Anthropological Critique and Framing of Suburban Enclaves: Case of Neighbourhood X

MATEJ BUTKO

Institute of Social Anthropology,
Comenius University in Bratislava
butko.matej@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The main point of this article is conceptualization of newcomers within specific suburb in perimeter of Bratislava. The analysis with fruitful and extensive base of evidence provides a connection between the western suburban community theories and local actual and discursive strategies in various topics. The content of this article consists of analysis of bonding, residential and motivational strategies of newcomers, and a wide conceptualization of them, including a class concept and a bounding character of socialization. Additional analytical and evidential asset of this article is the perceptiveness that provides us the 'other-than-actual' evaluative perspective. This perception is provided by other inhabitants outside of the researched Neighbourhood X. This evidence, which is connected to the theory of leisure class consumption, is therefore the perceptive side of the core definition of enclaves in residentially excluded neighbourhood. This article offers conclusions of a specific field experience and broadens not only the existing suburban community theories, but also the works that try to conceptualise significant traits of suburban enclaves.

KEY WORDS: suburban community, suburban class, suburban neighbourhood, suburban gating principles, lifestyle, perception

'*A city building, you experience when you walk; a suburban building, you experience when you drive.*' (Helmut Jahn)

Introduction

Because of recent political and medial discussions about the infrastructure in Bratislava, suburbs and their infrastructural problems are not something, what ordinary citizen miss in everyday news. Massive migration to the specific attraction zone in the given perimeter of Bratislava initiated many problems such as insufficient financing of the new public places mostly shared by newcomers in spatially centred neighbourhoods. But not only question about management of public places is alarming. If we consider this place socially diverse, thus consisting of two very different sorts of inhabitants (who we can resemble by their specific economic, residential, relational backgrounds) a different alarming topic pops-up. Although the root of this problem may seem as almost the same as the mentioned financial and urban management shortages mainly what I can call incompetence of 'human factor'. Of course, management depends only on a limited group of people, but this, what is among urban anthropologists known as suburban community question, is the dilemma accompanying a diverse society, in its broadest social and local political understanding based on a spatial, economical, and social exclusion.

To answer how we got to this state of exclusion - when the members of two groups, one being urban migrants (newcomers) and the other being settlers, are avoiding each other - is really tricky. A deep and time demanding research that includes recent details about almost every suburb in perimeter of Bratislava is necessary to see the bigger picture here. In my humble opinion, this interdisciplinary meta-project would be successful only in case of sharing the field experience of every single researcher working in this exceptional area and place of study. Therefore, the only thing I can offer here is my own individual field experience from one specific suburb that contributes to the theories which discuss reshaping of suburbia.

My article is based on the anthropological understanding of observed traits of newcomers to suburbs - mainly connected to local bonding strategies and discourses; and then framing of the suburban migrants into a group with distinctive and locally based social, economic, and spatial manifestations. The theoretical part and analysis of observed manifestations is in this article divided into two interpretational axes. The first consists of definitions and analyses of suburbanites from the urban-sociological, social-economical and spatial perspectives (including residence and bonding strategies), which are actual, and with

a little bias they may be called objective. The second axis (perceptional perspective) consists of the interpretation of the suburbanites by other inhabitants and works on the subjective and locally discursive level. The combination of these two kinds of interpretations and additional analysis will form the conclusions of this work - general traits of the specific suburban enclaves in mentioned conceptualization topics.

Part I: Local setting, participants and methods

Local setting

I conducted my research in Ivánka pri Dunaji. Cadastre of this municipality is directly adjacent to the capital city of Slovakia. According to a competent source from the local office - currently the municipality consists of approximately 6 200 permanent residents (for the year 2013 it was 6185 residents). After a discussion with another competent local elite, I gained the information about a presence of additional (also approximately) 1 500 non-registered inhabitants.

From a local political point of view, Ivánka pri Dunaji is formally a part of Bratislava Higher Regional Unit (abbr.: HRU). More specifically, it is a part of Senec district that is one of the three non-inner-city districts in Bratislava HRU. Because of its close position to the near capital city, municipality is a part of Bratislava suburban attraction zone, which mostly consists of near municipalities on the outer perimeter of the city. Generally speaking, the suburban sprawl affected the municipality (and attraction zone), where the building activity culminated around 10-15 years ago.

Introduction of participants

The setting of the suburban locality is connected to some general facts defining its specific character. In this section I will try to outline the most essential characteristics of the place of research, its inhabitants, and my respondents.

Just before my research I promoted the group of 'newcomers' to the group that is the main object for this research and whose social qualities and motivations (resulting in practices) are primary aims of evidence from the field. Because of technical fluctuations between the categories of 'newcomers' and 'settlers', these have to be defined more specifically.

By newcomers I consider the urban migrants – suburbanites, who entered the municipality as its inhabitants and live there (minimally since the year 2000, as our relative

time border): the base of their relationships is thus renegotiated by their own and free change of social environment. By these newcomers I mean urban migrants, who migrated mainly from Bratislava or from other locations in Slovakia. Settlers, on the other hand, can be briefly characterized as the group of permanent inhabitants of the municipality, who live there for more distant period of time (or were born here) and thus perceived more precise local and social context of municipality. To sum up, I interviewed 13 newcomers and 8 settlers. Their division was based on their life experience.

Model area: 'Neighbourhood X'

The special case based on which I will mostly interpret the mentioned suburban class phenomena is one pure residential neighbourhood with no public institution. This neighbourhood is already from narratives (which I will mention later as a part of the analysis) known as exclusively inhabited by newcomers. It has its origins in a period of the most massive estate-building activity that culminated around 10 years ago. The neighbourhood consists of, for the most part, individually sold estate-plots on what grounds grew predominantly single-family residences.

This neighbourhood is very specific and delicate. Its physical settings in context of the municipality spatial order is a fringe – it lies on the outside area, off the public centre of the municipality. Moreover, the significance of the distance of the locality from the centre (circa 15 minutes by walk) is enhanced by the fact that the locality is 'cut off' by physical obstacles (river, forested area). The area is connected to the municipality centre by a road and a footbridge which cross the river and a forested area.

I picked this model area as the space for the further analysis of various features connected mainly to the definition of a common suburbanite class (enclave) and occurrence of exclusive social motivations and strategies. Finally, I have to say that from the technical point of view, participants (suburbanites accompanied) in this neighbourhood are considered 'the same' category as participants (suburbanites - newcomers) from any other locality of the municipality. Practically, this neighbourhood served me as a good mean to look more 'inside' the community mechanism. Therefore, I consider it to be the concrete locus by which distinct characteristics of suburbanites' class (enclave) uniqueness can be shown.

It is also important to say, that the two mentioned interpretational axes resemble two clusters of this neighbourhood. While Cluster A consists of participants I interviewed directly, Cluster B consists of inhabitants I did not interview (the mean to describe this

cluster was through interviews with one of my key informants, Cluster A inhabitants who their closest neighbours are), and also other municipality inhabitants who live outside of the spatially segregated Neighbourhood X). Thus, as I said, analysis of this neighbourhood is based on the actual and discursive level.

Methods used

I will introduce the methods I used during my field research here. I defined the suburban space as the 'area of arrival of urban elements' with the meaning that its inhabitants disperse (sprawl) all around the space of suburbium - I used methods which can be described as 'urban anthropological'. This type of research is well-defined by Foster and Kemper (2009). They remark that the research in this kind of spatial setting is extremely difficult - mainly in the part of acquiring a suitable participant sample of anonymously constituted societies (communities). As authors insist, the golden way of handling these spatial and social limitations is the appropriate combination of ethnographic methods with other secondary means of acquiring data, mainly because anonymous and 'less emotionally reachable' character of suburbs represents (as my claim) in context of the urban elements flowing into suburbs. Therefore, the most suitable way to reach suburbanites that I used (as one of more options, which Foster and Kemper suggest), was to focus on particular dispersed units – clusters (that I described previously). Within this focus I used the 'snowball method' as a mean to acquire respondents – always based on the recommendation of previous respondents.

I picked the following predominantly qualitative data gathering means which I consider appropriate: interview, participant observation, photography. I also tried (when possible) to collect various secondary sources of information – magazines, statistics, and so on, which could broaden my view. Despite not knowing outcomes of all methods directly in analysis - all of these were used during the 5-week-long research. Thus, the main and the most relevant method that I used during my fieldwork, and the one that will serve as the main evidence in the next sections, is the interview.

Part II: Primary conceptualization of suburban newcomers

Before theoretical analysis of relevant settlement, let me remind one fact of big importance. I am aware, that in this chapter of the paper, mainly in its conceptual and theoretical part, I use social theory connected to the American, or Western theories of (sub) urbanism. I use these theories as roots to understand the whole concepts - because in some way I consider

them relevant in any area in the world, thus also in Slovakia. Many of them may be because of their historical context considered as 'universal' or 'pioneering'. The second justification for the usage of western urban material is limited theoretical base of non-western studies grasping the suburbs in Eastern (post-socialist) Europe.

Socio-economical and motivational conceptualization of migrants

First of all, the suburban migrants and their motivation, from the belletristic point of view, can be characterized as an exclusionary enclave, whose upper and middle class residents search for the sameness, status, and security in an ideal 'new town' or 'green oasis' (LOW 2003:390, LANGDON 1994, McKENZIE 1994). Geographical perspective, presented by Musterd and Lupi (2006), can be attached to this characterization by claiming that moving out of polluted and dense cityscapes with a significant rate of crime and poverty is the sign of social mobility. Then, this migration into suburbs can be viewed as a sign of desire of status change of family – what is in overwhelming suburban majority reflected by acquisition of single-family house in a particular neighbourhood (LUPI, MUSTERD 2006).

Negative outcomes of this motivations are mentioned also metaphorically, by William H. Whyte (1956) who (acc. to Musterd and Lupi 2006) depicts suburbs as 'freely chosen prison' - inhabited by the new type of individualized rootless (displaced) suburbanites (LUPI, MUSTERD 2006:804, WHYTE 1956). At first stance I can argue with the help of Baldassare, that this individualism is reflected just before the migration into suburbs - when a potential inhabitant picks from the variety of localities 'where to' the best destination, which can provide him the best services (BALDASSARE 1992). It is necessary to add, that this services can be understood in many meanings – in context of my research this term can be inferred into 'prize/locality' ratio when a potential migrant simply has no expectation about how he is going to be implemented into an existing social mosaic in an inhabited area. Therefore, before the actual moving into suburbs - the financial side dominates the suburbanites' field of expectations at the expense of motivations in a social engagement.

Let me present some of my interview excerpts in order to complete justifying of the mentioned theoretical conceptualization. These excerpts were provided by the inhabitants of Cluster A, in the Neighbourhood X, and also by newcomers from the other areas of the municipality.

'*If I'd be in Malinovo, or, I don't know, in Dunajská Lužná, or Bernolákovo, or Rača.. Generally, I didn't care. I came because of the land here and I decided to live here... And we liked the idea of 'new neighbourhood'. So the estate-land was free, and we'd been*

building it with neighbours at the same time from the beginning. Practically, two duplexes were built at that time... I ran out of there [from Bratislava], here it is chill. I have my privacy, no problems with parking. It's 100 percent better life here. I just sit in the evening in the garden, work there, I'm not closed here.' [M1, Cluster A]

'*Firstly I wanted to dwell the house, secondly I wanted the relaxation garden, and the thirdly – socialization, it would come naturally. So, the reason why I chose to move here was to raise our dwelling standards [in the past, the couple lived with 3 kids in a 2-room flat] ... And we were considering this ideas [about housing], that each of our children would have their own room. We'd been looking, of course we were a little limited by our financial sources [while selling 2 flat apartments before], so we took a loan... And then we saw the advertisement... And the neighbours were at ongoing project of duplex, and then it was just free - so we took it immediately.*' [Z1, Cluster A]

'*It simply attracted me here – in Bratislava we had 2 kids in 44 square meters - so we needed to have some place for ourselves. We needed something where I could arrange my stuff in a bigger space. The best financial solution was to come here. Also the traffic is good here – Ivánka, exit point, highway, done. And we wanted for each of children their own room, and also for my stuff. So we needed more space and also we wanted the silence and calm. So as it is in here now – the calm.*' [Z3, Cluster A]

'*We wanted to have a garden, and to have more space. We didn't prefer to stay closed in one apartment... Two things were essential – here it had better space than Bratislava, it was more reachable for us. And also the distance – to schools and work is good.*' [M3, Cluster A]

'*And when we divorced, I wanted to stay here – because I have a sister here, and a son – so we found this apartment...If I did want to go to an estate-flat, I would prefer Bratislava [Petržalka] and not the village. So, here everything is near, and I liked the estate-plot here, and also that here were like 10 children, so they are playing outside.*' [Z4, newcomer out of Neighbourhood X]

'*We expected that here it would be quiet, calm, the bigger comfort – and so that we would experience more space.*' [Z2, newcomer out of Neighbourhood X]

'*We were renters and we decided to have 'our own' with my girlfriend. We discussed various localities, but some friends were leaving this, so we decided to take it. Crucial was the ratio 'price-output effectiveness'...It's quiet here, its quasi-countryside...It's simply situated differently [than in Bratislava], it's just cool dwelling in here... I don't know about any community here, in general I just sleep here... I only do activities... but I don't create*

any bonds here… I just live my own lifestyle…. So I'm not fixed to this place, I'm not like 'Ivanka, top level, VIP, my favourite life in Ivánka' – it doesn't matter. And I don't care whether I live here, Bratislava, or Malinovo.' [M2, newcomer from out of Neighbourhood X]

As we can infer these interview parts - certain motivations and attitudes are expressed by the newcomers simultaneously. Firstly, the terms such as quiet, chill, silence are the reflections of what Low (2003: 390) called the 'search for green oasis' by suburbanites – even the motivation to have a garden extends this motivation. Also motivation to have a garden can be inferred from what Lupi and Musterd (2006: 806) claimed to be the search for 'idyllic, cosy, and almost rural lifestyle of the old days'. Secondly, again, according to Lupi and Musterd (2006) the other needs, such as space, place, comfort and raising dwelling standards, are something what suburbanites tried to find – or have found already. In this sense, acquisition of the new estate unit is the right way towards fulfilment of their demand for space. In the third point we come to motivations and occasions like distance or financial solution (opportunity), which are theoretically grasped by Baldassare (1992). Connecting to these realms - every prospective suburbanite 'makes the choice' and chooses the best fitting option according to the certain financial limits, and satisfy the idea about accessibility to the close city. To sum up, it is what M2 called as 'the price-effectiveness ratio'.

Bonding and residential strategies: Pioneering, gated, and life-stage community

In order of not to be one-sided, and to answer 'the community question' of spatially excluded - newly build neighbourhood (as was mine in research), let me introduce two significant socialization strategies I localized in my field research.

Firstly, let me present the concept of Barbara M. Kelly (1993), who came up with the term pioneer saga. This term encompasses the processes of socialization between suburbanites in their earlier days at the new place. This concept, when neighbours solve the same kind of problems and because of that they create deep social bonds 'from the beginning', is applicable mainly to the rapidly built suburban areas. To transform the theory into practice in case of my research this effect actually happened to a part of the neighbourhood. In this case, mainly the aspect of material cooperation plays a role. Let me introduce some excerpts to make better insight of this residential strategy.

'Well, us neighbours, we maintain it. Usually we have some meetings. We are in the middle position in our little community. So, neighbours from the one side, and other, and actually

also the other neighbour were at ours once. We call it 'susedovica'[1]. *These are very nice gatherings, in summer, maybe two times per month – we speak about our vacations, our kids, what happens in schools, and like that ... And many times we [with his wife] talk from the perspective, that we have grown kids, and we say how we handled some problems - everyday personal problems. What happens with family and like that.'*

'*Neighbour welded last time, he didn't have electrodes, so I gave them to him, and neighbour lent me the borer. When it is something I know he has, he lends me it, and I do the same. Or I drilled neighbour's irrigation well, because I have this stone-driller... And we share some stuff, because, for example this machine is enough for all three of us. We have above-standard neighbour relationships – it's not only about a salute, but we know what is happening in that family.'* [both excerpts - M1]

'*Yes, there is a couple next to us M3, Z3, they were only one acquaintance. I used to meet with both of our adjacent neighbours. They have 'susedovica' nowadays, too. Just, at our place, or at firsts, or at seconds. All these three families meet, and just sit or drink. So it's like a society of the best friends here, we experienced things together here – and it has lasted to present.'* [Z5, past member of cluster A]

'*Practically, we meet here if we arrange 'susedovica' – and meet with M1's family, and with the next neighbour. And we chat for a little; from 7 p.m. let's say until 2-3 a.m. It happens on birthdays, name days... And with those first and second neighbours we share things, we exchange plants, seeds, and share the garden tools... And for cultural events here, we are known to link-up. When a neighbour is free, we can go with M1's, or with those other neighbours [closest ones], if we're free, we can go to events as a gang.'* [Z3]

'*And the next thing is also, that our parents, are among these 3 neighbours* [Cluster A] *according to age the oldest ones, but they still are close age with them,... and also they are the closest to them, and have fine relationships with them, and we have them too. They visit each other, barbecue together, each of these 3 neighbours throw these parties.'* [M4]

'*We didn't bond through children, the house-building bonded us together - the fact that we came here at the same time.'* [Z1]

As we can see, this evidence proves that in this particular neighbourhood locally based relationships stem directly from the pioneer saga (for Cluster A members from over

---

[1]   In loose translation: 'neighbors' party'.

14-15 years). Its activities are based on local histories and residential proximity, concretely on the fact that 2 out of 3 households built the duplex at the same time and justify their close relationship by the fact of common residential history. This is a proof of Barbara Kelly's (1993) model of the pioneer saga that occurred in this clusters' close-bonded formation as a result of the fact that each of the neighbours started building and living there at the approximate same time. In order not to be one-sided, let me offer one of the bounding strategies (concept adopted from: LOW 2003) that limits potential contact with other municipality members by more spatially based rules.

This concept of gated community, well-developed by Setha Low (2003), is also visible in the terms of surveyed locality. Low (2003) defines gated communities as household clusters, which share common security means (cameras, high walls, gates, and in some cases personal security) in order to acquire control. In case of my research, this expression of material control occurred to a certain (limited) extent. The households did not share common means of control, but each of them accompanied in this solidarity network is dependent on its own security mechanisms, devices, or material solutions exhibited on their property. Thus, this community is not cohesive in this material sharing point, but practically their security cohesion stems from the individual material (architectonic, property construction) expressions. Therefore, this part of the spatial neighbourhood (Cluster B) is a perfect example of how private and individualistic embodiment of space (acc. to LOW 2009 - concept will be presented later) contributes to the formation of locally based neighbourhood. Also, this cluster can partly be described as consisting of 'the same sort of inhabitants' from the economical (material) point of view (also from the one of the observations made). Let me make this point clear by providing evidence.

'*They are very rich people. Beforehand, I was scared of them when I heard that some director, lawyer, or manager of a certain company would come. I am friends with a lot of them, I go there, and we stick together… So, I got used to knowing that here people speak about money differently.*'

'*They all know each other; know what to expect – who would prepare the stuff [for example for common gathering]. There is a street, two rows of houses. These houses have this field, so they built there a play-ground – the grass, nets, and like that. It is common – boys play football, bicycle there.*'

'*And they also had from the village the service that bring them the child back from school, spend time with child, or do the chores. Many of the women from the core village do chores here. Many of them found employment here, so they do not complain. So, there are 3-4*

women I see doing their housework. It can be called the help. They have no time for that [Cluster B newcomers], so these women do the housework for them."

'*They [other municipal inhabitants and elites] just see that there is a rich person, so they think they would help… But here they do not have time for that. They travel a lot and have high positions…We wanted XYZ[2] to be our candidate for a mayor, because he is super organizational guy, he has a lot of acquaintances everywhere. He rejected, saying there is no time for that. And, that the mayor does not have as big salary as he has in his function.*'
[Z7– Cluster B, key informant]

Figure 1: *Collectively semi-gated street in Neighbourhood X. Photo: Author*

---

[2]   Name of person is anonymous according to research ethics.

Now, I may infer some assumptions based on the given evidence. The most significant common sign about the described 20-25 households (assumed also by Z7 respondent) of this cluster is its 'well-being'. It is expressed by supposed presence of 'managerial person', luxurious gatherings this community arranges, possession and maintenance of more residencies, or the service that they hire for housework in their residences. Just a word - I experienced this last phenomenon in a life of another household outside this neighbourhood – when a senior woman (also a settler) worked as an au-pair for a newcomers' child because of their mother's busyness (caused by occupation).

Also the second sign was accentuated by respondent – a big amount of children, who form this community. Here we can utilize Putnam's (2000) argument about creation of a fragmented suburban enclave, as in Cluster A analysis – when, according to 'life stage' of clustered inhabitants the parts of suburban neighbourhoods are created (in case of Cluster A by older inhabitants). In case of Cluster B, this 'life-stage' linkage is expressed in the big amount of families with young children (in approximately the same age) living in this cluster of residences.

Part III: Key distinctions of suburbanites and perception on them

After mentioning the major bonding, residential, and motivational traits observed among the suburbanites, here comes the presentation of the major term where all observed traits can be fully put into a bigger interpretational frame. This term is class, and beforehand it is necessary to state its methodological importance in the formation of my argument. In this sense, it is important to say that my consideration of this term is of technical character – and I use it because of its unique power in order to grasp such a diffused category of inhabitants as suburbanites are. It serves me as the virtual connecting 'macro category' of people who share some common definitions – mostly about their distinctive performance and outcomes this performance carries in the suburban area. Thus, for this effective usage I start with terminology introduced by Pierre Bourdieu (1984) - particularly with key terms habitus, lifestyle, class and taste, which are the ones that correspond with my research outcomes.

First of all – habitus represents a perceptive, but also a productive mechanism that enables all of the practices to have a social meaning. Then, the outcomes of habitus are 'meaning giving practices' of an individual, but also 'meaning giving perceptions' that others receive (BOURDIEU 1984:170). Basically speaking, habitus represents socially approved complex of practices. So, habitus (1) gives classifiable judgments about practices accompanied in it and, more importantly, (2) the classification of habitual practices is

possible. Now to the point, habitus creates a space for appreciation of practices. This approving, appreciating and in some sense organizing process of practices and products is called taste (that is then a kind of socially approved preference).

In order to get further in theorization, the term lifestyle can be defined as a product of a specific taste, thus the product of the material and symbolic appropriation of practices, objects and relationships. Important is that this sense of lifestyle always encompasses the set of preferences of various material or symbolic kinds. According to my research, one (material) attribute of lifestyle taste preference is mostly reflected in multiplicity of expensive architectural and building design styles[3], and also in habitual activities that characterize the specific group - both reinforced by spatial exclusion of locality.

The sight to the other pole of taste production is also very interesting and leads us closer to the term of class. Bourdieu (1984) states that production of distinct and different cultural interests occurs in the society and thanks to them the consumers satisfy their needs in order to endorse and demonstrate their class lifestyle preference. At this point, analogically, the suburban migration - its physical (e.g. architectural, building, spatial character of housing) and symbolical expression (e.g. expectations of 'no, or little community', family life focus in the suburbs, In. BALDASSARE 1992), or about idyllic post-rural life (LUPI, MUSTERD 2006:806) respectively, become the product. Important is, that this product creates specific cultural interests for only a limited extent of potential migrants. Therefore, I claim the existence of the new class (enclaves), whose decision to migrate into a particular suburban setting, according to the mentioned culturally significant taste stimuli, is forming the new clusters in the suburban neighbourhoods - thus the unique class. And for the continuity of argument it is necessary to add that after the migration to the locality the sameness in some practical class specific performances can be claimed as the taste performances. Now let me be a little more concrete in the following part.

Prescribed limits of suburbanites: no time for broad community?

At the first stance, as I mentioned in the very intro of this paper – the occurrence of suburbanized inhabitants and suburbanization is the contemporary fact. The process Putnam uses is the suburban sprawl – this term is a well-known urban-related metaphor that encompasses massive and intense suburban migration during a relatively short period of

---

[3]   This aspect will be discussed later in context of Veblen's theory.

time. In contemporary public discussion this term, besides this characteristic, carries one extra quality – and it lays in uncontrollable residence-building across a certain area. Putnam (2000) claims suburbanization and suburban sprawl is mostly about intensifying of workplace-residence separation and segregation by class.

As Putnam (2000) also states - suburban sprawl stands behind the three socially negative phenomena:

(1) Because of need of commuting to the near city: the time that may be devoted to friends or community activities is limited. Thus, sprawl builds up disengagement.

(2) Social segregation is built up, and thus the involvement in broader public relations (inter-class) is limited. Then, more homogeneous groups are constituted.

(3) The boundedness of community is limited as well – it is caused by 'private zones' which suburbanite has to enter in different locations: house, shop, and work.

Therefore, the suburban sprawl brings to a certain area a specific sort of people with various motivations – but with the same prescribed limits in the social sphere. Namely, the processes of bounding (that is by Putnam described as a kind of cultivation of social networks in homogeneous units) is accentuated, but more importantly, the bridging (social relations within heterogeneous groups) is limited. I said 'more importantly' for a reason – if we discuss the class distinction, this limitation can be called one of the specific traits of a certain class when we connect the theories of Bourdieu (1984) and Putnam (2000).

Let me offer some evidence as a proof that the base for meeting new acquaintances and then for broadening of new locally based relationships is limited - thus consists of inner-community characteristic of bounded relationship. This set of evidence is from the inhabitants of the researched neighbourhood and is provided by informants who told me about their own practices and attitude (actual side) and also about attitude they think their neighbours have (outer or discursive side).

'*In the core municipality no, I don't have any relationships there. It's because of my busyness, that I don't have time to stick around in the village... So, when I have a 12-hours shift, I am the whole day at work, and then I have to cook. And then I have the garden – so then I have no time to spend there. And then I relax, and the next half a day I also spend some time by taking care of the house.*' [Z1]

'*From the organizational point, I don't have time for more in the social sphere. It's just work, and then go home and do the stuff here… I am very limited by work, and I'm not in touch with anyone, or even don't have time to be in broader friendships.*' [M3]

'*And husband has no time for relationships because he always has to fix something, or he is in the garden, so when the moment comes, we go on bicycle – and that's individual.*' [Z3]

'*These houses serve as a night-spend estates. Because they work, and they work in the city, and they don't know what to do first because of busyness – then there is time for nothing. No chatting with neighbours or caring about the municipality.*' [M1]

'*They close themselves out of the village. This Neighbourhood X, it's absolute – if someone goes there, there is 'no foot on the street'. I think, they perceive it like the rest, relax – that they just shut themselves from the world, and don't care. They come back from work, get closed and maybe stay in their garden.*' [Z5]

'*I really don't know the neighbours over there [Cluster B]. I know only the closest ones. Here on this street also, but only by their face and on the next street too – we don't have any contact with them… As I said, this new people are engaged by work too much, they commute to Bratislava – so it is anonymous here… Probably they just come home from work and then enjoy the rest with their families.*' [M3]

Social creation of the suburban space

After introducing some prescribed manifestations, which, according to Putnam (2000), urban sprawl creates for actual migrants to suburbs, let me introduce another practice. This practice is called social creation of a place and, as it seems, social creation of a space in suburban residential areas occurs in an interesting way - captured mostly in perception of newcomers by their neighbours or inhabitants who live out of their neighbourhood. About that later, firstly I will briefly describe, how social creation of a space emerges.

Firstly, based on my research experience, it is necessary to conceptualize the term of suburban place, and space - two interconnected realms in which suburbanites express themselves within a certain setting. The first important matter is the meaning of the two mentioned terms. Setha Low (2009) conceptualizes these two terms with another one: the body (embodied space) - that 'incorporates metaphors, ideology, and language, as well as behaviours, habits, skills, and spatial orientations derived from global discourses and faraway places – especially for migrant – and yet is grounded in any moment in a specific geographical location' (LOW 2009:22). Basically speaking, physical creation of a material setting can be understood as the outcome of culture spatialization. Then, in terms of my research locality, suburban space is a social product of various factors held by already migrated suburbanites: social, economic, ideological, and of course, technological. Therefore, suburban material (physical) and residential conditions and expressions, such as

the character of the neighbourhoods, preferred architectonical building design or gating of households, can be conceptualized as a product of a human and social agency. And also, it is necessary to say that in order to make this point clear, this social agency expressions result into physical (aesthetical) changes in the original environment, where these changes are incorporated by the flow of urban elements (theorized by WALKS 2013, LEFEBVRE 2003).

This flow of urban and material elements may also be classified as a signs of some economic exclusivity of the inhabitants of the specific neighbourhood that I researched. We can also see this kind of inclination in the attached pictures of estates and properties – situated mainly in one specific street. Financial well-being can be publicly seen at the architecture, design, or construction of the security means of the house-estates. In this point, it is proper to mention Setha Low (2009) and her claim that various global discourses ground the fashion of house-properties into the specific space. By evidence from the field, I claim these migrants as inclinable to building houses in modern architectural styles by their individual preference while neglecting the pre-existing canon (actually, intense character of building of this neighbourhood in the past caused, that practically no canon was present – thus physical individualization was free). Therefore, the multitude and visible opulence of the presented forms of properties and their security means (at least gating of estates) present common interest in the social or private gating of families – thus social segregation (LOW 2003 - gated communities). By fringe position of the whole Neighbourhood X 'out of municipality', this segregation may be taken into account more seriously.

Economy of material opulence

After starting this debate about corporate and economical materiality presented and provided by the other inhabitants to perceive; now I also need to provide the results of a brief material cultural analysis of my samples. For this topic, I picked one of the classic writers, whose concept of leisure class I observed directly during my fieldwork.

Despite Thorstein Veblen's theory of leisure class consumption (2007[4]) describes societal conditions of the earlier economic stages, various facts about conspicuous consumption, as a characteristic trait of mentioned class (enclave), are applicable nowadays too; thus seem to be universal.

---

[4]   Originally published in 1899.

Veblen states that ways of living (according to Bourdieu 1984: habitual, class taste practices – thus the lifestyle) are the items of conformity to the norm of conspicuous consumption. Thus, exactly the conformity of conspicuous consumption, that is in suburbanite's setting reflected (among other characteristics) in each one's individualistic and privatized expression of multitude designs resulting into the existence of neighbourhood's architectural 'gating-canon', can be explained as 'a way of (conspicuous) living' (applied on VEBLEN 2007:53).

Then, also second quality can be assigned to proposed lifestyle – its luxurious character. In reference to the definition of Veblen, each luxurious good has to provide a 'personal comfort and well-being' (VEBLEN 2007:52) to its owner. It is hard not to make this point relevant in the suburbs – because as I proposed (acc. to LOW 2009), the physical and spatial character of this particular suburban neighbourhood serves as a good example of how material (economical) well-being is exhibited by the suburbanites. In my research, other observable goods besides the house, can also serve as goods that are habitually consumed in conspicuous way.

And this leads us into a function of luxurious goods – that is its performance. Here I can mention the theory of Bourdieu (1984) again, who mentioned the term perception: the initiated result of a certain habitual (lifestyle) practice. Thus, in my research's context, the perception and classification of the suburbanites by other inhabitants of the municipality (mostly by settlers) is again the most clearly visible in the architecture and spatial order of the excluded neighbourhood. Because of the spatial character of the specific neighbourhood that (according to settlers' discourses) excludes newcomers from a possible social contact, the material (spatial, architectural) qualities of suburbanites' lifestyle are only visible for other groups' appreciation. Therefore, I will prove later, that the class conspicuous consumption - with both of its qualities (actual practice and its perception evaluation) are inevitably present in the particular accompanied neighbourhoods.

Moreover, the notions about suburbanites perceived and created by other enclaves, who inhabit the same municipality, are the evidence for the class definition - not just encompassed in the suburbanites' lifestyle tastes, but also technically 'out of them' – independently. Therefore, this class distinction exists according to their common tastes and their actual manifestations, but more importantly according to the other inhabitants, who appreciate and evaluate them (to perception).

So, to conclude this part, I add the statement of Veblen that in other words but in same way helped me to conceptualize the relationship between the material and abstract significance of the new class tastes: 'The means of communication and the mobility of the

population now expose the individual to the observation of many persons who have no other means of judging of his reputability than the display of goods (and perhaps of breeding) which he is able to make while he is under their direct observation' (VEBLEN 2007:60). As we will see in my data material this perception of newcomers (mainly their social clusters in the neighbourhoods) by the other municipality inhabitants is truly limited to passive observation of 'economic signs'. Thus, firstly I provide the evidence acquired from my interviews with the neighbours of Cluster B inhabitants, and its analysis.

'*They are closing themselves out of the village. This Neighbourhood X, it's absolute – if someone goes there, there is no foot on the street. I think, the others perceive it as the rest, just to relax – that they just shut themselves out of the world, and don't care. They come back from work, get closed and maybe stay in their garden.*' [Z5]

'*Yeah I think that it's fragmented because you can see the economical differences here [in Neighbourhood X] – like what kind of car people use here. And you see it on the house size, how each one of them is financially or economically well.*' [M4]

'*There are a lot of neighbours in this locality, who appeal – by what they have; they appear to be of a high class.*' [Z6]

'*There [within Cluster B] people drive Jeeps and this 'big kinds' of cars, everybody has 2 meters high walls, not even God knows who lives there. Here I only know M1's family, and the next neighbours, I feel the third ones also… I really am unsure about these people, and don't have the feeling that they see themselves as a part of the village. They are like 'travelling Bratislavans'… And here, behind the corner, there is a street where people meet together more – and that's because they all have small children. So, they have meetings, they let the children be on the street or the field next to it, and have parent-children gatherings.*'

"*And when you go and see that street, you see 'THOSE HOUSES'. There might be totally normal person, but the environment and its setting seem scary to me. Compared to this houses, this [her own house] is like, not bad, but compared to the next, pretentious one - it's a different cup of coffee, as we say here.*' [Z3]

'*I really don't know the neighbours over there [Cluster B]; I know only the closest ones. Here on this street also, but only relatively, and on the next street as well – we don't have any contact with them… As I said, these new people are engaged by their work too much, they commute to Bratislava – so it is anonymous here… Probably, they just come home from work and then enjoy the rest of the day with their families.*' [M3]

Primarily, the social composition of 'adjacent group' is visible for respondents (Cluster A members, direct neighbours of people they are referring to), participants see Cluster B as a social environment composed of (younger) families, who share various gatherings together. Also, the privatization of leisure time (PUTNAM 2000), based on the necessary commuting to work that causes the limitation in potential relationships (limited bridging, accentuated bounding) is referred to by participants 'from the outside' of the group.

Figure 2: *One of visible examples of conspicuous consumption. Photo: Author*

The most importantly, the exhibition of well-being is another big matter that leads us to another parallel with the part of the theoretical chapter that needs to be discussed exclusively. Now, for the first time the concept of Thorstein Veblen's (2007) conspicuous consumption is taking part in my analysis. As I mentioned (while combining Veblen's and Bourdieu's theories) in the theoretical chapter, the essence of conspicuous consumption of some group of people does not lie only in its actual usage of material matters, but in its

exhibition that creates the space for possible perception of the other person. In some of these excerpts we can find the perception of how and what kind of goods are presented by Cluster B. Thus, we can also see, how the sense of social separation within the neighbourhood is created (mostly expressed by M4, Z3; and magnified by the claim of M3). It means that even the migrants of the same spatial unit feel the importance to stress the economic background of the other inhabitants from Neighbourhood X. Therefore, I just proved that inside of the spatially excluded neighbourhood the perceptive and evaluative discourses take part in formation of independent and separated social units (clusters).

But my analysis does not end here. I will continue to analyse the perception based on discourses of the other inhabitants in the municipality towards the 'performance' of newcomers in general, thus the whole Neighbourhood X. Based on these examples I will finally present how the new enclaves are perceived in this particular neighbourhood via 'inter-group' evaluations and expectations of inhabitants living outside Neighbourhood X.

Public discourse or radical perception?

Let me offer the data excerpts first, then I will continue with the final part of the analysis.

'*There is no conflict [newcomers-settlers], because there is no space for the conflict – absolute disinterest. These people live a different life, have different a sense of morality. They 'live in their own world'. It is a life without bonds, with different interests: business chasing, kilometres, vacations.*' [M13, 'local polymath']

'*Yeah, it has its role [spatial exclusion of Neighbourhood X]. If I imagined I live in these outer housing resorts that were created a year ago and I have to do the shopping, then I would just go to the shop, then come back, and there I would have my own circle of good friends.*' [M2]

'*God, it is so densely-build, a house glued onto another. A huge 'Chinese walls' built-up. Actually, I don't even know who lives there… These Chinese walls they build… Then they just leave the residence by car, get the gate closed, and go to the city to work. And then, when they come back, the gate opens, they enter, the gate closes. It's like in prison – he closes it, and it is the end. No contact with the municipality.*'

'*He has a fence, behind it a swimming pool, he has there the stuff and cares about the other stuff with nobody. And also the time – all day at work or they work at home, so they don't have the time for other people – to care about their problems and stuff. Each of them lives the life on his own…Of course a multimillionaire would not chat with a hobo. It's like that*

in these relationships. They move to communities for that kind of people… And these huge estates and fences are their common features. This luxury and money… And he would not go to the village to make friends – the person at his level is one who he's going to live with.'

'*And I think the capital city is very near, it's his [newcomer's] priority – that appealed to him to live here. But I can't imagine his priorities… The capital city, that's what appealed to him to move here… And they are connected by money and then by other interests stemming from money…I think, that every one of them is ingrown, behind the big wall and doesn't even want to socialize... It's modern to be only with family – and to block others out.'* [Z11]

'*Firstly, participant mentioned the Neighbourhood X, and he called it spatially 'out of the world'. Then he spoke about supposed motivations of newcomers – that the decoy for newcomers is a lucrative setting of the municipality: the most expensive and superb estate-plots. The qualities this setting has are privacy, isolation, and closeness to Bratislava. These qualities are the most appealing to those people [newcomers].'* [M14]

'*And this guy [Cluster A member] is a newcomer. He lives a little eccentrically – that Neighbourhood X, it is indeed like an estate-housing, where usually person doesn't go… When you know it here - Ivánka [pri Dunaji] does not end with the sign. Guessingly, Ivánka ends, because farther, there couldn't be anything. There's forest, and behind the trees - it's hidden - but then, this estate-housing districts pop up. So when you enter, you see three houses, but then there are 30 of them. But it's off the map – very eccentrically out. It's completely behind these trees, with no communication – then it's isolated in this manner… and these ones are out of everything, they are not involved – that's the problem… when they don't have any contacts with settlers and live on fringe – they only life among newcomers…Also there is no chance for us to know these people. It's because, it is really out of the municipality.'* [M12]

The qualities by which local inhabitants perceive the newcomers have to be characterized separately, because of the various levels of correspondence with the actual manifestations.

Firstly, already partly discussed concept of privatization of time developed by Putnam (2000), also occurs in the excerpts. Even the other inhabitants see newcomers as very busy – and stemming from this point – as isolated. When I compare these claims with the analysis of actual practices and motivations of both clusters in Neighbourhood X, I can claim this as the first actual, general and justified characteristic trait of newcomers.

Moreover, the isolation caused by privatization of time within 'cluster-cluster' relationship or 'neighbourhood-municipality' relationship is visible from the previously mentioned excerpts, but it also is suggested by the perceptive informants' sample. Therefore, the privatization of time and the social isolation go hand-in-hand in my research setting.

Additionally, other various claims connected to the previously discussed privacy are mentioned by the 'perceivers'. The motivations of newcomers connected to having space (house) while living in a favourable distance from the city – from the perspective of 'observers', are similar to what was claimed by newcomers in the previous analytic parts. According to these parameters, even one of the interviewed respondents mentioned that within the newcomers' neighbourhoods there are situated families with children: what can be also understood as sign of 'knowledge' about the second group (but its relevance is limited, because this informant is the only one who mentioned this 'children fact'). Now let me move to the one very often mentioned lifestyle characteristic, whose way of perception needs to be confronted with the previous parts of analysis.

Just before, let me say, that it is also important to know how stereotypes and generalizations act in this matter. Now to the case, some of the respondents mentioned, that the specific trait of newcomers (while also applying it to Neighbourhood X) is their corporate economic base. In this matter I argue, that it is true to a limited extent. Despite the Cluster B being considered (also by its 'community member' - my respondent Z7) as the social unit consisting of economically exclusive inhabitants, the Cluster A's 'social glue' does not seem to have its social base in financial well-being (among the other reasons - because the professions of newcomers occurring in Cluster A cannot be explained as 'corporate', they are kind of 'public sphere professions'). In this moment I just want to stress the presence of stereotyping (generalizing), which is based primarily on the perception of the 'core' (spatially inner) municipality inhabitants. This perception mainly consists of narratives of the visible traits about Neighbourhood X – thus about the prominence rooted in the concentration of financial capital (luxury). Here, I can use the combination of Bourdieu's (1984) and Veblen's (2007) theory again. In this respect it is shown, that the discourse aimed on the newcomers as on the 'lucrative, and financially powerful business people', is perceived mainly because of 'what others see': in this case reflected in 'Chinese walls' (metaphor for gated-luxurious properties), and the property elements (e.g. swimming pools mentioned by Z11; or in the previous analysis excerpt parts 'the car', or 'the size of the house'). Also Low's concept about spatialization and adopted material embodiment (2009) of preferences to physical elements can be accompanied: in excerpts we can clearly see, that mentioned certain kind of 'visible lifestyle agency'

(opulent taste preferences) of newcomers is accentuated by other inhabitants – thus is present in the suburbanites' environment.

Here I can also remind the photographs, based on which the inference can be justified. Therefore, the theory of Veblen about conspicuous consumption was now just proved correct and can be understood as the mean to recognize another class (enclave) distinction (acc. to Bourdieu, 1984). As I pointed out in the previous analysis part, this distinction, that lies in the opulent consumption of Cluster B, is visible also to its neighbours from Cluster A within Neighbourhood X (from the spatial inside of neighbourhood). Therefore, these similar claims give some objective relevance to the existence of material and economic well-being of suburbanites in Neighbourhood X.

But regardless this perception corresponding with the actual state of all newcomers from Neighbourhood X or not, this perceptive quality may be called the suburban class trait. So, let me remind here that I try to explain how the whole discourse about suburban class lifestyle distinction is created. So, in this topic's relevant discussion it does not matter whether the elements of lifestyle are of 'true' (actual) or 'stereotypical' (biased, perceived) origin. Both of the origins are technically, and from the point of analytical relevance, the same, and they co-create the general enclave characteristics in the theoretical frame I use. But let me move my argument to the following point.

I also argue that this perception of financially based lifestyle has its roots in the lack of spatial closeness of Neighbourhood X with the municipality, even the evidence proved it. Since the neighbourhood is spatially excluded out of the municipality central parts, the only perception that can be made has no roots in the practical experiences (no social contact or relationship) with the inhabitants from this particular part of the municipality. It is more obvious when reading some of the provided excerpts, which are stating: the 'eccentricity of Neighbourhood X', that it is 'out of the municipality', 'off the map' (participant M12); or 'out of the world' (M14). And by that, this spatial order - when Neighbourhood X is on the fringe position in the municipality, strengthens the influence of socially (personally) inexperienced perception of the financial power of the newcomers. Therefore, within this discourse of the 'others' (spatially inner-municipality inhabitants), the categories of suburbanite and nouveau-riche are congruent; and by that fact the specific and actual lifestyle taste is in the discussion about class creation being co-created by perception of lifestyle.

In this last part of the analysis, practically every theoretical concept connected to the motivations for 'private life' of the newcomers was taken into account to some extent. Important is that I showed how the perception of the newcomers is formed, and also on

which specific traits stands the perceptive perspective. Also, when speaking about some general traits of the suburbanites, the main outcome of this part of the analysis is the presentation of how the traits about suburbanites are transformed into the general view (formed by the actual practices, and also on subjective, non-personal, discursive level). In the next part I offer the final conclusions, which were partly provided in the analysis.

Conclusions

Based on my material and analysis, I claim the exclusive suburban enclave that shares common characteristics. Firstly, stemming from the suburbanism itself, practically all of the newcomers shared the characteristic of the time privatization: thus the limitation in bridging of the social relations initiated their social isolation within the smaller homogeneous clusters (proof of Putnam's (2000) concept).

Secondly, with the contribution of this limited disposition of the suburbanites, the patterns of socializing are relatively divergent – but can be generalized and then termed as 'life stage bonding within closed homogeneous communities'. This phenomenon has its origin in the forming of the social clusters of the newcomers and encompasses the categories of the 'older-aged-pioneering group' with a common history (Cluster A in data) and 'child-oriented, economically powerful group' (Cluster B). Every habitual activity within the members of the both neighbouring clusters bears the labels like 'close', 'inaccessible', 'separate', 'isolated' or 'gated' (partly acc. to LOW 2003). Therefore, the whole neighbourhood and its clusters may be labelled as bounded (PUTNAM 2000) and then another trait of suburban enclaves is known.

Thirdly, the appearance of the class lifestyle tastes comes to discussion. The conspicuous consumption (reflected in exhibition of multitude of various designs, the 'gated' character of house-properties (property security means), and other valuable assets of the property of the newcomers) is accentuated mostly by the other inhabitants' perception, by what the evaluation of the newcomers' social activity is biased in discourse (in this point, also the Veblen's and Bourdieu's concepts were proved). Therefore, the perception based on 'how the newcomers live' is from the 'view of the others' taken into account from the economical (financial, material) point of view and then the exhibition of wealth is directly connected to the notions about isolation, individualization, and collective gating of the 'wealthy newcomers' into financially homogeneous neighbourhoods. This clustering into a 'rich residential neighbourhood' may or may not be factual to some extent – the 'actual extent' and a concrete definition of the economical background of the newcomers

was not planned to be the main core of my research (during the research, in this matter I partly acquired the perceptive perspective), and thus needs more intensive research. But at least my ethnographic experience with Cluster B mostly proves the 'concentration of economically powerful person' within Neighbourhood X as the common phenomena connected to the newcomers-suburbanites.

It is necessary to add that during my field research one specific variable influenced the formation of the three mentioned phenomena. The spatial exclusion of the neighbourhood that has been in locus of my research was claimed by both the newcomers from the neighbourhood and also by the evaluative respondents from the inside of the municipality as the one specific factor that reinforces the presence of the mentioned characteristic lifestyle traits (socially bounded clusters and collective property exhibition). Therefore, it would be my major mistake to forget about the spatial order of the municipality, when I characterize the suburban enclaves' (class') lifestyle and its perception. But now back to definition.

To conclude the outlined argument, I claim that according to my ethnography, the suburban enclave (covered by the class concept) consists of the inhabitants-newcomers, whose lifestyle habits and lifestyle tastes appearance causes their social isolation and preference for the limited social engagement (bounding, acc. to Putnam) within the homogeneous groups based on the 'life stage' principle, pioneering, and also economical prominence (partly by physical 'gating'). The existence and characteristics of the two studied clusters within Neighbourhood X proved this claim.

Now to finally sum up, the absolute majority of the suburbanites' motivations, habits, and its perceptions I mentioned, and which I called specific for the suburban enclaves, bear the inner quality of privacy. (1) Within the motivations is a claim for privacy reflected in request for more space, garden, and rise in dwelling standards, 'quiet housing setting', and also gating of house (property). (2) Within habits section, the privacy is showed on the bounded (closed, isolated, symbolic, and specific) character of events and activities held by each of clusters (Cluster A – gardening solidarity, reciprocity and symbolic; Cluster B – expensive, child-oriented 'class gatherings'). (3) Perception of lifestyle taste is showed in interest in household gating and 'economical exhibition of property' (mostly Cluster B) and consecutive evaluation of it by other municipality inhabitants'. At last, the private character of the newcomers within the studied neighbourhood is reinforced, as I already pointed out, also by its spatial isolation that has to be taken into account.

Discussion

Now after the revision of the research outcomes, let me use this space to address one note connected to them. The example of the specific enclave occurrence in the suburban setting is visible how inter-group boundaries are drawn, and how in the suburban setting the specification of 'we' and 'them' is happening nowadays. The actual lifestyle and tastes of suburbanites are, as I called it, of close-group, isolated, privatized character – here I claim the metaphoric 'wall' that is built upon their motivation for distinctive privacy. On the other side, the construction of that wall are other inhabitants, who are limited to see only the wall - its size, look, design, and many other visible characteristics, thus not anything about what happen on the other side. And by its evaluation observers also take part in its formation. My point is that the anthropological and ethnographical inquiry aimed on the both sides of this metaphoric wall helped the complex image of suburbs to be interpreted.

Thus, what really matters in this inter-connected setting of the suburbs is the inter-group 'psychology'. Not in the literal meaning, but in the quasi-metaphorical. This kind of evidence, about how the two groups feel about each other, or what the general discourse is, which depicts this relationship in the words of accompanied inhabitants, is what really matters. I think this view on suburbs, in areas like where I conducted research, is missing. Therefore, until we do just factual researches about the observable phenomena, or based just on the one-sided opinions, while forgetting about bringing of perceptions (psychology) of one another's side, there is no chance for the complex and interdisciplinary treatment of this area of study.

Acknowledgements

Bibliography

BALDASSARE, M. (1992): Suburban Communities. In. *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 475-494.

BOURDIEU, P. (1984): *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of the Taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

FOSTER, G.M., KEMPER, R.V. (2009): Anthropological Fieldwork in Cities. In. George Gmelch, George M. Foster, Robert V. Kemper (Eds.): *Readings in the Anthropology of the City*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press Inc, pp. 5-19.

KELLY, B.M. (1993*): Expanding the American Dream: Building and Rebuilding Levittown*. New York, NY: State University of New York Press.

LANGDON, P. (1994): *A Better Place to Live: Reshaping the American Suburb*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.

LEFEBVRE, H. (2003): *The Urban Revolution*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

LOW, S. M. (2003): The Edge and the Center: Gated Communities and the Discourse of Urban Fear. In. Denise Lawrence-Zuniga, Setha M. Low (Eds.): *The Anthropology of Space and Place: Locating Culture*. Malden, MA, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 387-407.

LOW, S.M. (2009): Towards an Anthropological Theory of Space and Place. In. *Semiotica*, Vol. 175, pp. 21-37.

LUPI, T., MUSTERD, S. (2006): The Suburban "Community Question". In. *Urban Studies*, Vol. 43 No. 4, pp. 801-817.

McKENZIE, E. (1994): Privatopia: *Homeowner Associations and the Rise of Residential Private Government.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

PUTNAM, R.D. (2000): *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

VEBLEN, T. (2007): *The Theory of Leisure Class*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

WALKS, A. (2013): Suburbanism as a Way of Life, Slight Return. In. *Urban Studies*, Vol. 50 No. 8, pp. 1471- 1488.

WHYTE, W.H. (1956): *The Organization Man*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.