
Articles

Locating Leisure in the Social Capital Literature

Troy D. Glover
University of Waterloo
John L. Hemingway
Western Illinois University

The guest editors of this special issue on leisure and social capital review the seminal perspectives of Pierre Bourdieu, James Coleman, and Robert Putnam on social capital. The review is followed by the authors' interpretations of the theoretical relationship between leisure and social capital, after which the contributions to this special issue are introduced. The aim of this introduction is help readers appreciate not only the relevance of social capital to leisure research but also the potential contributions of leisure research to the continued development of social capital theory.

KEYWORDS: *Citizenship, conceptual rigor, leisure, social capital.*

Since the mid-1990s, the concept of social capital has captured the attention of academicians, policy makers, and even reporters. Scores of analyses, reviews, and critiques of social capital continue to appear in academic journals, government reports, monographs, and the mainstream press, demonstrating its widespread appeal as a socially relevant construct. Leisure studies has not been immune to this phenomenon. Beginning with Hemingway's (1999) examination of social capital as a primary linkage between leisure and democratic citizenship, leisure researchers have gradually, yet increasingly, focused on the connection between social capital and leisure (e.g., Arai, 2000; Arai & Pedlar, 2003; Blackshaw & Long, 2005; Glover, 2004a, 2004b; Hemingway, 2001; Jarvie, 2003; Rojek, 2002, 2005). Social capital has in fact been invoked as a central organizing concept in recent calls for new directions within the leisure studies. Arai and Pedlar (2003), for example, propose a communitarian conception of leisure and use social capital while examining the potential contributions of community structures to social cohesion, mutuality, and co-operation. Meanwhile, Rojek's (2005) action approach to leisure research would effectively shift the gaze of leisure researchers toward the roles of leisure forms and practices in enhancing social capital and active citizenship. Though questions rightly exist over inequalities in the

Address correspondence to: Troy D. Glover, Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, N2L 3G1. Email: tdglover@healthy.uwaterloo.ca.

Author Note: Troy Glover is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies at the University of Waterloo. John Hemingway is an Associate Professor in the Department of Recreation, Park and Tourism Management at Western Illinois University.

distribution of social capital (Glover, 2004b) and its relevance to policy (Blackshaw & Long, 2005), interest in social capital continues to build among leisure researchers, as indicated by its presence on the agenda of the 2004 SPRE Research Roundtable and on the program of the "Rethinking Leisure and Community Research" pre-conference held in conjunction with the 2005 Canadian Congress on Leisure Research.

Despite this increased attention, however, social capital remains surprisingly under-examined in leisure studies given the attention its connections with leisure have garnered in other fields (e.g., Putnam, 2000; Lindstrom, Moghaddassi & Merlo, 2003; Rohe, 2004; Warde & Tampubolon, 2002). This special issue is intended as a first step in remedying that situation through showcasing studies of social capital by researchers working in several often quite different areas of leisure research. We hope the issue will demonstrate the central role leisure plays in generating social capital while stimulating other leisure researchers to examine social capital.

We first provide a brief orientation to the concept by introducing the perspectives of three researchers who have made seminal contributions: Pierre Bourdieu, James Coleman, and Robert Putnam. This review is followed by a description of what we take to be the theoretical relation between leisure and social capital, after which we introduce the contributions to this special issue. It will be evident from our comments here and elsewhere that we are not always in agreement with the contributors or with each other. This conflict is as it should be in the early stages of any research agenda, especially one as dynamic as social capital. We trust nonetheless that readers will come to appreciate, as we have, not only the relevance of social capital to leisure research but also the potential contributions of leisure research to the continued development of social capital theory.

What is Social Capital?

In a superb review of the origins and various conceptualizations of social capital, Portes (1998) noted with some exasperation that "despite its current popularity, [social capital] does not embody any idea really new to sociologists" (p. 2). Portes identified the roots of social capital in classic sociology, particularly Durkheim's theory of social integration and the sanctioning capacity of group rituals (e.g., reciprocity exchanges) and Marx's analysis of emergent class consciousness (e.g., bounded solidarity). De Tocqueville's *Democracy in America* has also inspired social capital researchers (e.g., Putnam, 1993, p. 89), especially his argument that voluntary associations facilitate social integration and civic participation. Others have pointed to social capital's resonance with Aristotelian themes (e.g., Maynard & Kleiber, this issue; Hemingway, forthcoming). However rich the rewards of exploring the conceptual history of social capital, here we are better served by turning to the trio of scholars whose work has contributed most directly to the recent explosion of interest in the concept: Bourdieu, Coleman, and Putnam. The following comments are intended only as a general orientation for readers

unfamiliar with this background. Fuller discussions are readily available for those wishing to pursue the topic further (see *inter alia* Field, 2003; Halpern, 2005; Schuller, Baron, & Field, 2001).

Pierre Bourdieu

An iconoclast working at the intersection of several fields, sociology and anthropology most notably, Pierre Bourdieu explored the role of social structures in reproducing patterns of power and inequality. He was particularly interested in the contributions of social practices to mutual recognition of membership in social groups and classes, which he regarded as central to reinforcing the privileged positions of dominant groups. Bourdieu's treatment of social capital is thus embedded in his analysis of social power and its manipulation to preserve class and group interests.

Bourdieu sharply criticized those who used a narrowly economic conception of capital, arguing that in doing so they neglected the salience of other forms of capital to daily life. He recognized the centrality of economic capital but insisted that the reproduction of social power and inequality depended on transforming economic advantages into informational, cultural, and social forms. Bourdieu's categorization of capital was an evolving one, but it led him to what is among the most precise and useful definitions of social capital:

the aggregate of actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition—or in other words, to membership in a group—which provides each of its members with the backing of collectively-owned capital, a 'credential' which entitles them to credit, in the various senses of the word. (1985, pp. 248-49)

Social capital lies in the persistent social ties that enable a group to constitute, maintain, and reproduce itself. Such ties establish reasonably clear boundaries through mutual recognition and obligation. They also allow group members potential access to resources held by others in the group, thus enabling an individual to increase financial capital through loans or information from another group member, expand embodied cultural or informational capital through connections to experts and connoisseurs, or enhance institutionalized cultural capital by ties to organizations that bestow valued credentials and honorifics. Social capital is not an individual possession, as are other types of capital, but is instead the collective possession of those who are connected by social ties. How *much* social capital exists depends, in Bourdieu's view, on the extent of one's social ties, the size of the social networks in which one is located, the volume of resources held by other members of those networks, and network durability or persistence.

Bourdieu regarded social capital as purposive, a resource facilitating individual action by virtue of the individual's location within social networks and groups. Social capital can therefore be deliberately created through the construction of social ties, a point with implications for leisure research given

what Stebbins (2002) referred to as the organizational basis of leisure is characterized by sociability, a theme also singled out by Portes (1998). Indeed, Field (2003) observes that in *Distinction* (1984), a monumental study of French taste and culture, Bourdieu "furnished only one indicator of social capital: membership of golf clubs, which he held to be helpful in oiling the wheels of business life" (p. 14). This depiction of leisure as a resource people may exploit for instrumental purposes will not sit well with those who believe leisure must be intrinsically motivated or pursued only for its own sake. But if such purism is laudable, it is also at odds with the social contexts in which leisure is located. Such, at least, would be Bourdieu's view, for he insisted that social networks are not natural givens but must be constructed through investment strategies "consciously or unconsciously aimed at establishing or reproducing social relationships that are directly usable in the short or long term" (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 249).

Bourdieu's conceptualization of social capital has attracted only modest interest within the North American leisure research community, regrettably so because it is the most theoretically sound of the three views under consideration here. Leisure researchers have largely overlooked Bourdieu's contribution, choosing instead to emphasize the presumed positive effects of social capital generated during leisure. One reason for this inattention appears to rise from Coleman's assertion, in which he was followed by Putnam, that social capital has some of the properties associated with public goods.

James S. Coleman

In contrast to Bourdieu, who understood social capital as a resource deployed in defense of class distinctions and social power, James Coleman's interest in the concept arose from his work with underprivileged and disenfranchised groups. Coleman, a sociologist at the University of Chicago, used data from a large national sample of public school students in the U.S. to demonstrate that greater social capital considerably reduced the probability a student would drop out of high school (see Coleman, 1988). Concluding that supportive social networks affected high school graduation rates regardless of socio-economic status, Coleman argued that social capital was indispensable to the creation of human capital that might enable individuals to escape from disadvantaged circumstances.

In conceptualizing social capital, Coleman emphasized "social-structural resources" (1990, p. 302) that are "embodied in relations among people" (1988, p. S117). He framed his conceptualization in functional terms, noting that social capital is generated in "a variety of entities with two elements in common: They all consist of some aspect of social structures, and they facilitate certain action of actors who are within structure" (1990, p. 302). Coleman highlighted two features of social structures as particularly important (see 1988): closure, because it connects social actors in a network of obligations and corresponding sanctions; and appropriability, allowing an organization created for one purpose to be used for another.

Social capital may take six forms within social structures thus characterized (see Coleman, 1990). First, mutually acknowledged *obligations and expectations* provide incentives to invest in social relationships because investors trust that other members of the network will reciprocate. Second, social relations have *information potential* and thus enable individuals access to specialized or privileged information that others have obtained. Third, *norms and sanctions* encourage members to act for the group's collective good even if the action does not directly or immediately benefit the individual member. Fourth, *authority relations* transfer "rights of control" to from several group members to one member who may then employ the resulting extensive network access to achieve a specific goal. Fifth, an *appropriable social organization* is one that was developed for one purpose but may be appropriated for another. When this happens, the resources within the organization are also appropriated, along with access to them. Finally, *intentional organizations* bring people together to create a new entity which directly benefits them and others who invest in it, but also benefits others who are less immediately involved.

These benefits are perhaps the most significant feature of Coleman's approach to social capital. He regarded social capital as the by-product of purposive action intended to achieve other goals. Coleman believed social capital had public good characteristics because its consequences extend beyond those whose action is primary in generating it to affect all members of a social network or structure. The cooperation among actors pursuing their individual interests benefits not only them, but others in the social group(s) to which the actors belong. Coleman turned more and more to rational choice theory as a framework for social inquiry, drawing on both sociology and economics. Rational choice theory is predicated on the assumption that human action is motivated by self-interest. Consistent with this assumption, Coleman understood social interaction as a form of exchange, but rejected the characterization of individual human beings as "atomistic elements stripped of social relationships" (1988, p. S117). Social capital allowed Coleman to resolve the problem of human cooperation in circumstances when immediate self-interest seems best served by competition. Social capital allows individuals to gain access to otherwise unavailable resources through cooperative action in pursuit of individual goals.

Robert D. Putnam

The reputations of Bourdieu and of Coleman are substantial if also largely confined to academic circles (though early in his career Coleman contributed significantly to education policy debates as primary author of *Equality of Education Opportunity*, a major U.S. government study). Not so with Robert Putnam, the Harvard political scientist who has brought more attention to social capital than anyone and who reportedly was the most cited author of the 1990s. Putnam's initial contribution was *Making Democracy Work* (1993), a study of regional government reform in Italy and widely regarded

as a classic. Putnam and his associates found that the effectiveness of institutional reform and performance were strongly associated with the long-standing presence of dense networks of voluntary associations, particularly where these networks had encouraged norms of trust, reciprocity, and civic engagement. Drawing on de Tocqueville, Putnam argued that the most important form of network was the voluntary association. Regardless of the activities around which they were organized—guilds, cooperatives, sports clubs, literary societies, or bird watching clubs—participation in voluntary associations apparently strengthened civic bonds by bringing people together in cooperative activity. To Putnam, then, the matter was clear:

The harmonies of a choral society illustrate how voluntary collaboration can create value that no individual, no matter how wealthy, no matter how wily, could produce alone. In the civic community, associations proliferate, memberships overlap, and participation spills into multiple arenas of community life. The social contract that sustains such collaboration in the civic community is not legal but moral. The sanction for violating it is not penal, but exclusion from the network of solidarity and cooperation. Norms and expectations play an important role . . . A conception of one's role and obligations as citizen, coupled with a commitment to political equality, is the cultural cement of civic community (1993, p. 183).

The greater presence and longer history of these horizontal civic bonds in northern Italy sustained economic growth and institutional performance at levels generally much higher than in southern Italy, where vertically structured social and political relations prevailed. The success of regional government reform, Putnam concluded, could be explained by these regional differences. In language that has now become widely familiar, Putnam argued that voluntary cooperation is easier in communities with substantial stocks of social capital, defined as "features of social organization, such as trust, norms, and networks, that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating coordinated actions" (p. 167).

Putnam next applied the concept of social capital to the decline of civic engagement in his native United States. His 1995 article with the provocative title "Bowling Alone" (also the title of his later book) examined the consequences of declining voluntary association memberships in the U.S. for the civic engagement central to a democratic society and government. The lone bowler metaphor was not chosen idly. Not only may one understand a great deal about Putnam's argument by examining the photograph on the inside of the book's rear jacket (see Putnam, 2000), but the metaphor's almost homely directness spoke past Putnam's fellow academics to a wider audience of policy experts, politicians, and concerned citizens. Building from the title metaphor, Putnam observed that Americans had steadily become less likely to bowl in organized leagues and more likely to do so with friends, family, or even alone. Similar declines in formal memberships, Putnam claimed, were to be found in almost all types of voluntary association, including citizen boards, service clubs, and fraternal organizations. This troubled Putnam because

the rise of solo bowling threatens the livelihood of bowling-lane proprietors because those who bowl as members of leagues consume three times as much beer and pizza as solo bowlers, and the money in bowling is in the beer and pizza, not the balls and shoes. The broader social significance, however, lies in the social interaction and even occasionally civic conversations over beer and pizza that solo bowlers forgo. (Putnam, 1995, p. 70)

Putnam main concern was, of course, the latter point. He argued that organized league bowling and other associational memberships bring relative strangers together routinely and frequently, thus building and sustaining a larger set of social networks that nurture values like generalized trust and reciprocity, values that in turn facilitate social cooperation. Building on his finding that leisure and cultural associations were the primary form in Italy, Putnam has continued to argue that leisure-based voluntary associations, far from being marginal or trivial, are in fact primary sites for the generation of social capital essential for social cohesion.

"Bowling Alone" garnered a great deal of media attention and stimulated countless laments over America's weakened civic bonds and declining sense of community. Academic social scientists were skeptical, however, and some quickly challenged Putnam's evidence and conclusions. Critics pointed out that Putnam had elevated a particular set of historical circumstances and a historically specific type of voluntary association to archetypes while overlooking the emergence of new associational forms. As memberships in traditional associations waned, memberships in newly created associations waxed. If fewer people joined the Odd Fellows, more joined the Sierra Club. To his credit, Putnam was attentive to the critics and in 2000 responded with *Bowling Alone*, an impressive as well as massive survey of research that appeared to confirm (1) the erosion of American social and civic engagement and (2) the heavy costs imposed by this damage to the social fabric. For example, Putnam (2000) pointed out:

We spend less time in conversation over meals, we exchange visits less often, we engage less often in leisure activities that encourage casual social interaction, we spend more time watching (admittedly, some of it in the presence of others) and less time doing. We know our neighbors less well, and we see old friends less often. In short, it is not merely 'do good' civic activities that engage us less, but also informal connecting. (p. 115)

He also reported data indicating that the costs imposed by weaker social bonds occur in such possibly unexpected forms as poor health, including depression, nervous breakdowns, ulcers and heart attacks. People with fewer social ties are also less likely to vote or trust their neighbors, and more likely to litigate or give motorists the finger. Though now defining social capital in more structural terms, Putnam did not waiver in his argument that the bonds developed through voluntary membership are fundamental to civic and social well-being.

Not surprisingly, criticism persists (e.g., McLean, Schultz, & Steger, 2002). The greatest challenge remains specifying the mechanism by which

the effects of voluntary association membership on social capital occur and the extent of those effects. Skepticism is highest regarding the consequences of memberships in leisure-based voluntary associations. In Etzioni's (2000) words:

What truly remains to be documented is what people talk about when they bowl, play bridge or chess, or go bird watching together. I grant that all are occasions in which people reinforce their friendships. However, I am less confident that they also are the places where people shore up their moral commitments, talk about basic moral questions, such as what is right and wrong, or encourage each other to be better than they would be otherwise—things that are essential prerequisites of a good society. (para 16)

Putnam has his defenders, however. Among them is Williamson (2002), who observes that "Some will find it all too easy to mock Putnam's fascination with bowling leagues and card games, but the trends he describes also refer to social institutions commonly associated with the working class (such as socializing in taverns)—as well as to political engagement itself" (p. 809). Putnam's work raises questions of fundamental interest to leisure researchers, along with fundamental challenges. The field's response remains uncertain.

Leisure and Social Capital: The Case of Citizenship

The juxtaposition of Etzioni's and Williamson's comments reflects several of the fault lines in the social capital literature, already evident in our discussion of Bourdieu, Coleman, and Putnam. These fault lines indicate differences among conceptualizations of social capital. Inattention to the significance of these differences threatens the prospects for social capital research in leisure studies and elsewhere. More than with most social science concepts, how one conceptualizes social capital fundamentally shapes the questions one then asks and the answers to them. Conceptual rigor is imperative.

To illustrate this point, we organize the following discussion around leisure, social capital, and citizenship. Doing so has the twin advantages of narrowing an otherwise almost unmanageable topic while addressing prominent themes in social capital research. To simplify matters still further, we adopt Woolcock's (2003) distinction between two related yet clearly distinct approaches to social capital. The first approach concentrates on the resources (e.g., information, ideas, support) available to individuals in their social networks (see Glover, Parry, & Shinew, this issue; Harshaw & Tindall, this issue). Researchers have, for example, studied the use of social ties in finding employment or advancing a career (e.g., Burt, 2005; Lin, 2001) and the effects of social structural constraints on individuals or groups (e.g., Bebbington, 2002; Portes & Landolt, 1996; Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993). Social capital is conceived in the *resources approach* much as Bourdieu did, as access to resources available within social networks, resources that are used in purposive action to establish or maintain individual and group advantages. The settings for such action may be a firm or other formal organization, a

community and its social or political structures, or classes and other social groups.

The second approach examines the types and extent of individual involvement in formal organizations and in informal social structures like discussion networks, focusing specifically on their civic content and extrapolating from this to assess the civic health of groups, communities, regions, and entire countries. This *civic approach* is probably the more common one in the social capital literature and is certainly more familiar in leisure studies (e.g., Maynard & Kleiber, this issue; Yuen, Pedlar, & Mannell, this issue). Putnam's dominant influence is clearly visible in the civic approach, which lumps together active citizenship, civic engagement, and civic virtue. Thus where the resources approach places greater emphasis on social structures like networks and social roles, the civic approach turns to cultural norms like generalized trust and reciprocity.

Etzioni's scepticism about the extent to which social capital is generated in leisure-based organizations is informed by the civic approach just described. Etzioni does not challenge the civic value of social capital in general, but points instead to Putnam's difficulty in specifying the mechanisms by which social capital is transferred from leisure to civic settings. The issue of transferability is a difficulty with which all social capital research must contend, but it is particularly acute for the civic approach. Hemingway (1999) addressed the issue by suggesting that both the generation of social capital in leisure and its transferability to civic engagement will be affected by the kinds of leisure in which individuals participate and how leisure services are organized and delivered. He suggested that the more autonomy people have during leisure and the more leisure contributes to fuller development of individual capacities, the more social capital would be generated and the more transferable it would be. Hemingway went on to speculate that to the extent autonomous individuals participate in creating their leisure, rather than simply consuming it, the more likely it is that the resulting social capital will contribute to what he called strong citizenship (see also Reid, 1995). The question is not *if* leisure is associated with civically relevant social capital, but what kinds of leisure in what kinds of settings (a question taken up from a resource perspective in Hemingway, forthcoming). And, indeed, Glover (2002) found just such a relationship in his analysis of citizenship orientations and participants' exposure to traditional, market, and co-production models of leisure service provision.

But are citizenship and social capital two parts of one general concept, as the civic approach seems to suggest? This question leads immediately to two others. First, what grounds do we have for expecting citizenship to be affected by leisure? Second, does the civic approach in fact help us answer this question better than the resources approach? Each question must be answered if we are to make a case that leisure has a role in creating social capital generally and for civic engagement specifically.

The civic approach conceives the link between social capital and citizenship as norms of behaviour learned in one context (e.g., leisure) and then generalized to other contexts, citizenship among them. There is a ten-

dency in the civic approach to conflate social capital with the purposes for which it is used, its presumed consequences, and the norms informing both purposes and consequences. This tendency creates serious conceptual difficulty in dealing with something as broad as citizenship, which extends considerably beyond social capital (see Adam and Roncevic, 2003). We can begin to overcome this difficulty by identifying two related approaches to citizenship, as we did with social capital. Citizenship may be understood as a juridical status that establishes eligibility to participate in civic and political processes and entitlement to legal rights and protections. It may also be understood as a socially constructed set of practices including various forms of civic and political participation, each with formal and informal dimensions, that occur with varying frequencies and durations, require varying resource mixes and competence levels (e.g., knowledge, information, skill), reflect varying levels of ideological or partisan intensity, and so on. Significantly, the socially constructed class of citizens will always be a smaller subset of the juridical class (an observation based on Shklar, 1991).

Social capital is most relevant to citizenship understood in this second sense, as a set of socially constructed practices. However broad the range of these practices, there will be certain underlying commonalities. All will have some degree of social structure in which particular conceptions of the social role of citizen will be embedded, with specific role expectations attached. Citizenship in this sense is very much like membership in any social structure, particularly membership in structures that have a more institutionalized or formal character. This factor might explain the greater clarity in the expressions of citizenship as obligation, responsibility, and community that Glover (2004a) found among community center volunteers, in contrast to the vaguer, more diffuse expressions commonly reported in less structured settings. It may be that we here begin to find the resource and civic approaches coming together in a way that suggests a central role for leisure in the creation and maintenance of social capital.

The conceptual core of social capital is the fact of membership in what Bourdieu (1986) described as "a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintanceship and recognition" (p. 248). Thus we find Putnam (2000) now emphasizing "connections among individuals—social networks and the norms . . . that arise from them" (p. 19). These norms may constitute civic virtue, Putnam acknowledges, but they will be "most powerful when embedded in a dense network of reciprocal social relations" (p. 19). The advantages conferred by social capital exist only insofar as one is recognized as a member of such a network by other members and recognizes them in return. Reciprocity exists not as a general cultural norm, but rather as an expectation attached to membership in a specific network. Note that there is neither inherent equality *between* networks in the resources they make available to their members, nor inherent equality of access among members *within* any specific network. The serious implications this inequality has for the consequences of social capital in a democratic society must be examined. The most fundamental issue, however, is the con-

tinued existence and maintenance of social networks themselves, for if a social network weakens or disappears, whatever social capital existed within it also weakens or disappears.

Social capital exists in the social ties among people; it is a consequence of social structure. Referring to it as a process, as is sometimes done, is therefore a bit misleading. Yet the social ties in which social capital exists are not natural givens or static. The creation and maintenance of social capital depends on the creation and maintenance of social ties, that is, on building relationships among people. Unlike other forms of capital, social capital expands with use but disappears without continuing investment: "social relationships will die out if not maintained; expectations and obligations wither over time; and norms depend on regular communication" (Coleman, 1990, p. 321). A sense of social capital's fragility, its susceptibility to decay through neglect, creates the urgency in Putnam's (2000) insistence that "What really matters from the point of view of social capital and civic engagement is not merely nominal membership, but active and involved membership" (p. 58). Face-to-face interaction is central to the creation of social capital and its long-term survival. If social capital is about anything, it is about what Portes (1998) called "the positive consequences of sociability" (p. 2).

Here lies opportunity and challenge for leisure researchers and professionals. Human beings are social, relational beings, as Aristotle pointed out long ago (*Politics*, 1253a) and as communitarian-minded scholars have continued to remind us (Arai & Pedlar, 2003; Etzioni, 1998; Pedlar, 1996). The self does not exist in isolation, unencumbered by history, culture, or society (Sandel, 1984; see also Hemingway, 1996, p. 29) or relationships with others. People are drawn to activities and settings that are social in nature. It is no surprise that sociability is a central component of leisure, both structurally and motivationally (see, e.g., Caldwell & Andereck, 1994; Crandall, Nolan & Morgan, 1980; Fine, 1989; Iso-Ahola, 1980; Mannell & Kleiber, 1997; Stebbins, 2002). Leisure can therefore be a significant arena for the sociability on which social capital depends, a point not lost on community development specialists (e.g., Green & Haines, 2002; Rohe, 2004). Leisure can be as purposeful as other forms of activity, but it is less likely to be instrumental. To the extent this holds true, leisure provides opportunities for more unfettered social interaction, the creation of potentially richer social ties in which social capital can be generated. This possibility is well worth exploring by leisure researchers. Sociability also characterizes leisure-based activity in formal organizations, even those that are instrumental in nature. The "solidary" rewards of organizational membership help explain activists' willingness to bear costs in pursuit of civic and political goals disproportionate to any instrumental rewards they personally receive and why some people are more readily mobilized for civic or political action (see, e.g., McCarthy & Zald, 1977; Smith, 2000; Warde, Tampubolon, & Savage, this issue; Wilson, 1973). Here, too, is a possibly rich topic for leisure research.

Sociability is not the only dimension along which leisure activity might have consequences for the social capital necessary to sustain effective citi-

zenship. It is, however, the one most familiar to leisure researchers and thus a reasonable starting point, as the contributions to this special issue will confirm. We are persuaded that leisure plays significant roles in the generation and maintenance of the social capital essential to the fullest realization of human capacities on many levels. At the same time, however, we are well aware that social capital has a dark side, that it may strengthen undesirable social networks and lock people into situations from which they would much prefer to escape. Passivity in leisure may destroy the relational basis for social capital just as readily as active forms of leisure build it up. These and other issues await the field's attention.

Introduction to the Contributors

The articles that follow address some but not all of the issues raised in our introductory remarks. The purpose of this special issue is therefore not only to report leisure research on social capital, but also to encourage more of it. The contributors come from a broad range of backgrounds and examine social capital from an equally broad array of perspectives. Their work shows considerable ingenuity in applying the concept of social capital in leisure research. The contributors are more than capable of speaking for themselves, and we will let them do so. Still, we would be remiss if this introduction closed without providing readers a hint of what lies ahead.

Warde, Tampubolon, and Savage focus on the role of informal leisure activities (e.g., being invited to someone's house, drinking and eating socially) in social capital formation among members of local political associations. Interestingly, they found that participation in such activities did not reflect the social homophily often reported in the literature. Their conclusion that informal social contacts may be particularly important in generating bridging and boundary-spanning social capital poses intriguing questions for further research.

Harshaw and Tindall consider social capital within the context of recreational forest land-use planning. Their discussion highlights the role of social structure in shaping identities and environmental values tied to forests. Among their findings is the positive relationship between range of social ties and identity diversity and the relative importance of strong social ties in explaining identity formation and diversity of forest values. They call for more representation of diverse outdoor and natural resource identities in the forest planning and management.

Glover, Parry, and Shinew take aim at resource mobilization in grassroots associations by examining how social relationships formed within community garden settings facilitate access to resources by community garden leaders. Their findings confirm the importance of leisure in building strong social ties, leading them to argue that leisure is a social lubricant for social capital generation.

Maynard and Kleiber examine retirees and those approaching retirement age, asking whether the retirement years offer possibilities for civic and

community engagement previously excluded during adulthood. They introduce Aristotelian notions of leisure, community, and friendship into the discussion of social capital to suggest a framework for redesigning contemporary community leisure services for more effective creation of social capital. In this way, they argue, public leisure service agencies can play a critical role in fostering community involvement among older adults.

Finally, Yuen, Pedlar and Mannell investigate social capital development among young international campers at Pangea Village, a program organized by Children's International Summer Villages. Drawing on participant observation, visual representations, and in depth interviews, the authors trace the contributions of leisure to an emerging sense of community and social capital among the campers.

It remains only to thank the contributors for their hard work, the many outstanding reviewers for their assistance, and the Editor for his support of this special issue. Now we look forward to the intensified discussion of leisure and social capital that we hope the following articles will stimulate.

References

- Adam, F., & Roncevic, B. (2003). Social capital: Recent debates and research trends. *Social Science Information*, 42, 155-183.
- Arai, S. (2000). A typology of volunteers for a changing sociopolitical context: The impact on social capital, citizenship and civil society. *Loisir et Société/Society and Leisure*, 23, 327-352.
- Arai, S., & Pedlar, A. (2003). Moving beyond individualism in leisure theory: A critical analysis of concepts of community and social engagement. *Leisure Studies*, 22, 185-202.
- Bebbington, A. (2002). Sharp knives and blunt instruments: Social capital in development studies. *Antipode*, 34, 800-803.
- Blackshaw, T., & Long, J. (2005). What's the big idea? A critical exploration of the concept of social capital and its incorporation into leisure policy discourse. *Leisure Studies*, 24, 239-258.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgment of taste*. London: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). New York: Greenwood.
- Burt, R. (2005). *Brokerage and closure: An introduction to social capital*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Caldwell, L., & Andereck, K. (1994). Motives for initiating and continuing membership in recreation-related voluntary association. *Leisure Sciences*, 16, 33-44.
- Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94 (Suppl.), S94-S120.
- Coleman, J. S. (1990). *Foundations of social theory*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.
- Crandall, R., Nolan, M., & Morgan, L. (1980). Leisure and social interaction. In S. E. Iso-Ahola (Ed.), *Social psychological perspectives on leisure and recreation* (pp. 285-306). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher.
- Etzioni, A. (1998). Introduction. In E. Etzioni (Ed.), *The essential communitarian reader* (pp. ix-xxiv). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Etzioni, A. (2000). *Book review: Community as we know it*. Available online at: <http://speakout.com/activism/opinions/2865-1.html>
- Field, J. (2003). *Social capital*. New York: Routledge.
- Fine, G. A. (1989). Mobilizing fun: Provisioning resources in leisure worlds. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 6, 319-334.

- Glover, T. D. (2004a). The 'community' center and the social construction of citizenship. *Leisure Sciences*, 26, 63-83.
- Glover, T. D. (2004b). Social capital in the lived experiences of community gardeners. *Leisure Sciences*, 26, 143-162.
- Glover, T. D. (2002). Citizenship and the production of public recreation: Is there an empirical relationship? *Journal of Leisure Research*, 34, 204-231.
- Green, G. P., & Haines, A. (2002). *Asset building and community development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Halpern, D. (2005). *Social capital*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hemingway, J. L. (forthcoming). Leisure, social capital, and civic competence. *Loisir/Leisure: Journal of the Canadian Association for Leisure Studies*.
- Hemingway, J. L. (2001). What goes around comes around: Teaching for and about social and human capital in leisure studies. *Schole*, 16, 1-13.
- Hemingway, J. L. (1999). Leisure, social capital, and democratic citizenship. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 31, 150-165.
- Hemingway, J. L. (1996). Emancipating leisure: The recovery of freedom in leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 28, 27-43.
- Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1980). *The social psychology of leisure and recreation*. Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers.
- Jarvie, G. (2003). Communitarianism, sport and social capital: Neighbourly insights into Scottish Sport. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 38, 139-153.
- Lin, N. (2001). *Social capital: A theory of social structure and action*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lindstrom, M., Moghaddassi, M., & Merlo, J. (2003). Social capital and leisure time physical activity: A population based multilevel analysis in Malmo, Sweden. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 57, 23-28.
- Mannell, R. C., & Kleiber, D. A. (1997). *A social psychology of leisure*. State College, PA: Venture.
- McCarthy, J. D., & Zald, M. N. (1977). Resource mobilization and social movements: A partial theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82, 1212-1241.
- McLean, S. L., Schultz, D. A., & Steger, M. B. (Eds.) (2002). *Social capital: Critical perspectives on community and "Bowling Alone"*. New York: New York University Press.
- Pedlar, A. (1996). Community development: what does it mean for recreation and leisure? *Journal of Applied Recreation Research*, 21, 5-23.
- Portes, A. (1998). Social capital: Its origins and applications in modern sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, 1-24.
- Portes, A., & Landolt, P. (1996). The downside of social capital. *American Prospect*, 26, 18-21, 94.
- Portes, A. & Sensenbrenner, J. (1993). Embeddedness and immigration: Notes on the social determinants of economic action. *American Journal of Sociology*, 98, 1320-1350.
- Putnam, R. D. (with Leonardi, R., & Nanetti, R. Y.). (1993). *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Putnam, R. D. (1995). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Journal of Democracy*, 6, 65-78.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Reid, D. (1995). *Work and leisure in the 21st century: From production to citizenship*. Toronto: Wall and Emerson.
- Rohe, W. M. (2004). Building social capital through community development. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 70, 143-144.
- Rojek, C. (2002). Civil labour, leisure and post work society. *Loisir et société/Society and Leisure*, 25, 21-35.

- Rojek, C. (2005). An outline of the action approach to leisure studies. *Leisure Studies*, 24, 13-25.
- Sandel, M. J. (1984). The procedural republic and the unencumbered self. *Political Theory*, 12, 81-96.
- Schuller, T., Baron, S., & Field, J. (2001). Social capital: A review and critique. In S. Baron, J. Field, & T. Schuller (Eds.), *Social Capital: Critical perspectives* (pp. 1-38). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shklar, J. N. (1991). *American citizenship: The quest for inclusion*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Smith, D. H. (2000). *Grassroots associations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stebbins, R. A. (2002). *The organizational basis of leisure participation: A motivational exploration*. State College, PA: Venture.
- Warde, A., & Tamboulon, G. (2002). Social capital, networks, and leisure consumption. *The Sociological Review*, 50, 155-180.
- Williamson, T. (2002). The usefulness—and limitations—of social capital as an analytical tool for progressives. *Antipode*, 34, 809-811.
- Wilson, J. Q. (1973). *Political organizations*. New York: Basic Books.
- Woolcock, M. (2003). Social capital. In K. Christensen, & D. Levinson (Eds.), *Encyclopaedia of community* (pp. 1258-1262). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.