

Families in Contemporary Intentional Communities: Diversity and Purpose

WILLIAM L. SMITH

People create and join intentional communities (communes, eco-villages, urban housing cooperatives, residential land trusts, student co-ops, co-housing, etc.) for a variety of reasons. According to Geoph Kozeny:

An 'intentional community' is a group of people who have chosen to live together with a common purpose, working cooperatively to create a lifestyle that reflects their shared core values. The people may live together on a piece of rural land, in a suburban home, or in an urban neighborhood, and they may share a single residence or live in a cluster of dwellings.¹

Communal living is alive and well and even the venerable *New York Times* has acknowledged the growth of intentional communities and the options they provide their members.² The present article investigates contemporary intentional communities that have identified family as a central focus or purpose of their everyday life. A variety of issues that intersect with this topic will be addressed -- especially the priority given by the communalists to certain communal goals and purposes.

Families and communities are diverse in structure and function, emulating either traditional or nontraditional models. Intentional communities, and the families contained within them, are usually categorized as being nontraditional in both structure and function. While this might be the case, not all intentional communities are considered to be alternative lifestyles or new family forms. For example, Graham Meltzer describes co-housing as a mainstream option rather than an alternative lifestyle.³ Scholars can debate over the semantics of the concepts used to describe communal living conditions, but they are usually in agreement that people are searching for a sense of community within a society fraught with individualism. A growing segment of American families are also nontraditional and society is lagging behind in coming to terms with

these changing families. As Stephanie Coontz has so eloquently stated, we need to pay more attention to the way we really are instead of the way we never were.⁴

John Scanzoni writes about the need for reforming family life and how we can make better families. Part of reforming family life involves reconciling a search for self or autonomy and freedom with a search for community or connectedness. He sees co-housing as one possible solution for reforming family life.⁵ Scanzoni echoes the concerns of Amitai Etzioni who argues that we need to find some balance between the issues of social order and personal autonomy in modern society. Etzioni proposes that responsive communities can mitigate the negative effects associated with social order and autonomy and create simultaneously both independence and interdependence.⁶ Responsive communities are authentic communities because they respond to the true needs of their members.⁷

While Scanzoni and Etzioni are guardedly optimistic about the future of family and community life David Popenoe argues that family life, or familism as a cultural value, is deteriorating precisely because there is an imbalance between self and community with more attention directed to autonomy and freedom and less to connectedness and dependency.⁸ Popenoe defines family as, "a relatively small domestic group of kin (or people in a kin-like relationship) consisting of at least one adult and one dependent person.... And it is meant to include single-parent families, stepfamilies, non-married and homosexual couples, and all other family types in which dependents are involved."⁹ Some intentional communities might be included in the category of other family types and therefore they could be considered as supporting or reforming family life. An ideal family environment for rearing children, according to Popenoe, would include, among other components, two biological parents and fathers who play an active role in the rearing of their children. These components may or may not be espoused by intentional communities.¹⁰

My recent work addresses an ongoing debate about the role of family in historic and contemporary communal groups. I argue that families are an essential component of communal life unless a reliable substitute is found to replace them and their functions. This position is contrary to the conventional wisdom on the subject.¹¹ While the Shakers abolished the nuclear family, they substituted for it by creating multiple communal families at each of their villages. Historic groups such as Amana incorporated nuclear families into the community and contemporary groups like the Hutterites and Jesus People USA do likewise. This present article is in part a continuation of that debate and a preliminary investigation of the status of family in contemporary intentional

communities.¹²

Background

Of the 550 North American intentional communities listed in the 1995 edition of the *Communities Directory*¹³, 24 state that their primary purpose and/or focus is family related. Six additional groups are listed in the 1996-98 annual updates provided by the *Communities Directory*. Of these 30 groups, 24 were asked to participate in a research project conducted in January 1999 (see Table 1 for a complete listing of the 30 groups). It is very possible that many more of the 550 intentional communities listed in the *Communities Directory* are interested in developing family ties but they did not indicate this as a primary purpose or focus of their community. Six of the original 24 groups from the 1995 edition of the *Communities Directory* had either ceased operating as a community or had incomplete mailing addresses. Of the 24 groups contacted in October 1998, 2 were defunct, 1 was regrouping, 3 had moved and left no forwarding address, 7 did not respond to either the original letter or follow-up letter, and 11 agreed to participate. Ninety members from the 11 groups were surveyed and 59 adult members from 9 of the groups returned completed surveys for a response rate of 66 percent.

Table 1. Contemporary Intentional Communities with a Family Focus

Name and Location	Focus
1. Agape Lay Apostolate Cmty (NM)#	Prayer service family
2. Alpha Farm (OR)#	Extended family, group processes
3. Black Oak Ranch (CA)*****	Humor, friendship, extended family
4. Bright Morning Star (WA)#	Musical loving close family
5. Caerduir (MO)***	Family independence earth-care
6. Cascadia Cohousing (WA)***	Value family
7. Common Threads (MA)#	Urban household community, family
8. Covenantal Cmty (IL)*****	Christian urban extended family
9. Crosses Creek (AR)****	To be a family
10. Earth Re-leaf (HI)****	Census land trust and family
11. Folkhaven (AK)*	Family tribe and folk
12. The Good Red Road (CA)***	Growth, family, sharing, security
13. Harmon House (CA)***	Ecological, family, stability, friendly, food
14. Heartwinds (CA)****	Good neighbors friends family
15. Hillegass (CA)#	Communal family-like living
16. International Puppydogs (CA)*****	Extended intimate family
17. L'Arche Mobile (AL)#	Permanent family-like home
18. L.I.F.E. (VA)****	Old fashioned extended family
19. Manau Kendra (CA)***	Forming a family of refinement
20. Pigeon City Cohousing Community (TX)****	Extended family
21. Prairie Ridge Cmty (WI)*	Family, ecology, wholeness
22. Recreation Center (HI)*	Family entertainment and fun
23. Rowanwood (Canada)#	Extended family, caring, stewardship
24. Six Directions (UT)**	Optimal family health (eclectic)
25. Society of Family Solidarity (CA)****	Enhancement of fraternal families
26. Songaia Cmty (WA)#	Earth centered extended family
27. Sunnyside Collective (MO)*****	Extended family
28. Syntony (HI)****	Family clusters, networking, polyfidelity
29. The Vale (OH)****	Family and environment centered
30. Whitehall Co-op (TX)#	Support, family bonding

Source: This table was derived from the North American Cross-Reference Chart in *Communities Directory: A Guide for Cooperative Living* by the Fellowship for Intentional Community (1995) and the 1996, 1997, and 1998 *Communities Directory Annual Update*.

* defunct

** regrouping

*** mail returned and not forwarded, undeliverable

**** did not respond to original inquiry letter or follow-up letter

***** did not return completed surveys

***** no address

returned completed surveys

Brief Profiles of Participating Intentional Communities

The following profiles are based on descriptions provided in the *Communities Directory*.¹⁴

The Agape Lay Apostolate Community, established in 1983, is located in Deming, NM and is a Catholic nonprofit organization whose focus is on prayer, service, and family. Members reside in single-family dwellings that are owned by the community and each family is responsible for their own bills. The community shares a meal and fellowship once a week and they are actively involved in volunteering their services at a local St. Vincent de Paul thrift store. In addition, they assist the homeless and transients. Men work in town and women are homemakers and the children attend local public schools. Agape Lay Apostolate is home to 7 adults and 14 children.

Alpha Farm is an extended family community located in Deadwood, OR. It was founded in 1972 and the community is structured around building consensus. Community-owned enterprises support the group and resources are shared in common. Evening meals are shared and individuals have private rooms. Alpha Farm is home to 11 adults and 4 children.

Bright Morning Star describes itself as a musical loving, close family. It is located in Seattle, WA and originally was formed in Philadelphia in 1979. Decisions are made by consensus and members share meals, chores, and meet weekly to discuss community issues. Bright Morning Star is home to 7 adults, 2 of whom are away at college, and 1 child.

Common Threads, a branch of Common Unity that was formed in 1991, considers itself a family and they are an urban household in Somerville, MA. They are interested in personal growth, social change, diverse spiritual practices, and communal living. Common Threads is home to 6 adults and 2 children.

Hillegass House, founded in 1973, is a collective in Berkeley, CA and they are a diverse group regarding interests, spirituality, diet, sexuality, employment, etc. They have a strong commitment to group living and respect each other's privacy while residing together in a large house where dinners are shared. Hillegass House is home to 10 adults.

L'Arche Mobile, established in 1974, is a Christian community located in Mobile, AL. Their focus is to provide a family-like environment where the mentally handicapped reside together with non-handicapped. Presently the community has four homes and it offers a work program for its residents. They live a simple life with an emphasis on developing relationships. L'Arche Mobile is home to 19 adults with developmental disabilities and 14 adults who live with them.

Rowanwood Conserver Society, begun in 1985, is a residential cooperative community and a nonprofit corporation owned by its members, which is located in Oro Township near Orillia, Ontario, Canada. Members live in their own homes constructed on sites owned by the cooperative. The community attempts to be an extended family and they share a commitment to conservation. Members gather at least twice a month for business meetings and decisions are made by consensus. There is a community potluck dinner once a month. They also share in community work parties to maintain their 92 acres and cooperative vegetable garden, maple syrup operation, and hen house. Rowanwood is home to 7 households including 15 adults and 10 children, 5 of whom are either in college or living on their own.

Songaia is located on a rural site 30 minutes from Seattle in Bothell, WA. They emphasize an extended family lifestyle where members share resources and purchase items in bulk. They supplement their diet with fruits and vegetables from their organic gardens. Songaia is gradually adopting a co-housing format. Songaia is home to 10 adults and 2 children.

Whitehall Co-op was founded in 1949 in Austin, TX and is a housing cooperative. All decisions are made by consensus and members are required to do housework and share household expenses. They are vegetarians and each member has their own room. Whitehall is home to 13 adults most of whom are college students.

Findings

When asked to define family, the majority of respondents identified items which were eventually grouped into three sets: husband, wife, children, related by blood (20), love, concern, friendship, mutual support, shared values (23), and traditional and nontraditional (15). Family for these members is a mix of the Census Bureau definition of family (members related by blood, marriage, or adoption) and a broader understanding of family meaning those who share a set of values and support each other in the pursuit of these values.

When asked to define community, the majority of respondents included the following items: like-minded, common goals, shared values and morals, committed, chosen lifestyle (36), more than blood (4), all needs are met (1), not as intense as family (1), love, acceptance, openness (2), ideal family relationship (2), and interaction (1). Community is overwhelmingly tied to like-mindedness, shared goals and values. To some extent, these concerns also are representative of what some members consider to be qualities that describe family. The organizational structure and ideology of the intentional community will influence how its members define family and community. Community life can be as intense or as laid-back as one wants depending on

the ideology of the group. There was little or no variation in responses regarding the meaning of family and community between the 9 intentional communities.

Of the 59 respondents, 57 indicated their sex, 32 are female and 25 are male. They range in age from 17 to 86, 47 being the mode and 28 members are 46 or younger and 31 are 47 or older. Forty-two members have lived communally for 10 years or less and 16 members have lived communally for 11 to 26 years. Regarding marital status, 17 are single and never married, 29 are married, 2 are separated, 3 are divorced, 3 are widowed, and 5 failed to indicate their marital status. Twenty respondents have children living with them and 23 replied that living in an intentional community had an effect on their children. The discrepancy between 20 respondents indicating they have children living with them and 23 replying that living in an intentional community had an effect on their children, might be due to the fact that some members, who no longer have children living with them, answered the question anyway. There are 28 children living in 6 (Agape Lay, Alpha Farm, Bright Morning Star, Common Threads, Rowanwood Conserver Society, and Songaia) of the 9 communities. Thirteen effects were identified by the respondents: outgoing, not shy (1), highly stimulated (1), trusting (1), good communication skills with children and adults (7), secure, belonging, sense of community (5), coping skills, stability (1), sharing belongings and time (2), imaginative, intelligent, articulate, innovative (3), not competitive (1), happy (1), socially advanced (2), gets lots of attention (6), and struggles with peers who live differently (1).

Forty-one of the respondents indicated that nuclear families are incorporated into community life, while 9 did not, and 9 failed to respond. Nuclear families are incorporated into community life in a variety of ways, as indicated by the following examples provided by the respondents: visit each others homes (3), share chores and responsibilities (7), share child care (2), emotional support (1), shared financial support (1), potlucks, community events, work parties, and social events (10), shared meals (2), core of the community (1), and responsible for own household and expenses (6).

Members were asked if community life enhanced and fostered the development and bonding of close intimate relationships between them and a variety of people such as their spouse or community friends. They responded in the following manner: 21 with their spouse, 19 with their children, 48 with their community friends, 10 with their parents, 19 with their non-community friends, 13 with their natural brothers and sisters, and 8 with others. The others included the needy, society in general, God, churches and local

communities, and nature. Members were also asked if the communal household functions as an extended family. They responded in the following manner: 10 always, 32 usually, 16 sometimes, and 1 failed to reply (see Table 2 for a break down of responses by community).

Table 2. Community Functions as an Extended Family

Name	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Missing
1. Agape Lay	1	2		
2. Alpha Farm		1		
3. Bright Morning Star		2	2	
4. Common Threads	2	2	1	
5. Hillegass House	1	3	3	
6. L'Arche Mobile		3		
7. Rowanwood	2	10	2	1
8. Songaia	1	4	4	
9. Whitehall	3	5	4	
Total	10	32	16	1

Members were asked to rank a list of six communal goals and purposes from most important to least important. The following are the number of times each communal goal was listed as number 1 or most important: 23 consensual community (live with like-minded others, put shared beliefs into practice, etc.), 3 extra-communal (change society, provide a service, be a model for the rest of the world, etc.), 3 utilitarian (live economically, make housekeeping easier, further business venture, etc.), 7 friendship (live with prior friends, make new friends, avoid loneliness, etc.), 10 interpersonal (learn to cooperate and share, develop ability to communicate, attain personal growth through interaction, etc.), 5 family (create a new family form, achieve family-like feelings, share parenting, change gender roles, etc.), and 8 failed to respond to the question (see Table 3 for a break down of responses by community).

Table 3. Most Important Reason for Living Communally

Name	C	E	U	FR	I	FA
1. Agape Lay	2				1	
2. Alpha Farm	1					
3. Bright Morning Star	1			1	1	1
4. Common Threads	4					
5. Hillegass House		1		1	2	2
6. L'Arche Mobile		1			1	1
7. Rowanwood	9	1	1		3	
8. Songaia	1	2	1	2	1	
9. Whitehall	3			1	3	2
Total	23	3	3	7	10	5

C=Consensual, E=Extra-Communal, U=Utilitarian, FR=Friendship, I=Interpersonal, and FA=Family

Discussion

Benjamin Zablocki found that parents in his study were positive about the impact that communal living had on their children.¹⁵ Bennett M. Berger, Bruce M. Hackett, and R. Mervyn Millar concluded that communes were good for children¹⁶ and Berger found that fewer communal children were shy or withdrawn and they were more self-confident than those reared in non-communal settings.¹⁷ The few studies done on the impact of communal living on children are consistent in their findings. Children tend to be well behaved, mature, self-confident, cooperative, trusting, emotionally well adjusted, and overall better adjusted than their non-communal counterparts.¹⁸ In a study conducted in 1984 on urban religious communes in Chicago I found similar results regarding the impact of communal living on children.¹⁹ Angela Aidala's research compares data collected in 1974-76 with data from 1984-86 regarding whether it was healthier for children to grow up in a communal setting or a non-communal setting. In that study, 50 percent agreed, 16 percent disagreed, and 31 percent had no opinion or did not know, while in the 1984-86 follow-up study, 41 percent agreed, 37 percent disagreed, and 22 percent had no opinion or did not know.²⁰ Eleanor Macklin, John Rothchild and Susan Wolf, caution scholars to avoid making broad generalizations about the impact of communal living on children. They believe that there is the possibility that communal living may have long-term effects in emotional expressiveness and value orientations that may develop later in life and which are difficult to detect beforehand.²¹ The responses provided by 20 parents about the 28

children in the present study discussed in the previous section are similar to those mentioned in the literature with regard to the impact communal living has had on children.

It is not surprising that 70 percent of the respondents replied that nuclear families are incorporated into community life. I have argued, in a previous work, that families are essential for community life and most successful intentional communities are well aware of this important fact. While families are essential for community life not all intentional communities are designed to maximize family life. Some are more family-friendly than are others and this will depend to a great extent on the ideology and structure of the community. Since more and more members of contemporary intentional communities reside in their own residences and work away from the community such as one would find in a co-housing situation, it is only natural that nuclear families will have to be integrated into community life for the community to exist. Nuclear families are usually encouraged to have their privacy and space, but not to the extent that they totally segregate themselves away from the community.²²

The influence of the community on intimate relationships is most obvious regarding the relationship between the member and other community friends. Eighty-one percent of the respondents indicated that community life enhanced this relationship. The same thing occurred when I studied urban religious communes. Seventy-eight percent responded in the same manner.²³ I attribute this outcome to the use of the commitment building process of communion. Communion is an affective mechanism that solidifies commitment to the fellow members of a community.²⁴ Another interesting finding in reference to the 9 intentional communities is that the respondents stated that living in community has enhanced their relationships with non-community friends (32 percent) more than it has with their parents (17 percent). I found just the opposite occurred among urban religious communes, 35 percent of the respondents stated that communal living enhanced their relationships with non-community friends and 42 percent replied it enhanced relationships with their parents.²⁵ Part of the difference might be explained by the fact that only 2 of the 9 intentional communities are religious whereas all of the urban communes I studied in the 1980s were religious.

Regarding the issue of the communal household functioning as an extended family, this varies depending on what type of living arrangements were pertinent to each respondent. In my study on urban religious communes, which included 7 different groups and 86 respondents, 80 percent replied that the communal household always or usually functioned as an extended family, whereas in the present study 71 percent indicated it always or usually

functioned as one.²⁶

The question I was most interested in was the one where I asked the members to rank a list of six communal goals and purposes from most important to least important. These intentional communities were selected for this study because they identified family as a primary purpose or focus of their group. I wanted to uncover if family life was their real focus. The results were quite revealing. Family (create a new family form, achieve family-like feelings, share parenting, change gender roles, etc.) ranked fourth among the six goals and purposes behind consensual community, interpersonal, and friendship (see Table 4 for a frequency distribution of responses regarding the importance of family as a communal goal). Seventeen respondents ranked family as either first or second among the six communal goals, 13 ranked family as either third or fourth indicating it was neither the most or the least important communal goal, and 22 ranked family at the bottom of their list of communal goals as either fifth or sixth. Eight people did not respond to the question. It appears that regardless of what type of intentional community one belongs to, family is a priority but not the top priority.

While it is popular to support family themes in communal life, the reality of the situation is that people are drawn to community primarily for consensual reasons (to live with like-minded others, put shared beliefs into practice, etc.). Angela Aidala and Benjamin Zablocki report similar findings in their study of 1970s communes.²⁷ One significant difference between Aidala and Zablocki's findings and those of the present study is their respondents placed more emphasis on utilitarian themes (live economically, make housekeeping easier, further business venture, etc.) than those who reside in contemporary intentional communities. Aidala and Zablocki's respondents ranked the six items in the following manner: consensual community 59 percent, utilitarian 54 percent, friendship 43 percent, interpersonal 22 percent, family 20 percent, and extra-communal 8 percent. The remaining 16 percent listed other.²⁸

Table 4. The Ranking of Family as a Communal Goal

Name	1	2	3	4	5	6	99
1. Agape Lay	2			1			
2. Alpha Farm					1		
3. Bright Morning Star	1	2		1			
4. Common Thread		2	1	1		1	
5. Hillegass House	2	2		1	2		
6. L'Arche Mobile	1			2			
7. Rowanwood	2	3	4	2	2	2	
8. Songaia	1	1		1	4	2	
9. Whitehall	2	2			3	3	2
Total	5	12	6	7	12	10	7

1=most important and 6=least important, 99=missing data

Conclusion

It is highly probable that many more of the intentional communities listed in the *Communities Directory* emphasize family as an important dimension of their communal ideology than the small number of diverse communities discussed in this article. While this might be the case, it is still very likely that they too, while emphasizing family, will be held together more by consensual concerns than by attempting to create a new family form. The work done by Aidala and Zablocki reconfirms this assumption, which is supported by findings of the present study.²⁹

There is no typical communal setting and family life within intentional communities is diverse. As history shows us, some intentional communities are better suited for marriage and family life than others. Intentional communities throughout history have introduced society to new family forms but they have not replaced the nuclear family, nor are they likely to. Communal living has a positive impact on children and nuclear families are by and large incorporated into intentional communities. Community life appears to enhance intimacy especially between community members and the vast majority of respondents found their groups acted as extended families.

Are families a threat to communal life? Are intentional communities a threat to family life? The answer to these two questions is the same. No. Families have the potential to be sources of conflict for communities but they also provide services that communities are not necessarily equipped to provide.

Successful communities integrate families and individuals into the fabric of community life. The vast majority of communal groups throughout history

have maintained family life in one form or another. Intentional communities provide an alternative reality or a mainstream option, as the case may be, for family life. Cohabitation has not replaced marriage and communal living will not supersede family life.

Family and community are intertwined enterprises that help sustain us in a modern individualistic world. More longitudinal research, along the lines conducted by Aidala and Zablocki, is needed so we can truly uncover the influences that communal living has on children, relationships, family, and eventually society.

ENDNOTES

¹ Geoph Kozeny, "Intentional Communities: Lifestyles Based on Ideals," in *Communities Directory: A Guide to Cooperative Living*, Fellowship for Intentional Community (Langley, WA: Fellowship for Intentional Community, 1995), 18.

² Andrew Jacobs, "Yes, It's a Commune, and Yes, It's on Staten Island," *New York Times*, November 30, 1998, B8.

³ Graham Meltzer, "Cohousing: Linking Communitarianism and Sustainability," *Communal Societies* 19 (1999), 85.

⁴ Stephanie Coontz, *The Way We Really Are: Coming to Terms with America's Changing Families* (New York: Basic Books, 1997) and *The Way We Never Were: American Families and the Nostalgia Trap* (New York: Basic Books, 1992).

⁵ John Scanzoni, *Designing Families: The Search for Self and Community in the Information Age* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge, 2000), 73.

⁶ Amitai Etzioni, "The Responsive Community: A Communitarian Perspective," *American Sociological Review* 61 (February 1996), 1.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ David Popenoe, "American Family Decline, 1960-1990: A Review and Appraisal," *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 55 (August 1993), 528.

⁹ Ibid., 529.

¹⁰ David Popenoe, "Point of View," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* XXXIX (April 14, 1993), A48.

¹¹ Yaacov Oved, *Two Hundred Years of American Communes* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1993), 411 and Rosabeth Moss Kanter, *Commitment and Community: Communes and Utopias in Sociological Perspective* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972), 90.

¹² William L. Smith, *Families and Communes: An Examination of Nontraditional Lifestyles* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 1999).

¹³ Fellowship for Intentional Community, *Communities Directory: A Guide to Cooperative Living*.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Benjamin Zablocki, *Alienation and Charisma: A Study of Contemporary American Communes* (New York: The Free Press, 1980).

¹⁶ Bennett M. Berger, Bruce M. Hackett, and R. Mervyn Millar, "Child-Rearing Practices of the Communal Family," in *Communes: Creating and Managing the Collective Life*, ed. Rosabeth Moss Kanter (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1973), 356-64.

¹⁷ Bennett M. Berger, *The Survival of a Counterculture: Ideological Work and Everyday life Among Rural Communards* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1981).

¹⁸ Bernice T. Eiduson, "The Commune-Reared Child," in *Basic Handbook of Child Psychiatry*, ed. Joseph D. Noshpitz (New York: Basic Books, 1979), 406-12; L. L. Constantine and J. M. Constantine, *Treasures of the Island: Children in Alternative Families* (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1976); L. L. Constantine, "Where are the Kids? Children in Alternative Life Styles," in *Marriage and Alternatives: Exploring Intimate Relationships*, ed. R. W. Libby and R. N. Whitehurst (Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, 1977), 257-63; Charley M. Johnston and Robert W. Deisher, "Contemporary Communal Child Rearing," *Pediatrics* 52 (1973), 319-26 and John Rothchild and Susan Wolf, *The Children of the Counterculture* (New York: Doubleday, 1976).

¹⁹ William L. Smith, "The Impact of Communal Living on Children in the 1980s," *Szygy: Journal of Alternative Religion and Culture* 3 (1994), 51-60.

²⁰ Angela Aidala, "Communes and Changing Family Norms: Marriage and Life-Style Choice Among Former Members of Communal Groups," *Journal of Family Issues* 10 (1989), 318.

²¹ Eleanor Macklin, "Nontraditional Family Forms," in *Handbook of Marriage and the Family*, ed. Marvin B. Sussman and Suzanne K. Steinmetz (New York: Plenum Press, 1987), 317-53 and Rothchild and Wolf, *The Children of the Counterculture*.

²² Smith, *Families and Communes: An Examination of Nontraditional Lifestyles*.

²³ Ibid., 118.

²⁴ Kanter, *Commitment and Community: Communes and Utopias in Sociological Perspective*, 72-73.

²⁵ Smith, *Families and Communes: An Examination of Nontraditional Lifestyles*.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Angela A. Aidala and Benjamin D. Zablocki, "The Communes of the 1970s: Who Joined and Why?," *Marriage and Family Review* 17 (1991), 87-116.

²⁸ Ibid., 109.

²⁹ Ibid.