Food for One, but Not for All:
Food Access and Collective Identity in the Urban Agriculture Movement

David Robinson
Haverford College, Class of 2014
Bryn Mawr College Department of Sociology
May 2, 2014

Abstract:

The urban agriculture movement is part of a growing alternative agrifood movement that attempts to solve social, environmental and economic problems in urban areas by introducing more local, organic and sustainable food into urban food systems. One of the primary goals of the movement is to mitigate a lack of food access in urban areas, especially for underprivileged populations. In this paper, I explore the collective identity of the urban agriculture movement in a major northeastern city in the United States. Through qualitative research conducted on farms in the city, I examine the construction of collective identity among actors in the movement. Collective identity is a dynamic process that is a function of shared attributes, shared goals, and the development of communality within movement communities. I find that through this process of collective identity, certain actors in the urban agriculture movement build boundaries that exclude certain social groups from participating in the movement. Moreover, these boundaries are constructed along existing lines of economic and social privilege. In constructing these boundaries, urban agriculture communities fail to solve issues of food access, and instead exacerbate food related inequality.

Introduction

The advent of industrial agriculture, which emphasized efficiency, standardization and scale, was met with both fervent proponents and equally zealous critics. As industrial agriculture began to achieve considerable scale during the 1960s, opponents of this industrial model began a movement toward alternative systems of agricultural production and consumption. In the past half-century, the alternative agrifood[1] movement has grown to incorporate a variety of goals, actors, and methods. Some alternative agrifood movements are concerned with the environmental costs of industrial agricultural production, which utilizes synthetic fertilizers and pesticides that cause harm to the natural environment. Others focus on the health concerns of fatty and processed foods, and its impact on cancer, obesity and diabetes in the population.

One of the movements within this larger category of the alternative agrifood movement is the urban agriculture movement. Urban agriculture can be defined as "the growing, processing and distribution of food crops and animal products within an urban environment" (University of Missouri, 2014). Urban agriculture is not a new phenomenon. People have been growing their own food in urban areas for centuries. In pre-industrial times when cities had much more space per capita, urban growing was commonplace. Over the past century and a half in the United States, residents and city governments have often turned to urban agriculture as a response to various economic and political stresses. In the 1890s during a period of economic depression in Detroit, the mayor at the time, Haze S. Pingree, called on owners of vacant lots to open this land for unemployed residents to grow food. These plots earned the name "Pingree's Potato Patches,"

---

[1] Alternative agrifood is a broad term that includes environmentally sustainable, organic and local food production.

and participation spanned to nearly 2,000 families (Lochbiler, 1998). During both World War I and World War II, citizens were encouraged to grow "victory" gardens to provide food relief to American and European soldiers fighting in Europe (Bassett, 1981). American presidents promoted these gardens through a nationalist rhetoric, arguing that gardening was a tool to assist American soldiers and defeat the Axis powers. In a statement during the closing years of World War II, President Franklin D. Roosevelt exclaimed, "I hope every American who possibly can will grow a victory garden this year … Because of the greatly increased demands in 1944, we will need all the food we can grow. Food still remains a first essential to winning the war" (1944). During the Great Depression a decade earlier, President Roosevelt offered more than three billion dollars in aid money for urban gardens as part of the New Deal. City officials across the United States convened to organize these urban gardens. In New York City alone, residents established 5,000 gardens in the span of two years (Warner, 1987). Throughout the past century, citizens, city governments, and even the federal government have used urban farming as a tool to address food insecurity and unemployment in troubled political and economic times.

In the 1970s, urban agriculture emerged again, this time under the name of "the community garden movement." Unlike previous instances of government-promoted city-based growing during times of political turmoil or acute economic distress, the community gardening movement sought to address a variety of long-term economic, social and environmental concerns. Laura Lawson, author of *City Bountiful: A Century of Community Gardening in America* writes, "the public was becoming increasingly aware of the negative impact of agriculture technologies, pesticides, and herbicides on the environment … equally influential was the growing public concern about the health consequences of pesticide residues on commercially produced foods" (2006, pp. 216). In addition to mitigating environmental damages caused by these industrial

agricultural practices, urban gardening was also seen as a means of activism. New post-industrial economic markets, racial segregation, white flight, and many other factors caused a tremendous decline in the wellbeing of many of the country's urban areas. Racial and economic divides manifested themselves in disparities in living conditions between upper class and white city residents, on the one hand, and lower class and minority residents, on the other. Crime and drugs also became rampant in many major American cities. The community garden movement became a vehicle for inner city empowerment. Many people involved in the movement "considered it a pivotal first step towards community revitalization" in these dilapidated areas (Lawson, 2006, pp. 219). Community gardening was seen to have a multitude of impacts, including the reclamation of vacant areas for more useful purposes, and the facilitation of social interaction among urban residents. By reclaiming these vacant areas, gardeners ensured that these spaces could no longer be used for drugs, violence, or garbage disposal. A promotional book for community gardening summarized this outlook, explaining that community gardening offers an opportunity for, "a greener, happier world, based on the proposition that the more people who have large fruit and flower gardens the better they, their community, their nation, and the world will be able to solve environmental economic, and social problems of our time" (Young, 1973, pp 1.). The origins of the community garden movement thus have their roots in the attempts to revitalize urban communities.

In the past decade, however, community gardens have become increasingly focused on improving access to healthy and nutritious food for disadvantaged urban populations (Alaimo et al., 2008; Dibsdall et al., 2002; Sobal & Stunkard, 1989l; Treuhaft & Karpyn, 2010). One of the primary issues facing low-income city residents over the past several decades is a lack of

available nutritious food. Increasing rates of cancer, diabetes and obesity have been attributed to these disparities in food access (Sobal & Stunkard, 1989; Beydoun & Wang, 2008). A 2009 study by the Food Trust, a policy center focused on food access in urban areas, claims, "Low-income communities of color have suffered as grocery stores and fresh, affordable food disappeared from their neighborhoods" (Treuhaft & Karpyn, 2010). In part these problems are related to the concept of food deserts, which are urban areas that lack of access to affordable healthy foods (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2012). Without access to food, many people in urban environments suffer from food insecurity and often hunger. According to the United States Department of Agriculture, 14.5% of American households were food insecure in 2012 (Coleman-Jenson et al., 2013). Food insecurity and a lack of food access cause lower qualities of life and long-term health issues for lower income Americans in urban areas. For proponents of the movement, urban agriculture is considered to be one solution to this issue of food insecurity because it improves local access to more healthy and nutritious food (Treuhaft & Karpyn, 2010; Hagey et al., 2010).

While community farms continue to address these issues of food access in the United States, a new branch of the urban agriculture movement has also begun to evolve: commercial urban farming. Commercial urban farming "provides the necessary groundwork for businesses to start to view this industry as a profitable investment" (Whitman, 2012). Commercial farming aims to address issues of food access through a different means than community farming—by scaling up production to become profitable. Commercial farming also "lends credibility to the movement," by proving that urban agriculture can be self-sufficient (Whitman, 2012). In this

way, commercial urban farming offers possibilities to increase the self-sufficiency of urban food systems, and make more food that can be accessible within city limits.

With the advent of community farming, and more recently, commercial farming, major cities in the United States are becoming increasingly dotted with venues of urban agriculture.[3] The urban agriculture movement now consists of a variety of networks of community farms and commercial farms in many American cities. In Detroit alone, there are an estimated 1,500 to 2,000 farming or gardening operations (Timm, 2013). Moreover, these farms and gardens represent a multitude of social, economic and environmental goals. According to the mission statement of one urban farm (not a commercial farm) in Providence, Rhode Island, "Urban agriculture has the potential to: increase self-reliance, connect us with the environment, lower our carbon foot print, connect us with food-growing neighbors, dramatically improve our health, educate our children through exposure to nature, and transform previously industrial areas into beautiful and practical green spaces" (Southside Community Land Trust, 2014). The increasing magnitude and diversity of farming operations in these cities, as well as the multitude of environment, social and economic goals, distinguishes the current urban agriculture movement from previous instances of city gardens in the United States. As a new phenomenon, one of the major questions surrounding urban agriculture is whether these movements are democratic, inclusive, and contain a wide variety of social groups. Do many people in urban environments have access to participate in the urban agriculture movement? What types of people are part of this movement? And are there differences between different communities in the movement?

---

[3] Urban agriculture is also a phenomenon all across the world. However, this paper will not cover urban agriculture in other countries in order to focus more deeply on urban agriculture in the United States.

In this paper I will address this question by exploring the urban agriculture movement in a major northeastern city in the United States. I intend to look at the social, cultural, and symbolic dimensions of collective action in the urban agriculture movement, focusing on the individual actors in movement communities. To do so, I will examine how the actors in this movement construct collective identity, specifically exploring how collective identity builds social, cultural and symbolic boundaries around movement communities. Understanding the ways in which collective identity in the urban agriculture movement creates inclusive or exclusive communities can assist in developing mechanisms to make the movement more participatory for a wider variety of urban residents.

This paper contributes to the literature on alternative agrifood movements in four primary ways. First, and most important, this study focuses on the voices of participants in the urban agriculture movement and how they understand their actions. There is very little research of this type in the field of urban agriculture. As a researcher, I spent two months immersed in this movement, working as an urban farmer, and meeting and talking to other urban farmers. The interviews and field notes I took away from this experience are only one part of a larger hands-on experience that allowed me to study this movement from the ground up. As I interviewed and conversed with urban farmers, I became a story-collector, learning about the values, motivations, goals, critiques, and feelings of the people with whom I worked. This closely textured, micro-sociological study lends insight to understanding the construction of collective identity in the movement, while providing a forum for the voices of the participants.

Second, the literature on alternative agrifood does not use new social movement theories and collective identity to explain trends in these movements. This study will use new social movement theory and collective identity as a theoretical framework for the data presented. While there is a significant amount of research on alternative agrifood movements, and a bulk of research on social movement theory, there is no academic tradition that combines these two fields of study. Using an approach grounded in new social movement theory will allow this paper to explore the urban agriculture movement in a new way, by understanding movement formation, movement cultures, and movement identities. Third, while there is a body of literature on alternative agrifood movements, there is very little sociological research on urban agriculture movements in the United States[4]. While much sociological research has been conducted on alternative agrifood movements in general, this research has never highlighted urban agriculture as a distinct category. This paper will identify the urban agriculture movement as a distinct field of study. Fourth, while there is some research about social and cultural patterns (Johnston et al., 2011; Johnston, 2011; Guthman, 2004; Flora et al., 2011; Alkon & McCullen, 2011), this research needs to be expanded by emphasizing the role of collective identity in these patterns. Collective identity is both an important aspect of new social movements that must be considered in an analysis of cultural, social and symbolic patterns in the urban agriculture movement. This study will take a new approach to urban agriculture by emphasizing social and cultural aspects of movement formation, as they relate collective identity. Through these four aspects—participant-centered research, social movement theory, urban agriculture, and social and cultural dimensions of food movements as they relate to collective identity—this study provides a fresh angle on

---

[4] There is literature on urban agriculture movements in other countries, especially West Africa and Cuba, which are hubs of urban agriculture. However, this study is specific to the United States, and generalizations about urban agriculture from other countries do not apply to the context of the northeastern United States.

participation in the urban agriculture movement that will advance the current body of literature on alternative agrifood movements.

I will begin this paper by introducing the literature on alternative agrifood movements. I will then introduce the development of social movement theory, and focus specifically on new social movement theory. I will explore in greater detail the role of collective identity in this theoretical tradition. In the last section of my literature review, I will provide a background of literature on boundary work in social groups. From this literature I will build a conceptual framework for the rest of my paper, through which I will be able to analyze the construction of collective identity in an urban agriculture movement in this major northeastern city in the United States. Next, I will provide a short explanation of my empirical data and my methodologies. Then, I will present my data, focusing specifically on the three primary factors through which actors construct collective identity in the urban agriculture movement. Finally, I will analyze how this construction creates barriers[5] to participation in the movement. Through this analysis I pose questions about how collective identity construction in the urban agriculture movement may contribute to the exclusion of certain social groups from participating in the movement.

---

[5] In this paper, I use the terms "barrier" and "boundary" interchangeably.

The "Alternative Agrifood" Movement in Scholarly Literature

The "alternative agrifood movement" has received a great deal of scholarly attention in the past several decades. The term "alternative agrifood movement" was coined by Julie Guthman, a researcher at the University of California Berkeley. According to Guthman, it includes four major types of food movements: movements focused on production, health, anti-industrial culture, and modern environmentalism (2004, pp. 4). In this section, I will examine the trends in the literature on the alternative agrifood movement. I will begin by discussing the way that authors trace the origins of the movement. I will then discuss the common criticisms of the movement, including critiques about the institutionalization of the alternative agrifood movement, and about the exclusiveness of the movement along symbolic, socioeconomic, and racial divisions.

Before I begin to discuss the trends in this literature I want to make an important point of clarification. There is a significant difference between journalistic literature[6] and scholarly literature on alternative agrifood. Journalistic literature tends to swoon over local, organic and sustainable food, with writers like Michael Pollan, Eric Schlosser, and Marion Nestle regularly touting its health, environmental, social, and economic benefits to the public. From the point of view of these writers, smaller-scale environmentally friendly production and consumption systems are the best alternative to the current industrial model of food production. Journalists

---

[6] By journalistic literature I mean books and articles that are intended for a mass readership. These may be authored by academics, but they bear distinction because they are not scholarly articles published in academic journals. Examples of this type of literature include Marion Nestle's *Food Politics,* Tanya Cobb's *Reclaiming Our Food,* and Eric Schlosser's *Fast Food Nation.*

often criticize the growing scale and profit-orientation of production, but never criticize smaller-scale organic agriculture. On the contrary, while there are strains of scholarly literature that do support these alternative systems, researchers and theorists tend to be more guarded about expressing preference, opting instead to analyze them through a more skeptical and scientific lens.

Julie Guthman is perhaps the most widely cited author of books and articles about alternative agrifood movements. Her book, *Agrarian Dreams*, published in 2004, typifies this skeptical scholarly approach by critically analyzing the history and development of the alternative agrifood movement in California (Guthman, 2004). Tracing the genesis of the movement in California, Guthman finds that it originated in the 1960s with a small group of "hippies" who became concerned about the increasingly industrialized and profit-driven orientation of the food system and sought a "return to the land" (Guthman, 2004). And while the movement has expanded in the past half-century, it still remains rooted in this counter-business ideology.

Guthman is among many scholars who express concern over the "institutionalization" of these movements within the larger food industry (2004; Johnston, 2008; Johnston, 2011; Allen & Kovach, 2000; Guptill, 2009; Fromartz, 2006). These authors find that as the alternative agrifood industry grows, these founding principles are in danger of being lost. In California, as the movement became more popular, consumer demand for organic products increased, and producers faced the task of legitimating and sustaining organic agriculture through the institutionalization and regulation of standards (Guthman, 2004). State and federal governments,

as well as third-party organizations, became mediators that were drawn into the business of certifying "organic." Through this process, the goals, values, and actual small-scale production methods associated with organic agriculture are becoming lost behind the "codification" of these standards and the emphasis on allowable inputs (Guthman, 2004; Belasco, 1989). In analyzing these changes, Guthman questions whether the movement will actually achieve its goals.

Josee Johnston, a sociologist at the University of Toronto, has written extensively on authenticity and corporatization at Whole Foods Market, a large supermarket chain with the stated goal to serve ethical and sustainable food. Johnston finds that the Whole Foods shopper identifies as a "citizen consumer" (Johnston, 2008; Johnston, 2011). The persona of the "citizen consumer" is founded on the idea that people can ostensibly make consequential choices with their consumption patterns, which, collectively, can have a profound impact on systems of production (Johnston, 2011). Johnston finds that because consumers stay within the confines of the corporate capitalist system, they actually do little to actually fight against the agro-industrial system, and perhaps even strengthen it. In this sense, the actions of the citizen-consumer are contradictory to the values associated with the counter-culture movement (Johnston, 2011). In the act of buying local and organic food at high prices, the citizen-consumer promotes the capitalist version of organic food and subverts the counter-culture ideology of the movement. Moreover, the process of reflexivity—the objective experience of one's self in relation to the larger system of production—in the shopping experience at Whole Foods, is critical to the identity of the shopper (Johnston, 2011). Johnston considers the shopper's use of reflexivity as a dance of distinction, separating him/herself from inferior eating classes (Guthman, 2003; Johnston, 2011). Johnston also demonstrates that on the other side of the socioeconomic spectrum, the material constraints of lower social classes cause people to forge eating identities

different from those of higher-class consumers (Johnston, 2011). In this way, people distinguish themselves through class-based consumption patterns[7] (Guthman, 2003).

Many researchers posit that because the act of consuming alternative agrifood is tied to social status, it is implicitly exclusive (Lockie, 2009; Johston et al., 2011; Johnston et al., 2012; Guthman, 2003; Flora et al., 2011; Alkon & McCullen, 2011). More specifically, some find that those of lower socioeconomic status and ethnic minorities lack access to sustainably-produced food. Exclusion is not only based on physical access to food (Whelan et al., 2002; Valera et al., 2009; Caraher et al., 2010; Johnston, 2011), but also on underlying class and cultural differences among consumers, which cause major rifts in alternative agrifood movements. In their study of the rural Iowa food system, Flora et al. find that while actors try to create an inclusive community, Latino immigrants are still excluded through subtle hegemonic behavior on the part of white farmers and consumers (2011). The authors found that the dominant frame of the predominantly white local food movement in Iowa is that local and organic food is a movement born out of opposition to industrial agriculture. Latino immigrants, on the other hand, are inclined toward local and organic food for different reasons—"having to do with family …with cementing social ties … [and] with concerns around foods … and communing with livestock" (Flora et al., 2011, pp. 131). Thus, alternative agrifood systems often exclude marginalized social groups and classes on the bases of differences in the perception of local food systems.

In particular, many scholars have identified a racialized pattern within the movement (Alkon & McCullen, 2011; Alkon, 2008; McCullen, 2001; Slocum, 2006), and in particular a

---

[7] Pierre Bordieu, in his book, *Distinction,* devoted a chapter to the consumption of certain foods as an expression of cultural capital and elite status. Bordieu's ideas about cultural capital and habitus will be referenced throughout this paper.

tendency toward whiteness. The ways in which alternative agrifood is produced and sold—

especially when the marketing emphasis is on environmentally friendly production practices—is

tailored to a white audience (Slocum, 2006). Even the physical clusters of white bodies in

locations where people practice production and consumption of alternative agrifood makes these

spaces feel inclusive for whites, and exclusive for others (Slocum, 2006; Alkon and McCullen,

2011). As Rachel Slocum explains, "There is a physical clustering of white bodies in the often

expensive spaces of community food—conferences, farm tourism, community supported

agriculture and alternative food stores" (2006, pp. 7). In contrast, locations of "unsustainable"

consumption are marked by more racial diversity. Furthermore, while many organic farms have

immigrant workers in the fields, these workers are underrepresented at markets, where the actual

interaction between producer and consumer occurs (McCullen, 2001; Alkon & McCullen, 2011).

Thus, there is a clear pattern of racialization in farmers' markets, local food stores, and other

spaces of alternative agrifood.

The literature on the alternative agrifood movement has become increasingly robust in

the past decade, a fact that reflects the growing impact of the movement on the public and

political sphere. With such a vast array of research, there are certainly patterns that have begun to

appear in the literature. For one, scholars agree that the movement has expanded to incorporate a

diversity of actors and motivations, and in doing so, has become institutionalized within the

larger industrial food system (Allen & Kovach, 2000; Belasco, 1989; Fromartz, 2006; Guptil,

2009; Guthman, 2003; Guthman, 2004, Johnston, 2008). Some argue that this undermines the

credibility of the counter-culture movement, and that with institutionalization, the movement

ceases to be a social movement (Guthman, 2003; Guthman, 2004; Johnston, 2008). Others,

however, see institutionalization as a sign of the movement's growing influence on the mainstream food culture (Belasco, 1989; Fromartz, 2006; Allen & Kovach, 1989). Moreover, researchers have flocked to farmers' markets in the past decade, using them as case studies to explore the interaction of producers and consumers (Alkon & McCullen, 2011; Alkon, 2008; Alkon, 2008; McCullen, 2001; Slocum, 2006; Andreatta & Wickliffe, 2002; Tiemann, 2008; Smith & Hobbs, 1977). Through observation of these locations, scholars have found a dominant trend of whiteness and a particular kind of upper class cultural capital at play among consumers, which calls into question the accuracy of the wholesome, inclusive, and democratic identity that the movement projects (Lockie, 2009; Johnston et al., 2011; Johnston et al., 2012; Guthman, 2003; Flora et al., 2011; Alkon & McCullen, 2011; Alkon, 2008; McCullen, 2001; Slocum, 2006). While journalistic literature is sometimes critical of the profit-orientation of organic food, scholarly literature digs deeper into the actual mechanisms of exclusion that exist in these movements.

A Background of Literature on Social Movement Theory

The literature on the alternative agrifood movement is rooted in social movement theory. In order to develop a theoretical framework with which to understand the construction of collective identity in the urban agriculture movement, it is critical to develop a background knowledge of social movement theory. In the following discussion I will first introduce social movement theory. I will then briefly trace the historical trends of social movement theory, bringing into conversation different theoretical paradigms on how social movements originate, develop, and attempt to exert meaningful social change. Next, I will present a synthesis of the literature on *new* social movements and collective identity, and relate these newer developments in social movement theory to previous theories. I will then review the literature on symbolic and cultural boundaries in social groups. In this section, I seek to construct an understanding of the what, why and how of collective identity. Using these theoretical traditions I will build a conceptual framework through which to understand my data on the urban agriculture movement in a major northeastern city.

The study of social movements is a critical field in sociology. Social movements are key agents of change in society. They may help cause revolutions, changes in thought, and political coups d'etat. Social movements can be defined as all "collectivities engaged in non-institutionalized discourses and practices aimed at changing the existing condition of society" (Garner, 1997). Social movement theory focuses on explaining social movements through an understanding of their actors, goals, and tactics, as well as the social and political context in

which they originate. As social movements have changed in shape, structure and ideology over time, so too, has social movement theory.

Early social movement theorists came from a variety of theoretical traditions. One of the first social movement theorists was Karl Marx. Marx took a distinctly structural perspective on social movements, emphasizing "movement formation by analysis of the social structure that gave rise to the ideology and the problems which it addressed" (Johnston et al., 1994, pp. 4). For Marx, structure, which "can be thought of as a set of limiting conditions on individual action" (Garner, 1997, pp. 19), was the primary root of social movements. Social movements were the product of the tension between social classes and would originate organically from conflicts embedded in social structures. From the perspective of other social movement theorists, this idea of structure failed to afford sufficient agency to actors within a social movement. As products of structural forces, Marx did not sufficiently theorize the conditions that would give rise to a class-conscious movement. This critique sparked other social movement theorists to develop different ways of viewing social movements that emphasized the role of the social movement participants as independent actors.

One of these departures from Marx's structural bias was symbolic interactionism. In stark contrast to Marx's structural perspective, symbolic interactionism is a micro-view of social life that explains how individuals create meaning in social situations. Sheldon Stryker explains the foundation of symbolic interactionist theory:

> "A symbolic interactionist frame assumes that humans are actors, recognizing the possibility of choice in human life. It further assumes that action and interaction are

shaped by definitions of situations; definitions are based on shared meanings developed in interaction; meanings persons attribute to themselves--self-conceptions--are critical to interaction and action; and self-conceptions, like other meanings, are shaped in interaction and are outcomes of others' responses to persons. These assumptions lead to the basic proposition of symbolic interactionism: society shapes self shapes social behavior. The proposition includes the possibility of reciprocity among parts" (2000, pp. 26).

Symbolic interactionism is rooted in the way actors define a social situation and construct meaning of it through interaction.

While George Herbert Mead is widely considered the father of symbolic interactionism, it was Herbert Blumer in 1969 who brought the tradition of symbolic interactionism to the study of social movements.[8] In contrast to Marx's structural approach, Blumer theorized about the interpersonal forces that allow individuals to come together in a social movement. He argued that a persistent social movement was based on, what he called an "Esprit de corps," which can be defined as the "organization of group feeling and essentially as a form of group enthusiasm" (Blumer, 1969 pp. 87) The esprit de corps allows an individual actor to feel a sense of belonging with others as part of a collective moving towards a specific goal. This esprit de corps is based on three component parts: the in-group/out-group relation, informal fellowship, and ceremonial behavior. For Blumer, an in-group/out-group relation allows actors to build boundaries to establish a collective "we," that is then compared to a "them;" "To have an enemy in this sense is very important for imparting solidarity to the movement" (Blumer, 1969, pp. 86). Informal

---

[8] Symbolic interactionism is a social psychological theory.

fellowship refers to friendship relations and "informal association" that unify people. And ceremonial behavior is a formal ritual (or many) that reinforces the esprit de corps of a movement. For Blumer, ceremonial behavior allows the participant in a social movement to experience "the sense of vast support" from others involved in the ceremony (Blumer, 1969 pp. 87). Blumer also discusses how group ideologies and morale separate a social movement from a more transient social grouping. Through Blumer's focus on the role of the esprit de corps, he was able to shed light on the ways in which individuals develop interpersonal attachments and feelings of belonging to a collective group. This paved the way for more recent social movement theories that emphasize the role of collective identity in a social movement development.

Before I discuss these new trends toward collective identity, I will introduce another important paradigm in the history of social movements: resource mobilization theory. In the 1960s, resource mobilization theory grew out of a fundamental disagreement with the symbolic interactionist approaches to social movement theory. The symbolic interactionism approach to social movements focused on the subjective factors and state of discontent[9] with the status quo that cause actors to organize in social movement groups. For resource mobilization theorists, discontent was simply not enough to explain the development of social movements. Regardless of its grievances, a social movement could not function without resources. At its core, resource mobilization theory is about understanding how social movements gain resources to help them mobilize in order to enact social change. Resource mobilization theory focuses on several important resources. First, it is concerned with how a movement finds money and labor

---

[9] This concept of "discontent with the status quo" is also related to relative deprivation theory. Relative deprivation theory is the idea that certain social groups are deprived of adequate resources in comparison to others. And these social groups become aware of their "relative deprivation" (Walker & Smith, 2002). Applied to social movement theory, this theory explains how actors who are deprived of these resources will strive to take back resources from those groups from which they are relatively deprived. Relative deprivation theory is outside the scope of this paper.

(McCarthy & Zald, 1987, pp. 152). Second, it emphasizes the organizational structure of a

movement. Third, it focuses on the rational costs and benefits that participants consider in

deciding whether or not to join the movement. Lastly, it looks at external factors that help or

hinder movement success. These external factors include "the linkages of social movements to

other groups, the dependence of movements upon external support for success, and the tactics

used by authorities to control or incorporate movements" (1977, pp. 1213). By taking into

account each of these factors, resource mobilization theory provides a useful foil to the more

interpersonally-oriented symbolic interactionist approach. Through the development of this

theoretical perspective, theorists were able to consider not only the intergroup relations in a

movement, but also the factors that determine a movement's success. Nonetheless, one of the

primary critiques of this paradigm is that resource mobilization theorists focus too much on how

movements rationally gather resources, and less on subjective actions of participants in

movement formation. This critique of resource mobilization theory was one of the factors that

led to the development of new social movement theory.

The Development of New Social Movement Theory

Many theorists view the 1960s as the beginning of a new type of social movement. These theorists saw many changes from the normal class and labor-based movement of earlier time periods. The ideologies and grievances of these movements began to change, as did the participants, and the organizational forms of movements. The youth movement, the environmental movement and the women's movement all typified a new type of social movement that some scholars began to view as analytically separate from previous social movements. For these theorists, it became necessary to begin to develop a new theoretical tradition—one that was adaptive to the differences between the "old" and "new" movements. For Johnston, Larana and Gusfield, "the emergence of new forms of collective action in advanced industrial societies stimulated a provocative and innovative reconceptualization of the meaning of social movements" (1994, pp. 1). The perceived change in social movements instigated the development of what is called "new social movement theory." But what do these authors mean by "new social movements?" And what is "new" about these new social movements? In short, the answer to this question is that new social movement theory focuses on changes in the ideologies, social base, and organizational forms and goals of these new movements. In this section I will proceed to explain these changes.[10]

---

[10] It is important to note that these distinctions made by some new social movement theorists are analytical, in that they represent a change in how some theorists *view* social movements, and not necessarily a change in the actual nature of social movements. There are certainly changes between these different types of movements, and the debate is over the extent of these changes. For Steven Buechler, the very concept of a new social movement inflates the newness of any social movement—"the term new social movements inherently overstates the differences and obscures the commonalities between past and present movements" (1995, pp. 303). These contemporary movements that have been identified as "new" all have important histories that relate directly to the forms of oppression that led to older social movements (Buechler, 1995). Thus, while we may still use the term new social movements to represent valid distinctions between more contemporary social movements and earlier forms of collective action, we must use it under the caveat that the idea of new social movements is not one that confines us to a rigid set of rules and practices of new social movements. Rather, it reflects certain changes in social movements, which while rooted

In an overview of the body of work on new social movements, Johnston et al. highlight several aspects of these movements that are analytically distinct from older social movements. First, the movements that emerged were no longer based exclusively on all-encompassing ideologies, such as socialism, conservatism, or liberalism. Instead, these movements "exhibit a pluralism of ideas and values" (Johnston et al., 1994, pp. 7). Grievances became untethered from economic interests, and focused more on "elements such as identity, status, humanism, and spirituality" (Johnston et al., 1994, pp. 21). Moreover, for Johnston et al., movements have evolved to question more personal facets of humanity, including abortion, health and sexual and bodily behavior (Johnston et al., 1994). Whereas older social movements focused on grand upheavals of class-based systems, newer movements have become differentiated and diversified, exhibiting new ideologies and challenges to the status quo. In this way, old social movements were seen to be fundamentally redistributive of power and resources, while new social movements were fundamentally focused on identity and status.

Second, as with the ideologies, the actors in social movements have become more diverse (Johnston et al., 1994; Garner, 1997; Mueller, 1992). In old social movements, participation was largely dependent on class boundaries. The lower classes perceived the reality of the class structure and rose up in an effort to equalize treatment and availability of resources. Naturally then, participants came from similar class backgrounds. Yet, as movements have become less and less oriented around class, participation has reflected this change. Buechler explains this idea, saying, "If old social movements presupposed a solidly working-class base and ideology,

---

in the past, can now be analytically differentiated as a set of theories pertaining to trends in modern forms of collective action.

then new social movements presumed to draw from a different social class base"[11] (Buechler,

1995, pp. 308). In the eyes of new social movement theorists, boundaries are now drawn along

different social statuses, such as gender, youth, and sexual orientation (Klandermans & Oegema,

1987).

Third, whereas previous social movements strived for an overhaul of social or political

order, new social movements often look for more pragmatic and institutional changes to the

current order (Johnston et al., 1994). As a result, organizational forms can be very diverse.

Earlier social movements forms were generally organized in a centralized manner. The mass

protests and strikes that characterized older social movements still exist, but they are now joined

by a group of social movements that "tend to be segmented, diffuse, and decentralized"

(Johnston et al., 1994, pp. 8). New social movements often consist of a network of related

organizations addressing similar goals. These organizations take the form of civil societies,

alternative businesses, and underground networks. The term "social movement organization" can

refer to any of these types of actors. Just as grievances and actors have become differentiated in

new social movements, so have the organizational forms of the movement.

A final characteristic of new social movements is their increased focus on movements as

messages. New forms of collective action emphasize not only future goals, but also seek to

demonstrate alternative models to current societal norms. In previous forms of collective action,

social movements were organized toward a program of future goals—for instance, labor strikes

during the industrial revolution organized around goals of higher wages. However, new

---

[11] In old social movements, these social class differences are also manifested as differences in race and ethnicity that were intertwined with socioeconomic status.

movements are in the present (Melucci, 1985). Like older social movements, new social

movements seek changes to the structure of society. Yet, new social movements organize toward

this change by identifying new cultural codes and lifestyles, and acting out these codes and

lifestyles in the present. Melucci famously refers to new social movement actors as "nomads of

the present" (1985) because collective actors "highlight the limits of the system," and

demonstrate to the rest of society a model way of living (Melucci, 1985, pp 52). Their action,

then, is oriented to the future, but lives in the present. "By reversing the cultural codes … the

very form of antagonistic collective action, with its organization and solidarity, transmits a

message to the rest of society" (Melucci, 1985, pp. 55). Many new social movements can be seen

through this lens—as a movement that challenges the existing structure by providing a model

way of living that is antagonistic to the status quo.

Collective Identity

In order to address the dynamics and characteristics of these new social movements and add an alternative perspective to resource mobilization theories, new social movement theorists have returned to symbolic interactionist and social psychological ways of explaining social movements (Gamson, 1992; Cohen, 1985; Eyerman & Jamison, 1991; Melucci, 1985; Melucci, 1989; Klandermans, 1984). William Gamson, one of the scholars responsible for this return to social psychology explains, "as social movement theory continued to encounter the movements of the 1970s and 1980s, social psychology emerged again with such vigor that it has now become a major frontier" (1992, pp. 54). These social psychological theorists developed their theory in opposition to a perceived over-reliance on structural explanations of social movements. For new social movement theorists, Marxist and resource mobilization theories lacked an understanding of the complexities of individual actors and entities involved in movement formation and protest (Klandermans, 1984; Cohen, 1985; Turner & Killian, 1987). Gamson artfully explains the need for a new scholarship on social psychology, saying: "None of this social psychology denies the importance of organization, social location, and the calculation of costs and benefits by movement actors. But there is an increasing recognition that an exclusive focus on such components leaves some of the most critical and difficult questions unanswered" (1992, pp. 54). In this way, the social psychological approach is not mutually exclusive with other structural approaches to social movements, but it provides a crucial tool for understanding the complexity of individual actors (including their motivations, values, goals, and grievances) within a movement that is left unexplained in other theories. Perhaps the most important

development of this symbolic interactionist and social psychological approach is the conception

of collective identity within a social movement.

Since the 1980s, collective identity has become a central tenet of new social movement

theory. According to Melucci, collective identity is "an interactive and shared definition

produced by several interacting individuals who are concerned with the orientations of their

action as well as the field of opportunities and constraints in which their action takes place"

(1989, pp. 34). It defines the "understandings, self-conceptions, ways of thinking, and cultural

categories" that ultimately help construct a "we" feeling among actors in a social movement

(Taylor & Whittier, 1992, pp. 110). The concept of collective identity is certainly reminiscent of

Blumer's esprit de corps in that it speaks to the collective "we" of a social movement.

Nonetheless, the esprit de corps existed primarily as a social fact that existed without attention to

the constituent parts (Johnston et al., 1994). Collective identity, in contrast, is both an external

social force that guides behavior, and a dynamic definition that is only possible through the

consistent negotiation from participants of the subjective frames that constitute this collective

feeling. Reflexivity—that is, seeing oneself in relation to others—is crucial to collective identity

formation. Melucci explains that theoretical approaches to collective identity emphasize "the

process-based, self-reflexive and constructed manner in which collective actors tend to define

themselves today" (1992, pp. 10).[12] In this way, "the relation of individual and collective is

---

[12] While this new theory of collective identity has developed to refer to "new" social movements, it has also led to a more nuanced understanding of the social psychological aspects of older social movements. Buechler explains, "it has led to a belated appreciation of how even 'old' class-based movements were not structurally determined as much as they were socially constructed in the mobilization process itself" (Buechler, 2000, pp. 47). In this way, collective identity is not only an insight for new forms of collective action, but it helps us understand further a different dimension of social protest throughout the years.

blurred," and collective identity is rooted in participants' reflexive social constructions of the relationship between who "I" am, and who "we" are (Stryker, 2000, pp. 24).

Collective identity is continually constructed by a number of factors. Many different theorists of new social movements have developed different terms for these factors, and there is a great deal of overlap. In the following paragraphs I will attempt to condense and synthesize these major factors into a coherent understanding of the primary component parts that constitute collective identity in a social movement. These ideas will then be used to frame the construction of collective identity in the urban agriculture movement. The first factor that creates collective identity is shared values among participants. Values can be defined "as conceptions or beliefs about desirable modes of conduct or states of being that transcend specific situations, guide decision making and the evaluation of events, and are ordered by relative importance. Values serve as standards by which to live, as well as goals for which to strive" (Gecas, 2000, pp. 95). Sharing values is a crucial aspect of collective understanding. These values define a person's worldview. In social movements, values give participants "a common vocabulary," that allows them to understand their world (Gecas, 2000, pp. 98). These values are also constructed and reinforced in a collective setting, "in the course of communication and cooperation" (Klandermans, 1992, pp. 83). Interacting with other movement participants over values helps members of a social movement articulate grievances upon which collective action is constructed. Gecas uses the example of values such as "pro-environment," and "pro-choice," that, when collectively held by members of a group, help to create a unifying ideology that legitimates environmental and abortion movements. Values, thus, are a crucial component of the shared

definitions of situations and meanings that help create the frames within which collective

identities are constructed in a social movement.

A second component of collective identity is shared frames, which build on shared values

to connect individual values to those of a movement. Snow et al. define framing processes as,

"The linkage of individual and social movement organization interpretive orientations, such that

some set of individual interest, values and beliefs and social movement organization activities,

goals, and ideology are congruent and complementary" (1986, pp. 211). The idea of "framing" is

particularly important to developing these definitions and meanings. Snow et al. find that people

use frames to cognitively interpret experience and give it meaning (1986). It enables participants

to understand the orientation, purpose, and goals of their collective action. And in social

movements, participants align their frames of understanding to fit those of the rest of the group.

Moreover, these frames of understanding are in part based on shared values. Through these

frames, members of a group define not only the social movement, but also the relationship of the

social movement to the rest of the world[13] (Taylor & Whittier, 1992; Cohen, 1985). In this way,

frames help orient actors toward the direction and goals of the movement. Collective identity

requires a framework of meaning and understanding that is shared by participants, allowing them

to interpret and define their collective action.

These shared values and frames are not static, but exist within a continual process of

collective identity construction. A third aspect of collective identity is the interaction between

---

[13] Defining how a movement constructs itself in relation to the rest of the world is integrally related to "boundary work," which is a set of sociological theories that attempts to understand the ways in which social groups construct differences between themselves and others. Building boundaries is part of a process of collective identity because it helps define the "we" in relation to the "them." I have chosen not to discuss boundary work in this section because I have dedicated the entire next section to literature on boundary work.

actors that helps build these shared understandings and a sense of solidarity among actors. Many theorists discuss collective identity not as a unified whole, but as a "process." Melucci articulates, "Collective identity as a process refers thus to a network of active relationships between actors who interact, communicate, influence each other, negotiate, and make decisions" (1996, pp. 71). The process of collective identity is the interaction among actors. It is only through this interaction that actors have the opportunity to develop these definitions and shared meanings. Interaction also allows actors to develop solidarity among one another. It provides the opportunity for actors to celebrate and reinforce that they are acting collectively, and not as individuals. For new social movements in which the grievances are particularly distant and abstract, "it is the intensely personal orientations and the close melding of the group with everyday life that provide the sustaining lifeblood of cohesion" (Johnston et al., 1994, pp. 288). Moreover, this process of collective identity occurs not only in daily life, but in rituals that reinforce the interpersonal connections between actors and the shared orientation of the movement. In building solidarity through interaction, actors legitimate their movement in the presence of others and reinforce the shared definitions upon which the movement is built.

In the literature on collective identity in new social movements, three factors emerge: 1) shared values, 2) shared framing processes that align individuals to the goals of the movement, and 3) processes of interaction that allow actors to develop solidarity in the movement. A fourth factor is boundary work, which is a topic I will discuss in the following section. I will return to and expand on these factors as they relate directly to the urban agriculture movement in order to develop the conceptual framework for this paper. However, I first want to make two points about how collective identity fits into broader schemata of new social movements. The first point is

that actors participate in social movements not only to achieve social change, but also to search for identity. Many new social movement theorists believe that participants in movements are identity seekers (Klapp, 1969). People seek identity because of the increasingly technocratic and rational society that affords individuals little opportunity to construct identity through social relations (Klapp, 1969). In Melucci's words, "What individuals are claiming collectively is the right to realize their own identity" (Melucci, 1980, pp. 218). Thus, collective identity in social movements attempts to fill the void left by a modern society deficient of identity-seeking opportunities. Collective identity, then, is not merely the side effect of participation in a social movement, but a primary reason that actors participate in collective action. It is these structural forces in society that make actors more inclined toward constructing collective identity.

The second point is that collective identity is not mutually exclusive with other social movement theories. New social movement theorists developed theories about collective identity in response to resource mobilization theory, which failed to understand how movements come together and develop collective understandings. However, while these two theories have different emphases, it is important to not see them in opposition, but rather as complementary— "these very processes of collective identity construction … are often a necessary prerequisite to the accomplishment of other goals" (Buechler, 2000, pp. 189). In this way, collective identity and resource mobilization have an interactive relationship. Collective identity theory focuses on how actors form groups in a social movement, and resource mobilization theory seeks to understand how social movements access resources to carry out collective action. Together, these paradigms provide a more complete understanding of social movement analysis. Thus, this

examination of collective identity should not be seen as isolated and antagonistic toward other

social movement theories, but as one part of a larger dialectical whole of a social movement.

Boundary Work

Another important aspect of collective identity is constructing the boundaries between the in-group and the outside world.[14] The irony of any collective identity is that while it creates a strong sense of group unity within, it necessitates the formation of boundaries in order to maintain the collective identity. In this section I will highlight boundary theories in order to provide a background of the different ways that boundary work can exclude certain groups in social movements. Boundaries, according to Taylor & Whittier, "mark the social territories of group relations by highlighting differences between activists and the web of others in the contested social world" (1992, pp. 111). The sociological field of "boundary work," has grown over the past 30 years. It seeks to understand how, and along what lines, social groups create boundaries. The idea of boundary work has many different uses—it can refer to social movements distinguishing themselves from the rest of the world, or, to the ways in which the dominant group maintains their elite status. In both cases, boundaries are "central to the formation of collective identity because they promote a heightened awareness of a group's commonalities and frame interaction between members of the in-group and the out-group" (Taylor & Whittier, 1992, pp. 111).

One of the ways that social movements construct boundaries is around these shared definitions that help constitute the collective identity of a social movement. These "symbolic resources (e.g. conceptual distinctions, interpretive strategies, [and] cultural traditions" play a significant role "in creating, maintaining, contesting … social differences" (Lamont & Molnar,

---

[14] This topic is complex and interrelated with other theories not related specifically to social movements. For this reason, I have chosen to dedicate a full section to literature on boundary work.

2002, pp. 168). It is through mutual understandings and agreed upon concepts and symbols that people interact, and thus divide themselves into groups. As Blumer explains in his theory of the "esprit de corps," building boundaries is a necessary aspect of group formation (1969). This idea of symbolic resources as boundaries sheds light on the role of collective identity formation in creating divisions between participants and non-participants. While collective identity has unifying power for participants in a social movement, it necessitates a certain symbolic understanding that excludes people, and reinforces social differences.

Several prominent theorists have made connections between a person's symbolic resources, and his/her social origins. One of the most prominent symbolic boundary work theorists is French sociologist, Pierre Bourdieu. His marquee book, *Distinction,* published in 1984, identifies how social classes utilize symbolic resources to distinguishing themselves from other classes and social groups (Bourdieu, 1984). The logic of distinction is that "social identity is defined and asserted through difference" (Bourdieu, 1984, pp. 172). Moreover, in the view of Michele Lamont and Marcel Fournier, Bourdieu's "principle of organization to all forms of social life [is] the logic of distinction" (1992, pp. 5). In other words, cultivating these symbolic differences is a principal component of a social group's identity. This act of distinction is rooted in a group's unique location in the class structure.

Distinction, however, is only the foundation for Bourdieu's theory. In a neo-Weberian tradition, Bourdieu uses the logic of distinction in order demonstrate and reinforce the relationships among education, social origin, and cultural practices. For Bourdieu, the upper classes engage in cultural practices that have their own logic and expression. These cultural

practices are "a distinctive expression of a privileged position in social space whose distinctive value is objectively established in its relationship to expressions generated from different conditions. Like every sort of taste, it unites and separates" (Bourdieu, 1984, pp. 56). This insight was revolutionary for Weberian sociology. Previously, class had never pervaded the realm of symbolic meaning and culture; the two were seen as distinct entities. In this vein, Bourdieu also introduced the concepts of habitus and cultural capital. Habitus refers to a set of dispositions in values and lifestyles that originates from a person's social origin and everyday life (Bourdieu, 1984). Cultural capital refers to symbolic understandings which, Bourdieu argued, could be used as resources (Lamont & Fournier, 1992). Cultural capital is part of the expression of a certain habitus and reflects one's location in the class structure. For instance, Bourdieu saw the appreciation of certain types of art as an exercise of cultural capital (1984). Bourdieu's theory allowed sociologists to develop a deeper understanding of the importance of symbolic and cultural resources in defining a person's class position.

Many sociologists followed in Bourdieu's wake, explicating further how cultural repertoires contribute to stratification. Annette Lareau, an American sociologist, studied the family and educational structure of different social classes, arguing that the parenting styles of parents from different classes contributes to the reproduction of class difference (2003). While controlling for race, Lareau found that the primary differences in parenting strategies were along class boundaries. Upper and middle class parents utilize "concerted cultivation," while lower class parents use "accomplishment of natural growth." Through concerted cultivation, upper and middle class children earn a sense of entitlement and a greater understanding of how to become upwardly mobile within institutions (Lareau, 2003). Another contributor to the growing field of

cultural differentiation is Ann Swidler, who conceived of the concept "cultural toolkit." For Swidler, "A culture is not a unified system that pushes action in a consistent direction. Rather, it is more like a 'toolkit' or repertoire from which actors select differing pieces for constructing lines of action" (1986, pp. 277). Swidler draws on Bourdieu's idea of cultural capital but differentiates her theory, arguing that individuals with different life experiences draw on all of these experiences to create a toolkit. In this way, culture is not determined entirely by class origin, but instead by a myriad of social experiences and identities, which includes race and gender.

While these boundary theorists do not specifically focus on social movements, their theories can be connected to boundary work in new social movements. The habitus and cultural toolkit are the basis for the shared definitions that actors use, in part to construct a collective identity. It is also possible to analyze new social movements as expressions of cultural capital that seek to distinguish different classes. In constructing collective identity then, these cultural conceptions and shared meanings also mark clearly the boundaries that define the in-group and out-group of a social movement; the "establishment of boundaries (whether social, psychological, or physical) promotes a heightened awareness of group commonalities and structures interaction between in-groups and out-groups" (Buechler, 2000, pp. 190). Boundary work is integral to the construction of collective identity.

Conceptual Framework for Collective Identity Construction in the Urban Agriculture Movement

The literature on new social movements and collective identity is complex. These theories are the product of a long history of social movement theory. Collective identity is unique in this history because it provides a nuanced way of understanding the processes of movement formation that focuses on the individual actors in a social movement. Using the new social movement theory about collective identity, I will now construct a conceptual framework through which to understand the role of collective identity in the urban agriculture movement in a major northeastern city in the United States. Building on these basic concepts introduced in the literature, I will develop a working definition of collective identity as it applies to the empirical case of the urban agriculture movement in a major northeastern city.

Collective identity can be defined as "an interactive and shared definition" among actors concerned with the orientation of their action (Melucci, 1989, pp. 34). Based on the literature, we can think of collective identity as having four main components. First, there are attributes and characteristics that people in a social movement share. One of these attributes is a set of values. As Gecas explains, individuals enter into a collective situation with a certain set of values (2000). While values are arguably the most important characteristic of actors in a social movement because they help define a person's worldview, there are other attributes that assist in building this foundation of collective identity. In the urban agriculture movement, these include shared backgrounds and interests. Together, these factors can be seen as the foundation for collective identity because they create the potential for actors in a social movement to develop a

unified vision of the world. While these attributes create potential for unity, collective identity is more than the sum of its shared attributes. A second aspect of collective identity is the shared understanding of the goals of the movement, which, as Snow et al. explain, are created through framing processes (Snow et al., 1986). These processes allows actors to locate and legitimate the movement in a larger social context. Related to these shared goals is a third aspect of collective identity: community. Community provides a concrete physical and social location for actors to engage in these framing processes of interaction and take part in rituals. Rituals are regular group activities that reinforce the collective identity in a specific community. For new social movement theorists, collective identity is a social process, not a stagnant entity. Only through daily interaction with others can actors in a social movement develop a collective identity around these shared goals and values (Melucci, 1996; Johnston et al., 1994). And it is through interaction and rituals in a community, that actors are able to develop a sense of solidarity with one another. The formation of social bonds in a community, and the processes that reinforce these bonds, are the social forces that build and reinforce collective identity in a social movement. A fourth factor is the boundaries around a social movement. Each of these previous three factors interact to establish symbolic boundaries around collective identity (Taylor & Whittier, 1992). Boundaries around collective identity are both unifying and exclusionary because they draw people in with close knit bonds, but exclude others who are not included in these connections. These four factors—shared attributes, shared goals, community, and the construction of boundaries—are the major components of the construction of collective identity.

Using this conceptual understanding of collective identity I will demonstrate how these four factors establish and reinforce collective identity in the urban agriculture movement of a

major northeastern city. Furthermore, I will show how the formation of collective identity constructs barriers that exclude many people and social groups from participating in the movement. The paradoxical nature of collective identity—as both inclusive among actors, and exclusive in relation to the rest of society—presents challenges to the ability of the movement to be as universalistic as its ideology suggests.

This paper will consist of four sections that each develop different aspects of collective identity in the urban agriculture movement. In the first section, I will delineate the attributes and characteristics that actors in a social movement share. Through interview data, I have observed three primary ways in which actors find common ground. They share values, interests, and backgrounds. I will demonstrate the ways that actors conceive of these similarities and also the interrelations among these characteristics. Just as shared traits lay the foundation for collective identity, differences build a foundation for separation among actors. In the second section I will demonstrate what actors consider to be the goals of collective action. These goals build on shared attributes to provide a collective orientation to action. I will use interview data to demonstrate how actors view these common goals, and the conflicts of interest between these goals. In the third section I will present evidence of the close-knit community in the movement. I will highlight the rituals that reinforce community. I will also analyze the ways in which actors view their community. It is through these three factors that collective identity is continually constructed. Finally, in the fourth section I will use this concept of collective identity in the urban agriculture movement to show how collective identities, as a unifying force within movements, simultaneously creates boundaries around the movement that prevent certain populations from participating. I will delineate how economic and demographic factors have

implications for cultural differences between actors. Before I discuss the data, however, I will

first introduce my data and explain the methods that I used in my data collection and analysis.

Data and Methodology

In this section I will introduce the methods that I used to collect the data for this study I will begin by explaining the research sites and my motivation for choosing these sites. I will then elaborate on my data sample and my data collection techniques. Next, I will explain how I recorded and analyzed my data. I will then explain the limitations of my data. Finally, I will explain the ways that my findings can be generalized based on my data.

Research sites

I became interested in learning about the relationship between social movement formation and social exclusion in my preliminary research about alternative agrifood movements. After reading qualitative studies about farmers in rural areas, I decided that I wanted instead to focus my research on agriculture in urban areas. The primary reason for this is that I felt as though studying sites of urban agriculture would offer better insight into the relationship between alternative agrifood movements, social exclusion, and access to healthy and nutritious food. In urban areas, there are people of many different backgrounds who live in close proximity. Thus, cities are a perfect place to study social exclusion and interaction because in these settings there are many groups that interact in close proximity. I also found that there is a bulk of research about farmers' markets in the north*west* areas of the United States, yet very little research on the alternative agrifood movement in the northeast. I wanted to offer a new contribution to the field so I decided to focus my research in the northeast of the United States. I contacted several farms in major northeastern cities in the United States. Several farms

entertained the possibility of me working there and conducting this research, and I was eventually accepted into an internship at one farm (the commercial farm in my study). The farm agreed to let me conduct my research in exchange for my unpaid internship.

The commercial farm is made up of two farm sites in two different areas of the same city. The farm grows vegetables and raises chickens for eggs. It has a broad rotating work force that uses primarily volunteer labor. There are seven paid workers, including the farm founders, and farm managers as well as approximately 50 volunteer workers.[15] These volunteer workers are unpaid, and are classified as either volunteers or interns. Each volunteer works anywhere from one to six days a week. The farm also has two associated social programs. The first one is a program that pays a small stipend for political refugees and asylum seekers to work on the farm. It provides a location for these refugees to work and develop social connections with locals. The other program is an educational program for inner-city public school groups. It brings school groups from grade school to high school to the farm on tours. The tours introduce the students to basic agricultural concepts, such as composting and irrigation. In terms of distribution, the farm sells its produce at two farm stands, a farmers' market, and to a number of local restaurants. The farm also has a regular Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) program, in which customers pick up a share of food each week at the farm. The farm has volunteer days on Saturdays for any members of the public.

---

[15] In my data analysis, I reference four different types of workers: "head farmers," "full-time farmers," "volunteer farmers," and "visiting farmers." I do this to break down the differences in the work force. A head farmer is a farmer who works in a paid management position. A full-time farmer is a volunteer that works the equivalent of a full-time job. A volunteer farmer is a farmer who works at the farm regularly, but only on a part-time schedule. A visiting farmer is a farmer who is from another country, but is living in the United States temporarily and working on the farm.

It was only until after I was living in the city and working on the commercial farm that I found the community farm. In worrying that my sample of urban farmers and sites of urban agriculture were not representative of the vast urban agriculture movement in the city, I began to look for other farms in the same city. I found the community farm through a friend of my brother. The community farm intends to engage members of the local community with local and organic food. The community farm is in a very different part of the city than the other farms. The surrounding population consists of primarily black and Hispanic immigrants. The farm is organized through a local community center. It has a small plot of land that is less than one acre, and helps to organize several dozen community gardens in different plots around the neighborhood. There are six paid workers at the farm. The majority of the labor comes from a youth program that employs local middle and high school students, who spend time at the farm after school and on weekends. The associated community gardens are run by local members of the community, and gardeners are volunteers, most of whom have full-time jobs. The farm also runs a farmers' market on Saturdays when the farm and other community gardeners sell their produce to members of the surrounding community.

Data Collection

Using participant observation and in-depth interviewing, I spent approximately two months collecting my data—between late May, 2013, and early August, 2013. During this time, I worked four days a week at the commercial farm. At the commercial farm, I generally worked from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. I passed my time at the commercial farm just like other interns. I worked, weeded, planted, harvested, and did any odd jobs that were necessary that day. During

this time I developed relationships with fellow farmers through working and conversing. I took extensive field notes each day after I left the farm about the conversations I had had as well as other observations I made about that day. I also took field notes about other times when I went to farm events, such as "farm parties."

I visited the community farm four times. At the community farm I spent time working with high school students involved in the youth internship program. I also visited several community gardens that were run by local community gardeners affiliated with the community farm. I visited the farmers' market twice. At the market I spent time conversing with the community gardeners and youth interns who were selling food. I took extensive field notes from each of these visits.

The other part of my data is in-depth interviews. I conducted a total of 27 interviews during my time at the farm. I omitted one interview from my data because it was with a non-affiliated member of another farm in the city. The sample of 27 interviews in my data is made up of 24 farmers at the commercial farm, and 3 farmers at the community farm. Of the 24, three of these interviewees are regular customers of the farm, while the rest are either farm workers or regular volunteers. The sample was not selected randomly. Rather, I asked people to be interviewees based on my relationship with that person. This method was more realistic for data collection, but may also introduce bias into my sample in that I may have a predisposition toward a certain type of person. Moreover, while I spent over two months at the farm, I conducted the vast majority of my interviews in the second half of my time at the farm. During the first three or four weeks, I established rapport with my fellow farm workers. I only approached people for

interviews when I felt comfortable that they would respond well to an interview. There were no

instances in which respondents asked not to be interviewed. In fact, most people were very

excited about the possibility of being interviewed. There are certain limitations to this selection

process, which I will elaborate on below.

The interviews were conducted in a variety of places, maximizing the convenience for the

person. I conducted several interviews at coffee shops and restaurants in the city that were of

mutual convenience to both myself and the interviewee. I also conducted interviews at the farm.

The farm was a good place for interviews because there was a lot of open space. In some cases, I

visited the houses of interviewees, and in several cases I conducted interviews on the phone. The

interviews ranged from 15 minutes to 47 minutes. Most interviews were between 25 and 35

minutes long. I loosely used an interview schedule, but did not strictly adhere to those questions

in the template[17]. Instead, I allowed interviewees to direct the conversation. In some interviews, I

exhausted the questions very quickly. In others, I only needed to ask one or two questions, and

the interviewee would talk for the rest of the time. I recorded the interviews on a handheld tape

recorder.

Data Analysis

My field notes were typed in MS—Word. I transcribed my interviews. With my interview data, I

used the computer software, *Nvivo*, to "code" my data. By "coding" my data I mean classifying

themes in the interviews. In *Nvivo*, I read through each interview, and classified comments and

---

[17] I have included my interview template in the appendix.

quotes into different categories. The main categories I used were "*shared values*," "*shared interests*" "*backgrounds,*" "*goals of urban agriculture*," and "*criticisms of urban agriculture*." Within each of these categories, I had many different sub-categories. For instance, I had over ten different sub-categories in the section on values. When I first began to code, I made many new sub-categories, however, as I finished the coding, I rarely created new sub-categories, suggesting that I was finding patterns that fit my existing categories. The software allowed me to view all of the different respondent comments that I had categorized under each sub-category.

When I began to write, I also began to do more complex analysis of my data. Using the Nvivo software, I conducted "queries" on my data. The most common of these was a "word frequency" query, in which I searched for all of the different times that a certain word was used in all of the interviews. These word frequency queries were useful in providing a certain degree of quantitative data about my qualitative interviews, but also helped me find instances that I had overlooked in the initial coding. Using these queries, I was able to find more complex trends in my data.

Limitations

The data I collected for this study has many limitations that introduce potential biases into my data and limit the representativeness of my findings. The first limitation is one that was discussed previously: that my interview sample was not selected randomly. I only interviewed approximately half of the people at the commercial farm, and even fewer at the community farm. However, I selected these people based on my own relationship with them, and not at random.

This means that my sample may represent certain types of people who I had closer relationships with. It also likely represents a population of people who feel more comfortable speaking about their own experiences, and who are more outgoing. These are all biases introduced by my interviewee selection methods. As a result of these methods, my interview sample is not a representative sample.

The second limitation is the large disparity between the amount of data from the commercial farm, and the amount of data about the community farm. My data consists of 24 interviews at the commercial farm, and only three at the community farm. Three is simply too small of a sample. Moreover, the number of respondents in the interviews also reflects the amount of time that I spent at each farm. While I worked as a volunteer and spent four full days a week at the commercial farm, I only visited the community farm four times. Thus, my field notes from the community farm are much less robust and, I assume, less representative about patterns that occur at the farm, and as a result, hold much less weight than claims about the commercial farm.

A third limitation in my data has to do with the customers of the commercial farm that I included in my sample. Because I needed to navigate my relationship with the owners of the farm, I was not able to choose samples of customers on my own accord. I agreed to let one of the owners of the farm put me in touch with several customers. This means, however, that she decided who I spoke to. This introduces clear selection bias into my sample of customers.

Based on my data, I can make very few generalizations about the scope of my findings. My data comes predominantly from one farm in the urban agriculture movement in one city. The city and the farm may have very unique or very common dynamics to others farms and other cities. However, because my sample size of farms and farmers is so small, I cannot conclude with confidence that my findings are generalizable to any farms in other cities. Research at this diverse urban case study offers the opportunity to observe a unique set of interactions between actors that may not be visible in other locations of urban agriculture. While this may lead to unique findings, its very uniqueness means that the results cannot be understood as a representation of the social forces at play in the entire alternative agrifood movement. At the same time, based on my research of other patterns in the agrifood movement, I will offer some speculative conclusions about how my research fits with other findings.

Shared Attributes and Characteristics

The first factor in collective identity is a set of shared attributes and characteristics among participants. These commonalities provide a foundation through which actors are able to construct a shared perspective on the world, and thus come together in a social movement. In this section, I will demonstrate three different commonalities among members of the urban agriculture movement: backgrounds, values, and interests. Together, these provide a foundation of similarities among participants that allow them to develop this shared vision.

These commonalities are distinct, but closely related. Backgrounds provide similarities among people that are rooted in their origins. People's backgrounds have a significant impact on their present values and interests[18], as well as their common interest. This concept of "interest" is separate from "interests," and refers to the built-in structural aspirations of a particular social group. Different socioeconomic classes and racial groups each have a different interest, which is generally related to achieving greater power and influence relative to that social group's location in the power structure.[19] Generally, similarities in backgrounds mean that people are more likely to find common ground in interest, interests, and values. Values, which are rooted in backgrounds, provide a shared system of beliefs among social movement actors. They are the foundation of collective identity because they define the ways in which people desire to live their lives, and thus how they make sense of the social movement in relation to their view of the

---

[18] By interests I do not mean material interests or desired ends. Instead I refer to surface level commonalities, such as an "interest" in cooking, or an "interest" in plants.

[19] I will not be discussing "interest" specifically in this section. However, the idea of class interest is woven into the fabric of this social movement. It is important to consider how a person's background influences not only what kind of activity a person is engaging in, but also why that person is engaging in this activity. What class interest may be at play in the urban agriculture movement? This is a question that will pervade the rest of the paper.

world. Values are also deeply connected to people's personal identities. Lastly, interests (not to be confused with interest) are more superficial but are still significant. They provide a common ground for people to engage with each other. Shared interests also stimulate discussions between people. I will now proceed to explain in greater detail each of these commonalities among members of the urban agriculture movement.

Backgrounds

Backgrounds are basic indicators of where people come from. It is their social and cultural origin. Backgrounds are the building blocks of people's identities, and crucially in the context of the urban agriculture movement, they help establish people's values, interests, and interest. In this section, I briefly outline basic demographic indicators of background, and then provide a deeper analysis of farmers' backgrounds in relation to agriculture. I introduce backgrounds first in this section because these have profound impacts on how people view the world. In the tradition of Bordieu, it is precisely these origins that help establish other factors important in building collective identity in a social movement, such people's common view of the world.

Demographic Data

I conducted a simple demographic analysis of the racial composition and education levels of the respondents in my study. Educational level is a very crude indicator of a person's

economic background. Figure 1 shows the racial composition and education level of the farmers

interviewed for this study.

Figure 1: Racial Composition and Educational Level of Urban Farmers

Respondent	White	College Education
1	X	X
2	X	X
3		X
4	X	X
5	X	X
6	X	X
7	X	X
8	X	X
9		
10	X	X
11	X	X
12	X	X
13	X	X
14	X	X
15	X	X
16	X	X
17	X	X
18	X	X

19	X	X
20	X	X
21	X	X
22	X	X
23	X	X
24	X	X
25*	X	X
26*		X
27*		
Total (#)	23/27	25/27
Total (%)	85%	93%

* Denotes community farmer

The data demonstrate that a near majority of urban farmers in my study are both white, and have at least a four-year degree. It is also important to note that there is more variation in race among community farmers.[21] This data is crude in that it only identifies two basic indicators of demographic background. Nonetheless, these results are stark. The urban farmers are almost all members of the racial majority in the United States and almost all of them have a high level of education. It is important to consider the extent to which similar demographic backgrounds may influence similar interests and values.

Backgrounds in Agriculture and Gardening

The previous section on demographic backgrounds displays a very crude picture of the commonalities in demographic backgrounds of urban farmers. Backgrounds are complex; they refer to a person's set of experiences and exposures. A person's background helps form and define who a person is, and informs what activities that person chooses to engage in. Through interview data, it is clear that many of these farmers also have very similar experiences and exposures as young people. In particular, most farmers have a background in agriculture, meaning that they were exposed to or took part in growing food as young people.

The idea of background is integrally related to Bordieu's notion of a "habitus." A habitus is a set of dispositions that is developed through social origin and everyday life (Bordieu, 1984).

---

[21] From this small sample, I cannot make any definitive conclusions about the representativeness of the racial composition of community farmers. However, from spending time at the community farm, it is clear from general observational data that those people working and visiting the community farm, and working in community gardeners, were almost all of African American descent or first generation immigrants from Latin America or the West Indies. Interestingly, those people who were white were in positions of authority at the farm and the farmers' market. The white person in my sample of community farmers was one of the paid workers at the farm. Other white people worked as food stamp directors at the farmers market.

For instance, if a person spends a lot of time outdoors at a young age, this experience will build in the idea of "being outdoors" into that person's habitus, predisposing him/her to spending time outside later in life. A similar concept is Swidler's "cultural toolkit," which is a spectrum of cultural forms that people can draw from in social situations. (1986). Moreover, these backgrounds are integrally related to other shared characteristics between people. Backgrounds help define a person's values and interests. In my data, one of the distinct and most common findings is that most respondents come from a background in which they were exposed to agriculture, especially at young ages. This finding helps to legitimate the claim that a person's background is instrumental in orienting people to the activities and cultural forms that they choose to engage in. As such, many people who participate in the urban agriculture movement have already had experience growing food.

More than half of respondents (15 of 27) came from families that owned or worked on gardens or farms. The narrative of many of these respondents is quite similar:

> *"My grandfather was a farmer in Poland actually, and he immigrated here, and he wasn't a farmer for his work, but he always had a pretty extensive garden. Um, so I grew up seeing people grow their own food, and in the summer we did not pay for food. We grew such an abundance of things"* (Alia).

> *"In the suburbs there was a pretty big [trend of having] some sort of garden in your backyard, and my dad would garden a lot, like growing up we had tomatoes, peppers, like squash, a couple of other things, so we would have a little bit of like knowledge*

around food because of that, and then we'd like freeze the tomatoes or preserve them in

some way or stuff like that" (Interview 21).

"I was born in Indiana on a cattle farm, grew up in the suburbs of the city, but you know

we had the farm for my whole childhood and upwards" (Matt).

These quotes are representative of a story that is common to many respondents at both

farms. Many people were exposed to gardens and farms at a young age. These people have now

returned to continue farming in the city, which suggests that these similarities early in life—

exposure to and experience growing food—lead to a similar set of interests and activities later

on.

One of the common findings among respondents is that due to this exposure at a young

age, agriculture (or gardening, farming, growing food, etc…) became normal to them. One

volunteer farmer at the commercial farm explains,

> *"I had 5 acres and my parents had a huge garden, so growing up it seemed like a normal*
>
> *thing. Like my dad would go right before dinner and pick a few tomatoes and onions and*
>
> *then you move to the city and you don't have that here at all"* (Interview 18).

Here, she comments that "it seemed like a normal thing." In order words, what for many people

is a largely foreign concept, the idea of growing food became common and accepted for her.

Another farmer also echoes this statement, saying, "I grew up in Massachusetts, where I did a lot

of gardening with my family, we had flowers, vegetables and a compost, and it was just kinda natural for me" (Interview 10). For this respondent, it is "natural" to be gardening and composting. It is part of her cultural toolkit. Thus, from these comments, it is clear that exposure to agriculture at a young age normalizes farming as something that is common. For two farmers, one at the commercial farm and one at the community farm, an affinity to agriculture is not only based in exposure and nurture, but in genetics. One head farmer says, referring to agriculture, "I feel like it's always been in my blood" (Matt). Another community farmer explains, "I think it's a hereditary trait, because everyone in my family, my brothers and my sisters, like to farm." (Interview 27). For some people who have grown up around agriculture, their affinity to farming is so strong, that it is conceived as a natural genetic trait.

For a majority of the participants at both the community and commercial farm, farming is an integral part of their cultural repertoire. It is a concept they understand, and in some cases, feel as though it is part of their genetic makeup. Swidler explains that a cultural toolkit defines the range of possibilities for any given person to engage in. In other words, when a person makes decisions about what types of cultural forms and activities he/she wants to engage in, his/her options are limited to those that have been built into his/her toolkit—those that they have been exposed to. For these respondents, agriculture has become natural and common. And this is a characteristic that they share with others in the movement. Not only are they all currently engaged in agriculture at their respective urban farms, but many respondents also share an affinity to agriculture that is deeply rooted in their past, and embedded in their cultural toolkit. Moreover, these backgrounds strongly influence the other commonalities that farmers share. Our

past deeply influences how we presently view the world, and the activities that we choose to engage in. In this way, a previous exposure to agriculture influences the value that we place on growing food and our current interests. Values and interests are not distinct from backgrounds, but integrally related. Backgrounds build into a person's habitus the many values and interests that predispose that person to certain activities and ways of viewing the world. In the following sections, I will delve into greater detail about the values and interests of community farmers. In reading these sections, it is important to consider the relationship between the backgrounds of farmers, and their values and interests.

Values

Values are beliefs about the world that guide a person's general conduct and decision-making (Gecas, 2000). They define how a person acts and thinks about the world. These value systems are also crucial to individual identity because a person perceives his/her own self in terms of what he/she values. One might say, "I am a person who values the environment." They may then self-identify as a person who values the environment. This self-conception is integral to that person's identity. Thus, shared values provide a level of commonality that is directly related to people's individual identities. As such, values are potentially powerful unifying factors.

Members of the urban agriculture movement express a myriad of values. I will focus my analysis, however, on the most important and most commonly-expressed values. Based on interviews with respondents at the commercial and community farm, these values are the

environment, localism, education, and *health*. These values are complex and are manifested in various ways by different respondents. Despite this complexity, and the differences among actors, these values serve as an important foundation for collective identity in the urban agriculture movement.

Environment

One of the most common values[22] among farmers is the environment, although it is important to note that this value is not common among community farmers. Broadly speaking, the environment refers to the natural world. However, this value is broad, and respondents express it in a variety of ways. Respondents express an environmental value in five primary ways: an appreciation for the natural world, a concern with the degradation of the natural world, a desire to achieve greater environmental sustainability, an interest in organic foods, and a desire to localize food systems.

One way in which this value is manifested is through an appreciation for the natural world. Approximately one-third (7 of 27) of the respondents identify a strong connection to nature and the outdoors. One volunteer farmer explains, "My parents really valued being in nature … just get us out of town was much as possible, so I definitely had an appreciation for green things and dirt and nature for a while" (Interview 11) In this case, nature is dichotomized

---

[22] It is important to note that a common value does not mean that the value has to be unanimous among respondents, or even represent a majority of respondent opinions. The interviews that I conducted for this study were open-ended. I did not ask questions about certain values, nor did I use my questions to elicit certain answers. Thus, even if only one third of respondents express a certain value, this means that one third of respondents brought up this topic voluntarily, without me asking about it. For this reason, these values, while they may only represent one third or one half of respondents, carry great weight because they come organically from respondents. I will indicate how commonly held these values are among my respondents.

from the city ("just get us out of town"), and is reified as a place separate, and special. Other

volunteer farmers identify a similar type of attachment to "natural" places, especially at younger

ages, several respondents explain: "[my parents] raised me in such a way that I spent a lot of

time outdoors when I was a kid, had a love of the land," (Interview 12) and, "I mean we went

camping in the woods. I grew up in the west coast of Canada. It was really nice, we were really

connected to the environment and nature" (Interview 16). In both of these cases, respondents

view the outdoors as a means through which people become very connected to nature.

Others—approximately one-third (7 of 27) respondents—express their environmental

values through a strong displeasure with environmental degradation. One full-time farmer

discusses pollution:

> *"Fumes that we put up in the air, um, you know, acid rain is becoming more and more of*
>
> *a problem in the environments that, you know, that we live in. Um, and the way that*
>
> *that's done is by us polluting the air."* (Interview 3)

For this farmer, pollution is damaging the environment that he values. Another visiting farmer

makes the connection between a love for the beauty of the natural world, and the deterioration of

it, saying,

> *"It's easy to see the degradation of the natural environment from the use of inorganic*
>
> *fertilizers, phosphates, especially up north in the Great Barrier Reef, and that's from the*
>
> *sugar cane farming that they did up there for the last 200 years. And that's really*
>
> *apparent and losing something like the Great Barrier Reef is a horrible thought for me.*
>
> *I've done a bit of snorkeling up there, but you know it's a beautiful place."* (Interview 7)

While both of these farmers identify environmental degradation as a problem in specific places, others are more concerned with the use of resources, and the deleterious effects that this may have on the environment. One respondent sees urbanization as an issue for resource consumption, questioning, "how much of the world population is going to be in an urban setting, and how much will they consume and suck the resources of rural environments?" (Interview 3).

In valuing the environment, urban farmers also value ways to protect the environment. One of the primary ways that respondents conceive of protecting the environment is by working to achieve greater environmental "sustainability." Sustainability refers to the continuation of something over time. It is the value of longevity, and resiliency. Nearly two thirds (14 of 27) of the farmers reference the word "sustainability."

One full-time farmer sees sustainability as an ethical issue. He says, "Just kinda thinking long term about sustainability, I think it's a moral imperative actually that people need to start addressing seriously" (Interview 6). For this farmer, the fact that sustainability is a moral concern shows how strongly he believes in this value. Sustainability is not only something that people should try to achieve, but it is a "moral imperative" that people need to act on.

Not every respondent believes that sustainability is a moral imperative. Still, the way in which respondents discuss sustainability is universally positive. None of the farmers question the value of sustainability. Rather, they comment on it in a way that indirectly implies its value. For example in saying, "I think sustainability is going to really involve regional problem solving and thinking," (Interview 5) this part-time farmer never questions the value of sustainability, but

rather assumes it as a desirable end, and offers ways to achieve that end. Another respondent

refers to it as a code by which to live, explaining, "I'm at a point in my professional career where

I wanted to focus on doing things I love and figure out how to make those things sustainable."

(Interview 8). For him, sustainability is something that he wants to achieve.

Other farmers express this value by discussing the ways to achieve greater sustainability.

For one volunteer farmer, sustainability means finding ways to efficiently use resources. She

says,

> "*There's an interesting element when you move it up onto a roof that increases certain*
>
> *sustainability, reducing heat costs, reducing the heat back in the atmosphere, helping*
>
> *with the, absorbing water that won't get run off into the sewer, which is a huge thing*"
>
> (Interview 6).

In this case, sustainability means minimizing external effects on the environment by using water

and heat efficiently. Several respondents also value efficient use of space, especially in crowded

urban environments. One full-time farmer claims,

> "*I'm just thinking about what the potential for this type of rooftop farming and using*
>
> *green roofs and making use of space that might otherwise be used for nothing, or more*
>
> *for pure recreation rather than production*" (Interview 12).

Another echoes this point, saying, "We have so many rooftops, there could be countless acres of

small farms" (Interview 12). The focus that these farmers have on different ways to achieve

sustainability, and its different meanings, demonstrates that respondents have already given

thought and attention towards finding ways to achieve environmental sustainability.

One way that respondents demonstrate environmental values and ways to achieve

sustainability is by expressing a preference for organic food. Organic food is produced without

the use of synthetic pesticides and fertilizers. Nearly two thirds or respondents (16 of 27) use the

term "organic" in their interviews. The phrase is used approximately five times per interview,

and 13 respondents use the term three times or more.[23]

For respondents, a belief in organic agriculture stems from two major factors: human

health, and environmental health. The value of human health will be discussed in greater detail in

a later section. For some farmers, producing food in an organic way is closely related to the

degradation of the environment. In response to a question about organic agriculture, one visiting

farmer explains, "I've always been really interested in the environment … It's easy to see the

degradation of the natural environment from the use of inorganic fertilizers, phosphates"

(Interview 7). In this case, producing food inorganically has many negative implications for the

"natural environment."

A final way that farmers express their environmental values is through a desire to localize

their food systems. For respondents, localizing food systems reduces carbon emissions caused by

transportation of food. Four of the 27 respondents explicitly mention this environmental issue as

a reason for supporting local food systems. Some respondents say, "to do this in a sustainable

way where you're not trucking food across the country or out of state … the environmental

effects of this are huge," (Interview 6) "there is a focus on local, reducing the mileage,"

(Interview 7) and "the more we can cut down on trucks, and shipping, and packaging and all

---

[23] This data is slightly skewed because of one respondent who uses the word "*organic*" 28 times in her interview.

those things … we're helping out the environment" (Interview 3). In this way, respondents value localizing food systems because carbon emissions caused by transportation has a negative impact on the environment.

There are many different ways that urban farmers express their value for the environment. Some express the value as a concern for environmental degradation, while others focus on the beauty and majesty of nature. What is common to all of them is a strong emphasis on celebrating, protecting, and working to find ways to minimize negative impacts on the natural world. In a society that is predominantly focused on the human elements of the world, this environmental worldview provides urban farmers with an important common ground that not only unifies like-minded people, but also distinguishes them from others.

Localism

Another common value among urban farmers is localism. In the previous section, localism was manifested as an environmental value—a way to decrease carbon emissions from transportation of goods. Localism, however, has many different components. Localism also means an affinity towards, and appreciation of the people and social groups in one's geographical proximity. Among respondents, this value is manifested as an appreciation of community and of supporting the local economy. Moreover, unlike the value of the environment, respondents at both the commercial farm and community farm value localism.

Nearly half (13 of 27) of urban farmers discuss this value in terms of their desire to develop a more robust local community. One full-time urban farmer explains:

"Just growing local, just growing local food for people. I mean that's, that's just um, I'm looking to build community within the urban setting that I'm involved in. I'm not looking to build a community outside of my urban community, and bringing, you know, local food in from, you know, an outside community. I want to localize everything as much as possible." (Interview 3)

For this farmer, local is almost synonymous with community. It refers to the people who live in "the urban setting that [he is] involved in," which is distinct from any other community. Another volunteer farmer explains that urban farming is a good way to involve the local community. She says, "I think there is a huge benefit to creating more produce, I think especially on a scale like we're doing which is organic and local and community emphasis is involved" (Interview 11). Expanding on this sentiment, one community farmer explains, "it was good to get involved, you bought a house, you live in the community, and I think one of the best things that you do is get involved in what's going on in the community." (Interview 24). For different respondents, there are a number of different layers to this idea of community. Many respondents explain the ways that a local focus allows them to interact with other people. For example, one full-time farmer discusses how, "I love basically just talking to the customers" (Interview 8). For this respondent, the social value of the local community is one of the most important aspects of localism.

Other farmers value localism as a way to stimulate the local economy. Of the 27 respondents, eight explicitly mention the benefit of stimulating the local economy. One of the head farmers simply says, "Supporting local farmers is very important to me" (Interview 10).

One customer explains that "I'll only buy meat from farmers' markets, upstate farms, local farms … we also want to support these farms" (Interview 4). Expanding on this point, another full-time farmer explains that purchasing from local farms allows you to "kind of generate more strong local farms selling organic high quality food, [and] you can reduce the price for that." (Interview 6). Thus, for her, the benefit of supporting local farms is not just for the benefit of one specific farm, but is also beneficial to the entire local economy.

Those respondents who discuss localism feel universally positive towards a more localized society. Respondents do not argue about the benefit of localism, but rather assume that it is a positive force. For instance, one farmer explains, "urban farming gives people, um, you know, a more localized food source." (Interview 3). In this example, the respondent does not question the "localized food source," but rather assumes its value. This type of positive attitude reinforces the strength of these values, and the near unanimity with which they are held among the urban farming community.

For many farmers, especially those at the commercial farm, the value of localism is manifest in a specific vocabulary. On average, respondents use the word "local" approximately three times per interview. In comparison, farmers at the community farm express a value of localism, but do so without identifying this value using this "local" vocabulary. In fact, the word "local" is only used once in all three interviews with the community farmers. Rather, all community farmers (3 of 3) express the value of "localism" by discussing relationships with specific people at the farm. One community gardener explains one of these relationships in detail, saying,

"In the beginning it's a lot of work, but I guess if you have the people to help, these days

I have one guy to help me, every time he passes me on his bicycle he would stop and say

hi or help me do something, so he saw me in the garden, so he asked me, you know, the

guy that helps me his name is Reggie, he's the one whose boxes are in the front"

(Interview 24)

In this comment, the community gardener expresses value of local community by detailing the specific relationships that she has made at her garden. Unlike commercial farmers, she does not emphasize this value through a vocabulary of "localism."

Respondents identify a strong value of localism. And unlike the environmental value, this value is shared across both community farmers and commercial farmers. It is a common emphasis for all urban farmers.

Health

Another shared value among urban farmers is the value of human health. This value represents a focus on preserving and maintaining human bodies. More than half (16 of 27) of respondents express this value. Some farmers demonstrate this value through a focus on public health, while others demonstrate this value through a focus on personal health.

In interviews, many respondents discussed their own healthy lifestyles. A sample of farmers say "I myself try to eat healthy and have a well-balanced diet," (Interview 8) "I absolutely love healthy living," (Interview 3) "I went to school for nutrition, and I just loved

learning about food and the effects it has on your body, and your overall wellness in general"
(Interview 20), and "I'm really trying to make sure [my children's] food is healthy, because I
really believe that it has, you know, so much to do with the cancer rates" (Interview 4). In these
cases, respondents express the value of health by explaining the ways that they have integrated
this value into their own lifestyles.

Other respondents focus instead on the public health aspect of eating and nutrition. For
them, organic agriculture is important because it improves the overall health of society. One
volunteer farmer at the commercial farm explains,

> *"I got more interested in agriculture specifically because, like thinking about food, um,*
> *the way that we grow and make food and process food and how unhealthy it is, and it has*
> *such a spiraling effect of negative consequences for people, um, a number of people in*
> *my family are overweight, and so I try to think about ways that I can help them to think*
> *about what they're eating and how they're eating."* (Interview 6)

This farmer expresses this value of public health by thinking about ways to address public health
issues. Other farmers also discuss public health issues. One of the head farmers at the
commercial farm, having traveled around the world for several years, discusses his realization
about obesity upon returning to the United States. He says, "The first thing you notice as you
leave this country, especially as a public health person, and you come back, is how obese and big
everybody in this country is" (Interview 25). Another one of the head farmers explains this issue
of public health through anger at large food companies. Speaking hypothetically to these
companies, he says, "If everyone just grew and ate their own food you wouldn't be able to
poison us with your sugar and fat" (Interview 26).

For many urban farmers, and especially those at the commercial farm, these discussions of public health are relatively broad in focus. For them, food is unhealthy and people suffer negative health effects. However, these statements are abstract; they do not refer to specific people. Other farmers, especially those who work at the community farm, broach these health issues from a far more personal standpoint, referencing the public health issues in their neighborhoods, which influence their friends and acquaintances. One community farmer discusses the lack of healthy available food in her neighborhood, saying,

> "*So in a radius of maybe 10 miles, there's nothing organic to buy, so that's one of the reasons we continue because you know what I look at the elderly and I look at the young mothers and I look at my own people*" (Interview 27).

The phrase, "my own people," reinforces this focus on the health of those around her. Another community farmer echoes this concern about a lack of available nutritious food: "Most of what you see around here in this neighborhood, are Chinese restaurants, fast food, OK, and people eat a lot of fast food" (Interview 24). Again, this community farmer focuses on her own neighborhood and community. Despite the different ways that they express these values, it is clear that all respondents at the commercial and community farm believe that health is a primary value.

Education

Another value that respondents believe in is education. This means that respondents value both learning and teaching others. Nearly every urban farmer—25 of 27 respondents—expresses

this value[24]. There are two primary ways that respondents express this value of education. One is through an emphasis on teaching and learning about how to actually work on a farm. This refers to learning about how to plant, identify insects, harvest, and conduct other work at the farm. The second is through educating the public about organic and local agriculture and the values of the environment and the local community.

In regard to teaching about how to actually farm, one of the head farmers at the commercial farm explains, "I really really have enjoyed teaching, and educating people this year" (Interview 25). For him, providing this agricultural education is vital to the internship program at the farm.

> "*I don't want people to just come up here and till beds every time they come. I want them to learn how to plant and learn how to harvest different crops, so I try to remember on any given week that X person hasn't used the seeder, so I try to make sure that I know which day that person is gonna show up, and so I save one bed so they learn how to use the seeder, so trying to remember all that and keep it cycled so every person is learning something every time that they come.*" (Interview 25).

While this head farmer expresses this value, not all of the volunteers believe that their agricultural education is satisfactory. Speaking in reference to his experience on the farm, one intern explains, "we just craved for more of a learning process, I felt like we weren't really getting enough back" (Interview 22). Another intern says, "I've come here and weeded for seven hours, that's not educational" (Interview 13). These farmers express this value of education through dissatisfaction with the lack of learning available at the farm. Others, however, feel as

---

[24] This number represents the number of respondents who discuss "learning," or "education," somewhere in their interviews.

though the educational component of farm life is satisfactory. Speaking about the head farmers, one volunteer explains, they "are just chock full of so much knowledge, and it's great to be around them and feed off their energy and soak up everything that they know." (Interview 20). While disagreement remains about the degree to which people are educated on the farm, nearly all farmers strongly value the learning process.

Farmers all expressed a strong value of educating the public about agriculture, and values such as the environment and health. One visiting farmer at the commercial farm describes education as his foremost belief:

> *"Education is like the crux of my belief system, and the way I'm structured as a person, to educate people and to be educated constantly, and that will mean for me as a person like creating a project or a whatever, [my] version of this farm, but it won't be anything like this [farm, instead it will be] with the framework of how to really educate people and have people take responsibility for their lives and their food situation, like that's my core belief"* (Interview 22).

For this farmer, education reflects the value of "personal responsibility"—gaining the knowledge necessary to take personal control over a person's own choices. Other volunteer farmers echo this sentiment—that education is about providing people with knowledge that they need to make important choices. One farmer says, "I was constantly trying to educate people … because you know prevention requires knowledge and education" (Interview 6). These respondents see education as a vehicle to disseminate information about other values, such as the environment and localism. The same farmer continues to explain this sentiment:

"I was constantly trying to educate people, like, here's the difference between processed food and non-processed food, here's the difference between organic and non-organic. Here's how you can eat organic and get really quality food without breaking the bank" (Interview 6).

Here, she explains how she is involved in the process of educating people about organic food and healthy eating. For some respondents, education is a means to spread one's values and belief systems. Some farmers focus their education efforts on teaching about the values of agriculture, especially as it pertains to personal and public health. One community farmer explains, "one of the things we also do is to go on the internet and download health information about different herbs and try to grow those herbs and let people use them, not as a doctor, you know, how does it help them, and we also educate people." (Interview 27). This farmer attempts to improve public health in her community through education. Education is seen as a way of passing on a system of beliefs.

In this vein, many respondents tout the importance of education for children, who are more likely to be impacted by education. One respondent who works with the children's education program at the farm explains how she developed her interest in this program:

"I was up here working on the farm one day and I heard these little kids screaming and laughing with delight from across the farm, and they just sounded so happy to be up here learning about nature and to be somewhere different and learning about where their food comes from, and it got me excited to teach the next generation of potential urban farmers" (Interview 15).

For this volunteer farmer, educating children about these values of "nature," and teaching them "where their food comes from," can make children more interested in farming. For her, having children become more interested in farming is a desired end. This interest in educating children reflects the fact that education is seen as a way to disseminate other values associated with urban farming.

Values are the guiding principles by which people live. They constitute a crucial component of a person's individual identity. Through this analysis of interviews from members of the urban agriculture movement, it is clear that these farmers share many values, including the environment, localism, education, and health. Because values are so connected to individual identity, these values provide a strong platform for a shared attribute that is deeply personal; they allow people to find common ground on a very personal level. People have a tendency to build connections with others who believe in the same values, and identify in the same ways. Moreover, shared values are a starting point for members of a social movement to develop a unified perspective of the world. In this way, common values held among urban farmers are an integral part of the foundation for collective identity in the urban agriculture movement.

Shared Interests

Another important characteristic among urban farmers is shared interests, which are activities, objects, or concepts that people enjoy. Shared values provide commonality on a deep ideological level. Shared interests, however, align people on a more personal, face-to-face level. These interests provide participants with activities and hobbies to share and converse about.

Respondents identify five common interests: physical activity, the outdoors, intellectual engagement, plants, and cooking. In this section, I will briefly discuss these interests, and show how they provide another level of commonality among urban farmers.

Physical activity

Approximately one-third (8 of 27) respondents enjoy the physically active nature of farm work. One full-time farmer at the commercial farm explains that "really physical work [is] meditative" (Interview 6). Another volunteer farmer echoes this sentiment, saying, "It's very therapeutic for me" (Interview 20). She goes on to say, "I enjoy it or else I wouldn't be here" (Interview 20). For one part-time farmer, physical work is her favorite part of working on the farm; "[physical work] is probably what I get most out of it" (Interview 2). Others enjoy the work because it is "hands-on" (Interview 18). One farmer in particular articulates how physical activity feels for the body. She says,

> *"I also practiced Bikram yoga, and one of the things that Bikram says about why people come to Bikram is to be able to feel what it feels like to use their body to their full capacity because in our developed, you know our culture of development where we are in offices all the time we can go years without actually feeling sometimes what it's like to use your body to your full capacity, so I love getting tuckered out, I love like, you know, those bigger jobs where you can kinda go full force" (Interview 11).*

For this farmer, physical labor is inspiring and engaging. While these farmers may have different reasons, they all thoroughly enjoy physical labor. A desire to be physically active is a point of common ground for urban farmers.

Being Outside

In conjunction with physical activity, many respondents expressed their enjoyment about working outside. Nearly one-fourth (6 of 27) of respondents enjoy this practice. Several farmers (3) identify themselves as "outdoors people." For one volunteer farmer, being outdoors is a positive experience because she "loves being around nature and plants" (Interview 20). One visiting farmer reflects that "this is probably the first full year of my life where I've spent more time outside than inside … it's been dominated by being outside in nature which has been an absolute blessing, a real blessing" (Interview 14). He goes on to explain that being outside is not simply a practice that he enjoys, but "it's more the lifestyle in a way" (Interview 14). The shared interest in being outdoors is another commonality for these farmers.

Intellectual engagement

Another practice that farmers enjoy is learning and problem-solving. Many (11 of 27) respondents explicitly discuss their interest in learning. One full-time commercial farmer says, "I'm constantly learning, and it's a wonderful experience … [there is] a lot of analytical thought and planning that goes into this and a lot to learn" (Interview 6). Not only does this farmer learn constantly, but she is also able to plan and make important decisions about the design and layout of the farm. This adds another level of intellect into the physical aspect of farming. Another articulates this idea, referring to farming as a "creative-thinking job." (Interview 2) For many of these farmers, learning is very important to their experience, and something they enjoy.

Plants

Many respondents express a strong interest in plants. Approximately one-fourth (7 of 27) people explicitly express an interest in plants. One part-time farmer at the commercial farm explains,

> *"I enjoy being around plants. I like working with tomatoes. I've always liked working with tomatoes. I really like growing tomatoes. You're smiling because you know that, you've seen it, I'm pretty attached to them as a crop."* (Interview 2)

Another farmer explains her affinity toward plants, saying, "I have a lot of house plants because I just love gardening so much" (Interview 27). Some farmers self-identify as people who like plants; "I think that personally I come at this from more of a plant's sake. I'm a plant person. For me, I'm more focused on, you know, growing the plants" (Interview 3). Moreover, some farmers derive their interest in plants from a background in horticulture. Horticulture is the study of growing plants. This interest in plants (not only edible plants) is another commonality for many urban farmers.

Cooking

Approximately one-third (8 of 27) respondents at the commercial farm express an interest in cooking. Several part-time farmers at the commercial farm explain their love of cooking and vegetables: "I love to cook and I love vegetables," (Interview 20) "I love to cook with vegetables," and "I've always enjoyed cooking, and prepping the ingredients for cooking, and

that was one of the aspects I really enjoyed when I was in culinary school" (Interview 8). Thus, not only do people enjoy growing vegetables, but they like to prepare them as well. This interest in the full process of growing food and preparing it provides people with a strong common ground.

These shared interests are less significant to a person's identity than shared values. Nonetheless, they add a different dimension of common ground for urban farmers. Each of these five interests is a locus for conversation and shared experience. Farmers work outside together, they discuss plants, and how to cook the vegetables they are cultivating. In this way, interests provide a basic level of commonality that allows people to engage with one another and pass time together.

From the data presented in this section, it is clear that urban farmers share a wide range of values, interests, and backgrounds. These shared attributes provide a platform for a strong collective identity because at a very basic level, they help unify people along similarities in how they see the world and how they exist. Shared values mean that people believe in the same ideas and concepts. Shared interests provide activities and topics that people can engage in together and discuss. Shared backgrounds are a platform on which people develop values and interests. Together, these three factors provide a strong foundation of similarity among farmers. Without these commonalities, people are unable to find common ground. We are predisposed to engage with people who are similar to us, who share the same values and interests, and who have come from similar backgrounds. While these shared attributes alone are unable to create a collective identity among urban farmers, they are a starting point that allows people to come together around shared points of view and visions of the world. In the following sections, I will explain

how shared goals and communality build on these commonalities to construct a strong collective

identity in the urban agriculture movement.

Collective Goals

In the previous section, I examined the ways in which shared attributes and characteristics provide a foundation for people to develop a unified vision of the world and the social movement. These commonalities provide a basic foundation of similarity that brings people in the movement together. However, similarities do not necessarily mean that people share a collective identity. Collective identities are based on more than just commonality. Another factor that contributes to collective identity is a shared understanding of the goals of a movement. These shared goals can also be understood through the concept of shared frames. Frames are cognitive understandings of the movement that provide a clear orientation to action. And these frames are developed through framing processes in which actors come to understand collectively their reasons for engaging in this social movement.[25] These frames are built on shared attributes, and construct common goals and a sense of shared purpose. Goals differ from values. Values are worldviews. While goals are derived heavily from values, they differ because they offer direction and orientation. They define for a person how the particular form of collective action that this person is engaged will achieve a world more closely aligned with his/her values. In this section I will explain the different goals of the movement, as expressed by participants. These goals are *production*, *economic sustainability*, *improving food access*, and *education*. These goals hold different meaning for different participants, and the variability of these collective goals represents the conflict over orientation that exists in the movement.

---

[25] I have split these different aspects of collective identity into sections in order that readers may more clearly understand the complex concept of collective identity. In reality, each of these components of collective identity is deeply interconnected. Framing processes are the mechanism through which actors develop and understand common goals. However, I do not have explicit empirical data to show evidence of these processes in the urban agriculture movement. The closest set of empirical data I have is the interaction between actors that contributes to these framing processes, which I will explain in the following section. This section, however, assumes that farming processes occur, and displays the end product of these processes: collective goals.

Production and Efficiency

One of the primary goals of the urban farming movement is simply to increase agricultural production and efficiency. Half (13 of 27) of urban farmers orient their action toward improving food production in the city. They see the goal of urban agriculture movement as increasing agricultural yield in urban areas.

A trend among urban farmers is to view urban agriculture in terms of efficiency and scale of production. Five respondents discuss this issue of production. One volunteer farmer explains her emphasis on production—"The whole idea is to show that you can really produce" (Interview 23). Other farmers discuss this idea of production in terms of space. One volunteer farmer emphasizes this idea of increasing growing space, saying, "I think I heard, um, something, a statistic that if every single backyard was used in New York City to grow food, we could probably, closely feed anywhere between like 500,000 people to 750,000 thousand people" (Interview 3). For this respondent, finding more growing space for agricultural production is a major goal of the urban farming movement.

For others, this idea of expanding production is deeply related to values of sustainability and localism. Sustainability, as was discussed above, is connected with localism because being sustainable in part refers to the ability to provide for oneself without reliance on the outside

world. One volunteer farmer says, "I am really interested in the question of like making urban growing sustainable" (Interview 2). In this way, producing more food in the city allows urban life to continue. Another volunteer farmer clearly articulates this idea, saying, "I really believe that if we keep this [urban farming] up we don't have to leave the city." Here, urban farming is seen as a way to preserve local living, to make it sustainable.

For some farmers, especially community farmers, production is a secondary purpose. Still, one of the three respondents sees increased production as a way to improve health in urban areas. She says that urban farming allows her the "satisfaction to know that for six months people can eat vegetables without having to worry about what they're eating" (Interview 27). Production, in this case, is localized, and for the purpose of providing healthy food to her neighbors. Apart from this mention, however, production is very clearly a secondary goal for many farmers, particularly community farmers. In response to a question about improving production one community farmer says, "We're a non-profit, we're not pretending to be a for-profit" (Interview 17). This statement refers to the lack of interest in improving production, instead focusing on other goals. Thus, many farmers find a shared sense of purpose in producing high yields efficiently, however others are less oriented toward this goal.

Economic sustainability

Expanding on the goal to improve urban production is the focus on economic sustainability, or self-sufficiency. This goal is only applicable to commercial farming. Slightly fewer than half of respondents (12 of 27) identify economic self-sufficiency as one of the

primary goals of the movement. This goal is manifested through discussion of a market-based

approach to small farming, as well as a focus on creating jobs. Nonetheless, among farmers,

there is disagreement and contention about the role of economic sustainability in the urban

agriculture movement, and its impact on other goals of the movement.

One of the head farmers at the commercial farm discusses this goal of economic

sustainability:

> *"We just wanted to be a normal farm, we don't wanna be relying on grants ... I think that*
>
> *urban farming has always been not-for-profit, it's always these parks and gov't*
>
> *organizations and community gardens run by nonprofits and its awesome and that's*
>
> *great, but farms are not non-profits, we wanted to farm just like other farmers around the*
>
> *city do, outside of the city do, but this is kinda the challenge is farming...farming is*
>
> *generally a for profit venture"* (Interview 10).

This comment exemplifies the commercial farm's focus on economic viability, at least from the

people in leadership positions.[26] For her, and the other farmers, commercial farming is a

departure from traditional types of urban growing. Inherent in her attitude is a desire to succeed

economically, without, as she says, "relying on grants." In other words, she desires economic

sustainability. Other part time farmers also see the benefits of this economic focus. One visiting

farmer explains, "I think a commercial farm, because it has the financial component to it, has the

potential to be more effective in the long run" (Interview 7). In this way, the economic

sustainability of farms is tied in with the "effective[ness]" of other benefits. Another farmer also

---

[26] It is difficult to find clear quantitative data on whether or not farmers believe in this commercial focus. This is because most respondents feel torn between the value of commercial farming, and the ways in which this focus on economic sustainability detracts from other goals and values, such as improving food access and education. As a result, I have chosen not to include a quantitative analysis of the number of people who feel positive towards this goal versus the number of people who feel negative towards it. In most cases, respondents feel strongly both ways.

expresses a positive orientation towards this economic goal, saying, "[the commercial farm is] a business, they have to produce, they want to be self-sustainable, they aren't there to be an educational thing" (Interview 1). For this respondent, it is understandable for the farm to focus on these economic ends.

Another way in which this goal is manifested is through discussion of job creation. For many respondents, commercial sustainability is reliant on the availability of jobs. Referring to the commercial farm, one full-time farmer explains this goal: "They're trying to create a model where commercial farming on a smaller scale, particularly in the city, becomes a viable career for people. And if they do that and create jobs for people" (Interview 6). Most other respondents, while emphasizing the importance of jobs, do not feel like the commercial urban farm industry has successfully created enough jobs. This idea is manifested through expressions of discontent with the lack of jobs, and a desire for more jobs. One volunteer farmer explicates this sentiment, saying, "It would be nice if there were more farms and things like this that could create jobs for people, but I think that's also another challenge because there's not a ton of money in farming" (Interview 20). Many farmers also express a desire for jobs, but do not feel satisfied with their availability. Some feel strongly that this lack of jobs is exploitative. According to one volunteer farmer, "I have my conflicts about being a free intern in a commercial business." (Interview 13). This statement is representative of a number of concerns of respondents about the lack of availability of jobs in the urban farming movement.

Some proponents of the commercial model juxtapose the commercial model of farming with the community farming model. One volunteer farmer at the commercial farm explains:

"This is a whole 'nother level than community gardens, because community gardens have been around since the '70s too, and that's the real community stuff, because it's in communities and it's communities doing those farms, but this is more production, it's kinda being a little bit more serious about farming, and it's more than just doing it for the community members in that small farm, you know, its reaching, it's like how do you do farming on a higher scale" (Interview 23). Again, this respondent discusses the impact of scale on the effectiveness of a social movement. This is echoed by another commercial farmer who says, "You got to have the dollars there too, not just the will to improve the community" (Interview 8). Commercial farmers often point to the differences between the commercial and the community model, emphasizing the greater effectiveness and credibility of commercial farming. These differences bring to the surface differences in goals between these two movement communities.

The disagreement is not one-sided either. Many urban farmers also question the emphasis on commercial viability. For one farmer, the economic focus of urban farming detracts from other goals of the movement. He says,

> *"The drive to succeed, the drive to make a profit and be a successful farm … which is fine and I respect that, but ultimately if that's gonna be your priority go hire some Filipino farm workers that are gonna knock it out."* (Interview 22).

The blunt tone of this statement highlights the other point of view, which questions the economic ends of the commercial farm. While there are respondents at the commercial farm who are stern advocates of the commercial approach, and there are others who are detractors, most respondents fall somewhere in the middle of these two opinions. For one volunteer farmer, "the practical side of me speaking," focuses on "the potential growth in that particular industry" (Interview 8). At

the same time, he remarks incredulously that, "I personally think it's amazing that they can sustain this business on essentially free labor" (Interview 8). In the case of this farmer, there is no clear answer. There are pros and cons to the commercial focus of the movement.

`One community farmer believes that the goals of the community and commercial farming movements are so different that the movements are fundamentally at odds. She says, "I do think there's two different movements and I think they have two different goals and they sometimes cross" (Interview 17). For this farmer, the goal of urban agriculture is not just to improve production, but also to provide improved access to this production. Yet these goals often come to a head because the increased focus on economic ends harms the accessibility of urban agriculture because it refocuses the emphasis of the movement onto production, rather than equitable distribution. This topic is a theme that will be discussed in greater detail throughout this paper. Moreover, these differences in goals between the two farms actually serve to distinguish the two farms as two separate movements.

The differences in opinions over the goal of economic sustainability demonstrate the variety of goals that are apparent in the movement. While there is certainly variation within the commercial farm, the differences are very clear between the commercial and community farm. These differences in goals highlight divides in the movement, and contributes to a feeling of shared goals and frames within movement communities, and less so across these communities. This is also a topic that will be discussed later on in the section about boundaries.

Improving Food Access

One of the primary critiques of the economic sustainability and production-oriented approach to urban agriculture is that while it increases agricultural yield, it fails to democratize access to that yield. Many farmers believe that urban agriculture ought to focus more on who has access to this food, and less on total production.

All three community farmers expressed a desire to improve access. One of these farmers explicates the fundamental differences between the business-oriented approach to urban farming, and the goal of increasing food access. Referring to commercial farmers, she says,

> *"I think the folks who are sort of in the business side of things or the side that's like pushing, showing its legitimate food production, has backgrounds that make it easier for them to access resources, and easier to leverage funding, at the city level or private funders, just because they have a historical legacy of having access"* (Interview 17).

In this way, commercial farmers have access to resources that community farmers lack. And as a result of funds being unevenly distributed, food is unevenly distributed:

> *"It's just really shitty to live in a place where one neighborhood has like fancy coffee shops and another neighborhood has a shitty ass bodega and that's it, and it's not anything bad about those bodega owners but there is just a lack of resources and access and a fairness on an economic level and a health level and a food justice level"* (Interview 17).

For this farmer, community farming is a way to ameliorate this lack of access. "Before [the community farm] there wasn't any source really for healthy and fresh food in the neighborhoods" (Interview 17). Here, it is clear that the work of this community farmer is

focused on ameliorating disparities in food access between different urban populations. Her goal is not to improve production, but rather to distribute food to people who lack access.

Many urban farmers, including commercial farmers, also lament that an emphasis on production does not democratize access to food. One head farmer at the commercial farm expresses this opinion, saying,

> "*I wish that we could reach out to more of I don't want to say 'those kind of people' because that's not the word, but people that don't have access ... like the whole food justice issues in this country are so large, and especially in this city ... the one wish I had is that those projects across the street, those people could afford to come to the market and buy vegetables, you know, and that doesn't happen because they can't afford it*" (Interview 25).

This comment brings up a major accessibility issue: the price of food.[27] The concern with the price of food is fairly common among respondents from the commercial farm. Ten of the 27 respondents express discontent with the lack of access due to the price of food. One part-time volunteer farmer explains, "I mean there's a lot of like high-end, urban, I mean when you look at the people who pick up their food here, I think because the CSA is pretty expensive … they're selling to people willing to pay that much" (Interview 5). Based on price, the buyers of this food tend to be, as one farmer says, "a well-to-do population, educated, mostly white" (Interview 1). As another volunteer explains, "it feels like it's kinda an elite industry at the moment" (Interview 11). For these farmers, the price of the food causes a lack of access. Only a "well-to-do" population can afford this food.

---

[27] This issue will also be discussed in greater detail in the section about barriers.

For some urban farmers, improving food access is the primary goal. For other farmers, improving access is secondary to improving production and maintaining economic self-sufficiency. To reduce these opinions to two polar attitudes, however, is to oversimplify the complexity of these goals for participants. Most urban farmers are oriented toward both improving food access and maintaining commercial viability. Urban farmers express a multiplicity of related and conflict goals. One head farmer at the commercial farm embodies this mixed opinion. He says,

> *"We're really torn in two directions there because we want to sell our food for as much as we possibly can, so we can pay as many people as we can, but we also want our food to be affordable, and it's already pretty expensive compared to the grocery store"*
> (Interview 10).

Collective identity among urban farmers in this case is not unified around a single goal, but a variety, and while the commitment to different goals varies across and even within commercial and community farms, these goals continue to draw people together. Moreover, while the collective struggle for identity along these goals of improving food access and maintaining commercial viability is divisive, it is also unifying, in that it allows farmers to collectively struggle with the same difficult questions about the goals and orientations of the movement.

These different goals reflect conflicts within the urban agriculture movement between the orientations of old and new social movements. Old social movements are primarily redistributive, in that they seek to redistribute wealth. New social movements are focused more on building new lifestyles. In this case, the goal of improving food access is redistributive

because it emphasizes the distribution of resources to lower socioeconomic groups. Yet within

the same movement, there are actors who are seeking to improve production and economic

sustainability, thereby making urban farming a more viable lifestyle. In fact, based on the data,

these differences seem to place old and new social movement goals in direct opposition.

Respondents identify that on the one hand, focusing on access diminishes production, and on the

other that emphasizing production makes it more difficult to achieve equitable access to food.

Thus, trends in old social movements still exist in new social movements, and that these trends

come into conflict with one another, and pose questions about the unified orientation of a

movement.

Education

As we have seen in the section on shared attributes and characteristics, almost every

farmer in the sample strongly values education. This value contributes to the fact that for urban

farmers, education is also one of the goals of the urban agriculture movement. Of the commercial

farmers, one third (8 of 27) see education as a primary goal. At the commercial farm there is an

educational program for local school children. One of the head farmers explains the rationale for

creating this program:

> "*All along we've wanted to do this as a for profit and then we started [the educational*
>
> *program] as a not for profit because we wanted kids from all backgrounds, low income*
>
> *children, kids from schools that couldn't afford to pay a fee to come to the farm, we*
>
> *wanted them all to have access to the farm, we wanted to be able to pay people to run the*
>
> *education program so it's a really high quality program and not just like an ad hoc, like*

tour service, so we did start [the educational program] because we didn't, as a small

business, we did not need to carry the burden of running an education program as well"

(Interview 10).

In this way, this educational program at the farm is a way of achieving a multiplicity of goals: providing children with a learning experience about agriculture, improving access to food by making people aware of certain healthy food options, and maintaining economic self-sufficiency. Another head farmer at the commercial farm claims, "Education is really what this place is all about" (Interview 25). Other volunteer farmers also find the educational program compelling, saying, "To me the educational piece up here is one of the most compelling pieces, that in the city there is basically the opportunity to learn about food, where it comes from, and how it grows, and to think about what we eat, when and why," (Interview 2) "urban agriculture you can actually … have the opportunity to make farming cool to the younger generations," (Interview 8) and it's "a great program because it shows kids like yeah potatoes don't come in packets" (Interview 12). For many of the farmers at the commercial farm, education about values of the environment, health and sustainability is a main goal of the movement.

All three community farmers also consider education as a primary goal of their farm work. One says, "I wanted a farm that is committed to education" (Interview 17). Another explains that, "the idea was to get people into eating vegetables, to encourage them to feed their children vegetables" (Interview 24). Similar to the commercial farm, education is seen as a vehicle through which to teach certain values.

To a certain extent, these four goals—production, economic sustainability, food access and education—are shared among actors in the urban agriculture movement. It is clear, however, that rifts exist in these understandings, particularly between farmers at the community farm and the commercial farm. Actors at the commercial farm place a far greater emphasis on producing a large quantity of food efficiently, and making a profit on this food. In contrast, community farmers place a greater emphasis on making food accessible at lower prices to people who otherwise would lack access. In fact, these differences in goals are also mirrored in the different values and backgrounds of actors at the two farms[28]—suggesting that these commonalities contribute to the differences in goals between the two farms.

These collective goals that I have presented are the end product of complex framing processes, in which actors develop an understanding of the orientation of collective action. In the next section I will discuss how processes of interaction and the development of community contribute to collective identity formation. First, however, I want to make a note on the significance of shared goals in a community. These framing processes are interrelated to the interaction and construction of community among actors. Addressing common goals builds solidarity among actors. One visiting farmer at the commercial farm explains, "there's great strength behind … working towards something" (Interview 22). This farmer explains how the social movement contains directionality—people are "working towards something," meaning they have a collective sense of purpose and goals. Moreover, another farmer explains that through working at the commercial farm, "everyone kind of comes together and is able to work towards this one common goal" (Interview 20). Collective purpose and common goals, in this way, are

---

[28] It is important to point out that these conclusions are drawn from a small sample size of three farmers at the community farm.

interrelated with creating a close social group; these common goals can only be realized through

solidarity and relations with others. The following section will describe this community, which

provides the environment for collective goals to be realized.

The Construction of Community and the Development of Solidarity

The previous two sections present two different components of collective identity: shared attributes and collective goals. To view collective identity as merely a collection of discrete parts would be an oversimplification. Rather, collective identity should be seen as an iterative and continual process. This process is based on interaction between actors in a social movement, which allow actors to build community, and develop solidarity with one another. A community can be defined the physical and social location that allows actors to interact and develop this solidarity. The process of establishing this community is part of the framing processes that develop collective goals. Collective identity is inherently social, and a community provides this social environment for the development of collective identity.

In this section, I will first explain the rituals that reinforce and construct community in the urban agriculture movement. These rituals are important to the process of community formation. These include group harvests, lunches, social gatherings, and farmers' markets. These rituals are part of the process of constructing and reinforcing a community. Next, I will use interview data to provide evidence of this community.

Rituals

Groups of people do not create strong communities simply by being together. Communities, and the communality of community members, rather, must be continually constructed and reinforced. In his *Elementary Forms of Religious Life,* Durkheim introduced the

idea of "rituals" as a way to reinforce community (1912). Rituals are central to the celebration of

the community. They create an emotional energy and collective moral force that draws people

together in the name of their common purpose and values. Rituals affirm common values and

goals, and unify individuals with each other and with the group as a whole. There are four

prominent rituals that I observed in the urban agriculture movement: group harvests, lunches,

farm social gatherings, and farmers' markets. In this section, I will explain these rituals, and

show how they reinforce the framework of collective identity.[30]

Group Harvests

Harvest days at the commercial farm occur when the farm workers spend the day picking

the vegetables they grow[31]. Harvests take place on days when the farm sells its produce, either at

the farm stand, or to restaurants; they occur three days of the week at the commercial farm.

Harvest days are different from other days, because they require farmers to arrive at work much

earlier. On normal days, farmers come to the farm to begin work at 8 a.m. However, on harvest

days, farmers generally arrive between 6 and 6:30 a.m. The reason for this is that many of the

vegetables wilt in the middle of the day because of the summer heat. In order to harvest

vegetables when they are in best condition, one must harvest them before the hot sun comes out.

Harvest days also require more workers. Whereas on other days farmers complete tasks such as

planting and building infrastructure that is less time-sensitive, harvest days require that

---

[30] In previous sections I have used primarily interview-based data. Because rituals require observation, I will be using both interview data as well as field notes to explain rituals and practices.

[31] I only observed harvests at the commercial farm. This is also true for communal lunches and social gatherings. I cannot definitively claim that these rituals do or do not exist at the community farm because I did not spend enough time at this site. This is a limitation of my data.

everything be finished by 11 a.m., when the orders need to be ready to sell. Because of this time-sensitivity, there are more people working harder and faster.

Harvests reinforce a sense of community and collective identity among community members for a number of reasons. First, there is an energy that comes from the sheer number of people who are working together. On other days of the week, there are fewer farmers, and the work is more individualized. According to one visiting farmer, on normal work days, "you can spend the whole day working in the field by yourself or with somebody else and not see anyone" (Interview 22). Yet working on harvest days means that there are more people who are working collectively. Second, on harvest days people work harder than on other days when there is no deadline. On other work days, there is no final product of a day's work. The farm work is just general maintenance tasks. On harvest days, the pace of the work, the number of people working, and the concrete sense of accomplishment provides a greater sense of collective energy than on other days. Third, these harvests are early in the morning, and therefore people sacrifice more to come together. By waking up earlier, and going out of their way to come to a harvest, people consider the occasion more special than just any other workday. Yet this sacrifice is, for many, very rewarding. One part time farmer says, "It's really good work, you can get your hands dirty quite literally … and at the end of the day you have something to show for it" (Interview 20). This comment also raises a fourth point: that harvesting is a time when the farmers are able to see the rewards of their work. Many respondents consider harvesting to be their favorite activity because of this reward. One part-time farmer explains,

> "*Harvest is fun. It's so rewarding, but when you go in in the morning and you prep a bed*
>
> *and then you come back and plant it, or transplant, and you come back in a month and*

you harvest it. I remember back in March when it was so cold outside and you are

hanging out in the hoop-house seeding everything, there were so many days that it was

frigid outside. Seeing it before and seeing it now and harvesting it now is really cool"

(Interview 18).

As she explains, harvests are the completion of a natural cycle of growth. They allow people to literally see the fruits of their labor.

Harvests create a strong collective energy because they require more collective and cooperative work, and are therefore more rewarding. Moreover, the physical reward at the end of the day allows farmers to visibly see their collective efforts. One volunteer farmer attempts to explain the feeling, saying,

"*There is just more of an edge to the like 'were making this happen when we're here,' just*

kinda that buzz of energy that we get from harvesting in the morning, it's about pride, it's

about kinda excitement, I don't know it's the feeling like you are a part of something"

(Interview 13).

This comment is illuminating about the power of ritual group harvests. She says, "We're making this happen when we're here." As a collective, the group is acting out the values and goals of the farm and the movement. Furthermore, the last sentence of this comment articulates the way that a harvest is able to bring people together. Harvests make this volunteer farmer feel like "you are a part of something." This ritual is independent of working to sell produce. Instead, it is about being together, and working together. In this way, harvest days are not just any workdays. They are a ritual celebration of working together towards a specific end. The end is tangible, and the work is difficult, rewarding, and communal.

Lunches

One of the regular rituals on the farm is the lunch hour. The lunch hour allows people to eat and interact with each other. During lunch, every farm worker stops to eat meals together at the farm. At the farm, there is a small trailer and a picnic table. If it is too hot, people gather in the trailer for shade. Many times, one of the farm workers brings home-cooked food for everyone else. People eat on makeshift plates and bowls, or out of large Tupperware containers. Other times, several farmers go to a local grocery store and buy several types of spreads and bread. The farmers supplement these meals with vegetables they pick from the farm. Before everyone starts eating, the head farmer has everyone introduce themselves, in order to be sure that everyone knew each other's names. Every aspect of this experience is communal and everything is shared.

Several respondents at this farm site discuss these meals as an important aspect of communal bonding. One visiting farmer says, "my favorite part, the community again, our communal lunches are fantastic … communal meals are fantastic" (Interview 14). This famer equates community with communal meals. Another visiting farmer explains:

> "*Sharing communal lunch which is the best, it's the best time of the workday, of being together, it's just so nice, you know you can spend the whole day working in the field by yourself or with somebody else and not see anyone, and you come to lunch and it's like here we are and have a yarn*[32] *and eat a great meal, and have a laugh*" (Interview 22).

---

[32] "*Yarn*" is a slang term for "*conversation.*"

Here, the strong communal ritual is juxtaposed with the isolation of working in the field alone. Lunches reinforce the fact that the individual action of working alone is not actually individual. Lunchtime provides a social space for people to talk, eat and "have a laugh."

In addition, the very act of eating food at a farm is a ritual celebration of values. All of the food at these communal meals reflects the values of environmental sustainability and localism. Some of the food is harvested straight from the farm, which embodies principles of localism. The rest is home-cooked or bought from a grocery store that sells local and organic foods. The meals are also full of healthy ingredients. In this way, eating local, sustainably-produced, and healthy food together as a group not only unifies people, but it also consecrates and reinforces the very values that the community stands for.

Social Gatherings

Another ritual at the farm is the frequent social gatherings. While group harvests and lunches occur on a regular basis during the workday, these gatherings occur at night at the farm, or at people's apartments or houses. They are often potluck-style parties, in which people cook and bring it to share with everyone else. Like the lunches, this ritual is not only a celebration, but also a celebration of the values of food.

Moreover, the fact that these gatherings occur separately from the workday represents the strength of these rituals in reinforcing collective identity. During the workday, people are supposed to be together. Yet, people who attend these gatherings make a conscious decision to

spend time with one another outside of the workday. In this way, people are not just celebrating

their values or harvests, but they are celebrating each other, irrespective of the farm context.

These gatherings show that the connections at the farm and the community of people transcend

the actual farm space. People are voluntarily spending time with each other, and reinforcing

these social bonds.

Farmers' Markets

The farmers' market is a weekly event where customers come to the market and buy the

food produced at the farm.[33] The farmers' market at the community farm is a ritual that

reinforces community. At the market, there are a number of vendors from the local community

who sell the goods that they have produced at their community garden plots. There are youth

selling the produce from the community farm. The customers are generally "regulars" who live

in the local community. Moreover, the food is very cheap, and there are demonstrations about

different ways to cook the food in order to eat healthy. These aspects of the ritual reinforce the

shared values of health and food access at the community farm.

It is the regular social interaction during the farmers' market that reinforces the strength

of the community at the farm. One vendor at the community farmers explains, "There are people

who if they come to the market, and they don't see me, they don't shop" (Interview 27). This

---

[33] The commercial farm has a farmers' market, but attending the farmers' market is not a ritual that reinforces the farm community. This is because the customer base at the commercial farmers' market is very diffuse. There are also a number of different vendors from different farms at the same market. Some people come regularly, but many people consider it a market to buy food rather than a social experience. People are not sufficiently connected for it to be a ritual that builds community. At the community farm, however, the farmers market has a very different atmosphere. People come for the food as well as for the social experience and the consecration of the community. For this reason, I distinguish between the farmers' market at the community farm, and the farmers' market at the commercial farm.

suggests that visiting the market is about reaffirming longstanding social bonds. The same farmer discusses this idea further, saying, "You build camaraderie with them, they talk, you share information, so it's a community, so you help them understand what to eat, how to eat, how to make things…" (Interview 27). Here, the farmers' market provides a space and a platform for people to interact, especially around food and eating. Another community farmer also discusses her enjoyment of the communal aspect of the farmers' market. She says, "We have quite a few … gardens in this neighborhood, and we all get together at the market, we know each other, we grow vegetables to sell at the farmers' market" (Interview 24). Not only is the farmers' market an interactive space for customers, but it also allows community gardeners, who grow food in different places around the neighborhood, to come together on a regular basis. Like the other rituals at the commercial farm, a crucial component of the farmers' market is this consistency. In this way, the farmers' market functions to bring people from the surrounding neighborhood together on a regular basis. While it is a strong community in itself, the community farm is also part of a larger community, with which it strongly identifies. The farmers' market regularly brings many people from the larger community to the farm, making the event not only a celebration of the farm community, but of the larger community. The collective identity of the community farm is thus created around this large group of people, connected not only by farming and food, but by strong social and geographical ties.

These rituals reinforce collective identity at both the commercial farm and community farm. They build relationships between people, and reinforce the feeling of interpersonal connection and solidarity in movement communities. It is important to note, however, that rituals exist in different spaces, and reinforce collective identity around particular communities. Thus,

while they may be part of the same movement, these communities are separate from one another, and have separate rituals. It is through membership in a community—that is a close social and emotional connection to a group of people in a particular place—that actors develop a collective identity. I will now go on to demonstrate the concept of community in the urban agriculture movement.

Community

One of the most important aspects of collective identity in the urban agriculture movement is a community, which is a social and physical location that allows actors to connect with one another. In a community, actors develop strong social and emotional bonds over their shared endeavors. Community is the glue of collective identity because collective identity is necessarily constructed between a close-knit group of people. Only through a community of people can the shared values, goals, rituals, and processes of interaction be realized to establish and reinforce collective identity in a social movement. In this short section, I will present the evidence of the strong community at the commercial farm[34]. From my data I found four themes that demonstrate community. This includes positive feelings toward others, social interaction between actors in the same social space, an expression of a "sense of community," and a feeling of "like-mindedness" among actors.

Commercial farmers express a feeling of community through a generally positive attitude towards other people in the community. These positive attitudes demonstrate that people in the

---

[34] I only present data about the community farm because I lack the data to make claims about community at the community farm.

community feel socially connected to one another. At the commercial farm, more than half of respondents (13 of 24) express this positive feeling about the others in the community.[37] One full-time farmer explains, "The people there are awesome, they're all awesome" (Interview 6). Others echo this sentiment, saying, "It's such a great crew up here," (Interview 18) and "I only can say that I really love the people," (Interview 19). In these cases, respondents feel positively toward their peers. For another visiting farmer, community is about recognizing the positive traits of everyone else at the farm,

> "*I think it needed a bit of glue, I think that people needed to realize that people are here from the same reason and are like minded and came from a similar path of like changing their lives from an unsatisfied place to a happy place, and also people coming from out of town and wanting to be here, or temporary here, and with a bit of social lubricant everyone opened their eyes and realized how lovely everyone else was*" (Interview 22).

This farmer identifies how many different people from different places can come together in a space and appreciate one another. Farmers referred to their fellow farmers as interesting, intelligent, friendly, and hardworking.[38] One part-time farmer explains, "I've met some really optimistic, enthusiastic people, who are inspired" (Interview 5). Another full-time farmer appreciates that the other farmers "all work their asses off" (Interview 6). One of the head farmers explains that everyone is very nice; "pretty much no assholes around here" (Interview 26). These positive feelings toward one another are an important component of a community.

---

[37] This is not to say that half of the respondents expressed negative views. The interviews were open-ended, and over half of the respondents voluntarily expressed these positive views. Several respondents expressed negative views toward other individuals, but this was rare, and never directed at the community as a whole.

[38] A low percentage of respondents identify these traits individually. Together, however, they represent a larger category of an appreciation of other people at the farm. I am including these traits in the study because together, approximately half of the respondents expressed a positive attitude toward these traits. While alone they lack any statistical significance, together, this positive attitude about others at the farm is expressed by more than half of respondents.

Another aspect of community is social interaction between members of the community. Nearly half of respondents at the commercial farm (11 of 24) identify the farm as a place in which they are able to interact with others. Several farmers explain this social setting, saying, "There is a big social scene here." (Interview 2), "it is kinda like intensely social," (Interview 13), and "with the social environment it's been lovely to come up to the farm, and talk to people and meet people" (Interview 7). For many farmers, this social space facilitates conversation and allows people to meet others. One part-time farmer explains, "I have interesting conversations every day, about all kinds of things" (Interview 5). Community is manifested through conversations and social interaction. Two farmers even see the farm as a space for romantic interaction; "it's awesome, it's like a dating establishment now," (Interview 22) and "I'm kinda sick of meeting people at the bar so I came to the farm instead, and met my boyfriend who was also a farmer, and were going to [farm] together all over the world now" (Interview 11). The farm is a social space for many people and in many different ways. In this way, both the positive feelings among actors and the social interaction between people assist in establishing a community at this farm in the urban agriculture movement.

Communities are, in part, based on positive feelings and interaction. However, what makes a community a community is not only these aspects, but also a feeling of solidarity among actors. Solidarity is distinct from positive feelings about others because it implies a deeper unity and connection. Moreover, people develop this unity because of their shared endeavors. At the commercial farm, farmers articulate this solidarity as a strong "sense of community." Across all

24 interviews with commercial farmers, community is one of the most frequently-used words.[39] One visiting farmer explains this sentiment, saying, "My connection to this place … it's largely based around this amazing sense of community" (Interview 3). In this case, community is connected to other people, but also to a specific location. Other farmers articulate this idea of community: "It's the sense of the whole family and community that's created" (Interview 25), and "it has been like a community, you guys are kinda like family" (Interview 15). The use of the word "family" in the latter comments demonstrates the strong level of solidarity inherent in this group of people. Family is associated with strong emotional and personal attachments and connections, and in using this word to express community, this respondent feels a high level of solidarity with this community.

Along with this "sense of community," respondents also express a feeling of "like-mindedness." "Like-mindedness," refers to a feeling of fellowship with others based on similar values and beliefs. Approximately one third of respondents (8 of 25) express this feeling of like-mindedness. Referring to the other people on the farm, one volunteer farmer explains, "They're people like me, and I get that incredible sense of solidarity of talking to other people who have similar principles and are interested in living in similar ways" (Interview 13). The same volunteer farmer goes on to articulate the significance of a like-minded community for her, saying, "I mean there is a really powerful feeling of like-minded people being in one space" (Interview 13). In this case, being together with other liked-minded people in one place builds a strong fellowship with others.

---

[39] Of all words over five letters, "*community*" was the eighth most frequently used. In 25 interviews it was used 155 times, or roughly 6 times per interview.

A feeling of like-mindedness is explicitly related to the shared values that provide a foundation for collective identity. One volunteer farmer at the commercial farm articulates this connection, saying,

> *"There is something to be said for the people in general that come to this farm, I think we're here for maybe different reasons, but all those reasons fall under the same umbrella—we're all people that have the same values, care about the environment, care about our health, care about the future of, you know, this earth and the people that are living on it, and want to make a change for the better, so yeah. It's been great to be surrounded by people like that."* (Interview 20).

These values of environment, health and sustainability, are the foundation of like-mindedness. They bind people together. Others also articulate the ways in which these values contribute to their feeling of community. One head farmer explains, "We all obviously care a lot about the environment, our health … all really like-minded and trying to do good for the planet" (Interview 26). As I have demonstrated previously, believing in the same values is a foundation for a connection between others. Yet these values in and of themselves do not create solidarity. In order to establish solidarity, participants need to interact, and reinforce these commonalities and connections, and develop an understanding that they are working together toward common goals.

It is often difficult to fully articulate the meaning of a community, and the effect that it has on people. Sometimes, these sentiments are best understood not in analytic distinctions, such as "like-mindedness," and "sense of community," but in firsthand accounts of the meaning of community. During one of my interviews, I listened to a volunteer farmer tell a story about the farm that I found particularly compelling. I will share this story below. She says,

"I think now I had a train ride recently, to get here at 8. I'm getting up at about 6:30 and get on a train by like 6:50, get here by eight, and the whole ride I was feeling pretty not into it, I was not excited to go, it was gonna be a stupid hot day, I was really just dreading the whole thing, and it was also I had been away for a while, this is actually only a couple weeks ago, so I had this whole train ride of all of this just discontent and like really just feeling like uh why am I still doing this, why am I coming to the farm, and then I got here and Miles gave me a big hug at the top of the stairs, and Anna and Maddy was here, it was my first day meeting Maddy and I think she is super cool, and the first thing we did was go downstairs to move these super heavy tubs of [compost] and it was like, we just all got on it, and by the time we moved everything up in the elevator, I was like sweaty but so much happier, just that feeling, that incredible, you know and I'm in it for that feeling at this point, the fact that there are people here, there's a network here, I mean that's community … like when there is a group of people that can turn something that I thought I did not want to do that much into something I was so happy doing, that's really powerful" (Interview 13).

The most important takeaway from this quote and this story, is that community is based on people, and the social and emotional connections between these people in one specific place. In her story, it is the interactions, hugs, and group labor that make her feel united with others in a common effort. And if this idea of community is so rooted in people, and collective identity is rooted in community, then we can think of collective identity as based fundamentally on people and the connections between people. The root of collective identity is human connections.

Collective identity in a social movement then is not possible without these three interrelated components—shared attributes, shared goals, and community. Shared attributes provide the foundation for people to develop similar visions of the world. Shared goals are created through framing processes that allows people to convert similar visions of the world into orientations of collective action. Lastly, interaction between participants and rituals develop solidarity among actors and reinforce these shared attributes and goals in movement communities.

Collective identity is the heartbeat of the urban agriculture movement. It is through the process of collective identity that actors are able to build a movement and a lifestyle to affect change in the status quo and model the "right" way to live. At the same time, collective identities, in their internal strength, can become exclusive, limiting people from entering into the movement. Boundaries contribute to the strength of collective identity, but also establish barriers to participation. In the following section, I will explain how the process of collective identity constructs barriers to entry in the urban agriculture movement. These barriers have tremendous implications for the ability of the urban agriculture movement to include a wide array of people in collective action.

Barriers to Collective Identity

Collective identity is the fabric that holds together social movements. However, there is a fundamental paradox of collective identity in social movements. Collective identity connects members of a social movement community with a shared understanding of who they are and of their collective purpose. Yet in order to create this collective identity, the social movement community must build boundaries, and distinguish clearly between "them" and "us."

In the past, social movements generally originated from the bottom up. Lower classes and other subordinated populations would enter into resistance movements to gain greater equality from higher classes. These large populist movements, however, are not the only type of social movement today. Many contemporary movements are conceived not by the lower classes, but by middle classes. These movements seek to move society forward by establishing improved ways of living. Rather than attempting to gain access to resources and assets that others have, these movements conceive of themselves as the leading edge of society, defining the ways that people ought to live. In the urban agriculture movement, there can be a distinction made between the commercial farm and the community farm. The commercial farm is a movement that more closely represents an elite movement that defines the best ways to live. The community farm is a more egalitarian manifestation of the urban agriculture movement. It is also important to note how these differences may relate to differences in backgrounds, values, and goals between the two movements.

In the urban agriculture movement at the commercial farm, the formation of collective identity around the idea of developing a right way to live can often exclude certain populations. By defining acceptable ways to live and to view the world, collective identity builds barriers that permit only certain kinds of people—especially those of privilege—to take part in the movement. In the urban agriculture movement, these boundaries exist both around the movement, separating the movement from the rest of society, and within the movement, separating different groups within the movement. Figure 2 denotes a basic framework of the urban agriculture movement and the barriers that exist both around and within it.

Figure 2: Conceptual Framework of Barriers in the Urban Agriculture Movement

	Community farm	Commercial farm
Participants		
Non-Participants		

In this diagram, there are two simple classifications. One is between participants and non-participants. This simply refers to people who are involved in the urban agriculture movement, and people who are not involved in the urban agriculture movement. In other words, movement actors, and the rest of society. The other, community and commercial, denotes the two separate movement communities within the broader urban agriculture movement. In this diagram, I am concerned with both the dotted line and the double line. The dotted line refers to the barriers around the urban agriculture movement, which prohibit access to movement participation for the rest of society. The double line refers to the barriers within the movement that cause the

community and commercial farms to exist as separate entities. In this section, I will begin by discussing the boundaries that exist between the movement and the rest of society. I will then discuss boundaries between the two parts of the urban agriculture movement. These barriers are created along complex economic, cognitive, social and political borders and are integrally related to the process of forming collective identity.

Barriers around the Urban Agriculture Movement

There are several types of barriers to access that exist around the urban agriculture movement. These barriers are fluid and interact with each other. The first type of barrier is economic. The second type of barrier refers to the meaning that is ascribed to urban agriculture. And the third type of barrier is the use of urban agriculture as cultural capital.

Economic Barriers

There are two economic barriers that exclude certain people from participating in the urban agriculture movement at the commercial farm: unpaid labor, and high prices of food. One of the barriers to participation in the movement is that for most of the farm workers, the work is unpaid. Of over 50 workers at the commercial farm, only seven are paid. Regular volunteer interns account for a majority of the workforce. Interns sign up for different days of the week to work. The work is variable, and some interns work most days of the week, while others work only one or two days each week. Approximately one third (8 of 21) of farmers at the commercial

farm express a strong frustration with the unpaid work. One volunteer farmer explains her own personal misgivings, saying, "I have my conflicts about being a free intern in a commercial business" (Interview 13). Another volunteer farmer explains, "The pay would be helpful, like it would definitely be more incentive if you come here and you're like oh it's my job to work eight to five on the farm" (Interview 12).

Apart from general frustration among interns and volunteers, unpaid labor is a barrier that blocks people from being able to participate in farm work. It limits the population who can work at the farm to college students who have received grants from their universities to conduct research, people on an extended vacation who are working for fun, and people who have enough savings to survive without having a full-time paid job. In addition, this volunteer work makes it difficult for people who have family obligations. This means that most people at the farm are young and without children. This is a very limited population, which excludes most people who have to hold a full-time job in order to survive, which is a majority of the population. Thus, because of the unpaid labor, working at the commercial farm is only available for these groups of people.

Not surprisingly, the population at the farm contains a majority of these types of people. There is a contingent of workers who work full time, and live on savings accumulated from previous, more lucrative jobs. One farmer used to work as a banker on Wall Street, another worked at a major consulting firm, while another worked as a lawyer. These more lucrative occupations give people the savings to sustain themselves while they pursue volunteer labor. Similarly, people on extended vacations have enough money to do volunteer work, while many

college students are funded by their universities. Each of these three populations is either

wealthy enough to sustain a long time period without a job, or has temporary income from

another source. One volunteer farmer concludes, "The people who work here are people who can

afford not to get paid" (Interview 2). The unpaid labor means that the farm population is only a

small representation of the population at large.

Not everyone at the farm falls into these three categories. The rest of the farm workers

simply work unpaid, and work a paid job as well. As one volunteer farmer notes, during the

beginning of the growing season before I began my research, "it was all people who work here

two or three days a week, and struggling to find part time jobs so that they could stay afloat to

come here and work for free" (Interview 13). Another volunteer farmer describes the farm

workers as, "a rotating workforce," (Interview 2) for the same reason. While these workers are

slightly more representative of the population, working as a volunteer during the day and a paid

job at night is a major sacrifice that many are not willing to make. As a result of unpaid labor,

involvement in the production side of urban agriculture is very limited to a small minority of

people—those who have found a way to afford it. This barrier limits the demographic diversity

of the farm population.

Along with limiting the people who can work at the farm, economic reasons also bar

people from consuming healthy food. At the commercial farm, the cost of food is very high. I

observed that honey at the commercial farm was 10 times more expensive than an equivalent

amount at the community farm. This limits who can purchase the food from the commercial

farm, effectively only catering to a more affluent clientele. A number of respondents note that

the customers at the farm are generally wealthy. One respondent explains that it is "a class marker when someone comes here and drops 30 bucks right away on just your stuff" (Interview 13). The local and organic food that the farm sells is much higher-priced than supermarket equivalents; says one head farmer, "it's pretty expensive compared to the grocery store." (Interview 10) As such, only people with enough money to spend more on food are able to purchase the food, which limits participation in the movement.

These economic boundaries—both unpaid labor and the cost of food—are not purely economic. They are connected to other boundaries as well. By barring participation on both production and consumption levels, economic barriers construct an in-group of similar people involved in the urban agriculture movement. This, in turn, influences the collective identity of the group, which forms around a similar set of values carried by a similar set of people. In the following section I will explain in greater detail how economic similarities construct cultural boundaries.

The Meaning of Urban Agriculture

One of the ways the urban agriculture movement can exclude people is through the different ways that people ascribe meaning to agriculture. Collective identity is built around shared systems of meaning. In the previous section on collective identity we saw how communities construct shared understandings of urban agriculture. Without a common understanding of the meaning of the movement, a collective identity cannot exist. At the commercial farm, participants ascribe certain meanings to the movement. While urban farmers

share an understanding about the meaning of urban agriculture, this is not true of all people. As such, these meaning systems, which are rooted in collective identity, form barriers to participation around the movement.

For members of the urban agriculture movement, agriculture is unanimously seen in a positive light. This is true at both the community and commercial farms (although there are differences in the meaning between these two parts of the movement that will be described in greater detail in the following section). Perhaps the greatest indicator of this positive meaning is the fact that most farmers in this study work for free. They actively pursue agriculture as an activity of interest. For them, agriculture has hopeful and exciting connotations. It is associated with an expression of values, and a strong connection to the earth. This positive view of urban agriculture is common among movement actors. However, these meaning systems are not common among the rest of society.

Many people outside of the movement do not see agriculture in such a positive light[40]. For many people, agriculture is not new and exciting, but in fact the opposite; it represents a return to more primitive times. One farmer, who is part of the refugee program at the commercial farm, was bewildered by the concept of educated and well-off people voluntarily farming. Below is an excerpt from my field notes regarding this interaction:

> "*She was going down, to introduce me to Dylan, who she described as an El Salvadorian asylum seeker who had been through a lot … One of the other things that Dylan said was that in his country most people farm because they are poor, and they farm for themselves,*

---

[40] The data for this section is predominantly field notes that document conversations with people and observations about other interactions and happenings on the farm.

not for others. He said that if they need money, sometimes they sell their food, and that

they grow a lot of corn and another crop that I forget. It seemed a very foreign concept to

Dylan that people would farm for a business, and even more so, that so many people are

doing this for free. He never quite said this outright, but it seemed like he was wondering

why they hell I would want to do this for free, and not go make money" (Field Notes

5/30/13).

For Dylan, farming is something that people do in order to survive. It is difficult to wrap his

mind around the concept of people working on a farm voluntarily. This way of thinking is not

specific to this farmer. In fact, it is common to people who come from a recent agricultural

background, often in a pre-industrial society. The head of the refugee program explains,

"*To be successful now in Africa, or Latin America, or Asia for that reason, is not to be a*

peasant. You know, it's to work in the city, to have an office job, to have a more white

collar job, you know, so they come here and now they see all these young people who are

working in the farm that maybe even their parents have left to go and work in the cities …

not only they think that you guys are crazy to do that, but some of them even have turned

down, even though they were in financial difficulties, to do this job, because they feel it,

they associate it as being shameful, to tell their family back in home. You know, 'what are

you doing now in America?' 'I'm working on a farm, I'm farming'" (Interview 1).

This view associates agriculture with "peasant" work. As recent immigrants from agricultural

societies, many people are eager to move away from agriculture to a more civilized way of life.

From this perspective, agriculture is overwhelmingly negative.

These perspectives identify an understanding of agriculture that is completely different than that of the majority of commercial urban farmers. Yet, collective identity at the commercial farm is fundamentally built on a positive view of agriculture. This shared understanding defines how people think about and understand their own participation in the movement. Viewing agriculture as a return to "peasant" work, as many recent immigrants do, excludes them from participation in this movement. These meaning systems are perhaps best exemplified through the different ways that movement participants, and non-movement participants view dirt.

Dirt has very different connotations for different actors. Urban farmers love to be dirty and be in the dirt. For them, dirt is associated with agriculture and is hopeful. It is nutritious to the plants and is part of the earth that they value. In contrast, many people outside of the farm see dirt in an opposite way. For them, dirt is dirty, and being dirty is bad. In one instance, there was a young African American volunteer working at the farm with the rest of the farmers clipping tomatoes. This volunteer was not there voluntarily, but through a school program. The rest of the farm workers were eating the tomatoes as they worked (a common practice among urban farmers). They insisted that he eat a tomato. He repeatedly objected because the tomatoes were "dirty," and they had not been washed. Below is an excerpt from my field notes that recounts this occurrence:

> "*It was pretty clear that D knew much less about food and agriculture than everyone else. We spent the afternoon taking off the bad leaves on the tomato plants, and we said that he should try a tomato. He was very hesitant and said he didn't like tomatoes. Everyone tried to convince him that it was very good, but then the one that we were offering him fell on the ground. To everyone else at the farm, food falling in the dirt is not a big*

concern, but D would not eat it and we picked him another one. He tried it and ate it but

did not like it very much" (Field Notes 8/2/13).

For members of the movement, a tomato off the vine is a delicacy. It is when the tomato is at its most fresh and clean state. The dirt on it does not contaminate it, but instead is symbolic of its freshness. For D, however, the dirt contaminated the tomato.

In another similar instance, an African American family of three was visiting the farm in order to buy produce. As they were leaning over one bed of carrots, the father of the family picked a carrot out of the ground and ate it. The daughter was incensed by this action, and screamed at him to not get near her after he did that. To her, the carrot was contaminated and dirty. In these two instances, it is clear that while there are shared meaning systems among movement participants, these meanings are not necessarily shared by the rest of society. Both of these actors were young African Americans with no exposure to agriculture. While these cases are certainly not representative of the entire African American population, my limited data demonstrates that certain urban minorities often have a negative perspective on urban agriculture. It is important to note the ways that these meaning systems may also be connected to the demographics of the population at the commercial farm, which was presented in a previous section on shared attributes and characteristics. Nearly every single respondent at the commercial farm is white, and well educated. They view agriculture in a positive light. In contrast, many of the people who show a negative view of agriculture are from minority backgrounds.

Collective identity is built on shared values and meanings. Those who have different meanings and values about the same object are excluded from the movement community. In this

way, the meaning of urban agriculture, and whether it has a positive or negative connotation, is

fundamental to constructing collective identity, and also contributes to constructing barriers

between the movement actors and the rest of society.

Cultural Capital

A third barrier is closely related to both economic boundaries and boundaries having to

do with meaning of urban agriculture. As was discussed previously, economic boundaries narrow

the number of people who are able to participate in the urban agriculture movement (at least at

the commercial farm). This creates a high degree of demographic similarity, especially in

education and race. The data presented in the previous section on collective identity show that of

the 27 respondents in the study, 23 are white, and 25 have received, or are in the process of

receiving a college education.[41] While this data is simple, it demonstrates that those commercial

farmers are, for all intents and purposes, privileged and elite.

This demographic data provides a jumping off point for understanding the ways in which

actors develop cultural capital that influences their actions and tastes. This is perhaps most

relevant to consumers of local urban food, not farmers. Many scholars, Pierre Bourdieu chief

amongst them, have shown that food tastes are strongly linked with class (Bordieu, 1984).

Consuming certain types of food is an expression of class and culture. The demographic of

---

[41] The respondents in this study are primarily farmers, not customers. There are, however, three customers that make up this group of 24 people. Apart from these three respondents, there is no quantitative data to show that the farm's customer base is made up of an elite population. Nonetheless, through general observational data I have found that the majority of people who buy the food sold at the farm are elite. Through visiting restaurants that the farm sells to, I was able to see the demographic of people who were buying the food. The restaurants were all high-end, selling to an elite group of people.

customers at the commercial farm is largely upper and middle class educated people. This is clear both at farmers markets, and at the types of restaurants that the commercial farm sells to. According to one of the head farmers, "Most of the chefs that we sell to are feeding people that are pretty wealthy, like middle class and upper middle class, they are like high end restaurants" (Interview 10). Other volunteer farmers echo these thoughts. One volunteer farmer explains that the business seems to be "about getting, sort of, high end food into high end people's hands and paying a high price" (Interview 2). Another farmer explains, that the demographic at the farm seems to be "mostly pretty wealthy people who are professionals and are busy with their days, and just want the vegetables" (Interview 5). One head farmer describes this customer base as the city's "foodie demographic." (Interview 10) A foodie is a person who has a very calculated, or as Bourdieu might say, distinctive taste in food. While the idea of a foodie certainly has economic limitations—indeed the price of food, discussed above, is a limiting factor that determines those who can purchase the food from the commercial farm—, it is rooted in a culture of people who want to make thoughtful decisions about their food consumption.

Education is a primary factor in food choices. The head farmer explains, "The demographic consists of people who are aware of food issues and want to support small farms" (Interview 10). In this way, consumption is based on education about "food issues." These types of knowledge-based consumption decisions are also reflected in the comments of customers. One regular customer at the commercial farm explains that purchasing this local and organic food is "a choice. It's really like a political choice in a way, of like where do you want to put your money? And what do you think is important? And what kind of world do you want to live in?" (Interview 4). While they may appear to be choices for this consumer, these choices come

largely from a place of privilege, both from an economic and an education standpoint. Local and organic food is expensive and therefore not available to a large population of people in urban areas. While more privileged populations may have this choice, many people are not able to choose expensive food, but instead must choose other, cheaper foods. Moreover, decisions to buy local and organic food is also rooted in education about organic agriculture. While some people are taught about what types of foods are "better," others do not receive this type of education. It does not become part of their cultural repertoire to consume local and organic food. Apart from economic factors, a perceived knowledge about what is right and what is wrong distinguishes the class of people eating local and organic food from others. The same customer explains, "People should know. It's like you should be educated, and then make the choice, but to just say that I'm gonna remain ignorant is just not acceptable" (Interview 4). The idea that people "should know," demonstrates an elite perspective on food consumption, that there are right and wrong ways to consume food. Not consuming this type of food is looked down upon and deemed to be a function of "ignorance." Making knowledgeable and awareness-based decisions about food consumption is an exercise of an educated and affluent cultural repertoire, which is available to only a certain section of the population. Moreover, as this customer explains, there is a sense of distinction and separation between those who make these decisions, and those who do not.

In this way, the customer base at the commercial farm uses its cultural repertoire of knowledge-based decision making in order to distinguish itself from other classes of people. While customers are only tangentially involved in the collective identity of the movement community, this distinction constructs a strong barrier to entry into the urban agriculture

movement. If knowledge is a prerequisite, then a lack of education, and the lack of a cultural norm to make invested decisions in one's food based on environmental and ethical criteria, makes it almost impossible for people without these orientations to participate in the urban agriculture movement.

Perhaps the most important point, however, is that these cultural norms of good food consumption are constructed from a place of power. It is the people with wealth and education who have attempted to establish a cultural arbitrary and made decisions about what types of food choices are best. These norms are then enforced on the rest of the population. They represent upper class cultural capital.

Barriers within the Urban Agriculture Movement

Barriers exist not only between the urban agriculture movement and the rest of society, but they also exist between different factions of the movement within the same city. More specifically, barriers exist between the commercial farm and the community farm within the urban agriculture movement. There are clear differences between the two farms in terms of their values and goals. As a result, these movements do not share the same collective identities. Along with the differences in values and goals, there are cultural barriers that separate the two movements. At their core, these barriers originate from different ways of conceiving of agriculture, as well as different socioeconomic circumstances. In this section, I will begin by discussing the different ways that actors at the community farm and commercial farm view

agriculture, and connect this to demographic indicators. I will then discuss the ways in which these differences create barriers between the two parts of the movement.

Different meanings of agriculture

Both community farmers and commercial farmers are voluntarily involved in agriculture, which means that they feel positively about agriculture. Yet, for these different types of farmers, agriculture has very different meanings. For the people at the community farm, agriculture is a way of life. It is something that they have been doing for years, and have become accustomed to. One community farmer attempts to explain this meaning, saying,

"*Where I'm from, my Mother was a farmer, I'm from Jamaica. I came here in 1984, May 6th, so that's almost, 30 years, approximately 30 years. My mother was a farmer, and um, I think it's a hereditary trait, because everyone in my family, my brothers and my sisters, like to farm. It might be, I don't know if farming could be a trait but it might be, but even my nieces and my nephews and my son and my grandchildren, not all of them but at least one of my grandkids have this affinity to planting things, both of my sons do, and all my sisters, all my brothers, and some of them can't farm but if they had a chance to they would, so I don't know what it is, but I'm wondering if it could be a trait factor. And that's not an affinity, it has to be a trait factor*"

(Interview 27).

In this quote, there is a lack of vocabulary to explain her "affinity" to agriculture. This is because it is something that comes naturally. She says, "I don't make a profit, I just do it because of the love of it" (Interview 27). In this way, much like anything that a person is born into, agriculture

is naturally appealing to this population. It is not grounded in explicit values, but instead in a

lifetime of experience. One community farmer comments on this, saying,

"*I think there's a world of people who have been doing it forever, I mean since, people have been*

farming here since before the Dutch came here, and a lot of it is marginalized people and

immigrants and they're doing it because that's what they do, and they have a history of farming

and a background in farming and it's a way to create something in their neighborhood that isn't

there already" (Interview 17).

This meaning of urban agriculture can best be characterized as a natural way of life. People

enjoy growing food, because it is something that they are accustomed to. This meaning,

however, is specific to a certain population. In this study, it is common to a large portion of the

community farmers. As the above quote says, many of these farmers are immigrants, born into

agricultural families. Another distinct characteristic is their age. There is a big difference in ages

between community and commercial farmers. Community farmers are middle-aged or older, and

are often first-generation immigrants. In this way, their affinity is born from firsthand experience

farming.[42]

These cultural differences in the way that community farmers and commercial farmers

view agriculture creates barriers between the two movements. Collective identity is not possible

when there are fundamentally different ideas about the movement subject. When asked about the

commercial farms and community farmers, one community farmer explains, "*I do think there's*

---

[42] Of course, not all people of minority backgrounds feel naturally inclined toward agriculture. In the previous
section we looked at several people whose family was involved in agriculture, and as a result those people would not
even consider gardening in the city. It is clear, then, that there is a group of immigrants who farm, and others who do
not farm, and do not want to be anywhere near farming. Without the adequate data, it is difficult to present clear
reasons for these discrepancies. One simple explanation is that there is natural variation in how people feel toward
agriculture. Certain people may associate farming with peasant work, and others may associate farming with an
idyllic rural life. These differences clearly exist, however, they do not undermine the patterns observed about each
set of people.

two different movements, and I think they have two different goals and I think they sometimes cross." (Interview 17) The overlap is clear in the section about values and goals, but the differences are equally as compelling. At their most foundational level, the differences in values and separation of collective identities is rooted in the different meanings that actors ascribe to agriculture and to the movement. This has profound impacts on the inability of these actors to collaborate and bridge existing differences through urban agriculture.

Exclusion and Marginalization

Both around the urban agriculture movement and between the community farm and the commercial farm, there are significant barriers. It is important to make a distinction here between the community farm and the commercial farm. Although they are technically part of the same movement, the two communities are very different. While the community farm offers possibilities for many types of people to become involved in agriculture, the commercial farm makes participation very difficult on many different levels. On one level, there are economic barriers, both to working on the farm, and to consuming farm food. On another level, there are cultural barriers in terms of how people view agriculture. Collective identity is formed around these commonalities and sense of shared understanding of urban agriculture. Yet in constructing around these particular attributes and ways of viewing agriculture, collective identity is exclusive, particularly to racial minorities and people with lower socioeconomic status. The commercial farm demonstrates the ways in which the collective identity at the commercial farm is constructed from a position of power, which reaffirms the "right" way to live, and in doing so

subordinates people without the characteristics to participate in this way of life. In this way, the

collective identity at the commercial farm is exclusionary and marginalizes many potential allies.

Discussion and Conclusions

This paper has demonstrated the ways in which actors in the urban agriculture movement in a major northeastern city construct collective identity. Shared attributes, including values, interests and backgrounds, build a foundation for actors to develop a unified vision of the world. Through framing processes, actors build on these commonalities to develop shared goals of the movement. These framing processes are inherently social. And collective identity should be seen as a process that is based on interaction between people, and the construction of communities within the urban agriculture movement. Strong emotional and social bonds between people are crucial to building collective identity. Lastly, these processes and orientations are also integral to boundary formation, which strengthens collective identity within a movement, while at the same time making it more difficult for people to participate in the movement. These boundaries also exist between communities in the urban agriculture movement. A lack of social connection and common ground causes collective identity to be disjointed between different communities in the broad network of the urban agriculture movement.

Boundary formation is integral to any social movement. However, in the case of this urban agriculture movement, there is evidence that boundary formation has a particular dynamic, in that this construction of collective identity is built along existing lines of power and privilege that exclude lower socioeconomic classes and racial minorities. The evidence presented on collective identity in the urban agriculture movement in a major northeastern city demonstrates this in a number of ways. For one, the shared attributes that provide the foundation for collective identity are based on symbolic resources available only to certain socioeconomic and racial

groups. And the demographic data of the respondents in my study reaffirms this by showing a striking degree of homogeneity. Most people are white and have received at least a college education. Interestingly, this is not the case for community farmers, and as we have seen, there are boundaries between community farmers and commercial farmers. This upper class and white homogeneity is reflected in the values of urban farmers. Environmental values, for example, are often considered to be more associated with people from dominant class and race groups (Snow, 1991). Caring about the abstract conditions of the world and the environment are based in a social location of privilege. This is reflected in the fact that the climate change movement is largely white and middle class, however, the environmental justice movement is much more diverse and often grassroots. Climate change is an abstract concept that is closely connected with values that are held by those who are not troubled by the challenge of day-to-day existence, while environmental justice is focused on oppression and injustice. And these environmental values, as I have demonstrated in section one, are common in the largely white and well-educated population at the commercial farm. In this way, the background of participants is integrally related to their values and how they see the world. Participation in the urban agriculture movement is based on a distinct cultural toolkit and habitus that is not available to everyone.

Moreover, it is clear from the data that these differences in values and goals are manifest not just between the movement and other social groups, but within the movement as well. One of the defining characteristics of new social movements is their diversity of actors, ideologies and grievances. And this is quite clearly the case in the urban agriculture movement. In this study, there are profound differences between the commercial farm and the community farm. Actors at

the commercial farm focus more heavily on these environmental values, while actors at the community farm do not once mention these values. Actors in these different communities also have different goals. Community farmers want to more directly reach underserved populations with healthy and nutritious food, while commercial farmers are more focused on becoming economically self-sufficient. In addition, these goals are related to actors' backgrounds and their symbolic understandings of agriculture. Even though many of these farmers have grown up around agriculture, their perception of agriculture varies tremendously. For commercial farmers in the study, agriculture is a value-driven hobby and a business. In contrast, community farmers see agriculture as a way of life. Thus, while all actors in the movement may all be planting food in the city, the symbolic perception of urban agriculture is very different.

We have seen in the fourth section about boundaries that urban agriculture can be exclusive. There are symbolic boundaries that distinguish not only the urban agriculture movement from the rest of the city that eats less healthy and imported food, but also between different communities in the urban agriculture movement. And these boundaries are closely connected with privilege, especially class and race. The mechanism of this boundary formation, however, is still unclear. I will now return to two theories about new social movements and class in order to explain the implications of my data. First, Alberto Melucci highlighted the fact that many new social movements are not redistributive, but instead are lifestyles that convey a message to society about the proper way to live (1985). These new social movements are cultural models of how to live. A number of urban farmers discuss the urban agriculture movement in these terms. One farmer explains, "hopefully this idea that what we're doing here could be a model for people to branch out and go do it everywhere" (Interview 25. This idea of urban

farming as a model demonstrates how urban farmers conceive of their own action as something

to be replicated. By developing a model, they are showing society the way forward.

The second theory I will return to is Pierre Bourdieu's theory of distinction. As I

explained in the literature review, Bourdieu argued that social classes and status groups

distinguish themselves through cultural practices (1984). Connecting these two theories—

movements as cultural models, and distinction of cultural practices—I believe that certain

communities in the urban agriculture movement (in this case the commercial farm) conceive of

themselves as a model for how society ought to live, and that this conception is part of a dance of

distinction by participants, who are members of the racial majority and upper class. The

formation of collective identity, then, is a means to distinguish themselves from others, and show

the world how food *should* be produced, and how people *should* live.

Using these ideas, I want to raise a question that I alluded to in the introduction: What are the

implications of this formation of collective identity on food access in diverse urban areas? In the

introduction, I reviewed many of the potential goals of the urban agriculture movement. At the

advent of the community garden movement in the 1970s, urban areas were becoming plagued by

crime, drugs, and widespread poverty. The movement formed in order to address these issues.

Community gardening sought to make productive uses of vacant spaces, and allow community

members to interact and socialize. In later decades, the movement became oriented around

addressing health concerns in urban areas, which are caused in part by a lack of access to healthy

food. In American cities, many racial minorities and people in lower income brackets are unable

to access nutritious foods. And as a result, rates of diabetes, obesity, and cancer are more

prevalent amongst these populations (Alaimo et al., 2008; Dibsdall et al., 2002; Sobal & Stunkard, 1989l; Treuhaft & Karpyn, 2010). By making food accessible in the city, urban farming would ameliorate these health and food security concerns.

Many scholars have posited that a combination of economic, geographical and political reasons bar people from accessing healthy food. While this is certainly true, there are other sociological dynamics that influence food access. In this study, I have demonstrated that certain communities in the urban agriculture movement build symbolic, cultural, and social barriers that limit access to the movement for many types of people in urban environments. By distinguishing themselves through collective identities that are based on specific cultural practices and symbolic resources, actors in the urban agriculture movement make it more difficult for lower classes and minorities without these symbolic resources to become part of the urban agriculture movement. And without the right social and cultural capital, it is more difficult for actors to gain access to healthy and nutritious food. In this way, through this dance of distinction, actors in the urban agriculture movement fail to help solve these rampant issues of food access in urban environments, and instead deepen, complicate and reinforce this exclusion.

These findings are worrying, and call into question the direction of certain communities in urban agriculture movement. Rather than focusing on redistributing and solving social ills, these communities are reinforcing identities constructed upon existing power structures. By providing healthy and nutritious food for people who are already able to access it, expansion of the movement as it is currently configured, will exacerbate issues of food access, rather than help solve them. In order for the urban agriculture movement to truly have a positive impact on the

diverse urban settings in which it is situated, these urban agriculture communities must deconstruct the privilege that they represent.

Based on the data collected in this study, there are two clear areas in the current urban agriculture movement that underlie this exclusion: 1) the reliance on volunteer labor, and 2) the high prices of food. There are many other underlying causes of this exclusion that this study has highlighted, but these are more complex, and do not have "easy" fixes. I argue that these two options are "easier to fix," and may have lasting ramifications on other, more entrenched issues. First, in order for the movement become less reliant on volunteer labor, it is important for city governments to provide subsidies to farms for jobs in urban agriculture. Through this subsidization, more people, not only those who have the free time, but working class people as well, will be able to make a living in agriculture. This would diversify the workforce and provide access to nutritious food for more people. Second, in order to reduce the prices of locally grown food, the federal and state governments must channel a portion of the money currently dedicated to other agricultural subsidies, into small-scale urban farming operations. According to the documentary film *King Corn,* over the past 15 years, the federal government paid $77 billion in subsidies to corn farmers, most of whom are large-scale producers, producing unhealthy ingredients of processed foods (Woolf et al., 2007). Rather than increasing the budget for agricultural subsidies, the government could direct more money from the existing subsidies to smaller farms in cities. By offering greater margins for small urban farmers, the high prices of this food would decrease and become more accessible to a larger population. In addition, small producers and distributors of local urban food should be required to take federal and state food stamps as a legitimate form of payment. This would allow for people with lower incomes to

purchase healthy food. By addressing these political and structural barriers, it may over time

cause a change in cultural and symbolic resources around local food. Commercial farms and

community farms could become more closely aligned, and the urban agriculture movement could

become more culturally and socially accessible for a greater diversity of social groups. These

solutions aim to address the particular issues identified in this paper. However, I suggest further

research into the complexities of these symbolic resources that have configured the movement in

such a way. Research on more farms in more cities will provide the more information to

understand the power structures that underlie many communities in the urban agriculture

movement. Only through understanding these dynamics, can we seek to make the urban

agriculture movement more inclusive and work to lessen the issues of food access rather than

exacerbate them.

References

Alaimo, K., Packnett, E., Miles, R.A., & Kruger, D.J. (2008). Fruit and Vegetable Intake Among Urban Community Gardeners. *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior, Vol. 40 (2).* pp. 94-101.

Alkon, A. H., & McCullen, C. G. (2011). Whiteness and Farmers Markets: Performances, Perpetuations … Contestations? *Antipode*, *43*(4), 937-959. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8330.2010.00818.x

Allen, P., & Kovach, M. (2000). The capitalist composition of organic: The potential of markets in fulfilling the promise of organic agriculture. *Agriculture and Human Values*, *Vol. 17*, 221-232.

Bassett, T.J. (1981). Reaping on the Margins: A Century of Community Gardening in America. *Landscape, Vol. 25.* pp. 1-8.

Belasco, W. (1989). *Appetite for change: How the counterculture took on the food industry 1966-1988.* New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Beydoun, M.A. & Wang, Y. (2008). How do socio-economic status, perceived economic barriers and nutritional benefits affect quality of dietary intake among US adults? *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition, Vol. 62.* pp. 303-313.

Blumer, H. (1958). Race prejudice as a sense of group position. *Pacific Sociological Review, Vol 1*. pp. 3-7.

Blumer, H. (1969). *Principles of Sociology, Part 2: Elementary Collective Groupings*. In Buechler, M.S., & Cylke, F.K. (1997) *Social Movements: Perspectives and Issues.* Mountain View, California: Mayfield Publishing Company.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste.* (Nice, R.). United States of America: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.

Caraher, M., Lloyd, S., Lawton, J., Singh, G., Horsley, K., & Mussa, F. (2010). A tale of two cities: A study of access to food, lessons for public health practice. *Health Education Journal*, *69*(2), 200-210. doi: 10.1177/0017896910364834

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2012). *A Look Inside Food Deserts.* Retrieved from: http://www.cdc.gov/Features/fooddeserts/

Cohen, J.L., (1985). Strategy or Identity: New Theoretical Paradigms and Contemporary Social Movements. *Social Research, Vol. 52 (4),* pp. 663-716.

Coleman-Jenson, A., Nord, M, Singh, A. (September 2013). Household Food Security in the United States in 2012. *The United States Department of Agriculture Economic Research Service.*

Retrieved from: http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/err-economic-research-report/err155.aspx#.U03CGVfQDlN

Collins, R. (1979). *The Credential Society.* New York, NY: Academic

Collins, R., (2001). Social Movements and the Focus of Emotional Attention. In Goodwin, J., Jasper, J.M., Polletta, F., *Passionate Politics.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Dibsdall, L.A., Lambert, N., Bobbin, R.F., & Frewer, L.J. (April 2002). Low-income consumers' attitudes and behavior towards access availability and motivation to eat fruit and vegetables. *Public Health Nutrition, Vol. 6 (2).* pp. 159-168.

Durkheim, E. (1912) *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life.* New York: Free Press.

Eyerman & Jamison, (1991) *Social Movements: A Cognitive Approach*. In Buechler, M.S., & Cylke, F.K. (1997) *Social Movements: Perspectives and Issues.* Mountain View, California: Mayfield Publishing Company.

Flora, J., Emery, M., Thompson, D., Prado-Meza, C. M., & Flora, C. B. (2011). New immigrants in local food systems: Two Iowa Cases. *International Journal of Sociology of Agriculture and Food*, *19*(1), 119-134.

Fromartz, S. (2006). *Organic, inc.: Natural foods and how they grew*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt.

Gamson, W. (1992). Social Psychology of Collective Action. In Morris, A.D. & Mueller, C.M., *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Gans, H. (1999). The possibility of a new racial hierarchy in the twenty-first century United States. In Lamont, M. (1999). *The Cultural Territories of Race: Black and White Boundaries.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press/New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Garner, R. (1997). Fifty Years of Social Movement Theory: An Interpretation. In Garner, R. & Tenuto, J, *Social Movement Theory and Research: An Annotated Bibliographical Guide* (1-58). Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, Inc.

Gecas, V. (2000). Values Identities, Self-Motives, and Social Movements. In Stryker, S, Owens, T.J., White, R. (2000). *Self, Identity, and Social Movements.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Guptill, A. (2009). Exploring the conventionalization of organic dairy: Trends and counter-trends in upstate New York. *Agriculture and Human Values*, *26*(1-2), 29-42. doi: 10.1007/s10460-008-9179-0

Guthman, J. (2004). *Agrarian Dreams: The Paradox of Organic Farming in California*. Ewing, NJ: University of California Press.

Hagey, A., Rice, S., & Flournoy, R. (2012). *Growing Urban Agriculture: Equitable Strategies and Policies for Improving Access to Healthy Food and Revitalizing Communities.* The Policy Trust. Retrieved from:

http://www.fairfoodnetwork.org/sites/default/files/UrbanAg_FullReport.pdf

Johnston, J. (2008). The citizen-consumer hybrid: Ideological tensions and the case of Whole Foods Market. *Theory and Society*, *37*(3), 229-270. doi: 10.1007/s11186-007-9058-5

Johnston, J. (2011). Reflexivity and the Whole Food Market Shopper: Shopping for change, or cruising for pleasure? *Agriculture and Human Values*, *28*, 303-319.

Johnston, J., Szabo, M., & Rodney, A. (2011). Good food, good people: Understanding the cultural repertoire of ethical eating. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, *11*(3), 293-318.

Johnston, H., Larana, E., Gusfield, J.R. (1994). Identities, Grievances, and New Social Movements. *New Social Movements* (3-35). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Johnston, H., Larana, E., Gusfield, J.R. (1994). Identities, Grievances, and New Social Movements. In In Buechler, M.S., & Cylke, F.K. (1997) *Social Movements: Perspectives and Issues.* Mountain View, California: Mayfield Publishing Company.

Klandermans, B., (1984). Social Psychological Expansions of Resource Mobilization Theory. *American Sociological Review, Vol 49,* pp. 583-600.

Klandermans, B., (1992). The Social Construction of Protest and Multiorganizational Fields. In Morris, A.D. & Mueller, C.M., *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Klandermans B., & Oegema D. (1987). Potentials, Networks, Motivations, and Barriers: Steps Towards Participation in Social Movements. *American Sociological Review Vol. 52 (4),* pp. 519-531.

Klapp, O. (1969). *Collective Search for Identity.* In Buechler, M.S., & Cylke, F.K. (1997) *Social Movements: Perspectives and Issues.* Mountain View, California: Mayfield Publishing Company.

Lamont, M. & Fournier, M. (1992). Introduction. In *Cultivating Differences: Symbolic Boundaries and the Making of Inequality.* Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Lamont, M. & Molnar, V. (2002). The Study of Boundaries in the Social Sciences. *Annual Review of Sociology, Vol. 28.* pp. 167-195.

Lareau, A. (2003). *Unequal Childhoods: Class, Race, and Family Life.* California: University of California Press.

Lawson, L. (2006). *City Bountiful: A Century of Community Gardening in America.* University of California Press.

Lochbiler, D. (June 10, 1998). The Shoemaker Who Looked Like a King. *The Detroit News.* Retrieved from: http://blogs.detroitnews.com/history/1998/06/10/the-shoemaker-who-looked-like-a-king/

Lockie, S. (2009). Responsibility and agency within alternative food networks: Assembling the "citizen consumer". *Agriculture and Human Values*, *26*(3), 193-201. doi: 10.1007/s10460-008-9155-8

Manza, J. (1992). Classes, status groups, and social closure: a critique of neo-Weberian social theory. *Current Perspectives on Social Theory, Vol. 12:* pp. 275-302.

McCarthy, J.D., Zald, M.N. (1977). Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory. *The American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 82 (6),* pp. 1212-1241.

McCullen, C. G. (2001). *Why are all the white kids sitting together in the farmer's market?:*

Whiteness in the Davis Farmers Market and Alternative Agrifood Movement. MI: University of

Michigan.

Melucci, A. (1980). The New Social Movements: A Theoretical Approach. *Social Science

Information, Vol 19 (2),* pp. 199-226.

Melucci, A. (1989). *Nomads of the Present*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Melucci, A. (1992). *Challenging Codes: Collective Action in the Information Age.* Cambridge,

England: Cambridge University Press.

Missouri, University of. (2014). *Urban Agriculture.* Retrieved from:

http://extension.missouri.edu/foodsystems/urbanagriculture.aspx

Mueller, C.M. (1992). Building Social Movement Theory. In Morris, A.D. & Mueller, C.M.,

Frontiers in Social Movement Theory. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Oberschall, A. (1989). Culture Change and Social Movements. Paper presented at the annual

meeting of the American SOciological Association, San Francisco, August 9-13.

Ridgeway, C.L., (1997). Interaction and the conservation of gender inequality: considering

employment. *American Sociology Review, Vol 62.* pp. 218-235.

Roosevelt, F.D. (April 1, 1944). "Statement Encouraging Victory Gardens." In *The Presidency Project.* Retrieved from: http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=16505

Slocum, R. (2006). Whiteness, space and alternative agrifood practice. *Geoforum*, 1-14. doi: doi:10.1016/j.geoforum. 2006.10.006

Smith, J. P., & Hobbs, D. (1977). Farmers' markets in Missouri: Rural/urban differences among markets and consumers. *Rural Sociological Society*.

Snow, D. (1991). *Inside the Environmental Movement: Meeting the Leadership Challenge.* Island Press.

Snow, D.A., Burke, E.R., Worden, S.K., & Benford, R.D. (1986). Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization, and Movement Participation. In Buechler, M.S., & Cylke, F.K. (1997) *Social Movements: Perspectives and Issues.* Mountain View, California: Mayfield Publishing Company.

Sobal, J. & Stunkard, A.J. (March 1989). Socioeconomic Status and Obesity: A Review of the Literature. *Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 105 (2).* pp. 260-275.

Southside Community Land Trust. (2014). The Urban Agriculture Movement. Retrieved from: http://www.southsideclt.org/urbanagriculture

Stryker, S. (2000). Identity Competition: Key to Differential Social Movement Participation?. In Stryker, S, Owens, T.J., White, R. (2000). *Self, Identity, and Social Movements.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Stryker, S, Owens, T.J., White, R. (2000). *Self, Identity, and Social Movements.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Stryker, S, Owens, T.J., White, R. (2000). Social Psychology and Social Movements: Cloudy Past and Bright Future. In *Self, Identity, and Social Movements.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Swidler, A. (1986). Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies. *American Sociological Review, Vol. 51 (2).* pp. 273-286.

Taylor, V., & Whittier, E.N. (1992). Collective Identity in Social Movement Communities. In Morris, A.D. & Mueller, C.M., *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Tiemann, T. K. (2008). Grower-Only Farmers' Markets: Public Spaces and Third Places. *The Journal of Popular Culture*, *41*(3), 467-487. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-5931.2008.00531.x

Timm, J.C. (September 10, 2013). Urban Farming takes hold in blighted Motor City. *MSNBC*

News. Retrieved from: http://www.msnbc.com/morning-joe/urban-farming-takes-hold-blighted-motor

Touraine, A. (1985). An introduction to the Study of Social Movements. *Social Research, Vol. 52.* pp. 749-787.

Treuhaft, S. & Karpyn, A. (2010). The Grocery Gap: Who has Access to Healthy Food and Why it Matters. *The Food Trust.* Retrieved from:

http://thefoodtrust.org/uploads/media_items/grocerygap.original.pdf

Turner, R.H., & Lewis, M.K. (1987). *Collective Behavior.* 3d ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Valera, P., Gallin, J., Schuk, D., & Davis, N. (2009). "Trying to Eat Healthy": A Photovoice Study About Women's Access to Healthy Food in New York City.

Walker, I. & Smith, H.J. (2002) *Relative Deprivation: Specification, Development, and Integration.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Warner, S.B.J. (1987). *To Dwell is to Garden: A History of Boston's Community Gardens.* Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.

Waters, M.C. (1999). *Black Identities: West Indian Immigrant Dreams and American Realities.* New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation/Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Whelan, A., Wrigley, N., Warm, D., & Cannings, E. (2002). Life in a 'Food Desert' *Urban Studies*, *39*(11), 2083-2100. doi: 10.1080/0042098022000011371

Whitman, M. (November 16, 2012). Commercial Urban Farming: What is it and Why Does it Matter? *Sustainable Business Forum.* Retrieved from:

http://sustainablebusinessforum.com/sbtoolkit/71541/commercial-urban-farming-what-it-and-why-does-it-matter

Woolf, A., Ellis, C., Cheney, I., Miller, J.K. (2007). *King Corn: you are what you eat.* New York, NY: Mosaic Films.

Young, D. (1973). *Gardens for All: Guide to a Greener, Happier Community.* Charlotte, VA.

Appendix

Sample Interview Template:

Sample interview guide for farmers:

When did you first start farming?

What did you do before you began farming?

Can you tell me a little about how you became interested in farming?

What made you want to be an organic farmer as opposed to a conventional farmer?

How did this farm start?

Can you tell me a little about how your business operates?

What do you think about the CSA model?

What about the farmers' market model?

What about your farm, can you tell me about what you farm, your farming methods?

Could you tell me about what an average day is like for you? You can just tell me what you did

yesterday if it's easier.

What is your favorite part of being a farmer at this farm?

What is your least favorite part of being a farmer at this farm?

Do you enjoy the events that the farm hosts?

Which event is your favorite, and why?

Do you think that farming has changed during the time you have been a farmer?

What are the greatest challenges you face as an organic farmer?

Do you find it hard balancing economic and environmental needs?

Would you recommend farming as a career/life to your children or other young people?

Is there anything else you want to tell me about your experience at this farm or your thoughts on food production?

Sample interview guide for customers:

Can you tell me a little about your food shopping and eating habits?

How have your habits changed over time?

Can you tell me a little about why you shop here?

What are some of the positive aspects of shopping at this farm?

What are some of the negative aspects?

Can you tell me a little about your experience when you shop here?

What does an average visit to this farm stand/farmers' market look like for you?

Can you tell me a little about your interactions with other customers and farmers when you shop?

What is your favorite part of your visits to the farm and why?

How convenient is it for you to shop here?

Do you come to any of the events hosted by the farm? If so, which ones?

IF APPLICABLE: Can you reflect a little about the events at the farm?

Is there anything else you want to tell me about your experience at this farm or your thoughts on food production?

Interview Citations

***These names are pseudonyms

Interview 1: Mary (6/17/2013)   ***omitted from farm sample

Interview 2: Eli (6/26/2013)

Interview 3: Miles (6/28/2013)

Interview 4: Eliza (6/29/2013)

Interview 5: Rosy (7/1/2013)

Interview 6: Alice (7/2/2013)

Interview 7: Olive (7/3/2013)

Interview 8: Paul (7/19/2013)

Interview 9: Emily (7/21/2013)

Interview 10: Georgia (7/22/2013)

Interview 11: Zanya (7/24/2013)

Interview 12: Sacchie (7/24/2013)

Interview 13: Lucine (7/26/2013)

Interview 14: Mac (7/30/2013)

Interview 15: Natasha (7/30/2013)

Interview 16: Lyle (7/31/2013)

Interview 17: Dalia (8/1/2013)

Interview 18: Emma (8/1/2013)

Interview 19: Grace (8/2/2013)

Interview 20: Dara (8/2/2013)

Interview 21: Breanna (8/5/2013)

Interview 22: Ash (8/6/2013)

Interview 23: Regina (8/7/2013)

Interview 24: Gilda (8/7/2013)

Interview 25: Mark (8/8/2013)

Interview 26: Brian (8/9/2013)

Interview 27: Paige (8/10/2013)

Field Notes Citations

Field Notes 5/30/13

Field Notes 8/2/13