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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this phenomenological study was to explore motivations for participation, how social structures influence the adult non-professional members of the Harrisonburg- Rockingham Concert Band (HRCB), and identify the characteristics of community present in the band. The following questions framed the investigation within an interpretative phenomenological approach:

1. What motivates the band members to participate in the HRCB?
2. How do the institutional social structures influence the sense of belonging, development of social capital, and socialization of band members?
3. What characteristics of community are present within the HRCB?

Data was collected from long-term researcher observation and one-on-one semi-structured interviews with each participant. Results indicate that the participants are motivated by personal and musical motivations, and the HRCB exists with institutional social structures that influence social capital, social belonging, and socialization. Each of these themes form a unique sense of community within the HRCB. Research into this topic is significant as we learn how music-making can span throughout the life and contribute to individuals, society, and music education.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

*Most everything else during my child-raising years—because I chose to stay home, because I chose to homeschool—those are choices I made and I wouldn’t change that, I really wanted to do that, but you still have to have something that is your own and gives you a place for expression and art and that type of thing. And band was it for me. And it’s the one thing that I’m holding on to.* - Grace

Grace has consciously held onto music in her life. She has moved several times, assisted her husband through medical school, had four children, and chose to be a stay-at-home mother. She has adapted to all of these circumstances, as adults generally do, but has prioritized music engagement. While she devoted her life to giving to other people, music serves as an expressive outlet just for her.

In my career as a musician and music educator, I have heard many stories of people who consider music participation an integral part of their lives. The church choir in which I participate is an example of this. Many of the singers began singing in that same choir when they were old enough to stand, some sixty or seventy years ago. Others are newer to the choir but enjoy the camaraderie and worship aspects that the group affords. While their reasons differ, most consider their participation of this group a vital activity. I have heard similar sentiments from community band participants in ensembles with which I have been associated.

The Harrisonburg-Rockingham Concert Band (HRCB) is a community-based wind band in the Shenandoah Valley. It has been a traditional concert band since 1984, and existed as a parade band prior to then. The band accepts members from middle school age to nonagenarians and ability levels from novices to professionals, under the assumption that members can fluently read music notation. The motivations for participation in the HRCB are as varied as the members, but adult music participation
and engagement across the lifespan is considered valuable and integral to many people’s lives.

The purpose of this phenomenological study was to explore motivations for participation, social structures, and characteristics of community within the Harrisonburg- Rockingham Concert Band (HRCB). Literature related to each of these constructs serves to frame the study.

**Community**

Despite common use of the term “community” to describe several different types of groups, including neighborhoods, people with local commonality, or a collection of people who share some concept of their lives, social and political scientists are divided on what the term means. The word derives from the Latin *com* (together or with) and *unus* (single) and has been subjected to constant defining and formulating, which has pushed it “into an abyss of theoretical sterility” (Cohen, 2013, p. 38). Gerard Delanty, a British sociologist, provides perspective on the uses and types of communities:

Communities have been based on ethnicity, religion, class, or politics; they may be large or small; ‘thin’ or ‘thick’ attachments may underlie them; they may be locally based or globally organized; they may be affirmative or subversive in their relation to the established order; they may be traditional, modern or even postmodern; they may be reactionary or progressive (2010, pg. xi).

Humans search for a meaning and recognition in life, leading them towards community and belonging (Delanty, 2010). In the social sciences, community ideals are split between anthropologists and sociologists. Sociologists generally view
community as a collection of people who share some type of social interaction, in terms of territorial interaction, mutuality, or a strong group feeling (Amit, 2002; Anderson, 2006; Cohen, 2013; Delanty, 2010). However, Anthony Cohen, a British social anthropologist, has taken the social practice of community, where those involved see it as social interaction based on locality, to more of a symbolic structure with communal identity and meaning—community is what people want it to be and what people think it is (2013).

Amit (2002) argues that the “conceptualization of community in anthropological and related literatures has involved a marked shift away from community as an actualized social form to an emphasis on community as an idea or quality of sociality” (p. 3). In other words, community is a collective identity rather than explicit social interaction (Amit, 2002; Anderson, 2006; Cohen, 2013). Anthropologic studies suggest this collective identity not as make-believe or illusory, but rather as a conceptualization of community; an imagined commonality among strangers (Anderson, 2006; Cohen, 2013). Regarding this imagined community, however, sociologists respond that

[i]f communities must be imagined, then by the same token, what is imagined can only be truly felt and claimed by its potential members if they are able to realize it socially, in their relations and familiarity with some, if not every other constituent. To treat the idea and actualization of community as if these are in essence independent elements is to leave us and our analyses with only one hand clapping (Amit, 2002, p. 8).

Not all communities involve intentional and direct social interaction, but if
interaction is necessary to actualize a community, liminality and *communitas* may explain collective communal identity in some contexts. Anthropologist Victor Turner defined liminality as a place that is vague, ambiguous, and between points of classification (1974). Liminality can best be understood in this context as “in between moments” when normality is suspended:

> Liminality—‘moments in and out of time’—is thus often connected with those moments of symbolic renewal when a society or group asserts its collective identity. Although these moments can become highly institutionalized – as in church rites – they are expressive of creativity and perform important social functions (Delanty, 2010, p. 44).

Edith Turner, an anthropologist, defines *communitas* as “the sense felt by a group of people when their life together takes on full meaning,” as when, and how, for example, Americans feel a sense of *communitas* and community, even though the personal knowledge and social interaction of each person is lacking (2012, p. 1). Delanty identifies a relationship between liminality and communitas:

> In the present context, what is particularly interesting is that [Victor] Turner discusses liminality not in exclusively symbolic terms, but as an expression of what he calls ‘*communitas*’, which, while not being the only expression of liminality, is one of the most significant (Delanty, 2010, p. 31).

The idea that community can be symbolic in addition to, rather than exclusively, institutional and social opens the definition to account for the fluid nature of “community” (Delanty, 2010; Cohen, 2013). Liminality and *communitas* can create powerful links in a social group. Theorizing community as symbolic, as noted by
Delanty (2010) and Cohen (2013), offers a dynamic, interpretative definition of community. In this way, members of a community can experience a collective sense of communal identity through the relations made via *communitas*, even if their interactions are liminal. When an individual feels that sense of identity and community connected to a specific context, they are generally motivated to return to that community.

**Motivations**

Social motivations are the backbone of participation in any activity. Social belonging and the need to feel relevant is a basic human need (Dunning, 2011; Leary & Allen, 2011). In *Meaning-Making: Therapeutic Processes in Adult Development* (1988), Carlsen provides a list of other basic human needs:

1) **Identity Needs:** to be perceived and respected for one’s uniqueness, to find creative outlets for that uniqueness, and to continue to grow in the meaning of that uniqueness.

2) **Participation Needs:** to actively participate in success, to create and complete personal goals, and to find rewards valued by one’s culture and by oneself.

3) **Partnership and Intimacy Needs:** to blend self with another, independence with dependence, autonomy with intimacy.

These basic human needs, along with social belonging, align with music participation (Achilles, 1992; Cavitt, 2005; Coffman, 1996, 2002, 2006, 2009).

Adult music learning and engagement often fulfills musical and non-musical needs in an adult’s life. Coffman (2009) notes that the reasons for adult participation in
music experiences can be grouped into three categories: (1) personal motivations, such as self-expression, recreation, self-improvement, and use of leisure time; (2) musical motivations, such as love of music, performing for one’s self and others, and learning more about music; and (3) social motivations, such as meeting new people, being with friends, and having a sense of belonging (p. 202). Music experiences as a young child or teenager are often cited as a reason for continuing music as an adult, and for forming a relationship with music (Cavitt, 2005; Coffman, 2009). Adults, especially older adults, are driven to participate and play in musical groups that perform what they know, e.g. Broadway tunes as repertoire.

Stebbins (1992) established nine areas of “rewards” or motivations of adult amateurs that could be grouped into two categories—personal motivations and social motivations. Personal motivations drive many actions in an adult’s life. These are the motivations that directly relate to them as humans rather than workers and individuals rather than groups. Leisure time comprises a large part of personal motivation. It is usually associated with a happy, carefree, and un-coerced time away from the seriousness of work and the social standing present in most jobs (Elkington & Stebbins, 2014; Stebbins, 1992). It is a constructive and rewarding activity for individuals and society. A major framework in leisure theory is the Serious Leisure Perspective (SLP).

**Serious Leisure Perspective (SLP).** Serious Leisure Perspective is a framework by Elkington and Stebbins (2014) that connects three main forms of leisure: serious leisure, casual leisure, and project-based leisure. Serious leisure is:

the systematic pursuit of an amateur, hobbyist, or volunteer activity that is
sufficiently substantial and interesting for the participant to find a leisure career there in the acquisition and expression of its special skills and knowledge (Stebbins, 1992, p. 3).

The word ‘career’ is used here in the traditional sociological sense, “where careers are seen as available in all substantial, complex roles, including leisure” (Elkington & Stebbins, 2014). Instead of the typical solemn meaning of the word ‘serious,’ Stebbins instead means qualities such as “earnestness, sincerity, importance and carefulness” (Elkington & Stebbins, 2014, p. 16). In Stebbins’s framework there are three levels of serious leisure: amateurs, hobbyists, and volunteers. In the arts, generally serious leisure generally falls into the category of amateurism.

Amateurs are inevitably linked to professionals and embrace by the standards of excellence set and communicated by professionals (Stebbins, 1992). The difference between the two is that livelihood, a viable living, and working full-time constitutes a professional, whereas amateurs do not rely on the activity to live and generally participate part-time (Elkington & Stebbins, 2014). Amateurs are a link between professionals and public in a model called the P-A-P system (professional-amateur-public) (Elkington & Stebbins, 2014; Gates, 1991; Stebbins, 1992). The influential relationship among the subjects creates a social system in which each party benefits. They share agreed-upon values that are used to control behavior and quality, “including settling questions of stratification:

High-status individuals are either or both the “definers” or the “modelers” of high quality for others. These people’s behaviors define and model the group’s set of values, regardless of whether or not they make their livings at the activity
Many music ensembles in schools and communities model their rehearsals on professional musician instruction, rehearsal, and performance. This allows for socially acceptable teaching and learning for all involved:

Without having to articulate it, teacher/conductors who enact this model tap the social organization and value hierarchies of the P-A-P system.

Nonprofessional participants who “buy into” this value system can be classed either as amateurs or apprentices (professionals in training) … As amateurs or apprentices, they benefit from the P-A-P system personally, socially, and, sometimes, economically. For most of them, their teachers or conductors are the professionals or surrogate professionals, the human definers and modelers of the professional value system’s behavior patterns. Parents, friends, and others who support the group economically and nurture group members psychologically constitute the publics and complete the P-A-P system (Gates, 1991, p. 10-11).

Stratification can be a motivation for the professionals as well as the amateurs—the professional standards of instruction, rehearsal, and performance generally are used for results in students in the traditional autocratic music ensemble (Gates, 1991).

Quality of life (QOL). In addition to personal, social, and musical motivations, some people perceive the contributions of arts activities to quality of life and seek to engage as a consequence. In modern conceptions, QOL has significant connection to leisure time. Measures of quality of life (QOL), even as late as the first half of this century, included a person’s material level of living (Rapley, 2003; Veenhoven, 1996).
In the 1960s when values shifted to “post-materialism,” United States President Lyndon B. Johnson gave a speech stating that social progress cannot be “measured by the size of our bank balance… [but] by the quality of the lives our people lead” (Rapley, 2003). This represented a transformation in the concept of QOL. By the turn of the century, the World Health Organization defined quality of life as “an individual’s perception of his or her position in life in the context of culture and value system where they live, in relation to their goals, expectations, standards and concerns” (WHO, 2002, pg. 13). QOL, in addition to culture and values, accounts for health in a person’s life (Health-Related Quality of Life, 2016). In general, QOL can be stated as the general well-being of a person determined by health and happiness rather than materials and wealth.

The QOL mentioned in this paper will refer to the “American quality of life,” coined by Berger-Schmitt & Noll (2000):

[T]he American quality of life approach defines welfare in terms of need of satisfaction which can be assessed best by the individuals themselves. According to this view, the ultimate goal dimensions of societal development do not concern objective features of quality of life but people’s subjective well-being in terms of satisfaction and happiness. Hence, the conceptualization of quality of life is operationalised [sic] primarily by subjective social indicators (p. 10).

Leisure time is an aspect of happiness that includes spare time and disposable income. It is largely a Western construction modeled after the Ancient Greeks’ concept of spare time, and is a main factor in QOL, as well as motivation (Mantie, 2015; Rapley, 2003;
Stebbins, 1992). People generally like to have control over their time (freedom versus obligation) and the ways that they choose to use their time (responsible and irresponsible) (Mantie, 2015). These aspects affect how people feel and drive their actions to seek a balance between satisfaction and requirement. To fill their spare time and raise their QOL in various ways, many people join cultural, civic, or community groups (Ahmed-Mohamed et al., 2015; Cavitt, 2005; Coffman, 2009; Cohen et al., 2006; Kruse, 2009; Mantie, 2012b; Mantie, 2015; Pitts; 2009; Solé Resano et al., 2010; Tsugawa, 2009).

Per Ahmed-Mohamed, Rojo-Perez, Fernandez-Mayoralas, Forjaz, & Martinez-Martin (2015), there are positive effects on QOL for adults that participate in activities that are cultural, spiritual, or civic. Participation in activities generally contributes to general well-being and QOL, especially if those activities serve as expressive outlets. This is true of any activities to which a person is contributing and the activity, in turn, fulfills a need, whether it be expressive or civic (Ahmed-Mohamed et al., 2015). The activities must be fulfilling for the person based on their personal preferences, needs, and abilities—a premise that also accompanies successful and active aging.

Adults seek potential for social, mental, and physical well-being throughout the lifespan and want to meaningfully participate in society as part of successful aging, which has three components: “low probability of disease and disease-related disability, high cognitive and physical functional capacity, and active engagement with life” (Rowe & Kahn, 1997, p. 433). These components work together to create successful aging; a person must have activity, not potential for activity alone, to be considered as aging successfully (Rowe & Kahn, 1997). Active aging enhances any opportunities for
health, security, and participation; it also can enhance the quality of life as people age (Ageing and life-course, n.d.). The goal of active aging is to extend life expectancy and increase quality of life as people age. Aging happens in social contexts, including family members, friends, and colleagues, which makes interdependence and “intergenerational solidarity” two important tenets of the concept of active aging (Ageing and life-course, n.d.). With this “intergenerational solidarity” and the basic need of participating in society comes lifelong engagement.

**Lifespan engagement.** Lifespan engagement, lifelong participation, learning throughout the lifespan, and lifelong learning are all terms that are sometimes used interchangeably. Adult education in the United States can be traced to a movement during the 1920s and 1930s related to John Dewey and Eduard Lindeman (Mantie, 2012b). During this time, schooling and education became available to all, not just the elite or the young. This type of education was not labeled “lifelong learning,” but was rather connected to a Deweyan sense that “human growth, understood primarily as intellectual growth, was necessary for happiness, well-being and ancient Greek ideals of ‘the good life.’” (Mantie, 2012b, p. 219). Eventually, the term “lifelong learning” became highly promoted through several initiatives and policies, including the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the 1976 US Lifelong Learning Act (Jarvis, 2009; Mantie, 2012b). Many studies have focused on adult learning and pedagogy in music (Boswell, 1992; Busch, 2005; Coffman, 2009; Darrough, 1992; Kruse, 2009; Myers, 1992; Tsugawa, 2009), but the atmosphere around lifelong learning, while related to adult learning and pedagogy, is much more government- and institution-driven—potentially a fight for economic dominance
among countries (Jarvis, 2009; Mantie, 2012b). To this end, lifelong learning has become something of a moral obligation among governments (Jarvis, 2009). But is involvement in a community activity, such as a community music group, driven by the desire to learn more so than any other motivation?

While some people engage in community activities specifically to learn, most of the population participates in these activities to do something. Mantie says that

[e]very activity arguably involves some form of learning as a prerequisite; it may or may not involve explicit teaching or instruction. That is, we do not do things in order to learn, we learn in order to do things. When learning takes precedence over doing this distorts the nature of the activity. I play squash each week for the enjoyment and health benefits it affords, not to for any collateral learning that might occur along the way. I do this with music also, and suspect that many others do as well (2012, p. 223).

In the theory of situated learning and legitimate peripheral participation, learners participate with others via real-world social practices in a community. The learning is not simply passed on but rather experienced and co-constructed by social processes in a specific context (Lave & Wenger, 1991): “[P]eripherality, when enabled suggests an opening, a way of gaining access to sources for understanding through growing involvement” (1991, p. 37). Involvement and participation are main tenets of situated learning and legitimate peripheral participation.

To ensure lifelong engagement, people need to believe that the activity has value in their lives and is relevant and needed (Myers, 2008). Relevance lies at the core of musical engagement after schooling years (Mantie, 2015; Mantie & Tucker, 2008;
Some researchers feel that school music experiences do not provide relevance for students beyond graduation (Mantie, 2015; Mantie & Tucker, 2008; Myers, 2008). Steven Morrison (2001), believes that school programs are so self-contained that students see their participation ending when school ends rather than leading into the community. Students often do not see themselves as co-participants, which, in turn, distorts motivation for learning (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Mantie & Tucker, 2008; Morrison, 2001).

Research on lifespan engagement in music typically focuses on post-high school contexts rather than approaching school music as a large part of a lasting impact on lifelong music-making (Mantie & Tucker, 2008; Myers, 2008). According to Myers (2003), lifespan engagement is not only about preparation for adulthood or learning only done in adulthood, it is about a “lifetime continuum of learning” (p. 3). It represents a relationship between learning in structured, formal settings and less formal settings and participation to encourage engagement in both spaces. A significant part of lifespan engagement is the multiple entry points that should be available to all—to extend growth at any stage or age in life (Myers, 2008).

Participants of any activity may choose to engage based on learning or leisure; motivations for joining any activity or group are different for everyone. Yet the perception of participants (i.e. learners versus participants) can influence the actions of educators and facilitators. Those who guide activities need to be careful not to make any participant feel like an object of concern because of labels, such as those who are there are “learners” who are lacking in their knowledge and in need of edification (Mantie, 2012b). “Lifelong enjoyment, involvement, participation, or engagement are
more fruitful terms for adult music activities” (Mantie, 2012b, p. 228).

**Social Structure**

Engagement in any activity occurs in a social context. Social structures can be defined as a “recurring pattern of social behavior” or lasting and patterned social relationships between elements of a society (Abercrombie, Hill, & Turner, 2000). According to Merton (1968), social structure emerges from associated roles with a social status. For example:

the status of school teacher has its distinctive role-set which relates the teacher not only to the correlative status, pupil, but also to colleagues, the school principal and superintendent, the Board of Education, [and] professional associations (Marten, 1968, p. 42).

Social structures consist of “culturally defined goals, purposes, and interests” (Merton, 1938, p. 672). These elements are a component of “designs for group living” and they define and control the acceptable ways of achieving the goals (Merton, 1938, p. 672). Groups have desired end- goals and each one determines the “permissible and required procedures for attaining these ends” (Merton, 1938, p. 673). Within these structures and institutions, there are different elements acting upon and among agents. These create relationships and interactions that lead to the creation and maintenance of social capital and social belonging.

**Social capital.** Social capital has taken on many different meanings among different eras and sociologists. The first mention of the defined term came from L.J. Hanifan, a state supervisor of schools in West Virginia. In 1916, the same year and same edition of *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* of
Peter Dykema’s *The Spread of the Community Music Idea*, he wrote on the importance of community involvement in the success of schools. In this article, Hanifan defines social capital as not real estate, property, or money but “that in life which tends to make these tangible substances count for the most in the daily lives of a people, namely, goodwill, fellowship, mutual sympathy and social intercourse, among a group of individuals and families who make up a social unit” (130). In her second lecture of the series “A Truly Civil Society,” Eva Cox refers to social capital as “the processes between people which establish networks, norms, social trust and facilitate co-ordination and co-operation for mutual benefit” (1995). Cox also compares the term to “social fabric” or “social glue” (1995).

Essentially, social capital, fundamental to social functioning, is what many sociologists see as holding human relationships together; social networks and relationships have value, and people work together for the common good (Cox, 2002; Putnam, 2000). While the term has been reinvented many times in the past, the term calls attention to the fact that lives are made more valuable and productive through social ties (Putnam, 2000). Seeking out relationships that have value is something that sets the human species apart from others, as many species seek interaction but not valuable relationships with acceptance (Leary & Allen, 2011). These relationships and participation in community and civic activities accumulate social capital, which produces goods for the common welfare of all involved (Cox, 2002, Putnam, 2000). Social capital can be accessed through the relationships and trust built between individuals. Those individuals then use the gained social capital to secure the benefits it provides them (Gotto, Calkins, Jackson, Walker, & Beckmann, 2010).
There are three types of social capital—bonding, bridging, and linking (Langston, 2011; Putnam, 2000; Woolcock, 2001). Bonding social capital is among family members, neighbors, and close friends, making very dense connections. Bridging social capital is among more distant friends and relations and implies a horizontal relationship among people (Babaei, Ahmad, & Gill, 2012; Langston; 2011; Woolcock, 2001). Linking social capital involves a vertical relationship, with some type of authority or institutionalized power (Babaei, Ahmad, & Gill, 2012; Woolcock, 2001). Linking social capital is applied in discussions of civil society groups, public representatives, and the private sector (Babaei, Ahmad, & Gill, 2012). Woolcock (2001) articulates that different combinations and dynamic usage of bonding, bridging, and linking social capital can create a multidimensional approach to description and analysis of social structures. In the case of a community music ensemble, linking social capital explains the vertical relationship of a traditional, autocratic concert band with varying levels of authority, while bonding and bridging may exist in the interactions among members.

Social Capital has individual gains as well as group gains—“a private face and a public face” (Putnam, 2000; p. 20). In the sense of a community music group or a civically-engaged group, some of the social capital goes to the bystanders, while the individuals involved receive immediate social interaction that benefits them personally, whether it be with friendships and happiness or a business motive (Putnam, 2000).

Per some studies, social capital has been in decline in the United States since approximately World War II (Putnam, 2000; Wuthnow, 2002). In his *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community* (2000), Robert D. Putnam outlines
the many ways that social capital and the sense of being civic-minded has weakened over the last two or three decades. Instead of well-formed and dense bonds with others, “surf-by interactions” are popping up more and more; the thin single-stranded, one-shot, and potentially self-oriented bonds are seemingly preferred. Among the damaging effects on society, Putnam offers suggestions on rebuilding relationships, generating more social capital.

Ruth Wright (2012) believes there is a way for music to generate more social capital; “a way of reaching outside individual identities and co-constructing new shared ones: a new sensation of ‘we’” (p. 13). After all, this shared sense of communal identity can help form a community. Steven Mithen says that

[t]hose who make music together will mould [sic] their own minds and bodies into a shared emotional state, and with that will come a loss of self-identity and a concomitant increase in the ability to cooperate with others (2006, p. 215).

Bernstein (2000) lists three interrelated rights that people have: inclusion, enhancement, and participation. Community groups ideally require these three rights. Per Wright (2012), groups and society must find a way to include others while respecting differences, retaining autonomy, and not forcing participants to conform to the normative values.

Social belonging and motivation. Social belonging involves a sense of relatedness, coming from personal relationships, especially within shared experiences (Walton, Cohen, Cwir, & Spencer, 2012). Humans are very in-tune with the social world; we live in a world full of other objects, but, often, it is the interactions with others that people crave and the punishments from others that they fear (Dunning,
Belonging is a fundamental need that has strong influences in a person’s life and daily, social behavior (Leary & Allen, 2011). Rejection, stigmatization, ostracism, and signs of disinterest cause strong reactions and feelings of threat.

In general, people try to reduce the likelihood of rejection by trying to maintain or increase their relational value, which is the degree to which others value having relationships and interacting with him or her (Leary & Allen, 2011). Maintaining and increasing relational value normally grants access to many different social and material outcomes, such as friendship, group memberships, camaraderie, social support, logistical support, financial resources, and various opportunities.

Walton & Cohen (2011) suggest that people are more motivated to work together and share goals when they feel socially connected to others in the group, tying into their social identity: “[m]otivation, we suggest, is often associated with whether an endeavor is tied to a person’s sense of identity and their feelings of belonging in a group associated with the endeavor” (p. 81). Studies in social motivation in music show continued social engagement is beneficial to and a motivation of participation in a group, even if not the main motivator (Achilles, 1992; Boswell, 1992; Cavitt, 2005; Coffman, 2009; Coffman & Adamek, 1999; Cohen et al., 2006; Mantie, 2012a; Pitts, Robinson, & Goh, 2015; Solé Resano et al., 2010; Tsugawa, 2009; White, 2016). In addition to participation in community groups, social engagement is fundamental to healthy engagement (Ageing and life-course, n.d.; Rowe & Kahn, 1997; White, 2016).

**Socialization.** Organizational theorists John Van Maanen and Edgar H. Schein have written extensively on a theory called “organizational socialization” (Schein, 1988; Schein, 2010; Van Maanen, 1978; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). It refers to
people “learning the ropes” and how others structure that learning within the organization (Van Maanen, 1978, p. 19). This socialization is mainly used in a workplace setting; however, it can be applied to any type of organization in which people are spending their time.

Socialization depends on assimilation, which is the process of people joining, participating, and leaving organizations (Kramer, 2010). Assimilation is then broken into two different categories: socialization and individualization. Socialization is a process that nearly all individuals experience at some point in life, whether it be formally or informally. It happens when a person gains social skills, knowledge, and experience to assume an organizational role. Within organizations, a person will learn what behaviors are acceptable, desirable, and customary within the setting as well as the ones that are not (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979).

People learn these behaviors because going from being an outsider to an insider, or a transition phase, can be considered anxiety-producing. To alleviate the anxiety, people learn the requirements, functional and social, of their new role as quickly as they can (Van Maanen, 1978). People try to reduce the risk of rejection to maintain their relational value (Leary & Allen, 2011). This process can be formal, such as specific restrictions or regulations, or informal, such as observations of the organization (Kramer, 2010). It is important to emphasize the individual’s perspective, as “individual differences will affect how socialization experiences will be learned and interpreted” (Chao et al., 1994, p. 731).

Contrasting to socialization, individualization happens when individuals attempt to change the organization to meet their needs (Kramer, 2010). Individual and
collective needs can be fulfilled within the environment of an organization, and the organization can invent the means for which those needs are fulfilled (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). However, as in assimilation, many prefer to avoid conflict, so they censor their thoughts and actions, withholding information that make them appear confrontational. This, in turn, undermines effective group dynamics and can end up being the downfall of groups (Leary & Allen, 2011).

Studies relating to each of these themes have been done in various settings, qualitative and quantitative. In senior citizens and older adults, Coffman and Adamek (1999) did a study with a voluntary wind band for senior citizens with the purpose of finding how the band contributed to the quality of life in the senior adults. Cohen, Bailey, & Nilsson (2002) studied the importance of music to seniors, raising questions about access to music by seniors. Dabback (2010b) published a work discussing music identity formation in older adults. Darrough (1992) investigated making choral music with seniors and the rewarding experience. White (2016) explored musical activity across the lifespan and its effect on quality of life in older musicians.

Works relating to social capital and music have been done, suggesting that music participation is a pronounced approach to building social capital (Jones, 2010; Langston, 2011; Prest, 2016; Wright, 2012). Langston (2011) and Langston and Barrett (2008) found that social capital indicators such as shared norms, trust, involvement, networks, and resources are all present in community choirs.

Community music group studies are numerous and show the advantages of civic and community engagement (Cavitt, 2005; Coffman, 1996, 2006, 2009; Coffman & Adamek, 1999; Cohen et al., 2006; Dabback, 2010a, 2010b, 2016; Darrough, 1992;
Dykema, 1916; Mantie, 2012a, 2012b; Mantie & Tucker, 2008; Myers, 2008). Cavitt (2005) studied specifically what factors influenced participation in community band, finding that the music, personal satisfaction, and social interaction all were reasons for adults to join community bands. Dabback (2010a, 2010b) has studied different music communities in the Shenandoah Valley. Each of these studies play an important part in this area of research, but no other study has combined the elements of motivation, socialization, and community as a framework. This study seeks to reveal the unique lived experience of participating in the Harrisonburg-Rockingham Concert Band (HRCB) through this lens.

The purpose of this phenomenological study was to explore motivations for participation, how social structures influence the adult non-professional members of the Harrisonburg- Rockingham Concert Band (HRCB), and what characteristics of community are present within the band. The themes of motivations and social structures are both prevalent themes in community music and this study. The questions this study seeks to answer are:

1. What motivates the band members to participate in the HRCB?
2. How do the institutional social structures influence the sense of belonging, development of social capital, and socialization of band members?
3. What characteristics of community are present within the HRCB?
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this phenomenological study was to explore motivations for participation, how social structures influence the adult non-professional members of the Harrisonburg-Rockingham Concert Band (HRCB), and what characteristics of community are present within the band. Contextualizing literature in areas of motivations, quality of life, lifespan engagement, social capital and belonging, socialization, and liminality informed the research.

Motivations

Adults evidence a range of motivations for participation in any activity. Per Gates (1991), minimal evidence of participation includes:

[A]cquiring the information that will allow one to engage in a specific activity; identifying oneself with an activity or expressing intent to continue involvement with others who identify with an activity; performing the activity-related behaviors of other participants; taking a causal role in an activity’s events; using one’s resources (money, time, energy, etc.) to support the activity’s economic and other costs; and patterning one’s behavior in accord with the values held in common among other participants (p. 4).

Commonly researched motivations fall into two categories: personal and social motivations (Cavitt, 2005; Coffman, 2002; Coffman, 2009; Stebbins, 1992). A motivation for participation in any leisure activity is finding personal fulfillment, self-expression, creativity, and a sense of identity and meaning (Stebbins, 1992). These aspects drive a person to seek out and stay in an activity for personal motivation. Cavitt (2005) studied 401 adults’ participation in ten different community bands in California,
Texas, and Michigan. Her results showed that the adults in the study were greatly motivated to find additional musical activities outside of rehearsals. The most enjoyable aspects were the music played, the personal satisfaction of playing in a group, and the social interaction with others. As far as participating after high school, the reasons most given were enjoyment, fun, and social interaction (Cavitt, 2005). In Coffman and Adamek (1999), socialization was a main motivation for the senior citizens’ participation in the wind band.

Stanley Parker (1983) presents five categories of the ways a person uses time in their life:

1. Work, working time, sold time, subsistence time; 2. Work-related time, work obligations; 3. Existence time, meeting physiological needs; 4. Non-work obligations, semi-leisure; and 5. Leisure, free time, spare time, uncommitted time, discretionary time, choosing time (p. 8-9). Generally, music participation relates to the latter category. People pursuing these activities in time not used by work are generally not compensated for participation in the activity and can even give up the activity if it is not meeting their personal fulfillment. This is a main difference between an amateur and a professional (Stebbins, 1992).

The use of the word “amateur” is almost always related to the concurrent understanding of “professional.” As Stebbins (1992) points out, people believe professionals are always better than amateurs, and a comparison subconsciously happens when one word or the other is mentioned. In the P-A-P system (Professional-Amateur-Public), all three subjects are related to one another. According to Gates (1991), the most important thing in the P-A-P system is that “members share an agreed-upon set of values that is used to regulate behavior and decide issues of
quality, including settling questions of stratification” (p. 10). Amateurs can be considered special members of the public, but know better the quality of a product or performance, potentially making the PAP system more of a continuum than three separate categories (Juniu, Tedrick, & Boyd, 1996). However, the motivations of people on the continuum vary based on their self-perception. Wagner, Lounsbury, and Fitzgerald (1989) compared high school and college basketball players on scholarship with the players not on scholarship. Scholarship athletes, or the ones with more extrinsic motivation, were less likely to view basketball as leisure. The athletes with no scholarship were more intrinsically motivated in the sport, finding more satisfaction, fulfillment, and enjoyment than those affected more by the chance of failure, just as professional musicians versus amateur musicians.

Juniu, Tedrick, & Boyd (1996) studied the perceptions of rehearsals by amateur versus professional musicians. They found that 56% of professionals viewed rehearsal as work compared to the 13% of amateurs. Similar patterns were found regarding performances: 50% of professionals viewed performances as work, 47% as leisure/work, and 3% as leisure; only 15% of amateurs viewed performances as work, 52% as leisure/work, and 33% as leisure (Juniu, Tedrick, & Boyd, 1996).

Musical motivation serves as another potential motivation for adult participation (Cavitt, 2005; Coffman, 2009). Researchers have linked prior experiences in music, and creating a love of music to music participation later in life (Bowles, 1991; Cavitt, 2005; Coffman, 1996). In a study of adult community band members in Tasmania, Australia, Coffman (2006) asked “What is it like being a musician?” For many participants, it was the aspect of being enveloped in a sound made by the group;
they like playing with others. While there were some negative comments specifically surrounding limitations, the commitment statements from participants were uniform. They were playing to improve, even going to drastic measures to do so, such as one woman undergoing weekly chiropractic treatments to play her instrument and two older men pursuing Bachelor degrees in music just to learn (Coffman, 2006). The researcher found that the main motivation of the participants in the band was to make music with others, with giving back to the community as a close second.

Quality of Life (QOL)

Many people perceive arts participation as important to QOL. It has historically been understudied, especially in sociology. Per Michalos (2005), in the 63 volumes and 1,085 papers of Social Indicators Research between the first issue in 1974 and 2005, not one focused on the arts and their impact on QOL. Michalos (2005) studied the impact of the arts on quality of life, with arts broadly including music, dance, painting, theater, literature, pottery, photography, gardening, and quilting. He found that 89% of his participants listened to music on average 13.5 hours per week with a satisfaction level of 5.9 on a 7-point satisfaction scale, the highest percentage in one group and the highest ratio of satisfaction. Participants were also asked to cite their beliefs and feelings about the most important arts-related activities. Twenty-eight people, or 12.7%, selected the statement “my artistic activities contribute to my overall well-being;” 9.1% said “my artistic activities help me to relax;” 6.8% chose “generally my artistic activities have a positive effect on my life;” and 6.8% also selected “artistic activity strengthens a community.”

Research in QOL mostly involves the elderly, as QOL plays a large part in
successful and active aging (Ageing & life-course, n.d.; Rowe & Kahn, 1997). Health, as it contributes to QOL, is also a large part of successful and active aging (Ageing & life-course, n.d.; Health-Related Quality of Life, 2016; Rowe & Kahn, 1997; Solé Resano, Mercadal-Brotons, Gallego Matas, & Riera, 2010). Adults have noted better mental, emotional, and physical health since joining musical activities (Cavitt, 2005; Coffman & Adamek, 1999; Cohen, Bailey, & Nilsson, 2002). Cohen (2006) presents four developmental life phases that contribute to psychological growth, and therefore QOL and motivations, in older adults. These phases help people to see new potential in themselves, allowing for a new awareness in creativity and artistry:

1) Midlife reevaluation: occurs during one’s early 40s to late 50s. A sense of crisis or yearning combines with insight and reflection to seek meaning in life. The quest that occurs in midlife makes one think of their own mortality; no longer do they think of the time they’ve had, but instead the time that they have left. This allows for uncovering a new creative side.

2) Liberation: emerges between one’s mid-50s and mid-70s. People in this stage feel a personal freedom that lets them speak their mind and do what needs to be done. Retirement creates a new liberating feeling, which allows for more time to experiment with their potential in different areas of life besides career.

3) Summing-up: generally late 60s into the 80s and beyond. Reflections of the past causes one to look back and find a larger meaning in one’s life, leading to reexamining life and summing-up the lifetime. This reflection also causes one to pass on wisdom in various ways, such as autobiographies and storytelling,
as well as giving back through community volunteering and activism.

4) Encore: develops any time from a person’s late 70s to the end of life. A person shapes plans and actions with a desire to reaffirm the major themes from their life, but also to attend to unfinished business or conflicts. A person seeks to live well to the end of life, having a positive effect on family and community.

(Cohen, 2006).

In addition to health, music participation promotes an increase in QOL through self-expression and creativity (Boswell, 1992; Tsugawa, 2009). Adults believe that social and personal development are improved by the arts (Boswell, 1992; Michalos, 2005; Tsugawa, 2009). This belief is one motivation for music participation and lifespan engagement.

Coffman and Adamek (1999) surveyed fifty-two members of a volunteer wind band for senior citizens. According to their study, “social interactions, a sense of personal well-being and accomplishment, and enriching recreational activities were dominant factors in defining QOL. Health was an emergent theme, as health, especially in older adults, is a main factor of QOL (Coffman & Adamek, 1999).

Socialization

Socialization is “the process by which an individual acquires the beliefs, values, skills, and resources needed to live and participate in society” (Isbell, 2015). Many studies surrounding socialization and music pertain to teacher socialization (Austin, Isbell, & Russell, 2012; Bouji, 2004; Dolloff, 1999; Froehlich & L’Roy, 1985; Isbell, 2008, 2015; Woodford, 2002). Bouji (2004) studied the socialization among music
teachers. His definition of socialization considered an active creation of identity rather than solely a transfer of socialization (Bouji, 2004). He found that music teachers, via role-identity, move from socialization in a music education teacher program to socialization in the working world, often with surprise and unpreparedness.

Froehlich and L’Roy (1985) studied the occupational identity and socialization of undergraduate music majors. This study utilizes occupational socialization, in which a student learns to adapt behaviors and notions of a lay person into those held by professionals. They found that the students that adapted these behaviors and notions to fit the change in life and profession had a smoother transition to professionalism than those that maintained the lay conceptions from before becoming a professional (Froehlich & L’Roy, 1985). This is similar to organizational socialization.

As described previously, organizational socialization refers to learning how an organization works from the inside (Schein, 1988; Schein, 2010; Van Maanen, 1978; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Typically related to socialization in a workplace, it can also be applied to various community and civic organizations. As noted by Hess (2009), after spending time in a culture or organization, people begin to realize the norms and values and anomie—the feeling of normlessness—is reduced. Anomie reduction can be slowed by reluctance of members to provide cultural information and if newcomers continue to receive ambiguous messages for a prolonged amount of time (Hess, 2009).

Social Capital, Belonging, and Motivation

Social capital happens when people establish meaningful and valuable
relationships among them, a sort of “social fabric” or “social glue” (Cox, 1995). Social capital can, in part, emerge from socialization, but does not specific socialize people. The literature surrounding social capital suggests that social capital is identified by the presence of involvement, trust, and networks (Cox, 1995; Langston, 2011; Woolcock, 2001; Wuthnow, 2002). Social capital in civic involvement and participation is considered a “virtuous circle…social capital facilitates voluntary activity; which in turn generates more social capital” (Langston, 2011, p. 165). Trust, in the form of mutual or trust that people will behave in an expected way, is central to social capital (Dietz, 2000; Langston, 2011). For some people, trust is the only form social capital:

[Social capital] can be thought of as the stock of goodwill or mutual trust that accrues from cooperative relations among two or more parties… social capital does not reside in the solitary confines of private ownership but among the collective hands of the communities that mould [sic] it (Dietz, 2000, p. 139-40).

Langston (2011) studied the phenomenon of social capital in a community choir by examining the participants, their individual interactions with the choir, and the interactions of the choir with members of the community. Langston found that trust, as the indicator that social capital is developing, and community, as the element of social capital, are both commonly found in community choir:

Social capital, as developed in the Milton Community Choir, has proven longevity and resilience. The more that the community choir is called upon to fulfil [sic] a civic and community role, and hence expand its stocks of social capital, the more social capital is generated, and the greater the community choirs stock of social capital becomes (Langston, 2011, p. 179).
This is the type of social capital that is cyclical; this social capital is what Putnam (2000) means when he mentions group gains. Where there is a community music group or a civically-engaged group, bystanders receive some social capital and individuals receive immediate, personal benefits.

Putnam (2000) believes that social capital improves civic engagement and that the trust and norms developed by networks produces social capital, rather than the networks alone producing social capital. The reciprocity created from the trust and norms helps individuals and groups, which Putnam calls the “private face” and the “public face” (2000, p. 20). “Putnam considers social capital a by-product of social activity, rather than its end goal” (Prest, 2016, p. 135). Studies show that music is inherently social and can help build social capital and networks (Coffman, 2006; Jones, 2010). In the view that social capital is in decline suggested by Putnam (2000), Jones (2010) specifically makes the argument that globalization has made the development of skills and dispositions for civic engagement and intercultural understanding some of the most crucial things that people must develop for our era and the foreseeable future; that social capital is the stuff from which such understandings and engagements emanate; and that music educators and community musicians can and should purposefully foster the development of such social capital as goals to their musicking projects.

Thus, instead of social capital being a by-product of musicking, music educators and community musicians should make it an implied goal (p. 292). Social belonging is truly a human need that influences everyday behavior (Dunning, 2011; Leary & Allen, 2011). The motivations behind the need to belong relate to fear
of rejection, a want for valuable relationships, and a need for interaction (Asch, 1952; Dunning, 2011; Leary & Allen, 2011). In his famous conformity experiments, Asch (1952) illustrated the pressure of a group versus the individual. One participant per group and actors for the study were asked to match lines between two different cards. When all the actors gave the obvious correct answer, participants did as well, which was expected. When the actors gave the wrong answer, a large portion of participants changed their answer to fit in (Asch, 1952). Most participants just went along with the group to conform.

This type of motivation can be tied to feelings of social belonging and acceptance, which are heightened when a person considers the endeavor closely related to their identity (Walton & Cohen, 2011). Also, when a person is in a valued social setting, socially shared attitudes become the reality (Walton & Cohen, 2011). Relational value is gained and maintained by promoting acceptance and minimizing the chance of ostracization and rejection (Leary & Allen, 2011). The actions that minimize those chances are generally shown by a group to an individual, whether formally or informally. It is this action that connects social belonging to socialization.

Studies on New Horizons bands reveal social capital and belonging as main motivators and byproducts of participation. Jutras (2011) asked over 1,000 New Horizons band members from twenty-eight states and Canada to rate the existence and importance of forty-two benefits. “Social/Cultural Benefits” were the second most-agreed upon category, and “new friends” was the second-highest agreed upon benefit, with “camaraderie, common purpose, and belonging” all with agreement rates of 95% or higher. According to Jutras (2011):
A New Horizons ensemble is by nature a social organization, as members must work together to produce a musical outcome. Of all the benefits in the Social/Cultural category, it is the socially interactive benefits, benefits specifically involving friends and working with others that are rated the highest… This finding suggests that the study participants placed a high value on the friends and friendships they developed through New Horizons, and they received benefits from their interaction and common work with fellow New Horizons members (p. 78).

Rohwer, Coffman, and Raiber (2012) studied perceptions of important frustrating issues among senior adults in band rehearsals. The second most common theme from the question, “What was the most important aspect to you in today’s rehearsal?” related to social components such as togetherness, fun, and group improvement (Rohwer, Coffman, & Raiber, 2012). Many also noted that playing with other people was the most important aspect.

**Liminality and Communitas**

Liminality has mostly been studied as a stage in rituals (Turner, 1967, 1969; Turner, 2012), although liminality in informal communities differ:

Liminal play occurs in small-scale tribal societies; it is serious, obligatory, cyclical, and repetitive. In contrast liminoid play takes place in modern settings; it is entertaining, voluntary, and varied in form and function (Yarnal, 2008, p. 54-55).

The idea of liminoid play is what Yarnal (2008) used when she studied the role of liminality and *communitas* in the Red Hat Society, a social group for women over fifty.
The results showed that many women indicated that the Red Hat Society was a third place outside of work and home; a place with its own meaning. Yarnal (2008) also used *communitas* as a theme, as liminality and *communitas* go together quite often (Turner, 1967, 1969; Turner, 2012). The researcher criticized Turner for a narrow view of *communitas* as there is no mention of the concept in an informal setting in Turner’s work:

He neither recognizes that *communitas* may occur in contexts that do not require suffering and humiliation, nor does he acknowledge that deeper meaning may come from informal settings that promote positive affect (Yarnal, 2008, p. 68).

Emmanuel (2011) explored the concept of liminality in the urban music classroom. The music classroom is a space outside of the students’ and teachers’ “real, lived worlds” even though they enter the space every day (p. 54). Emmanuel (2011) found that liminal spaces were a place where students and teacher alike put aside social and political structures experienced outside of the classroom, which allowed to form a community of belonging:

It is when we can place our values side-by-side with those of our students in nonjudgmental ways that we can work toward mutual understanding, build relationships, and move toward community in the liminal space… Developing such a community would depend largely on promoting a sense of belonging which would be predicated on mutual respect, empathy and reciprocity in which all participants benefit, learning from one another in spite of holding different viewpoints and having other life experiences (p. 59).
Emmanuel (2011) also noted that *communitas* was nurtured in the liminal spaces where equalization occurred and the equal status drew the community together.

Dabback (2016) studied the cultures in a Mennonite School music program and how they contribute to group and individual identity. In the study, he found that the practices in the music classroom, combined with the Mennonite values generated liminality and *communitas*. The rich cultural community of Mennonites promotes a communal identity through liminality of rituals (Dabback, 2016).

Motivations for engaging in activities can be varied and complex. Evidence from many studies show that motivations for participation can be linked to leisure activity, personal fulfillment, self-expression, and meaning in life. These same motivations are factors in quality of life, as is lifespan engagement. Social structures including socialization, social capital, and social belonging also are factors in adult music participation, with “social” generally being regarded as the highest or most important factor for many adults, which is interesting considering the potential of a liminal community in a community music setting. This is an area where further research may be warranted.

This study sought to examine the ways that motivation and social structures affect the sense of community and influence participation in the Harrisonburg-Rockingham Concert Band (HRCB). The lived experiences of the members of the HRCB gave insight into each of these factors, allowing a conceptualization of how membership in the HRCB is experienced.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Introduction and Overview

The purpose of this phenomenological study was to explore motivations for participation, how social structures influence the adult non-professional members of the Harrisonburg- Rockingham Concert Band (HRCB), and identify the characteristics of community are in the band. The following questions framed the investigation within an interpretative phenomenological approach:

1. What motivates the band members to participate in the HRCB?
2. How do the institutional social structures influence the sense of belonging, development of social capital, and socialization of band members?
3. What characteristics of community are present within the HRCB?

Phenomenologies fall under qualitative research approaches, which relate to how people experience and understand cultural and social worlds in a certain context in a certain moment of time (Lincoln & Guba, 2000) Phenomenological studies are concerned with the application of systematic inquiry toward understanding lived experiences and processes in multiple contexts and perspectives; interpretative phenomenology specifically aims to give insight into how a person in a specific context makes sense of the phenomenon they are experiencing (Matsunobu & Bresler, 2014). The lived experience is the focus of interpretative phenomenology, in which a researcher studies a phenomenon and the lived experiences of the participants and makes an interpretation (Creswell, 2007).

Harrisonburg-Rockingham Concert Band

HRCB is a community-based wind band that has been playing in the
Shenandoah Valley for more than 30 years. The band has been around since the late 19th-early 20th century, but took its modern-day concert band form in 1984. The band consists of middle school musicians to “Golden Agers,” novices and professionals, those who have never taken a break from music and those who have been away from an instrument for more than fifty years. The ensemble boasts an attendance of fifty to seventy members, but has dropped as low as thirty in the 2016 season. Originally, HRCB was formed for charitable and educational purposes, “to benefit the community through the practice, performance and presentation of concert band music. The band provides an artistic and recreational experience for anyone wishing to pursue instrumental music in the traditional concert band format” (Harrisonburg-Rockingham Concert Band, n.d.).

Mostly, the band performs in Harrisonburg City and in Rockingham County, but also at parks in surrounding counties, especially for the Fourth of July. Some regular performances include the summer “Concerts on the Lawn” at James Madison University, the Bridgewater Summer Concert series, and visits to retirement homes and communities in the area. In addition to performing on its own, HRCB performs with the Shenandoah Valley Choral Society, another community music group in the area.

The band has had two main directors since 1984 and currently has an interim director. There is no audition to be in HRCB, but the website specifically states that the director may ask to hear a player in order to assess ability. If the ability does not meet the standard of HRCB, the person may be asked to practice further and seek membership later. There are no dues or fees to be HRCB, but all materials must be provided by the members, excluding music stands, music, and percussion instruments. They will provide
members information about where to purchase their own equipment. As far as instrumentation, the website says, “[t]he band will accept almost any instrument used in the modern wind band, but we actively seek percussion, low reeds and low brass instruments” (Harrisonburg-Rockingham Concert Band, n.d.).

There is no attendance policy in HRCB, but members are encouraged to attend as many rehearsals as possible, especially before the concert. HRCB has two concert seasons: the fall/winter season is October through December with two to three concerts; the spring/summer season is February through July, with four to six concerts.

**Participants**

Study participants included seven current members of the Harrisonburg-Rockingham Concert Band. Dukes (1984) suggests studying three to ten subjects for a phenomenological study; Creswell (2007) states that as long as participants can provide a comprehensive picture of the phenomenon being studied, the researcher may determine the necessary number of study members. To participate, members had to turn in a consent form, be over 18 years of age, and be an amateur musician, stated specifically as “a non-professional musician” on the information sheet handed out (see Appendix A). I received fifteen consent forms and purposefully chose the sample from the forms by considering age, time of membership with the group, gender, and order of return of the forms to represent the whole of HRCB (Creswell, 2007). In addition to seeking an appropriate ratio, I attempted to gather the participants that would present a wide array of thoughts and viewpoints. Collected consent forms were locked in a fireproof security case at my house. Files on the computer were encrypted and password protected. All identifiable data collected was destroyed upon completion of
Four of the participants were female and three were male. Pseudonyms were created after participants were notified of their selection into the study. Karen is 53 years old; an accountant, who has played in the band for two years. The HRCB is the second community band that she has played in after coming back to music after a decade-long break. Katie is 25 years old and works in healthcare administration. She has been in the band for approximately two and a half years. Katie has not had a significant break in her playing and came almost straight from college, where she was very involved in the collegiate athletic bands, just as basketball pep band and marching band. Grace is 46; a homemaker. She has been in the band the longest (18 years) of the participants interviewed. Prior to staying at home with her children, she was a career counselor in a university setting. She had a small break from playing of six years, but has been involved in music in some way her entire life. Elizabeth is 37 and is a software engineer. She has been heavily involved in church music all her life but joined the HRCB to keep up her playing after she was out of school and without a regular routine of playing. She has been a member of the band for four years now.

Doug, who is 49 years old, is a math professor at a local university. He has an extensive background in community music through local concert and brass bands where he grew up. While he also took a significant break from playing, he considers himself to have a high technical background due to the music he played before the break. He has been in the band for two years. Rick, a retired schoolteacher and scientist, is 74. He grew up in the Harrisonburg area, participating in the band throughout his school career. He gave up playing when he moved to get his Master’s
degree and did not return to music until he retired in 2002. He has played in the HRCB for six years. Steve is an 84-year-old retired electrical engineer. He planned on music being his career until he went into the Navy and became interested in aviation electronics. After the Navy, he took a 20-year break in his playing to raise his family before joining a different community band in a different location. He has now been in the HRCB for 10 years.

**Design and Procedure**

The HRCB allowed me to come speak about my study and present members with the consent form. The consent form (see Appendix A) was presented as the study I originally intended. Emergent themes required that my title and purpose statement be reviewed and changed accordingly to the current title and purpose statement.

Creswell (2007) states that the backbone of a qualitative study is extensive data collection from multiple sources. This study was designed to use observations and field notes, semi-structured interviews, and voice recordings. Per Creswell (2007), I obtained permission to observe on-site and was introduced to the group as an outsider. To observe the phenomenon of being in HRCB, I was a nonparticipant at rehearsals and observed by sitting to the side to reduce distraction and taking notes (Schmidt, 2014). Observations were done over the course of two months. These notes were observations from the outside into the HRCB and attempted to gather basic information on the group, such as numbers and demographics, but also to witness from the outside what it is like to be in HRCB. In this way, the participants served as the teachers and experts, and I positioned myself as a learner (Spradley, 1980).

In addition to observations, this study used semi-structured interviews, which
allowed for a natural conversational approach but with guided, specific questions (see Appendix B; Creswell, 2007). The conversational approach let the participants give in-depth descriptions of their experiences and allowed for me to ask relevant and thoughtful follow-up questions (Roulston, 2014). Participants turned in a consent form with an email so the researcher could contact them to set up an interview. Some interviews were set up via email and others were set up in person, depending on the attendance and convenience for each person. Five interviews took place in public areas such as coffee shops, one took place in a personal office, and one took place at my house. Each interview was done in a place that the researcher and participant felt comfortable being together and speaking with one another. Data trustworthiness was promoted via multiple data sources and methods. Participants were sent the transcript of their interview to approve and field notes were taken over several rehearsals to avoid a one-time view.

**Data Collection & Analysis**

The observations took place at Thomas Harrison Middle School in Harrisonburg, Virginia, during HRCB’s 7:30pm to 9:00pm rehearsal on Tuesday nights. Observations were done over the course of two months. During the observations, I took notes on my password-protected laptop, where the notes were stored in an encrypted folder. The interviews were recorded using iPad voice recording software, Voice Record Pro 7. The iPad was locked using a 6-digit code and a fingerprint for security. During each interview, I took notes on a paper notepad only for the purpose of developing related questions without interrupting the participant. These notes were not full notes and did not mention any identification of the participant, so I
discarded these single sheets after each interview. Each interview lasted between 30 minutes and 90 minutes, totaling 6 hours and 54 minutes. The interviews were transcribed three to seven days after the interviews using play-back software on Voice Record Pro 7. Transcriptions were between 10 and 24 pages, totaling 98 pages, and were stored in the same encrypted folder as the observations on the researcher’s password-protected laptop.

After transcribing, I used a phenomenological approach to data analysis detailed by Creswell (2007). I read through each transcription, making notes in the margin, forming initial codes by assigning words or phrases to certain parts of the interviews. I looked for common threads relating to the purpose of the study and unexpected emergent themes, resulting in 105 original codes. In the second round of coding, I combined the original codes into categories, which revealed 48 subsequent codes. After the third round of coding, I found the emergent themes used in the study.

The final stage of this study was synthesizing the results and reporting the findings. As noted in White, Woodfield, Ritchie, and Ormston (2014), the aim of writing in a qualitative research study is to unravel and present the findings in a coherent and productive way:

In achieving this there is a need not only to represent the social world that has been researched, but also to re-present it in a way which both remains grounded in the accounts of research participants and explains its subtleties and its complexities. The reporting task, therefore, is not simply an act of recording the outcomes of the analysis but also an active construction and representation of the form and nature of the topics being explored (p. 368).
While culminating the findings, the data was further assembled into a conclusive account that was narrative in the results and reflective in the discussion.
CHAPTER 4: MOTIVATIONS

There’s something about making music with other people that’s... maybe, it’s motivating, a little bit? To sound good. To have a purpose to play. Like, if I couldn’t play at church and I wasn’t in band, would I do music at all?

- Elizabeth

The purpose of this phenomenological study was to explore motivations for participation, how social structures influence the adult non-professional members of the Harrisonburg-Rockingham Concert Band (HRCB), and what characteristics of community are present within the band. Emergent themes include motivations and socialization with sub-categories of self-expression, leisure time, social capital, and social belonging. The questions this study aims to answer are:

1. What motivates the band members to participate in the HRCB?

2. How do the institutional social structures influence the sense of belonging, development of social capital, and socialization of band members?

3. What characteristics of community are present within the HRCB?

Entering this study, I expected to find that members of the HRCB were interested in playing in the community group for musical and personal motivations, socializing with others that enjoy the same activity as them, and engaging in an activity that was important and relevant in their lives (Achilles, 1992; Boswell, 1992; Bowles, 1991; Busch, 2005; Cavitt, 2005; Coffman, 1996, 2002, 2006, 2009; Coffman & Adamek, 1999; Darrough, 1992; Mantie, 2012a, Mantie & Tucker, 2008; Morrison, 2001; Pitts, Robinson, & Goh, 2015; Tsugawa, 2009).

Specifically, Cavitt (2005) noted that “[m]ost community band members listed enjoyment, fun, and social interaction as the most important reasons for participating in
band” (p. 54). While findings did align with these areas, they were sometimes actionized in different ways.

**Motivations**

The motivations mentioned by the participants in this study fall into three main categories aligned with Coffman (2002) and Stebbins (1992): personal motivations, musical motivations, and social motivations. In Coffman (2002), no single reason appeared to be the leading reason for participation, but more able performers noted higher ratings in personal and musical motivations.

**Personal motivations.** Personal motivations revealed five different themes: (1) past experiences, (2) playing with others, (3) giving back to the community, (4) self-expression, and (5) leisure time. Participants said that music contributed to these ideas in some way, and that is part of why they returned to music after a break in their playing. Reasons for each participant seeking out and continuing music as an adult vary.

**Past experiences.** Study participants talked about their past musical experiences, mostly with warmth and smiles. Elizabeth began formal music learning in the second grade on piano. She continued her piano lessons throughout high school and joined band in sixth grade. Growing up in a Mennonite church, a religion in which music is emphasized, she cannot remember a time when music was not a part of her life:

I thought about studying music in college but I decided not to, and I decided it would be a hobby instead of a career…I started formal lessons in second grade; I started taking piano lessons. I took piano lessons from second grade all the way through high school and I started band in sixth grade. I was in band from
sixth grade through high school. And I did do one year of concert band in college but it was a lot when it’s not your major (laughs) so I didn’t continue with that. And then, I did a lot of music at church. Both as a kid and—well, all my life! Well not all my life but ever since I started playing music (laughs). And I was in choir in elementary school and I didn’t really stick with choir, I mostly did band in school… I guess that I can’t really remember a time when music wasn’t a part of my life. And, you know, even though I don’t take any formal lessons anymore or anything, I still play regularly in one format or another.

She had fond memories of middle school and high school music experiences, but once out of high school, she decided that she wanted to continue playing in church. In order to do that, she realized she needed to be playing clarinet on a more regular basis, so she searched for “community band” online and found the HRCB. It was ten years in between playing regularly and finding the HRCB, so it was difficult for her to get her “chops” and technical skills back, but she believed that she did a good job at the time of the study.

Doug started music in elementary school in Australia, so his experience with school and community music had been different than the other participants. He began playing a band instrument earlier than most in the United States; in second grade, he started playing a tenor horn. He joined a local brass band and was switched to the euphonium. He played in that brass band until seventh grade, when he joined a different brass band, in which he stayed through graduate school, a total of 15 years in one band before adulthood. In addition to the brass band, he also joined a community
band in Australia before coming to the United States for his post doctorate. He did not bring his instrument when he came to the United States, and it was twenty years before he would pick up his instrument again for the HRCB. When asked about his past musical experiences, Doug gave credit to his parents for his early interest:

My father was a big early jazz buff—so lots of trumpet and trombone from that—and so because of that when I got involved in the local band—well brass, you try different things and it just suited me. So I tried it and I enjoyed it. So it was one of those extra-curricular activities that was kind of fun. I was not particularly sporty at the time so having an indoor activity that was kind of fun made sense. So I joined the band, moved to euphonium, and got some private lessons and just kept going.

Steve is another member of the HRCB that had a long history of community band participation. He was involved with another ensemble in Northern Virginia for thirty years before moving to Harrisonburg. Steve, who is 84, spoke positively of the musical and social parts of his high school musical career. He originally wanted to go into music education before joining the Navy, where he became interested in aviation electronics. Even though he did not continue to pursue music as a career, he still played in some bands during his time in the Navy. Once out of the Navy, he got married and had children and put his horn away for nineteen years before joining the community band in Northern Virginia.

Rick, like Steve, was retired. He had a very busy academic career, moving several different places in the country for teaching and various science degrees and jobs. He loved his high school experience and even played while obtaining his
undergraduate degree. Mostly, he spoke of the social aspects of that time in his life and the fun revolving around those times. When he moved to go to graduate school, he did not take his instrument and said that he did not miss playing his instrument. It was not until after he retired, almost forty years later, that he decided he would play again when he and his wife decided to be a part of the James Madison University Lifelong Learning Institute (LLI). They began taking classes together and he got information about the New Horizons Band. Their main purpose for joining the LLI was to keep their minds sharp, and he decided that New Horizons would help him in that quest. Shortly after, he switched from trumpet to tuba and began playing in the HRCB.

Karen was very opportunistic in playing music in her lifetime. She had the typical traditional beginning with starting band in fifth grade and continuing to play through high school. She was unable to play through college due to working to pay for tuition. She stopped playing for about ten years and picked up her clarinet again when she was around thirty years old, when she joined a community band in Northern Virginia. She played in that band for twenty years until her children were more involved in activities and she needed to be available to take them to various things. She took a five-year break until her youngest child graduated high school and then continued playing. Eventually, she moved to Harrisonburg where she looked up the HRCB and joined as soon as she moved.

Grace started music in middle school and was very involved in band and choir throughout middle and high school:

I started with piano lessons when I was four years old and I started flute lessons when I was ten. I played flute for two years and then our public school
system had an overabundance of flute players, like thirty in a band (laughs),
and my dad had played tenor saxophone when he was growing up, and I found
his saxophone in a back bedroom closet. And so when I was in the sixth grade,
I switch to playing tenor saxophone. I also had been in mixed chorus in middle
school, concert choir in high school… High school I was in concert band,
marching band all four years, jazz band for one year, madrigals— yeah, my
senior year five out of seven classes were music classes (laughs)!

She began playing again after a six-year break during college at the age of twenty-four
and had children at the ages of twenty-six, twenty-nine, thirty-three, and thirty-five.
She said that when a person starts having children they give up many things for them
and she was lucky enough to have a supportive husband who has made it happen for
her for the last eighteen years. Now, her children are all old enough to stay home
together by themselves, which made it easier and allowed her to take on a leadership
role in the HRCB.

Katie was the youngest of all the participants and had the shortest break time
away from her instrument at nothing more than a few months during a one-year span.
She was the one participant who did not recount a very positive memory of her early
music career. She had seven public school band directors in seven years, with no
continuity at all. She felt that none of them had a positive influence on the students and
she found that she was eventually was doing music for continuity’s sake and college
applications. She felt fortunate to have a transformative musical opportunity prior to
graduation:

I can’t say I enjoyed music in high school. I got the opportunity, though, to
come play with the [James Madison University Marching Royal Dukes] just in the stands and that really changed the outlook I had on how college band would be different from high school band and that’s what [was] kind of a defining factor in what made me want to continue music in college in general. Katie even said that she would have stopped playing music after high school if she did not have that experience. But, once she attended college, she became very involved in James Madison University’s marching band, the Marching Royal Dukes, and the JMU Pep Band, which performs at basketball games during the year.

*Playing with others.* Almost all research participants mentioned the excitement and collaborative feeling brought about by playing with others. Katie said that was one reason that she decided to pursue music as an adult. She missed being involved in a musical organization because something about it makes her happy, no matter if it is concert band or marching band. Doug made it clear that he loves music and playing his instrument, but said that if he only had solos at home to practice, he would always be able to find something else to do instead of playing. For Doug, the community band is fulfilling in that he gets to be involved with doing something that he loves with other people that love it. Speaking of his nearly constant community music experiences, Doug said:

[I]t was the fun of playing not just by yourself. Uh, the—sure, everyone does a lot of practice, but the ability to play with other people was kind of fun and to make something sound good and because you listen to the radio or, back then, tapes and CDs and stuff of good music and then sometimes you manage to do it yourself. That’s kind of cool. So, yeah, it was fun! So I kept doing it over and
over.

The most fulfilling thing about the HRCB for Karen was playing with other people. She considered herself an introvert and the HRCB was a great way to be away from work, in a relaxing environment, doing what she loves. Grace said, “I don’t know, there is something about creating things with other people, creating music especially, you know?” It was something intangible that Grace was describing, but was clearly present to her and other participants.

**Giving back to the community.** Giving back to the community through music was mentioned several times. Elizabeth found that the most personally satisfying part of being in the HRCB was making contributions to the community through music—it’s an act of selfless altruism that allowed her to contribute to the group and society. She really enjoyed that people were volunteering their time and talents to bring music to others, especially when they play at places where the audience members cannot go to other places to hear music: “I like playing at [Virginia Mennonite Retirement Community] or the retirement homes… it’s rewarding… it’s funny how people you’ve never talked to in your life come up to you after a concert to talk to you about how much they enjoyed it!”

Grace also loved the performances that the HRCB does because it’s a chance to give music to people who cannot see it anywhere else. For her, it was a sense of being “other-centered rather than self-centered,” which she found extremely rewarding. For Katie and Karen, the group was about bringing music to those who can’t get it elsewhere, specifically their performances at retirement homes and communities. Karen said it was rewarding to play for people who don’t get out much:
I think it’s interesting that you always get a lot of people that come up and thank you very much and they’ll know if you play—I heard Cathy say today that they’ll love the Rodgers and Hammerstein, and they will. They know all the music. They like the musicals, it kind of takes them back. It’s neat to see.

Steve mentioned that people really appreciate the concerts, even if the venues are not ideal:

It appears that the people really appreciate it, yeah. Although, sometimes the places that you’re playing are not ideal for concerts (laughs), you know, low ceilings, that sort of thing. But yeah, I think they enjoy it. And it is a rewarding thing to do. You know, it provides some music for a change.

The aspect of giving back to the community was mentioned specifically among several people, but self-expression was a theme that emerged implicitly.

**Self-expression.** Grace was in the band the longest of all the participants at eighteen years. She actively sought out many musical opportunities throughout her lifetime because she saw music as her a main part of her identity. This led her to make time for music amidst a growing family and busy lifestyle:

When you’re a stay-at-home mom, you look for places to interact with adults [laughs] and to be able to use whatever talents you’ve developed and when music is that much a part of your identity… growing up through middle school and high school and right up through marriage and college… I remember telling my husband, who is a physician, so working with his schedule and his call schedule and having a child was very difficult. Especially when we lived in Roanoke and he was in his residency. But I told him, ‘[t]here’s going to be lots of things about my life that are going to be
changing when we have children, when I choose to stay home, but the one
thing I do not want to lose is band. So however we make band happen, it has
to happen.’

Grace and her husband have a plan every Tuesday that involves her husband and
children giving Grace time to attend the HRCB. For her, the band was a de-stressor; a
chance to not just play the mother and wife roles, but a chance to show who she was as
a musician. Others did not mention their life and roles outside of HRCB affecting their
participation as much as Grace. However, Grace was the only stay-at-home mother and
at this stage in her life.

Katie considered herself to be good at her instrument and said that her
personality is one that she feels better when she does something at which she is good;
it is a “pick-me-up” for her whenever she can play. It’s something that she does for
her—less service oriented. Her job in healthcare administration was a stressful one,
and, while she does not consider the HRCB to be a de-stressor exactly, she noted that
she felt better, focused, and had a clearer mind when she played with the group. It was
a break away from everything else for a bit.

Like Katie, Karen mentioned the HRCB being a creative outlet that provided
stress-relief for her:

I think it’s kind of a fun [thing], you know, it’s a good outlet for me. A
good creative outlet for me… It’s a good way for me to participate… I do
have a stressful job, what [the HRCB] does is it helps me relax.

For Steve, his favorite part of the HRCB was having a chance to play; a chance
to express himself as a musician:
[T]hat’s really why I guess I’m in the band because I like to play. I mean, it
doesn’t necessarily mean playing the concerts; I just enjoy going to rehearsals.
You know, I don’t—concerts are okay, I mean, you do that but it’s not—I
don’t know, to me, it’s not that important… I guess that most of the people
that are in the band are similar to me; they just like to play. And so, [the
HRCB is] an outlet to do that.

Leisure time. Steve enjoyed playing his instrument and having a set routine to
do so. He practiced almost every day, which he made sure to note was not because he
should but because he liked to. Steve was also retired, which gave him more time to
devote to practicing than those with full-time jobs and children still living at home.
Rick was a great example of someone truly interested in lifelong learning and lifelong
engagement. He found that his mental and emotional health is better in check because
of his choice to continue learning and engagement in his older years. Rick practiced
about an hour every day, but when asked if he enjoys practicing, he hesitantly said
yes. He then explained the practicality of practicing; it’s necessary to practice to do
well and he believes that is true in all facets of life.

The other participants said the HRCB was a good use of their down time.
Practicing was not common among the other participants. Karen, like others, had a
full-time job, so it was hard for her to find time to practice, and coming back to
playing was difficult for her, but that has not changed her love for music and for
playing; she found it to be a great use of leisure time and recreation.

Musical motivations and satisfaction. Musical motivations for participants
included love of music, learning more about music, and satisfaction with musical
repertoire and performance. While it was easy for people to talk about and identify their personal motivations related to the HRCB, there were tensions about musical motivation and satisfaction within the group. Participants expressed dissatisfaction about the ensemble’s repertoire answered ambiguously when asked specifically how they are satisfied with how the group fits into their definition of musical satisfaction.

**Love of music.** When asked why she returned to music as an adult, Karen said that she loved music and that’s why she came back to it:

> It was just that I missed the music… I love music, I love all kinds of music—I like being part of [something] bigger, you know, even if I’m playing 3rd clarinet and off beats, just putting everything together and making it. I always enjoyed that.

Doug also loved music and getting a chance to play again:

> I certainly look forward to it, and I try not to miss practice. I’ve only missed one in the last two years… The fulfillment is…getting to play music again, and that’s cool. It’s a motivation for me to keep playing. If it were just me at home with a music stand and solos, I’ll always have something else I have to do.

Even though I love music and I’ve loved music forever. When you’re a parent with an academic job, you’re running around like a mad thing all the time.

> Having a set time that I have to be there has the advantage that it makes it more likely that I will do it. And enjoy it!

Katie’s involvement with college athletic bands really made her miss playing her instrument after her college graduation. That was the main motivator behind joining music as an adult for her:

> I figured out I was going to be living here for an extended period and just
wanted to get involved and everything and find some outlet to play in if I was
going to be here for a, seemingly, indefinite basis. So that’s really what pushed me and really just missing playing.

For Grace, playing her instrument was her niche, a place where she found who she was:

[M]usic was a very big part of my growing up. I mean, every kid is trying to find their place, especially if you go to public school and music was the place that I found… So it was just very much a part of my life.

Grace spoke the most passionately about her love for music and the things she’s done in her life to keep it a focal point. She saw the HRCB as much more than just a place to play her instrument.

**Learning more about music.** Learning during the HRCB was a point that participants did not agree on. For Rick, he came back to music after retiring. He and his wife decided to take classes at the James Madison University Lifelong Learning Institute (LLI) to have something to do and keep their minds sharp. Rick chose to be in the New Horizons Band in the LLI. His reasons for being in the New Horizons Band versus the HRCB differed, but together the bands provided him the mental acuity he was seeking:

[New Horizons is] where I go to get instruction essentially. Because in the community band, you can get by without necessarily doing it all right. But if you’re the only one of your kind in the LLI band, you have to get your act together. So, that’s where you learn to do stuff and then [you] go over to the
community band and do their concert series with them… [Playing an instrument] keep me learning to move fast… it makes you think and keeps us sort of busy… It keeps us moving along, and music is part of it. I’ve only missed one practice with LLI and I’ve only missed—I haven’t missed any practice with the community band.

Katie and Grace also thought that some level of instruction would be beneficial to the group. Both mentioned that the HRCB runs differently than what they were used to in concert bands. Katie thought the members were not there to get better musically, which was fine with her, but thought that more focus on improving various things would be better for the whole group. Grace discussed what she wanted musically out of the HRCB:

[A previous director] was like, ‘We aren’t a community band, we’re a concert band.’ And I agreed with him. I don’t want to come in—anybody can just throw something up on the stand and play it. I don’t want to play it like that, I want to play it musically. When we finish, people are sitting there like [makes amazed face]. That’s how I want to play music.

However, instruction is not something that every participant wanted or thought the group needed. Steve said that most people have been playing for many years so they do not necessarily want more instruction. Elizabeth echoed that sentiment, even bringing up past instruction in her musical career:

When I was in middle school or high school, I don’t really remember getting much instruction at all. No one ever told me how to play the clarinet (laughs). I mean, at a very basic level they did. Sometimes you have someone doing a
practicum or something and they happen to be a clarinet player and they give you little tips, but my band directors in school never really gave a lot of technical advice about playing clarinet. And I came into band already reading music so other than the act that I could read music already, I was pretty much self-taught on clarinet. So even now sometimes [the director] will say something and I’ll think ‘I didn’t know that!’ But there’s not a lot of that in the band and I think that’s okay. Like I said, I don’t think that anyone is there to be, ‘HRCB is my life and everybody’s got to do it right!’ That’s not why we are there.

Elizabeth also noted how she would feel if someone was teaching her:

Yeah, if I pick up a tip here or there, that’s fine. But if someone is full-on teaching me I’m going to feel like, ‘eeehhhhh you know what—this is a low-pressure situation and you’re making it not one’… we’re not there to be lectured.

Musical satisfaction. Doug felt that he was musically satisfied in the group because it fits his lifestyle. He did not want music that was going to take a lot of time to prepare, especially outside of rehearsal. Doug, like a few others when discussing personal motivations, liked the comfort of that level of music. He said that it definitely was not demanding like the music he played in the brass bands, but he was not looking for that type of musical involvement right now. He also enjoyed the variety of the music chosen, rather than the same type of music for every concert. For performances, he thought the music fit the crowds for the most part, but noted that you cannot please everyone. Mostly familiarity is something that should be considered when choosing
repertoire, he thought. As far as performance venues, Doug thought that the places where they perform provided limited audiences, and he’d prefer to perform at places where more people could be reached. When asked if this would mean more concerts, he said possibly, but he would not want that to be the outcome of changing venues. With everyone’s schedules, more concerts would be more challenging and would not fit many people’s lives.

Rick was personally musically satisfied because he got to play his instrument. His concern was with the audience. When asked if the audience generally enjoys the choice of repertoire, this was Rick’s response:

[long pause] Sometimes. Sometimes they don’t. Celebrate America is a very good example. Previous year, I had the same group of in-laws come to the Celebrate America thing. They generally have a big sort of cookout and then they go to the show. And two years ago we had a tremendous performance. Last year we had a really crummy selection of stuff and I got bad reviews from them. They didn’t have a problem with the quality of the playing, but they did have a tremendous problem with the repertoire. And so, in that particular scenario, too many fancy modern things didn’t do well. So, sometimes the repertoire works and sometimes it doesn’t.

His long pause was interesting—he made some faces that made me think he wasn’t sure if he should answer completely honestly. In his opinion, the audiences they play for want to hear things that are familiar and they are not at those concerts to “learn anything.” As he put it, “Gustav Holst doesn’t get big reviews.” Steve and Rick both shared the statement that in the HRCB the music is passed out and the director is the
only person who decides if it is played or not. According to Steve, the traditional autocratic ways of a concert band worked with repertoire, but according to Rick, it did not work.

The following conversation with Katie demonstrated how uncomfortable she was to give her opinion on her musical satisfaction with the HRCB:

Researcher [R]: In college, you were very involved in music, playing in the marching band and the pep band. Do you feel like you are musically satisfied right now in this group?
Katie [K]: uhm… the current group I play in?
R: Yes.
K: [long pause, scrunches up face] From a personal perspective, I get to play my instrument and that’s all I care about right now. From an ensemble perspective, I’m used to having higher expectations associated to [concert band] so that’s like settling to me but it’s… it doesn’t sway whether I do the ensemble or not, it’s just a new environment to get used to. It is what it is. One person isn’t going to sit in the back row and change it so… it’s alright for what it is.
R: So then mostly it’s the personal experience, the stress relief that you talked about, that’s really bringing you back, not so much the musical quality?
K: Absolutely. And the performances we do, they don’t stress, necessarily, musical quality. It’s a community ensemble, they’re really… the primary focus, or main events are, like, more geared toward getting people out and enjoying music rather than being some nationally talented symphony or wind band or any sort. So, yeah…
Katie clearly stated that she was not drawn to HRCB because of musical achievement, but rather for personal motivations. She also brought up that she does not feel as if she could change anything. The autonomy and agency that is generally characteristic of adult learning appears to not be a main part of the HRCB, or even many community bands due to the hierarchical nature of the “traditional” community band. Grace and Elizabeth also noted that they do not feel like they can change anything about the group. Both said that they never had a chance to express their thoughts and felt uncomfortable bringing issues up.

Elizabeth also was very hesitant when asked about repertoire and if she enjoyed it. She said that no, she did not typically enjoy it but is torn because she does not know what else they can play. One thing that she does recognize is important is what they do for the audience:

I think that it’s important that we throw in a few crowd pleasers whether that’s, you know, something Broadway or a movie or whatever. I don’t know, it’s kind of hard to get excited about standard concert band repertoire [laughs]. Am I the only one? [laughs].

Grace was especially unhappy with repertoire and concerts. She, like others, said that the audiences like variety, but mostly in the form of popular music and marches. During the summer, she thought that Sousa marches, movie themes, and collections were big hits. Around Christmas and the holidays, she thought the concert should consist of what the audience expects: Christmas music. Now, she said, the music is just a “hodge podge” of things and she does not invite her family when she thinks the concerts will not be enjoyable.
All participants mentioned how the group has a wide age range and a wide talent range. The participants themselves all are non-professional, amateur musicians so they all mentioned that they enjoyed playing with professionals in the group. Another group has formed in the Shenandoah Valley, the Valley Wind Ensemble, that is made up of only professional musicians in the area. Something that Grace found particularly exciting was when local college members or professionals came in to play with the band. She liked that it pushed her to play better and be a better musician, as she did not get a lot of that anymore. Now that the Valley Wind Ensemble is up and going, Grace expressed her sadness of some professionals leaving the HRCB to play in that group:

I’m a little disappointed about [Valley Wind Ensemble forming] because when [the professionals] see the quality go down in the community band, they are going to go somewhere else to play and that’s disappointing to us amateurs, who… we like to play with the professionals because it makes us better. Numbers of the professionals that have left the HRCB to go to the Valley Wind Ensemble and the reasons causing it have not been gathered, but Grace attributed their leaving to the way the music is rehearsed. She preferred that the HRCB was run as it used to be run, with no one being satisfied with coming in and just playing but rather actually rehearsing. This is counter to those that said they do not want to explicitly learn.
CHAPTER 5: SOCIAL STRUCTURES

[I] walk in the door, and there are generally a lot of other people warming up. I get there, kind of put my stuff down at my chair. Tom sits beside me and he always has a punny joke to tell so he’ll say, “You missed rehearsal last week,” and I’ll tell him why and he’ll make a pun out of it. He’s very sweet. - Katie

Observations of the HRCB made it clear that most socializing occurs within sections. When they entered, the section members said hello, rehearsal happened, rehearsal ended, and everyone packed up. According to the participants, there was not a great deal of socializing, especially among members across the band. Although the participants in this study said that playing music with others is a main factor for playing music, when asked about their friendships in the band, many said they did not know the people in the group.

When asked if it was part of their social life, the only people gave it significance were Rick and Steve, who are both retired. Rick thought of the band as one of his many hobbies, along with cars and dog shows, and considered the band one of the main parts of his social life. They reflected that even if they do not talk often with people outside of their section, they got some sort of social interaction from the group.

Elizabeth, like many others, mentioned that one of her favorite parts about playing music is playing with others. But when asked about the social side of the band, she said:

I mentioned the social aspect, but the truth is I hardly know anybody’s name. I know the faces just being there a long time but mostly I talk to the people in my section and a few people that I know from outside the band are from previous
life [laughs]. So yeah, I don’t think of it as... while I enjoy playing with the people and enjoy seeing them and I talk with them, I haven’t formed any friendships with any of them and they’re mostly strangers that I smile at if I run into them outside of the band [laughs].

Doug said that there is no social element for him in the band but he knows about ten people in the band. He said that getting to know those ten people took him months and even years.

Katie, the youngest participant, speculated that the lack of socializing could be due to a large gap in ages:

[A]fter school it’s weird adjusting to your surroundings in general, so I don’t know that the band itself should be viewed as a basis of a change to my social life, positively or negatively. It’s just, there’s a large age gap in that band.

Uhm… [I’m] probably one of the younger people. I’m the youngest person out of school of any kind, for sure. And there is no real sense of camaraderie to hanging out or doing potlucks or go out to dinner as a group or anything like that. It really is just a group of people who get together to play music and leave.

I’m sure that maybe some people hang out, but I don’t run in those circles.

When asked whether they would be interested in a break in the middle of rehearsal to get to know others or have a little refreshment, participants answered with a unanimous “no.” Grace, Doug, and Elizabeth said that a social break in the middle would make them, and, most likely the rest of the band, feel uncomfortable. Grace said that it would feel strange and she wonders how many people are actually interested in socializing and forming relationships. Elizabeth and Doug also shared the
sentiment that a social break in the middle would make them feel juvenile. Rick, Steve, Doug, and Elizabeth said that thought a break in the middle would take away from rehearsal time because it would probably go longer than intended and rehearsals were already long. Rick, in particular, was against any unscheduled time:

You can’t just… you can’t have anarchy; it’s got to be organized. I think everybody expects that. You know, you don’t really have free will if you play in a band. It has to be structured. It’s the way everybody has been used to it working all the time… [M]ost everybody has come up through high school and maybe the college band or college orchestra. The fooling around gets pushed out of you in high school. You come out a senior still in the band, you did okay.

The rest of the get thrown out the first year.

Going into this study, I expected to find that the members of the HRCB relied heavily on their social interactions and meaningful relationships with one another for social capital and trust, and that they sought out friendships among the people sitting around them. The results showed instead of camaraderie and neighborliness, there seemed to be a sense that people do not know each other because that is “just how it is.”

**Social belonging and motivation.** The need to belong and be accepted is very strong for humans and relates to people’s identities and behavior. The members of the HRCB shared a collective identity as participants in the band, and a sense of acceptance was important to the participants. Each member felt that the group itself was accepting, allowing a sense of belonging; however, the experiences and timeline differed for different people.

Karen said that she felt accepted in the group from the time she walked in, and
that most people were just very excited to have more people to play with. Steve did not have much to say on his acceptance other than he has always felt accepted in the group and that new members were always welcomed.

Elizabeth remembered a bit of her first rehearsal with the group. Her section asked her excitedly to play first part for her instrument so she did. When asked about feeling accepted in the group, Elizabeth said that she felt out of place for the entire first season because the person she sat next to was very shy and she did not know anyone else. Over time she has gotten to know more people and has felt more accepted the more people she knows.

Rick came in at the beginning of a season and has no memory of being introduced to the group other than to his fellow tuba players. He noted that the band members are accepting, and unless you “have a real bad attitude”, there would be no problem. Even then, he did not know of anyone shunned. Grace, however, said that she knew of one case where someone left the HRCB and asked to come back but was told that he was not allowed to come back due to some negative interaction with the director that was not related to the music. A look at HRCB’s website revealed that attitude problems or issues were never addressed in the official information on the group. The observational field notes by the researcher revealed no true attitude issues, aside from a talkative person being shushed occasionally.

There was one participant who felt accepted in a different way than the other participants. Katie, the youngest of the participants and one of the youngest members of the HRCB, said that she did not remember her first rehearsal and that no one ever introduced her, but she knew some people in the trumpet section. Even though she did
not remember the details of her first rehearsal, when asked when she started to feel accepted in the group, she said:

> Pretty much immediately. Even when I was true new kid on the block; never been there. That’s the thing about band kids or band people. It’s like, ‘You play an instrument? Cool, let’s hang out.’ So there was never, like, an adjustment period or any sort of, like, ‘I don’t belong here.’ I can play and yeah… I think if I couldn’t play they’d still take me maybe [laughs].

Katie’s statement said that she feels accepted, overall. However, she then went on to say that she also kind of felt like an outsider due to her age:

> If anything it is almost like an unspoken pressure to find people who are my age as well… The whole point is that as people move on or can’t play anymore that you have new folks come in and generally new folks would maybe mean a younger grouping of people who could start picking up some of those positions. So, not that anyone has ever approached me about that, but being younger, it is… it’s just like, is it an expectation? I could totally be making it up but… I might not be [laughs].

It appeared that Katie felt conditionally accepted in the group. All the actions toward her and the interactions around her told her that she was accepted as a member of the group, but she was under the impression that she had an unspoken duty in the group.

Katie’s mention that they’d still take her even if she could not play was important, as well. Rick also said that you do not have to be very talented to participate in the group.

Elizabeth, when noting that the age range of the group is large, said that they do not
necessarily want a beginner sixth grader coming to play in the group. There were not a lot of expectations but she thought that one is probably being able to read the level of music that they play. When data was originally collected, their website said they will accept a beginner sixth grader in their group. However, since original collection, their website has been updated with a page dedicated to “Requirements for Participation.” Of membership, it states: “Membership is open to individuals who are interested in being part of an established ensembles, play traditional concert band instruments, and are proficient enough on their instrument to be able to competently perform the selected repertoire” (Harrisonburg-Rockingham Concert Band, n.d.).

The website stated proficiency as a requirement for participation, and even said a playing test can happen at the discretion of the director, with postponed membership as a potential consequence. Yet participants remained unsure of the standards for acceptance in the group.

Observation notes revealed that there was also a wide range of ability in the group. Grace brought up how the acceptance of almost anyone affected her:

So when you’re in a community band, anybody can come and play. And most of the time, when people do come and play, it’s a really great experience and you get to play with all different kinds of people. But you sometimes don’t. And we went through a period… it was about a three-year period, where the saxophone section was tortuous in the band.

And I went away on a seven-week western trip and when I came home I was going to quit the band.
Socialization

Every participant mentioned the initial welcome they received from the group and how they were immediately shown where to sit and the location of the music. Humans are very social beings; we exert effort into belonging and being accepted. Band members have been socialized to act in specific ways and the interactions and structure of the group reinforced acceptance, depending on how players aligned with those expectations.

One observed socialized behavior related to speaking in the ensemble. Over time, it was obvious to me as the observer that most people did not voice their opinions to the group. While a select few occasionally offered a suggestion, for the most part, people did not. Because most people observed that others do not speak up, they seemed to accept that it was not a part of the group dynamic. In field notes and observations, there was one person, a nonparticipant in this study, who spoke his mind quite regularly in rehearsal. The opinion was usually met with shushes and comments back to him.

Rick and Doug, when asked about speaking up and voicing opinions, only mentioned that the professionals in the group do it:

Rick: They’re so many professionals in there, besides us non-professionals that are just sort of the spear carries in the operas… the professional level communicates among themselves a little bit more, and, generally speaking, it works.

Doug: Some of us just sit down and play our parts and enjoy it. Some people, especially those that have been there for a long time and have worked in promoting the band and doing stuff, I think they are a little more vocal. Then
again, we have a ridiculous number of professionals in the music biz in that band. So, maybe that’s part of why they feel that they can speak up more. I have no problem with that.

Grace and Elizabeth said that they felt uncomfortable speaking up in the middle of rehearsal, and, for Grace, even in leadership meetings. Elizabeth was very unsure about even having the chance to voice her opinion because she did not want to put pressure on anyone, considering it was a low-pressure environment. Grace said that many decisions were made that the group had no say in, and she thought they should have a say. But she did not feel that she could speak up at any moment. She noted several times that the band had no forum for expressing opinions about anything with anonymity, which was important for her. Others were more accepting about not voicing their opinions. Steve said he was okay with it because he was just there to play. Katie felt that she had nothing of importance to say because she does not know how the group ran and was not a professional or a veteran of the group.

Is the HRCB “y’all come”? It appeared that the members were socialized to not speak up in rehearsal unless they were part of the founding crowd or a professional. If we consider the traditional autocratic band classroom, that is very typical. Perhaps they were so accustomed to the “traditional band classroom” that they did not question it.

While the assumption was that HRCB and other community music groups are all-welcoming, do its policies and processes reflect the unconditional and unpredictable nature of full acceptance? To accept everyone and anyone without regard to any prerequisites is a purist view of community groups. For a community
group to achieve this almost utopian view of acceptance, it would truly have to accept everyone that showed up. This calls into question the practicality of an all-welcoming community music group. Would a desire for this type of acceptance even be a responsible one?
CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, & IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this study was to explore motivations for participation, how social structures influence the adult non-professional members of the Harrisonburg-Rockingham Concert Band (HRCB), and identify the characteristics of community in the band. Themes emerged from the participants’ interviews, but as the experiences are lived experiences by the participants of this study as members of the HRCB the results are not generalizable to other contexts. The results informed the following research questions:

**Question 1: What are the motivations for participation of non-professional adults in the HRCB?**

The motivations of the participants in this study were varied, but supported expectations. Personal, musical, and social motivations each emerged aligning with literature in this area (Cavitt, 2005; Coffman, 2002, Coffman, 2009; Elkington & Stebbins, 2014; Stebbins, 1992). Personal motivations can include self-expression, recreation or leisure time, self-improvement, and self-efficacy (Cavitt, 2005; Coffman, 2002; Coffman, 2009). Personal motivations in this study revealed five different themes: (1) past experiences, (2) playing with others, (3) giving back to the community, (4) self-expression, and (5) leisure time.

Bowles (1991), Cavitt (2005), and Coffman (1996) found that most involvement in adult music participation is linked to past music experiences and participation. The results indicated that was a main factor for seeking out the HRCB as participants all had a background of some type of formal music participation. Doug’s experiences with music began at home, prior to formal education, which was also a
result in a study by Cavitt (2005). Additionally, many of the participants had a significant break of ten or more years from their instrument before returning to a music ensemble. As noted by Pitts, Robinson, & Goh (2015), some cease music participation after several years due to concerns about their standard of playing, pressure of other commitments such as family and job responsibilities, or an unwelcome ensemble experience. Apart from two participants, others mentioned their break overlapping with typical life developments after your schooling years, such a full-time job and starting a family. These aspects alone are enough for many to never come back to music, but the participants each sought out a way to return.

Playing with other people that enjoy that same activity was another important idea mentioned by participants. White (2016) found that participants in her study placed the highest value on playing and performing at a high level with others. The social dimension of playing with “one’s neighbours [sic]…in one’s home community” was also cited as important (White, 2016, p. 167). In the HRCB the interaction seemed to be more musical than social. The participants said “playing with other people” was important to them but then went on to say that it was not the specific people in the group so much as the act of making music together that drew them.

Participants frequently cited giving back to the community in this study, as many saw their performing as a way of contributing to the community. This aligns with White (2016), who found that people in her study felt as if they were contributing to the cultural life and social capital of their community. As Grace put it, participation allowed her to be “other-centered instead of self-centered.”

Myers (1992) concluded that participants experience high levels of satisfaction
and achievement in adult education programs when learning meets expressive needs. Participants noted self-expression regarding their identity as a person involved in music as an important factor in their participation. Grace mentioned that it gave her a chance to be herself and not just a mother or wife. Katie and Karen both used music as an outlet to express themselves and to de-stress. Their obligation to the HRCB and music was not part of making a viable living, so their time involved is a use of leisure time.

Rick and Steve, both retired participants, also mentioned the use of leisure time. They have both entered the life stage that allows renewed interest in prior skills and in pursuing something new. They have raised their children, watched their children depart from home, and transitioned from professional life to retired life, leaving them with more time to pursue participation in civic and community activities (Tsugawa, 2009). They also both mentioned practicing on a regular basis. Other cited pressures from family and job as reasons they could not practice as frequently as they wanted or needed. Even without being able to practice as much as some would like, the participants stated that the HRCB was an important use of their leisure time. The leisure time described by participants falls under the “non-work obligations, semi-leisure” category by Parker (1983), meaning there are obligations related to the chosen activity, but the line between obligation and leisure is unclear due to the attitude toward the activity.

Each participant in this study was an amateur musician according to the stipulations by Stebbins (1992), aligning with Serious Leisure Perspective (SLP) by Elkington & Stebbins (2014). Their amateurism put them in a direct line between the
public and professionals, just as in the P-A-P model (Gates, 1991). The use of professional standards of instruction, rehearsal, and performance evident within the HRCB also aligns with literature on SLP and the P-A-P model (Elkington & Stebbins, 2014; Gates, 1991). Per Wagner, Lounsbury, and Fitzgerald (1989), those intrinsically motivated to participate in an activity in search of satisfaction, fulfillment, and enjoyment consider their time with that activity leisure. The participants who considered fear of failure above satisfaction, fulfillment, and enjoyment were less likely to consider the activity leisure. Perhaps it is because of this that two of this study’s participants did not consider themselves musicians—fear of failure or a stigma around the word “musician.” Rick said:

I enjoy playing in the band but I’m not a hardcore trying-to-be-a-musician person. Try to do the best I can each time. Sometimes it works and sometimes it doesn’t. I enjoy trying, I enjoy being there. It’s a nice thing… It’s fun to do and it’s nice to have a good concert from time to time…I play an instrument and I try to play it at the best of my ability at more or less the right time but I am not a musician. When I played in the [James Madison University] Orchestra, I sat between musicians who would help me when it was my turn to play because I usually lost count of the rests because my mind wandered and I just didn’t count my rests well. I still don’t do that very well. But they were—those were musicians. I could never consider myself a musician. I didn’t have the drive for it.

Karen also stated that she does not consider herself a musician:

I am not a musician, I am an accountant [laughs]… I know some people who
are natural. I have a good sense of rhythm, I have a pretty good ear. But clarinet is is [laughs]. Show me piano music and it’s like “no! I can’t deal with that!”

Karen and Rick both considered music to be a part of their identity, especially in the past, but did not consider themselves musicians, people who play or make music. This aligns with the findings of Kruse (2007), who found that participants in his study who were adult non-professional musicians also did not find themselves to be “musicians.” Many of those participants mentioned the same aspects as Rick and Karen; some mentioned that maybe one day they’d be a musician and one said that he didn’t consider himself a “musician with a capital ‘M’” (2007). While Rick and Karen felt uncomfortable calling themselves musicians, the other participants were less concerned with the notion of being good enough that surrounds the term. This further suggests that the P-A-P model is viewed as being only one option, but should be a continuum to account for those who are, or believe themselves, to be in between public and amateur or amateur and professional.

A concept that seemed to be an objective of motivation rather than a driving force was quality of life (QOL). Adults like to have control over their time and the ways in which they use their time (Mantie, 2015). This generally leads seeking out activities that are satisfying and rewarding in some way. Each participant agreed that they would not be in the HRCB if they did not find something satisfying about the group. Their participation in this group is a large part of their QOL—they have an outlet for expression, a moment away from the demands of everyday life, and find satisfaction in the group. Grace spoke very often of how big a role the band plays in her
life. She said that her quality of life would suffer without the band in her life:

If you interact with younger people, that always keeps you- improves your quality of life, keeps you young, and just how you live life, so it definitely improved my quality of life.

One aspect of QOL that may not be a motivator but rather potentially a limitation is health. Health is a major component of successful aging, which assists in improving a person’s QOL (Ageing and life-course, n.d; Ahmed-Mohamed et al., 2015; Health-Related Quality of Life, 2016; Rowe & Kahn, 1997; Solé Resano et al., 2010; WHO, 2002). Health limitations potentially interfere with needs that involve actively participating in success and creating and completing personal goals (Stebbins, 1992).

When asked if there were any limitations affecting their previous return to music and current participation, participants conveyed that the hardest part was getting their embouchure back in shape and their technique back. Each noted these factors as being difficult, even for Katie, who had the shortest time away from her instrument.

None of the participants stated they had any cognitive change in their health over the years. For Doug, Karen, and Katie, getting back their embouchure and technique were the only physical limitations that they had experienced when coming back to music. Steve, Elizabeth, and Grace each had slight vision problems, but it only minimally affected their participation. Steve and Grace both mentioned hearing issues. Steve used hearing aids in rehearsal and Grace used earplugs because of diagnosed hearing loss. Rick had diagnosed Parkinson ’s Disease, which took around a year to get diagnosed and medicated. He credited his still-sharp mind to his jobs over the years requiring many “inputs,” as he called them. He never had a moment of stasis in his life,
even now in his retirement, so he believed that, along with staying up-to-date with current technology, kept his mind young. He found that his mental and emotional health was better in check because of his choice to continue learning and engagement in his older years, aligning with much of the research (Boswell, 1992; Busch, 2005; Jarvis, 2009; Kruse, 2009; Mantie, 2012; Myers, 1992; Myers, Bowles, & Dabback, 2013; Pitts, 2009; Tsugawa, 2009).

Another outcome of involvement in a music ensemble as an adult may be lifespan engagement. Participants each noted that they favored the low-pressure environment of the HRCB. Most also said that they preferred to not specifically “learn” in the HRCB. This created a divide in the results, as some wanted to play harder music but most did not want to be “taught.” “Low pressure” was something that every single participant mentioned. They each liked the low-pressure feel of the community band. Yet this creates potential tension. If people want to play harder music or want to sound better, they may require a level of education. Many community music ensembles are generally modeled on professional ensembles—an aspect of the P-A-P system (Gates, 1991). School groups in the United States also typically follow this model, making it a familiar system to all who went through band in grade school. However, Myers (1992) promotes specific teacher instruction when teaching adults because it should differ from school music, depending on the purpose of the group. So, if learning is not desired, are they still engaged? The results suggest that they are indeed engaged; they joined the activity to be active in participation, aligning with the literature from Lave and Wenger’s (1991) Situated Learning Theory, and Mantie (2012), who proposed that “every activity arguably involves some form of learning as
a prerequisite; it may or may not involve explicit teaching or instruction” (p. 223). It is certainly a question worth asking to improve and understand how certain community music groups work: Is there a way to play harder music, get better musically, and still have a low-pressure environment? If learning is not desired, is it lifelong learning? Or is it rather lifelong engagement? How do we define those boundaries?

**Question 2: How do the institutional social structures influence the adult non-professional members of the HRCB?**

The social behavior suggested by the results was a mix of expected and surprising. Coffman (2009) and Cavitt (2005) both note that a main motivation and value in adult music participation is social interaction. However, it was obvious from participant interviews and researcher observations that deliberate social interaction in the form of talking and non-musical interaction was rare. The only participants who mentioned the group as a part of their social lives in any way were Rick and Steve, the two retired participants. They both expressed that even if they do not talk often with people outside of their section, they still get some sort of social interaction from the group. This aligns with much of the research of older adults in music groups and their social motivation (Ahmed-Mohamed, 2015; Cavitt, 2005; Myers, 1992; Myers et al., 2013; Solé Resano, 2010; Tsugawa, 2009).

With respect to social capital, “group gains,” as mentioned by Putnam (2000) are apparent—the HRCB is a community group generating social capital between themselves and the audience (such as in the P-A-P system), where both receive immediate and personal benefits. Trust, a main social capital indicator, was present in that the participants trusted the group to perform its function as a community music
group and to socialize the incoming members to the norms of the group (Cox, 1995). In this way, bonding social capital was built and accrued among the members as they recognized their collective identity. The social capital that happened outside of rehearsing music appeared to be bridging social capital, as the members and participants were more distant friends than close with dense connections (Babaei, Ahmad, & Gill, 2012; Langston, 2011; Woolcock, 2001). Once the rehearsal began, however, the social capital accrued in that time and space was linking—a social capital with vertical relationships, typical of the traditional, autocratic concert band. While social capital generally requires overt relationships and interactions among individuals, it seemed that the social capital mostly present in the HRCB was less among individuals and more a trust and involvement with the group itself, counter to the literature that suggests social capital is mostly among individuals (Gotto, Calkins, Jackson, Walker, & Beckmann, 2010).

Another way people create social capital in the HRCB was through musical interaction, which many called social interaction. Whereas social interaction is easy to identify, musical interaction is harder to conceptualize. Making music together is intangible, and the meaning structure involved is difficult to express in conceptual terms (Schütz, 1951). The people in the HRCB did not seem to value the social relationships among the members given their lack of bonding through language. Yet through a sociological lens, communication and the interplay of understood gestures among participants can broadly constitute language (Schütz, 1951). In other words, the musical interplay among the members of the HRCB was a specific language that is understood interpersonally, conveying meaning to those who understand it. Results
show that this concept of creating something larger than themselves, however briefly, created a communal sense of identity, which participants sought. This in turn formed social capital in the HRCB.

While social capital appeared to be group-based, individual social belonging remained a concern for study members. The belonging needed among members of the HRCB was met by the hospitable welcome of the group to new members. In general, participants said that even if they were not personally welcomed into the group, they certainly felt accepted. Katie said that she felt accepted because “[t]hat’s the thing about band kids or band people”—she believed that there was something bigger, something intangible, perhaps a communal identity, causing the feeling of acceptance rather than specifically the members of the HRCB being accepting.

It seemed apparent that organizational socialization occurs in the group, something that is expected in any community, civic, or work group socialization (Kramer, 2010; Schein, 1988; Schein, 2010; Van Maanen, 1978; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979), yet it took an unexpected form. Results show that the acceptable behavior toward social interaction was not to interact socially. Each member said that they do not personally know other people in the band to a large extent. Doug mentioned knowing about ten people, and that took him months—even years—to do. It appeared that it was not a priority to them. Each member also noted that they did not think a social break in the middle of rehearsal would be welcomed and deemed it “juvenile.” This could be because school music experiences were largely social and now that each participant had their own world and experiences with plenty of social interactions (e.g. job acquaintances, church friends, family), they were not seeking that
in their participation with the HRCB. Instead, they were seeking a way to play their instrument in the same, familiar way that they learned to play their instrument—among others.

Another aspect of socialization, assimilation, was apparent in the findings. When people assimilate in organizational socialization, they reduce the risk of rejection by essentially blending into the crowd (Kramer, 2010). The participants were not comfortable voicing opinions to the band, even when their needs were not being met. Their thoughts and actions were diluted to avoid confrontation of any type. In this way, the group dynamics could potentially suffer (Leary & Allen, 2011). Perhaps finding a way for the participants to voice their opinions, even anonymously, would see that more needs are met and more people are satisfied.

Question 3: What characteristics of community are present within the HRCB?

As evidenced in the first chapter, “community” is not easy to identify (Delanty, 2010). It is a dynamic and fluid notion; it is not necessarily generalizable and can change in different contexts. For the HRCB, it was clear they considered themselves a community band. They shared a strong group feeling—something intangible that participants were unable to express, so they instead said “playing with others,” but denied the other people being the reason they were there. The social interaction taking place was not necessarily meaningful socially, but it was happening and it was meaningful in some way. Perhaps the type of community could be best explained by social belonging and communitas.

Social belonging and communitas are connected to each other in this study, but also to motivations and social structures. The basic human need to belong and
participate was present in the HRCB, motivating the members’ participation (Carlsen, 1988; Dunning, 2011; Leary & Allen, 2011; Walton & Cohen, 2011). In order to belong, a person must learn how the group works in terms of institutional social structures through the process of socialization and the generation of social capital (Chao et al., 1994; Jones, 2010; Schein, 1988; Schein, 2010; Van Maanen, 1978; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). The norms of the HRCB lead people to seek acceptance and belonging in the group, allowing them to take on a meaningful life together as the HRCB.
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The liminal aspect of HRCB was not mentioned by the participants, but it emerged in the findings. While it plays a part in supporting *communitas* and social belonging, it was a factor of the social structures and norms of the group. The space in which the HRCB meets was a liminal one—people came and occupied the space
together for short amounts of time and leave. Liminality as researched by Victor Turner (1967) and Edith Turner (2012) would require a next step, as it is an “in-between moment,” according to Turner (1967). However, in the case of HRCB, there is no next step. For HRCB, the liminality in place is not in-between because it is not moving to a different status with people standing eagerly at the threshold. The space is a communal space—one that is set aside in their minds solely for the purpose of the HRCB. In this way, they reserve that space as one with a collective identity of the Harrisonburg-Rockingham Concert Band. It is a space where they meet each other once a week for several months out of the year; it is a space where they come together to create something intangible that they find meaningful. Ultimately, the liminal aspect of the HRCB represents this space away from the daily pressure of social responsibilities and a space where the equality among the members brings about a sense of community.

Most participants stated that the band specifically was not a social outlet for them. In relation to social capital, the relationships among the band seemed to be less about individual relationships and more about the collective identity of the band, or *communitas* (Turner, 2012). The liminality and in-between feeling existed because the members of HRCB have been socialized to see the community in this way: liminal only, no extra socializing. So, although the interactions were liminal, or brief and in-between, the idea of *communitas*, as defined by Edith Turner, explains this clear sense of communal identity. The personal knowledge and meaningful social interaction did not need to be present for their lives together to take on meaning. This also aligns with the concept of a symbolic community—one consisting of what people want it to be and what people think it is (Cohen, 2013).
Each smaller theme is an ingredient, rather than a building block, for this unique community. In the HRCB, the members experience, individually, motivations, social capital, social belonging, and socialization. The group experienced the collective identity of the HRCB; the members were satisfied and motivated to participate in this community and everyone received something back from this community, including the public.

**Conclusion & Implications**

The purpose of this study was to understand the workings of motivations, social structures, and community in the HRCB. Results offer insights into community music, music participations motivations, social structures, and music education beyond the classroom. The idea of community was the main basis of this study, which influences perceptions of community music. Community music is defined in many ways (Veblen, 2008). This study can only define community as perceived in the HRCB. The lived experiences of the participants helped to shape this definition, a completely unique one consisting of many relationships and ingredients. Veblen (2008) examines community music definitions, not with the hope of defining community music, but to “emphasize the inherent diversity of [community music] programmes, their situated natures and the fluidity of this global phenomenon” (p. 5). This statement captures the essence of community music—diverse in every aspect. Employing this study to a different community music ensemble would produce different motivations and social structures, and, therefore, a different community. It is my hope that community music groups can be seen not as one type or another (although labeling can be a helpful surface-level indicator) but as independent, unique, and individual communities.
This study also has implications for music education. There should be more connection and cooperation between school music educators and adult music educators to truly encourage lifelong learning and lifespan engagement. Lifelong learning and engagement is often cited as an end-goal for music education, and this study is a glimpse into why people stop participating in music and why they come back to music. An emphasis on learning and engagement in adulthood would require a more comprehensive teacher education program. Current teacher education programs focus primarily on teaching those who are in their schooling years. Collegiate Schools of Music and professional organizations such as the National Association for Music Education are also primarily focused on a target population of those in their schooling years. If there more were offerings in higher education for adult learning, it is entirely possible that more people will become competent adult educators. This could initiate a rise in adult music education, helping to bridge the gap between school music and community music, and leading to more opportunities for adult music participation.

Findings correlate prior musical participation to current musical engagement for the participants. However, the musical satisfaction among the participants was not high. Relevance and recruitment are two important concepts in community music groups. Many participants mentioned that the repertoire chosen was not satisfactory to them or the audience. Does this make HRCB less relevant to them? How does this change what we should be experiencing in K-12 music classrooms? The question of relevance in life and in musical preferences offers opportunities for long-term research that could inform connections between primary music education and adult music education. Recruitment for adult music ensembles is and should be handled different than recruitment for
some groups welcome everyone while others target specialists, e.g. bluegrass jam sessions. Having a social media presence and an advertising/personal relations position would help spread the word. A clear idea by the leaders and members of which type of community music ensemble is represented will help to determine who is welcomed and encouraged to join.

Participants mentioned that they liked playing with other people at various times throughout the study. While the group numbers currently have dramatically increased since the completion of data collection, the group numbers had been diminishing over the years. There were less professionals, amateurs, and students coming to the group and staying. Was this because of unmet needs? Or was it because of unawareness in the community and the schools? This is another reason that the field of music education should be seeking ways to bridge the gap between music in the schooling years and music in the rest of life.

This study explored the ways in which a community was defined in the Harrisonburg- Rockingham Concert Band. This unique community reflected *communitas* and a search for social belonging, not unlike the norms of other community music groups. However, the motivations and social structures involved in the HRCB are unique to these participants and their lived experiences. This was their community in this point in time. The active nature of “community” changes often in different circumstances. It is possible—in fact, almost inevitable—that in a year, five years, or ten years, members will find new ways to engage and belong, and the sense of *communitas* within the HRCB will change as a result.

Future research relating to this specific study might include a long-term study
with the HRCB; they have a new director that began after the completion of this study. A longitudinal study of the HRCB would offer a new perspective of the fluid nature of community in a specific context. Additionally, research studies relating to this topic will continue to provide insight into lifelong learning and engagement, quality of life, music education outside of K-12 schools, and music in the community for people across the lifespan.
APPENDIX A: CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Identification of Investigators & Purpose of Study
You are being asked to participate in a research study conducted by Sarah Wilson from James Madison University. The purpose of this study is to study the changes in the socialization and quality of life of non-professional adult musicians in community music groups, specifically the Harrisonburg-Rockingham Community Band. This study will contribute to the researcher’s completion of her master’s thesis.

Research Procedures
Should you decide to participate in this research study, you will be asked to sign this consent form once all your questions have been answered to your satisfaction. This study consists of an interview that will be administered to individual participants at your rehearsal space. You will be asked to provide answers to a series of questions related to your relationship with music and the Harrisonburg-Rockingham Community Band. Participants will be audio recorded using voice recording software on an iPad.

Time Required
Participation in this study will require 30-60 minutes of your time. It is possible that the researcher will ask for a follow-up interview for clarification. You have the right to deny a follow-up interview.

Risks
The investigator does not perceive more than minimal risks from your involvement in this study (that is, no risks beyond the risks associated with everyday life).

Benefits
There are no direct benefits to participants of this study. Overall perceived benefits include a better understanding of how the Harrisonburg-Rockingham Community Band fits into the lives of its participants and how those participants benefit from its existence.

Confidentiality
The results of this research will be written in the researcher’s master’s thesis. The results of this project will be coded in such a way that the respondent’s identity will not be attached to the final form of this study and pseudonyms will be used from the beginning of the study. The researcher retains the right to use and publish non-identifiable data. While individual responses are confidential, aggregate data will be presented representing averages or generalizations about the responses as a whole. All data will be stored in a secure location accessible only to the researcher. Upon completion of the study, all information on paper that matches up individual respondents with their answers will be destroyed via shredding. All recordings and transcriptions on the researcher’s computer will stay on the password protected computer and in password encrypted folders.
Participation & Withdrawal
Your participation is entirely voluntary. You are free to choose not to participate. Should you choose to participate, you can withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind.

Questions about the Study
If you have questions or concerns during the time of your participation in this study, or after its completion or you would like to receive a copy of the final aggregate results of this study, please contact:

Sarah Wilson Dr. William Dabback
School of Music School of Music
James Madison University James Madison University
wilso3se@dukes.jmu.edu (540) 568-3464
dabbacwm@jmu.edu

Questions about Your Rights as a Research Subject
Dr. David Cockley
Chair, Institutional Review Board
James Madison University
(540) 568-2834
cocklede@jmu.edu

Giving of Consent
I have read this consent form and I understand what is being requested of me as a participant in this study. I freely consent to participate. I have been given satisfactory answers to my questions. The investigator provided me with a copy of this form. I certify that I am at least 18 years of age.

I give consent to be audio taped during my interview._______(initials)

Name of Participant (Printed) Date

Name of Participant (Signed) Date

Name of Researcher (Signed) Date

If willing, please include your email address for follow-up:

Email address: ____________________________________________

[Signature]
APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1) What is your background in music?

2) What led you to pursue music as an adult?
   a) [For those who have a background on their instruments]
      i) Have you had a break in your playing over the years?
      ii) Is playing your instrument more difficult than earlier in your life? Have you had to change anything about how you play your instrument?

3) How does HRCB fit into your life?
   a) When did you decide that joining the group was something that you needed/wanted to do? Explain.
   b) Do you think you experience music differently now than you did before you joined HRCB? How?

4) Have you experienced any cognitive or physical changes since joining HRCB?
   a) How has your participation in HRCB related to those changes?

5) What is different about your life from before joining HRCB to after?
   a) How has your social life changed since joining HRCB?

6) Do you feel accepted in the group? How do (or not) people make you feel accepted?
   a) When did you start to feel accepted as a member of the group?
   b) How do you think the group reacts to new members?

7) Describe a typical rehearsal.

8) Do you practice often? Does that provide any joy for you? Elaborate.
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