I examine the factors contributing to within-subculture variation in the affective meanings (evaluation, potency, and activity) associated with roles and behaviors central to the jamband subculture belief system. The jamband subculture is a group somewhat like a contemporary version of the subculture surrounding the rock music band the Grateful Dead. The analyses are divided into two studies.

In the first study I use two continuous measures of subculture involvement (ideological embeddedness and behavioral-relational involvement) to examine the relationship between involvement in the jamband subculture and the affective meanings associated with eighteen roles. I find that the two continuous measures of subculture involvement are related positively to the evaluation of subculture roles, yet only ideological embeddedness is associated with the potency of subculture roles. Both measures are negatively to the evaluation of authority roles. However, neither ideological embeddedness nor behavioral-relational involvement is related significantly to the potency of authority roles. Thus, jamband subculture members are not a homogeneous group.

In the second study I use differential association theory to explain the distinctive affective meanings associated with six behaviors that are relevant to the jamband
subculture. The findings suggest that although differential association theory does in part explain the development of unique behavior meanings, the theory may not be suited to fully explain distinctive behavior meanings that develop in this subculture. Further findings suggest that the relationships between the modalities and behavior meanings may be more complex than differential association theory proposes. Specifically, there may be mediating and suppressing relationships among the modalities.

This dissertation makes methodological contributions to studies of subcultural meaning socialization and the general subculture literature. First, whereas past studies of subcultural meaning socialization use bivariate statistics to examine subcultural meaning variation, I use multivariate methods to do so. Second, whereas subculture studies generally use qualitative methods to investigate attitudes and behavior, I provide a quantitative measure of ideological embeddedness and behavioral-relational involvement in the first study. Third, I measure behavior definitions with affective behavior meanings in the second study. Measuring definitions with affective meanings provides a universal, unintrusive, and parsimonious way of measuring attitudes within subcultures.
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A basic assumption of symbolic interactionism is that individuals within a given culture share meanings for most social concepts (Stryker 1980). This assumption is supported by numerous studies that suggest that most people agree on the evaluation (good vs. bad), potency (powerful vs. weak), and activity (active vs. inactive) of most social roles and behaviors (Heise 1965, 1966, 1979; Osgood 1962; Smith-Lovin and Heise 1988). For instance, most people agree that a receptionist is nicer than a mugger, that a bouncer is more potent than a flight attendant, and that a teenager is livelier than a widow. Affect control researchers have used semantic differential scales to collect evaluation-potency-activity (EPA) ratings for thousands of social concepts in several cultures. These studies repeatedly show that the affective meanings associated with most concepts are widely shared and relatively stable. Evaluation, potency, and activity (EPA) are the three universal dimensions of meaning identified by Osgood and his colleagues in their cross-cultural research (e.g., Osgood May and Miron 1975).

Despite evidence of generally shared meanings, several researchers have found that subgroups and subcultures have variant, distinct cultures in which they develop a “unique system of knowledge, beliefs, behaviors, and customs...to which members can
refer and that serve as the basis of further interaction” (Fine 1987:125). In other words, every group constructs a meaningful social reality for its members, and this reality may consist of unique meanings for roles and behaviors (Fine 1979, 1987; Hollingshead 1939). A group’s culture influences what members define as group well-being, how they communicate with others in the group and outside the group, and how they act to maintain meanings and well-being (Cole and Tan 2007).

Several empirical studies within the affect control theory (ACT) tradition have shown that participation in a subculture or exposure to an ideology different from the mainstream leads members to develop unique meanings for concepts central to the subgroup or subculture (Heise 1979:100-102; Francis 1997; King 2001; Smith-Lovin and Douglass 1992; Thomas and Heise 1995; Thomassen 2002). Thus, although individuals within a given culture rate most social concepts (e.g., roles, behaviors, settings, emotions) similarly, individuals who are members of subcultures sometimes develop unique meanings for concepts central to their group. In addition, studies have shown that meaning differences have implications for social interaction. For example, Smith-Lovin and Douglass (1992) found that members of a gay friendly church, holding distinct and more extreme meanings for religious identities, expect more positive and lively interaction between a minister and worshipers than do members of a Unitarian church.
Subcultural Theory and Studies

In the past, subcultural theory generally focused on one particular type of subculture: working class delinquent boys (Clarke et al. 1976; Cohen 1955). Strain theory and early studies at the British Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS) generally theorized that social class commonalities lead to commonalities in attitudes, values, behaviors, and subcultural identity. As a result, early subcultural theory assumed that members of subcultures were similar.

More recently, subcultural theory has focused on youth and music subcultures, moving away from theorizing only about social class commonalities, and qualitatively finding that members of subcultures are heterogenous (Andes 1998; Haenfler 2004; Sardeillo 1998; Wood 2003). That is, subcultures members vary in a number of ways including: the extent to which they internalize the ideology of the group, their level of physical and behavioral involvement, the number of social relationships they hold within the subculture, the intensity of those relationships, and their tenure of involvement. However, there have been no quantitative investigations of heterogeneity within subcultures.

My dissertation is divided into two distinct studies quantitatively investigating meaning socialization in the jamband subculture. Both studies investigate the factors that affect how individuals feel about social concepts. Yet, each study is unique in its theoretical, substantive, and methodological contributions. Before introducing the studies, I describe the jamband subculture and empirical studies of the subculture.
The Jamband Subculture

The jamband subculture is a contemporary version of the subculture surrounding the rock music band the Grateful Dead. The Deadhead subculture consisted of individuals who traveled around the country following the Grateful Dead on tour. And, in the 1970s fans began setting up a temporary community in the parking lots of the venues at which the band performed (Sheptoski 2000). They would camp there if the band was playing several nights at one venue. Or if the event lasted only one evening, fans would setup a place where people could share, barter, and even buy and sell from one another items that they needed; and, many of these items were handcrafted. This temporary community recurred at every event before and after the concert and became a ritual event for traveling members of the subculture. Even members who attended only local shows or a few shows per year would take part in the festivities in these parking lots.

Members of the community consist of independent vendors - people who sell crafts, clothing, food, jewelry in order to make travel money - and the community also consists of concert goers may attend anywhere between 1 and 200 shows per year (Sheptoski 2000). The jamband subculture arose after the death of Grateful Dead lead singer Jerry Garcia. A growing music festival scene began to form showcasing the remaining members of the Grateful Dead as well as other new jambands. The similarities between the two subcultures (Deadhead and jamband) include but are not limited to the following activities: fans following bands on tour for weeks at a time, fans sharing a temporary community outside venues where independent vending occurs, fans connecting
outside the shows via the internet (which occurred even before the advent of the world wide web with Usenet newsgroups), and the bands’ promotion of taper-friendly policies (Hunt 2002; Pattacini 2000). As the Deadhead subculture did, the temporary community in the jamband subculture functions as a home spot for traveling fans to share a system of values and attitudes that is different from mainstream U.S. culture.

The jamband subculture, like any other culture, has established standards and shared practices for social interaction in order to achieve their goals and maintain social order. In the case of the jamband subculture, those goals are prosocial and communal (vs. individualistic). Hastings, Utendale, and Sullivan (2007:639) define prosocial behavior “as proactive and reactive responses to the needs of others that serve to promote the well-being of others.”


Deadhead scholars have studied identity (David 2000; Jennings 2000; Lehman 2000; Ritzer 2000; Sardiello 1998); the atmosphere surrounding the concerts (Hunt 2002; Paterline 2000; Sheptoski 1995, 2000); the music (Shank and Simon 2000; Freeman...
2000); and the spirituality and ritual nature of the subculture (Hartley 2000; Sutton 2000).

In the years following the transition from Deadhead subculture to jamband subculture, a few researchers continued to examine Deadhead subculture life (Adelman 1995; Baiano Berman 2002; Barnes 1999; Brightman 1998; Dollar 1999a, 1999b; Pattacini 2000; Pelovitz 1999; Sardiello 1998; Sylvan 1998, 2002). One study examined the transition from Deadhead to jamband subculture and changes in the subculture since the death of Jerry Garcia and the band’s subsequent cessation of touring as the Grateful Dead (Pattacini 2000). Pattacini found that “Tourheads” (a subgroup category of fans who travel from concert to concert living hand to mouth) now are scattered into fractions of groups: “there is no whole entity left to physically identify with any one group” (Pattacini 2000:4). She found that most were willing to attend concerts of newer jambands. However, Deadheads see the distinction between these bands and the Grateful Dead (Pattacini 2000). They also recognize that toward the end of Grateful Dead touring, the parking lot vending area became more of an “overindulged arena for privileged kids” and also became more commercial than the lots of the past (Pattacini 2000:5). Some Deadheads say this newer environment, not as focused on peace, love, and kindness, continues in today’s jamband scene (Hunt 2002; Pattacini 2000). There are fewer scholarly studies on the more contemporary jamband subculture. Specifically, to date, there have been two studies of the jamband subculture. Whitman (2005) conducted his master’s thesis on the tape trading activities with the jamband subculture. Schultz (2006) investigated reciprocity activities within the subculture (e.g., tape trading) as a way of
examining voluntary compliance with copyright laws. My dissertation provides a quantitative empirical analysis of jamband subculture members.

Studies of the Dissertation

Study One: Examining the Relationship between Jamband Subculture Involvement and Role Meanings

In the first study (N = 418), I investigate the relationship between continuous measures of subculture involvement and role meanings. I address gaps in three areas of subculture studies. First, most studies of subcultural socialization analyze the relationship between a dichotomous measure of subculture involvement and affective meanings (e.g., Smith-Lovin and Douglass 1992; Thomassen 2002). These researchers do not take into account levels of involvement within a subculture. Instead, by measuring involvement dichotomously, the studies assume that members of subcultures are quite similar in their outlook. By contrast, I investigate the relationship between the two continuous measures of involvement and role meanings in the jamband subculture, suggesting that levels of involvement affect meanings. Second, unlike most studies of subculture meaning socialization (King 2001; Smith-Lovin and Douglass 1992), I use multivariate analyses rather than bivariate analyses (e.g., correlations and t-tests), which allows me to examine the effects of involvement simultaneously while controlling for members’ demographic characteristics (age and gender). Third, although qualitative studies of subculture suggest that individual members hold varying levels of ideological and behavioral commitment to the subculture (e.g., Baron 1989; Fox 1987; Haenfler 2004;
Sardiello 1998; Wood 2003; Young and Craig 1997), no quantitative investigations of within-subculture variation in ideology and behavior exist.

I address these issues by introducing two continuous measures of subculture involvement (ideological embeddedness and behavioral-relational involvement).

Ideological embeddedness refers to respondents’ self-rated similarity to five fictional characters who represent various levels of ideological immersion in the subculture. Using qualitative findings from my master’s thesis, I developed a vignette-style instrument to quantitatively measure the ideological embeddedness dimension of subculture involvement. Respondents are asked to rate their similarity to each vignette character in terms of their views on the jamband scene. Using both multidimensional scaling and factor analysis, I find that ideological embeddedness is unidimensional. Behavioral-relational involvement (termed “involvement” for simplicity) pertains to respondents’ attendance at subculture events and to the number of relationships respondents hold within the subculture. This construct is also unidimensional.

I hypothesize that ideological embeddedness and behavioral-relational involvement will be related positively to the evaluation and potency of subculture roles (e.g., a deadhead). I also hypothesize that ideological embeddedness and behavioral-relational involvement will be related negatively to the evaluation and potency of authority roles (e.g., a police officer).
Study Two: Using Differential Association Theory to Explain Prosocial Behavior

Differential association theory proposes that an excess of association with individuals who hold definitions favorable to law violation disposes individuals to develop delinquent behavior definitions, which then promotes their own delinquent behavior (Sutherland 1939). Associations are represented as a ratio: the proportion of associations with individuals who hold delinquent behavior definitions to associations with individuals who do not hold delinquent behavior definitions. The influence of each association is a function of the frequency, intensity, priority, and duration of these associations, whether delinquent or non-delinquent. That is, definitions encountered through social interactions that occur frequently (frequency), from a prestigious source (intensity), early in life (priority), and for a long time period (duration) will have greater influence on behavior definitions than those definitions encountered otherwise.

Tests of differential association theory have investigated delinquent subcultures or delinquent behaviors (e.g., Matsueda 1982; Short 1957; Warr 1993). However, studies have not considered using the theory to investigate prosocial subcultures. Therefore, in the second study (N = 379), I use differential association theory to explain the distinctive behavior definitions within a prosocial subculture: the jamband subculture. I categorize the behavior definitions and the hypotheses according to whether the behavior is considered normative (prosocial, “kynd”) or non-normative (“unkynd”) within the subculture. I hypothesize that the differential association modalities will be related positively to the evaluation and potency of kynd behaviors. I also hypothesize that the
differential association modalities will be related negatively to the evaluation and potency of unkynd behaviors.

I find that differential association theory explains prosocial behavior meanings in the jamband subculture. However, the theory is less useful in explaining behaviors defined as non-normative with the subculture (unkynd behaviors). I address four substantive and theoretical gaps in the literature on differential association theory. First, several empirical studies have neglected to explicitly measure the differential association modalities (frequency, intensity, priority, and duration) and have neglected to examine their effect on behavior definitions. I operationalize these modalities and investigate their relationship to six behavior definitions (barter, follow a band, share, trade music, talk down, and threaten) central to the jamband subculture. Second, despite documented problems with using attitude statements to measure behavior definitions, differential association theory researchers still use this measurement procedure. I operationalize behavior definitions with affective behavior meanings, allowing me to provide a precise conceptualization of respondent’s meanings without measuring attitudes directly. Third, although differential association is a theory of delinquency, I investigate whether its basic principles apply to other types of subcultures and behaviors: specifically in explaining the behavior meanings in the jamband subculture.

I conclude the dissertation with a final chapter that outlines the methodological, theoretical, and substantive implications of both studies, notes the limitations of the dissertation, and provides suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER 2

EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
JAMBand SUBCULTURE INVOLVEMENT AND ROLE MEANINGS

Study Abstract

I introduce two continuous measures of subculture involvement (ideological embeddedness and behavioral-relational involvement), and use them to examine the relationship between involvement in the jamband subculture and the affective meanings (evaluation, potency, and activity) associated with eighteen roles that are relevant to that subculture. I expect the continuous measures of involvement to be related positively to the evaluation and potency of fourteen subculture roles (deadhead, drinker, drug user, environmentalist, festie, hippie, phishhead, rainbow person, rastafarian, raver, stoner, tourrat, vendor, wharfrat), and negatively to the evaluation and potency of four authority roles (capitalist, nark, police officer, venue security officer). Using data from self-administered surveys (N = 418 for familiar subculture and authority roles, N = 219 for less familiar subculture roles), I find that there is role meaning variation within the jamband subculture, especially with regard to the evaluation dimension.

Thus, jamband subculture members are not a homogeneous group. Rather, members vary along levels of ideological embeddedness and behavioral-relational
involvement. This study makes methodological contributions to studies of subculture and meaning socialization. First, whereas past studies of subcultural meaning socialization use bivariate statistics to examine subcultural meaning variation, I use multivariate methods to do so. Second, whereas subculture studies generally use qualitative methods to investigate attitudes and behavior, I provide a quantitative measure of ideological embeddedness and behavioral-relational involvement.

Introduction

Early subculture theories suggest that subculture members are fairly homogeneous in their beliefs, socioeconomic backgrounds, and subcultural identities (Clarke 1976 et al.; Cohen 1955; Levine and Stumpf 1983; Suall and Lowe 1988). Strain theories and early research from the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS) at Birmingham University, for example, assumed that commonalities in social class background produced uniformity in behaviors, attitudes, and subcultural identities (Clarke et al. 1976; Cohen 1955). And, more recent studies of subcultural socialization have compared subcultures to the mainstream and have found that subculture members develop meanings for concepts central to their belief system that are distinct from the mainstream but that are shared and fairly homogeneous within the subculture (Francis 1997; Heise 1979:101-102; Smith-Lovin and Douglass 1992; Thomassen 2002). These subcultural theories and studies suggest that members within subcultures are quite similar in their outlook.

Yet, more recent qualitative studies of subcultures suggest that individual subculture members are more heterogeneous. These studies show that members perceive
Although qualitative studies have suggested that Grateful Dead fans (termed "Deadheads") vary from the mainstream (Jennings 2000; Lehman 2000; Sardiello 1998), no study has investigated role meanings within the jamband subculture or how these meanings are related to involvement.

Baron (1989; Fox 1987; Haenfler 2004; Sardiello 1998; Wood 2003; Young and Craig 1997) and hold varying levels of ideological and behavioral commitment to the subculture (Andes 1998; Fox 1987; Sardiello 1998). However, researchers have not quantitatively examined the factors contributing to this variability, nor have they examined the implications of this variation.

In this study, I investigate factors contributing to variability within the jamband subculture by introducing two continuous measures of involvement (ideological embeddedness and behavioral-relational involvement). Using these measures I make three contributions to the literature on role meaning socialization: First, I investigate the relationship between the two continuous measures of involvement and role meanings in the jamband subculture, a group somewhat like a modern-day version of Grateful Dead followers.¹ Second, I use multivariate analyses rather than bivariate analyses (e.g., correlations and t-tests), which allows me to examine the effects of ideological embeddedness and behavioral-relational involvement simultaneously while controlling for members’ demographic characteristics (age and gender). Third, I use hierarchical multivariate linear modeling (HMLM) to capture variation in repeated affective measurements among subculture members and to test specific predictions about how that

¹Although qualitative studies have suggested that Grateful Dead fans (termed "Deadheads") vary from the mainstream (Jennings 2000; Lehman 2000; Sardiello 1998), no study has investigated role meanings within the jamband subculture or how these meanings are related to involvement.
variation is a function of members’ levels of ideological embeddedness and behavioral-relational involvement.

*Role meanings* in this study are the evaluation, potency, and activity (EPA) ratings of roles significant to the jamband subculture belief system. The roles I examine are listed and defined in Table 2.1. The evaluation dimension gauges approval or disapproval and reflects judgments about morality (good vs. bad), aesthetics (beautiful vs. ugly), hedonism (pleasant vs. unpleasant), and utility (useful vs. useless). The potency dimension reflects judgments of strength (strong vs. weak), size (big vs. little), depth (deep vs. shallow), and force (powerful vs. powerless). And activity reflects assessments of perceptual stimulation (noisy vs. quiet), speed (fast vs. slow), age (young vs. old), and keenness (sharp vs. dull) (Heise 2000). I use these dimensions of meaning because research in over 20 cultures suggests that most social concepts evoke affective meanings along evaluation, potency, and activity dimensions using semantic differential scales (Osgood, May, and Miron 1975; Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum 1957).

In this study, *ideological embeddedness* refers to respondents’ self-rated similarity to five fictional characters who represent various levels of ideological immersion in the subculture. *Behavioral-relational involvement* (termed “involvement” for simplicity) pertains to respondents’ attendance at subculture events and to the number of relationships respondents hold within the subculture.
Table 2.1. Definitions of Roles Significant to the Jamband Subculture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subculture Roles</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deadhead</td>
<td>a fan of the Grateful Dead’s music who enjoys spending time with like-minded others (Shenk and Silberman 1994).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinker</td>
<td>an individual who drinks alcohol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug User</td>
<td>an individual who uses drugs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentalist</td>
<td>an individual concerned with the protection of the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festie</td>
<td>an individual who attends only a few music festivals, generally with little interest in the music or in sustaining the jamband community (Hunt 2002).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippie</td>
<td>a nonconformist associated with the countercultural appearance often linked to the 1960s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phishhead</td>
<td>an individual devoted to the music of the band Phish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow Person</td>
<td>a member of the Rainbow Family, an intentional, utopian group whose members assemble at regional, national, and international gatherings (Niman 1997).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rastafarian</td>
<td>an individual of the Rasta religious movement originating in Jamaica.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raver</td>
<td>an individual who attends rave parties where amphetamines and other manufactured drugs are taken regularly (Millman and Beeder 1994).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoner</td>
<td>a term used by the mainstream to describe an individual who smokes marijuana and is unmotivated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourrat</td>
<td>“hardcore tourheads who live in the parking lot (of venues), earning road costs by vending and waiting - or scamming” for a free ticket (Shenk and Silberman 1994:291).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>an individual who vends wares at concerts, usually in order to finance his or her travel. Such independent vendors are distinct from corporate vendors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharfrat</td>
<td>an individual who is a member of a group of sober Deadheads who hold meetings during the set break of shows (Shenk and Silberman 1994).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority Roles</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capitalist</td>
<td>an individual with wealth invested in profit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nark</td>
<td>any type of informer; within the jamband subculture, specifically an undercover narcotics officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officer</td>
<td>an officer of the law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue Security Officer</td>
<td>an individual hired by concert venues to uphold regulations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview of the Jamband Subculture

The jamband subculture is a contemporary version of the subculture surrounding the rock music band the Grateful Dead. It shares two important features with the Grateful Dead subculture: the band’s live improvisational jamming (Brightman 1998; Pattacini 2000) and the practice of fans following the bands across the country (Budnick 2003). The Grateful Dead followers, who call themselves “Deadheads,” actively followed the band on concert tours from 1965 until 1995. “Deadhead” is a term Grateful Dead fans use to describe a fan of the Grateful Dead’s music who enjoys spending time with like-minded others (Shenk and Silberman 1994). Thus, Deadhead is not a derogatory term in the subculture, and many members who are called Deadheads do not fit the stereotypical, negative image the mainstream often holds of Grateful Dead fans (e.g., unkempt, drug using, and unemployed) (Adams 2003; Ritzer 2000; Schultz 2006). In fact, many are professionals and scholars (Adams 2000, 2003; Kanzer 1992; Sardiello 1998; Shenk and Silberman 1994).

In the years following the death of Grateful Dead lead singer Jerry Garcia in 1995, the subculture grew from a few bands (the most popular include the Grateful Dead and the Allman Brothers Band) to hundreds of bands and fans of several different genres of live music, unified by live improvisational music and the connection to their recurring ephemeral community (Sutton 2000). Today, the larger, more musically diverse subculture is termed the “jamband culture” (Budnick 2003). Jamband subculture members share a temporary community outside the venues at which bands perform. Among members of the community are independent vendors who sell wares in order to
travel and, sometimes, to make a living (Sheptoski 2000). The community also consists of members who travel from concert to concert (vendor or not) and those who visit only local events or weekend-long festivals.

The scene that develops out of this temporary, yet recurring, community of people is one where individuals value human association, equality, political and spiritual consciousness, and sociality (Baiano Berman 2002). Although many members keep connected through the internet, the recurring community outside concert venues functions as a home spot for traveling fans to develop new friendships and rekindle old ones, to sleep, purchase food and clothing items, and, like many other subcultures, share a system of values and attitudes different from mainstream U.S. culture (Jennings 2000; Lehman 2000; Sardiello 1994, 1998; Wilgoren 1999).

In the next section, I review studies that have found that distinct meanings develop as a result of subcultural involvement. Then, I review studies that have found that levels of immersion in a subculture affect meanings.

*Participation as a Dichotomy*

Several researchers have operationalized involvement dichotomously and found that participation in a subculture or exposure to an ideology different from the mainstream fosters unique meanings for concepts central to the subgroup or subculture (Heise 1979:100-102; Francis 1997; King 2001; Smith-Lovin and Douglass 1992; Thomas and Heise 1995; Thomassen 2002). For instance, Smith-Lovin and Douglass (1992) measured involvement dichotomously and found that members of a gay-friendly
community church and members of a more traditional liberal Christian church held
significantly different meanings for gay and religious role identities. Similarly, Gilchrist,
as reported in Heise (1979:101-2), measured involvement dichotomously and found that
highway patrol recruits have significantly different role meanings for group-relevant roles
such as “state trooper” and “criminal” than do mainstream society members. Other
researchers use a dichotomous approach to involvement by measuring meaning change
before and after members’ exposure to a group’s ideology. For example, Francis (1997)
found that exposure to divorce and bereavement support group ideology changed negative
self-identities and emotions into positive self-identities and emotions. Also, Thomassen
(2002), examining the effect of Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) participation, measured
meaning change for concepts at two time points: first AA meeting attendance
(nonmembers) and six months after involvement (members). She found that six month’s
exposure to Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) ideology and culture influenced the way
members felt about identities and emotions relevant to AA, such as the identity “an
alcoholic” and the emotion “feeling humble” (Thomassen 2002).

The research above suggests that distinct meanings for social concepts can
develop, in part, from involvement in a subgroup or subculture. However, this binary
conceptualization of involvement precludes the possibility of investigating variability
among subculture members (Dixon and Lizotte 1987). In other words, members may be
involved at varying levels in the subculture, and measuring involvement dichotomously
misses this variation. I now review studies that either measure or conceptualize
involvement continuously.
Participation as a Continuum

Similar to the current study, some researchers have suggested that involvement in subgroups is continuous and have also conceptualized involvement with ideological and/or behavioral-relational dimensions. For instance, Fine and Kleinman (1979) argue that identification with a group varies along two dimensions: the degree of commitment to the group, termed “centrality,” and the frequency of identification with the group, termed “salience.” Also, Irwin (1977) finds that the hippie countercultural movement of the 1960s demanded two types of “investment” from its members: an ideology and life-practices. Friedkin (2004) concludes that social cohesion is a function of both attitudes (attraction or loyalty to the group) and behaviors. Latane (1981) observes that the total impact of a social force (e.g., a community, norms, expectations) is a function of the strength (in terms of power or status), the number, and the immediacy of the force in space and time, much like I am proposing that the jamband community’s socialization force is a function of ideological embeddedness and behavioral-relational involvement. Finally, Stryker (1980) finds that individuals vary in commitment to a role-identity as indicated by the number of relationships related to the role.

Some researchers have found that varying levels of behavioral-relational immersion in a subgroup affect meanings (King 2001; Thomas and Heise 1995). King (2001:426), for example, found that meanings of online concepts changed as individuals spent more time using the internet and as years of internet use increased. Specifically, he found that weekly time spent online and number of years spent online are correlated negatively with the evaluation of concepts indicating new user status (such as the
identities “a newbie” or “an AOL’er”), but associated positively with the evaluation of roles indicating higher levels of embeddedness in the culture such as “a hacker,” “a cyberpunk,” and “a lurker” (King 2001:428).

Similarly, Thomas and Heise (1995:428), citing unpublished data, found that as undergraduate university students’ level of experience with different types of drugs increased, so did their evaluations of marijuana and cocaine (Heise 2007:24-25). Therefore, consistent with the current study, King’s and Thomas and Heise’s research suggest that a continuum of behavioral involvement in subgroups is associated with meaning variation.

Why Study the Jamband Subculture?

The jamband subculture is ideal for examining within-subculture variation because its members, similar to Deadheads, are known to vary quite extensively in their commitment to subcultural ideology and in the extent to which they are behaviorally-relationally involved (Sardiello 1998). Sardiello (1998:136) observes, “being a Deadhead may be experienced on different levels, which may range from a simple appreciation of the music to a full internalization of the behavioral and value content of this subculture.”

Perhaps one reason why some researchers have measured subcultural involvement dichotomously is that many subgroups have a relatively restricted range of behavioral involvement (i.e., the Amish or nomadic gypsies, see Gelder 2006). On the contrary, jamband subculture members’ range of involvement (similar to their range of ideological embeddedness) varies widely. For instance, at one extreme of behavioral involvement are
members who live almost completely within the subculture, traveling extensively throughout each year, and generally having more contact with other subculture members than mainstream society members (Lehman 2000; Pearson 1987; Sardiello 1998). At the other extreme of involvement are individuals who may attend only one or a few shows per year, having more contact with mainstream culture than the subculture (Pelovitz 1999; Ritzer 2000; Sheptoski 2000).

Hypotheses

In this next section I hypothesize the direction of the relationships between the two continuous measures of involvement and the evaluation and potency ratings of eighteen roles. These hypotheses emerge from qualitative studies regarding the perception of concepts within the jamband subculture. First, I briefly outline the subculture and authority roles I have chosen to include in the analyses. I chose these roles based on my own and others’ observations and interviews that revealed the centrality of each role within the subculture (Hunt 2002; Niman 1997; Ritzer 2000; Shenk and Silberman 1994).

Evaluation

Subculture roles in this study are: deadhead, drinker, drug user, environmentalist, festie, hippie, phishhead, rainbow person, rastafarian, raver, stoner, tourrat, vendor, and wharfrat. Subculture roles are held in high regard within the jamband subculture. For instance, a vendor plays an important functional role in the subculture, and a deadhead is valued as someone who may have a strong historical connection to the subculture. I
expect that both ideological embeddedness and behavioral-relational involvement will be related positively to the evaluation of subculture roles.

Authority roles in this study are: capitalist, nark, police officer, and venue security officer. Qualitative research generally suggests that Deadheads reject the values espoused by capitalism and mainstream authority figures, and therefore may evaluate these roles negatively (Paterline 2000; Sardiello 1998; Sheptoski 2000). This disjuncture between subculture members and authority figures may create a feeling of disdain for one another. Therefore, I expect ideological embeddedness and involvement to be related negatively to the evaluation of authority roles.

Potency

Subculture roles. Potency reflects a role’s strength, depth, and power and also indicates its importance to the social system or the role occupant’s control over valued resources. Qualitative research suggests that jamband subculture members often consider subculture roles potent in the sense that they are convincing with deep personalities (Ritzer 2000; Sardiello 1998). Despite a norm of power equality within the jamband subculture, evidence suggests that there may be gradients of potency in roles. For instance, wharfrats, individuals who are committed to sobriety, must have a strong sense of will power in order put themselves in an environment surrounded by drugs and alcohol (Ritzer 2000; Sylvan 2002). Vendors hold power in the subculture by creating the environment outside shows. Also, environmentalists are generally viewed as relaying a powerful message to others (Wilgoren 1999). Therefore, I expect that ideological
embeddedness and involvement will be related positively to the potency of subculture roles.

*Authority roles.* Like subculture roles, authority roles are relevant to the subculture (Paterline 2000; Sheptoski 2000). However, no studies explicitly investigate how members feel about authority figures. Authority roles may be considered weak because their values are at odds with those of the jamband subculture. Accordingly, members may feel that a nark and a capitalist are, for instance, shallow (Ritzer 2000). Alternatively, authority roles may be considered powerful because of the real power they possess to punish subculture members (Paterline 2000). Due to conflicting and limited research regarding the power of authority roles, I offer only exploratory hypotheses that ideological embeddedness and involvement will be related negatively to the power of authority roles.

*Subculture Roles Ideology Hypotheses 1-2:* Ideological embeddedness will be related positively to the (1) evaluation and (2) potency of subculture roles.

*Subculture Roles Behavior Hypotheses 1-2:* Behavioral-relational involvement will be related positively to the (1) evaluation and (2) potency of subculture roles.

*Authority Roles Ideology Hypotheses 1-2:* Ideological embeddedness will be related negatively to the (1) evaluation and (2) potency of authority roles.

*Authority Roles Behavior Hypotheses 1-2:* Behavioral-relational involvement will be related negatively to the (1) evaluation and (2) potency of authority roles.

*Activity*

Due to the paucity of research in the area of activity dynamics within this subculture, I do not advance hypotheses concerning the relationship between the two
continuous measures of involvement and the activity of these roles. I do, however, investigate these relationships.

**Methods**

**Data and Sample**

Culture researchers have found that using small, informed convenience samples yields stable, reliable results (Heise 1966; Romney, Weller, and Batchelder 1986). Therefore, I use a convenience sample of jamband subculture members. Data were collected with a self-administered survey distributed online and at jamband events in several geographic regions of the United States: the Midwest (five events), the southeast (one event), and the northeast (two events). Any event participant was eligible for the study. I used four data collection procedures. First, I created two types of correspondence (business cards and a large banner) that listed my name, the name of the study, and the website where the on-line version of my survey was based. I distributed these business cards at jamband events. Second, individuals who preferred to complete the survey at the concert were given a paper version of the survey. Respondents placed the completed surveys in a secured drop box that was located at two vendors’ booths. Third, individuals who did not have access to a computer but also did not want to complete the survey at the concerts used these business cards to complete the survey at their convenient time and place. Finally, I also collected a convenience sample of jamband concert attendees who used the business cards to complete a survey at the event.

---

2 I collected data at a variety of jamband-related music concerts and festivals, including: a String Cheese Incident concert, a Dark Star Orchestra concert, a Rusted Root concert, a Government Mule concert, a Moe concert, a Ratdog concert, a Widespread Panic concert, and Bonnaroo Music Festival.
concert were given a paper version of the survey along with a self-addressed stamped envelope. Fourth, the link to my survey was posted on an online magazine website (www.jambands.com), several jamband related message boards, and a Dave Matthews Band fan message board. Thus, although all individuals who participated knew that they were taking a jamband related survey, not all respondents were self-identified members nor were all highly integrated. After several months of low response rates, an incentive was offered to respondents for completing the survey. Respondents were given the option to enter their contact information for a chance to win a ticket to a popular jamband festival. The winner was randomly selected and contacted at the end of data collection.

_sample demographics_

Sixty eight percent of respondents are male and 32% are female (N = 418 unless noted). Ages range from 18-64 with a mean of 28 years. Fifty percent of those who participated were older than 27. Of the respondents, 81% report being a member of the jamband subculture (N = 417), and 93% support the values of the jamband subculture (N = 416). Respondents attend between 1 and 200 jamband related events per year, with an average of 20 shows per year. Respondents attended their first jamband related event between 1 and 37 years ago, spending on average 11 years in the subculture (N = 339).

---

3 Budnick (2003) suggests that there are likely crossover or overlapping fans from The Dave Matthews Band (DMB) to the jamband scene. Because most of my respondents were from jamband events, I used the DMB message board in order to collect data from less integrated members.
The sample is 99% non-Hispanic White (N = 344). Sixty-five percent of the respondents hold a bachelor’s degree or higher level of education.4

**Dependent Variables**

*Role meanings* are the evaluation, potency, and activity of 18 roles listed in Table 2.1. As I noted above, I chose these roles based on observations and interviews (Hunt 2002; Niman 1997; Ritzer 2000; Shenk and Silberman 1994). Based on response rates in a pilot study in 2003, I separated terms into categories of familiar and less familiar.

Using nine point semantic differential scales (ranging from -4 to +4), respondents rated concepts on each dimension. The evaluation dimension was anchored with the adjective pairs “good, nice” and “bad, awful,” the potency dimension with “powerless, little” and “powerful, big,” and the activity dimension with “slow, quiet, old” and “fast, noisy, young.” The middle point of the scale was marked neutral, and the circles between the mid-point and each endpoint were marked slightly, quite, extremely, and infinitely. These were coded so that -4.0 is infinitely bad/powerless/quiet; -3.0 is extremely bad/powerless/quiet; -2.0 is quite bad/powerless/quiet; -1.0 is slightly bad/powerless/quiet; 0.0 is neutral (neither bad nor good/powerless nor powerful/quiet nor active); +1.0 is slightly good/powerful/active; +2.0 is quite good/powerful/active; +3.0 is extremely good/powerful/active; +4.0 is infinitely good/powerful/active. To reduce response sets, I randomized both the order and the direction of the three rating scales.

---

4 Number of respondents fluctuates for variables not included in the analyses (length of time in subculture, race, ethnicity, and level of education).
The semantic differential measurement technique avoids at least one validity problem that handicaps many measures of attitudes: the authenticity of responses from individuals uncomfortable with disclosing their attitudes with outsiders (Fine and Kleinman 1979). The semantic differential does not directly ask respondents to state their attitudes, but rather asks them to rate concepts on three abstract dimensions of meaning thereby reducing the tendency of respondents to withhold candid responses.

Some roles listed on the instrument were likely familiar to most respondents (e.g., deadhead, hippie, or police officer), whereas other roles were less familiar to all respondents (e.g., festie or wharfrat). Therefore, I included separate instructions for the less familiar roles and placed them in a separate section of the survey. Because of the different number of cases between familiar and less familiar concepts, I conducted separate analyses: one for all familiar roles (including familiar subculture and all authority roles) and one for all less familiar subculture roles. Data consist of cases for which complete data are available in each category (all familiar and all less familiar). The descriptive statistics for the dependent variables are listed in Table 2.2. The instructions for the familiar concepts section of the survey read as follows:

Please read carefully:

This section includes a list of the kinds of people one might find in this scene. The lines with circles below are like a ruler for measuring how you feel about each kind of person. On each row, mark off how close each one is to the description at one end of the ruler or the other. If you feel that the kind of person listed is not close to either description, put a mark in the middle (for neutral).

Note that the direction and order of the descriptions on the ruler change throughout this section.
Table 2.2  Mean Evaluation, Potency, Activity (EPA) Ratings of Subculture and Authority Roles (N = 418 for Familiar Roles and N = 219 for Less Familiar Roles)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subculture Roles</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Potency</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deadhead</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinker</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug User</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>-.81</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentalist</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festie</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippie</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phishhead</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow Person</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rastafarian</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raver</td>
<td>-.69</td>
<td>-.65</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoner</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>-.70</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourrat</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.62</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharfrat</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority Roles</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Potency</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capitalist</td>
<td>-.95</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nark</td>
<td>-2.76</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officer</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue Security Officer</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Due to the different number of cases between familiar and less familiar concepts, I conducted separate analyses: one for all familiar roles (capitalist, deadhead, drinker, drug user, environmentalist, hippie, nark, phishhead, police officer, stoner, vendor, and venue security officer, N = 418) and one for all less familiar subculture roles (festie, rainbow person, rastafarian, raver, tourrat, and wharfrat, N = 219).
Be sure to mark on every row of circles.

Later in the survey, I presented special instructions for the less familiar concepts:

The following terms are unfamiliar to some people. If you know the meaning of the term, please rate it in the same manner as those above. However, if you do not know the term, please skip to the next term.

**Independent Variables**

*Ideological embeddedness* is measured with a scale in which respondents rated their similarity to five gender-neutral character vignettes (see Kroska 2000 for a similar technique). The instructions read:

The following pages include self-descriptions from several different people. Please read each description carefully. Remember that people sometimes hold inconsistent views. Do your best to indicate your level of similarity on the following scales.

The vignettes are displayed in Table 2.3. The vignettes describe lifelike characters I designed that vary along the multiple characteristics I identified in my own ethnographic exploration of the current jamband scene as well as in sociological literature on the Grateful Dead scene. These characteristics are: (1) socializing new members (Jennings 2000), (2) political activity (Adelman 1995), (3) involvement in the subculture (Lehman 2000; Pelovitz 1999; Sheptoski 2000), (4) communal values (David 2000; Sheptoski 2000), and/or (5) dedication to the music of the scene (David 2000; Sardiello 1998). I also attempted to diversify the vignettes in goodness, power, and activity in order to represent variability on the three universal dimensions of meaning of evaluation, potency, and activity identified by Osgood, May, and Miron (1975). Although much of the Deadhead literature suggests that a spiritual connection to the music is a major part of
Table 2.3. Vignette Characters for Ideological Embeddedness Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEAF</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It gets so crazy in the lot! I trade music out of the back of my van with some really cool people, and get to play all summer long. We throw frisbees and watch people swing fire sticks and glow sticks. I usually sell whatever I can to make my ticket into the show. If I can't get in, it's still good, because I can hang out with people here in the lot, party, and hear the music for a lot cheaper! I'm mostly into the scene for traveling and having fun. I usually don’t go to big festivals, there are mostly just festies (poseurs) there anyway. It doesn't matter which show I go to next, as long as I'm with the people like there are here, people who know how to have fun. The vendors here sell great stuff, although I usually don’t buy anything from them.</td>
<td>.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RAIN</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the way the people here in the scene take care of one another and check on each other. I take an active role in socializing new members into what I call our “community.” I believe it's important to take care of the Earth first and foremost. I don't agree with the consumer driven capitalist economy. Therefore, it is also important to me that I enjoy life by sharing it with people who are interested in the same values as me. I like to follow one or a few bands rather than attending shows that only come close to my hometown because I like to meet people again whom I've met on tour before. I usually depend on miracle (free) tickets rather than buying them. I trade and barter my stuff with vendors at shows.</td>
<td>.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MOON</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The scene is so much fun. I get to camp with my friends and meet new people. The music is great and I can feel free to do whatever I want without a lot of hassle from people who don't understand the scene. I think the vibe here is very catching and the expressions that people direct at one another are beautiful. It's important to buy from people in the scene to keep it going; buying too much from outside the scene only supports profit driven companies who exploit workers and pollute the environment. Here, we care about supporting independent artists and vendors and keeping our scene alive. I buy tickets mainly to festivals, I don’t follow any certain band. During shows, I'll walk around every once in a while to watch out for my brothers and sisters who might be taking drugs. Most of the people here are really kind. I do notice an increasingly large number of people who come here but don't seem to belong here.</td>
<td>.698</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.3 Vignette Characters for Ideological Embeddedness Measure (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RIVER</strong></td>
<td>.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to have fun. Jam band festivals and shows are the best places to make money and party. The best way to have fun is to be with friends, good music, and my pets. I usually bring my pets with me to events, even when the venue prohibits it. I spend a lot of time talking with people in the lot and having a good time. I think the people here are the best people around. They understand me, and I feel like I can be myself here, although some people here try to make others feel guilty if we don't walk around like a barefoot hippie. But, overall, touring is great, because I get to meet and party with so many people and sometimes see the same folks again. Sometimes, I help clean up the festivals with Clean Vibes. I like to show young kids how to party, make money, and how to tour. My friends and I usually stay in hotels nearby or crash in someone's camping area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STAR</strong></td>
<td>.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the feeling I get when I come to shows; if I tried, I could really get into coming to them more often. I don't think I could live on the road, though. It's important, while I'm here, to shine the vibe of kindness to the young kids who are coming along in this scene. I come when I can to the shows that are fairly close to my house and sometimes to large festivals, and I like to be a supporter to the members of this scene. I definitely support their environmental consciousness, although I don't consider myself to be much of an activist. I support their views about &quot;family&quot; and how they care for one another. The clothes that vendors sell are beautiful and I try to get a 'hippie' dress when I come to festivals. I don't know many jam bands and I don't listen to their music much at home, but I never miss the chance to see my favorite jam band when they are within driving distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the Deadhead ideology, little research suggests that spirituality is a part of the ideology of the more contemporary jamband subculture. Therefore, I did not include spirituality as a characteristic of the vignette characters. Further, psychedelic drug use has been widely reported to occur in this subculture; however, self-reports of deviance are often biased, especially if respondents suspect the researcher is an outsider (Fine and Kleinman 1979). Therefore, I also did not include drug use as a characteristic in the vignettes.

After reading each vignette, the respondents gauged their similarity to the character’s views on the jamband scene. For example, the first instruction after the Rain vignette was: “Mark a circle to show how your views on the scene compare to Rain’s.” This instruction was followed by a row of numbers ranging from 1 (extremely different) to 7 (extremely similar). I applied principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation on the full sample (N = 744) and results indicate that the construct is one-dimensional. The vignettes are listed in Table 2.3 in the order of their factor loadings. The factor scores serve as the ideological embeddedness values. Descriptive statistics for ideological embeddedness and other independent variables in this study are displayed in Table 2.4. Because I use only those cases retained in the analyses, the mean and standard deviation of the factor scores are not 0 and 1, respectively. Multidimensional scaling results also suggest that the ideological embeddedness is one-dimensional. These results are available upon request.

---

5 Principal components factor analysis results for the full sample (N = 744) and the restricted sample using only cases available in the multivariate analyses (N = 418) are very similar. Factor scores from the two analyses are highly correlated, r = .99). Therefore, I use results from the full sample.
Table 2.4. Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations for All Independent Variables in Chapter 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ideological Embeddedness</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td>-.17***</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Behavioral-Relational Involvement</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.16***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Age</td>
<td>28.40</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Female</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001 (two tailed tests).

I labeled the ends of the ideological embeddedness continuum (weakly embedded to strongly embedded) based on the character descriptions within each vignette. Star is weakly embedded (stating that he or she does not listen to music outside the concert area) while Leaf is strongly embedded (stating that he or she actually lives in the scene).

*Behavioral-relational involvement* is operationalized with an index pertaining to behaviors, emotional investment, and relationships in the subculture. Respondents answered five questions in the involvement index, four of which were open-ended: (1) “How many friends have you made purely as a result of being a jamband subculture member?” (2) “How many people would you miss if you stopped being a part of the jamband subculture?” (3) “How many people would you no longer see if you stopped being a part of the jamband subculture?” and (4) “How many jamband type concerts or performances do you typically attend per year?” The fifth question gave closed-ended responses ranging from 1 (not invested at all) to 7 (extremely invested): (5) “To what extent are you emotionally invested in your relationships with people in the jamband subculture?” I logged the four write-in questions to improve the normality of their distributions. The first three items were logged using 1 to represent the value of 0; there
were no values of 0 for item 4. The transformation of the first item changes the chi-square for the joint skewness and kurtosis test for normality from $\chi^2 = 658.46$, $p = .000$ to $\chi^2 = 9.46$, $p = .009$. The transformation of the second item changes the chi-square from $\chi^2 = 638.37$, $p = .000$ to $\chi^2 = 4.47$, $p = .11$. The transformation of the third item changes the chi-square from $\chi^2 = 558.11$, $p = .000$ to $\chi^2 = 23.16$, $p = .000$. The transformation of the fourth item changes the chi-square from $\chi^2 = 368.26$, $p = .000$ to $\chi^2 = 12.98$, $p = .002$. Principal components factor analysis reveals that the index has only one dimension. The alpha reliability coefficients for these five items is .86.\(^6\) I use the factor scores for the involvement values.

**Control variables.** I controlled for age (in years) and gender (1 = female). Means, standard deviations, and correlations for all independent variables are displayed in Table 2.4.

**Results**

**Subculture Role Meanings**

**Evaluation.** As shown in Table 2.2, roles directly related to the subculture have higher evaluation ratings than do authority roles. Respondents consider a deadhead (2.16), an environmentalist (1.94), and a hippie (1.84) quite good. They also rate a phishhead (1.00), a rainbow person (1.31), a rastafarian (1.38), a stoner (.92), and a wharfrat (1.22) as

\(^6\) When tenure of involvement (reported in years) is included in the involvement index, the alpha reliability coefficient drops to .51; therefore, I did not include it in the index.
slightly good. A drinker (-.50), a drug user (-.39), a festie (.36), a tourrat (-.38), and a vendor (.49) are considered neither good nor bad, and a raver is the only subculture role rated negatively, with a rating of slightly bad (-.69).

Five of the subculture roles pertain to subgroups within the subculture (an environmentalist, a rainbow person, a rastafarian, a raver, and a wharfrat). Generally, subgroups have similar, yet slightly different practices, values, and norms. Rainbow people are a subgroup that is very similar in ideology to Deadheads, for example (Niman 1997). Also, although the literature on ravers (a subgroup) suggests that ravers are similar in their beliefs and behaviors to members of the jamband subculture (Millman and Beeder 1994), the subculture has shunned the use of “designer drugs,” which are popular among the raver subgroup (Hunt 2002). This contempt for the use of non-organic drugs carries over into the slightly bad evaluation of the raver role.

Potency. Respondents generally rate subculture roles neutral in potency, with the exception of a few that they consider slightly impotent: a drug user (-.81), a raver (-.65), a tourrat (-.62), and a stoner (-.70). Although a tourrat is the closest to the mainstream’s “image of a Deadhead, driving Volkswagen buses and selling various wares to pay for gas, food, and concert tickets” (Ritzer 2000:257), tourrats (as well as heavy drinkers and ravers) are known to loiter outside the concert venue, to arrive without intention of entering the concert, and to cause problems (i.e., disturb the peace) between the jamband community and the local surrounding community (Paterline 2000). These actions are
considered shallow to subculture members, which may explain the low potency ratings of a drug user, a raver, and a tournat.

Unlike a drug user, a raver, or a tournat, a deadhead (.66), an environmentalist (.92), and a vendor (.70) have more important and usually powerful roles in sustaining the jamband community. The slightly potent rating of a vendor, for instance, can be explained by the central role vendors play in the subculture (Sardiello 1998; Sheptoski 2000).

Independent artists make a living vending wares in the subculture. Their presence in the parking lots of venues makes the surrounding environment a “scene,” which captures the essence of the community experience for jamband subculture members. Vendors possess important subcultural resources and serve a vital functional role within the subculture (Sardiello 1998). Therefore, members see a vendor as a slightly potent role.

**Activity.** The most active subculture roles are a drinker (1.14), a drug user (1.03), a festie (.95), a phishhead (1.48), a raver (2.39), and a tournat (1.73). This makes intuitive sense because ravers and phishheads are very active in dancing and a tournat consistently travels (Hunt 2002; Ritzer 2000) and because the other roles (a drug user, a drinker, and a festie) are based on actions. Perhaps a deadhead (-1.20), a hippie (-.79), and a wharfrat (-.80) are considered slightly inactive roles because of the aging effect: deadheads may be generally thought of as those individuals who attended concerts many years ago and therefore may be considered slow and old (two characteristics on the inactive end of the activity scale). Also, a hippie is historically defined as a relaxed role and may be a label to use for older subculture members with connections to the 1960s. Finally, relatively
speaking, wharf rats (i.e., sober fans) are not as physically active, especially inside the concert, as say, a raver or a drinker tend to be.

Authority Role Meanings

*Evaluation.* Although the jamband subculture considers all authority roles generally negative and potent, the intensity of these ratings varies. For instance, although respondents rate a police officer (-.42) and a venue security officer (-.53) (both enforcers of laws and regulations) close to neutral on evaluation, they consider a capitalist slightly bad (-.95) and a nark extremely bad (-2.76). A capitalist and a nark both violate one of the core values of the subculture: a desire to help one another through human association and equality. A nark is known for betrayal, and a capitalist desires profit, often at the expense of others.

*Potency.* A nark is considered neither potent nor impotent (-.05), but a venue security officer is rated slightly potent (.94), and both a police officer (2.08) and a capitalist (1.67) are considered quite potent. This makes sense, because in comparison with the power of a police officer to enforce the law, a nark is powerless to enforce the law. And a capitalist has social, political, and economic power in society.

*Activity.* Finally, most authority roles are considered neither active nor inactive, ranging from -.26 to .41. A nark is the liveliest of the authority roles (.41), again possibly due to the action creating the role.
HMLM Analyses

To evaluate the hypothesized relationships between ideological embeddedness and behavioral-relational involvement and affective (EPA) role meanings, I use hierarchical multivariate linear modeling (HMLM) (Raudenbush and Bryk 2002). To test my hypotheses, I run separate HMLM analyses on (1) each distinct affective dimension (evaluation, potency, and activity) of the familiar subculture roles, (2) each affective dimension of the less familiar subculture roles, and (3) each affective dimension of the authority roles.

The repeated measures in the analyses are the set of evaluation ratings, the set of potency ratings, and the set of activity ratings (separately) for each of the roles within the three groupings described above (i.e., familiar subculture, less familiar subculture, and authority). For instance, each respondent provided repeated evaluation ratings, repeated potency ratings, and repeated activity ratings for each of the eight familiar subculture roles (e.g., deadhead, phishhead), each of the six less familiar subculture roles (e.g., wharfrat, tourrat), and each of the four authority roles (e.g., police officer, venue security officer).

The data structure for each analysis consists of two levels. Level 1 (the repeated-observations model) assesses the within-person variability in repeated measures of affective role meanings. Level 2 (the person-level model) includes the between-person differences in ideological embeddedness, behavioral-relational involvement, and the two control variables (age and gender).

Preliminary analyses (available upon request) revealed that the best fit to the data is provided by models assuming that the structure of the Level 1 variance/covariance is
unrestricted; hence the parameters from unrestricted models are reported in Tables 2.5-2.7.

The unrestricted model does not assume that the error variances are constant across each of the respondent’s ratings, nor does it assume that the error variances are mutually independent. The results of HMLM analyses are shown in Tables 2.5-2.7. Table 2.5 displays the coefficients for familiar subculture roles estimated separately for the repeated evaluation ratings, the repeated potency ratings, and the repeated activity ratings. Table 2.6 displays the results for less familiar subculture roles and Table 2.7 displays the results for authority roles.\(^7\)

In the first stage of each analysis (Model 1), an unconstrained model is utilized to estimate the mean level of evaluation, potency, and activity ratings before any independent variables are entered. The baseline evaluation of familiar subculture roles is slightly good \((b = .620, se = .036, p < .001)\) and is neutral for less familiar subculture roles \((b = .479, se = .056, p < .001)\), while the mean evaluation of authority roles is slightly bad \((b = -.586, se = .055, p < .001)\). The baseline potency of familiar \((b = .080, se = .034, p = .015)\) and less familiar \((b = -.159, se = .054, p = .004)\) subculture roles is neutral, while the baseline potency of authority roles is slightly potent \((b = 1.361, se = .060, p < .001)\). Finally, the baseline activity ratings for familiar subculture roles \((b = .230, se = .030, p < .001)\), less

\(^7\) As noted above, some roles were placed on a separate page of the survey instrument with instructions for respondents to rate only those concepts for which the definition was known. I expected the response rates to be lower for these less familiar concepts. Therefore, I separated the analyses between the more familiar concepts (both familiar subculture roles and all authority roles) \((N = 418)\) and less familiar concepts \((N = 219)\) and used all cases available within each category.
Table 2.5. Hierarchical Multivariate Linear Modeling Coefficients of Repeated Evaluation, Potency, and Activity Ratings of Familiar Jamband Subculture Roles on Ideological Embeddedness, Behavioral-Relational Involvement, and Controls (N = 418)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Potency</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-.620***</td>
<td>-.637***</td>
<td>-.698***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.036)</td>
<td>(.043)</td>
<td>(.041)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.009†</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>-.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.077)</td>
<td>(.074)</td>
<td>(.072)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>-.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.131)</td>
<td>(.129)</td>
<td>(.126)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideological Embeddedness</td>
<td>.193***</td>
<td>.171***</td>
<td>.080*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.036)</td>
<td>(.034)</td>
<td>(.031)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral-Relational Involvement</td>
<td>.111**</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.036)</td>
<td>(.034)</td>
<td>(.031)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Standard errors are in parentheses. †p < .10; *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001 (two tailed tests).

Table 2.6. Hierarchical Multivariate Linear Modeling Coefficients of Repeated Evaluation, Potency, and Activity Ratings of Less Familiar Jamband Subculture Roles on Ideological Embeddedness, Behavioral-Relational Involvement, and Controls (N = 219)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Potency</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.479***</td>
<td>.474***</td>
<td>.447***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.056)</td>
<td>(.064)</td>
<td>(.066)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.131)</td>
<td>(.129)</td>
<td>(.126)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.056)</td>
<td>(.054)</td>
<td>(.049)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideological Embeddedness</td>
<td>.179**</td>
<td>.162**</td>
<td>.070†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.058)</td>
<td>(.056)</td>
<td>(.040)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral-Relational Involvement</td>
<td>.119*</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.056)</td>
<td>(.054)</td>
<td>(.039)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Standard errors are in parentheses. †p < .10; *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001 (two tailed tests).
Table 2.7 Hierarchical Multivariate Linear Modeling Coefficients of Repeated Evaluation, Potency, and Activity Ratings of Authority Roles on Ideological Embeddedness, Behavioral-Relational Involvement, and Controls (N=418)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Potency</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Models 1</td>
<td>Models 2</td>
<td>Models 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-.586***</td>
<td>-.678***</td>
<td>-.644***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.055)</td>
<td>(.064)</td>
<td>(.063)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.027**</td>
<td>.023**</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.008)</td>
<td>(.008)</td>
<td>(.009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.313**</td>
<td>.246*</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.115)</td>
<td>(.114)</td>
<td>(.129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideological</td>
<td>-.113*</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embeddedness</td>
<td>(.055)</td>
<td>(.063)</td>
<td>(.063)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral-Relational</td>
<td>-.189**</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>(.055)</td>
<td>(.063)</td>
<td>(.063)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Standard errors are in parentheses. † p < .10; * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001 (two tailed tests).

familiar subculture roles ($b = .452, se = .039, p < .001$), and authority roles ($b = -.016, se = .047, p = .734$) are neutral.

In the next stage of analysis (Model 2), age and gender are added as Level-2 (between-person) predictors. Looking across Tables 5 through 7, neither age nor gender are significantly related to the repeated evaluation ratings or the repeated potency ratings for both familiar and less familiar subculture roles; however, age ($b = .027, se = .008, p = .001$) and gender ($b = .313, se = .115, p = .007$) are both related positively to the repeated evaluation ratings of authority roles. Specifically, females and older subculture members tend to evaluate authority roles as a set more positively than males and younger subculture members. Also, age is related negatively to the repeated activity ratings of both familiar ($b = -.015, se = .004, p = .001$) and less familiar subculture roles ($b = -.021, se = .005, p <$
Overall, older respondents tend to rate both familiar and less familiar subculture roles as less active than do younger respondents.

Subculture Ideology Roles Hypotheses 1-2 and Subculture Roles Behavior Hypotheses 1-2

Evaluation (1). In the third and final stage of each analysis (Model 3), the variables of theoretical interest (ideological embeddedness and behavioral-relational involvement) are entered in the HMLM analysis as additional Level-2 predictors. Consistent with Subculture Roles Ideology Hypothesis 1 and Subculture Roles Behavior Hypothesis 1, both ideological embeddedness ($b = .193, se = .036, p < .001$) and behavioral-relational involvement ($b = .111, se = .036, p = .002$) are related positively to the repeated evaluation ratings of familiar subculture roles, net the effects of age and gender. Embeddedness ($b = .179, se = .058, p = .002$) and involvement ($b = .119, se = .055, p = .032$) are also related positively to the repeated evaluation ratings of less familiar subculture roles.

Potency (2). Consistent with Subculture Roles Ideology Hypothesis 2, ideological embeddedness is related positively to the repeated potency ratings of familiar subculture roles ($b = .171, se = .034, p < .001$), net the effects of age and gender. The same is true for less familiar subculture roles analysis: embeddedness ($b = .162, se = .056, p = .004$) is related positively to the potency of less familiar subculture roles. However, contrary to Subculture Roles Behavior Hypothesis 2, behavioral-relational involvement is not related to the repeated potency ratings of either familiar or less familiar subculture roles.
To summarize, members with high levels of ideological embeddedness in the subculture tend to rate the evaluation and potency of both familiar and less familiar subculture roles higher than those with lower levels of ideological embeddedness. Members who attend more concerts and have stronger ties to the subculture (strong behavioral-relational involvement) rate subculture roles more positively, but not more potently, than less involved members.

Authority Roles Ideology Hypotheses 1-2 and Authority Roles Behavior Hypotheses 1-2

Evaluation (1). Consistent with Authority Roles Ideology Hypothesis 1 and Authority Roles Behavior Hypothesis 1, both embeddedness ($b = -.113$) and involvement ($b = -.189$) are related negatively to the set of evaluation ratings for authority roles.

Potency (2). Contrary to Authority Roles Ideology Hypothesis 2 and Authority Roles Behavior Hypothesis 2, neither embeddedness nor involvement are related to the set of potency ratings for authority roles.

In sum, although members who are highly embedded and who have strong behavioral-relational involvement evaluate authority roles less positively than weakly embedded and weakly involved members, neither ideological embeddedness nor behavioral-relational involvement is related significantly to the potency of authority roles.
Discussion

Implications for Studies of Meaning Socialization

The present study makes three contributions to the literature on meaning socialization. First, although several studies have suggested between-group role meaning variation, this study investigated within-group role meaning variation. That is, whereas early subculture research suggested that subcultures are homogeneous entities, the two continuous measures used in the current study indicate that members do vary by attitudes and behaviors. The results indicated the extent to which members vary along levels of ideological embeddedness and behavioral-relational involvement and how this variation relates to sets of role meanings. The relationship between the two continuous measures of involvement and role meanings was significant for roles unique to the subculture (e.g., a deadhead, a phishhead) as well roles significant to the subculture that are also part of the mainstream (e.g., a hippie, a nark). These findings suggest that jamband subculture members are not a homogeneous group.

Specifically, I found that members with high levels of ideological embeddedness in the subculture tend to rate the evaluation and potency of subculture roles higher than those with lower levels of ideological embeddedness. Also, members who attend more concerts and have stronger ties to the subculture (strong behavioral-relational involvement) rate subculture roles more positively, but not more potently, than less involved members. Further, I found that while members who are highly embedded and who have strong behavioral-relational involvement evaluate authority roles less positively than weakly
embedded and weakly involved members, neither ideological embeddedness nor behavioral-relational involvement is related significantly to the potency of authority roles. This is inconsistent with Schneider’s (2004:316) findings that because authority figures have legitimated power (including institutional authorities like a capitalist), they tend to be positively evaluated despite their ability to coerce. Jamband subculture members, due to their unorthodox lifestyles, historically have a tainted relationship with authority figures. Perhaps within the jamband subculture, the power of authority figures is not legitimated, and therefore authority roles are not positively evaluated.

I also found that age is related negatively to the activity of subculture roles. Older subculture members rated subculture roles as less active than did younger members. In addition, I found that age and gender are related positively to the evaluation of authority roles. Females and older subculture members tend to evaluate authority roles more positively than males and younger subculture members. This finding is consistent with previous findings about the gender differences in perceptions of authority roles (Schneider 2002). That is, Schneider (2002) found that women tend to evaluate authority figures more positively than do men.

The second and third contributions are methodological. While other researchers examining meaning socialization have found associations between involvement and meanings using bivariate statistics (e.g., correlations and t-tests), I have examined the relationship between continuous measures of involvement and role meanings using multivariate methods. Therefore, I was able to examine the effect of the two continuous measures of involvement on sets of role meanings while controlling for age and gender. I
found that relationships between embeddedness and meanings and involvement and meanings held net of the effects of age and gender. Relationships between age and meanings and gender and meanings also held net of the effects of the main independent variables. These are findings that have not been possible in past studies using only bivariate statistics to examine subcultural meaning variation.

Third, I have examined the relationship between involvement and role meanings using an application of hierarchical multivariate linear modeling (HMLM). Repeated measures analysis with HMLM is typically used to study individual growth over time with longitudinal data (Raudenbush and Bryk 2002). However, I used HMLM to capture variation in repeated affective measurements within subculture members at Level 1 and to test specific predictions about how that variation depends on the levels of ideological embeddedness and behavioral-relational involvement at Level 2. In doing so, I was able to (1) produce a single estimate of the effect of ideological embeddedness on the repeated evaluation ratings, repeated potency ratings, and repeated activity ratings within three theoretically distinguishable sets of roles (familiar subculture, less familiar subculture, and authority), and (2) produce a single estimate of the effect of behavioral-relational involvement on the repeated evaluation ratings, repeated potency ratings, and repeated activity ratings within each of the three sets of roles.

*Implications for Studies of Subculture*

In addition to the contributions made to the meaning socialization literature, the current study also has implications for studies of subculture. The first and second
contributions are related. Specifically, I measured both the independent variables and the
dependent variable quantitatively. First, I used the evaluation, potency, and activity
ratings of roles to measure quantitative affective role meanings. Second, I suggested a
standardized way to measure variation within subcultures that has not been used before in
qualitative studies. I have provided a quantitative standardized measure of ideological
embeddedness using qualitative information from jamband subculture. To date, there are
no quantitative measures in the general subculture literature of ideological embeddedness
or behavioral-relational involvement. And, the measure of ideological embeddedness may
provide stronger measurement validity than other standardized procedures (e.g., attitude
statements), because I did not impose an a priori conceptualization of embeddedness on
respondents. Rather, I asked respondents to compare themselves to identity vignettes that
I developed using my qualitative research in the subculture (Hunt 2002). I also developed
an index of behavioral-relational involvement that combines important properties of
involvement that other researchers have identified (Fine and Kleinman 1979; Friedkin
2004; Latane 1981; Stryker 1968, 1980). For instance, the measure included dimensions
of both behavioral or physical involvement (number of events attended) and relational
involvement (number of relationships held in the subculture).

Implications for Studies of Deadheads and the Jamband Subculture

In addition to contributing to the general literature on subcultures, the current study
adds to the literature on the Deadhead subculture specifically. First, qualitative Deadhead
subculture researchers find that members evaluate subculture roles positively and authority
roles negatively (Paterline 2000; Sardiello 1998; Sheptoski 2000). This study provides quantitative evidence consistent with these qualitative findings. I also find that females and older subculture members tend to evaluate authority roles as a set more positively than males and younger subculture members. Future research might now qualitatively investigate this relationship. Are male subculture members anti-authority? Also, perhaps researchers could cross age and gender to determine if there is a multiplicative effect of the two on authority role meanings.

Previous qualitative research, did not, however, provide conclusive findings regarding role potency or role activity. This study adds potency and activity findings to previous qualitative research investigating the relationship between Deadhead (and jamband) subculture involvement and the authority role meanings. Specifically I find that although more embedded and involved members evaluate authority roles less positively than members who are less embedded and less involved, no relationship exists between ideological embeddedness or involvement and the potency of authority roles. As I noted above, no studies specify how members feel about authority figures. Rather, the reverse scenario is usually told: how authority figures and community members feel about subculture members. While some researchers have reasoned that members feel the power of authority figures through the latter’s ability to punish (Paterline 2000; Ritzer 2000), others have concluded that members feel that at least some authority figures (a nark and a capitalist) are shallow (Ritzer 2000). The current study suggests that ideological embeddedness and behavioral-relational involvement have no effect on how members feel
about the potency of authority figures. Future studies might continue to investigate quantitatively as well as qualitatively how members feel about authority figures.

Conclusion

I have introduced two continuous measures of subcultural membership to test predictions of within-group variation among jamband subculture members. The results indicate that ideological embeddedness and behavioral-relational involvement are two dimensions of membership in the jamband subculture, a finding consistent with research from other areas of social psychology, including subcultures (Fine and Kleinman 1979), social cohesion (Friedkin 2004) and social influence (Latane 1981).

I found support for Subculture Roles Ideology Hypotheses 1-2, Subculture Roles Behavior Hypothesis 1, Authority Roles Ideology Hypothesis 1, and Authority Roles Behavior Hypothesis 1. I used hierarchical multivariate linear modeling (HMLM) to capture variation in repeated affective measurements among subculture members and to test specific predictions about how that variation is a function of members’ levels of ideological embeddedness and behavioral-relational involvement. The findings indicate that, consistent with previous qualitative research of within-group variation in other subcultures such as punk (Andes 1998; Fox 1987), straightedge (Wood 2003), and Deadhead (Sardiello 1998), the jamband subculture is heterogeneous in terms of ideological embeddedness and behavioral-relational involvement. And, these two continuous dimensions of membership are related to repeated sets of role meanings. I
suggest future quantitative investigations using these two continuous measures of membership in other subcultures and subgroups.
CHAPTER 3

USING DIFFERENTIAL ASSOCIATION THEORY
TO EXPLAIN PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR

Study Abstract

I use differential association theory to explain the distinctive behavior definitions found among members of the jamband subculture. Specifically, I examine the relationship between the differential association modalities (frequency, intensity, priority, and duration) and the affective meanings (evaluation, potency, and activity) associated with six behaviors that are relevant to that subculture. I expect the modalities to be related positively to the evaluation and potency of four prosocial (what I term “kynd”) behaviors (to barter, to follow a band, to share, to trade music) and negatively to the evaluation and potency of two “unkynd” behaviors (to talk down, to threaten). Using data from self-administered surveys (N = 379), I find that frequency and intensity predict the affective meaning of kynd and unkynd behaviors. However, priority and duration generally do not predict the affective meaning of kynd and unkynd behaviors.

Thus, although differential association is a theory of deviance and delinquency, I investigate whether its basic principles apply to other types of subcultures and behaviors: specifically in explaining the non-normative behavior meanings in the jamband
subculture. The findings suggest that although differential association theory does in part explain the development of unique behavior meanings, the theory may not be suited to fully explain distinctive behavior meanings that develop in this subculture. Further, my findings suggest that the relationships between the modalities and behavior meanings may be more complex than differential association theory proposes. There may be mediating and suppressing relationships among the modalities.

Introduction

Numerous studies have documented the distinctive subculture among the Grateful Dead followers ("Deadheads") and more recently among members of the related jamband subculture. These studies have shown that members of both subcultures value sharing and reciprocity, values that often translate into communal behaviors such as pooling resources, bartering, and trading (rather than selling) music (Pearson 1987; Sheptoski 2000; Wilgoren 1999). These studies also show that members value kindness, generosity, tolerance, and acceptance, qualities that, many argue, are undervalued in American mainstream society (Vela-McConnell 1999). In fact, members of these subcultures use the term "kynd" to emphasize the compassionate collective aspects of their culture, aspects that may be considered non-normative to persons who are nonmembers (Ritzer 2000; Shenk and Silberman 1994).8

Despite subculture members’ non-normative behavior documented in numerous

---

8 This word is spelled both distinctly ("kynd") and traditionally ("kind") within the subculture as are other words such as "phriendly" (to denote a person who is friendly and also a fan of the band Phish). I use the distinctive (kynd) spelling in this study.
studies, researchers have not used theories of deviance to explain their non-normative behavior patterns. I begin to explore these issues in this study. I show how differential association theory can be used to explain the distinctive definitions members of the jamband subculture associate with several behaviors. More specifically, I investigate whether interpersonal association with members of the jamband subculture produces distinct behavior definitions. Behavior definitions are important predictors of behavior (Heise 1979, 2007; MacKinnon 1994; Matsueda 1982).

The Jamband Subculture

The jamband subculture is a contemporary version of the subculture of the rock music band the Grateful Dead. Similar to the Grateful Dead subculture, jamband subculture members follow bands across the country on tour and share a temporary community outside the venues at which bands perform (Budnick 2003). The community consists of members who travel from concert to concert, including those who vend various items (e.g., handmade clothing, jewelry, crafts, and food) in order to cover travel expenses, and those who visit only local events or weekend-long festivals. This temporary community is where members develop friendships and share a system of values and attitudes different from mainstream U.S. culture (Lehman 2000; Sardiello 1994, 1998; Wilgoren 1999). The scene that develops out of this temporary, yet recurring, community is one where individuals value human association, equality, political and spiritual consciousness, and individual freedom and cooperation (Baiano Berman 2002).
**Differential Association Theory**

According to the principles of differential association theory, individuals are exposed, through interaction with others, to behavior definitions both favorable and unfavorable to law violation. An excess of association with individuals who hold definitions favorable to law violation disposes individuals to develop delinquent behavior definitions, which then promotes their own delinquent behavior. Sutherland (1939) intended researchers to think of associations in terms of a ratio: the proportion of associations with individuals who hold delinquent behavior definitions to associations with individuals who do not hold delinquent behavior definitions. Further, the influence of the association is a function of the frequency, intensity, priority, and duration of these associations, whether delinquent or non-delinquent. That is, definitions encountered through social interactions that occur frequently (frequency), from a prestigious source (intensity), early in life (priority), and for a long time period (duration) will have greater influence on behavior definitions than those definitions encountered otherwise. Figure 3.1 depicts the structure of differential association.

**Theoretical and Substantive Questions**

Despite several empirical tests of the theory (e.g., Battin et al. 1998; Matsueda 1982; Matsueda and Heimer 1987; Rosecrance 1986), substantive and theoretical questions remain. I address four of these questions in this study.
Figure 3.1. Differential Association (Sutherland 1939; Sutherland and Cressey 1966)
Omission of modalities of association altogether. While some researchers (e.g., Short 1957; Warr 1993) have taken into account the modalities of association (frequency, intensity, priority, duration), most empirical tests of differential association theory do not (e.g., Tittle, Burke, and Jackson 1986; Matsueda 1982; Matsueda and Heimer 1987). Further, some researchers choose among the modalities they investigate, while failing to examine others. Massey and Krohn (1986), for example, measure frequency, intensity, and duration, but do not measure priority.

As Sutherland and Cressey (1966:88) note, “If these ‘modalities,’ as Sutherland called them, are ignored, then the theory would equate the impact of a behavior pattern presented once in a radio show with the impact of a pattern presented numerous times to a child who deeply loved and respected the donor. It does not so equate the pattern.” I measure the modalities of association and investigate their direct relationship to six behavior definitions central to the jamband subculture.

Neglecting the effect of modalities on behavior definitions. As stated above, several studies omit the modalities of association. However, the studies that do take into account the modalities have not examined the intervening effect of the modalities on behavior definitions. Rather, as Figure 3.2 illustrates, some studies simply examine the relationship between the modalities and behavior (e.g., Short 1957; Warr 1993). Figure 3.3 shows another way researchers evaluate differential association. In these studies researchers examine the relationship between structural characteristics and behavior definitions, and the relationship between behavior definitions and behaviors, while not
examining the effect of the modalities on behavior definitions (Matsueda 1982; Matsueda and Heimer 1987). Other differential association studies combine control theory variables (e.g., attachment, commitment, and beliefs) with differential association theory variables (e.g., behavior definitions) and examine the direct and indirect effect of the variables on deviant behavior (e.g., Payne and Salotti 2007; Thornberry et al. 1994) while still neglecting to examine the relationship between the modalities and behavior definitions. It has been noted that perhaps researchers fail to operationalize the modalities because Sutherland provided unclear definitions of the modalities (see Warr 1993).

Although differential association researchers have generally failed to examine the relationship between the modalities and behavior meanings, meaning socialization researchers have investigated a similar relationship: between involvement in a subgroup and behavior meanings. For instance, Heise (2007:24) finds that the more experience and individual has with drugs (similar to frequency and perhaps, duration) the more likely he or she is to positively evaluate such behaviors as “sniffing cocaine” and “smoking marijuana, hash.” Although my investigation is not a test of differential association theory, I examine the first half of the mediating relationship originally proposed by Sutherland (1939) by investigating the relationship between the modalities of association and behavior definitions significant to the jamband subculture belief system.
Figure 3.2. Short (1957); Warr (1993)

Figure 3.3. Matsueda (1982); Matsueda and Heimer (1987)
**Behavior definition operationalization.** Within deviant subcultures, measuring attitudes explicitly can be intrusive because the researcher is usually an outsider (Fine and Kleinman 1979). Despite this problem in using attitude statements to obtain valid measurements of attitudes from subculture members, researchers testing differential association theory nonetheless typically measure behavior definitions using this measurement procedure. For instance, behavior definitions are generally calculated by respondents’ level of agreement to attitude statements such as, “To get ahead, you have to do some things which are not right” (Matsueda 1982:502). These statements then become indicators of a theoretical construct that is intended to represent the ratio of definitions favorable to and unfavorable to law violation.

I operationalize behavior definitions with affective behavior meanings. Behavior meanings in this study are the evaluation, potency, and activity (EPA) ratings of six behaviors significant to the jamband subculture belief system. The evaluation dimension reflects judgments about morality (good vs. bad), aesthetics (beautiful vs. ugly), hedonism (pleasant vs. unpleasant), and utility (useful vs. useless). The potency dimension reflects judgments of strength (strong vs. weak), size (big vs. little), depth (deep vs. shallow), and force (powerful vs. powerless). And activity reflects assessments of perceptual stimulation (noisy vs. quiet), speed (fast vs. slow), age (young vs. old), and keenness (sharp vs. dull) (Heise 2000).

I use affective meanings to represent behavior “definitions” for several reasons. First, researchers in several substantive areas of study (e.g., gender, emotions, affect control theory) have found that evaluation, potency, and activity profiles provide a
parsimonious way of capturing much of the meaning of social concepts (e.g., role-identities, behaviors). Second, research in over 20 cultures has shown that most social concepts universally evoke affective meanings along these three dimensions (Osgood, May, and Miron 1975; Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum 1957). Third, as noted above, within delinquent/deviant subcultures, measuring attitudes explicitly can be intrusive because the researcher is usually an outsider (Fine and Kleinman 1979). In contrast to the typical attitude statements noted earlier, affective meanings provide a precise conceptualization of one’s attitude without measuring attitudes explicitly, thereby reducing the tendency of respondents to withhold candid responses.

Differential association theory to explain development of prosocial behavior definitions. Despite decades of research investigating the utility of differential association theory and decades of research on subcultures, no study has used differential association theory to explain the development of non-normative prosocial behavior meanings like those that may exist within the jamband subculture. Understanding behavior meanings and their relationship to the modalities of association is important for understanding any subculture’s distinctive behavior patterns because behavior meanings can be used to explain and predict behavior (Heise 1979, 2007; MacKinnon 1994; Matsueda 1982). As noted before, although I do not test the theory, I use the theory’s main propositions to investigate the first set of relationships in this process: between the modalities of association and behavior meanings in the jamband subculture.
Modalities of Association Operationalized

Differential association theory was developed by Sutherland (1939). The modalities of association were also defined originally by him, and each operationalization by other scholars is very similar to Sutherland’s. Next I detail how Sutherland and others researchers define the modalities of association and how I measure the modalities. Sutherland states that the meaning of frequency and duration are “obvious and need no explanation” (Sutherland and Cressey 1966:82). However, Sutherland evidently meant that frequent (frequency) and prolonged (duration) associations have a greater effect on learning behavior definitions than infrequent and limited associations. Other researchers have measured frequency and duration in this manner (Short 1957; Warr 1993). Thus, I operationalize frequency with three indicators: individuals’ attendance at jamband events, their association with individuals within the subculture, and their association with individuals outside the subculture. And, I operationalize duration by the number of years in the jamband subculture. Sutherland defines intensity, “with such things as the prestige of the source of a criminal or anticriminal pattern and with emotional reactions related to the associations” (Sutherland and Cressey 1966:82). Therefore, I measure intensity as the emotional and relational attachment made to others in the subculture. Sutherland (1966:82) operationalizes priority with early, youthful socialization and states that, priority is important because any behavior (lawful or delinquent) developed early in life “may persist throughout life.” Therefore, I measure priority as the inverse of respondents’ age at their first jamband event.

In the next section I hypothesize the direction of the relationships between the
differential association modalities and the affective meanings of six behaviors significant to the jamband subculture belief system. These hypotheses emerge from qualitative studies of the perception of behaviors within the jamband subculture. I chose these behaviors based on my own and others’ observations and interviews that revealed the centrality of each behavior within the subculture (Hunt 2002; Niman 1997; Ritzer 2000; Shenk and Silberman 1994).

_Hypotheses_

Americans generally value the individual acquisition of status, income, and authority (Bellah et al. 1985; Fromm 1976; Heckert and Heckert 2004; Jones 1998; Poplin 1979; Selznick 2002; Tocqueville [1835] 2000). In the U.S., selflessness is often viewed with suspicion (Vela-McConnell 1999). In fact, some studies show that prosocial behaviors such as sharing resources or helping a stranger are considered non-normative in the mainstream, causing individuals on the receiving end to react negatively (Jones 1998). Conversely, members of the jamband subculture are generally dedicated to communal, self-transcendent values and power equality that encourage prosocial actions. Jamband subculture members value peacefulness and camaraderie, and they use the term “kynd” to emphasize the prosocial aspects of their culture (Pearson 1987; Ritzer 2000; Shenk and Silberman 1994). Kynd behaviors are considered normative within the jamband subculture. In the next section, I use a kynd/unkynd categorization to develop my hypotheses about the relationship between the differential association modalities and behavior meanings. Below I highlight the behaviors that I investigate in italics.
Jamband subculture members place high value on *sharing* and *bartering* resources (David 2000; Sheptoski 2000). Members share rides, food, concert tickets (called “miracles”), water, and other resources with one another, and this generally happens without an expectation of receiving something in return (Wilgoren 1999). In fact, Sutton (2000:122) finds that “the Deadhead code, or rules for everyday living,” consists of “an adherence to an ethic of sharing.” Sharing and bartering are two of the strongest elements of the Deadhead code (Sutton 2000).

The most frequent bartering practice is that of *trading music*. The Grateful Dead once suggested “when we’re finished with it [the concert], they can have it” (Fraser and Black 1999:33). And, this decision was pivotal to the development of a now legitimate tape-trading network within the jamband subculture. The practice of freely taping and trading live music is acknowledged and encouraged by jambands. Members only trade, never sell, tapes to one another; and there are informal yet heavy sanctions against those who are caught selling tapes (Pearson 1987:430).

The final kynd behavior I investigate is *to follow a band*. Many fans follow jambands throughout the length of a tour. They share with one another the joys and the hardships of living on the road, an experience that forges strong bonds among subculture members (Sheptoski 2000).
Unkynd Behaviors

Jamband subculture values discourage negative, nonegalitarian, and violent social actions, actions that are termed “unkynd” in the subculture. As stated earlier, peacefulness and camaraderie are two central values that have carried over from the hippie countercultural movement to the jamband subculture (Pearson 1987). Therefore, members discourage threatening speech, such as threatening or talking down to someone. These behaviors would be considered non-normative within the jamband subculture.

Evaluation

Kynd Behaviors. Ritzer (2000) and Jennings (2000) find that individuals who spend more time at concerts and who have spent more time in the subculture are more likely to value, and therefore engage in, kynd behaviors. Therefore, I expect that frequency (frequency of association), intensity (emotional and relational attachment to others in the subculture), priority (youthful socialization within the subculture), and duration (time length of association) will be related positively to the evaluation of kynd behaviors.

Unkynd Behaviors. While there are subtle expectations for proper behavior within the subculture, there is no formal mechanism of social control. Yet, qualitative researchers have found that those who have spent less time in the subculture and have fewer relationships in the subculture are less familiar with the social norms; therefore, they tend to take from the community without giving back, and sometimes behave in
violent and destructive ways (Sutton 2000). Therefore, I expect frequency, intensity, priority, and duration of association to be related negatively to the evaluation of unkynd behaviors.

**Potency**

*Kynd Behaviors*. While “kynd” generally refers to pleasant aspects of the subculture, “heady” is sometimes used to describe potent components of the scene (Hunt 2002). Although this adjective is sometimes used within the subculture in the traditional sense to mean intoxicating, it is also used with reference to positive, powerful behaviors and experiences. So, granting someone a miracle (i.e., free) ticket, for example, would be a “heady” gesture. Those with more experience and involvement in the subculture are more likely to understand this; qualitative researchers have found that “those who do not share the concert experience may be less likely to observe the code” (Sutton 2000:123). Thus, I expect that frequency, intensity, priority, and duration will be related positively to the potency of kynd behaviors.

*Unkynd Behaviors*. Deadheads and jamband subculture members tend to hold spiritual and countercultural views of power and they believe in the notion of karma (Adams 2000). For instance, the Deadhead code espouses the potency of sharing and giving, while suggesting that it is weak to harm (Sutton 2000). Unkynd behaviors (to talk down, to threaten) contradict the values of the jamband subculture. In fact, each of these unkynd behaviors, if performed by an individual, would weaken his or her position within
the subculture. Therefore, I expect frequency, intensity, priority, and duration of association to be related negatively to the potency of unkynd behaviors.

_Activity._ Due to the limited research on activity dynamics within this subculture, I do not advance hypotheses concerning the relationship between the differential association modalities and the activity of kynd and unkynd behaviors. I do, however, investigate these relationships.

The hypotheses are listed individually by the characterization of the behaviors (kynd or unkynd), the modality of association (frequency, intensity, priority, and duration), the affective dimension (evaluation is indicated with the number 1, potency with the number 2), and the direction of the effect (positive or negative). For instance, every kynd hypothesis proposes the same direction of effect: a positive relationship between each modality and the (1) evaluation and (2) potency of kynd behaviors.

_Kynd Frequency Hypotheses 1-2:_ Frequency will be related positively to the (1) evaluation and (2) potency of kynd behaviors (to barter, to follow a band, to share, and to trade music).

_Kynd Intensity Hypotheses 1-2:_ Intensity will be related positively to the (1) evaluation and (2) potency of kynd behaviors.

_Kynd Priority Hypotheses 1-2:_ Priority will be related positively to the (1) evaluation and (2) potency of kynd behaviors.

_Kynd Duration Hypotheses 1-2:_ Duration will be related positively to the (1) evaluation and (2) potency of kynd behaviors.

Every kynd hypothesis proposes the same direction of effect: a negative relationship between each modality and the (1) evaluation and (2) potency of unkynd behaviors.
Unkynd Frequency Hypotheses 1-2: Frequency will be related negatively to the (1) evaluation and (2) potency of unkynd behaviors (to talk down, to threaten).

Unkynd Intensity Hypotheses 1-2: Intensity will be related negatively to the (1) evaluation and (2) potency of unkynd behaviors.

Unkynd Priority Hypotheses 1-2: Priority will be related negatively to the (1) evaluation and (2) potency of unkynd behaviors.

Unkynd Duration Hypotheses 1-2: Duration will be related negatively to the (1) evaluation and (2) potency of unkynd behaviors.

Methods

Data and Sample

Data were collected with a self-administered survey distributed online and at jamband events in several geographic regions of the United States: the Midwest (five events), the Southeast (one event), and the Northeast (two events). Any event participant was eligible for the study. I used four data collection procedures. First, I created two types of correspondence (business cards and a large banner) that listed my name, the name of the study, and the website where the on-line version of my survey was based. I distributed the business cards and displayed the banner at jamband events. Second, individuals who preferred to complete the survey at the concert were given a paper version of the survey. Respondents placed the completed surveys in a secured drop box that was located at two vendors’ booths. Third, individuals who did not have access to a computer but also did not want to complete the survey at the concert were given a paper version of the survey along with a self-addressed stamped envelope. Fourth, the link to my survey was posted on an online magazine website (www.jambands.com), several
Budnick (2003) suggests that fans from The Dave Matthews Band (DMB) overlap with fans from the jamband scene; therefore, I used the DMB message board to collect data from less integrated members of the jamband community. After several months of low response rates, an incentive was offered to respondents for completing the survey. Specifically, respondents were given the option to enter their contact information for a chance to win a ticket to a popular jamband festival. The winner was randomly selected and contacted at the end of data collection.

Sample Demographics

The average age of respondents at first jamband event is 18 years (N = 379 unless noted). Ages range from 18-53 with a mean of 28.6 years. Sixty-five percent of respondents are male and 35% are female (N = 376). Of the respondents, 80% report being a member of the jamband scene (N = 378), and 94% reported that they support the values of the jamband subculture (N = 377). Respondents attend between 1 and 150 jamband related events per year, with an average of 18 events per year. Respondents attended their first jamband related event between 1 and 37 years ago, spending on average 10.5 years in the subculture. The sample is 99.5% white (N = 376) and 93% non-Hispanic (N = 85). Sixty-four percent of the respondents hold a bachelor’s degree or higher level of education.

---

9 Budnick (2003) suggests that fans from The Dave Matthews Band (DMB) overlap with fans from the jamband scene; therefore, I used the DMB message board to collect data from less integrated members of the jamband community.
**Dependent Variables**

*Role Meanings* are the evaluation, potency, and activity of six behaviors: to barter, to follow a band, to trade music, to share, to talk down, and to threaten. Respondents rated behaviors on each dimension using nine point semantic differential scales (ranging from -4 to +4). The evaluation dimension was anchored with the adjective pairs “good, nice” and “bad, awful,” the potency dimension with “powerless, little” and “powerful, big,” and the activity dimension with “slow, quiet, old” and “fast, noisy, young.” The middle point of the scale was marked neutral, and the circles between the mid-point and each endpoint were marked slightly, quite, extremely, and infinitely (see Table 3.1).

**Independent Variables**

*Frequency of association* is operationalized with an index pertaining to frequency of attendance at jamband concerts, relationships within the subculture, and relationships outside the subculture. Respondents answered three questions in the frequency index, two of which were open ended: (1) “How many jamband type concerts/performances do you typically attend per year?” and (2) “How many people would you no longer see if you stopped being a part of the jamband subculture?” The third question was closed-ended with responses ranging 1 (very often) to 7 (never): (3) “How often do you get involved with friends who are not in this scene?” I logged the first two questions to improve the normality of their distributions. While there were no values of 0 for item 1, I used 1 to represent the value of 0 before logging the second item. The transformation of the first item changes the chi-square for the joint skewness and kurtosis test for normality from
Principal components factor analysis results for frequency for the full sample (N = 503) and the restricted sample using only cases available in the multivariate analyses (N = 379) are very similar. Factor scores from the two analyses are highly correlated, \( r = .99 \). I do the same for intensity, for which factor scores from the full and restricted samples were also perfectly correlated, \( r = 1.0 \). Therefore, I use the factor scores from the full sample.

Table 3.1. Mean Evaluation, Potency, Activity (EPA) Ratings and Standard Deviations of Kynd and Unkynd Behaviors (N = 379)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kynd Behaviors</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Potency</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barter</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.55)</td>
<td>(1.50)</td>
<td>(1.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow a Band</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.42)</td>
<td>(1.75)</td>
<td>(1.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.28)</td>
<td>(1.77)</td>
<td>(1.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Music</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.16)</td>
<td>(1.74)</td>
<td>(1.44)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unkynd Behaviors</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Potency</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talk Down</td>
<td>-3.03</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.60)</td>
<td>(2.47)</td>
<td>(1.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threaten</td>
<td>-3.46</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.14)</td>
<td>(2.77)</td>
<td>(2.06)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Standard deviations are in parentheses. All behaviors are in transitive verb form: to [insert behavior] someone.

\[ \chi^2 = 368.26, p = .000 \] to \[ \chi^2 = 12.98, p = .002 \]. The transformation of the second item changes the chi-square from \[ \chi^2 = 558.11, p = .000 \] to \[ \chi^2 = 23.16, p = .000 \]. I standardized each of these items and conducted principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation on the full sample (N = 503) and results indicate that the index has only one dimension.\(^\text{10}\) Thus, high frequency represents frequent association with individuals in the jamband subculture and infrequent association with individuals outside the subculture. The alpha reliability coefficient for the index is .52. I use the factor scores for the

\(^{10}\)Principal components factor analysis results for frequency for the full sample (N = 503) and the restricted sample using only cases available in the multivariate analyses (N = 379) are very similar. Factor scores from the two analyses are highly correlated, \( r = .99 \). I do the same for intensity, for which factor scores from the full and restricted samples were also perfectly correlated \( r = 1.0 \). Therefore, I use the factor scores from the full sample.
frequency values. Descriptive statistics for all independent variables in this study are
listed in Table 3.2. Because I use only those cases retained in the analyses to obtain the
descriptive statistics, the mean and standard deviation of the factor scores are not 0 and 1,
respectively.

*Intensity of association* is operationalized with an index pertaining to number of
prestigious relationships in the subculture (measured as number of friends) and the extent
of emotional investment in these relationships. I gauge prestige with two items: (1) “How
many friends have you made purely as a result of being a jamband subculture member?”
and (2) “How many people would you miss if you stopped being a part of the jamband
subculture?” I measure emotional investment with a third question that gave closed-
ended responses ranging from 1 (not invested at all) to 7 (extremely invested): (3) “To
what extent are you emotionally invested in your relationships with people in the jamband
subculture?” I logged the first two questions to improve the normality of their
distributions, using 1 to represent the value of 0. The transformation of the first item
changes the chi-square for the joint skewness and kurtosis test for normality from $\chi^2 = 658.46, p = .000$ to $\chi^2 = 9.46, p = .009$. The transformation of the second item changes
the chi-square from $\chi^2 = 638.37, p = .000$ to $\chi^2 = 4.47, p = .11$. I standardized each
variable before conducting principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation on
the full sample (N = 534) and results indicate that the index has one dimension ranging
from high intensity to low intensity. The alpha reliability coefficients for these three
items is .82. I use the factor scores for the intensity values.
Table 3.2. Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations for All Independent variables in Chapter 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Frequency</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.74***</td>
<td>.18***</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Intensity</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Priority (logged)</td>
<td>-2.85</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Duration (centered)</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001 (two tailed tests).

*Priority of association* is intended to tap socialization at an early age. I operationalize priority with the inverse of age (in years) at first jamband event. I developed this measure by subtracting duration (number of years involved in the subculture) from respondents’ age at the time of data collection, then multiplying by (-1) so high values indicate high priority (young socialization). I then logged the variable to improve normality. The transformation of the item changes the chi-square for the joint skewness and kurtosis test for normality from $\chi^2 = 184.60, p = .000$ to $\chi^2 = 72.44, p = .000$.

*Duration* is designed to capture length of association. Therefore, I measure duration with the number of years respondents have spent in the subculture (Table 3.2).
Results

Kynd Behavior Meanings

As shown in Table 3.1, jamband subculture members consider kynd behaviors good and, generally, potent. Specifically, they rate bartering as slightly good (1.36) and neutral in both potency (.26) and activity (.37). For comparison purposes, I provide data from college student raters who consider bartering slightly good (1.21), slightly potent (1.07), and slightly active (1.04). This suggests that these respondents consider bartering a more potent and lively action than do members of the jamband subculture.

Subculture members find following a band to be quite good (2.34), slightly potent (.84), and slightly active (1.09). More extreme are the meanings for sharing and trading music, both of which members feel are extremely good (3.17 and 3.07, respectively), quite potent (1.94 and 1.82, respectively), and neutral in activity (-.20 and .30, respectively). Members of the U.S. mainstream rate sharing as quite good (2.08), slightly potent (1.11), and slightly active (.71). There are no mainstream ratings for trading music and following a band.

Unkynd Behavior Meanings

Jamband subculture members generally rate unkynd behaviors as bad, impotent, and active. For instance, members consider talking down to someone extremely bad

---

11 U.S. mainstream ratings are data collected by Heise from university undergraduates in 2003. These ratings are kept in an online dictionary: http://www.indiana.edu/~socpsy/ACT/interact.htm
(-3.03), slightly impotent (-1.44), and slightly active (.99). Members rate threatening someone as extremely bad (-3.46), slightly impotent (-.51), and quite active (1.69). The potency rating for talking down to someone is extreme when compared to the U.S. college student (mainstream) raters. College students rate talking down to someone quite bad (-1.58) and neutral on both the potency (-.07) and activity dimensions (.31).

Threatening someone in the mainstream is also considered quite bad (-2.50) and neutral in potency (-.10), but slightly active (.93). Therefore, mainstream raters tend to feel that unkynd behaviors are less wicked, more potent, and less active.

**Analysis Plan**

To evaluate the hypothesized relationships between the differential association modalities and affective (EPA) role meanings, I use hierarchical multivariate linear modeling (HMLM) (Raudenbush and Bryk 2002). To test my hypotheses, I run separate HMLM analyses on (1) each distinct affective dimension (evaluation, potency, and activity) of the kynd behaviors and on (2) each affective dimension of the unkynd behaviors.

I examine six sets of repeated measures: the set of evaluation ratings, the set of potency ratings, and the set of activity ratings (separately) for each of the behaviors within the two groupings (i.e., kynd and unkynd). The data structure for each analysis consists of two levels. Level 1 (the repeated-observations model) assesses the within-person variability in repeated measures of affective behavior meanings. Level 2 (the
person-level model) includes the between-person differences in frequency, intensity, priority, and duration.

Preliminary analyses (available upon request) revealed that the best fit to the data is provided by models assuming that the structure of the Level 1 variance/covariance is unrestricted; hence the parameters from unrestricted models are reported in Tables 3.3 and 3.4. The unrestricted model does not assume that the error variances are constant across each of the respondent’s ratings, nor does it assume that the error variances are mutually independent. Table 3.3 displays the coefficients for kynd behaviors estimated separately for the repeated evaluation ratings, the repeated potency ratings, and the repeated activity ratings. Table 3.4 displays the results for unkynd behaviors.

In the first stage of each analysis (Model 1), an unconstrained model is utilized to estimate the mean level of evaluation, potency, and activity ratings before any independent variables are entered. The baseline evaluation of kynd behaviors is extremely good ($b = 2.648, se = .045, p < .001$), while the mean evaluation of unkynd behaviors is extremely bad ($b = -3.346, se = .045, p < .001$). The baseline potency of kynd behaviors is slightly potent ($b = .960, se = .062, p < .001$), while the baseline potency of unkynd behaviors is slightly impotent ($b = -1.084, se = .116, p < .001$). Finally, the baseline activity ratings for kynd behaviors is neutral ($b = .263, se = .046, p < .001$), while the baseline activity of unkynd behaviors is slightly active ($b = 1.307, se = .085, p < .001$).
Table 3.3 Hierarchical Multivariate Linear Modeling Coefficients of Repeated Evaluation, Potency, and Activity Ratings of Kynd Behaviors on Frequency, Intensity, Priority, and Duration of Association in the Jamband Subculture (N = 379)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.648*** (0.045)</td>
<td>2.638*** (0.045)</td>
<td>2.628*** (0.044)</td>
<td>2.612*** (0.044)</td>
<td>3.596*** (0.445)</td>
<td>2.648*** (0.045)</td>
<td>3.629*** (0.472)</td>
<td>3.315** (0.465)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>.175*** (0.067)</td>
<td>.019 (0.068)</td>
<td>.007 (0.068)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>.219*** (0.044)</td>
<td>.206** (0.065)</td>
<td>.204** (0.065)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority (logged)</td>
<td>.332* (0.155)</td>
<td>.344* (0.165)</td>
<td>.240 (0.162)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>.004 (0.008)</td>
<td>-.002 (0.008)</td>
<td>-.002 (0.008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Potency** | | | | | | | | |
| Intercept | .960*** (0.062) | .971*** (0.061) | .973*** (0.061) | .973*** (0.061) | .886 | .959*** (0.062) | .882 (0.065) | .612 (0.060) |
| Frequency | .144* (0.064) | .0001 (0.094) | -.006 (0.094) |
| Intensity | .191** (0.061) | .190* (0.090) | .191* (0.090) |
| Priority (logged) | -.026 (.212) | -.027 (.225) | -.126 (.213) |
| Duration | -.0002 (.010) | .0002 (.011) | .002 (.010) |

| **Activity** | | | | | | | | |
| Intercept | .263*** (0.046) | .262*** (0.046) | .263*** (0.046) | .259*** (0.046) | 1.128* (0.452) | .260*** (0.046) | 1.686** (0.472) | 1.838*** (0.474) |
| Frequency | -.084† (0.048) | -.153* (.070) | -.167* (.069) |
| Intensity | -.018 (.046) | .090 (0.068) | .087 (0.067) |
| Priority (logged) | .302† (.158) | .499** (.165) | .554** (.166) |
| Duration | -.020** (.008) | -.028** (.008) | -.028** (.008) |

Notes: Kynd behaviors include: to barter, to follow a band, to share, and to trade music. Standard errors are in parentheses. † p < .10; * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001 (two tailed tests). Variables are stepped in to reveal mediation and suppression patterns.
Table 3.4  Hierarchical Multivariate Linear Modeling Coefficients of Repeated Evaluation, Potency, and Activity Ratings of Unkynd Behaviors on Frequency, Intensity, Priority, and Duration of Association in the Jamband Subculture (N = 379)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-3.346*** (.054)</td>
<td>-3.346*** (.054)</td>
<td>-3.350*** (.054)</td>
<td>-3.341*** (.053)</td>
<td>-2.957*** (.531)</td>
<td>-3.343*** (.054)</td>
<td>-3.110*** (.563)</td>
<td>-3.082*** (.564)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>.012 (.056)</td>
<td>.184* (.082)</td>
<td>.177* (.082)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>-.098† (.054)</td>
<td>-.228** (.079)</td>
<td>-.228** (.079)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority (logged)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.136 (.185)</td>
<td>.081 (.196)</td>
<td>.089 (.197)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td></td>
<td>.009 (.009)</td>
<td>.008 (.010)</td>
<td>.007 (.010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-1.084*** (.116)</td>
<td>-1.084*** (.115)</td>
<td>-1.075*** (.115)</td>
<td>-1.075*** (.115)</td>
<td>-2.452* (.143)</td>
<td>-1.082*** (.116)</td>
<td>-2.234† (.1210)</td>
<td>-1.843 (.1215)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>-.244* (.120)</td>
<td>.010 (.176)</td>
<td>.007 (.177)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>-.314** (.116)</td>
<td>-.306† (.171)</td>
<td>-.304† (.170)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority (logged)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.481 (.398)</td>
<td>-.405 (.422)</td>
<td>-.271 (.424)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.018 (.019)</td>
<td>-.011 (.021)</td>
<td>-.011 (.020)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.307*** (.085)</td>
<td>1.310*** (.085)</td>
<td>1.307*** (.085)</td>
<td>1.314*** (.086)</td>
<td>1.007 (.841)</td>
<td>1.307*** (.085)</td>
<td>.963 (.892)</td>
<td>.843 (.902)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>.073 (.089)</td>
<td>.143 (.131)</td>
<td>.150 (.132)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>.010 (.086)</td>
<td>-.091 (.126)</td>
<td>-.090 (.126)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority (logged)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.105 (.293)</td>
<td>-.121 (.311)</td>
<td>-.165 (.315)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td></td>
<td>.0002 (.014)</td>
<td>.002 (.015)</td>
<td>.002 (.015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Kynd behaviors include: to barter, to talk down and to threaten. Standard errors are in parentheses. † p < .10; * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001 (two tailed tests). Variables are stepped in to reveal mediation and suppression patterns.
In the next seven stages of analysis (Models 2-8), differential association modalities (frequency, intensity, priority, and duration) are added as Level-2 (between-person) predictors. I first step each modality in alone to test the hypotheses. Then I add each to an additional model to examine possible mediation and suppression effects. Finally, the full model controls for all differential association modalities. Next I review findings for the relationship between the differential association modalities and the evaluation, potency, and activity of kynd and unkynd behaviors.

Kynd Behavior Hypotheses

Evaluation (1). Consistent with Kynd Frequency Hypothesis 1, frequency ($b = .175, se = .046, p < .001$) is related positively to the repeated evaluation ratings of kynd behaviors. However, when controlling for intensity (Model 4), frequency is not significant ($b = .019, se = .068, p = .783$), possibly indicating intensity is mediating the relationship between frequency and the evaluation of kynd behaviors. Four conditions must hold for mediation: (1) the independent variable (frequency) must affect the mediator (intensity), (2) the independent variable must affect the dependent variable (behavior meanings), (3) the mediator must affect the dependent variable when the independent variable is controlled, and (4) the strength of the independent variable must be less after controlling for the mediator (Baron and Kenny 1986).

Consistent with the first criterion, OLS regression shows that frequency ($b = .761, se = .036, p < .001$) (the independent variable) is related positively to intensity (the mediator). Consistent with the second mediation criterion, frequency ($b = .175, se = .046,$
$p < .001$) is related to the repeated evaluation ratings of kynd behaviors (dependent variable). Consistent with the third criterion, intensity ($b = .206, se = .065, p = .002$) is related to evaluation of kynd behaviors when controlling for frequency. And, consistent with the fourth criterion, the size of the frequency coefficient ($b = .019, se = .068, p = .783$) is less after controlling for intensity. In addition, the Sobel mediation significance test suggests mediation (Sobel test = 4.845, $p < .001$) (Baron and Kenny 1986; Sobel 1982; MacKinnon et al. 2002; Krull and MacKinnon 1999), which suggests that intensity mediates the relationship between frequency and the repeated evaluation ratings of kynd behaviors.

Consistent with Kynd Intensity Hypothesis 1, intensity ($b = .219, se = .044, p < .001$) is related positively to the repeated evaluation ratings of kynd behaviors. Consistent with Kynd Priority Hypothesis 1, priority ($b = .332, se = .155, p = .032$) is related positively to the repeated evaluation ratings for kynd behaviors. However, contrary to Kynd Duration Hypothesis 1, duration ($b = .004, se = .008, p = .595$) is not related significantly to the repeated evaluation ratings of kynd behaviors.

**Potency (2).** Consistent with Kynd Frequency Hypothesis 2, frequency ($b = .144, se = .064, p = .024$) is related positively to the repeated potency ratings of kynd behaviors. But when controlling for intensity (Model 4), frequency is not significant ($b = .0001, se = .094, p = .999$) which suggests that intensity mediates the relationship between frequency and the potency of kynd behaviors. Consistent with the criteria of mediation, frequency ($b = .761, se = .036, p < .001$) (the independent variable) is related to intensity (the
mediator), frequency \( (b = .144, se = .064, p = .024) \) is related to the potency of kynd behaviors, intensity \( (b = .190, se = .090, p = .035) \) is related to potency of kynd behaviors when controlling for frequency, and the size of the frequency coefficient \( (b = .0001, se = .094, p = .999) \) is less after controlling for intensity. Further, the Sobel mediation significance test suggests mediation (Sobel test = 3.097, \( p < .01 \)) (Sobel 1982).

Consistent with Kynd Intensity Hypothesis 2, intensity \( (b = .191, se = .061, p = .002) \) is related positively the repeated potency ratings of kynd behaviors. However, contrary to both Kynd Priority Hypothesis 2 and Kynd Duration Hypothesis 2, neither priority \( (b = -.026, se = .211, p = .904) \) nor duration \( (b = -.0002, se = .010, p = .982) \) is related significantly to the repeated potency ratings of kynd behaviors.

Activity. Although I did not hypothesize a relationship between the differential association modalities and the activity of kynd behaviors, I report the results of these analyses. While both frequency \( (b = -.084, se = .048, p = .077) \) and duration \( (b = -.020, se = .008, p = .008) \) are related negatively to the activity of kynd behaviors, priority \( (b = .302, se = .158, p = .055) \) is related positively to the activity of kynd behaviors. Finally, intensity \( (b = -.018, se = .046, p = .694) \) is not significantly related to the activity of kynd behaviors.

In sum, frequency and intensity are related positively to the evaluation and potency of kynd behaviors. And, priority is related to the evaluation of kynd behaviors. However, priority is unrelated to the potency of kynd behaviors and duration is unrelated to the evaluation and potency of kynd behaviors.
**Unkynd Behavior Hypotheses**

*Evaluation (1).* Inconsistent with Unkynd Frequency Hypothesis 1, frequency \((b = .012, se = .056, p = .832)\) is not related to the repeated evaluation ratings of unkynd behaviors. This relationship only becomes significant when controlling for intensity in Model 4 \((b = .184, se = .082, p = .024)\), indicating that intensity is suppressing the relationship between frequency and the evaluation of unkynd behaviors. Further, when controlling for intensity, frequency is related to the evaluation of unkynd behaviors in the opposite direction than hypothesized. High frequency results in higher (rather than lower) evaluation ratings for unkynd behaviors when controlling for intensity.

Consistent with Unkynd Intensity Hypothesis 1, intensity \((b = -.098, se = .054, p = .070)\) is related negatively to the evaluation of unkynd behaviors. However, contrary to both Unkynd Priority Hypothesis 1 and Unkynd Duration Hypothesis 1, neither priority \((b = .136, se = .185, p = .462)\) nor duration \((b = .009, se = .009, p = .299)\) are related to the repeated evaluation ratings of unkynd behaviors.

*Potency (2).* Consistent with Unkynd Frequency Hypothesis 2 and Unkynd Intensity Hypothesis 2, both frequency \((b = -.244, se = .120, p = .042)\) and intensity \((b = -.314, se = .115, p = .007)\) are related negatively to the potency of unkynd behaviors.

Contrary to both Unkynd Priority Hypothesis 2 and Unkynd Duration Hypothesis 2, neither priority \((b = -.481, se = .398, p = .227)\) nor duration \((b = -.018, se = .019, p = .359)\) are related significantly to the potency of unkynd behaviors.
Activity. Although I did not advance activity hypotheses, I report the results of the analyses. None of the differential association modalities are related significantly to the activity of unkynd behaviors.

In sum, frequency and intensity are related negatively to the potency of unkynd behaviors. Intensity is also related negatively to the evaluation of unkynd behaviors. However, frequency is unrelated to the evaluation of unkynd behaviors. Both priority and duration are unrelated to the evaluation and potency of unkynd behaviors.

Discussion and Conclusion

Differential association theory was designed to explain the development of behavior definitions from the frequency, intensity, priority, and duration of associations. However, several investigations of the theory do not explicitly examine the relationship between the differential association modalities and behavior definitions. This relationship is important, since behavior meanings often predict behaviors (Heise 1979, 2007; MacKinnon 1994; Matsueda 1982). In this study, I examine this relationship and I investigate whether the principles of differential association apply to a prosocial subculture. Using new operationalizations of the differential association modalities and of behavior definitions, I investigated hypotheses that the modalities of association explain the development of distinctive behavior definitions within the jamband subculture.

In the investigation, I have proposed measuring behavior definitions with affective meanings (evaluation, potency, and activity ratings). This operationalization provides
several advantages. Affective meanings provide an established, parsimonious, and universal way of measuring behavior definitions. It is a technique that is useful when researching meanings in most populations, delinquent or not. Further, the technique provides an unintrusive way to collect data from groups whose members may distrust researchers and feel reluctant to disclose their non-normative attitudes to outsiders. 

Although this study provides a contribution to the literature on differential association theory, the study nonetheless has limitations that warrant consideration. First, I did not include the behavioral outcome component of the theory. In other words, this study is not a test of differential association theory, rather I use parts of the theory to explain a relationship between modalities (types of involvement and interpersonal association) and behavior meanings. But, this provides an avenue for future research: to examine the relationship between behavior meanings and behavior on a prosocial group such as the jamband subculture. Second, the cross-sectional nature of this study provides only a snapshot investigation of the development of behavior meanings. It would be useful to examine the relationships among the modalities of association, behavior meanings, and behavior longitudinally as some researchers have investigated these relationships in delinquent subcultures (Massey and Krohn 1986; Warr 1993). With longitudinal research, I could investigate questions such as: Do subculture members alternate between subculture friends and non-subculture friends over time, or are there friendships more consistent? Investigating these relationships longitudinally could also provide more insight into my findings regarding the priority and duration of associations. Third, tests of differential association theory have indicated that the transference of
attitudes is not the only mechanism of socialization within subcultures (e.g., Warr and Stafford 1991). Thus, there may be additional predictor variables (in addition to the modalities of association) that explain the development of distinctive behavior meanings. For instance social learning variables (Akers et al. 1979; Burgess and Akers 1966) such as imitation or conformity to group pressures may be predictors of behavior meanings in subcultures. Future research should investigate this possibility with regard to predictors of jamband subculture behavior meanings.

Support for Differential Association Theory

According to differential association theory, the influence of any association (delinquent or not) is a function of the frequency, intensity, priority, and duration of the association. Therefore, investigating the relationship between the modalities and behavior meanings is a crucial part of the theory. Yet, several tests of differential association theory fail to examine this relationship. Instead, these studies examine the relationship between the modalities and behavior (e.g., Short 1957; Warr 1993) or the relationship between behavior meanings and behavior (Matsueda 1982; Matsueda and Heimer 1987). Therefore, this study goes beyond past studies because I investigated the relationship between the modalities and behavior meanings, and I focused the investigation on the jamband subculture.

I that as expected, frequency, intensity, and priority (three of the modalities) were related positively to the evaluation of kynd behaviors. Specifically, I find that individuals who attend jamband events more frequently (frequency) and who have extensive and
emotionally invested social relationships (intensity) within the subculture are more likely to rate kynd behaviors, such as sharing and bartering, as good and potent than those who attend fewer events and have fewer, less invested relationships in the subculture. Intensity also predicts evaluation and potency of unkynd behaviors. Those who have many deep, emotionally invested relationships evaluate unkynd behaviors negatively and less potently. These findings for frequency and intensity are similar to Thomas and Heise’s (1995) finding that individuals with more extensive (frequency) and deep (intensity) social ties tend to hold different affective meanings than those with few and unstable social ties.

As noted above, priority is related positively to the evaluation of kynd behaviors. Consistent with differential association theory, high priority (associated with youthful socialization in the subculture) is associated with high evaluation of kynd behaviors. Individuals who joined the subculture early in life perhaps understand the level of positive value attached to these behaviors. On the other hand, those who joined the subculture later in life may feel that these activities are not as highly valued. Individuals who join the subculture later in life are more likely to need to balance time spent in the subculture and other adult roles and commitments, and therefore may not be as zealous about bartering, sharing, trading music, and following a band as those who joined earlier in life (Adams and Rosen-Grandon 2002; David 2000).

Finally, while priority is related positively to the activity of kynd behaviors, both frequency and duration are related negatively to the activity of kynd behaviors. That is, those who attended their first jamband event at a younger age (high priority) are more
likely to rate kynd behaviors as more active. The cumulative number of years in which one has been involved in the subculture has a negative effect on the activity ratings of kynd behaviors. But, among those members with the same duration of involvement, those who became involved most recently (low priority) give those kynd behaviors an even lower activity rating. This finding, that more recently developed associations (rather than those from youthful socialization) have an effect on behavior meanings, is more in line with research in social learning (e.g., Akers 1985). That is, imitation and reinforcement, rather than early friendships, may explain the development of distinct behavior meanings.

Given the limited research on the relationship between the modalities of association and behavior meanings, it is difficult to determine if the theory can be used to explain the development of distinct behavior meanings within the jamband subculture. And, because the theory has not been previously used to examine meanings in a prosocial environment it is also difficult to interpret the results of non-normative (unkynd) behavior meanings within a prosocial subculture. Below, I discuss findings inconsistent with differential association theory.

Mediation and Suppression

Inconsistent with differential association theory, my findings suggest mediating and suppressing relationships among frequency, intensity, and behavior meanings. Specifically, I find that intense social relationships (intensity) mediate the relationship between frequency of association (frequency) and the evaluation and potency of kynd
behaviors such as bartering and trading music. That is, the more frequently individuals attend jamband events the more they develop numerous and emotionally invested relationships with other members of the subculture, and as a result, they rate kynd behaviors more positively and more potently than those who attend fewer events. The mediating relationship between frequency of association and the development of intense social relationships resonates with findings in several qualitative studies of subculture (Fox 1987; Jennings 2000; Pearson 1987; Ritzer 2000; Sutton 2000; Sardiello 1994, 1998; Wood 2003). That is, several studies have qualitatively found that the development of intense relationships mediates the relationship between physical involvement (frequency) and meanings.

My findings also suggest that intensity suppresses the relationship between frequency and the evaluation of unkynd behaviors. When controlling for prestigious and emotionally invested relationships (intensity), the positive relationship between frequency and the evaluation of unkynd behaviors emerges. That is, controlling for intensity, those who frequently attend events evaluated unkynd behaviors more highly than those who attend events less frequently. Given the support for the hypothesis that frequency is positively related to the evaluation of kynd behaviors, it is surprising to find that frequency is also related positively to the evaluation of unkynd behaviors.

One interpretation of the finding that frequency is related positively to the evaluation of unkynd behaviors (and an interpretation of my nonfindings) is that differential association theory is less useful for explaining the relationship between modalities of association and behavior meanings in a prosocial subculture. This
conclusion is consistent with Sutherland and Cressey’s (1966:88) assumption that differential association theory may not be able explain behavior that is not criminal. Thus, the theory may not be suited to explain the development of behavior meanings in a non-criminal subculture. A related argument is that the theory may be useful for explaining the development of meanings associated with behaviors that are normative within the jamband subculture (kynd), but may not be useful for explaining meanings associated with behaviors that are non-normative (unkynd) within the subculture.

Another explanation of the finding that frequency is positively related to the evaluation of unkynd behaviors is that there is a learning curve within the subculture. Specifically, when individuals first join the jamband subculture they are especially zealous in their acceptance of peacefulness as a value. Then, as they become more familiar with subcultural processes, individuals may begin to feel that unkynd behaviors such as threatening sometime have value, especially when done in an effort to prevent another individual from experiencing harm. Thus, threatening and talking down to someone may not always be considered antisocial, non-normative behavior after frequent involvement in the subculture. They may be considered necessary behaviors to keep order within the subculture.

Finally, another explanation is that perhaps jamband subculture members attribute behaviors to karma (Adams 2000). Collectivist cultures often attribute behaviors to external events (Al-Zahrani and Kaplowitz 1993). And, jamband subculture members often develop a “what goes around comes around” attitude, and they live by the “golden rule” (Ritzer 2000; Sheptoski 2000; Sutton 2000). After frequent association with
members of the subculture, individuals may adopt this attitude and attribute the acts of threatening or sharing, for example, to an individual’s karma. If someone is threatened, members may feel that the individual deserved it because they may have done something harmful to someone in the past.
CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSION

In this chapter I discuss implications and limitations of the dissertation, highlight the methodological, theoretical, and substantive contributions, and offer suggestions for future research.

This project contributes to theory and research on subcultures, deviance theories, affective meaning, and more broadly to the study of meaning socialization and culture. In this dissertation, I have shown how identification with subculture members allows individuals to create their own social reality. Individuals who are stigmatized in the general culture often form or join subcultures in order to maintain positive identities or in order to turn their stigmatized identity into a positive identity (in the subculture) (Heise 1979, 2007).

Subcultures possess their own beliefs and meanings, and socialization involves identifying with a group whose members give unique meanings to roles, behaviors, norms, rituals, and other cultural artifacts (Fine and Kleinman 1979). Rather than relying on values to identify subculture, I instead used the symbolic interactionist notion that subculture is defined by segregated interactions and thus, unique meanings. Indeed, subcultures are “pockets of consensus” (Heise 2007:21). In other words, individuals tend
to be attracted to groups that confirm their meanings. And, subculture members tend to hold positive evaluations about concepts that are of focal concern to the group than do members of U.S. mainstream culture (Heise 2007).

I divided the dissertation into two substantive studies in which I examined within-subculture variation in the affective meaning of roles (in Chapter 2) and behaviors (in Chapter 3). I measured role meanings and behavior meanings with the evaluation, potency, and activity of roles and behaviors significant to the jamband subculture belief system.

Limitations

Although the dissertation makes several methodological, theoretical, and substantive contributions, there are limitations to be considered. First, there are possible limitations to using an internet-based survey. Among the most important is self-selection bias. Respondents who select to complete the survey via the web may be more internet savvy than those who choose to complete the survey in pencil form (Zhang 1999). Also, internet survey completion could have an effect on responses based on age and education level (Hardre et al. 2007). However, the respondent base in the current sample was a similar age range and education level as samples used in studies of the similar Deadhead subculture (Adams 2003; Lehman 2000). Table 4.1 displays demographic characteristics of my sample versus those found in quantitative studies of Deadheads.

Second, because I used a convenience sample, my response rate is unknown. Subcultures generally lack a clearly defined population, so using a convenience sample
Table 4.1. Demographic Characteristics of My Sample vs. Quantitative Studies of Deadheads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>50% bachelor's degree</td>
<td>50% some college</td>
<td>47-50% bachelor’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of tenure in subculture</td>
<td>11 years</td>
<td>not reported</td>
<td>10-11 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

was the only option available for this research. However, in the future, researchers might better approximate a probability sample by conducting systematic random sampling of individuals at one jamband event. Third, there may be additional predictor variables that explain the development of distinct meanings within subcultures. Longitudinal research might provide a basis for determining whether spurious relationships exist. Finally, it is difficult to establish time order of variables in cross-sectional research. Do stigmatized individuals develop unique meanings and as a result join a subculture whose members share those meanings? Or, do individuals become members of a subculture and as a result develop unique meanings? A longitudinal study within this subculture would provide a more detailed account of these processes.
Methodological Contributions

Method of Data Collection

In both studies, the data used were collected with a new method of collecting survey data from subculture members. Rather than collecting information with a paper-based survey only, I created two types of correspondence (a business card and a large banner) listing the name of my survey, my contact information, and a link to an online version of the survey. I developed the online survey procedure and distributed business cards rather than administering only paper-based surveys because collecting information from concert/festival attendees was especially difficult. First, attendees were sometimes miles from their vehicle where they could possibly lose a paper survey. With the convenience of small cards, I was able attract potential respondents almost anywhere within the festival area: camping areas, at the stage, walking around, as well as entering or exiting the camping area. As a corollary, with the convenience of the banner, which I placed at my camping site, I was able to attract potential respondents while at my campsite as well. Second, attendees might have been uninterested in completing a 15-20 minute survey while enjoying a leisurely camping and festival experience: a challenge many subculture researchers might face.

Solicitation of Respondents

Further, I gave individuals several options for participating in the study: completing an online survey, completing a paper-based version of the survey in person, or completing the paper-based version and returning it via postal mail with a self-addressed
stamped envelope. Granting respondents a number of ways to respond is especially important when studying a subculture in its setting because members may be preoccupied with their recreational experience. Also, the option to complete the survey at another time in another place may help foster candid responses from members who might be reluctant to disclose non-normative values or experiences.

**Substantive Contributions**

This dissertation also contributes to the limited research on the jamband subculture. While numerous scholarly studies exist on the closely related Deadhead subculture, few studies examine the jamband subculture. The two subcultures are related historically (Budnick 2003; Donnelly 2005) and ideologically (Sutton 2000), yet the sociological study of the jamband subculture is only beginning. My findings are consistent with qualitative findings from the Deadhead subculture. For instance, I found that involvement in the subculture was generally related positively to subculture roles and kynd behaviors and negatively to authority roles and unkynd behaviors (Paterline 2000; Sardiello 1998; Sheptoski 2000).

Perhaps future studies could investigate other interesting aspects of this subculture. For example, jamband subculture members exhibit aspects of both rebellion from and cooperation with the dominant society (Ritzer 2000). How do these contradictory behaviors allow for or hinder the continuance of the subculture? What does this contradiction mean for interactions between the subculture and the dominant culture? Further, Ritzer (2000:256) stated that “Deadheads constantly struggle to define
themselves and the ‘proper’ behavior that should be associated with their culture. This discussion...often occurs over very controversial cultural issues such as the use of drugs or the ‘proper’ protocols for tape trading.” The jamband subculture is also likely to struggle with these and similar issues. Thus, scholars might investigate issues of drugs use, reciprocity, and collective behavior within the jamband subculture.

Another contribution of this research is that I investigated a prosocial subculture. Most subculture research within sociology is conducted on delinquent or criminal subcultures. In order to understand the full spectrum of human behavior, it is also important to study other types of subcultures. As scholars, we can learn about gender, class, and racial differences by studying prosocial, as well as delinquent subcultures. For instance, it has been found that males who perform random acts of kindness to strangers are misinterpreted as a homosexual, yet females generate little more than surprise when performing the same act (Jones 1998). Do individuals in mainstream America avoid prosocial behaviors because they do not want to be viewed as weak, homosexual, or in the case of the jamband subculture, as a hippie? According to affect control theory principles, the character of a behavior (the behavior meaning) affects the actor who performs the behavior to a degree. An admired person who engages in a hostile, violent action appears less good. An admired person who performs an act that is “too positive” in nature (e.g., buying lunch for a homeless person or helping a stranger carry their packages to the car) violates mainstream social norms, and may appear to be less good and less potent than before the act. This is an avenue for future research, and may be as important to understanding behavior as the investigation of delinquency.
Similarly, given that involvement in the jamband subculture was related to the meanings of such communal behaviors as sharing and bartering, we might ask: Are positive evaluations and high potency ratings for communal behaviors considered deviant to individuals in the mainstream? Some sociological studies show that certain behaviors that are positive in nature (e.g., acts of sharing resources such as buying lunch for a homeless person or helping a stranger carry their packages to the car) are actually considered nonnormative in the mainstream, causing individuals on the receiving end to react negatively (Jones 1998). These behaviors, however, are normative in the jamband subculture. Generally jamband subculture members believe that the idea of community is becoming less important to America as the mainstream values the acquisition of status, income, and authority rather than sharing and bartering (Bellah et al. 1985; Fromm 1976; Heckert and Heckert 2004; Jones 1998; Poplin 1979; Selznick 2002; Tocqueville 1969). The jamband subculture provides members with new meanings for communal behaviors. What does this mean for studies of deviance and for our conception of communal values and behaviors in society? Can some deviations from the norm be construed as positive deviance? Further, what could it mean for the interaction patterns between jamband subculture members and nonmembers? When attempting to barter in mainstream America, an individual holding jamband meanings for the behavior “to barter” is likely to be viewed as nonnormative.
Several sociological and psychological theories hypothesize that group membership leads to shared attitudes or meanings (Carley 1986, 1991; Heise 1979; Matsueda 1982; Shibutani 1961; Stryker 1980; Tajfel 1972). Many studies have found that this hypothesis is supported (King 2001; Smith-Lovin and Douglass 1992; Thomassen 2002). Consistent with this line of research, my findings also suggest that individuals within the jamband subculture share unique meanings for roles and behaviors. Shared meanings are often necessary in order for members of a particular culture to define situations, interpret communications from others, and perform tasks (Festinger 1954; Goffman 1974; Vallacher and Wegner 1987). Without shared meanings, individuals would have little basis for discussion or agreement. Further, my findings suggest within subculture variation in affective meaning along levels of ideological embeddedness, behavioral-relational involvement, as well as frequency, intensity, priority, and duration of association. Obviously then, as stated within each study, these findings have implications for studies of subculture, meaning socialization, and differential association theory.

Both studies also have implications for the social psychological study of stereotyping that often leads to discrimination and prejudice. Social identity theorists find that social categorization accentuates similarities within categories and differences between categories (Tajfel 1969). My findings suggest that although members of the jamband subculture are categorized as members of the group, members’ meanings vary with regard to: the extent to which they internalize the ideology of the group, their level
of physical and behavioral involvement, the number of social relationships they hold
within the subculture, the intensity of those relationships, and their tenure of involvement.
Thus members of groups may be similar in some ways, yet be much more variable than
stereotyping suggests. This could have implications as to how individuals treat one
another based on social categorization. Future studies could use measures similar to the
two continuous measures of involvement used in the first study and the affective meaning
of concepts to illustrate the variability that exists within a categorized group of people.

My findings may also relate to recent findings in social exchange theory,
especially those regarding trust and reciprocal exchange (e.g, Molm, Takahashi, and
Peterson 2000, 2002). Reciprocal exchange exists when individuals act in benign ways
toward others yet do not expect immediate or exact returns. The benign, reciprocal
behaviors found in reciprocal exchange are like those found in the jamband subculture.
For instance, one unique aspect of the jamband subculture is that the bands allow fans to
freely tape the live music. Fans share music with one another freely, but they must never
sell the recordings. That is, rather than behaving in opportunistic ways, members of this
subculture are cooperative and prosocial. And, some of the other-focused behaviors
within the subculture are not only prosocial, but can be relatively costly with an uncertain
payoff. For instance, members believe that giving away live recordings or concert tickets
may one day payoff, but the payoff is not of deliberate concern. Recent empirical studies
have shown that such reciprocal exchanges foster the development of trust and
commitment (Molm et al. 2000, 2002). To the extent that reciprocal exchanges develop
trust and reduce uncertainty, my findings indicate that trust may not be disappearing from
society, as some scholars have argued (e.g., Putnam 2000). Future research could investigate the development of trust as a result of reciprocal exchange within a prosocial subculture such as the jamband subculture.

Similarly, my dissertation could also have implications for the study of the motivation behind human action. What makes individuals within the jamband subculture motivated to enhance the outcomes of others when entering into interaction with strangers? Are they doing so for selfish reasons, such as to increase their own reputation? For example, studies of indirect reciprocity find that some individuals reciprocate only when their cooperation leads to reputational benefits, while other research indicates that individuals act prosocially without anticipation of future rewards (Simpson and Willer 2008). Knowledge of one’s social value orientation (prosocial, individualist, or competitive, e.g., Van Lange 1999) may help researchers understand the motivations behind several types of human action: negotiated exchange, problem solving within relationships, and responses to injustice. The jamband subculture provides an ideal group to study with regard to motivation for reciprocal exchange.
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