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Although heterogeneity in consumption communities is pervasive, there is little understanding of its impact on communities. This study shows how heterogeneous communities operate and interact with the marketplace. Specifically, the authors draw on actor-network theory, conceptualizing community as a network of heterogeneous actors (i.e., individuals, institutions, and resources), and examine the interplay of these actors in a mainstream activity-based consumption community—the distance running community. Findings, derived from a multimethod investigation, show that communities can preserve continuity even when heterogeneity operates as a destabilizing force. Continuity preserves when community members depend on each other for social and economic resources: a dependency that promotes the use of frame alignment practices. These practices enable the community to (re)stabilize, reproduce, and reform over time. The authors also highlight the overlapping roles of consumers and producers and develop a dimensional characterization of communities that helps bridge prior research on brand communities, consumption subcultures, and consumer tribes.

Bryan embodies the complexities and paradoxes of a strong, heterogeneous, activity-based consumption community that is able to align the differences between members. Over the past three decades, Bryan has witnessed a radical transformation of the running community from a small, competitive, tight-knit, male-dominated group to a mainstream, popular activity-based consumption community with mass participation. As outlined in appendix A, throughout these 30 years, heterogeneity has emerged in terms of the actors present within the community, the roles they play, and the resources they use and exchange. The purpose of this study is to enhance understandings of how complex heterogeneous communities manifest and interact.
with the marketplace. This is accomplished by investigating the interplay between heterogeneous actors in a community and assessing the impact of this heterogeneity on community continuity.

A heterogeneous community comprises an assemblage of diverse actors, including consumers, producers, and social and economic resources (social resources are resources that take on an expressive role as symbols and sentiments used to build individual and social identities and communicate meanings to others, and economic resources are resources that take on material roles in the community such as objects, commercial experiences, and monetary instruments [Arnould, Price, and Malshe 2006; DeLanda 2006]). These actors vary in how they orient toward the community, and in the meanings they construct in relation to the community. This view of community is built on the central tenet of actor-network theory: social entities are “patterned networks of heterogeneous materials” (Law 1992, 381), which include human and non-human actors (i.e., individuals, institutions, and resources). This collection of actors comprises an assemblage that, despite its heterogeneity, takes on an emergent unity through processes of formation and reformation (DeLanda 2006; Latour 2005). As such, heterogeneous communities are complex, where members often have multiple and divergent views on authenticity, membership, and consumption (Beverland, Farrelly, and Quester 2010). Traditionally, research on community has been dominated by a perspective that privileges the homogeneity of groups. More recent research, however, has uncovered a host of heterogeneous communities that “[challenge] and [undermine] the authority of the hegemonic perspective” (Schouten, Martin, and McAlexander 2007, 74). Such communities challenge our understandings because they require the careful integration of “disparate but equally important groups” (Fournier, Sele, and Schoegel 2005, 16). The process through which this integration happens, however, is unknown.

While prior research identifies sources of heterogeneity and its associated tensions, we still know little about how heterogeneity impacts consumption communities and how it is collectively managed. This knowledge gap persists because consumption community research typically focuses on what unites, and is shared by, individuals in a community. Moreover, the role of multiple producers in communities is underresearched, as research tends to privilege the dyadic relationship between a defined producer (e.g., firm or brand) and a community. This view of communities, however, fails to capture the nuances of these complex assemblages: consumption communities are not just a series of dyads but rather an interconnected network of heterogeneous actors whose experiences are shaped by the interplay between actors and informed by marketplace dynamics. A full understanding of the processes at play within this kind of community, and how heterogeneity impacts community continuity, is lacking. This lack of understanding is problematic, as many communities, especially mainstream communities that are highly valued by both consumers and producers, are characterized by heterogeneity that, as will be described later, challenges community members and threatens community continuity.

In this work, we embrace this problem and determine how the interplay among multiple heterogeneous actors impacts community continuity. Consistent with theory, we show that heterogeneity in a community is destabilizing and a source of tension (DeLanda 2006; Latour 2005). However, we show that heterogeneity paradoxically also contributes to community continuity when the emergence of heterogeneous actors co-occurs with resource dependence. This co-occurrence inspires community actors to engage in frame alignment practices that ease heterogeneity-related tensions. Frame alignment practices are processes that facilitate the accommodation of differences, legitimize heterogeneity, and protect community continuity (Snow et al. 1986). These practices include groups: modifying their mandates to include and appeal to heterogeneous others; creating opportunities to engage diverse others; and emphasizing core values to invigorate members. These practices contribute to community continuity by solidifying a membership base where diverse members feel valued and can enact their identities.

In the sections that follow, we articulate current understandings of consumption communities and highlight key knowledge gaps that serve as the conceptual grounding for our research questions. Then we describe our methodological approach and present a detailed discussion of our findings. We conclude by outlining the implications of our findings.

CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT

The body of research on consumption communities informs our work. In the aggregate, prior work exposes the heterogeneous nature of consumption communities, but each independent work tends to focus on within-community similarities and not on heterogeneity’s impact, limiting our knowledge of heterogeneity’s role in communities. In the following sections, we describe what constitutes a community, and a consumption community, and discuss how researchers have tackled issues of heterogeneity in communities, uncovering key questions that guide our research.

Heterogeneity in Consumption Communities

Community. Originally, communities were conceptualized as small, homogenous groups characterized by familial and emotional bonds (Tönnies 1887). This conceptualization presented a fictive sense of homogeneity and cohesion rarely found in communities that extend beyond confined geographic locales (Anderson 1983). In contrast, contemporary community theories outline the complexities of community and show they are intricate assemblages of heterogeneous individuals, organizations, and resources. These communities evolve over time through a dynamic process of definition and redefinition that results in perpetually evolving groups that adapt and respond to changes both in the broader en-
environments and within the community (e.g., DeLanda 2006; Fischer, Bristor, and Gainer 1996; Latour 2005). While a universally accepted definition of community eludes researchers, theoretical views of community share commonalities: community members share a sense of belonging (i.e., communities differentiate members from nonmembers and emphasize aspects of commonality, including a consciousness of kind); being part of a community provides members with personal fulfillment (i.e., they share common norms, goals, interests, and moral responsibility such that members experience positive emotions, personal growth, self-efficacy, and distinction through membership); communities provide members with a sense of continuity where ongoing practices (e.g., everyday interactions, routines, rituals, and communications) ensure the community is able to engage and legitimate members over time; and communities consist of a series of associations among heterogeneous actors (Baker and Hill 2011; Cohen 1985; Crowther and Cooper 2002; DeLanda 2006; Fischer et al. 1996; Foà and Foà 1980; Latour 2005; Muñiz and O’Guinn 2001).

Emerging from these characteristics are two important points: (1) a sense of belonging is central to communities at the individual and collective level (e.g., Fischer et al. 1996) such that (2) communities are viewed as shared social relationships and actions that make the collective meaningful to members. A key theoretical implication of these points is that it “avoids the need to assess the degree of convergence across the minds of individuals” (Hardy, Lawrence, and Grant 2005, 62), since community is comprised of those who feel and experience a sense of individual and collective belonging. Thus, belonging is reinforced and co-constructed in collective practices, regardless of what may be differing individual psychological views (Blanchard and Markus 2002; Hardy et al. 2005; Schau, Muñiz, and Arnould 2009).

Belonging is, therefore, defined by each individual in reference to the dynamics of the community (Holland, Fox, and Daro 2008; McMillan and Chavis 1986). Specifically, an individual’s sense of belonging is reinforced (or diminished) through engagement with the community and its practices (Rosen, Lafontaine, and Hendrickson 2011). Thus, having access to the collection of social and economic resources needed to enact community identities enhances belonging. However, belonging can be diminished if individuals cannot access the resources necessary to engage in community practices. In these situations, the individual may leave the community (Irwin 1973). As such, an individual’s sense of belonging is inextricably entwined with the socially constructed practices and resources that shape community.

Communities also exhibit collective belonging. Collective belonging refers to the degree to which communities embrace solidarity and togetherness (communitas) as a part of their collective identity (Arnould and Price 1993; Turner 1969). As such, a strong collective identity does not ensure collective belonging: it emerges from a collective commitment to, and valuing of, communitas (Marotto, Roos, and Victor 2007). Communities that embrace belonging engage in unifying practices that contribute to individuals’ sense of belonging and preserve community continuity (Hardy et al. 2005; Schau et al. 2009). In summary, individual and collective belonging are central features of communities and are linked to community continuity.

Consumption Communities. Consumer research builds upon community literature to understand communities centered on consumption. Consumption communities are comprised of consumers who share a commitment to a product class, brand, activity, or consumption ideology (Cova and Cova 2002; Muñiz and O’Guinn 2001; Schouten and McAlexander 1995). This definition privileges consumers’ roles in communities but also implicitly acknowledges the role of producers, brands, products, and other resources. Thus, while not explicitly addressed, consumption communities are in effect comprised of consumers, producers, and resources.

Researchers have investigated many types of consumption communities, including subcultures of consumption (Schouten and McAlexander 1995), brand communities (Muñiz and O’Guinn 2001), and tribes (Cova and Cova 2002). While these communities all center on consumption, research defines each as a distinct entity with little consideration for how community types relate to each other—the distinctions between them are unclear (Canniford 2011). As a result, it is difficult to develop a macrolevel, systematic understanding of consumption communities. To enable a more theoretically driven assessment, we examined consumption community literature as a whole, analyzing approximately 100 articles published in marketing and consumer research. Based on this analysis, we identified several dimensions—focus, duration, appeal, access, dispersion, marketplace orientation, structure of resource dependency, collective belonging, and heterogeneity—on which consumption communities vary. These dimensions are described in table 1.

In our analysis, three dimensions emerged as underresearched. While the role of marketplace orientation, resource structure, and heterogeneity are discussed, their implications for community have yet to be fully explicated. This leaves us with little understanding of how complex heterogeneous communities manifest and interact with the marketplace and leads to our first research question: What role does heterogeneity play in consumption communities? We discuss the theoretical underpinnings of this question next.

Heterogeneous Actors within Communities. As described previously, consumption communities include heterogeneous actors assembled around a shared commitment. Consumption community research traditionally focuses on two sets of heterogeneous actors: consumers and producers. Explorations of consumer heterogeneity in communities typically focus on a single dimension: the level of commitment, and the corresponding level of expertise, to an identity. For example, research explores how novices and experts, and new and established members, differ (Reinhardt and Hemsberger 2007; Sirsi, Ward, and Reingen 1996) and how they transition through levels (Fox 1987). This research portrays an oversimplified view that posits a single ideal mem-
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Heterogeneity and Community Continuity

In addition to not understanding the role of heterogeneous actors in communities, we do not know what impact heterogeneity has on communities as a whole: existing theories offer conflicting views, with influxes of heterogeneity viewed as destabilizing but having the potential both to strengthen and to destroy community (DeLanda 2006). Research grounded in sociology and political theory demonstrates that heterogeneity strengthens communities, facilitates continuity, enhances members’ experiences (Omi and Winant 1994; Putnam 2000), helps maintain member engagement (Rubenson 2005), and heightens members’ sense of belonging (Crowther and Cooper 2002; Decker 2010). This work describes how heterogeneity allows communities to accommodate the varying needs and motivations of a range of members (Cohen 1985) as well as how heterogeneity is managed using frame alignment strategies that unite diverse individuals (Benford and Snow 2000; Decker 2010; Kretsedemas 2000; Snow et al. 1986; Wry, Lounsbury, and Glynn 2011). Overall, this work posits that when communities accommodate the varying needs of their members, heterogeneity contributes to continuity.

In contrast, other research shows heterogeneous communities tend to fragment and enter a state of decline (Hebdige 1979; Irwin 1973; Logan 2004; Spiegler 1996; Wood 2003). Consider, for example, the disco dance movement. In its early days, disco was culturally situated within the community, with members varying only in their commitment to an identity (Fox 1987; Schouten and McAlexander 1995). This perspective has been questioned with practitioners and researchers calling for a closer examination of heterogeneity in consumption communities (Cova, Pace, and Park 2007; Fournier and Lee 2009; Schau et al. 2009).

These closer examinations uncover complex, varied, and nuanced heterogeneity. Research shows multiple identity projects can be enacted (Martin, Schouten, and McAlexander 2006), different subtribes can exist (Cova et al. 2007), and members can take on diverse roles (Diamond et al. 2009; Fournier and Lee 2009) in a community. Further, members vary in what membership means to them, how they engage in consumption (Dong and Tian 2009), their reasoning used to guide behaviors (Sirsir et al. 1996), and their motivations (Beverland et al. 2010; Widdicombe and Woffitt 1990). Research also describes community debates resulting from heterogeneity. For example, Leigh, Peters, and Shelton (2006) show how members of the MG brand subculture negotiate the legitimacy of multiple authenticities, while other researchers show the evolution of multiple legitimate identity enactments in the biker community (Martin et al. 2006; Schouten et al. 2007). In sum, consumer research has uncovered significant consumer heterogeneity in consumption communities, but the implications of this are underexplored.

Likewise, understandings of producer and resource heterogeneity are also limited, because research tends to focus on the relationship between a community and a single producer. This tendency is most pronounced in brand community research (e.g., Avery 2007; Bagozzi and Dholakia 2006; McAlexander, Schouten, and Koenig 2002; Muñiz and Schau 2005; Schau et al. 2009; Thompson and Sinha 2008). Work on tribes and consumption subcultures also acknowledges producers’ roles in community resource provision and demonstrates how brands link networks of consumers (Cova 1997; Cova and Cova 2002; Diamond et al. 2009; Kates 2004; Martin et al. 2006; Schouten and McAlexander 1995). The focus, however, is still on singular producers and does not examine the interactions between multiple producers across multiple product and service categories and a community. For example, Martin et al. (2006) and Schouten and McAlexander (1995) mention the role of multiple motorcycle brands—and consumer reactions to these brands—but do not explore this in detail. Similarly, Kates (2004) shows that members assess the legitimacy of multiple brands but does not discuss the interplay between these brands and the community. Moreover, Goulding et al. (2009) demonstrate how a range of producers co-create a consumption community, but the interactions between producers are not examined. Thus, while research is consistent with a view of communities as complex, with dynamic associations among consumers, producers, and resources, these interplays have not been explored.

How communities orient to the marketplace has also not been explicitly investigated, further limiting our understanding of producers’ roles in heterogeneous communities. When discussed, the focus is usually on countercultural communities with antagonistic marketplace orientations (Arsel and Thompson 2011; Kozinets 2002a; Thompson and Coskuner-Balli 2007). Here, research often portrays marketplace tendencies as oppositional, focusing on market co-optation as a destructive force that transforms cultural community elements into mass-market artifacts that brings about undesirable “mainstreaming” for that group (Hebdige 1979; Thompson and Coskuner-Balli 2007). Mainstreaming is viewed as detrimental to communities, since it invites unwanted heterogeneity that upsets the sense of exclusivity derived from membership (e.g., Fox 1987; Irwin 1973). Consumer responses to these perceived negative effects vary: some abandon communities (e.g., Irwin 1973), others form new ones (e.g., Thompson and Coskuner-Balli 2007), and still others reclaim community meanings (e.g., Arsel and Thompson 2011). Consequently, conceptualizations of producer-community interactions do not account for all involved stakeholders, nor do they account for mainstream communities operating synergistically with multiple producers across multiple product and service categories.

In sum, explicit attention to multiple heterogeneous actors, including consumers, producers, and resources, is needed to understand mainstream consumption communities and assess “how a network of actors . . . get tied together by bonds of mutual reciprocity” (Legge 2002, 78). As detailed in our findings, we show that heterogeneous actors are united through resources that facilitate this mutual reciprocity.
### TABLE 1

**STRUCTURAL CLASSIFICATION OF CONSUMPTION COMMUNITIES STUDIED IN CONSUMER AND MARKETING RESEARCH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension and description</th>
<th>Categories and example</th>
<th>Running community status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus</strong>: Whether communities primarily center on a brand, consumption activity, or ideology</td>
<td>Brand: The Saab community (Muniz and O’Guinn 2001) Activity: The surfing community (Canniford 2011) Ideology: The Burning Man community (Kozinets 2002a)</td>
<td>Activity focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration</strong>: The degree to which communities vary in how long they exist, ranging from temporary to enduring</td>
<td>Temporary: Flash mobs form seemingly instantly, enact a community identity, and disperse (e.g., Bames 2006). Enduring: The Apple Newton community formed in the early 1990s and continues to thrive despite the product being discontinued (Muniz and Schau 2005).</td>
<td>Enduring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appeal</strong>: The degree to which communities appeal, or are attractive to, consumers, ranging from being limited in appeal to being broadly appealing</td>
<td>Limited: Voluntary simplicity communities require giving up many consumer luxuries that are viewed as necessities by most consumers (Cherrier 2009). Broad: The Tom Petty and the Heartbreakers brand community is mainstream, nonstigmatized, and highly appealing to a large group of consumers (Schau and Muniz 2007).</td>
<td>Broad: Running is extremely popular around the world, showing considerable growth annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access</strong>: The ease with which consumers can join a community, including (1) barriers to entry related to the minimum membership requirements (Von Hippel 2005) and (2) welcoming behaviors (how community growth is encouraged and facilitated; Schau et al. 2009)</td>
<td>Low barriers to entry: Joining a peer-to-peer online problem-solving community requires only registering on a website (Mathwick, Wiertz, and Ruyter 2008). High barriers to entry: Becoming a recognized member of the Harley-Davidson community requires a substantial financial investment (Schouten and McAlexander 1995). Low welcoming: The Porsche brand community prioritizes exclusivity, making it difficult for new members to gain legitimate status in the community (Avery 2007). High welcoming: The 3Com Audrey community actively seeks out new members and encourages them to join (Schau et al. 2009).</td>
<td>Low: There are multiple ways to join as it is highly accessible in terms of both effort and financial cost. High: Members prophesy about the benefits of running and recruit newcomers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dispersion</strong>: The degree to which communities are localized (in person), dispersed (online), or hybrid (both on and offline; Wind, Mahajan, and Gunther 2002)</td>
<td>Local: River rafting communities are localized (Arnould and Price 1993). Dispersed: The peer-to-peer problem-solving community exists only in a dispersed online environment (Mathwick et al. 2008). Hybrid: The Hummer brand community has both local and online components (Luedicke, Thompson, and Giesler 2010).</td>
<td>Hybrid: Members of the community interact in person (at local events) as well as online.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Marketplace orientation: The degree to which the marketplace plays a collaborative role in communities. Collaborative communities work synergistically with the marketplace, neutral communities have limited marketplace relationships, and oppositional communities are counter-cultural and oppose marketplace tendencies.

Synergistic: The Harley-Davidson brand community works closely with the company to pursue goals central to both the community and the company (Schouten and McAlexander 1995).
Neutral: Consumer-based book clubs represent consumption communities where the marketplace plays a neutral role: consumers buy marketplace books, but there is very little marketplace interaction beyond this exchange (Long 2003).
Oppositional: The Community Supported Agriculture community opposes the practices of mainstream commercial entities, focusing its ideology on practices deviant from the mainstream (Thompson and Coskuner-Balli 2007).

Structure of resource dependency: How informational, social, cultural, and economic resources flow into and within the community. Simple structures have a clearly defined, one-way structure. Other communities do not have any defined structure. Complex structures involve networks of interdependent entities through which resources flow.

Simple: Fournier and Lee (2009) describe hub-like communities where members have a strong devotion to a particular individual but rarely interact with each other. Resources flow from members to the central figure and back but rarely between members.
No structure: Communities, like broad political organizations (e.g., Republicans and Democrats), where members are dispersed with little interaction (other than imagined interaction) with each other or a focal entity (Fournier and Lee 2009).
Complex: The American Girl community (Diamond et al. 2009) is a complex community with multiple networks of stakeholders interacting with each other in multiple ways.

Collective belonging: The degree to which communities embrace solidarity and togetherness (communitas) as a part of their collective identity, ranging from being a limited to a prominent part of the collective identity.

Limited: Many associations (e.g., professional organizations, political organizations) have a limited sense of collective belonging (Fournier and Lee 2009).
Prominent: River-rafting communities embrace communitas and work to build a sense of togetherness (Amould and Price 1993).

Prominent: The Community Supported Agriculture community embraces communitas and works to build a sense of togetherness and belonging for members (Thompson and Coskuner-Balli 2007).
Prominent: The community works to enhance togetherness and belonging for members.

Heterogeneity: The degree to which communities exhibit variation in how they orient to the community in terms of the roles played in the community, the meanings derived from membership, and the resources created within the community. Communities range from homogenous to heterogeneous.

Homogenous: Gangs represent a homogenous community that repress and ostracize difference (Venkatesh 1997).
Heterogeneous: The Chinese community is varied, with members embracing their roles, symbols, and brands in different ways (Dong and Tian 2009).

Heterogeneous: A variety of different types of runners, roles, and ideologies are present.

underground gay community. Disco was then featured in the movie *Saturday Night Fever*, which resulted in mass popularity of the musical genre and lifestyle. As a result, core community members abandoned the music and the subculture quickly disintegrated and lost popularity (Garofalo 2002). This evolutionary pattern is documented across a range of communities, including music (Anderson 2009; Fox 1987), sports (Humphreys 2003; Irwin 1973), and ideologically based consumption communities (Thompson and Coskuner-Balli 2007). Across these communities, growth resulting in heterogeneity and unwanted producer involvement is blamed for reducing members’ sense of belonging, since personal fulfillment is diminished with the disruption of exclusivity and distinction associated with membership. This dilutes members’ sense of belonging and inhibits their access to the resources associated with community identity enactments (Bourdieu 1979; Hebdige 1979; Muñiz and O’Guinn 2001). In contrast to what was described earlier, the conclusion derived from this work is that heterogeneity threatens community continuity. This conflicting evidence motivates our second research question, How does heterogeneity contribute to the continuity of consumption communities?

In summary, while research describes several community types, explores collective consumer experiences, and describes some roles played by producers and resources, our understanding is still limited: research has yet to explicate the impact of heterogeneity on communities despite the prevalence of heterogeneous communities in contemporary consumer culture. To attenuate this shortcoming, we investigate a mainstream, heterogeneous, mature consumption community. This historically situated and socially constructed community is large in members and associated resources, and both individuals and organizations (e.g., race organizations, charity running programs, specialty stores, and running shoe and apparel manufacturers), and associated resources (e.g., brands, products, races, and gathering places) that together participate in long-distance running. This historically situated and socially constructed community is large in members and associated revenue. In the United States in 2010, nearly half a million people completed marathons (Khalid 2011), over 10 million finished one of over 12,000 road races (Running USA 2010), and hundreds of thousands were members of over 3,000 running clubs (Road Runners Club of America 2009; USA Track and Field 2009). Almost 44 million people run or jog in the United States (Running USA 2010), and 12% of Canadians age 20 or older run or jog (Hurst 2009). The commercial side of the community is also large, estimated at over $13 billion, with dozens of companies selling running shoes and apparel (Running USA 2008, 2010). These figures are the result of significant, and heterogeneous, community growth: in 1976 there were fewer than 25,000 marathon finishers and only 150 running clubs in the United States (New York Road Runners 2012; Road Runners Club of America 2009).

Demographics of the running community have also evolved. In the United States, 47% of race participants are female, compared with only 10% in 1976. Further, middle-age females currently comprise the fastest growing demographic segment in the community (Running USA 2010). While a full explication of the historical evolution of this community is beyond the scope of this article, appendix A highlights some of the pivotal historical events that have contributed to the influx of heterogeneity in this community. Thus all actors in this community are heterogeneous: consumers have multiple orientations toward the activity, producers comprise a large industry that supports and participates in the community, and resources such as brands, products, races, and sites are integral to the community.

Our research goal was to elucidate as many aspects of the community as possible, revealing the interplay between all community actors. We focused our analysis in two places: the experiences of individuals and organizations within the community and online community forums and popular press commentaries. We derived our data from depth interviews (McCracken 1988b), online forum observation (Kozinets 2002b), and prolonged participant observation (Jorgensen 1989), examining both consumer and producer perspectives.

First, we conducted depth interviews with 83 community members, representing both individuals and organizations (see app. B). Informants (47 male) were ages 11–68. We recruited them using purposeful and snowball sampling in three North American cities over 2 years. Recruiting through personal contacts and local running organizations, we sought members with varying degrees and types of community involvement. We interviewed members new to the community, as well as Olympic athletes. We also interviewed those involved in the production side of the community, including leaders of running organizations, employees and members of charity running programs, running store owners and employees, and race directors. Of our informants, 98% are regular runners and 70% participate in races, 17% at an elite level (i.e., national and international levels). Our informants are also highly involved with production in the community: 7% coach; 18% work with local running and race-producing organizations; 5% work with regional or national running organizations; 7% work or volunteer for charity running programs; 6% work in running stores; and 17% derive income from the running industry. Importantly, many of our informants take on a variety of roles in the community, adopting both consumer and producer roles. As such, heterogeneity is pervasive both across all informants as well as within individual informants.

The depth interviews focused on three topics: (1) the role of running in informants’ lives and how this role evolved over time; (2) informants’ views of the community and how it impacts their experiences and engagement with commu-
HETEROGENEOUS CONSUMPTION COMMUNITIES

In addition, we conducted online forum observation (Kozinets 2002b; Muñiz and Schau 2005). Over 3 years, we observed two running forums: one founded by elite runners and one affiliated with a mainstream running magazine. We also followed popular press articles. We used naturalistic observation with the forums where interview findings guided our selection of current and archived threads, such that we sought avenues for confirmation and disconfirmation of emerging themes.

Finally, we engaged in prolonged participant observation (Jorgensen 1989). The focus of this fieldwork was a local running club with 1,200 members that produces 15 races per year. The first author also conducted fieldwork with a national organization that coordinates and works with over 1,000 US running clubs. Over 4 years, fieldwork consisted of attending monthly running club board meetings, first as an observer and then as a board member, attending and participating in club races and social events, working with community producers (e.g., running stores and other race organizers), attending and participating in national running club meetings and conferences, and organizing races. During this time, the first author became embedded in the community, gaining access to its backstage workings at both the local and national levels.

We analyzed transcripts, message board data, and field notes using QSR NVivo. Following Strauss and Corbin’s (1990) procedures, we analyzed each transcript, thread, and set of field notes individually and then began open and axial coding. We uncovered important themes using an iterative, back-and-forth reading process, uncovering patterns within and between informants and within and between data sets (Spiggle 1994; Thompson 1997).

FINDINGS

Our analysis focused on heterogeneity’s role in the running community and the interplay between heterogeneous actors and resources within the community. Our findings, overviewed in figure 1 and described next, show how and why a heterogeneous, mainstream consumption community preserves continuity. We show that, in this community, heterogeneity and resource dependence co-occur and are intertwined such that the community sustains itself by building a network of dependent social and economic resource exchanges between heterogeneous actors. We show that while heterogeneity leads to tensions that threaten belonging, resource dependence leads to benefits for members that include a strengthening of belonging. Motivated to preserve these benefits, the community uses frame alignment strategies to collectively accommodate the differences that give rise to the heterogeneity-related tensions. These strategies legitimate heterogeneity, facilitate belonging, unite heterogeneous actors, and contribute to continuity.

Our findings draw upon a range of informants, but throughout we highlight Bryan’s comments and historical perspective as a case study that encapsulates the definitions, tensions, resource dependence and benefits, and frame alignments in the community (see table 2). In addition, we focus on the exchanges between two important sets of heterogeneous actors in the community: consumers and producers. Importantly, these two groups of actors are not mutually exclusive—single individuals and single organizations often take on both consumer and producer roles in the community—nor do they exhibit a hierarchical relationship with each other. Instead, these actors operate as equal and dependent members of the community. Here, we see a community that is made up of multiple groups of people, resources, and institutions all of which exhibit heterogeneity but come together with a shared sense of belonging.

Community Heterogeneity, Belonging, and Tension

Heterogeneity Character. The running community is an assemblage of heterogeneous actors who take on a variety of roles and differ in how they enact those roles, the meanings derived from membership, and how they use and create resources. We focus first on consumer and then producer heterogeneity, but as noted earlier, these roles are themselves porous, with actors participating in both as well as moving between them.

Members differ in motivations for joining and staying in the community and in how membership fits with their lifestyles. Some are motivated to run to “stay in good shape” (Nate, male, age 21) and others for competition, “strategy and time” (Kerry, female, age 30). For some, running is not...
## TABLE 2
FINDINGS EXEMPLIFIED BY BRYAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Quotation</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity</td>
<td>“The last 10 years there’s been a huge influx of much more casual competitors who are concerned about completing the distances and not so much about time. The races are a time to socialize and see the community. . . . Focus on competition has probably decreased. Before that, for 20 odd years, it was a spiritual approach to the sport. . . . These days, it’s approached more as a lifestyle and a recreational activity and a healthy activity.”</td>
<td>Highlights community’s heterogeneity and describes the inclusive nature of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension</td>
<td>“The typical store clinic approach, while it may indeed put bodies into races, actually erodes the sport of running . . . by mass-promoting the notion that a vigorous and competitive approach to running is too difficult and dangerous for the average person . . . store-based learn to run and marathon training clinics systematically discourage thousands of people . . . [from experiencing] the joy and fulfillment of a vigorous, competitive approach.”</td>
<td>Presents tensions within the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource dependence and benefits</td>
<td>“I like [the website] because it’s a community where there are people who think the same things you do are important and can really appreciate when someone knocks 20 seconds off their 10km personal best or something; that realize how significant that is. You need to think you’re not just insane, that there are other people out there like you.” “As a coach of runners who are quite serious, I would like to see more people take it more seriously as a competitive thing. . . . Yet on the other hand it’s great to see lots of other people coming into it. They fill out the races, they spend their money, and they support us.” “[Brand A] makes it possible for younger runners to continue in the sport because product is very expensive. . . . But on top of that they also sponsor races. They’re very important contributors to the local road race and national road race scene.”</td>
<td>Describes social and economic resource dependences between consumers and producers and the associated benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame alignment</td>
<td>“Our sport is one of the few sports in which . . . elites compete alongside, literally physically right beside non-elite competitors. In my experience the lead runners are very supportive of the average person . . . because they realize that it’s the same pursuit no matter what your speed.” “I’m never actually going to beat some personal bests [because of my age], but I can work with people who can achieve personal bests . . . I really get a kick out of watching people who don’t think they ever had any ability or talent, and in some cases didn’t think they had any athletic ability at all, actually discover running and do quite well . . . passing on the torch.”</td>
<td>Describes frame alignment strategies used to unify the community, validating divergent community members.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a central feature of their lifestyle. For example, Sonya (female, age 27) states,

My whole life isn’t centered around running and running culture. . . . For me, if I don’t have time on a particular day, I won’t run. Other people make time for running. I don’t.

For Sonya, other aspects of life, such as time with family, take on greater importance. For others, running is central to life, individual, and family identity:

When we look back on what we did as a family, when these kids look back, we ran. That’s what we did. And there’s no ambiguity about it. . . . We’re runners. (Anthony, male, age 45)

While these differences add to heterogeneity’s character, they are inconsequential compared to the degree of contestation about the core activity. Specifically, the most fundamental and emotionally charged strain stems from how members determine what constitutes the practice of running (i.e., whether running, jogging, or walking are appropriate “running” enactments).

The genesis of this strain lies in the community’s evolution. As disclosed by our informants, at its origins in the early 1970s, the community focused on competition, progressive improvement, and performance. Over the next 40 years, the community grew substantially. Today, running is popular with some participants and organizations seeking and/or offering recreation, competition, or charitable programs (e.g., Team In Training 2011).

Bryan (male, age 40), as a lifelong competitive runner, exemplifies the community’s complexity. His ambivalence about what constitutes running typifies the heterogeneity and tension:

The last 10 years there’ve been a huge influx of much more casual competitors who are concerned about completing the distances and not so much about time. The races are a time to socialize and see the community. . . . Focus on competition has probably decreased. Before that, for 20 odd years, it was a spiritual approach to the sport. . . . These days, it’s approached more as a lifestyle and a recreational activity and a healthy activity.

Bryan highlights the diverse range of identity enactments in the community. Logan (male, age 30) reiterates:

There are people who are into it for fitness and wellness, and there are varying degrees. There are some who will never show up at a race. . . . There are people like me who are very competitive. . . . and go out and do that seriously. Then there are a group of people who are kind of in the middle. They go out there, they like the atmosphere of being around a whole bunch of other people, but don’t care about the competition side of things.

Producers also exhibit heterogeneity around running discourses. For example, Reebok and Pearl Izumi launched campaigns with different positions on running practices. Reebok sought to “bring the fun back into running” with irreverence toward competitive running (Business Wire 2007), while Pearl Izumi designed an “attack on jogging” (Kelly Awards 2007). These campaigns mirror consumers’ discourses, epitomize competing producer discourses and the accompanying collection of social and economic resources, and highlight heterogeneous views of what constitutes appropriate running enactments.

Importantly, it is not membership that is contested but rather enactments of community practices. As such, a sense of belonging emerges in this community despite heterogeneity:

You have people who just got off their couch recently and they’re out there because they went to one race and they walked or ran part of it and they enjoyed themselves, so they think they might want to try running. . . . I absolutely consider those people part of the community of runners . . . they’re kind of transient, but at the same time I’m just as happy to run with one of those people and hope they get excited enough about running to continue. (Paige, female, age 32)

Paige’s comment demonstrates members are cognizant of differences but are accepting and welcoming nonetheless. An online poster elaborates:

I respect everyone on the roads who is trying to get it done. Whether their goal is to run sub 2:30 for some local marathon, or just to lose a few pounds. I wave when I see them, because I’ve been there. I like to think of it as a family/species. I may be a tiger out there running, or I may simply be a cat, but I’m still a feline. Give ’em props. (AD, November 2005)

Another online poster reiterates:

The [runners in the back] aren’t in the picture for me as far as the race itself is concerned. However they are part of the social fabric of the race day and the running/racing community, and in my mind add to the enjoyment of the sport. (PE, January 2003)

Recreational runners mirror these sentiments of belonging. Victoria (female, age 53) states that during a race “I like being part of the community of people.” Victoria’s access to the resources associated with races provides her with a sense of belonging. She says: “The race directors who invite walkers and the charities are very welcoming.” Although Victoria has access to resources that provide a sense of belonging when she participates in community events, others may question her belonging as the community negotiates how to fully integrate members like Victoria. This tension, described next, challenges the community and could threaten belonging.

Sources of Tension. Many concerns related to belonging arise from heterogeneity, with multiple views of what it means to run circulating in the community. Emergent from our analysis are three key sources of tension: co-optation, orientation, and enactment. Co-optation refers to tension arising from corporate involvement with the community that is viewed as exploitive and a corruption of community val-
ues. Orientation tension refers to conflicts stemming from how members engage with running and enactment tension refers to conflicts that occur when members disrupt the identity enactments of others. Bryan (male, age 40) comments:

The typical store clinic approach, while it may indeed put bodies into races, actually erodes the sport of running . . . by mass-promoting the notion that a vigorous and competitive approach to running is too difficult and dangerous for the average person . . . store-based learn to run and marathon training clinics systematically discourage thousands of people . . . [from experiencing] the joy and fulfillment of a vigorous, competitive approach.

Bryan presents the classic co-optation argument where marketers co-opt “authentic” practices and dupe unqualified consumers, inhibiting these “newcomers” from having a “true” experience. The underlying assumption is that there is a single correct way to run and that marketers attempt to disrupt and devalue the experiences of true runners. These statements partially contradict Bryan’s early comments about community inclusiveness. Ryan (male, age 23) elaborates on co-optation noting the role of “the chain running store”:

I think that [the chain running store is] a plague on running. I think [the magazine] is a plague on running. It systematically increased participation and decreased quality in North American running. [The store] in particular is quite a pathetic little place if you ask me . . . at first they were pretty dedicated to the sport, but now, what do they have, joggers. They teach people how to jog a marathon just to finish a marathon, which is completely ludicrous.

Ryan argues that co-optation dilutes the sport and produces a community that devalues performance and competition. This diminishes his competitive identity and sense of belonging.

Conflict between performance and participation is another source of tension. This tension emerges between those whose purpose is to be competitive and those who think just participating is appropriate, an ideological battle between those who adhere to the philosophies of the first and second running booms, respectively (see app. A). Dylan (male, age 23) comments on marathoners whose purpose is completion, not time:

I don’t care if it’s 26 miles, [they’re] jogging. . . . It pissed me off unbelievably when people said “oh you went for a jog.” F--- you. I’m going for a run. You come with [and] call it a jog!

Dylan opposes associating jogging with his runner identity. Likewise, Logan’s (male, age 30) belief that performance supersedes participation impacts how he produces races: “the best thing for pitching a race is to pitch it as a race and not as a party [even though there are those who] disagree with me vehemently.” Trista (female, age 25), a charity running program organizer, disagrees about competitive aspects being most important, even though she is a fast runner and often wins race awards:

I’m not a big race person . . . because of the [charity program] I’ve started doing more of the races just because I need to experience them from that perspective [but] . . . it’s not real competitive for me . . . when I do an event and I come in . . . second place for my age group, I get really excited but I wasn’t there to be competitive . . . I run for fun and to see everybody.

These comments illuminate the tension between participation and performance such that some community members devalue the enactments of others.

Similarly, clashes between fast and slow runners are a third source of tension: an enactment tension. Ryan (male, age 23) explains,

If you are going to run or walk a marathon, just go walk [26 miles] yourself. Don’t waste everyone else’s time, getting in front of everyone and slowing down . . . elite runners.

Megan and an online poster describe similar frustrations with others “getting in the way”:

Those really big races can be frustrating because these [non-competitive] people sort of get in the way of what people who are actually running are trying to do. (Megan, female, age 24)

[Slow runners getting in the way of faster runners] are the one and only reason I refuse to run mega-events like [big city] marathons. (DM, November 2002)

Slower runners also recognize this tension. Trista (female, age 25) notes,

When [my program] first started [there] was a little tension just because walkers get in the way of runners. [Our participants] didn’t know to stay on one side rather than [walking] in a horizontal line taking up the whole way so the runners can’t get by.

Slow runners blocking fast runners threaten belonging for multiple members: fast runners cannot access identity related resources (i.e., the race experience), while slow runners feel unwelcome.

In sum, while heterogeneity is accepted, there is still tension related to how members view community identity enactments. This tension threatens belonging. Yet, we see this community thrives despite this tension. In the sections that follow, we unfold the drivers of this paradox, adopting a network perspective of community where dichotomies between fast runners and slow runners, and members and corporations are replaced with a view of community that consists of heterogeneous actors united through a resource dependence that underpins the benefits accrued from community involvement.
Resource Dependence

Our findings highlight the role of heterogeneity and how this contributes to community continuity. We show how heterogeneity, co-occurring with resource dependence, affords benefits to community members that enhance belonging and motivate frame alignment practices that bridge heterogeneous actors and facilitate community continuity. For individuals within the community, predominantly those taking on consumer roles, the benefits include enhanced belonging, maintenance of perceived authenticities, ample and strategically structured opportunities for marking distinctiveness, and continued access to resources required for enacting running related identities. For organizations within the community, predominantly those adopting producer roles, the benefits include legitimacy, belonging, authenticity, increased sales and customer loyalty, and enhanced brand images. Resource dependence includes exchanges of both social and economic resources between groups of heterogeneous actors including: consumers and consumers; consumers and producers; and producers and producers. Social resource dependence emerges from identity relationships between members and economic resource dependence emerges from complementary goals. Next we describe, and summarize in table 3, these dependencies and how they motivate practices that facilitate community continuity.

Consumer-to-Consumer Resource Dependence. Our data reveal social and economic consumer-to-consumer resource dependencies that provide benefits to consumers. We find that community members derive social benefits from the presence of other members who are able to appreciate, discern, and empathize with their experiences. A sense of authenticity and distinctiveness is derived from sharing insider knowledge with informed others who appreciate what it means to be a runner. This reinforces belonging. To achieve authenticity and distinctiveness (subjective and socially constructed judgements [e.g., Grayson and Martinec 2004; Peterson 2005]), members depend upon each other to confer status and legitimate experiences. As Dylan (male, age 23) discusses,

Running is part of my life. Running defines me. . . . That’s something that no one understands who’s not a runner. People often say, “You have to run today, why? It’s not that big a deal to miss a day,” No. I have to. It’s part of who I am. And no one gets running if they don’t do it.

Bryan (male, age 40) also treasures sharing experiences with an informed audience he finds online:

I like [the website] because it’s a community where there are people who think the same things you do are important and can really appreciate when someone knocks 20 seconds off their 10km personal best or something: that realize how significant that is. You need to think you’re not just insane, that there are other people out there like you.

For Dylan and Bryan, an informed audience gives them social capital: without the audience, their runner identity value is diminished. These individuals are discerning and
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appreciate running experiences, legitimizing members’ enactments, providing belonging and personal fulfillment.

Belonging and personal fulfillment are also enhanced by runners capitalizing on member heterogeneity to achieve personal authenticity and distinctiveness. For consumers, authenticity and distinctiveness emerge through comparisons with heterogeneous runners in the community:

[Our charity program participants] love [races] because it makes them feel like they’re an athlete . . . they love showing up at five in the morning on race day . . . they love crossing that finish line, getting that medal, and being a part of it. (Trista, female, age 25)

For these runners, belonging and personal fulfillment is enhanced by engaging in collective practices with heterogeneous others, and accessing meaningful race resources, resulting in a feeling of shared identity. In contrast, Lyndsay (female, age 22) stakes her perceived sense of authenticity and distinctiveness against slower runners validating that she is fast:

Everyone’s a runner nowadays, but that doesn’t bother me . . . [sometimes I will correct people who say “I jog”] because I feel like the term jog means that you’re going really slow. So I like them to know I run. That I go fast.

Lyndsay, ambivalent about her identity value being diluted, benefits from asserting status as a fast runner and, through her comparisons with others, acknowledges the authentic enactments of those from whom she differs. Thus, members’ heterogeneous identity enactments take on expressive roles, communicating and conferring status, that reinforce distinction and belonging.

Similar to social resources, economic exchanges also involve consumer dependence. These exchanges maintain a supply of material resources that contribute to member benefits. Members recognize that size, inextricably bundled with heterogeneity (Wilson 1986), make the community a target of consumer dependence. These exchanges maintain a supply of material resources that contribute to member benefits. Members recognize that size, inextricably bundled with heterogeneity (Wilson 1986), make the community a target of consumer dependence. These exchanges maintain a supply of material resources that contribute to member benefits. Members recognize that size, inextricably bundled with heterogeneity (Wilson 1986), make the community a target of consumer dependence.

As a coach of runners who are quite serious, I would like to see more people take it more seriously as a competitive thing. . . . Yet on the other hand it’s great to see lots of other people coming into it. They fill out the races, they spend their money, and they support us.

An online poster shares Bryan’s views:

Respect should be given to ALL runners, even those who train to achieve but will never be “elite,” as it is these runners who will pay the future bills of the future stars through their commitment to the sport. (GD, April 2003)

The diversity of runners sustains community size which attracts producer investment:

Do I wish the magazine [Runners’ World] wasn’t as brought into the mainstream culture of just participating means you win and “eight ways to get great ab muscles?” Yeah, I wish they wouldn’t do that, but I understand that’s where the revenue is. (Andy, male, age 42)

The importance of economic resource dependence is also evidenced in producers’ commitment to maintaining relationships with all members. A local running club board member comments:

It’s important that we consider our membership and their feedback when making decisions . . . [we] have 800–1200 members . . . with views about [us] and what they would like from [us]. Of those members and runners surveyed, the majority want us to focus on all runners, be more inclusive (slow, medium, and fast runners) and make efforts to have more events outside of races (runs, meetings, seminars, etc.). (Field notes, November 2009)

Community size and corresponding heterogeneity ensure that members have access to resources and inspires producer innovation: without the prospect of profits, firms would not support the community. Producer involvement thus benefits consumers, since they can obtain the resources needed to enact running practices, thereby enhancing the enactment dimension of belonging.

In sum, consumers derive authenticity, belonging, and distinctiveness from social resource dependence, with heterogeneity playing a key role in this process. Heterogeneity and community size also attract economic resources needed for identity enactments.

**Consumer-to-Producer Resource Dependence.** Next, we unfold the dependencies between consumers and producers, noting the collaborative role of market players in the community. Like consumers, producers’ practices can be viewed as appropriate or inappropriate, resulting in exchanges between consumers and producers that can be tenuous. In general, however, runners view producers as vital to community continuity and consumer benefits but may dispute the legitimacy of a given set of producer practices:

[Brand A] makes it possible for younger runners to continue in the sport because product is very expensive. . . . But on top of that they also sponsor races. They’re very important contributors to the local road race and national road race scene. (Bryan, male, age 40)

Bryan believes Brand A supports the community; however, Lyndsay (female, age 22) resists:

I don’t like to wear [Brand A] stuff because . . . they’re all over the American Track and Field team and they’re also really expensive. . . . I guess it’s helping pay for their training and stuff but . . . they’re paying $50 for a shirt that just has a little [logo] on it. . . . And that bothers me.

Lyndsay believes Brand A exploits runners by overcharging; it is not an authentic member. Producers walk a tightrope between engaging co-creatively with the community and pursuing commercial ends that are not always aligned with community goals. Consumer reactions to these actions range from hostile to welcoming. Consumers may question the
legitimacy of producer actions and determine their practices undermine the community (e.g., Kates 2004; Thompson and Coskuner-Balli 2007; Zhao and Belk 2008) or view producer actions as a positive co-creation of value (e.g., Schau et al. 2009). Tyler (male, age 31) describes both these viewpoints:

To me it seems like [they’re] doing it just for the bottom line. They just want to sell shoes whereas giving to running isn’t a high priority. I’ll look at [other brands and companies] that sponsor grass roots kind of running and local types of things.

We find that these seemingly opposing viewpoints are not mutually exclusive, identifying instances where individual producer actions are viewed negatively but are accommodated if they occur within an ecosystem of interactions that is viewed as positive and co-creative.

Once producers are entrenched in the community, consumers and producers derive benefits from exchanges with one another. A benefit of producers’ social resources is the role they can play as community hubs. Running stores and groups operate as focal points that organize and unite heterogeneous actors, co-creating a sense of community and belonging. Kerry (female, age 30) describes this role:

The running shop was the main store, it was the core of the running community, and everything happens through them. They do a great job supporting all the races.

Evan (male, age 45) comments on local running clubs playing this hub role in communities:

Our [local running group] is pretty much the catalyst behind all the good things here in the running community. . . . Without them, running wouldn’t be nearly as big [here].

Kerry and Evan highlight the unifying role of stores and clubs such that consumers coalesce around producers (Rosenbaum 2006). Without producers, consumers would have difficulty locating and connecting with others in a heterogeneous community. Producers also benefit as they develop relationships with consumers who view them as valued community members.

In addition to using producers as hubs, consumers use producer resources in the social construction of identity, capitalizing on the expressive nature of these resources:

I like the type of running commercial that glorifies running a little bit more, that makes running look like a really respectable thing to do. Like, “I’m a runner. I’m proud of it.” . . . Everyone wishes they were a runner too. (Luke, male, age 21)

Luke is attracted to ads that inform others of running’s value. Runners also use mainstream media to show others they possess insider knowledge. For example, a Nike commercial featuring runners running along a beach elicited the following online discussion from June 2005:

**Poster 1:** Has anyone seen the new Nike Free commercial?


**Poster 2:** They’re all Nike athletes. The “star” is Todd Witzehen, a 2:21 marathon runner (he’s very good, but not as good as the others). He got the role from going to a casting call.

This discussion continued until every detail of the ad was dissected, illustrating how members use producer resources as a social tool to express insider knowledge and stake distinct identities.

Runners also use producer resources to show they belong to an exclusive informed community. Evan (male, age 45) illustrates this in his description of an ad showing a woman on a couch, wrapped in a foil blanket she presumably received after completing a marathon:

I think this would go over well, especially with the marathon crowd . . . this would really appeal to runners . . . nonrunners wouldn’t even understand what this wrap is all about.

Other informants also discuss ads portraying running’s inner workings. This type of ad, and the corresponding discussion, creates a sense of belonging and highlights how runners use producer resources to communicate their place in the community.

In addition to consumers using producer resources to enhance their identities, producers use consumer experiences to create brand images and build community status. For example, a 2011 Nike campaign involved runners submitting their reasons for running to a website. Nike then created an ad campaign using these submissions. The goal of the campaign was to leverage stories of real runners which capitalizes on the expressive nature of individuals’ experiences (*Advertising Age* 2011). Producers also use heterogeneity to enhance their business models. For instance, charity programs use coaches who do not fit the stereotypical runner mould:

We have volunteer coaches who look like the normal average everyday person. You would look at them and you would never suspect that they’re runners or walkers or exercise of any kind. That really gets people motivated because it’s not the average runner like you see in those ads where you walk up and you’re like “oh my gosh, I can’t do this.” (Trista, female, age 25)

Trista, a charity running program coordinator, recognizes and uses multiple authenticities to appeal to heterogeneous members, illustrating how producers use consumer experiences to co-create content that resonates with runners. Naturally, the goal is to increase brand awareness and sales; however, if producers successfully resonate with consumers, consumers will likely view the producers as legitimate members.

In addition to accruing benefits from social resource exchanges, consumers and producers also benefit from economic resource exchanges. Consumers rely on producer re-
sources to enact their identities and producers rely on consumers to purchase products:

I probably have floating around here 30 pairs of running shoes . . . technical running shorts . . . hats and special hats . . . running tights . . . jackets . . . [and other] technical wear.

(Andy, male, age 42)

Running shoes, for example, are viewed as a vital producer resource. As Dylan (male, age 23) describes,

You go and try on six pairs of shoes. I don’t care if it’s Nike, Saucony, New Balance, Adidas, Reebok, Brooks. No matter what brand, the only impact is how the shoes fit my foot. And how I think that is going to carry me through 500 miles without me getting hurt.

Dylan’s comments show that the provision of resources is central to continuity as it is tied to runners’ sense of fulfillment and running identity enactment which reinforces belonging. Andy’s comments also highlight the value of multiple producers innovating a constellation of goods that includes equipment, races, training groups, and other activities tailored to diverse needs.

In summary, consumers and producers engage in a series of dependent social resource exchanges, through which they reap the rewards of synergistic identity building. Consumers share experiences with producers, who draw on these to build brand identities, which consumers use to enhance their own (McCracken 1988a). Moreover, producers provide community hubs that facilitate structure and coordination, furthering social resource dependence. Finally, consumers and producers exchange economic resources: consumers need producer goods to enact their identities and producers need consumers to buy their products.

Producer-to-Producer Resource Dependence. Finally, we unfold the social and economic resource dependence among producers. The running community provides a forum through which producers interact to enhance their brand images within the community:

Two years ago we started fortifying our relationship with the US Olympic committee and we were designated a US Olympic training site. And that designation was based on another relationship that we had established with USA Track and Field. (Barb, female)

These collaborations also occur locally, where race producers partner with clubs to become club-certified “good neighbor races.” Here, smaller brands capitalize on the club’s image. These co-branding initiatives place producers in a collaborative rather than an antagonistic relationship.

Naturally, producers still compete. For example, in the local community we investigated there are three running stores that compete to be linked to club races. This can lead to accusations of favoritism by store owners. The following email exchange between Store A and the club demonstrates these dynamics:

It seems [Store B] clearly is your de facto running store sponsor (nearly all events on your calendar). We certainly do not want to take anything away from [Store B]—they have been a great supporter of local events for a long time. However, we have not been given the opportunity to support new [events] that are created. (Field notes, June 2007)

Here, Store A recognizes the community value of Store B but competes for visibility and customers. This is consistent with a view of producers as generally in co-opetition such that they compete at some levels but co-operate on other levels (Brandenburger and Nalebuff 1996).

Producers are also economically dependent on each other and work together to serve the needs of the community. Lauren (female, age 32), a charity running program director, describes producer cooperation:

The local shops help support us. They give discounts to our current participants and we help support their shop by sending people their way. . . [and they] run shoe clinics for us.

Producers also collaborate in the production of races, which are central to community practices. Our field notes reflect on producer-producer relationships for a race organized by the first author:


The backs of t-shirts given to race participants that display a multitude of producers’ logos exemplify community cooperation. While competitive tendencies persist, this does not preclude collaborative exchanges between complementary (e.g., a shoe store and a water provider) and competitive (e.g., two shoe stores) producers. For example, in the local community we investigated, there is a large social run (Monday Night Downtown) sponsored by multiple, competing restaurants, shoe stores, and medical services providers.

In summary, when heterogeneity co-occurs with resource dependence, both consumers and producers benefit. The benefits motivate the community to attenuate tensions arising from heterogeneity that threaten belonging. This is accomplished through the use of frame alignment practices (see fig. 1), which we describe next.

Frame Alignment and Community Continuity

Emergent in our data is community members deploying frame alignment practices to legitimize heterogeneity, attenuate its associated tensions, and preserve continuity. Frame alignment practices operate as a stabilizing mechanism for the community (Law 1992) through which the community is able to overcome tensions and reproduce and reform itself over time. These collaborative practices reinforce collective and individual belonging. We identify three types of frame alignment practices that contribute to com-
community continuity: language, structural, and role. Language alignments use language to unite divergent community members. Structural alignments are strategies that alleviate tensions associated with diverse members occupying the same physical and cultural space. Role alignments refer to consumers or producers who take on roles within the community designed to bridge heterogeneous actors. Recall how Bryan (male, age 40) has thus far described heterogeneity and tension as well as resource dependence and its benefits. Here he describes frame alignments that manage tensions and result in a community that validates divergent members through mutual engagement with running practices:

Our sport is one of the few sports in which . . . elites compete alongside, literally physically right beside non-elite competitors. In my experience, the lead runners are very supportive of the average person . . . because they realize it’s the same pursuit no matter what your speed.

In this excerpt, Bryan uses a language alignment that links divergent members through a trope of “equality in pursuit,” echoed in an online post highlighting motivational equality:

This is a truly brilliant sport we are able to participate in —the ability to lift both feet off the ground and to challenge oneself to improve, no matter if it is for a sub 13 min 5K, or for one to aim to achieve one’s goals of bettering your [personal bests] . . . that makes all runners unique . . . We are ALL in the same boat. (GM, April 2003)

The trope of motivational equality reframes participation versus competition into a discussion of self-improvement applied to, and accommodating, diverse community members.

An additional language alignment highlights members’ mutual support:

There [are] people who train hard to run fast times [and] other people who just go out and run for the love of it and both are equally valid . . . I don’t think there should be an elitism because there needs, if it’s a sport, to [be] a pyramid structure where the bottom group gets fed in to support the top group. (Maxine, female, age 29)

Maxine, albeit in a classic version of elitism where an inferior group supports a superior one, legitimates heterogeneity by asserting that member differences are comparable. A final emergent language alignment is an expression of shared connection and empathy, manifested in three kinds of statements: “I was you,” “I am you,” and “I know someone like you.” The first two statements involve runners talking about how they share similar experiences:

It’s a loose-knit community . . . you feel it when you’re out running and you see somebody who’s running . . . You can relate to that, saying, “I know what it’s like to run, I know what they’re going through.” (Aidan, male, age 25)

Here, we see that runners feel linked through their shared commitment to running, even without formal interactions. Kate (female, age 22), a recreational runner, expands:

I feel like distance runners and those who are into running just have this connection and can understand each other. If you’re running at 5 a.m. and it’s dark out and you’re freezing and you just feel terrible, and you run by another runner and you make eye contact, it’s almost like “Ugh, I feel ya.” Like “great job,” “keep going.” Just this look of “Oh, I get it.”

Kate and Aidan show how competitive and recreational runners are united through rituals, shared experiences, and patterns of engagement that enhance their sense of belonging.

Paige (female, age 32) illustrates the third kind of statement, “I know someone like you”:

My mom’s one of those runners. She does it a little bit, walks, and continues to do it. I wouldn’t [always] call her a runner but at the times that she chooses to participate, I see her as a part of the community.

Paige’s comment focuses on assuring others’ belonging through a narrative of understanding, acceptance, and connection. These comments operate as a frame alignment where community definitions expand to unify heterogeneous actors. Producers adopt similar alignments: the local running club revised their mission statement to move from an organization servicing runners, to one serving both runners and walkers, while promoting general health and fitness (field notes, August 2006). These language alignments take on expressive roles in the community where they serve to validate the identities of divergent community members.

The second kind of frame alignment, structural alignments, help community actors deal with the challenges associated with heterogeneous actors occupying the same physical and cultural space. For example, in heterogeneous communities, producers often struggle to serve all members. Logan (male, age 30) elaborates:

Within the [running club] board, there’s always been this fight between people who always just want to have these “citizen” races that should be non-competitive . . . and the people, like me, who want a really competitive event . . . we really can’t reconcile all [of them].

Producers face the question “How do I create races that bridge these groups?” acknowledging the need for structural alignments. Producers create these alignments: they adjust their offerings to accommodate heterogeneous needs and provide reward opportunities for different pursuits (Schau et al. 2009). For example, race organizers give awards for participating in multiple events and for exceptional volunteers, in addition to the conventional awards for fast times. Organizers also let slower runners start early, or run different routes, to avoid disrupting faster runners:

[Race producers now] know that there’s a lot of walkers out there and so they’ll keep the courses open longer and award the last finisher. (Trista, female, age 25)

Charity programs also coach their participants on running etiquette:

[We] tell them everything . . . where you should be walking
Producers also offer both competitive and social events as structural alignments. For example, the local club feels “an obligation to take care of all types of participants” (Paige, female, age 32), offering events for less serious runners, such as Monday Night Downtown, and for serious runners, such as a Grand Prix race series. These practices reduce tensions associated with feeling a particular identity enactment is more valued and enable heterogeneous members to share the same cultural and physical space, legitimizing differences and bolstering collective belonging.

The final emergent frame alignment is role alignments where individuals take it upon themselves to bridge heterogeneous actors. Bryan (male, age 40) embraces this bridging role:

I’m never actually going to beat some personal bests [because of my age], but I can work with people who can achieve personal bests. . . . I really get a kick out of watching people who don’t think they ever had any ability or talent, and in some cases didn’t think they had any athletic ability at all, actually discover running and do quite well . . . passing on the torch.

Kayla also operates as a role alignment by taking on multiple community roles that unite members, as evidenced in this field note excerpt from a community youth track meet:

Without any fanfare, [Kayla] cheered on these tykes, definitely not old enough to spell words with more than two syllables, but old enough to enjoy competition. . . . If someone unfamiliar with the sport watched this event, they would have no idea who the coach was. They would think she was a regular community volunteer or someone’s mom. Never would they guess that she’s one of the best runners in the world. (Field notes, March 2006)

Individuals in alignment roles appreciate the multiple authenticities in the community and occupy key positions where they embrace maintaining community cohesiveness:

I’ve focused my life on being a competitive, elite runner. But then in the last five or six years, this is where it’s changed. I have taken on more of a community leadership role in running. . . . I’m no longer committed with my soul and fiber of my existence to running fast, I’m more committed to helping people learn, to enjoy running. (Andy, male, age 42)

Producers also take on aligning roles. For example, as described earlier, the running clubs and stores operate as hubs that unite and welcome heterogeneous members.

The Monday Night Downtown event is complex and serves as a microcosm for the running community and epitomizes how all three types of frame alignments can be deployed to accommodate and legitimize heterogeneity. This event is a weekly social run/walk that attracts between 500 and 1,000 participants each week, with over 9,000 individuals participating in the event at least once. Its mission is “to bring active adults and families to the downtown to enjoy healthy exercise.” Hence, the downtown itself, as a hub of expressive and material resources, becomes a central actor in this event. The event, marketed as an easygoing evening downtown, is rife with frame alignments. Event promotions use language alignments to ensure everyone feels welcome. For example, describing the event as a “run/walk” legitimizes heterogeneous enactments. Moreover, organizers assess event success based on such measures as the number of people attending, including babies in strollers, further legitimizing heterogeneity.

The event also uses structural alignments. There are multiple routes for participants, including one designated for those who wish to run uninterrupted (i.e., a no-walking route). Participants also receive awards for attending multiple events, with no awards offered for speed.

Finally, role alignments are also prevalent, with community members working to unite diverse others. Notably, the founders of the event, who are two regular runners without formal community roles, view it as an opportunity to bring together members, “young and old, running and walking, some pushing strollers, some with their dogs.”

In total, Monday Night Downtown exemplifies how frame alignments can unite and accommodate diverse actors. This event enables members to feel they belong and gives them social and economic resources to enact their identities, contributing to community continuity.

To summarize our overall findings, the consumption community we studied comprises a network of heterogeneous actors united through the flow of social and economic resources. While heterogeneity gives rise to tension, community actors are dependent on each other for social and economic resources from which they derive benefits that reinforce belonging. Motivated to preserve these benefits, diverse members co-exist, avoid fragmentation, and exhibit a strong sense of collective belonging by using frame alignment practices that stabilize the community, resolve heterogeneity-related tension, and ensure community continuity.

DISCUSSION

The primary contribution of this work is that we bring to light the heterogeneous nature of communities, defining what this means, and exploring the implications of heterogeneity for community actors and the community as a whole. Existing theories about heterogeneity’s role in communities offer contradictory views about heterogeneity’s impact, with prior consumer research highlighting fragmentation as a pervasive outcome (e.g., Irwin 1973; Thompson and Coskuner-Balli 2007). Our research reconciles these conflicting findings, demonstrating community continuity can prevail when heterogeneity co-occurs with resource dependency. Specifically, we show that even though heterogeneity incites tensions, the benefits derived from social and economic resource dependence motivate heterogeneous actors to collaborate and adopt frame alignment practices that overcome heterogeneity-related tensions. These practices preserve community continuity. In other words, we show that the running community manages heterogeneity, and overcomes the associ-
ated tensions, because resource flows within the community place heterogeneous actors in dependent relationships with each other.

This view of community, highlighting the key role of resources, and the interplay between community members and resources, embraces the central tenet of actor-network theory (e.g., Latour 2005), which allows us to understand how all components of a community (not just members) work together. In particular, we characterize this community in terms of heterogeneity and show the role of resources in the formation and maintenance of the community. While some consumer research addresses institutional fields in which actors are implicitly viewed as heterogeneous with competing agendas (e.g., Giesler 2008; Humphreys 2010; Thompson and Coskuner-Balli 2007), these works do not unpack the interplay and outcomes of heterogeneity. We do this with consumption communities, examining how heterogeneous community members, practices, and dynamics are entwined with both institutions and social and economic resources such that the interactions between heterogeneous members are mediated through social and economic resources. As a result, a fuller understanding of community evolution and continuity is revealed. By adopting a view of communities as a network of heterogeneous actors, both human and nonhuman, we uncovered the pivotal role of resources and documented how these resources, through both material and expressive capabilities, inform the social dynamics of community and motivate community members to adopt stabilizing mechanisms (i.e., frame alignment practices) that manage and capitalize on community heterogeneity.

These stabilizing mechanisms highlight how heterogeneous actors, motivated by a shared sense of collective belonging and other benefits derived from community involvement, strive to achieve ongoing continuity for the community. This view of community departs from the current emphasis in consumption community research on the role of conflict, and opposition to the mainstream marketplace, within communities (e.g., Thompson and Coskuner-Balli 2007). By examining the collaborative role of the marketplace, however, our work foregrounds multiple producer roles within consumption communities. In contrast to prior research which emphasized the collaborative activities of consumers (Schau et al. 2009) or the collaborative work of consumers with a single producer (Diamond et al. 2009), our article stresses the collaborative work of networks of individuals, institutions, and resources. This perspective shows how the contemporary networked nature of communities works in tandem with traditional community values such as belonging and stability.

In addition to highlighting the collaborative nature of communities, our work also shows that frame alignment practices deployed in heterogeneous consumption communities are vital to community continuity as they allow for community evolution that embraces heterogeneity and growth. Within communities, and other assemblages, heterogeneity is a destabilizing force that threatens continuity (DeLanda 2006). In the running community, language, structural, and role alignments allow the community to (re)stabilize, reproduce, and reform over time. While frame alignments emerged organically in the running community and are effective in transcending divides, we do not know whether and when frame alignments could work in other communities. We speculate that frame alignment practices could be purposefully deployed within other consumption communities to attenuate tensions. We contend that in past scenarios, where consumption communities were crippled by heterogeneity, frame alignment strategies could have produced more favorable outcomes, especially in communities with potential benefits from resource dependencies. For example, when Porsche introduced the Cayenne (Avery 2007), alienating their core community, they could have deployed frame alignments that highlight the benefits of resource dependence. These benefits could have included more dealerships, better access to service, and a larger informed audience with whom to share their identity. Without emphasizing these benefits, members were not inspired to align community differences.

An additional benefit of adopting a networked view of communities is that it provides a richer understanding of communities as an assemblage of heterogeneous actors, as opposed to a dichotomized grouping of consumers and producers. While communities naturally consist of actors that adopt consumer and producer roles, these roles are entwined with each other, are fluid, and are socially and economically dependent. While some research acknowledges that consumption communities are interacting with an array of producers, in what may be a synergistic relationship, these conversations still tend to be dichotomized as “consumers” and “producers” without looking at the fluid interplay between these actors (Goulding et al. 2009; Kates 2004). In our work, we question the need for this division and instead adopt a view of community that embraces it as an assemblage of heterogeneous actors taking on a variety of interdependent roles.

Finally, we also contribute to consumption community knowledge by classifying communities along dimensions that implicate underlying community dynamics. We delineate nine dimensions: focus, duration, appeal, access, dispersion, marketplace orientation, structure of resource dependency, collective belonging, and heterogeneity. These dimensions are not a set of independent categories but rather represent a complex interplay of elements that are helpful in describing the overall structure of the community network, the character of the network, the types of actors within the network, and the nature of the relations between actors within the network. Our dimensional view of communities reduces theoretical ambiguities that stem from the parallel development of multiple streams of related research about consumer tribes, consumption subcultures, and brand communities.

In the community we studied, we see a confluence of easy access, high welcoming behaviors, and a synergistic marketplace orientation that contributes to heterogeneity. These co-occur with a complex resource structure and situate our
outcomes. We propose that various consumption communities can be characterized as composites of the dimensions identified in table 1 as these dimensions inform the dynamics of the actors comprising each community. It is, however, the interplay of these dimensions that is consequential in illuminating theoretical similarities and differences between communities, since the complexities of communities, and the nuances that define the capabilities, roles, and motivations of heterogeneous actors, are where the key theoretical distinctions and implications are likely to emerge. Overall, consumer theory and research would benefit from examining how community dynamics are impacted by the specific cluster of dimensions that characterize a community.

In closing, our findings could be extended through future research that explores both the macro- and microlevel mechanisms that inform community dynamics. Specifically, a more detailed historical analysis of how this heterogeneous community is situated within a broader array of societal institutions, beliefs, values, and trends could further inform our understandings of consumption community dynamics. Moreover, a microlevel examination of specific practices that comprise a community could reveal how various frame alignment strategies interplay and activate relations among actors within a network. Such a microlevel examination could also further enunciate the agency of institutions and resources in shaping community practices and interactions. This analysis could reveal the conditions under which specific frame alignment strategies are most effective at alleviating different kinds of tensions that destabilize consumption communities.
## APPENDIX A

### TABLE A1

**RUNNING COMMUNITY HISTORY HIGHLIGHTING INFLUXES OF HETEROGENEITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Dominant characteristics</th>
<th>Events and descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-1970s</td>
<td>Exclusive sport era</td>
<td>Running restricted to cross country and track teams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>The first running boom popularizing running as a competitive activity and starting the industry associated with the activity.</td>
<td>American Frank Shorter wins gold medal in marathon at 1972 Olympic Games. This spurs individuals to now view running as an accessible activity. Significant increases in participants, though mostly males with a competitive orientation. Surge in running clubs throughout US and Canada. Introduction of running-specific brands and products. For example, Nike produced their first pair of running shoes in 1974. Running specific magazines (e.g., <em>Runners World</em>) gain popularity, with <em>Running Times</em> founded in 1977.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>The rise of women</td>
<td>Female marathon event officially added to the Olympic Games in 1983. American Joan Benoit Samuelson wins gold medal in marathon at Olympic Games, triggering an increase in female participation in running.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s to the present</td>
<td>The second running boom popularizing running as a participatory pastime.</td>
<td>Focus on family-friendly running that emphasized slower running and running to finish, not place. Surge in fundraising charity events (e.g., Race for the Cure) and charity running programs (e.g., Team In Training). Increasing corporate sponsorship of events (e.g., in 2000 ING became the title sponsor for the now ING New York City marathon). Continued increase in female participation with middle-aged females representing the largest growing demographic in the sport. Hardcore runners from the 1970s now take on diverse roles in the community that reflect their diminished physical running abilities and support community heterogeneity. Increase in the number of events catering to the differently abled (e.g., ING New York City added a wheelchair event in 2000).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE.**—Boston Athletic Association 2010; Lambrecht 2010; New York Road Runners 2012; Nike 2010; Road Runners Club of America 2008, 2009; Running USA 2011; Team In Training 2011.

### TABLE A2

**RUNNING COMMUNITY HISTORY, INDICATIVE STATISTICS BY YEAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marathon finishers in US</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>143,000</td>
<td>293,000</td>
<td>507,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female marathon finishers in US (%)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marathon finishers over age 40 in US (%)</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running clubs in US (approx.)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finishers in New York City Marathon</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>14,012</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>45,103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE.**—Boston Athletic Association 2010; Lambrecht 2010; New York Road Runners 2012; Nike 2010; Road Runners Club of America 2008, 2009; Running USA 2011; Team In Training 2011.
**APPENDIX B**

**TABLE B1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender, age (years running)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender, age (years running)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aaron M</td>
<td>M, 42 (20)</td>
<td>RR; LRP</td>
<td>Julie F</td>
<td>F, 23 (5)</td>
<td>RR; LRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aidan M</td>
<td>M, 25 (10)</td>
<td>IC triathlete</td>
<td>Karen F</td>
<td>F, 22 (4)</td>
<td>RR; LRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexis F</td>
<td>F, 30 (16)</td>
<td>RR; LRP; RS owner</td>
<td>Kate F</td>
<td>F, 22 (4)</td>
<td>RR; LRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy F</td>
<td>F, 22 (6)</td>
<td>RR; NR</td>
<td>Kayla F</td>
<td>F, 34 (20)</td>
<td>Olympic competitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew M</td>
<td>M, 58 (45)</td>
<td>RR; LRP; RC worker</td>
<td>Kerry F</td>
<td>F, 30 (22)</td>
<td>FCR; LRP; RC worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy M</td>
<td>M, 42 (27)</td>
<td>FCR; Former NC and IC; LRP; heads RC; RP</td>
<td>Kyle M</td>
<td>M, 11 (4)</td>
<td>RR; LRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna F</td>
<td>F, 23 (3)</td>
<td>RR; NR</td>
<td>Landon M</td>
<td>M, 22 (4)</td>
<td>RR; NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony M</td>
<td>M, 45 (30)</td>
<td>RR; LRP; RC worker</td>
<td>Lauren F</td>
<td>F, 32 (2)</td>
<td>RR; LRP; CRP director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley F</td>
<td>F, 32 (14)</td>
<td>RR; LRP; CRP coach</td>
<td>Laurie F</td>
<td>F, 21 (7)</td>
<td>RR; LRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barb F</td>
<td>– (35)</td>
<td>RR; LRP; heads professional training firm</td>
<td>Lilly F</td>
<td>F, 21 (10)</td>
<td>RR; NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brayden M</td>
<td>M, 21 (7)</td>
<td>FCR; LRP; works in RS</td>
<td>Logan M</td>
<td>M, 30 (10)</td>
<td>RR; LRP; RC worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton M</td>
<td>M, 29 (19)</td>
<td>RR; LRP; RC worker; RP</td>
<td>Luke M</td>
<td>M, 21 (4)</td>
<td>RR; NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brody M</td>
<td>M, 21 (5)</td>
<td>RR; LRP</td>
<td>Lyndsay F</td>
<td>F, 22 (8)</td>
<td>RR; LRP; IC; NC; CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan M</td>
<td>M, 40 (29)</td>
<td>NC; Former IC; coach</td>
<td>Matthew M</td>
<td>M, 25 (1)</td>
<td>RR; NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caden M</td>
<td>M, 22 (8)</td>
<td>Current CR</td>
<td>Maxine F</td>
<td>M, 29 (15)</td>
<td>RR; FCR; NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callan M</td>
<td>M, 21 (3.5)</td>
<td>RR; LRP</td>
<td>Megan F</td>
<td>M, 24 (12)</td>
<td>FCR; LRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles M</td>
<td>M, 44 (30)</td>
<td>Former IC; LRP; RC worker</td>
<td>Mike M</td>
<td>M, 21 (1.5)</td>
<td>RR; NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris M</td>
<td>M, 33 (1.5)</td>
<td>RO; LRP</td>
<td>Nate M</td>
<td>M, 21 (8)</td>
<td>RR; NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire F</td>
<td>F, 20 (2)</td>
<td>RR; NR</td>
<td>Nick M</td>
<td>M, 45 (35)</td>
<td>RR; LRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliff M</td>
<td>M, 23 (6)</td>
<td>RR; LRP</td>
<td>Noah M</td>
<td>M, 68 (52)</td>
<td>RR; NR; CRP coach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connor M</td>
<td>M, 33 (6)</td>
<td>RR; NR</td>
<td>Olivia F</td>
<td>F, 45 (30)</td>
<td>RR; LRP; RC worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cory M</td>
<td>M, 22 (2)</td>
<td>RR; NR</td>
<td>Owen M</td>
<td>M, 22 (6)</td>
<td>RR; NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel M</td>
<td>M, 41 (18)</td>
<td>RR; LRP</td>
<td>Paige F</td>
<td>F, 32 (17)</td>
<td>RR; FCR; LRP; NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie F</td>
<td>F, 20 (10)</td>
<td>RR; LRP</td>
<td>Paul M</td>
<td>M, 29 (15)</td>
<td>FCR; NC; RS manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dylan M</td>
<td>M, 23 (12)</td>
<td>RR; FCR</td>
<td>Pearce M</td>
<td>M, 22 (4)</td>
<td>RR; NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliza F</td>
<td>F, 34 (21)</td>
<td>RR; LRP</td>
<td>Rachel F</td>
<td>F, 20 (1)</td>
<td>RR; NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ella F</td>
<td>F, 21 (16)</td>
<td>RR; LRP</td>
<td>Ross M</td>
<td>M, 24 (10)</td>
<td>FCR; NC; works in RS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily F</td>
<td>F, 19 (6)</td>
<td>RR; LRP</td>
<td>Ryan M</td>
<td>M, 23 (11)</td>
<td>FCR; LRP; coach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma F</td>
<td>F, 28 (16)</td>
<td>RR; LRP; CRP coach</td>
<td>Sarah F</td>
<td>F, 23 (10)</td>
<td>RR; NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethan M</td>
<td>M, 65 (40)</td>
<td>RR; NR</td>
<td>Shane M</td>
<td>M, 21 (7)</td>
<td>RR; LRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evan M</td>
<td>M, 45 (35)</td>
<td>RR; LRP</td>
<td>Simon M</td>
<td>M, 22 (6)</td>
<td>RR; NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith F</td>
<td>F, 20 (6)</td>
<td>FCR; LRP</td>
<td>Sonya F</td>
<td>F, 27 (1)</td>
<td>RO; LRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoff M</td>
<td>M, 22 (9)</td>
<td>FCR; LRP</td>
<td>Steph F</td>
<td>F, 20 (8)</td>
<td>RR; LRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg M</td>
<td>M, 23 (9)</td>
<td>IC wheelchair racer</td>
<td>Steve M</td>
<td>M, 22 (3)</td>
<td>RR; LRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hailey F</td>
<td>F, 22 (5)</td>
<td>RR; NR</td>
<td>Sydney F</td>
<td>F, 21 (8)</td>
<td>FCR; LRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah F</td>
<td>F, 22 (4)</td>
<td>RR; NR</td>
<td>Tony M</td>
<td>M, 21 (1)</td>
<td>RR; NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayden M</td>
<td>M, 50 (2)</td>
<td>RR; NR</td>
<td>Trista F</td>
<td>M, 25 (11)</td>
<td>RR; LRP; CRP director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather F</td>
<td>F, 21 (1)</td>
<td>RR; LRP</td>
<td>Tyler M</td>
<td>M, 31 (20)</td>
<td>RR; LRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson M</td>
<td>M, 23 (2)</td>
<td>RR; NR</td>
<td>Victoria F</td>
<td>F, 53 (3)</td>
<td>RR; LRP; coordinates CRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob M</td>
<td>M, 34 (20)</td>
<td>FCR; NC; coach</td>
<td>Wayne M</td>
<td>M, 24 (11)</td>
<td>RR; FCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James M</td>
<td>M, 50 (35)</td>
<td>RR; LRP; RC worker</td>
<td>William M</td>
<td>M, 23 (1)</td>
<td>RR; LRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica F</td>
<td>F, 23 (4)</td>
<td>RR; LRP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE.**—M = male; F = female; CR = collegiate runner; CRP = charity running program; FCR = former collegiate runner; IC = international level competitor; LRP = local race participant; NC = national level competitor; NR = never participates in races; RC = local running club; RO = runs occasionally; RP = race producer; RR = runs regularly; RS = running store.
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