Ethnography of Caffiends: Can Exclusive be Inclusive?

Caffiends, $1 COFFEE→

Each school day hundreds of university students pass through towering wooden doors, beneath the stain glass faces of Shakespeare and Jesus, into the foyer of a pink stone castle in the middle of downtown Toronto. In the corner of this foyer of Victoria College (called “Old Vic” by students and staff at the University of Toronto) leans a wooden sandwich board that reads, in scrawled chalk letters “$1 COFFEE” with an arrow pointing to a room tucked away in the back corner of the main floor. With this sign in sight, I follow the arrow to begin my ethnographic study of Vic’s volunteer student run, not for profit, organic, fair trade Cafe, Caffiends.

The scent of ground coffee beans and the low drum beat of an indie pop song signal to me that I am leaving the foyer and stepping into a new space. The room is the size of a small class room. There are two-storey high pressed tin ceilings and a chandelier. There are two couches. Four barstools face a ledge against the wall and a table with four chairs sits in the middle of the room. At the rear of the room there is a large counter with a cash register, espresso machine, kettle and microwave on it, which separates the cafe volunteers from the cafe visitors. The wall behind the bar is a large window. The space is fairly cramped and I have to tuck in some chairs to manoeuvre my way back to the counter to order a tea. The four volunteers behind the counter, all female and all very smiley, spring up from the low ottoman on which they were sitting. One volunteer asks what she can get for me today, I say “just a tea, please”. One volunteer asks whether I prefer loose-leafed or bagged, whether I want room for milk, soy milk, cream or almond milk, whether I would like a large or small mug, only to be interrupted by
another who realises that the kettle is broken (apparently it short circuited last week). Another volunteer quickly suggests they use the hot water from the espresso machine. I pass a toonie to the fourth volunteer who takes a moment to calculate proper change in her head after she hits one button on the cash register, which then springs open. I then take my steaming mug to the couch by the door and set it down on the mosaic topped table. There are three other non-volunteers in the cafe, two sit on the barstools clicking between Facebook and PowerPoint slides on their laptop computers and the third slouches into the plush leather couch flipping through Victoria College’s newspaper, *The Strand*.

I let my tea cool on the table top, noticing a precariously detached piece of the stain glass jutting from one edge of the table, I try to wedge it back into the abstract pattern. This table is familiar to me, I know that my friend and former co-worker made this tabletop from spare pieces of glass her mother had in the house, when she was co-manager of Caffiends three years prior. I look to the bulletin board that displays an outdated poster for a talk on Aboriginal Rights in Canada and a flyer for auditions for a Victoria College Drama Society production of “Our Town”. The quiet of the soft music is interrupted as one volunteer grinds some coffee beans, catching the attention of both people formerly glued to their laptop screens.

I pick up my tea, swirl in some agave nectar with the noodle presented by the cafe as a biodegradable stir-stick, and wonder at the specificity of my drink. The volunteers are now invisible, sitting behind the counter, but audible, discussing the latest topic they received for a column that they write for *The Strand*, the same paper the girl across from me is now napping under. This is not my first time in this space, but it is my first time observing the atmosphere as an anthropologist. Thinking back to my previous experiences in the cafe (not “coffee shop”) I am struck by the relative homogeneity of the space over time, despite the frequently rotating
managers and volunteers, and the seemingly similar group of students and staff attracted by this cafe atmosphere.

Context of the Cafe

Caffiends is a small fragment of the University of Toronto, but a fascinating site of student and professor interaction. The space and funding allocated to the cafe is representative of the shifting values and focuses of the modernising university. Over my one semester of observation, I came to see a particular character of this cafe which limited its appeal to a specific demographic of students. Currently, I work as a Residence Don in Victoria College and in the future, I hope to become a teacher. A key tenet to both of these positions is to strive to create an inclusive space in which people from a variety of backgrounds feel safe, comfortable and able to express themselves. The concept of inclusive and accessible space is a highly debated topic in the university community, and significant funding is provided to make the university more “accessible” to a diverse group of students. But, the question remains, is a truly inclusive community possible? Caffiends promotes itself as an accessible space on campus welcome to all students.

Now in my fourth year, I have been aware of Caffiends since my first year, and even then, it did not really seem to be a wholly inclusive space. I remember one classmate in my first year program saying that she had begun volunteering at an organic cafe at Vic, but that all the volunteer shifts were probably already taken. Steeped in the rhetoric of Frosh week, I remember feeling that I had really missed out on making my university experience all it could be, by getting involved. Since then, I have learned much more about what this cafe is about and how it operates. I was a volunteer in my second year and the first semester of my third year, and two of my close friends have worked as co-managers.
The logistics of the cafe are integral to an understanding of its function as an exclusive space. The cafe sells mixed coffee and tea drinks and several kinds of organic baked goods and chocolate at cost. Caffiends receives their room space from the Principal of Victoria College.

There are two co-managers working every semester, with staggered hiring so there is always an overlap of an experienced manager with the new co-manager. These co-managers receive a $500 honorarium paid for through Victoria College Students’ Administrative Council Levy fees. The cafe also has an unpaid treasurer. Co-managers recruit volunteers at club fairs at the start of each term and interested students are added to their email list. Through this email list, potential volunteers are able to sign up for weakly hour long shifts from 9:30am-4:30 pm from Monday to Friday. Some volunteers organise with their friends to share a shift, but many people opt to be on a shift with strangers. There are usually 3-4 people signed up per shift, however as the semester continues, volunteer turnout seemed to dwindle. The cafe is not-for-profit and any surplus revenue is used to buy new equipment for the cafe (perhaps a new kettle) and is donated to a charity of the co-managers choice. Volunteers at the cafe are trained in one-hour sessions at the beginning of each semester.

At the beginning of the 2010 academic year, Caffiends was relocated by Victoria College administration to the small room in which it now operates. The concept of a student lounge emerged after Victoria College received low rankings in the National Survey on Student Engagement (NSSE). To fill this need, the Principal received funds from student fees to develop such a space. Students decided to create a cafe in this space and the funding for the renovations to include a sink in the room were financed through the Principal’s fund. I am aware of this process because during this transition, one of my good friends was working as the co-manager.

This semester, I knew very few people who volunteer and Caffiends and did not know the
co-managers. Despite having an existing personal relationship with the cafe, at the beginning of this project I felt alien in the cafe space. The space of Caffiends fills a particular niche, and has many sister spaces around campus, including different cafes and lounges at different colleges. Each of these spaces has certain strategies for inclusiveness, with conflicting barriers to access, which are largely unacknowledged by participants in the space and the administration.

Puzzle: Exclusive Inclusivity?

As I spent more and more time in Caffiends as a researcher, my conviction developed that this space functions to serve a very small community of Vic students yet conceives of itself as a welcoming and open space attractive to all university students. This space is not explicitly academic, like a library, nor is it necessarily social like a student group. Without a specifically designated purpose, students are able to create new meaning in this space through their interactions with it. There are no regulations posted, nor were particular groups explicitly catered to in Caffiends marketing, yet those students who participate in the cafe are of similar disciplines and socio-economic backgrounds. Most students studied the humanities, including Philosophy, History, Political Science and English, also there were an increasing number of commerce students. Thirty-nine of the 52 people on the volunteer list-serve are female. Most people who I spoke to had at least one parent who went to university. Also, a significant number of the volunteers, over one third, had participated in Victoria College’s Vic One first year program (myself included). The Vic One program provides the opportunity for small classes and weekly guest lectures in first year, participants are selected based on High School grades and a personal statement. These students are often the most involved in the Vic community, sometimes criticised for privileging the “Vic One-Hundred”. The similarity in participants in the cafe space demonstrates that the space is attractive to people of a certain “type”.

The volunteers change every hour, receive minimal training and are obviously unpaid, yet in every instance I was in the cafe the volunteers were extremely friendly and accommodating to all the customers, using care that is rarely seen in a cafe with paid employees. The customers, too, tended to be friendlier than those in other cafes such as Tim Horton’s or Starbucks. No one every complained of having to wait a long time for their drink (which happened often) nor about a drink made improperly. One older woman ordered a green tea, and after she started drinking (after a wait for the water to boil), a volunteer realised that she had incorrectly given an Earl Grey tea. The customer said not to worry and that she really did like Earl Grey. The tone of this interaction was present in most Caffiends transactions I witnessed – the customers were overly accommodating to the employees, not wanting to undermine their effort in any way.

Through this study, I hope to convey to you how the norms in Caffiends are perpetrated, and how the perpetration of these norms, through a variety of practises in the cafe, limits the appeal of the cafe to a certain type of student.

Theorising Caffiends: “Cultural Capital” and Subculture

Above, I outlined some of the common attributes of a Caffiends participant, that they are mostly female, had at least one parent go to university and many participated in the Vic One program. These few factors, along with all the different traits and life experiences each volunteer possesses, contribute to their personal “cultural capital”. Pierre Bourdieu’s theory of “cultural capital” allows me to examine how the circumstance of participants in the Caffiends culture have come to feel a sense of belonging in that culture. “Cultural capital” is a consciousness of certain cultural practises (fashion, art, music, politics) which allows one to participate in a particular milieu. Bourdieu, in “Introduction to Distinction”, proposes the concept of cultural capital, explaining “a work of art has meaning and interest only for someone who possesses the cultural
competence, that is, the code, into which it is encoded” (87). Caffiends, in parallel with the work of art described by Bourdieu, it has “meaning and interest” only to those students and staff of the University of Toronto who have a cultural competence parallel to the cultural practises existing in the Caffiends space, those who know the code of the cafe.

However, unlike a piece of art, Caffiends is not static, and is formed not only by the physicality of the space but also the living actors in the space. Yet, through my observation, I find that the cafe appeared to maintain a regular character despite the high turnover of people in the space. The continuity of the space emerges from the reality that Caffiends people (volunteers and customers) exist as a subculture within the university community. Ken Gelder in his introduction to The Subcultures Reader defines subcultures as “groups of people that are in some way represented as non-normative and/or marginal through their particular interests, practises, through what they are, what they do and why they do it.” (Gelder 1). This definition of a subculture as non-normative applies to Caffiends with its place as a not-for-profit organisation in a capitalist society. Participation in Caffiends allows one to enter a particular type of community with specific modes of doing things. The presence of this subculture provides insight into how Caffiends maintains an exclusive character without explicitly disallowing certain people from entering the cafe. The subcultural practises of Caffiends, which I will detail in my analysis section below, emerge from the particular cultural values shared by Caffiends participants. It is not that Caffiends imposes a certain ideology onto its volunteers, but rather that volunteers self select themselves as members of this subcultural community through the similar cultural capital they already possess, before entering the space.

The term “subculture” implies a dominant culture. In the Caffiends subculture, the dominant culture is that of the larger university. The university is a capitalist organisation and is
led and governed predominantly by non-students. The opportunity to control a student space is a unique opportunity for students. I observed that most people in the cafe feel dissatisfied with the capitalist system in which they participate, particularly the focus on consumerism. Albert Cohen explains that people who face “problems of adjustment” (1955) to the dominant culture seek a likeminded group of people to find a common solution to their problem. The manner through which people find and establish a subculture is through “exploratory gestures” (Cohen 1955) which hint at problems and possible alternatives to the dominant mode of being. At Caffiends, students in the community can solve many issues such as a feeling of loneliness in a large university and a dissatisfaction with commercial food practises. Phil Cohen explains that groups used available materials “(dress, music, talk), and their context’s activities...” to form a subcultural identity (Clarke et al 1975). However, I agree with Clarke, Hall, Jefferson and Roberts who explain it is not the materials themselves which form a subculture, but rather “the activity of stylization – the active organization of objects with activities and outlooks, which produce an organised group identity in the form and shape of a coherent and distinctive way of ‘being-in-the-world’” (Clarke et al 1975). Below, I structure my analysis around materials central to Caffiends and explicate how they are stylised within their subcultural milieu.

With a subcultural status as a non-capitalist organisation described above, I cannot rely solely on the existing conception of participation in subculture as “establishing one’s opposition to the norms of modern capitalism” (Gelder 2005). Previous theorists, including Gelder, have remarked on how the materialism of many subcultures, such as the necessity to buy a particular type of clothing, necessarily immerses them in commercial activity. However, the capitalism of Caffiends is more absolute. The only reason Caffiends can operate in its current mode is because University administration uses student fees to pay for Caffiends space and resources. By
allowing students to run an undergraduate cafe in the college’s main building, the administration is able to display their care from student wellbeing and market this to the incoming class. Caffiends exists because the university wants to draw in the best students, to continue the prestige of the institution. Universities’ increasing focus on student experience to promote their institution is not inherently negative, but may be perceived as such from an anti-capitalist subcultural community. The Caffiends community, to itself is a welcoming space in which to express particular non-normative views, however the particularity of these views limits the appeal of the space and perhaps more significantly the subcultural priorities of this group are perhaps undercut by Caffiends position in the supraculture of the capitalist university.

The Caffiends’ Subculture: Analysis of the Stylisation of Objects in Caffiends

There is an emergent paradox in the logic of the organisation of Caffiends. The regular volunteers and clients all acknowledge the welcoming feeling Caffiends provides and all value an ‘inclusive’ University community (through projects such as Positive Space), yet do not (before my questions) consider who does not come to Caffiends and who does not feel welcome. It seems that through general friendliness, advertising and a “cozy atmosphere” current clients and volunteers believe they create the atmosphere that would welcome any student to hang out or study. Both the volunteers and the people sitting in the room frequently treat the room as one big conversation area open to all people whether they are already friends or not. Volunteers explained to me some of their reasons for participating in the cafe – one of the most salient examples was that the volunteer felt that staff and clients were working toward the same goal: having a low cost not for profit convenient cafe on Vic campus, run by students. This limits the appeal of this cafe to students and staff with those assumed cultural priorities. A common goal binds the participants in the subcultural community. The different “cultural capital” of the
participants in the Caffiends space determines their desire to spend more or less time in the space, and will shape how they interact in the space and the people within it. Caffiends space shapes and is shaped by the kind of activities that occur within its walls. In this section of my paper, I examine what types of cultural capital/display work most significantly into the cafe and how these priorities maintain the continuous character of the cafe.

The cafe space is so small that it does not have the reliable babble of other campus cafes, which makes for a more private cafe experience. This lack of white noise makes every conversation in the cafe, and every action by the volunteers, a kind of performance in the space that everyone can see and hear. Caffiends is not a cafe for someone who wants to be anonymous. No one needs anything urgently from Caffiends, and if they did, they would soon find that it could not be provided. One of the volunteers comments to a customer that the cafe was open from 9:30-4:30, but that it may be unexpectedly closed with no forewarning if some volunteers do not show up. Each time I went to Caffiends, there was at least one volunteer behind the counter, but the openness about the cafes laid back occasional disorganisation showed it did not necessarily detract from the cafe’s value. It seems that the slowness, frequent volunteer confusion and slow initiative to change things (the kettle was broken for 3 weeks) all add to the general character of the cafe.

There are a set of about twenty regular customers, many of whom are also volunteers. These people are noticeable in the space as they generally talk more loudly and are willing to sit closer to the other patrons. These regular Caffiends people are those who benefit most from the Caffiends space and create the subcultural community. Many of this core group participate in other extracurricular activities such as writing and editing for The Strand and volunteering at schools. This group has the luxury of free time that many university students simply do not have.
because of the demands of a job and family commitments. However, several members of this group do have jobs in paid cafes. They choose to devote their time and skills to Caffiends because they support its “project” of bringing organic fair trade products to students at a low cost. When I asked some of these volunteers of what they meant by fair trade one responded “Like so the farmers don’t get ripped off”. The “project” of Caffiends seems to be how volunteers describe their general sense of the cafe as goal oriented.

Through the analysis of several objects in the cafe, I demonstrate the specific nature of this general sense of the cafe. I follow Cohen’s theory on the positioning of the materiality of subcultures, it is not the materials themselves which establish a subculture but rather how these materials are stylised through the collective positioning. I present my analysis of Caffiends through an explication of the stylisation of objects in Caffiends that appear anomalous in a standard cafe. Caffiends deviation from a standard is what limits its accessibility, and allows a subcultural community to express itself within the space. The objects I focus on below work to structure Caffiends into a space with a regular character despite the high turn over of volunteers.

Cash Register

This regular feature of every cafe assumes an alternative function in this cafe context. Anyone used to the usual strictness surrounding the cash box at most commercial stores would be confused at Caffiends’ use of the cash register. The manual for how the register works was lost in the move to the new space. The machine is currently programmed to calculate tax on food and drink orders, despite that the cafe does not directly pay tax on its sales. The register does not calculate the amount of money supposed to be in the register, nor does it record daily purchases. When I asked one of the co-managers how to use the machine to pay form my drink, he instructed me to push the cash button to open the till, and to do the arithmetic to make change in
my head. This object in the cafe becomes stylised into the subculture of Caffiends. Not one volunteer questioned the functioning of the register while I was there nor did they express any desire to learn how to use it. The basic use of a complex technology represents a feeling of aversion to technology emergent from a desire for a more simplistic existence. Additionally, the use of the machine shows the intense trust placed on the volunteers at the cafe. There is no financial accountability on the part of any of the volunteers. One of the co-managers says there has not been a problem with stealing, and it would even be fine for volunteers to take some change for subway fare if they needed. Caffiends has the luxury of the safety net of the university financially backing it project. Additionally, the feeling of pride and ownership bestowed on the volunteers appears to create a sense of ownership over the cafe that prevents any urge to take money.

**Staff Book**

There is a tattered spiral ring note book that volunteers offer staff (or really anyone who looks to be older than an average undergraduate) to sign their name and department so they can receive their drink or snack for free. Not one of the 15 or so volunteers with whom I spoke about the book was exactly sure how or who paid for these purchases, or if they were even paid for. One volunteer even suggested that the staff received the drinks free of charge because they were entitled to them, and the book was just so Caffiends could keep track of inventory. One of the co-manager’s told me that the treasurer at the end of every term tallies up all the orders and submits the bill to Vic’s Principal, David Cook. I interviewed Cook about his involvement in the cafe, he explained to me that the incentive behind paying for staff beverages was to have Caffiends be a space where professors and students would interact. To entice professors into the cafe, he pays for their drinks through his discretionary student experience fund. At first glance, this seems a
great way to allow professors and students to spend more time together. However, because of the small room Caffiends now occupies, professors could not bring a group of student for an after class discussion, and almost always immediately leave with their cup of coffee. Some teaching assistants hold their office hour in the cafe, while drinking free coffee. It seems paradoxical that the paid employees of the university get free drinks at the student cafe, while the students paying for their education have to pay for their own drinks.

The presence of this book stratifies the people in the cafe between professors and students. Perhaps there is a recognition that without the incentive of a free drink, a student run cafe would be unwelcoming to professors. This administrative realisation of the boundaries between different people in the university are significant. This book ties the cafe to the supraculture of the university administration, and reveals that this subculture is not in direct opposition to the capitalist practises of the university.

Take-Away Mugs

At Caffiends there are no disposable cups. The cafe only has mugs that they allow to-go customers to take out of the room, provided that they bring them back to the milk crate that is always outside their door. This system of trust lessens the distance between the seller and the buyer. Immediately, the customer is trusted by the cafe to bring back the mug, even if they have no pre-existing relationship. Most new customers to Caffiends are bewildered that there are no disposable cups and frequently leave without purchasing anything because they will not be staying around Vic while they finish their drink. The non-portability of Caffiends cups works, just as the small room, to limit the presence of Caffiends in the larger community. The rationale for the reusable mugs is to reduce waste. All the members of the Caffiends subculture privilege this feature of Caffiends, and take pride in offering porcelain cups to the customers.
One regular customer came in one day and handed the volunteers behind the counter a mug. She said that she had broken a Caffiends mug in her office and offered a replacement. The volunteers were thankful to her. This instance showed to me how much some customers are invested in the success of Caffiends. This exchange would never happen at a Starbucks, where there is not the same sense of communion between the customers and staff – they do not necessarily share a set of similar cultural priorities.

Speakers

Each volunteer team has the option of using their iPod to play music from the Caffiends speakers. This privilege seems to be an opportunity for volunteers to present their cultural capital and knowledge of the indie music scene. One volunteer spends time making playlists that are exactly one hour for her shift. In one of my interviews, I was surprised to hear that the informant believed Caffiends to have “no fixed identity”, this is contrary to what I’d originally assumed about the homogenous feeling I felt at different times in the cafe. He was a self confessed “music snob” and described that the entire character of the cafe changes with the different music choices. This informant preferred the sonic quality of the space over all the other fixed qualities (such as lighting, chair/couch set up, decorations, posters). He said he would leave if he found the music annoying. This volunteer is a regular and a part of what I have identified as the Caffiends subculture. I did not witness it, but I imagine there is a complicated politics of choosing which volunteer gets to select the music for their shift. The speakers represent a place for people to express their subcultural identity and a sense of agency over the character of university space.

The above items and their particular stylisations in the cafe belie the general positioning of the Caffiends subculture. The non-conventional use of the cash register structures Caffiends as
a business not rigidly tied to profit and calculation. This casual treatment of the money in
Caffiends works to undermine a capitalist ideology, but is only made possible by the capitalist
institution that houses Caffiends, represented through the staff book. The lack of disposable
mugs shows the eco-conscious attitude of the Caffiends crowd, and builds a trust relationship
with regular customers. The speakers allow for a display of cultural capital and limit the appeal
of Caffiends to people with certain musical tastes. These four objects stylized in the cafe
welcome some people and make others feel unwelcome.

Ultimately, Caffiends is a low stakes business. If no volunteers showed up all term, no
one would be impacted other than those who value the subcultural community which Caffiends
provides. If Caffiends did not sell anything, no one would not earn their wage and they would
not be evicted from their space. There is a university run cafe in the building next to Caffiends,
that also sells fair trade organic coffee. Caffiends is ultimately a place of a tight-knit subcultural
community. This space is not accessible to everyone, but to those who it does appeal, it provides
a place to truly feel comfortable and express opinions.

Conclusion

Caffiends is a space created through the developing conceptions of what a university should be.
In this particular cafe, I observed that norms of cafe stay consistent despite constant turnover of
volunteers and co-managers. The unpaid staff are very friendly and engaged, along with the
regular patrons. The cafe has no economic benefit to the volunteers who run it, and does not
operate for an explicitly financial purpose. The similar group of regulars enforce norms of space,
displaying their particular modes of cultural capital and attract more like minded people into the
space. Caffiends was created to fill a need demonstrated through a student experience survey to
build strength of university institution. The cafe as it exists now is a marketable feature of
“student experience”. Therefore, the non-capitalist cafe is able to function within the larger capitalist institution of the university. This community hub is successful because the subculture which is able to exist within it. The subcultural use of the cafe may seem politically impotent as it works to build the institution of the university, but it does provide users with a strong sense of community. The success of the community in this cafe leads to the conclusion that both inclusion and exclusion are a necessary part of forming a community. If everyone felt equally welcome in a space, it seems that they would not feel truly welcome at all because none of the features of that space would appeal to their individual, unique cultural capital. In the modernising university perhaps it is a hope that everyone finds such a community in which they can feel connected.

Finally, in my interview with Principal Cook, I asked whether he thought Caffiends is an exclusive space to which he replied “Well, there isn’t a sign that says “No Blacks Allowed” or anything like that”. This inattention to the new forms of exclusion is a danger in developing university communities where exclusion is not explicit, but rather implicit through cultural practises. Cook went on to further acknowledge that Caffiends could act as an exclusive space. It is important for planning purposes for people to examine all the cultural factors which make space accessible and inaccessible.
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Reflection

I have found this experience extremely enlightening. In my studies of anthropology I have read many ethnographies and have been fascinated by this lens into another culture of even to provide a new perspective on a culture which I am already familiar. In this experience I have come to see how much the positionality of the anthropologist plays into what information is preferred. After only viewing a field site for five minutes, one could probably write a 4,000 word paper on their experience. In my study of Caffiends, and hearing what my peers choose to focus on in their sites I see the wide variety of facts, data that can be gleaned from relatively similar sites. Further, the types of theory each student in our class has chosen to apply are very different. Writing this paper in a community context I feel like our final papers will reveal more about ourselves as people and anthropologists than about our field sites. It was helpful to read the articles on the objectified observer.

If I were to do this project again, I would hope to settle on my site more quickly. I found that it took me a while to feel comfortable taking notes and observing in a public place in which I was used to being a participant. I chose my site because it was a place with which I was familiar but I had never deeply thought about its social organisation. Anthropology as a discipline is often critiqued as focusing on the other, and “othering” (one of my English professors even described it as “The Science of Othering”!). I have felt that these critiques often hold merit, and in selection of my site I attempted to choose a place where I felt a part of the community. From this experience, I found not that I “othered” the group but rather that I self “othered”. With all my thinking and theorising about this space I was no longer able to feel comfortable in it merely as a participant, as if I had revealed the secret inner workings of its structure, I could no longer participate in the surface action.

I was very intimidated by the writing process for this paper, despite your repeated encouragement that the writing would be more of a compilation of previous notes. I complied my outline but felt that I wasn’t saying enough, given that we have been working on this project all semester. It was important for me to remember that two months in a field research site, while doing other work, is very short. After writing my paper I feel like I have so much more to say and that I have only scratched the surface of my field notes.

Were I to do this project again I would like to do a comparison with another student lounge on campus, perhaps working with a partner. In this situation, we would both go to both locations. It would have been helpful to discuss my ideas with someone who was familiar with the space and had had previous interaction with it. In class, I felt that I could provide the most helpful feedback to people with environments which I had experienced. Additionally, I would spend more time talking with people outside the cafe. I realise I have mostly focused on the similarities of the people inside the cafe, and how they are an exclusive community, with no enough focus on those outside the cafe. Further, I would like to conduct more interviews with the faculty members who use the cafe to see if they know the intention behind their drinks being free.
Ethics

I first sent an email to the two Caffiends co-managers requesting to research in their space, along with a blurb I asked them to send to volunteers so they would know who I was and that participation in my project was voluntary. They agreed. I posted the consent for on the bulletin board in the cafe and each time I was taking notes in the space I placed little blue flyers on every table and by the cash explaining my project. Before speaking with anyone I explained that I was researching Caffiends. I used verbal consent for all my interviews, except for with Principal David Cook I used a signed consent form, which I will keep for six months. When people shared sensitive information with me, I asked whether they wanted it on or off the record. People were generally very willing to speak with me and did not seem too interested in the ethics protocol.
The COVID-19 pandemic, also known as the coronavirus pandemic, is an ongoing global pandemic of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) caused by severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). It was first identified in December 2019 in Wuhan, China. The World Health Organization declared the outbreak a Public Health Emergency of International Concern on 20 January 2020, and later a pandemic on 11 March 2020. As of 27 March 2021, more than 126 million cases have been confirmed, with more vulnerable, are being marginalised and excluded (DIFE, 2011). Circle Solutions builds on Circle Time and is a philosophy. Educational & Child Psychology Vol. 30 No. 1 39. Inclusive and exclusive belonging the impact on individual and community well-being. gist in being an agent of change for student. and whole school well-being especially in 7th to 12th grade students (Blum et al., 2002). School connectedness was found to be the strongest protective factor for both. When it comes to establishing and following through on a commitment to diversity and inclusion, however, you can have a big impact. Here are the top 15 ways you can support inclusion and diversity in your workplace. 1. Use the Inclusive Workplace Model. What’s the difference between diversity and inclusion in your workplace?