Journal of Leisure Research
2010, Vol. 42, No.2, pp. 221–242

Creating Community at the Farm: A Contested Concept

Rudy Dunlap
Texas A & M University

Corey W. Johnson
The University of Georgia

Abstract

This ethnography explores the competing concepts of community that are deployed within the context of a communal farm. Residents of the Farm articulate oppositional concepts of community that are based on familial and instrumental relationships. The concepts of *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* are utilized to better understand the manner in which these discourses manifest themselves in the lived experiences of Farm residents. The contradictory nature of these conceptualizations suggests that the concept of community cannot be treated as a monolithic reality within scholarly inquiry.

KEYWORDS: Community, farming, ethnography, discourse, leisure

9:00 p.m., A Tuesday Evening in July

"Has anyone seen George?" The screened door had not even—thwacked—before he finished his question.

"Nope."

"Not since this morning."

"I told him we were meeting tonight at nine." Mosey sounded mildly annoyed as he stood in the middle of the kitchen. Mosey had been working on a home remodeling project for the past week and he now looked as if he had just come from the job site. His blue jeans were dusty and stained and his orange t-shirt had seen better days. Mosey took out his mobile phone and disappeared into the hallway that led back to the house's bedrooms.

His tone added to my anxiety about this meeting. Mosey had called me yesterday afternoon and informed me that we were having a "family meeting" tonight. He didn't say what the meeting was about, but I had a feeling it had

---

The data and findings in this manuscript have been generated from the first author's dissertation.

Send correspondence to: Rudy Dunlap, Recreation, Park & Tourism Sciences, Texas A&M University, 2261 TAMU, College Station, TX 77843-2261. E-mail: rdunlap@ag.tamu.edu

something to do with me. For several years as a graduate student, I had entertained the idea of studying a community for my dissertation, and George, our missing roommate, had provided me with the opportunity to do so. Knowing of my interests, George had casually suggested that I consider visiting the communal farm that he and six others called home. I did so and immediately embraced the idea of exploring the Farm for a study on community. In particular, I believed the Farm offered a unique context to describe how groups of individuals who purport to be a community manifest that concept in their daily lives. Having gained the approval of the Farm's residents to pursue my research, I had finally moved out to the Farm about a month ago. I was conducting ethnographic research, which entailed living on the Farm in a small camper and to the extent permissible, participating as a member of the community. During my short stay at the Farm, I had not knowingly exchanged so much as a cross word or grimace with my new neighbors. Perhaps tonight's meeting was the result of having violated an unspoken rule or norm of communal behavior. Regardless, as a member of the community and as an ethnographer, I welcomed this opportunity to explore the Farm's communal norms.

I turned back to Wendy who was sitting across the table from me. "You were saying?"

"I was saying? Oh yeah, I think this is the simplest bread recipe I've ever made. You don't even have to knead the dough." Wendy passed a worn piece of white paper to me that contained hand-written instructions for making bread. "Feel free to make a copy," she said.

The Farm was actually a community supported agriculture (CSA) farm and Wendy was one of the co-managers of this operation. As opposed to funneling their harvest into the industrial agriculture system, CSAs such as the Farm sell fresh, organic produce directly to local consumers. CSAs utilize a seasonal shareholder system in which individuals purchase a "share in the farm" at the beginning of the growing season and in exchange receive large, weekly deliveries of produce. In cooperation with Bernie, her co-manager, Wendy gave her full energies to the Farm's prosperity.

Mosey returned to the kitchen. "I didn't get George, but I've left him a message. We won't wait for him, so if you all want to get started with dinner, go ahead. I'm going to grab a quick shower and then I'll join you." Mosey disappeared from the kitchen again.

The Farm house's upper floor is explicitly divided into a public space, which consists of the kitchen, dining area, and family room, and a private space, including its bedrooms and bathrooms. The kitchen is roughly a ten-by-ten foot square that is framed on three sides by cabinets and appliances. The kitchen's contents are an eclectic and organic mix of bought and shared dishes and appliances. The upper cabinets' doors have been removed for ease of access and their shelves are filled items such as vegetarian cookbooks, spices, and a sizable collection of unlabeled glass bottles containing untold liquids. The kitchen's appearance is unpretentious and bespeaks a life of continual and communal use.

The kitchen opens onto the house's dining area where Wendy and I sat. Loosely separated from the house's family room by a two-and-a-half foot tall

brick wall, the dining area is dominated by two large wooden tables. The table closest to the kitchen is approximately six feet long and three feet wide and built of solid wood that has been stained to a light oak color. Sitting end to end, the other table, stained a dark walnut color, is almost eight feet long and as wide as its companion. Each is covered in a patina of tiny dents and scratches, giving one the impression that if tables could talk, these two would have good stories to tell.

Wendy rose from the table and set about slicing a loaf of bread. "This is George's bread, but I'm going to trade him for a portion of the loaf I just bought. Since it's older, I want to use his before it gets stale." Wendy's comments suggested that in addition to serving as a witness to this transaction, I was also silently affirming her decision. I had not been at the Farm very long, but I knew already that food, its ownership and use, were ongoing topics of negotiation amongst community members.

I turned to look out the dining area's large picture window that framed the sun as it set behind the Farm's gardens and forest. The heat of the day had begun to dissipate outside, but lingered on inside the house. The overhead fan provided relief and distraction, but I found it comfortable to move as little as possible. I took a moment to enjoy the setting sun and the scene before me.

By nine-thirty Mosey had cleaned himself up and the three of us were sitting at the walnut colored table sharing a plate of bruschetta. The tomatoes, basil, and garlic in the bruschetta had been grown at the Farm. The basil's tanginess, the romas' sweet acidity, the garlic's bite, and the subtle sourness of the bread combined to create an experience that was definitely greater than the sum of its parts. We sat in silence for a moment, the only sounds being those of toasted bread crunching between our teeth. I would have been content to feast exclusively on bruschetta for my dinner. As we quietly savored these "fruits of the Farm," the scent of a pizza heating in the oven began to fill the room.

Mosey finished his bruschetta, washed it down with some Red Stripe, and looked over his glasses at me. "Okay, let's get down to business."

.....

Introduction

The popularity of Robert Putnam's (2000) *Bowling Alone* and its conceptualization of social capital have resulted in a healthy proliferation of scholarly inquiry focused on community. Despite speaking positively about community, the majority of such inquiry has failed to further our understanding of the concept itself (Day, 2002; Pedlar & Haworth, 2003). Implicit references to community in scholarship typically treat it as one of three concepts: a geographically defined space, 2) a social network, or 3) a particular type of relationship (Day, 2006). Just as frequently, community is referred to in a manner that presumes all three conceptualizations.

Gerald Creed (2006) has argued that this tendency to gloss over the concept of community may actually obscure, rather than illuminate, that which scholars seek to understand.

> What actually defines a group of people as a community is rarely, if ever, specified, and even when it is, the proffered definitions are rarely adopted by others. This is because the term has become part of the commonsensical way we understand and navigate the world. Community does not *need* defining, and this is precisely why scholars need to pay attention to it. Such common notions reveal the taken-for-granted understandings of the world that are so internalized and routinized as to escape comment and specification. It is essential, then, to look inside this seemingly transparent term and discover the associations that are, as it were, hidden in plain view. (p. 3-4)

Creed's admonition demands a more nuanced engagement of the concept of community. An exclusively deductive approach, entailing the application of one of the three concepts described above, only further obscures community by shifting the act of description to second order concepts. Creed's charge to scholars requires a contextualized description and interpretation of phenomena, such as the Farm. As opposed to merely being pedantic, such explorations create opportunities to understand community as a dynamic, contingent, and ambiguous phenomenon.

In light of such a claim, the present manuscript describes and interprets the manner in which individuals associated with a communal farm, called The Farm, define the concept of community for themselves. Guiding the endeavor, we asked: What cultural norms and practices, especially leisure practices, do participants identify as being constitutive of community at the Farm? How do those features of the Farm's micro-culture contrast and compare with relevant scholarly conceptualizations of community? Finally, what are the implications of the Farm's unique manifestation of community for future inquiry?

In addressing these research questions, we examine relevant scholarship and theory related to the concept of community, especially within leisure studies. We proceed with a description of our ethnography, detailing methods of data collection and analysis. Finally, we represent and interpret members' competing conceptualizations of community. All of these elements are woven together using the Family Meeting narrative that was introduced above. This analytic narrative has been carefully constructed from field notes and interview transcripts to represent the Farm members' conceptualizations of community. In so doing, this study is exemplary of so-called *new ethnography* (Ellis & Bochner, 1996; Madison, 2005), a theoretical perspective that recognizes the presence and inherent influence of the researcher within the research context. This epistemological and methodological stance is reflected by our use of first person voice and narrative. Despite being a collaborative effort, "I" denotes the thoughts of first author, who was primarily responsible for the data collection, while "we" includes the participation of the second author.

.....

Mosey and Wendy sat across from me at the table. In many respects, the three of us were a study in contrasts. I am five foot nine and Mosey is well over six feet tall. He has a mass of brown, wild, curly hair which is complemented

by a short goatee. My hair is short, straight, and red. Mosey is tanned; I am fair and freckled. With his rimless glasses on, Mosey looks like reincarnated beatnik sans turtleneck. Turning to Wendy her shorter stature was apparent, even when seated. She has straight brown hair that has been streaked by the sun with honey brown highlights. Her long hair would fall well below her shoulders were it not put up in a ponytail. Her tank top exposes Wendy's petite, yet muscular physique, which is no doubt the result of hours spent picking, planting, and hauling. Wendy and I looked at Mosey, waiting to hear what sort of "business" he wanted to discuss.

"As the first order of business, I move that Wendy be made to conduct the meeting," Mosey declared.

"Second," I exclaimed.

"Objections? None, great, motion carries. Wendy, next item on the docket?" Mosey asked.

"Hey!" Wendy objected.

"Just kidding," Mosey raised a hand as if protecting himself from attack. "Seriously though, it does always seem as if I'm put in charge."

"Tough," countered Wendy.

"Okay, then." Mosey turned his attention to me. "In the past we've had little orientation meetings when new folks arrive at the Farm."

"Okay," I agreed.

The Farm's other members, George, Rowdy, and Bernie were not present for a variety of reasons. When I had been told earlier that the "family meeting" would only consist of Wendy, Mosey, and me, I suspected that the meeting was not really about family; in actuality, this meeting was about me and my newly established residence at the Farm.

"We think that beginning this dialogue early on makes our little community function more smoothly. So we're going to go over some ground rules tonight," Mosey explained.

.....

Theoretical Perspective

The idea of community has been a perennial feature of leisure scholarship, and rightly so, given leisure's historical treatment as a communal experience (Arai & Pedlar, 2003; Hemingway, 1988; Hunnicutt, 2000). A considerable amount of scholarship has explored the manner in which leisure services and experiences have affected various communities. Among others, these explorations include inquiries into community health (Arai & Pedlar, 1997), sense of place (Kruger, 2006; Stedman, Amsden & Kruger, 2006; Stokowski, 2002), community development (Mair, 2006; Pedlar 1996, 2006), and social capital (Arai, 2006; DeGraaf & Jordan, 2003; Glover, 2004a, b, 2006; Glover, Shinew, & Parry, 2005; Hemingway, 1999, 2006; Maynard & Kleiber, 2005). As alluded to above (Creed, 2006), the majority of this scholarship has glossed over an explicit exploration of the concept of community, preferring instead to focus attention on the manner in which leisure services ought to function within communities.

In their review of leisure and community scholarship, Glover and Stewart (2006) captured this omission by distinguishing between inquiries that are guided by "community *recreation*" as compared to "*community* recreation." The former, which is the more conventional of the two, focuses on the manner in which leisure services occur within a given community. In this instance, community serves only as a conceptual backdrop for the study of recreation and leisure activities. In contrast, *community* recreation focuses on the manner in which recreation and leisure affect the very notion of what it means to be a community. This distinction functions as an important heuristic for examining leisure scholarship related to community.

As discussed above, the community *recreation* (Glover & Stewart, 2006) approach to inquiry takes for granted the seemingly commonsensical concept of community. Such approaches to scholarship tacitly use conceptualizations that treat community as a geographic space, a social network, a shared purpose, or a psychological construct (Day, 2006). Such assumptions ignore the changing nature of the idea and phenomena of community itself. When one speaks of leisure services' effect on community, which of the preceding concepts is being used?

For example, numerous scholars have asserted that leisure service agencies may benefit communities by increasing their stocks of social capital (Arai, 2006; DeGraaf & Jordan, 2003; Glover, 2004a, b, 2006; Glover, Shinew, & Parry, 2005; Hemingway, 1999, 2006; Maynard & Kleiber, 2005). The assumption underlying such an argument is that leisure services will create bridges between individuals that cross social divisions (Coleman, 1988; Putnam, 1995, 2000). This may in fact be the case, but without specification, how can scholars hope to describe and understand the interplay of leisure and community?

As opposed to glossing over the concept, *community* recreation (Glover & Stewart, 2006) assumes that the concept of community is itself contingent and subject to continuous re-production via practices such as recreation and leisure. The *community* recreation conceptualization supports the contention that community is a powerful symbolic construction (Cohen, 1985; Day, 2002; Turner, 1977) and that recreation and leisure practices are but two of the many domains in which community is re-produced. Thus *community* recreation may manifest in a variety of domains (Cook, 2003). Activities such as sporting events allow participants to construct community via an us-versus-them display. Perhaps more enduring than such symbolic contests is the recreation of community via the construction of civic places, such as farmer's markets, fairgrounds, or town squares. Thus, as opposed to community serving as a context for recreation, recreation serves as the context in which community is created.

As with all social processes and cultural practices, the re-construction of community through leisure is fraught with power inequities. Among its numerous benefits, the *community* recreation approach to inquiry more readily facilitates analyses of power inequities (Glover & Stewart, 2006). In her review of its detrimental uses, Joseph (2002) explained that "the term *community* is [used] to refer to social practices that presume or attempt to enact and produce identity, unity, communion, and purity,…and a diverse range of oppressions, including but by no means limited to genocidal violence" (p. xviii-xix). In the extreme, the nationalist

sense of community has been used to rationalize genocidal practices in the Nazi regime and the apartheid policies of South Africa. Less extreme, the term community is often used to construct particular identity categories with characteristics that simultaneously exclude certain individuals while including others.

Glover's (2004b) exploration of racial and class privilege in a community gardening setting, and Johnson and Samdahl's (2005) depiction of misogyny in a country-western gay bar provide examples of such exclusionary uses of the concept of community in everyday life. In each, leisure practices, such as gardening and visiting a bar, were examined as tools with which participants created community. In the gardening context, affluent, white residents defined community as participation in gardening activities that were fraught with numerous social and physical hazards for residents of color. Similarly, gay male bar patrons used gender, space, and sexuality in an effort to exclude lesbian patrons from their community. In both instances, the concept of community itself was in dispute and contingent upon participants' use of various leisure practices. Similar examples include explorations of white privilege in Little League baseball (Glover, 2007) and the construction of oppositional identities through music production (Lashua, 2006).

The present exploration of community aligns itself with such inquiries and with the *community* recreation approach to inquiry. Consequently, it examines the manner in which members of a communal farm articulate different conceptualizations of community in their day-to-day lives.

.....

With the stated intention of keeping the Farm community functioning smoothly, Wendy, Mosey, and I spent the next half hour sharing laundry lists of our personal pet peeves related to communal living.

"If a bedroom door's closed, don't even bother knocking," Mosey explained.

"Buy some toilet paper every once in while," Wendy implored.

"Don't eat my leftover pizza," Mosey asked.

"Oh, that's just wrong," I agreed.

"Thank you!" Mosey said with vindication.

Mosey explained to me that the kitchen fridge utilized a system of assigned shelves for each person. The lowest shelf was the "communal shelf" and food items placed on it were free for the taking. We all agreed that "direct communication" regarding disagreements was most appreciated. Additionally, as one of the CSA co-managers, Wendy explained that she especially did not appreciate people using tools without asking.

"Unless you want to use the weedeater or the lawnmower," Mosey said with a snicker.

Having shared these thoughts with one another, we settled back into our dinner. That wasn't so bad, I thought to myself. However, I had assumed incorrectly that the "business" portion of the meeting was over.

Mosey finished a piece of pizza and paused for a moment. He pushed his plate to the side, leaned forward, and addressed me directly. "Generally, we have all gotten along pretty well here, which I think is largely because we all respect

each other. However, when we've had disagreements in the past, I've been called upon to act as the landlord, which I suppose is because I'm one of the Farm's co-owners. One of the few issues that folks have argued about is the use of public space here in the house. In that role, I sometimes have to 'keep the peace' by explaining who can use the house and when they can use it. I don't know if you've noticed, but when I get home in the evenings, I'm usually pretty tired and don't really feel like socializing. I think other folks feel the same way and so we ask that folks who don't pay to live in the house, not hangout in its public areas unless something social is going on.

"So I know that you've been cooking in the house for the last few weeks, but if you could do your cooking in the camper that would help keep the house open for everyone else."

Mosey paused.

His words hung in the air as I tried to grasp their meaning.

"I'll help you set up the stove in the camper if you need some help," Mosey offered.

I paused for a second not knowing quite what to say.

Was I shrinking? I thought.

It felt at that moment like I was actually shrinking in size if not in status. I resisted the urge to become defensive. I also resisted the urge to explain how my relationships with everyone at the table had just been commodified within a matter of seconds. I was at that moment struggling to reconcile my dual roles as a researcher and a human being who was trying to be a part of the Farm community.

"That's okay. I don't think the tank has any propane," I explained. "I'll pick some up next time I go to the store."

"Will this be a problem as far as your research goes?" Wendy asked. She had immediately identified the problem created by excluding me from the house.

Of course this affects my research! I thought. Calm down. If you make a big deal out of this, you might banish yourself from the Farm completely.

"Um…As long as I'm kept in the loop regarding what's happening socially at the Farm, I don't suppose that will be a problem. However, I will need to spend some amount of time in the house in order to create an adequate description of it for my fieldnotes," I explained.

Just then, Bella, Mosey's dog, stood up in the family room and started barking at the front door.

"That shouldn't be a problem," Mosey conceded, "especially if it's done during the day when we're gone."

Just as Mosey finished his sentence, the front door opened and George walked in.

"Did you get my message?" Mosey asked immediately.

"I'll be right back," George said as he disappeared into his bedroom.

.....

Methodology

In an effort to examine the Farm as a unique cultural context, an ethnographic research methodology was used for this study. Due to its emphasis on contextual description, ethnography facilitates analyses of cultural norms and values that are not possible using other research methodologies. In particular, ethnographic methods of data collection, such as participant observation and ethnographic interviewing, allowed me to identify the different conceptualizations of community present at the Farm.

Description of Context

To say that I chose to study the tightly-knit collection of people living at the Farm is not exactly accurate. After a six-month long "courting" process that entailed going to Family Dinners, volunteering in the fields, and conversing with its individual residents, it would be more accurate to say that I was chosen by the Farm. Having received the approval of its residents to proceed with my research, I began living on the Farm in a small pop-up style camper in July 2007.

Spatially, the Farm is a thirteen-acre rectangle whose longer axis extends from East to West. Two thirds of the land is composed of fields and pastures, while the remaining third is covered by an oak-pine-hickory forest. The Farm's physical center is anchored by the Farm house, a two-story, log cabin-style structure, which contains four bedrooms, three bathrooms, and a large basement. In addition to functioning as its physical center, the house is also the social center for its permanent residents as well as the network of individuals who spend time at the Farm on a weekly basis. As a CSA operation, the Farm provided food for approximately fifty shareholders. Thus, in addition to its full-time residents and neighbors, the Farm's extended social network encompassed sixty to seventy individuals.

Data Generation

Given the need for rich, contextual data on communities, an ethnographic methodology seemed best suited to the task. As is customary of ethnography, I endeavored to become part of the context under study, even while acknowledging that I could not fully shed my identity as a researcher. From July though November 2007, I lived on the Farm in a small pop-up style camper. In keeping with traditional ethnographic methodology (Lofland, Snow, Anderson, & Lofland, 2005; Wolcott, 1999), participant observation was the primary method used to generate data. In my role as a participant observer, I spent time planting, harvesting, weeding, and performing the many other chores that contribute to a farm's productivity. I also spent numerous hours playing, cooking, cleaning, eating, and talking with members of the Farm community. In order to document the experience of "farm life," I recorded my experiences and those of my fellow participants by composing field notes. As have countless other ethnographers, I struggled to balance the competing necessities of participation and documentation. To that end, I would periodically break from an activity and retreat to a quiet place in which to capture audible "jottings" in my digital voice recorder. These jottings consisted of significant words or phrases that I spoke into the recorder and subsequently used to type expanded field notes.

In addition to my field notes, I generated data in two other forms. Periodically, I captured my subjective reactions to events in a researcher journal. This journal served as a useful means to monitor the intersection and interaction of my dual roles as a resident and researcher. Finally, data were generated by conducting both formal and informal interviews. As events warranted, I conducted informal, so called ethnographic interviews, in which participants were engaged in a focused conversation about a topic related to my research agenda (Spradley, 1979). As opposed to more formal interviews, the data from such ethnographic interviews were recorded as field notes.

Near the conclusion of my five-month stay at the Farm, I also conducted semi-structured interviews with six of the Farm's residents, including Mosey, Wendy, and George. These interviews utilized a focused interview protocol and were recorded and transcribed for analysis. Both the ethnographic and semi-structured interviews served to bolster the trustworthiness of the subsequent representations of the Farm by contrasting and comparing my own experiences with those of its primary residents.

Data Analysis

In analyzing the data, I utilized Wolcott's (1994) three stages of data transformation: description, analysis, and interpretation. Using field notes, research journals, and interview transcripts, I composed detailed descriptions of the Farm and its inhabitants. Concurrent with data collection, the descriptive process identifies significant phenomena for subsequent analysis. During the second stage of data transformation, I read, coded, and sorted the data in an effort to identify significant patterns. Through the open coding process, I bracketed significant portions of data with a descriptive word or phrase. The resulting collection of codes was compared and consolidated based on commonalities, a process known as axial coding (Charmaz, 2006). The resulting code categories, "communal food practices" for example, were further developed by the creation of analytic memos that explored the underlying structure of such patterns.

The final phase of data transformation entailed constructing the data into a narrative representational format. Using Polkinghorne's (1995) unique iteration of narrative analysis, I carefully crafted the present narrative from unemplotted field notes and interview transcripts. In doing so, I identified and brought meaning to prominent themes generated during the memoing process. Far from being *inspired* by the data, the narrative results from a "recursive movement" between the data and narrative. Polkinghorne (1995) explained saying,

> Evolving a plot that serves to configure the data elements into a coherent story requires testing the beginning attempts at emplotment with the database. If major events or actions described in the data conflict with or contradict the emerging plot idea, then the idea needs to be adapted to better fit or make sense of the elements and their relationships. The development of a plot follows the same principles of understanding that are by the notion of the hermeneutic circle. The creation of a text involves the to-and-fro movement of parts to whole that is involved in comprehending a finished text. (p. 16)

While the narrative may or may not describe events exactly as they occurred, it should not be considered fiction. As described by Polkinghorne, the present narrative takes the form of that a "research tale" (Van Maanen, 1988). Such a tale is carefully constructed from the data in order to encapsulate the salient features of numerous events within the textual space of one narrative. Thus, the purpose of the narrative is not simply to report findings, but to configure unemplotted data in such a way that they induce meaning from the phenomenon under study (Polkinghorne). Examples of such analyses in leisure scholarship can be found in the work of Johnson and Samdahl (2005), Parry and Shinew (2004), and Glover (2007).

Trustworthiness

In order to preserve the fidelity of the descriptions and the integrity of the conclusions, we have taken several steps to preserve the trustworthiness of the representations. Often referred to as member checking, participants were allowed to inspect and comment on the field notes and interview transcripts. Recognizing that any depiction of events is inherently partial and biased, member checking also served as a means to improve the honesty of the data generation efforts. Additionally, we reviewed my research journal in an effort to identify instances in which my dual role as researcher and resident often conflicted with one another. Using my research journal, we reviewed the data and continually questioned my relationship with the Farm and its residents. Finally, the second author visited the Farm himself in order to further interrogate the representations.

.....

George sat down next to Mosey and Wendy, leaving me by myself on the opposite side of the table. He pulled out a half-eaten burrito wrapped in aluminum foil and some tortilla chips from a white paper bag. He and I exchanged greetings.

"So what's going on?" he asked.

"We were just going over the rules of the house with Dr. Fun," Wendy explained.

After receiving their own pseudonyms, my fellow residents had nicknamed me Dr. Fun in light of my graduate work in leisure studies.

"Yeah, in an effort to keep our little community functioning smoothly, we're sharing our pet peeves with one another," Mosey added.

"Okay," George said as he ate.

Still stinging from my ejection from the house, I attuned to Mosey's use of the term community and decided to pursue it with him. "Related to the whole point of this conversation, let me ask exactly what you mean by community?"

"What?" he asked.

"You said this was a little community and I'm just curious what exactly makes the Farm a community?"

Wendy spoke up. "That's a good question. I'm not sure what the official definition of a community is, but I assume it has something to do with people

coming together and working for a common purpose. And I know part of our purpose is the whole CSA operation and feeding people and that's a purpose."

"That's interesting," I commented wondering how I might cautiously proceed. "So everyone shares in the goals of the CSA and contributes to its operations?"

"Everyone contributes differently." George answered.

"What do you mean by that?" I asked.

"Well, some people contribute with actual labor, some with money, some people contribute both," Mosey explained.

"Can someone be a part of the community if that person does not contribute anything to the Farm? What if someone only showed up at Family Dinner, but contributed nothing to the operations of the Farm. Would that person be a part of the community?" I asked.

"Well, let's keep in mind that everyone who comes to Family Dinner brings a dish, so they're contributing to the community in that sense. However, I would argue that, ironically, you can come to Family Dinner and not be a part of the Family," Mosey explained.

"So what is the Family exactly?" I asked.

Mosey thought for a second. "Well, there's a large group of people who are out here on a weekly basis, but then there's a group of people who make up the core, the heart of the Farm and that's the Family."

"Who's a part of the family?" I asked.

"Everyone sitting here is definitely a part of the Family. Rowdy and Bernie and Lila are definitely members of the Family. There are some folks who've lived here in the past, who don't live here anymore, but who are definitely a part of the Family—Skippy for example. Then there are folks who are a part of the extended Family, like Hank. Hank is like an uncle," Mosey explained.

"Yeah, and then you have a bunch of cousins, like Sam and Mack and Eve," George offered.

"The thing is though, that all of these people, especially those folks in the core Family, are really like family. They may not be blood relatives, but I know if I ever need anything, I can depend on these people. They don't take the place of my actual family, but they're an addition to that family," Mosey explained.

"So those people who are a part of the Family, they feel a certain obligation to one another?" I asked.

"Just like any other family," Wendy chimed in. "If George needed something for instance, I would do whatever I could to help him without expecting anything in return."

"Exactly," Mosey agreed.

.....

Competing Conceptualizations of Community

As Sandel (1992) argued, individuals manifest their beliefs about community through their daily actions. Given this assertion, what can one learn from the preceding passage about Farm members' conceptualizations of community? We

contend that members of the Farm community articulated two coexisting, but distinctly different articulations of community. The first of these conceptualizations is the Farm as a *family*, and the second treats residents as a collection of individuals who have *associated* for *mutual benefit*.

The Farm as Family

Farm residents often referred to themselves as being a family. As referenced in the narrative, residents and core members were thought of as members of the immediate family, while neighbors and individuals in the extended social network were referred to as being a part of the extended family. George captured this sentiment when he described his relationships with the Farm's residents by saying, "we might not be blood-related, but we're family. I feel like I have brothers and sisters." In fact, the Farm hosts a *Family* Dinner every Wednesday evening in which residents, neighbors, and friends partake in a potluck-style meal. In describing this meal, Bernie explained that it possesses "a nurturing, loving aspect" that is often associated with family.

The metaphor of family was also extended to individuals outside of the Farm's immediate residents. As discussed in the narrative, close friends and neighbors of the Farm were thought of and referred to using kinship terminology such as cousin, aunt, or uncle. The term "tribe" was also occasionally used to refer to non-residents who were closely affiliated with the Farm. Being based on kinship ties, the tribe metaphor is consistent with the Farm's emphasis on family relations and obligations. The metaphor of family or tribe is significant because it implies a connection to others that is not predicated on an exchange for mutual benefit. As described in the narrative, residents of the Farm are willing to offer assistance to one another without any expectation of compensation.

Existing as a field of study in its own right, inquiries focused on family are not without precedent in leisure scholarship. In her review of sociological paradigms, Shaw (1997) asserted that analyses of family leisure must take into account both the dynamics of localized action as well as broader sociological forces that shape familial interactions. For example, in the role of "mother," women are called on to perform various gender norms and expectations related to motherhood within the context of particular relationships. In this way, different performances of motherhood may resemble one another generally, but differ subtly according to the particularities of each woman's life. Similarly, the Farm Family broadly resembled other families, but differed in several important ways.

As mentioned, Farm members occasionally referred to one another as "sisters" or "brothers," while the more authoritarian roles of "mother" or "father" were notably absent. Where individuals were referred to as "aunts" or "uncles," as is the case with the next-door neighbor, Hank, the term is used to indicate respect and affiliation as opposed to authority. This absence of explicit parental roles reflected the egalitarian discourse that was often deployed when referring to the hospitality of Family Dinner. Visitors to Family Dinner encountered a set of practices (e.g., potluck commensality, communal cleaning) that presented the Farm as a non-hierarchical collection of individuals. In contrast to this egalitarian discourse, the family metaphor often includes a hierarchical division of roles (e.g., grandmother,

father, daughter, etc.). The unorthodox nature of the Farm Family highlighted the limits of this concept for shaping relations between its members and further illustrates the tension between localized dynamics and sociological discourses (Shaw, 1997; Shaw & Dawson, 2001).

Mosey and Wendy's exchange at the outset of the Family Meeting is indicative of the tension surrounding the need for direction and leadership within this "family." As mentioned above, Mosey lamented that it "always seem[ed] as if [he were] put in charge." In subsequent interviews, Mosey explained that due to his ownership of the property and proprietorship of its farming operations, he was unwillingly forced into the role of managing and adjudicating issues that affected the collective. In other words, Mosey was compelled to take on the role of "father" in contrast to Farm members' preferred conceptualizations of one another as "brothers" and "sisters." In his *de facto* role as father, Mosey performed tasks such as collecting rent, communicating to outsiders on the behalf of the Farm, and conducting meetings to coordinate actions among Farm residents. While not explicitly using the term "father," Wendy and George admitted that Mosey was often forced into the role of mediating disputes and coordinating actions.

Of all the dominant cultural conventions associated with family in contemporary society, perhaps the most salient within the Farm Family is the construction of "sense of family" (Shaw & Dawson, 2001). As opposed to merely delineating roles, "sense of family" portrays the family as a reality that is greater than the sum of its parts. Members are to some extent subsumed by the family and draw their identity from it. In the case of the Farm Family, Watters' (2003) concept of the "urban tribe" is particularly relevant. Urban tribes consist of networks of friends that begin to take on the social support functions traditionally associated with families. Similar to the Farm's members, Watters's tribes engaged in rituals to delineate insider-outsider status, and they also shared social and living spaces. As with most families, tribe members' obligations to one another were not based on cost-benefit calculations, but were portrayed as an entitlement of membership. In this sense, family contrasts with other forms of social organization that exist based purely on the basis of mutual benefit.

The Farm as an Association for Mutual Benefit

Despite referring to themselves as family, Farm residents also often described the manner in which their relationships were based on mutual benefit and rights. Exemplary of this conceptualization of the Farm was the landlord-tenant relationship that existed between individuals. As Mosey explained, "when it comes down to it, the mortgage has to be paid." Implicit in the landlord-tenant relationship is an underlying system of legal protection. If either party to a landlord-tenant relationship fails to meet its obligation, the other party has the ability to protect its rights via judicial remedy. For example, were a resident of the Farm to fail to pay rent, he or she could be evicted. Additionally, differing contributions to the Farm's expenses entailed differing degrees of privilege. For example, individuals, such as myself, who paid less rent were prohibited from being in the house unless by invitation or during a public event. Such a system of regulation and control highlights the rights-based nature of certain relationships at the Farm.

As discussed within the narrative, this rights-based approach to understanding interpersonal relations also governed the use of food and the maintenance of privacy within the house. The consumption of other people's food was a source of on-going tension. As discussed in the narrative, the exchange of food items was carefully regulated and a shelving system was used in the refrigerator to demarcate individuals' food items. Additionally, residents' bedrooms were understood to be private spaces and individuals were not to be disturbed while in their bedrooms. Such careful regulation of food and space is more closely related to the norms of behavior associated with landlord-tenant relationships as opposed to those of the family.

In addition to monetary contributions, Wendy conceptualized community as "people coming together and working for a common purpose," which at the Farm was the cultivation and sale of food. However, not all contributions to the farming operations were equally valued; the relative impact of individuals' contributions conferred differing status with the Farm community. Bernie described the effect of differing contributions saying,

> …the paying members are contributing an important form of energy towards the perpetuation of the Farm….Now the people who pay and work are contributing more energy than the people who just pay…and I appreciate those people immensely…. The members who paid and picked up their food and never came out and volunteered, I felt a fairly shallow connection with.

Bernie went on to explain that he developed a more intimate connection with those individuals who shared in the Farm's labor on a weekly basis. Thus, an individual's acceptance and status within the Farm community was predicated on that person's contributions to its operations. This contrasts sharply with familial relations in which membership and status are not dependent on individuals' contributions. Such a system is wholly incompatible with the familial metaphor discussed earlier in which conflict is resolved by members based on an ethic of care.

Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft: Community and Association at the Farm

Descriptions of the Farm as a family or as an association of individuals for mutual benefit are seemingly contradictory. Where family is stereotypically inclusive and nurturing, exchange-based relations are typically instrumental in nature. These incongruent conceptualizations of community have a long history related to sociological explorations of community. One of the more influential dichotomies underlying scholarly efforts to describe community is Ferdinand Tönnies articulation of *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft*.

Set against the backdrop of nineteenth century German industrialization, Tönnies's (1887/1955) *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* described the transformation of Germany from a nation of small, agrarian communities (*Gemeinschaft*) to a society of urban, industrial centers (*Gesellschaft*). As is also typical of contemporary community scholarship, Tönnies's analysis is shaped by a backwards-looking nostalgia for simpler and more wholesome way of life. *Gemeinschaft* modes of living and thinking were rooted in the organic structure and function of the family and its household. Defined family roles and hierarchy provided order, stability, and

unity to individuals' lives. Additionally, membership in and identification with the family unit provided individuals with an experience of belonging and contributing to an entity that was greater than the individual. Tönnies's characterization of the use of community resources exemplifies *Gemeinschaft* organization.

> According to the way of thinking of the *Gemeinschaft*, that which we regard as the use of the common land for the payment of special services to the community, as such, is also regarded as a use of the *common good* for the immediate needs to everyone. (emphasis added, p. 70)

Thus one of the primary functions of the family is the creation of a mode of thinking that recognizes and embraces a *good* that is *common* to both the individual and the community. Every facet of life, ranging from education to commerce to governance, emanated from this distinctive worldview. However, for Tönnies, the unity, stability, and self-sacrifice of the *Gemeinschaft* were quickly giving way to the its successor, *Gesellschaft*.

Roughly translated as "association," the *Gesellschaft* worldview dictated that individuals behave in their own best interests, rather than those of a collective. Where interests of individuals coincided, collective arrangements would prosper. However,

> In the *Gesellschaft*,…we find no actions that can be derived from an *a priori* and necessarily existing unity; no actions, therefore, which manifest the will and spirit of the unity even if performed by the individual; no actions which, in so far as they are performed by the individual, take place on behalf of those united with him[sic]. (Tönnies, 1887/1955, p. 74)

Thus individual behavior is always self-interested and typified by market-based, exchange relationships. Where business and law have evolved to protect individual interests, their existence further insures the alienation of the individual from any sort of unity.

Despite not being explicitly discussed, Tönnies's *Gemeinschaft* (community) and *Gesellschaft* (association) typologies closely paralleled Farm member's discourse related to community. As with other families, the creation and maintenance of the Farm were based on close friendships, especially the friendship of Mosey and Rowdy, the Farm's co-owners. Related to their ownership of the Farm, Mosey and Rowdy took on the role of its patriarchs. While decision-making at the Farm was often facilitated by consensus, Mosey and Rowdy would cautiously impose their will in conflict situations. As with the *Gemeinschaft* family, the presence of such hierarchical roles brought a degree of stability and order to the Farm. References to the Farm as a family invoke the *Gemeinschaft* concept and suggest that residents must contribute to a common good that supersedes their particular interests. Contributions to the *greater* good are exemplified in comments such as that made by Mosey, that in actions such as cleaning, one must contribute "an extra 10% of effort" to keep the Farm functioning smoothly. Statements such as this suggested that the Farm family/community embodied a social reality that greater than its individual members. In this way, the family and *Gemeinschaft* concepts are constitutive of individuals' identities. As a constitutive identity category, use of

the family metaphor implies that membership cannot be revoked; once a member of the family, always a member of the family.

However, in contrast to Tönnies's (1887/1955) use of the terms, the presence of the *Gemeinschaft* concept in the Farm members' discourse does not preclude the presence of the *Gesellschaft* concept as well. From the protection of individuals' privacy and food to their contributions of rent, many of the residents' relations were predicated on rights-based entitlements. With reference to the use of space in *Gesellschaft* arrangements, Tönnies stated specifically that "individuals' spheres of activity and power are sharply separated, so that everybody refuses everyone else contacts with and admittance to his[sic] sphere; i.e., intrusions are regarded as hostile acts" (p. 74). Thus in exchange for rent, residents were given a room and, as described above, its sanctity was inviolate. Rent paid for one's room and access to the house could take the form of money, labor, or a mixture of the two. The currencies of money and labor were carefully regulated as some individuals were under no obligation to contribute labor (e.g., George), while others exclusively contributed labor for residency (e.g., Bernie). The self-interested nature of *Gesellschaft*-based relationships is present in residents' descriptions of their contributions to the Farm's operations. As discussed in the narrative, the *Gesellschaft* concept is especially prominent when members discuss their rights to space and privacy, privileges related to the use of space in the Farm house, and obligations to pay rent.

Tönnies (1887/1955) understood the two concepts to be antithetical to one another. This leaves one to ask how these seemingly dichotomous and contradictory types can coexist within the Farm's discourse on community?

Discussion

As is evident from the narrative, the Farm's residents utilize numerous, potentially conflicting conceptualizations of community in their day-to-day lives. In certain situations, Farm residents are thought of as "unencumbered selves" (Sandel, 1992) who freely associate with one another and are entitled to certain privileges based on their contributions of money and/or labor. At other times, residents speak of each other as family for whom they would provide assistance without consideration of compensation. The contradictory nature of their discourse is not exceptional, but is illustrative of the complex and ambiguous nature of lived experience.

In his deconstruction of the community concept, Creed (2006) contended that both scholars and lay people tend to be selective and romantic in their descriptions of community relations. In other words, individuals draw attention to those aspects of their relationships that support their preferred characterization of community at a particular moment. In this way, the concept of community has a normative function that fundamentally influences its capacity to describe a phenomenon. Thus, when members of the Farm describe themselves as a family, they have chosen to highlight aspects of their relationships that support such an assertion. However, these familial or *Gemeinschaft* notions of community are never reconciled with the instrumental or *Gesellschaft* landlord-tenant relations. Thus

these two conceptualizations remain partitioned from one another in the Farm's discourse of community. The Farm's members deploy distinct, even contradictory conceptualizations, for functional reasons. In other words, instrumental and romantic concepts are alternatively deployed to maintain order.

As Friedman (1992) argued, individuals are prone to vacillate between thinking of themselves as being fundamentally independent and inter-dependent. Indeed, as opposed to the *Gemeinschaft*-style communities of previous societies, individuals in contemporary society are faced with unprecedented opportunities to find and create communities. Such is the case for members of the Farm who created, rather than inherited, its social structure. The constructed nature of the Farm community allows its members to pick and choose from disparate and sometimes contradictory concepts such as "family" or "tenant" to describe their relations to one another. To the extent that their community is socially constructed, such a contradictory view is possible.

Such incongruent concepts may lead to conflict or tension as was the case when I was excluded from the Farm house during certain times of day. Such tensions might be threatening to its continued existence were it not for the fact that the Farm is a "community of choice" (Friedman, 1992). Individuals freely chose to associate with the Farm and its contradictory discourses of community. Despite its use of a familial discourse, the Farm cannot claim to be a *Gemeinschaft*-style community. The use of such language amongst individuals who are not related by kinship merely highlights the extent to which individuals can exercise autonomy in constructing their individual and communal identities. For example, in contrast to previous eras during which individuals inherited the occupations of their parents, Wendy, Bernie, Mosey, and Rowdy all came to the Farm without any previous farming experience and subsequently constructed their identities as farmers. Being a community of choice, individuals have chosen their identities as residents or members of the Farm family. Having not been born into "the Family," its members can easily abandon such an identity as soon as they please.

Communities of choice, such as the Farm, are consistent with Arai and Pedlar's (2003) belief that community can serve as a space in which individuals re-create themselves. By focusing on a focal practice (Borgmann, 1992), such as farming, individuals are able to partially re-create their identities through the Farm community. Such a conceptualization of community focused around specific practices disrupts monolithic references to community, especially those that treat community as a geographic space (i.e., neighborhood, village, city). Such a geographic conceptualization of community is often implicit when scholars refer to the potential for recreation and leisure activities to serve as mediums for community development. However, when conceptualized as being fundamentally matters of choice, the taken for granted relationship between communities and leisure services becomes problematic. Scholarly inquiry that examines the intersections of leisure and community must be more explicit in its description of the type of community being discussed.

My experiences at the Farm suggest that *Gemeinschaft* conceptualizations, that is concepts of community as being wholly constitutive of identity, are not useful for understanding the manner in which collectives function in contemporary so-

ciety. Consistent with Friedman's (1992) arguments, contemporary society makes possible, even necessitates, that individuals select from and perform a myriad of identities that are in turn connected to numerous collectives. As described, members of the Farm can freely move between the identities of farmer, family member, and tenant, just to name a few. This performativity of communal identity supports Arai and Pedlar's (2003) preference for conceptualizing communities as being fundamentally re-creational. Aside from a few organizations such as the military or the clergy, contemporary society is devoid of social structures analogous to *Gemeinschaft*-communities that are capable of subsuming every facet of individuals' identities. This is not to imply that social collectives do not try to impose identity characteristics (Joseph, 2002). Indeed as described throughout this manuscript, residents of the Farm endeavor to shape behavior by constructing the insider/outsider identity of Family member. While this Family metaphor intimates a *Gemeinschaft*-style community, its ability to influence behavior is limited. If banishment from the ancient Athenian *polis* was tantamount to death, leaving the Farm and its Family is considerably less traumatic.

Conclusion

Through the context of a Family Meeting at the Farm, this study has reviewed the manner in which members of the Farm perform their understandings of community in daily life. Members of the Farm commonly describe the Farm community in two ways: 1) as an extended family and 2) as a collection of individuals pursuing a common purpose. Once elaborated, these two descriptions of community relate closely Tönnies's concepts of *Gemeinschaft* (community) and *Gesellschaft* (association). We contend that when such competing conceptualizations of community exist together, they highlight the essentially performative nature of communal identity. As opposed to being universalizing and constitutive of individuals' identities, communities are formed by choice. As suggesting by the narrative, the Farm's community is more accurately a community *of* farming that revolves around the focal practice of its farming operations (Arai & Pedlar, 2003). The more closely one is associated with these operations; the more prominent one is within its community.

Similar to Glover's (2004b) explication of competing interests within a community garden, this study highlights the nuances and competing discourses that constitute a community. As suggested by Creed (2006) at the outset of this manuscript, such descriptions of community indicate the need for scholars to contextualize the communities they wish to study. Understood as a collection of competing interests, scholars must be more cautious when discussing the manner in which leisure is experienced by "communities."

.....

Several weeks after our Family Meeting, I sat in the shade near my camper with Philip, a shareholder in the Farm's CSA and a participant in many of its social activities. We were enjoying a few minutes of stillness after a morning spent working at various farm chores. Philip inquired about my research and I

spent a few minutes describing ethnographic methodology as well as my research questions. I explained that I was interested in describing residents' ideas about what constituted community.

"I think this is the ideal community," Philip responded flatly.

"What makes it so?" I asked.

"People are living their visions here. They live out their ideals about the way they want to treat each other and the land," he explained.

"Are those visions shared?" I asked.

"I think the great thing about this place is that everyone's vision, even if it is different, is respected here," he countered.

"But can this really be a community, if everyone's vision is radically different from one another?" I pushed.

Philip paused for a moment. "Well, basically everyone who is a part of the Farm community cares about and contributes to its operations. Some people contribute time and labor, some people give money."

"For the sake of argument, can a community like this one be made of people whose motives for belonging are primarily selfish? In other words, is it a community if we're all contributing in the hopes of getting something, like a basket of food, in return?" I asked.

"Well, that makes it sounds kind of cold. I think most everyone out here contributes because they want to be a part of something larger than themselves. You know what I mean?"

"An idea, a vision of some sort?" I questioned.

"Yeah, exactly. I think people want to be a part of the Farm and they do that by contributing their energy in the form of work or money. In return, the Farm feeds them with its fruits, so to speak. I never take any food from the Farm unless I put in a full day's work here each week. I feed the Farm, it feeds me. You see what I mean?" he asked.

"Uh…yeah. I guess so."

.....

References

Arai, S. M. (2006). Where does social control end and social capital begin? Examining social space, conflict, and the politics of difference. *Leisure/Loisir, 30*(2), 329-339.

Arai, S. M., & Pedlar, A. M. (1997). Building communities through leisure: Citizen participation in a Healthy Communities Initiative. *Journal of Leisure Research, 29*(2), 167-182.

Arai, S. M., & Pedlar, A. M. (2003). Moving beyond individualism in leisure theory: A critical analysis of the concepts of community and civic engagement. *Leisure Studies, 22*, 185-202.

Borgmann, A. (1992) *Crossing the postmodern divide*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cohen, A. P. (1985). *The symbolic construction of community*. New York: Tavistock.

Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *The American Journal of Sociology, 94*, S95-S120.

Cook, D. T. (2003). Recreation. In K. Christenson, & D. Levinson (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of community: From village to virtual world, v. 3*. (pp. 1146-1149). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creed, G. W. (Ed.) (2006). *The seductions of community: Emancipations, oppressions, quandaries*. Santa Fe, NM: School of the American Research Press.

Day, G. (2006). *Community and everyday life*. New York: Routledge.

DeGraaf, D., & Jordan, D. (2003). Social capital. *Parks & Recreation, 38*(11), 20-27.

Ellis, C., & Bochner, A. P. (eds.) (1996). *Composing ethnography: Alternative forms of qualitative writing*. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira.

Friedman, M. (1992). Feminism and modern friendship: Dislocating the community. In S. Avineri & A. De-Shalit (Eds.), *Communitarianism and individualism* (pp. 101-119). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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. (2006). Toward a critical examination of social capital within leisure contexts: From production and maintenance to distribution. *Leisure/Loisir, 30*(2), 357-368.

Glover, T. D. (2007). Ugly on the diamonds: An examination of white privilege in youth baseball. *Leisure Sciences, 29*, 195-208.

Glover, T. D., Shinew, K. J., & Parry, D. C. (2005). Association, sociability, and civic culture: The democratic effect of community gardening. *Leisure Sciences, 27*, 75-92.

Glover, T. D., & Stewart, W. (2006). Rethinking leisure and community research: Critical reflections and future agendas. *Leisure/Loisir, 30*(2), 315-328.

Hemingway, J. L. (1988). Leisure and civility: Reflections on a Greek ideal. *Leisure Sciences, 10*, 179-191.

Hemingway, J. L. (1999). Leisure, social capital, and democratic citizenship. *Journal of Leisure Research, 31*(2), 150-165.

Hemingway, J. L. (2006). Leisure, social capital and civic competence. *Leisure/Loisir, 30*(2), 341-355.

Hunnicutt, B. (2000). Our reform heritage: Recovering the vision of community leisure service. *Journal of Leisure Research, 32*(1), 58-61.

Johnson, C. W., & Samdahl, D. M. (2005). "The night *they* took over": Misogyny in a country-western gay bar. *Leisure Sciences, 27*, 331-348.

Joseph, M. (2002) *Against the romance of community*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Kruger, L. E. (2006). Recreation as a path for placing making and community building. *Leisure/Loisir, 30*(2), 383-392.

Lashua, B. (2006). "Just another native?" Soundscapes, chorasters, and borderlands in Edmonton, Alberta, Canada. *Cultural Studies <=> Critical Methodologies, 6*(3), 391-410.

Lofland, J., Snow, D. A., Anderson, L., & Lofland, L. H. (2005). *Analyzing social settings: A guide to qualitative observation and analysis*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Madison, D. S. (2005). *Critical ethnography: Method, ethics, performance*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mair, H. (2006). Community development: Creating spaces for deep democracy, social action, and resistance. *Leisure/Loisir, 30*(2), 447-454.

Maynard, S. S., & Kleiber, D. A. (2005). Using leisure services to build social capital in later life: Classical traditions, contemporary realities, and emerging possibilities. *Journal of Leisure Research, 37*(4), 475-493.

Parry, D. C., & Shinew, K. J. (2004). The constraining impact of infertility on women's leisure lifestyles. *Leisure Sciences, 26,* 1 -14.

Pedlar, A. M. (1996). Community development: What does it mean for recreation and leisure? *Journal of Applied Recreation Research, 21*(1), 5-24.

Pedlar, A. (2006). Practicing community development and Third Way politics: Still faking it? *Leisure/Loisir, 30*(2), 427-436.

Pedlar, A., & Haworth, L. (2003). Community. In C. Rojek, A. J. Veal, & S. M. Shaw (eds.), *A Handbook of Leisure Studies*. (pp. 518-532) New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Polkinghorne, D. E. (1995). Narrative configuration in qualitative analysis. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 8*(1), 5-23.

Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Sandel, M. (1992). The procedural republic and the unencumbered self. In S. Avineri & A. De-Shalit (Eds.), *Communitarianism and individualism* (pp. 12-28). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Shaw, S. M. (1997). Controversies and contradictions in family leisure: An analysis of conflicting paradigms. *Journal of Leisure Research, 29,* 98-112.

Shaw, S. M., & Dawson, D. (2001). Purposive leisure: Examining parental discourses on family activities. *Leisure Sciences, 23*, 217–231.

Spradley, J. P. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Stedman, R. Amsden, B. L., & Kruger, L. E. (2006). Sense of place and community: Points of intersection with implication for leisure research. *Leisure/Loisir, 30*(2), 393-404.

Stokowski, P. (2002). Languages of place and discourses of power: Constructing a new sense of place. *Journal of Leisure Research, 34*(4), 368-382.

Tönnies, F. (1887/1955). *Community and association* (*Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*)

(Loomis, C. P., Trans.). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.

Turner, V. W. (1977). *The ritual process: Structure and anti-structure*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Van Maanen, J. (1988). *Tales of the field: On writing ethnography*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Watters, E. (2003). *Urban tribes: A generation redefines friendship, family, and commitment*. New York: Bloomsbury.

Wolcott, H. F. (1994). *Transforming qualitative data: Description, analysis, and interpretation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Wolcott, H. F. (1999). *Ethnography: A way of seeing*. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.