12 months

Listened to or viewed recordings of opera performances in the last 12 months

Listened to or viewed recordings of ballet/dance performances in the last 12 months

Listened to or viewed recordings of classical concerts in the last 12 months

Listened to or viewed recordings of pop rock concerts in the last 12 months

Listened to or viewed recordings of other concerts in the last 12 months

Architecture, visual arts and crafts % of persons who have...

Painted or drawn

Made photographs

Practiced other visual art activity (e.g., making pottery, restoration)

Were member of an association, club or group of amateur artists or craftsmen in the last 12 months

Presented own work in an exhibition in the last 12 months

Took lessons for their artistic or creative activity in the last 12 months

Uploaded images of their work to the internet in the last 12 months

Viewed paintings, drawings, graphic works, photos, sculptures, craft products or virtual exhibitions of visual arts or crafts (on the internet or other media) in the last 12 months

Viewed or listened to a program about visual arts and crafts in the last 12 months

Heritage % of persons who in the last 12 months...

Were member of a cultural association

Did voluntary work for a cultural association

Visited museums or public galleries

Visited monuments or archaeological sites

Viewed virtual art exhibitions or any kind of museum objects

Viewed monuments, historical or artistic places, buildings or sites (on the internet or other media)

Viewed or listened to a program about museums (on television, radio, video, dvd, internet or other media)

Viewed or listened to a program about monuments, historical or artistic places, buildings or sites (on television, radio, video, dvd, internet or other media)

Books and press % of persons who in the last 12 months...

Wrote poetry, prose, fiction or non-fiction in leisure time

Lived in a household with no books at home

Read books (both printed or ebooks)

Read printed books

Read digital books

Read books in the last 12 months by kind of books read

Read between 1–3 books

Read between 4–6 books

Read more than 6 books

Read newspapers at least once a week

Read magazines and periodicals at least once a month

Read newspapers online at least once a week

Read magazines and periodicals online at least once a month

Archives and libraries % of persons who in the last 12 months...

Visited an archive

Consulted archival records online

Accessed libraries via internet

Visited libraries

Film & video % of persons who in the last 12 months...

Made at least one film or one video as an artistic hobby

Took lessons for making films or videos

Visited cinemas

Watched videos at least once a week

Downloaded films from the internet

Radio, television and internet average time spent...

Listening to the radio in an average week

Listening to the radio via internet in an average week

Watching television in an average week

Watching television via internet in an average week

On the internet in an average week

On social networks in an average week

Percentage of persons who designed something for the internet in the last 12 months

Appendix 2. Comparison of Measures of Cultural Participation Discussed in Reports

Report	Main Features	Application
2009 UNESCO Framework for Cultural Statistics (FCS; UNESCO 2009b)	<p>Key statistical indicators:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Participation rate in cultural activities, typically reported as a percentage of the population (or sub-populations) who participate during a given period. 2. Frequency of participation in cultural activities, typically reported as average attendance per participant (or subject) during a given period. 3. Time spent in cultural participation, typically reported as a rate or a quantity of daily/weekly time dedicated to leisure and cultural activities. 4. Cultural expenditure, typically measured as the share of total household expenditure devoted to cultural activities (consumption and production), or the average annual cultural expenditure per household. 	Not implemented in any major data collection effort pertaining to cultural statistics
2011 European Statistical System Network on Culture (ESSnet-Culture; ESSnet 2012)	<p>Distinguishes four kinds of participation (ICET model):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Information – to seek, collect and spread information on culture. 2. Communication and community – to interact with others on cultural issues and to participate in cultural networks. 3. Enjoyment and expression – to enjoy exhibitions, art performances and other forms of cultural expression, to practice the arts for leisure, and to create online content. 4. Transaction – to buy art and to buy or reserve tickets for shows. 	Not implemented in any major data collection effort pertaining to cultural statistics

Report	Main Features	Application
	<p>On the societal level, identifies 10 cultural domains and 6 cultural functions.</p> <p>Cultural domains:</p> <p>(1) Heritage, (2) Archives, (3) Libraries, (4) Books and Press, (5) Visuals Arts, (6) Performing Arts, (7) Audiovisual and Multimedia, (8) Architecture, (9) Advertising, (10) Arts and crafts.</p> <p>Cultural functions:</p> <p>(1) Creation, (2) Production/Publishing, (3) Dissemination/Trade, (4) Preservation, (5) Education, (6) Management/Regulation</p>	
2019 UNESCO	<p>Emphasizes dimensions of cultural participation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Respect accorded to people from other cultures to practice and participate in cultural activities through a measure of intercultural understanding and a respect for their rights. 2. Artistic freedom to create and express; sustainable environment for artists and creators. 3. Equal access by all regions and neighborhoods to cultural facilities for practice, creation, distribution and dissemination of cultural knowledge, services, and goods. 4. Visits to cultural sites, facilities, and events; and cultural practices at home, including the use of internet for cultural purposes. 5. Participation by civil society and cultural sector professionals in decision-making processes related to cultural activities. 	Very recent, hence not yet implemented

Appendix 3. Measures of Cultural Participation Used in Surveys

- [Survey on Income and Living Conditions \(SILC\), 2006](#)
- [Eurobarometer European Cultural Values, 2007](#)
- [Adult Education Survey \(AES\), 2007](#)
- [Eurobarometer 399, 2014](#)
- [Eurobarometer 466, 2017](#)
- [SPPA](#)
- [ISSP](#)

Appendix 4. Summary of Information Included in Reports by the Ministry of Culture, Israel

חללי תצוגה 2018	להקות מחול 2017	מוזיאונים 2017	תיאטרונים 2016	גופים מוסיקליים 2017	
מספר פעילויות היקפיות	היקף הפעילות	אוספים	מספר וסוגי מופעים	היקף הפעילות	היקף פעילות
תערוכות	ניתוח רפרטואר	תערוכות חדשות	ניתוח רפרטואר	ניתוח רפרטואר	ניתוח רפרטואר
–	יצירות שזכו להצלחה הרבה ביותר בקרב הקהל	מספר מבקרים	ניתוח קהל	ניתוח קהל	ניתוח קהל
–	צוות אמנותי ואדמיניסטרטיבי	צוות אמנותי ואדמיניסטרטיבי	צוות אמנותי ואדמיניסטרטיבי	צוות אמנותי ואדמיניסטרטיבי	צוות
תקציב חללי התצוגה והוצאות	הכנסות והוצאות	הכנסות והוצאות	הכנסות והוצאות	הכנסות והוצאות	הכנסות והוצאות
פיזור גיאוגרפי של הגלריות	פיזור פעילות לפי אזורים גיאוגרפיים	–	פיזור פעילות לפי אזורים גיאוגרפיים	פיזור פעילות לפי אזורים גיאוגרפיים	פיזור פעילות לפי אזורים גיאוגרפיים
–	הופעות בחו"ל	–	הופעות בחו"ל	הופעות בחו"ל	הופעות בחו"ל
–	שיטות הפצה ומכירה	–	שיטות הפצה ומכירה	שיטות מכירה	שיטות מכירה
–	–	ציוני איכות	–	–	ציוני איכות

Appendix 5. Well-Being Themes, Indicators, and Their Association with Sustainable Development Goals

Environment and resilience		Prosperity and livelihood		Knowledge and skills		Inclusion and participation	
Indicator	Sustainable Development Goal	Indicator	Sustainable Development Goal	Indicator	Sustainable Development Goal	Indicator	Sustainable Development Goal
Expenditure on heritage	Sustainable cities and communities	Culture in GDP	Reduced inequalities; Sustainable cities and communities	Cultural knowledge	Reduced inequalities; Responsible production and consumption	Access to culture	Sustainable cities and communities
Open space for culture	Responsible consumption and production					Cultural participation	Reduced inequalities; Sustainable cities and communities

Source: Adapted from UNESCO 2019

Sustainable Well-Being in Israel

Report of the Expert Committee of The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities

<https://doi.org/10.52873/Policy.2021.Wellbeing-en>

The Capital Approach

Selected Topics in the Capital Approach to Sustainability
(Hebrew)

Asaf Tzachor

<https://doi.org/10.52873/Policy.2021.Wellbeing.01>

Economic Capital

Economic Capital, Its Components, and the Situation in Israel
(Hebrew)

Michael Sarel

<https://doi.org/10.52873/Policy.2021.Wellbeing.02>

Natural Capital

Natural Capital and Critical Natural Capital in Israel
(Hebrew)

Asaf Tzachor

<https://doi.org/10.52873/Policy.2021.Wellbeing.03>

Human Capital

Israel – The Human Capital Perspective

Dov Chernichovsky

<https://doi.org/10.52873/Policy.2021.Wellbeing.04-en>

Social Capital

Building Social Capital for Sustainable
Well-Being in Israel: A Scientific Review

Yinnon Geva, Itay Greenspan and Michal Almog-Bar

<https://doi.org/10.52873/Policy.2021.Wellbeing.05-en>

Cultural Capital

Culture and the Future Sustainability
of Well-being in Israeli Society

Tally Katz-Gerro

<https://doi.org/10.52873/Policy.2021.Wellbeing.06-en>