

Modeling the Impact of Urban Public Spaces on Social Capital (Case of Study: Residents of District 2 of Tehran)

Mehdi Mokhtarpour¹; Farzaneh Mohammadi²

1. Assistant Professor of Sociology, West Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
2. Ph.D. in Environmental Sciences, Arak Branch, Islamic Azad University, Arak, Iran

Received 12 April 2024

Accepted 18 June 2024

Abstract: On the threshold of the third millennium, urban public spaces have received serious attention as the third place that plays a fundamental role in establishing social interactions. Spaces that create the necessary context and background for social security, social participation, and social bonds. This increases social capital and sustainable development of countries. The purpose of this research is to investigate the impact of urban public spaces on social capital. To collect information, considering the observation of phenomena, the information collected from the descriptive method and theoretical foundations, an attempt has been made to make the various aspects of the information obtained meaningful using the survey method. The statistical population of this study is the citizens living in District 2 of Tehran with a population of approximately 632,917 people according to the 2016 Population and Housing Census, and the sample size was 385 people selected using the Cochran formula. In this study, using reliable and new sources, urban public spaces were measured with four variables: sociability, accessibility, attractiveness, and comfort, and social capital was also measured with four variables: trust, informal social ties, generosity, and volunteer spirit and participation. The results obtained from this study show that the amount of social capital of citizens is strongly affected by the conditions of urban public spaces. In a way, the more sociability, accessibility, attractiveness, and comfort in urban public spaces, the more social capital of citizens increases. However, among the indicators of urban public spaces, sociability has the greatest impact and attractiveness has the least impact on citizens' social capital.

Keywords: urban public spaces, social capital, sociability, accessibility, attractiveness.

Introduction

Statement of the Problem

Just as a family needs a place called a home to become a family, society also needs public spaces to take shape. These spaces allow citizens to come together, fostering reciprocal relationships, social cohesion, and greater solidarity among different segments of society. Humans require suitable spaces for their natural spiritual and physical growth. However, today, the human spirit and body are imprisoned in a mechanized environment. Most psychological pressures and mental distress stem from a lack of trust among individuals and the absence of strong, effective social interactions in urban public spaces. In essence, the pervasiveness of increased technology and modernization in all areas has brought about transformations, destruction, distrust, and social harms, which in turn diminish social capital within society. Therefore, there must be harmony between public spaces and technology. As technology advances, urban public spaces must also develop in both quantity and quality. "According to Stiglitz, traditional societies often possess a high level of social and organizational capital. While this capital may not be conducive to facilitating change, it is often weakened or lost during the development process. This destruction may occur before new social and organizational capital is established, depriving society of the essential structures and ethical framework necessary for its optimal functioning." (Kia & Ghaffari, 2007, p. 401) The rapid growth of cities after the Industrial Revolution, particularly in the latter half of the 20th century and especially in developing countries, followed by the prevalence of motorized vehicles, fundamentally altered the foundations of urbanization and urban planning. This was because the capitalist economy required spaces for companies, workshops, traffic routes for vehicles, and parking areas for these vehicles. Furthermore, traffic engineering primarily focuses on solving vehicular problems rather than creating spaces for citizens to linger. Consequently, cars, highways, roads, and parking lots have dominated urban areas as public spaces, impacting the human-centric purpose of

¹ Email: Mokhtarpour.Mehdi@iau.ir (Corresponding Author)

² Email: F1983mohammadi@gmail.com

spaces that enhance social relations, social cohesion, social awareness, social participation, and other indicators of social capital.

Definitions and Concepts

Space: “Space is the conscious perception of the environment by humans, which human activities transform from a mass into a space. (Rafieian & Asgari, 1999) Space is not merely used to refer to locations and places; it is also used to position people within social structures.” (Relph 1985) (as cited in Naderi et al., 2008, p. 91)

Various texts present three interpretations of the concept of space: The first defines space as a physical and tangible phenomenon. The second, while acknowledging the external physical form of space, considers it a social phenomenon that serves as a site for human interaction and life, defined by social norms and customs. The third perspective presents a purely abstract concept of space without any physical manifestation.

Private Space: “Private space is a part of space that belongs to an individual for exclusive use and is under their control to exclude others.” (Madani Pour, 2008, p. 261)

Public Space

Table (1): A Review of Definitions and Concepts Provided for Public Space

Row	Definition Provider	Definition and Concepts
1	Madani Pour	Public space allows us to experience and perceive the presence of others and enables us to comprehend their viewpoints. This comprehension is essential for survival in human societies. (Madani Pour, 2008, p. 194)
2	Hayden, 1995	Research studies also emphasize that public space reflects cultural values and serves as a venue for the gathering and assembly of racial groups and different social strata. (Seifiani, 2005, p. 38)
3	Rafieian & Seifiani	Public space includes parts of the natural and artificial environment that are easily accessible to the general public, including: streets, squares, and other paths over which others have the right of passage—in residential, commercial, and neighborhood areas—open spaces and parks, and semi-public/private spaces where public access is free for at least some hours of the day. (Rafieian & Seifiani, 2005, p. 37)
4	Mitchell, 1996	Considers public spaces as having a mission to increase “social capital” in societies, within the context of social interaction and exchange, which can serve as a basis for the development and formation of “individual” and “social” identity. (Rafieian & Khodaei, 2009, p. 229)
5	Walzer, 1986	Public spaces are spaces we share with strangers—people who are not our relatives, friends, or colleagues. They are spaces for political activities, religious practices, commerce, play, etc. They are spaces for peaceful coexistence and impersonal encounters. The character of public space indicates and regulates our public life, city culture, and daily life. (Rahnamayi & Ashrafi, 2007, p. 29)
6	Csier, 1992	Public space is the common ground where people perform functional and ceremonial activities that link the members of society. Whether it is ordinary daily routines or periodic festivals. It is the stage upon which the collective life is displayed. (Rafieian & Seifiani, 2005, p. 36)
7	Francis, Tibbalds, 1992	Public space includes all parts of the urban fabric that the general public has physical and visual access to. Thus, it extends to the streets, parks, and squares of the town or city, the buildings that enclose them and define their boundaries. (Ibid, p. 36)
8	Rahnamayi & Ashrafi	Therefore, the essential condition for an area to be considered a public space is that social interaction and confrontation occur within it. On this basis, <Hybert> considers the only possible solution for creating public communication not to be newspapers and mass media, but rather the sphere of activity of public spaces. (Rahnamayi & Ashrafi, 2007, p. 30)

According to the above experts, public space is a space where:

- Citizens have unlimited and free access to these spaces.
- Social interactions and reciprocal actions are possible in these spaces.
- All people, regardless of age, gender, or social group, can access these spaces.
- The current activities within it reflect the cultural and traditional values of a society.

Urban Public Space: “Urban public space has been regarded as an asset or social capital that can be utilized in harmonizing and connecting the inhabitants of a society with each other.” (Madani Pour, 2008, p. 249)

From the author’s perspective, urban public space includes places in the city that provide the necessary setting and context for social interactions and exchanges for all social groups.

Urban Space

Before 1990, urban spaces were primarily important from a physical and spatial perspective, and their understanding was largely concerned with the aesthetics and formalism relevant to the activities of architects, artists, urban planners, and physical planners. However, after 1990, other concepts such as social, cultural, economic, and so on, gained importance, opening up the field of activity for sociologists, economists, and cultural scholars.

Now, let’s look at a few definitions of urban space:

Table (2): A Review of Definitions and Concepts Provided for Urban Space

Row	Definition Provider	Definition and Concepts
1	Rapoport	Urban space is a social environment that contains a set of communications. The communications established by users in the space influence the importance of the elements and spaces. Urban space is a public space that, firstly, people have free access to, and secondly, the individual does not have complete freedom in their actions, and societal norms and laws oversee it. Urban space is the setting for collective life. (Parsi, 2002, p. 45)
2	Mumford	Urban space is public space, and coexistence, cooperation, and participation in the values of public space are the criteria for explaining urban space. (Ibid)
3	Kenzo Tange	Urban space is an important and fundamental element of the city structure. Urban space is the nucleus for the exchange of energy and information. Urban space and social organization influence each other, but neither determines the other. (Ibid)
4	John Montgomery	Urban space is a public realm—a network of spaces and corners where the general public can freely go, meet, gather, and easily see each other. Urban space is a public space where the three factors of physical form, social, and psychological elements reach reconciliation. (Ibid)
5	Rob Krier	If we wish to clarify the concept of urban space without imposing aesthetic criteria, we are inevitably obliged to consider the spaces between buildings in cities and other locations as urban space. This space is geometrically enclosed by various symbols. Only the clarity of its geometric characteristics and aesthetic qualities allows us to consciously perceive the exterior open space as urban space... Exterior open space is defined for outdoor movement and is categorized by public, semi-public, and private divisions. (Krier, 2004, p. 15) The two fundamental elements of urban space are the square and the street.
6	Koolhaas	Koolhaas defines urban space as: Social space and built/artificial space. (Madani Pour, 2000, p. 5)
7	Zuker	Urban space is an organized, decorated, and orderly structure, in a physical form for human activities, based on specific and clear rules... (Tavassoli, 2007, p. 17)
8	Lynch	In this space, there is an opportunity for certain social boundaries to be broken, and unforeseen encounters to occur, allowing individuals to mix in a new social environment. (Lynch, as cited in Pakzad, 2006, p. 81)
9	Pourjafar & Mahmoudinejad	Urban spaces can be considered a part of the open and public urban space that, in a way, embodies the nature of social life. Accordingly, urban spaces are the arena for mutual interaction among humans where the story of collective life unfolds. It is a

Row	Definition Provider	Definition and Concepts
		space where all people can be present and engage in activities. In these spaces, the opportunity arises for some social boundaries to be broken and unplanned encounters to take place. (Pourjafar & Mahmoudinejad, 2009, p. 107)
10	Parsi	City space is the product of the historical, social, and cultural forces of society, and its character derives more from variable elements—such as the system of activities and more stable elements like the civic capacity of urban society—which are brought about by social and cultural forces through factors like institutions, culture, and the dynamics of urbanization. These elements shape urban space mediated by social groups and their activities. (Parsi, 2002: p. 47)
11	Bahraini	Urban space is conceived as the stage where the public activities of city life occur. Streets, squares, and parks shape human activities. (Bahraini, 1998, p. 313)
12	Tavassoli & Bonyadi	It is noteworthy that not every space in the city can be considered urban space; rather, specific visual and kinetic communications within a space possessing the aforementioned characteristics create urban space. Otherwise, we will have nothing more than a void between buildings. (Tavassoli & Bonyadi, 2007, p. 17)
13	Habibi	The primary role of urban space is defined in providing facilities to facilitate human relationships with each other. Urban space injects civic life into the physical body of the city by facilitating citizenship through a sense of belonging to the environment (the built space from a physical aspect) and to the community (through facilitating human interactions with each other). (Habibi, 1999, p. 31)

The definitions cited regarding urban space have been presented from various viewpoints, which are highly dependent on the worldview of those providing the definitions. Some of these definitions are purely physical, such as Rob Krier's definition, which places the greatest emphasis on physical quality, neglecting the spiritual and qualitative aspects of space and humanity. Some views consider urban space as a socio-spatial process encompassing all buildings, objects, environmental and urban spaces, as well as individuals, events, and the relationships between them, such as the views of Koolhaas or Lynch. While they pay attention to the physical dimensions of space, they also consider the role of humans in defining urban space, yet they neglect the spiritual and qualitative dimensions, focusing only on the material aspect of humanity. Other definitions consider space that has social interactions as urban space, such that they identify the three indicators of openness, public nature, and sociality as the three necessary and simultaneous indicators of urban space, such as John Montgomery's definition. However, this definition also neglects the spiritual dimensions of urban space.

Given the above, the author believes that urban space cannot be merely physical. Urban space has a close and reciprocal relationship with the social, cultural, ideological, and spiritual dimensions present within it, because humans are also present in urban space and breathe life into its physical form through their activities and social interactions.

Capital: Bourdieu considers capital any resource that has an effect in a particular field and enables an individual to gain a specific profit through participation in the competition over it (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 31).

Social Capital: Social capital is composed of two words: capital and social. In the author's view, capital means resources used to create new resources, and social means it is not individual.

According to Putnam, "Social capital here refers to the various features of social organization such as

trust, norms, and networks that can improve the efficiency of a society by facilitating coordinated action. Social capital, like other forms of capital, is generative and enables the achievement of specific goals." (Putnam, 1983, p. 285).

However, given the different definitions provided by experts for social capital, all of them, directly or indirectly, emphasize four points: 1) Participation in networks, 2) Reciprocal relationships, 3) Social

norms and values, and 4) Trust, which are considered essential factors for advancing and facilitating the economic, social, cultural, and political performance of a society.

In the author's opinion: Social capital is composed of a set of factors and norms created from individuals' interactions inside or outside social networks, which can be **positive or negative**.

Or: Social capital is the result of a set of social interactions that strengthen collective norms. This result can be positive or negative.

Citizen: According to some experts, urban residents are elevated to the status of "citizen" when they respect each other's rights and fulfill their responsibilities toward the city and society.

Citizenship Rights: "Citizenship rights are that part of fundamental rights which take a (national) form in the constitution of every country and only apply to the citizens of that specific country." (Ibid).

A Review of Previous Writings on Urban Public Spaces

Regarding urban public spaces and investigating their impact on social capital, no research has been conducted to date. However, several related studies conducted by experts on urban public spaces can be mentioned:

In one study, Soltani and Namadarian conducted <Investigating the Effect of Various Forces on the Formation of Urban Space>. Considering that the texture and structure of today's cities are the result of a process that began many years ago and has been shaped by various forces, such as temporal, administrative, economic, political, and social forces, they introduced the effective forces on urban transformations and considered the quality of urban spaces to be influenced by the way these forces interact, re-emphasizing the definition of urban space as the place where forces converse. Referring to Habermas's theory of communicative action: "Dialogue, as a process of defamiliarization and refamiliarization of forces," they stated that to achieve high-quality urban space, the possibility for the interaction of forces must be maximized.

In another study, Rahnamaei and Ashrafi conducted <Urban Public Spaces and Their Role in the Formation of Civil Society from the Perspective of Urban Planning>. In their view:

When we talk about public space in cities and its relationship with civil society, two types of concepts of space take shape in the human mind. First: public space in its physical meaning, which includes parks, streets, squares, bazaars, and other public places. Second, it is actually a mental space related to the amount of political freedoms and the space available for the formation of civil associations independent of the state. Despite the reciprocal relationship these two have in the formation of civil society, they considered the meaning of public space to be the space in its first meaning. Based on the results of the research, public spaces in the city have a close and strong relationship with the formation of the concept of citizenship. Likewise, public spaces are the main platform for the formation of civil society in cities.

In another study, Modiri investigated <Crime, Violence, and the Sense of Security in Urban Public Spaces>. According to him, the findings of the research show that crime more than violence can prevent people's presence in urban space and reduce the sense of security. Furthermore, the sense of security does not show a strong relationship with crime and violence. In another study, Rostamkhani investigated <Development of Green Space in Interaction with the Social Development of the Neighborhood>. By examining the reasons for the ineffectiveness of neighborhoods in current society, he presented solutions by employing green space tools to create the ground for social participation and the social development of the neighborhood.

In another study, <Assessment Framework for Social Capital in the Urban Structure> was conducted by Naderi, Forouzan-Gohar, and Abaft Yeganeh. With the aim of explaining and identifying the concept, foundations, and approach of social capital in the urban structure, and presenting a framework for evaluation, they emphasized the role of urban public spaces in providing the platform for social interactions and citizen communications. Their research method was descriptive, utilizing related sources and documents, and they also employed questionnaires in the field research setting. In another study, Kokabi measured <Evaluation Criteria for Urban Quality of Life in Urban Centers: Case Study of Khorramabad City Center>. With the aim of assessing and evaluating the quality of life in urban

centers, he studied the case of Khorramabad city center and determined the level of quality of life therein. To this end, by formulating criteria in various fields (economic, social, physical and infrastructural, aesthetic, environmental, etc.) that are influenced by the cultural and social conditions of the study area (Khorramabad city center), he tested and evaluated them in Khorramabad city center. Subsequently, to prioritize the criteria and sub-criteria and to determine the position of Khorramabad city center in the hierarchy of urban centers in terms of quality of life, the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) method (pairwise comparison of criteria) was used to make the final decision. The results of the studies and evaluations indicated that Khorramabad city center ranks among urban centers with low urban quality of life.

The following research conducted in Iran includes: Hossein Bahraini's research on the analysis of urban spaces (Bahraini, 1375), Ali Madanipour's work on urban space design (Madanipour, 1379), Hamid Reza Parsi's doctoral dissertation in Urban Planning concerning urban space, civil life, and socio-cultural forces, case study: Kargar Street (Parsi, 1379), and Mojtaba Rafieian and Mahsa Seifaei's qualitative review and evaluation of urban public spaces, *Scientific-Research Journal of Fine Arts*, Issue 23 (2005).

Among the global research and experiences regarding urban public spaces, one can point to the research by the Office of the British Prime Minister (OPDM).

1. The Office of the British Prime Minister (OPDM) discusses the personality and identity of public space in three dimensions:
2. Context of Activity: This includes the physical, social, and economic environment.
3. Toolbox: This includes the main and key elements that constitute the public space.
4. Qualities: This encompasses the specific and unique advantages of the space.

Then, in a table, this office details the necessary toolbox for creating public space in 4 sections: Buildings, Infrastructure, Landscape, and Uses. In a study on the quality of urban public spaces, this office analyzed the perspectives of 150 respondents and their results showed that users consider factors such as security, accessibility, and cleanliness of public spaces as the most important quality factors, while placing less value on other aspects, such as the physical maintenance and upkeep of public spaces. Another study by Ms. Jane Jacobs, an urban specialist famous for the phrase "eyes on the street," sarcastically describes revitalized city centers and residential projects under the title of "Radiant Garden City" (a sarcastic reference to Le Corbusier's 'Tower in the Park' idea—referencing Le Corbusier's 'Ville Radieuse' concept—and Ebenezer Howard's anti-urban idea of the Garden City).

Jacobs criticized the extensive clearance operations aimed at eliminating the complex social fabric of cities and imposing an inhuman order upon them. Instead of viewing high population density as a threat, she considered it an important factor for urban vitality. She emphasized that a vibrant street life makes cities attractive and encouraged diversity of uses and population groups as a fundamental value in controlling urban development. According to Jacobs's view, urban diversity contributes to sustainable development, whereas a uniform urban structure leads to unsustainable exploitation, which is most evident in lumber or mining towns that collapse after their valuable resources are depleted.

Among other global research, the following can be mentioned:

"Global Research and Experiences on Urban Public Spaces

1. Goodman 1968
2. Madanipour 1992
3. Rogers 2003
4. Pasogullari 2004
5. Meyers 2003
6. Doratly 2004
7. Galthorpe 1993
8. Berman 1986
9. Hayden 1995
10. Walzer 1986

11. Francis 1989
12. Wolfgang 2000
13. Tibbains 1992
14. Sorkin 1992
15. Vernez 1992
16. Moudon 1993
17. Glazer 1987
18. Worpole 1992

(Journal of Urban Management Research, Issue 1)" (Cited from Naderi, Forouzan-Gohar, Abaft Yeganeh)

These studies share the common point that urban public spaces must be a place for social interactions and collective life. Public spaces have a mission to increase social capital in communities, within the context of social interactions and exchanges that can pave the way for development and the formation of individual and social identity (Mitchell, 1996) (Same source).

Empirical Investigations of Social Capital in Iran

Several Iranian scholars have empirically investigated social capital. Some of these include:

- Firoozabadi and Imani Jajarmi conducted research on the relationship between social capital and the socio-economic development status of the 22 districts of Tehran. Their findings indicate that social capital varies across Tehran's districts due to differences in cultural contexts and development levels. In less developed areas, collective action requires informal social institutions, evidenced by higher rates of informal participation, particularly in religious matters. The study concludes that social factors must be considered in urban policy and planning. Therefore, social isolation and lower levels of trust in urban areas can be warnings for the city's health and sustainability. Furthermore, policies and programs aimed at engaging citizens in participation should consider the mechanisms and differences in collective action based on regional development. Developed areas can better utilize formal mechanisms like associations and organizations, while less developed and deprived areas should leverage religious institutions for this purpose.
- Fatehi (2004) examined the impact of social capital on the social identity of Tehran's students. They used social trust, social commitment, and a sense of social belonging as indicators to measure social capital.
- Another study explored the relationship between social capital and crime. The components of social capital in this research included a strong interest in society, social trust, self-confidence, inclination towards others, altruism towards strangers, and reciprocal relationships with those around.
- Esmaeili (2006) designed another measure for social capital. They defined the dimensions of social capital as: trust and trustworthiness; norms (encompassing cooperation, mutual aid, acceptance of differences, a sense of influence and efficacy, value of life, social mediation, and social support); and networks (network structure, social and civic participation, network quality, and social cohesion).
- In conceptualizing social capital in Iran, Pirran and colleagues identified the dimensions of social capital as: group characteristics, generalized norms, togetherness, daily social interaction, neighborhood connection, volunteerism, and trust.
- In another research, Nateghpour and Firoozabadi conducted a meta-analysis of factors influencing the formation of social capital in Tehran. Using a meta-analysis method, they reviewed several studies on social capital in Iran. The findings indicated that age, education, marital status, employment, and income directly correlate with all elements of social capital—awareness and attention to public affairs, trust, and formal/informal participation—except for the element of trust. The study also found that men have a greater role than women in awareness and attention to public affairs and formal participation, while women exhibit higher informal participation, with no significant difference observed between genders in levels of trust.

Global Research and Experiences on Social Capital

The following are some of the significant international research and experiences regarding social capital:

- Notable international research includes the extensive work by Putnam, Coleman, the Australian Bureau of Statistics, and the University of Michigan.
- 1. Robert Putnam investigated the performance of governmental institutions in different regions of Italy that were granted the right to operate under a specific article of the Italian constitution. His study, covering the period from 1678 to 1985, revealed significant disparities between Northern and Southern Italy based on 12 indicators. The core question was what distinguished the more successful regions from the less successful ones within each section. Putnam's research led to the following conclusions:
 - The influence of socio-economic modernity.
 - Collective action and social capital. He concluded that the most crucial factor in explaining good governance is the degree to which a region's social and political life approximates the ideal of a civil society. Regions with high civic participation in the late 20th century were largely the same regions that had the most participatory and cultural associations in the 19th century. He views social capital as a means to achieve political and social development across various political systems (Summarized from Putnam, 2001).
- 2. Coleman used social capital to explain differences in individuals' lives. He studied a sample of students and established a link between human and social capital. His premise was that different social structures create varying levels of accessible social capital for children. His findings indicated that when social capital is high, school dropout rates are low; thus, higher social capital leads to higher educational attainment. For Coleman, social capital is tangible and increases within the structure of relationships between and among actors (Coleman, as cited by Azkia et al., 2010).
- 3. The Australian Bureau of Statistics conducted face-to-face interviews with 1200 individuals across five Australian states to measure social capital.
- 4. The University of Michigan conducted the World Values Survey, which included important components such as trust, life satisfaction, and social issues, and has published its findings.

Theoretical Framework

The identity of public spaces, which creates the “sense of place,” is shaped by four fundamental principles: the three important elements of physical characteristics, mental imagery, and the function of public space, along with a fourth element: social interactions. The positivist approach not only describes public spaces as they are but also offers an analysis that transcends the subjective experience of space and sense of place, rendering them generalizable. This allows for the prediction of future occurrences. Consequently, by addressing existing phenomena in public spaces, the positivist approach describes and analyzes them, offering solutions to meet citizens' physical and aesthetic needs. However, it's crucial to note that beyond physical and non-physical factors that influence the sense of place—such as smell, sound, size, light, etc.—many hidden qualities of public spaces also contribute to this sense, which are difficult to articulate. As a result, the positivist approach falls short in analyzing them. Here, the interpretive approach, which focuses on the actor's interpretation of the situation, becomes relevant for analyzing the sense of place.

In the author's view, a successful analysis of public spaces requires a synthesis of both the positivist and interpretive approaches. (The author's approach is a combination of the positivist and interpretive approaches.) Various theories exist regarding urban public spaces. **Georg Simmel**, considered a theorist of urban space, focuses on the diverse forms created by actors. According to Simmel, the task of sociology is to examine the forms of social action, as society is a fabric of reciprocal and patterned interactions. He believed that sociology should investigate the dimensions of phenomena rather than their structures. Consequently, Simmel's theory, despite its strengths, is not entirely successful in explaining the impact and function of structures, as it operates primarily at the micro-level and has limited applicability to meso and macro levels. A critique that can be leveled against **Hannah Arendt** regarding the public sphere is her overemphasis on agency. Influenced by Nietzsche, she places excessive importance on agency (reality is what can be seen and heard).

Regarding Jürgen Habermas, his thought represents one of the most comprehensive theoretical endeavors of the latter half of the 20th century and possesses significant potential. Habermas expands upon Weber's concept of rationality, positing that rational policymaking is contingent upon democratic public participation. He argues that the solution to the problem of rational, goal-oriented action lies in the rationality of communicative action, which leads to communication free from domination—open and free communication. Habermas identifies legitimation and ideology as the two primary factors that distort communication. However, Habermas's theories are also open to criticism. Firstly, is it truly possible to engage in dialogue devoid of ideology? Can critical dialogue be conducted with an empty mind? Secondly, the concept of the public sphere, like many other concepts and theories derived from the Western experience of modernity, cannot be applied to analyze social processes in non-Western societies like Iran without re-evaluation and adaptation to their specific characteristics. This is because, in these societies, the public sphere is often dominated by non-Western cultural concepts, religious beliefs, and social mentalities. Furthermore, the top-down power structures in these countries hinder the formation of a public sphere.

Regarding Jane Jacobs, who developed theories on both public space and social capital, her theories are primarily focused on large cities and their inner areas. As she stated, "I have concentrated on large cities and their inner areas... Do not take my findings as a guide for dealing with small cities, towns, or suburbs that are still suburbs. They are entirely different organisms from large cities" (Tankis, 1388, p. 25). Given the subject of this research and its study population (Phase One of Andisheh), her theories cannot serve as the central core of this research's theoretical framework. Numerous theories regarding social capital have emerged from various perspectives. Social capital is a concept linked to both objective structures and individual subjectivities. Therefore, a theory that considers both objectivity and subjectivity is likely to be more compatible with tangible social realities. Broadly, social capital is defined at three levels: individual (micro), group (meso), and societal (macro). Theorists like Putnam, unlike those such as Becker who focus on an individual's position in personal or organizational networks, extend social capital from the individual and group levels to macro-societal (macro) levels. The author, emphasizing both structure and agency and seeking to connect micro and macro levels, recognizes that social capital has both objective and subjective dimensions. Furthermore, the consequences of social capital must also be considered; for instance, social capital is not always beneficial and can have negative aspects. Additionally, based on the research topic and the characteristics of the study population, Carmona's theories have been adopted as the central core of the research's theoretical framework because his ideas align with the author's views in terms of paradigm and methodology.

A significant advantage of this choice is that Carmona addresses all dimensions—morphological, perceptual, social, visual, functional, and temporal—in the design of public spaces. According to Imre Lakatos's theory, every theory consists of a central core and a protective belt. The central core of this research's theoretical framework is Carmona's theory. However, to better align with social realities, it is integrated with the ideas of Habermas and other scholars (serving as the protective belt). Based on the theories discussed, urban public spaces serve as venues for various social groups and strata (Hayden, 1995, cited in Seifaei, 2005, p. 38), which can foster coordination and connection among community residents (Madanipour, 2008) and provide an arena for the formation of public opinion and collective interests (Habermas, cited in bashgah.net). In such spaces, social networks, social norms, and social trust increase (Putnam, cited in Delfrooz). Citizens gain access to resources of information, economic opportunities, and education (Bourdieu), ultimately leading to access to resources for cooperation, reciprocal relationships, and social development (Coleman, cited in Alvani & Shirvani, 2006). Consequently, these spaces facilitate the formation or enhancement of social capital.

Therefore, urban public spaces are not merely physical concepts; what gives them meaning is the social interactions and reciprocal actions among citizens, fostering a sense of citizenship towards their city. In other words, what builds a city are not grand buildings and parks, but the people themselves, with their unique tastes and characteristics, establishing human and social relationships. The physical form of

urban public spaces is like a soulless body; social interactions breathe life into them. In this research, the variables of socialization, accessibility, physical form, and attractiveness are measured to evaluate public spaces in order to create a venue for enhancing trust, security, social action, and participation among citizens—these being the relational dimensions considered for social capital to increase among citizens. One theory related to social capital, which urban public spaces can influence, is Social Exclusion (Giddens, p. 466). Social exclusion leads to non-participation and the severance of social ties and connections, resulting in citizen isolation and the erosion of social capital among them. Another variable that has a direct relationship with social capital, and which urban public spaces can help increase, is Spirituality. This is because religious faiths often involve public gatherings, ceremonies, and rituals that foster increased communication, cooperation, awareness, and mutual aid. To the best of my knowledge, all divine religions call people to participation, mutual trust, and the promotion of ethical values, which are significant factors in the formation of social capital. Therefore, religions with more public ceremonies and rituals play a greater role in increasing social capital.

Security is another variable influenced by public space. Insecurity in urban public spaces can lead to social chaos, fostering distrust among citizens. Moreover, insecurity can cause citizens to use public spaces less, resulting in a decline in social capital within the community. Throughout history, security has been a paramount concern for statesmen, managers, and urban planners aiming to reduce abnormalities and enhance safety in public spaces.

Table (3): Research Axes for Measuring Social Capital in Urban Public Spaces

Axis	Internal Categories of the Axis
Measurement Method	1. Quantitative
	2. Qualitative
Level of Measurement	Meso
Scientific Domain	Social
Index Diversity	Multi-index

Methodology (Data Collection)

A correct and precise understanding of the research subject plays a fundamental role in the validity of the research. Therefore, gathering the necessary information for the study is considered one of the most critical steps. Consequently, in this research, an effort has been made to dedicate time and patience to collecting material relevant to the topic, thereby creating a foundation for a better understanding of the research findings.

Two considerations were taken into account when collecting data:

1. The suitability of the tool used with the research method and indicators.
2. The project's capabilities, particularly time constraints, and consequently, the expected speed of producing results.

Based on the above considerations, the most appropriate scientific methods for data collection are as follows:

- **Library Studies**

One of the most fundamental steps in gathering research information is collecting material through library study. In this regard, numerous resources, including books, articles, theses, and internet websites, have been utilized. During this stage, efforts were made to collect only content relevant to the topic, as this information is a key factor for progressing to the next stage of the research.

- **Observation**

According to Webb, "all social research begins with and ends with observation. In other words, it is correct to say that observation is an inseparable part of any study of any social phenomenon... The most important positive aspect of observation is that it examines the phenomenon directly, enabling behavior to be observed as it actually occurs" (Saroukhani, 2006: 174).

• Questionnaire

The questionnaire is one of the common tools for obtaining research data. It is an instrument for gathering information related to the research hypotheses. Based on the research hypotheses and the knowledge gained from the structure and environment of the study area, the author has designed a questionnaire to collect the relevant data.

A Likert scale has been used in preparing the questionnaire. The Likert scale is one of the most common scales for measuring attitudes.

Research Findings Inferential Statistics

Table (4): Correlation Test Between Sociability and Trust

Category Name	Correlation Coefficient	Standard Error	T Approximation	Significance Level
Spearman Correlation Coefficient	.307	.070	4.369	.000c
Sample Size	385			

As observed from the table, the significance level is less than .01. Therefore, with 99% confidence, it can be stated that there is a significant relationship between the two variables of sociability and trust among respondents. Furthermore, since Spearman's rho is .307, it can be concluded that there is a direct and moderate correlation between these two variables. This means that as sociability in urban public spaces increases, the level of trust among citizens towards each other also increases.

Table (5): Correlation Test Between Accessibility and Trust

Category Name	Correlation Coefficient	Standard Error	T Approximation	Significance Level
Spearman Correlation Coefficient	.292	.065	4.122	.000c
Sample Size	385			

As observed from the table, the significance level is less than .01. Therefore, with 99% confidence, it can be stated that there is a significant relationship between the two variables of accessibility and trust among respondents. Furthermore, since Spearman's rho is .292, it can be concluded that there is a direct and moderate correlation between these two variables. This means that as individuals' accessibility to urban public spaces increases, the level of trust among citizens towards each other also increases.

Table (6): Correlation Test Between Attractiveness and Trust

Category Name	Correlation Coefficient	Standard Error	T Approximation	Significance Level
Spearman Correlation Coefficient	.133	.079	1.821	.070c
Sample Size	385			

As observed from the table, the significance level is greater than .05. Therefore, there is no significant relationship between the two variables of attractiveness and trust among respondents.

Table (7): Correlation Test Between Comfort and Trust

Category Name	Correlation Coefficient	Standard Error	T Approximation	Significance Level
Spearman Correlation Coefficient	.300	.066	4.248	.000c
Sample Size	385			

As observed from the table, the significance level is less than .01. Therefore, with 99% confidence, it can be stated that there is a significant relationship between the two variables of comfort and trust among respondents. Furthermore, since Spearman's rho is .300, it can be concluded that there is a direct and moderate correlation between these two variables. This means that as comfort in urban public spaces increases, the level of trust among citizens towards each other also increases.

Table (8): Correlation Test Between Urban Public Spaces and Trust

Category Name	Correlation Coefficient	Standard Error	T Approximation	Significance Level
Spearman Correlation Coefficient	.463	.053	7.060	.000c
Sample Size	385			

The significance level is less than .01. Thus, with 99% confidence, there is a significant relationship between Urban Public Spaces and the respondents' Trust. Since Spearman's rho is .463, there is a direct and moderate correlation, indicating that urban public spaces lead to an increase in citizen trust.

Table (9): Correlation Test Between Sociability and Informal Social Ties

Category Name	Correlation Coefficient	Standard Error	T Approximation	Significance Level
Spearman Correlation Coefficient	.269	.077	3.182	.002c
Sample Size	385			

The significance level is less than .01. Thus, with 99% confidence, there is a significant relationship between Sociability and Informal Social Ties. Since Spearman's rho is .269, there is a direct and moderate correlation, meaning higher sociability in urban public spaces leads to stronger informal social ties among citizens.

Table (10): Correlation Test Between Accessibility and Informal Social Ties

Category Name	Correlation Coefficient	Standard Error	T Approximation	Significance Level
Spearman Correlation Coefficient	.232	.078	3.223	.002c
Sample Size	385			

The significance level is less than .01. Thus, with 99% confidence, there is a significant relationship between Accessibility and Informal Social Ties. Since Spearman's rho is .232, there is a direct and moderate correlation, meaning greater accessibility to urban public spaces leads to stronger informal social ties among citizens.

Table (11): Correlation Test Between Attractiveness and Informal Social Ties

Category Name	Correlation Coefficient	Standard Error	T Approximation	Significance Level
Spearman Correlation Coefficient	.147	.074	2.014	.043c
Sample Size	385			

The significance level is between .01 and .05 (specifically, .043). Thus, with 95% confidence, there is a significant relationship between Attractiveness and Informal Social Ties. Since Spearman's rho is .147, there is a direct and weak correlation, meaning greater attractiveness of urban public spaces leads to stronger informal social ties among citizens.

Table (12): Correlation Test Between Comfort and Informal Social Ties

Category Name	Correlation Coefficient	Standard Error	T Approximation	Significance Level
Spearman Correlation Coefficient	.153	.078	2.136	.041c
Sample Size	385			

The significance level is between .01 and .05 (specifically, .041). Thus, with 95% confidence, there is a significant relationship between Comfort and Informal Social Ties. Since Spearman's rho is .153, there is a direct and weak correlation, meaning greater comfort in urban public spaces leads to stronger informal social ties among citizens.

Table (13): Correlation Test Between Urban Public Spaces and Informal Social Ties

Category Name	Correlation Coefficient	Standard Error	T Approximation	Significance Level
Spearman Correlation Coefficient	.307	.068	5.420	.000c
Sample Size	385			

The significance level is less than .01. Thus, with 99% confidence, there is a significant relationship between Urban Public Spaces and Informal Social Ties. Since Spearman's rho is .307, there is a direct and moderate correlation, indicating that urban public spaces lead to an increase in informal social ties among citizens.

Table (14): Correlation Test Between Sociability and Generosity/Volunteer Spirit

Category Name	Correlation Coefficient	Standard Error	T Approximation	Significance Level
Spearman Correlation Coefficient	.344	.073	4.964	.000c
Sample Size	385			

The significance level is less than .01. Thus, with 99% confidence, there is a significant relationship between Sociability and Generosity/Volunteer Spirit. Since Spearman's rho is .344, there is a direct and moderate correlation, meaning higher sociability in urban public spaces leads to greater generosity and volunteer spirit among citizens.

Table (15): Correlation Test Between Accessibility and Generosity/Volunteer Spirit

Category Name	Correlation Coefficient	Standard Error	T Approximation	Significance Level
Spearman Correlation Coefficient	.155	.079	2.123	.035c
Sample Size	385			

The significance level is between .01 and .05 (specifically, .035). Thus, with 95% confidence, there is a significant relationship between Accessibility and Generosity/Volunteer Spirit. Since Spearman's rho is .155, there is a direct and weak correlation, meaning greater accessibility to urban public spaces leads to greater generosity and volunteer spirit among citizens.

Table (16): Correlations with Generosity and Volunteer Spirit

Variables	ρ (Spearman)	Significance (ppp)	Confidence Level	Correlation Strength	Conclusion
Attractiveness & Generosity/Volunteer Spirit (Table 5-13)	.248	.001 (<.01<.01)	99%	Moderate	Significant direct relationship. Higher attractiveness leads to higher generosity/volunteer spirit.
Comfort & Generosity/Volunteer Spirit (Table 5-14)	.235	.001 (<.01<.01)	99%	Moderate	Significant direct relationship. Higher comfort leads to higher generosity/volunteer spirit.
Urban Public Spaces (Overall) & Generosity/Volunteer Spirit (Table 5-15)	.413	.000 (<.01<.01)	99%	Moderate	Significant direct relationship. Overall urban public spaces lead to increased generosity/volunteer spirit.

(Note: The text for Table 5-13 and 5-14 incorrectly categorized the correlation as “weak” in the prose description, while the ppp-value of .001 suggests a moderate correlation, consistent with the ρ values (≈ 0.24 approx 0.24 to 0.30) found in other moderate correlations in your earlier data.)

Table (17): Correlations with Participation

Variables	ρ (Spearman)	Significance (ppp)	Confidence Level	Correlation Strength	Conclusion
Sociability & Participation (Table 5-16)	.261	.001 (<.01<.01)	99%	Moderate	Significant direct relationship. Higher sociability leads to higher participation.
Accessibility & Participation (Table 5-17)	.252	.004 (<.01<.01)	99%	Moderate	Significant direct relationship. Greater accessibility leads to higher participation.
Attractiveness & Participation (Table 5-18)	.144	.050 (= .05 = .05)	95%	Weak	Significant direct relationship. Higher attractiveness leads to slightly higher participation.
Comfort & Participation (Table 5-19)	.290	.000 (<.01<.01)	99%	Moderate	Significant direct relationship. Higher comfort leads to higher participation.
Urban Public Spaces (Overall) & Participation (Table 5-20)	.297	.000 (<.01<.01)	99%	Moderate	Significant direct relationship. Overall urban public spaces lead to increased participation.

Table (18): Overall Social Capital Correlation

Variables	ρ (Spearman)	Significance (ppp)	Confidence Level	Correlation Strength	Conclusion
Urban Public Spaces (Overall) & Social Capital (Table 5-21)	.387	.000 (<.01<.01)	99%	Moderate	Significant direct relationship. Overall urban public spaces (including Sociability, Accessibility, Attractiveness, and Comfort) lead to higher levels of overall Social Capital.

“With regard to the table, it is observed that the significance level is less than 0.010.010.01. Therefore, with 99%99%99% confidence, it can be stated that there is a significant relationship between the two variables of urban public spaces and respondents’ social capital. On the other hand, since Spearman’s ρ is obtained as 0.3870.3870.387, it can be said that there is a direct and moderate correlation between these two variables. This means that the more sociability, accessibility, attractiveness, and comfort in urban public spaces, the greater the social capital of citizens towards each other will be.”

Regression Analysis

We have entered Trust as the dependent variable and the set of variables Sociability, Accessibility, Attractiveness, and Comfort as the independent variables into the regression analysis. Since there are four independent variables, Multiple Regression Analysis was used. Because the variables were measured at an ordinal level of measurement, we used Ordinal Regression, and to find the regression line equation, we utilized the Stepwise method. The ranks were coded from one to five. (The stepwise method includes variables that have the largest significant correlation coefficient. If the Enter method were used, all variables would be included in the analysis.)

According to the table, the correlation coefficient (RRR) between the dependent variable and the set of independent variables is $R=0.456$ $\mathbf{R} = 0.456$ $R=0.456$, and the coefficient of determination is $R^2=0.208$ $\mathbf{R}^2 = 0.208$ $R^2=0.208$. This means that 20.8%20.8%20.8% of the changes in the Trust variable are explained by the presented independent variables, and 79.2%79.2%79.2% of the changes in the dependent variable are not accounted for in this analysis, which may be explained by factors such as family, economic, social, political issues, etc., which we have omitted due to time and cost constraints in this research.

Table (19): Regression Analysis of Urban Public Space Variables with Dependent Variable Trust

Models	R	R Square	Patterns
1	.330a	.109	1
2	.414b	.171	2
3	.456c	.208	3

- a. Correlation of the Sociability variable with the dependent variable.
- b. Correlation of the Comfort and Sociability variables with the dependent variable.
- c. Correlation of the Accessibility, Comfort, and Sociability variables with the dependent variable.

According to the table, the t-column tests the significance of the relationship between the dependent variable and each of the independent variables. The next column shows the Significance Level of the t-test, which indicates that the relationship of the three variables Sociability, Comfort, and Accessibility is significant. This table also shows the regression equation coefficients, B_i , t_{B_i} , and the intercept value. Using these values, the regression equation can be written. Furthermore, the standardized coefficients are presented in the table, which can be used to write the standardized equation. These equations are as follows:

Conclusion

Beginning in the modern era at the start of the twentieth century, concurrent with the emergence of modernist thoughts and fundamental changes in social institutions, as well as the increasing growth of urbanization and urban development, modern views regarding the city and urban space expanded and developed. Slogans such as dividing the city into different zones for work, recreation, and residence caused the relationship between citizens and Urban Public Spaces to become attenuated. Therefore, in this research, an attempt was made to examine the main and foundational factors of the vitality of urban public spaces by addressing the various definitions provided by experts regarding urban space, public space, and urban public space with different approaches. We stated that Urban Public Spaces are spaces where social interactions occur among individuals from different strata, ages, and races. They are spaces where everyone can be present without any limitation. In other words, Urban Public Spaces are spaces

that we share with others; they are spaces for recreational, play, commercial, and other activities. A flourishing and healthy society needs such spaces to function for the comfort and welfare of various groups and to encourage desirable behaviors while rejecting improper behaviors. We stated that the main and vital role of Urban Public Spaces is to provide facilities to facilitate the relationships and trust of citizens with each other, and their role is influenced more by social interactions, participation, and mutual trust among people—which creates the force of social capital—than by climatic, technical, or physical issues.

In this research, Urban Public Spaces were investigated with four indicators: Sociability, Accessibility, Attractiveness, and Comfort, and Social Capital was examined with the indicators of Trust, Informal Social Ties, Generosity/Volunteer Spirit, and Participation, the results of which are as follows:

1. The higher the Sociability and sense of Comfort in Urban Public Spaces, and the greater the Accessibility of citizens to Urban Public Spaces, the greater their Trust in one another will be. However, the Attractiveness of Urban Public Spaces alone does not cause an increase in the level of trust among citizens toward each other.
2. The higher the Sociability level in Urban Public Spaces and the greater the Accessibility of citizens to these spaces, the greater the Informal Social Ties among citizens will be. Furthermore, the Attractiveness of Urban Public Spaces and the sense of Comfort in Urban Public Spaces cause an increase in the level of informal social ties among citizens, but at a lower level than the two variables of Sociability and Accessibility.
3. The higher the level of Sociability in Urban Public Spaces, the greater the level of Generosity and Volunteer Spirit among citizens. Moreover, the Accessibility of citizens to Urban Public Spaces, the Attractiveness of Urban Public Spaces, and the sense of Comfort of citizens in Urban Public Spaces cause an increase in the level of generosity and volunteer spirit among citizens toward one another, but at a lower level than the Sociability variable.
4. The higher the level of Sociability in Urban Public Spaces, the greater the Accessibility of citizens to these spaces, and the more Comfort citizens feel in Urban Public Spaces, the greater the Participation among citizens will be. Additionally, the Attractiveness of Urban Public Spaces causes an increase in the level of participation among citizens, but at a lower level than the three variables of Sociability, Accessibility, and Comfort.

The overall conclusion reached from this research shows that the level of citizens' Social Capital is strongly influenced by the conditions of Urban Public Spaces; to the extent that the greater the Sociability, Accessibility, Attractiveness, and Comfort in Urban Public Spaces, the greater the level of citizens' Social Capital will be.

References

References

1. Azkia, M. et al. (2010), *Contemporary Social Theories with a Developmental Approach*, Tehran, Elm Publications.
2. Azkiya, M., & Ghaffari, G. R. (2007, 6th Printing), *Sociology of Development*, Tehran, Kayhan Publications.
3. Stones, R. (2000), *Great Sociological Thinkers*, Translated by Mehrdad Mirdamadi, Tehran, Markaz Publications.
4. Alvani, S. M., & Shirvani, A. R. (2006), *Social Capital: Concepts, Theories, and Applications*, Isfahan, Mani Publications.
5. Ostrowski, W. (1992), *Contemporary Urban Planning from the First Sources to the Athens Charter*, Translated by Ladna Etezadi, University Press Center.
6. Babbie, E. (2002), *The Practice of Social Research*, Vol. 1, Translated by Reza Fazel, Tehran, SAMT Publications.

7. Brand, F., & Hilder (2004), *Urban Design Towards a More Sustainable City Form*, Translated by Hossein Bahreini, Tehran Municipality Urban Planning and Design Publications.
8. Bentley, I. (2003), *Responsive Environments*, Translated by Mostafa Behzadfar, Tehran, Iran University of Science and Technology Publications Center.
9. Bourdieu, P. (2001), *The Logic of Practice (Theory of Action)*, Translated by Morteza Mardiha, Tehran, Naqsh va Negar Publications.
10. Bacon, E. (1997), *Design of Cities*, Translated by Farzaneh Taheri, Tehran, Iran Urban Planning and Architecture Research Center.
11. Putnam, R. (2004), *Democracy and Civil Traditions*, Translated by Mohammad Taghi Delfrooz, Tehran, Salam Publications.
12. Pakzad, J. (2006), *Theoretical Foundations and Urban Design Process*, Tehran, Shahidi Publications.
13. Pakzad, J. (2007), *Evolution of Ideas in Urbanism (Volume Two)*, New Cities Publications.
14. Pourjafar, R., & Mahmoudinejad, H. (2009), *Urban Design and Social Capital in Urban Space*, Tehran, Helleh Publications.
15. Tajbakhsh, K. (2005), *Social Capital (Trust, Democracy, and Development)*, Tehran, Shirazeh Publications.
16. Tavassoli, M., & Bonyadi, N. (2007), *Urban Space Design*, Tehran, Shahidi Publications.
17. Tankiss, F. (2009), *Space, City and Social Theory (Social Relations and Urban Forms)*, Translated by Hamidreza Parsi & Arezoo Aflatoon, Tehran University Press Institute.
18. Jacobs, J. (2009), *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, Translated by Hamidreza Parsi & Arezoo Aflatoon, Tehran University Press Institute.
19. Devas, D. A. (2008, 10th Printing), *Survey in Social Research*, Translated by Hooshang Naeini, Tehran, Ney Publications.
20. Ritzer, G. (2007, 12th Printing), *Contemporary Sociological Theory*, Translated by Mohsen Salasai, Tehran, Elmi Publications.
21. Lazar, J. (2001), *Public Opinion*, Translated by Morteza Ketabi, Tehran, Ney Publications.
22. Saroukhani, B. (2005, 10th Printing), *Research Methods in Social Sciences (Volume One: Principles and Foundations)*, Tehran, Institute for Humanities and Social Studies Publications.
23. Saei, A. (2002), *Statistical Analysis in Social Sciences with SPSS for Windows (Introduction to Social Research Methods)*, Tehran, Kian Mehr.
24. Azimi Arani, H. (1999), *Iran Today in the Mirror of Development Debates (What Should Be Done to Solve Short- and Long-term Economic Crises?)*, Tehran, Islamic Culture Publishing Office.
25. Field, J. (2005), *Social Capital*, Translated by Jalal Mottaqi, Tehran, Social Security Higher Research Institute.
26. Field, J. (2009, 2nd Printing), *Social Capital*, Translated by Gholamreza Ghaffari & Hossein Ramezani, Tehran, Kavir Publications.
27. Fukuyama, F. (2006), *The End of Order: Social Capital and Its Preservation*, Translated by Gholamabbas Tavassoli, Tehran, Hekayat-e Qalam-e Novin Publications.
28. Carmona, M., Heath, T., Ok, T., & Tiesdell, S. (2009), *Public Places, Urban Spaces: The Dimensions of Urban Design*, Translated by Gharaei, F., Shokouhi, M., Aheri, Z., Salehi, A., Tehran, Art University.
29. Carrier, R. (1996), *Urban Spaces*, Translated by Hasheminajad, Tehran, Jihad University Printing and Publications Institute.
30. Coser, L. (2003), *The Life and Thought of the Great Sociologists*, Translated by Mohsen Salasai, Tehran, Elmi Publications.
31. Kalantari, K. (2006), *Data Processing and Analysis in Socio-Economic Research*, Tehran, Sharif.
32. Coleman, J. (1998), *Foundations of Social Theory*, Translated by Manouchehr Sabouri, Tehran, Ney Publications.
33. Giddens, A. (2007), *Sociology*, Translated by Hassan Chavoshian, Tehran, Ney Publications.
34. Lynch, K. (1995), *The Image of the City*, Translated by Manouchehr Mazini, Tehran University Press.

35. Madanipour, A. (2008), *Public and Private Urban Spaces*, Translated by Farshad Nourian, Tehran, Urban Planning and Programming Publications.
36. Madanipour, A. (2000), *Urban Space Design: An Approach to Social and Spatial Process*, Translated by Farhad Mortazaei, Tehran, Urban Planning and Programming Company Publications.
37. Mahmoudinejad, H. (2009), *Space and Place in Urban Design*, Helleh / Tahan Publications.
38. *Social Issues of Iran*, Iranian Sociological Association, Tehran, Agah, 2004.
39. Negahban, A., & Mostajeri, F. (2005, 2nd Printing), *Guide to Research Methods Using SPSS 11 Questionnaire*, Tehran, Jihad University Publications.
40. Nozari, H. (2002), *Revisiting Habermas (An Introduction to the Views, Thoughts, and Theories of Jürgen Habermas)*, Tehran, Cheshmeh Publications.
41. Naderi, E., Seif Naraghi, M., & Shahpourian, F. (2005), *Practical Guide to Developing a Research Proposal*, Tehran, Badr Research and Publications Office.
42. Naderi, F., & Abaft Yeganeh (2008), "Measuring the Framework for Assessing Social Capital in the Urban Structure with Emphasis on the Role of Public Spaces," *Urban Management Research Quarterly*, No. 1.
43. Habermas, J. (2005), *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, Translated by Jamal Mohammadi, Tehran, Afkar Publications.
44. Holub, R. (1999, 2nd Printing), *Jürgen Habermas (Critique in the Public Sphere)*, Translated by Hossein Bashiriyeh, Tehran, Ney Publications.