

“In”:

A Qualitative Study of Induction and Belonging in United States High
School Bands

By
Tobin C. Shucha

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

(Curriculum and Instruction)

at the

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

2019

Date of final oral examination: May 15, 2019

The dissertation is approved by the following members of the Final Oral Committee:

Dr. Julia Eklund Koza, Professor, Curriculum and Instruction
Dr. Bernadette Baker, Professor, Curriculum and Instruction
Dr. Amy Bellmore, Professor, Education Psychology
Dr. Carl Grant, Professor, Curriculum and Instruction

© Copyright by Tobin C. Shucha

All rights reserved

*Dedicated to my parents, who have always shown that they value education,
And to my wife and children,
who have taught me more than I've ever taught anyone.*

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Although the process of writing a dissertation often felt like a solitary process, it is a process that would be impossible but for the help of so many people. I would like to acknowledge some of them now, knowing that I won't remember everyone that I should, and understanding that my words will not do justice to the depth of my appreciation for all of those who helped me get to this point.

First, I want to thank my participants, who gave of their time to share their memories with me. Even in the short time in which we spoke, I often felt your fear, your hope, your hurt and your joy as you recounted your experiences in high school band. I hope that the experience brought back more good memories than bad, and that you find some valuable enlightenment in these pages. If my analysis of your experiences causes any discomfort, I do apologize.

I would like to thank my fellow music education doctoral students: Antia Ben, Emma Joy Jampole, Jess Mullen, Robert Schoville, and Angela Wellman. Your support and encouragement as well as the sheer joy of your camaraderie have kept me going through these (too) many years. The only negative about your company is that I didn't get to share it enough. I hope that even those of you with whom I have shared conference hotel rooms feel the same about me!

I owe special thanks to Adam Harry, who always seemed to have just finished whatever stage it was with which I was currently struggling, and who shared generously with me what he had learned from those successes. Of course, all of the previous paragraph applies to you as much as to anyone.

Special thanks, too, to Kristin Myers, who not only shared a TA office with me, but also shared her talents as an editor by helping me to format chapters 2 and 3 of this document. More importantly, you showed me how to endure the hardships of grad student life with a beaming smile and an infectious laugh.

I also owe thanks to the doctoral students outside of music education that filled in my support network. To Michelle Coleman and Irene Resenly, thanks for sharing in a group with a certain acronym that encouraged us to finish, already! And thanks especially to Irene, who sat across a table from me at coffee shops for far too many hours of dissertation writing, and who sat next to me at other establishments for far too few hours of camaraderie.

I am thankful to all of the music education professors that I have had the pleasure of working with and learning from at UW-Madison. To my master's degree advisor, Elizabeth Gould—one year with you was not nearly enough; to Deb Bradley, whose course led to my first conference presentation, and to Teri Dobbs, who was there for all the years of my doctoral program, and whose influence deserves more recognition than just a line in my acknowledgments. Teri, I hope you know that I appreciate all that you have taught me along the way, and that these words aren't nearly enough to express that.

I am deeply appreciative of each of my committee members. I know that taking the time to read this book is a big deal, and I am so grateful that you did. To Carl Grant, with whom I wish I could have spent another class; to Amy Bellmore, whose work on bullying helped inspire me to research hazing (even though I ended up elsewhere!); and to Bernadette Baker, whose teaching changed how I think, and whose encouraging words stuck with me during that first conference presentation—which subsequently made me think I could actually do this.

I cannot possibly adequately convey my thanks to my doctoral advisor, Julia Eklund Koza. From day one of my master's degree program to the last day of my doctoral program, you were there to guide me, encourage me, challenge me, and support me. No one in my academic world has influenced my thinking so much as you have. I couldn't always see that I needed what you were providing, but you got me to the finish line in the end. I wish you the happiest of retirements!

Finally, I owe the most thanks to my wife, Bonnie, and my two children, Cal and Kate. Without your love and support I never could have persisted. Bonnie, without your patient ear and wise counsel, I never would have navigated the process successfully. Each of you sacrificed much so that I could follow this path, and I hope that where it has taken me will prove to be worth it for you as much as I know it will be for me. I love you!

ABSTRACT

In this study, I examine induction practices, with a particular focus on hazing, in United States high school bands. I also analyze conceptions of belonging and how these affect members. From two semi-structured interviews with 23 participants between the ages of 18 and 25, I identified categories of description for induction activities, and events that led participants to feel “in” their high school bands. I employed a Foucauldian analysis of the micro-physics of power in the interactions described to me by participants, and constructed a model of ways in which participants found belonging (if they did) in their high school bands.

Participants described a wide variety of induction activities, including both teacher-led and student-led. Participants described achieving a feeling of being “in” anywhere from a few days to over a year after their initial high school band experiences, if ever. There were very few activities described that met my criteria for hazing, resulting in a much lower rate of hazing in my sample than was expected based on previous hazing studies. Other activities that bore resemblances to hazing included a case of bullying and several teacher-led induction activities.

In analyzing interview narratives, I noticed an interesting pattern in the different ways that participants described their experiences. This led me to analyze conceptions of belonging, and ways in which participants that held self-concepts as stronger or weaker musical performers constructed their sense of belonging in high school band. I constructed a model of belonging in band wherein members feel like they belong when they sense that they are making strong contributions to group success. Using Foucauldian notions of power/knowledge, I claim that members whose contextual clues allow them to believe that they are stronger musical performers experience an easier time constructing a sense of belonging via musical performance

contributions. Members whose contextual clues do not allow them to believe that they are making strong contributions through music performance must construct an alternate path to belonging if they are to remain in the group. This is made more difficult by the paradigm of musical performance as the primary contribution to group success.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	i
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
ABSTRACT	v
CHAPTERS	
I INTRODUCTION	1
Prelude	1
Introduction to the Research Project	3
Glossary of Terms	8
II LITERATURE REVIEW	14
Induction Processes	14
Hazing	20
Belonging	53
Chapter Summary	60
III THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	62
Power	62
Bourdieu and Power	63
Foucault and Power	72
Bourdieu vs. Foucault:	
Choosing a Theoretical Lens	83
Theory in Application	86
Analysis of Conceptualizations	
of Power in Hazing Literature	91
Chapter Summary	96
IV METHODOLOGY	98
Methodological Influences	98
Researcher's Positionality	105
Study Design	107

V	FINDINGS AND ANALYSES ON “IN”	118
	“In” Was Not a Given	118
	Foucault’s Disciplinary Power and “In”	132
	Categories of Description: Markers of Being “In”	134
	Types of Social Induction Activities	146
	Hazing in Band Inductions	154
	Foucault, “In,” and Welcoming	175
	Chapter Summary	177
VI	FINDINGS AND ANALYSES ON BELONGING	182
	Two Ways of Belonging	182
	Self-Conceptualizing as a Stronger	
	Musical Performer	186
	Self-Conceptualizing as a Weaker	
	Musical Performer	210
	Belonging in High School Band and	
	Foucauldian Conceptions of Power	243
	Chapter Summary	249
VII	SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS	252
	Summary	252
	Discussion and Implications	263
	Limitations and Future Directions	266
APPENDICES		
A	INTERVIEW SCRIPT I	269
B	INTERVIEW SCRIPT II	273
C	INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT SAMPLE	275
D	RECRUITMENT LETTER	277
E	RECRUITMENT LETTER II	278
F	PROTOCOL APPROVAL	279
G	CONSENT FORM	280
BIBLIOGRAPHY		282

CHAPTER ONE – INTRODUCTION

Prelude

Once upon a time.

This is the way that stories begin; is it not? At least it was the way that stories once began, in the “once upon a time” of many of our own stories. “Once upon a time” sets the stage; it tells the listener that the story is about to start and that it took place in a past far more distant than the immediate.

Once upon a time, this research project was imagined as an investigation into the phenomenon of hazing in high school bands. Although the spark of inspiration for this line of research came into being a few years beforehand, the topic seemed particularly germane on the morning of November 20, 2011, when I awoke to the news that a young man had died in Florida. Robert Champion had been a drum major in the Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University marching band, and he had died from injuries allegedly inflicted by his fellow band members, a victim of hazing (Hernandez, 2011).

After much examination of the literature on hazing and many surrounding concepts—initiations, rites of passage, bullying, and psychology of group processes, among others—I began to craft a research project to examine hazing in high school bands, but this was not as easy as I had hoped.

Getting Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval to interview “human subjects”¹ about past hazing experiences proved to be trickier than I had imagined. IRB representatives expressed

¹ I place this term in scare quotes because “human subjects research” is the official title for the kind of research I did; however, I recoil from the positioning of participants as subjects, with the

concerns about the possibility of participants experiencing trauma in the process of recounting their hazing experiences. In addition, my status as a state-mandated reporter of child abuse meant that I would be required to report to authorities any incidents described that rose to the level of child abuse. While this may seem like simply the right thing to do, my research on what constituted child abuse led to more questions than answers. Any person under the age of 18 would be considered a child – thus, almost all high school students—and state law provided no sunset for reporting, so it would not matter if the participant were 16 or 60. The language I read about what constituted sexual abuse made me extremely uncomfortable with the specter of mandated reporting looming over the process, as I realized that some of the hazing rituals that I had experienced as a sixteen-year-old could qualify as sexual abuse of a child.

Perhaps more importantly for the research project, I began to question how much participants would tell me about hazing if they knew that I was studying the phenomenon. Potential participants might assume that someone studying hazing would most likely not be in support of such activities, and a twenty-five-dollar gift card probably would not be enough to coax them into the uncomfortable position of confessing to the hazing activities in their past.

For these reasons, I decided that I would focus my research on the broader topic of high school band induction processes. In this way, I would be able to learn more about the avenues to becoming part of the social group that is the high school band, one variety of which might be hazing. Not only would the broader scope, perhaps, offer insight to the narrower phenomenon of hazing; any participants who had experienced hazing activities in their high school bands might

connotation that they were “subjected to” something. My participants participated by speaking with me; I hope that I did not make them “subjects.”

be more willing to talk about those activities if they were not suspicious that I might judge them negatively.

Thus, this research project began. However, like many stories, there was a plot twist. In the final result, the findings that became more interesting to me were not those that answered my initial questions. This is not an uncommon occurrence in qualitative research, and especially not in narrative research, because one can never know what participants will say. It is also not a bad thing: I found answers to my questions and found an additional, related avenue for future research.

Introduction to the Research Project

For many participants, high school band programs are not “just another class.” In most United States schools, band is an elective, and one of the very few classes that can be repeatedly taken for the duration of a student’s high school years. Retaining students is a critical concern for high school band teachers and others interested in quality music education (see Corenblum & Marshall, 1998; Hartley, 2016; Kinney, 2009).

High school band programs are not the only organizations concerned with retention—it is a concern that is shared by many industries in terms of retaining employees. Citing the induction process as a critical factor in retention, many researchers have studied newcomer induction in the workplace (e.g., Ashforth, Sluss, & Saks, 2007; Reichers, 1987; Sprogøe & Rohde, 2009). One specific area of employment that has seen a significant amount of new employee research is teaching (e.g., Ingersoll & Smith, 2016; Kelchtermans & Ballet, 2002; Rosenholtz, 2015; Smith & Ingersoll, 2016). If induction processes are, indeed, a key to retention for employees, perhaps it would also be a key to member retention in other organizations.

There has been little research examining induction processes for students other than induction of students transitioning to post-secondary education (see Dias & Sá, 2014; Edward, 2016). To my knowledge, there has been no significant research into induction processes for high school music performance groups. If induction is accepted as a significant factor in group retention rates, it then follows that induction into high school band programs could be assumed to play a part in influencing retention rates in those groups.

One way in which high school band programs are set apart from most other classes is in their social cohesiveness. In many cases, the band program shares social aspects with sports teams and co-curricular clubs. There is a tendency to identify more strongly with membership in high school music groups than in other classes (Adderley, Kennedy, & Berz, 2016; Cusick, 1973; Morrison, 2001). However, in groups with stronger social identification, induction processes can sometimes take patently harmful forms. One such form is hazing.

Robert Champion's death thrust the topic hazing into the national spotlight (Hernandez, 2011; Hudak, 2012a, 2012b). In the aftermath of Champion's death, several high school marching bands in the south were suspended from activities after hazing was discovered to also be present in those organizations (Freer, 2012).

The body of scholarly literature on hazing is relatively small. Most of the research available focuses on only a few types of organizations, including sports and Greek letter organizations: "The extant literature is thin regarding the characteristics of those participating in hazing beyond athletes and fraternity and sorority members—even though documented exceptions to these groups exist" (Campo, Poulos, & Sipple, 2005, p. 138). With a limited body of research on the subject, policy is being driven by anecdotal evidence and so-called "common sense," with little to no demonstrable success in reducing the harmful effects of hazing.

In summary, research to this point suggests that induction processes may have a significant impact on factors relevant to organizational success, including retention. Induction processes may also have effects that are harmful to the organization and the individuals involved. There is little or no research on induction processes concerning high school band programs.

Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

This study is an examination and analysis of the ways in which participants describe their experiences in becoming part of their high school bands. The following questions guide the research:

- What types of social induction activities do participants describe having occurred in their high school band? Do any of these types meet the working definition of hazing, or bear other resemblances to hazing?
- What do participants cite as markers for knowing and/or realizing that they were fully “in” their high school band?
- Did participants feel a sense of being fully “in” their high school bands immediately upon taking part in high school band activities? If not, how long did it take for participants to feel like they were fully “in” their high school band—if ever?

During my analysis of the data collected to answer these questions, I realized that the content of the participants’ narratives was suggesting additional lines of inquiry. There was more to becoming a part of high school band than induction; there was achieving a sense of belonging. Based on my preliminary analyses, I constructed two new research questions:

- In what ways do participants construct a sense of belonging in their high school bands, if at all?

- How do participants' self-perceptions of skill level or ability as a music performer relate to their constructions of belonging in their high school bands?

Description of the Study

To answer these questions, I conducted two semi-structured interviews² with twenty-three participants between the ages of 18 and 25 (inclusive) who had participated in a United States high school band program. The first interview included simple demographic questions about the participants, as well as several questions about the structure and culture of the participants' high school band programs. The first session ended, and the second session began, with a request for the participants to tell me "the story" of their high school band induction (see Appendix A). The second session continued with questions about how that process made them feel, how they think others felt about it, and if and how their views have changed since the events that they described occurred (see Appendix B).

I coded the relevant portions of the participant's narratives using an eclectic, holistic coding method (Saldana, 2015, p. 166) first in order to find discursive themes that ran through the participant narratives. I used more focused coding for additional rounds in order to help clarify certain phenomena for my analysis.

That analysis came in two parts. The first addresses the research questions one through three, along with critical analysis of participant narratives. This critical analysis both helps to answer the research questions, and, at the same time, troubles those answers. The second half of the analysis addresses the last two research questions and examines connections between

² Two participants did not return for a second interview session, and two met me for a brief third interview session.

participant's self-perception as a music performer, as projected through their narratives, and their ways of belonging in their high school band.

Significance of the Study

The present study draws upon multiple disciplines to contribute to research in the areas of group social induction, hazing, and belonging. Also, it contributes to the broader field of music education pedagogy by discussing the implications of all of the above research areas within the context of high school band; however, the issues and principles examined transfer readily to all secondary-level music programs, and even non-music programs at the secondary level and beyond.

To my knowledge, this is the first research to specifically examine the process of social induction into high school bands and perhaps the first to examine the induction phenomena into any high school music group. While there is a body of research on hazing, I also believe the present study to be the first to focus on high school band. Additionally, most of the research on hazing has been quantitative; the narrative methodology used in this study provides a richness of perspective that cannot be captured through surveys alone.

I also believe the present study to be among the first to examine the concept of belonging specifically in the context of high school band. Together, these analyses will help music educators, especially at the secondary level, better understand the social dynamics at play within their programs and how those dynamics can impact student learning. It can also help music educators to (re)design their programs, including curriculum, mechanics, and delivery to leverage this increased understanding of social dynamics to better educate students through increased retention and reduced anxiety, and to help avoid potentially harmful activities.

Organization

In Chapter Two, I review extant literature on social induction and surrounding concepts, including hazing, initiation, and rites of passage. In Chapter Three, I present the theoretical framework for the present study, mainly in the form of a debate between Bourdieusian and Foucauldian philosophies as applied to the phenomenon of hazing. In Chapter Four, I present the methodological traditions that support the present study. In Chapter Five, I present participant data that speaks to the research questions and analyze their narratives to examine the ways in which participants felt that they became fully a part ("in") their high school bands. In Chapter Six, I present the additional findings regarding the connections between self-perceptions of musical ability and belonging in high school bands through further analysis of participant narratives. Finally, in Chapter Seven, I summarize the conclusions and implications of this research project, discuss the limitations of the present study, and propose directions for further research.

Glossary of Terms

High school

There are many variations in school models across the United States, but one of the most standardized aspects is the sequence of twelve grade levels, lasting one school year each. This sequence starts with first grade³ at the approximate age of five or six and concludes with grade twelve at approximately age seventeen or eighteen. Because individual states are given relatively

³ I acknowledge the existence of Kindergarten, the school year most children attend (and which is compulsory in fifteen states) before first grade. However, my purpose here is not to explain the United States school system in detail, but just enough to explain the terminology used by participants to describe their experiences.

wide latitude in governing schools, and local communities (i.e., cities, towns, and villages) are, in turn, also given a great deal of latitude, there is much variety in the configurations of the various grades into schools.

However, the most standardization occurs at the older end of the sequence, with grades nine through twelve most commonly organized into what is known as “high school.” The four years of high school in the United States are known, in common parlance, by the labels adopted from United States colleges, which, in turn, adopted them from those that originated at Cambridge University (which has since abandoned the labels). Since these labels are not commonly in use outside of the United States, these labels are commonly used as follows:

- Freshman/freshmen for ninth grade
- Sophomore for tenth grade
- Junior for eleventh grade
- Senior for twelfth grade

In addition, ninth- and tenth-grade students are collectively known as “underclassman/underclassmen,” while eleventh- and twelfth-graders are collectively known as “upperclassman/upperclassmen.”

While I left these labels intact within quotes from participants’ narratives, I acknowledge the gendered nouns within many of them and wish to problematize their use. For this reason, I did not use the terms including “-man” or “-men” in my writing. Since I sometimes refer to “upperclass” students or members, I also want to acknowledge that this is not a widely recognized term, but one that was used purposefully (and against the advice of the spell-check feature in my word processing software) to remove gendered language from descriptions wherein it does not actually apply. Further, I chose to use the non-hyphenated version for clarity, as any

use of “upperclass” or “underclass” in this document refers to grade status, and not to the socio-economic status more widely associated with the hyphenated “upper-class.”

Band

In the context of United States secondary schools, “band” most commonly refers to a performing music ensemble or ensembles associated with the school, but also to each school’s band *program*, which may include a single ensemble or, more often, multiple ensembles. These ensembles consist primarily of wind and percussion instruments, although some string instruments are sometimes included. It does *not* refer to ensembles that are primarily string instruments, which are commonly referred to as “orchestra.”⁴

Band programs almost always include one or more concert ensembles—larger groups (generally between 30 and 100) of students playing wind and percussion instruments. Most also include a marching band, in which students play their instruments while physically moving. There are two main performance venues for high school marching bands: parades, where the group plays while marching down a street or similarly (mostly) straight and narrow space, and field marching, where the group performs on an athletic (usually American football) field, most often at the intermission of an athletic event. Many of the participants’ bands took part in field marching competitions, wherein marching bands perform on a football field to be judged against each other (with no football involved).

Other ensembles included in band programs may include jazz bands—usually smaller ensembles of ten to twenty students, playing a specialized subset of band instruments along with

⁴ The data from one person that I interviewed was ultimately left out of this study, as I (eventually) determined that what she was describing as her high school band activity was taking place in what most people would call an orchestra (primarily strings).

string bass, guitar, piano, and drum set. Another traditional band ensemble is pep band, which is similar to the concert band in instrumentation, but which usually serves in support of indoor athletic events, rather than presenting their music as the focus of the audience (like the concert band).

Although individual schools vary, concert band is almost always a high school course offering. Marching band is most often, but not always, a mandatory part of the band class, taking the place of concert band for parts or all of roughly the first two months of the school year. Jazz bands are sometimes held as high school course offerings but often are offered as co- or extra-curricular activities. Pep band is sometimes a separate co- or extra-curricular activity but is most often a class requirement of the band course.

Band programs can involve many other types of ensembles and activities as well. Bands, along with other performing ensembles, often occupy a unique position in United States high schools, straddling the borders between classes, co- or extra-curricular organizations, and service organizations. It is one of the few courses that students can repeatedly take, making the social aspect of the group more pronounced as students may spend four years together with their teacher(s) and some classmates.

Induction

Induction refers to the process of becoming a part of a group. The addition of “social,” as in “social induction” is critical, as there are many facets or layers to becoming a part of any group. In the context at hand (high school bands), there is an official entry into the group, involving registration into the class with the school administration; however, no participants considered this official entry to be significant to their feelings of being “in” the group.

Therefore, induction here refers to the social process of becoming a part of one's high school band, starting with the first activities with that group, and ending at a distinct or indistinct point at which a newcomer feels that they are "in" the ensemble.

Induction activities

This term generally refers to any activities directly related to band or the band program during a participant's induction phase. Note that while a band activity may involve both newcomers and veterans of a group, veterans are not (usually) going through a re-induction. Also, some induction activities for newcomers might not be viewed as such by veterans. A rehearsal during the first week of band camp might be an induction activity for most or all of the ninth-grade newcomers, who are still navigating, negotiating, and finding their way to a place in the group that they can claim as theirs.

Induction activities as a concept lean toward those activities held with the purpose of inducting newcomers, but do not exclude other band activities, since many participants cited activities other than those purposed to facilitate induction as the pivotal point at which they moved into a state of feeling "in."

"In"

"In" is a participant-defined term. When used in quotations throughout this document, it refers to a participant's state of feeling like they have become fully part of a group. For almost all participants, "in" was not the same as the official state of being registered in the group, nor even their arrival for their first day of high school band activities, each of which could logically be considered a point at which one was in their high school band.

“In,” then, has as many definitions as users, but these definitions, at least as demonstrated by the participants in this study, cluster around the concept of being a part of a group in a way that exceeds simple physical attendance or official documentation. It involves the social connections within the group beyond the mundane, necessary exchanges involved in any human group activity. “In” has associations with “belonging” but usually does not occupy the same linguistic space. In general, “in” as a concept does *not* imply a bond with the group as strong as those associated with the term belonging. Rather, “in” tends to connote a feeling of arrival, of now being considered as a “part of” by others who are already “in.”

Hazing

Hazing was an initial research interest of this project, and, as such, it enjoys an extended exploration in Chapter Two, wherein a definition of hazing is constructed. That definition is as follows:

Acts performed upon (or by) band student(s) (“victims”), by (or at the suggestion of) other band student(s) who are in a more powerful position than the victims (“hazers”).

These acts must also meet all of the following criteria:

- The victims are given reason to believe that these acts are necessary to gain or maintain membership or status (official or unofficial) within a group (official or unofficial), regardless of the victims’ apparent willingness to participate;
- There are actual or likely outcomes that can reasonably be considered detrimental, physically or otherwise, to the victims, or other persons, or that damages property (without free consent); and
- The activity cannot reasonably be considered to serve the overt purposes of the band.

CHAPTER 2 - LITERATURE REVIEW

The present study was constructed to explore the broader topic of induction, or joining, processes in U.S. high school bands, with a focused interest in the phenomenon of hazing. Therefore, this section will include a brief overview of literature relating to the broader topic of induction or joining processes, especially initiation, followed by the main body of the literature review on hazing. The hazing section will begin with a literature-based construction of a working definition of hazing before entering into a more traditional review of hazing literature. This is followed by a brief overview of literature on belonging, which is a critical concept to the last research question.

Induction Processes

Group processes is a sub-field of study within social psychology, and the joining of peer groups has received its share of attention in this context. While much of this research focuses on younger children and smaller groups (e.g., Blumenkrantz & Gavazzi, 1993; Putallaz & Gottman, 1981), the theoretical ideas put forth in this literature can be useful in beginning to examine the joining process of high school bands.

Much research on group processes has been influenced by social exchange theory (Homans, 1958). This psychological theory holds that humans will seek out, maintain, or leave relationships based on the perceived cost/benefit ratio of the relationship(s). Blau (1964), relying extensively on Homan's theory, added the element of power and theorized how this theory applied when bridging the gap between microstructures (face-to-face interactions) and

macrostructures (larger organizations). Moreland and Levine (1982) relied heavily on social exchange theory to construct their model of group socialization, which includes the suggestion that people join groups based on the perceived cost/benefit ratio of membership.

Hogg and Hardie (1991) suggest that a person's self-concept and how closely it matches the perceived prototypical group member is a much stronger indicator of group cohesiveness than perceived cost/benefit ratios. Self-concept, however, may also change to match the group prototype (Brown, 1988).

Levine and Moreland (1994) revisited their model of group socialization, including aspects of Hogg and Hardie's theory, but also adding transition points. Particularly germane to this study, then, is the transition from group socialization to full group membership, which Levine and Moreland termed "acceptance" (p. 309). Although they were studying smaller groups, this transition echoes the process of moving from being merely part of the band via official membership to being "in" the group.

Researchers have also focused on young children starting school, and on students entering college (Dias & Sá, 2014; Edward, 2016), but this particular lens has not been turned toward starting high school (and especially not at joining the high school band). However, the responses received as part of this study indicate that high school band classes are often (though not always) experienced as a community and culture in their own right (see also Adderley, Kennedy, & Berz, 2016; Cusick, 1973; Morrison, 2001). If students joining these classes are genuinely considered members, it would suggest that, in those cases, induction of some sort is likely to take place when newcomers join.

Initiation and Rites of Passage

Initiation, in the context used here, is a ceremonial form of induction and therefore a subset of the same. Not all inductions involve initiation, but all initiations at least purport to be part of an induction process. A substantial portion of the literature on initiation is built on theoretical frameworks surrounding “rites of passage” as established by Arnold Van Gennep (2004) in the early twentieth century.⁵

Many hazing authors also cite hazing as a kind of rite of passage (Abdulrehman, 2007; Barber, 2012; Chmelynski, 1997; DeWitt & DeWitt, 2012; Dixon, 2001; Ellsworth, 2004; Hinkle, 2005; Hollmann, 2002; Hoover & Pollard, 2000; Hosansky, 2013; Howard & EnglandKennedy, 2006; Johnson, 2011; Lodewijkx & Syroit, 1997; Pelletier, 2002; Rogers, Rogers, & Anderson, 2012; Schnur, 2007; Stuart, 2013; Taylor, 2001; van Raalte, Cornelius, Allen E., Linder, Darwyn E., & Brewer, Britton W., 2007; Waldron & Kowalski, 2009; Wilcox, Andrew, 1997). Van Gennep (2004) coined the phrase “rites of passage” in his book of the same name, *Les rites de passage*. He studied many cultures in various parts of the world to come up with a theoretical framework for “such rituals marking, helping, or celebrating individual or collective passages through the cycle of life or of nature exist in every culture, and share a specific three-fold sequential structure.” He postulated that all such passages shared three distinct phases: preliminal, liminal, and postliminal.

Preliminal rites symbolically (and, sometimes, actually) cut ties to the subject’s past. Examples include physically taking subjects away from their childhood families and traveling to

⁵ The date in this citation refers to the English-translation edition referenced. The date of first publishing is 1909.

military “boot camp.” This stage is considered to be necessary in order to prepare for a “new” stage of life.

Liminal, or transitional, rites are those that take place while the subject occupies a place neither in their past world nor yet in the world they are to enter. Examples of this phase might include the Australian Aboriginal walkabout, or the time spent by military recruits in boot camp—no longer part of their childhood or civilian life, but not yet part of the adult society or the full-fledged military, respectively. Postliminal rites are those that formally induct the subject into their new status. Examples may include debutant balls and graduation ceremonies.

Van Gennep postulated that these stages were universal to rites of passage in all cultures. His work has had a profound impact on anthropology and sociology, and a great deal of literature in these fields is written under the premise that Van Gennep’s postulates are universally true.

Grimes (2002) pushes back against Van Gennep on this front. Grimes rejects the notion that all initiation rites follow the three-step pattern “discovered” by Van Gennep; Grimes claims that this pattern was, rather, “invented,” and initiation rituals were then seen to fit into it.

Van Gennep’s theorized liminal stage is greatly expanded upon by Victor Turner in several works, but most succinctly in an essay entitled, “Betwixt and Between” (in Mahdi, 1987). Turner describes many common features from transition rites world-wide that bear resemblances to common hazing features, such as requiring initiates to be covered in dirt (symbolizing death and rebirth); having names taken away from initiates, who are to be addressed only by terms for neophytes (“rookie”, “freshie” et cetera); and treating neophytes as neither male nor female (forced cross-dressing).

Also, Turner points out how the absolute authority of masters over neophytes, along with the equality of all neophytes, helps to complete the process of separation from previous social

ties and prepare neophytes for re-integration in a new social order. Finally, secrecy of the *sacra* (sacred objects or acts) is emphasized, and it is pointed out that the *sacra* help unite the neophyte as a person with their new station. All of this seemed to suggest that hazing practices that may seem absurd and pointless might have ties to ancient and long-held traditions of initiation rites.

The intellectual descendants of Van Gennep also include Mircea Eliade and Jean Sybil la Fontaine. Eliade asserts that there are three basic kinds of initiation rites: puberty, secret societies (usually male), and religious leader (shaman). At the point at which he begins to describe the initiations into men's secret societies, he asserts that these initiation rites often closely resemble puberty initiation rites, except that not every boy in the culture is initiated into the secret society, the trials are often harsher, and the Supreme Being is not part of the rite. These aspects are reminiscent of hazing rituals: they are usually only for those that choose to join a group, the trials may be harsh, and they are generally not religious. Eliade (1965) also took Van Gennep's three stages of initiation (separation, transition, rejoining) and postulated that they represent death, a return to origins, and re-birth.

Fontaine (1986) also applied Van Gennep's theoretical framework to his anthropological studies. Although he was writing directly about initiation rituals elsewhere, several of his quotes might seem to be about hazing in United States schools:

- Initiation rituals are “for” those already initiated as much as for the novices (p. 104).
- Initiation rituals have much in common with plays. They are artificial experiences, created by the people concerned and performed in a manner, time, and place which the participants choose . . . like theatrical performances, rituals make use of deceptions and “special effects” to create impressions. . . nor must one ignore the element of entertainment provided by these rituals (p. 181).

- Shared secrets create a bond. This bond is the basis of the solidarity of members (p. 186).
- Initiation rituals include . . . elements which may be called tests . . . What seems to be significant is that they all entail proper responses to the initiators, demonstrating submission to the authority which the initiates now accept (p. 186).

Several authors suggest that rites of passage are desired and needed to ease the difficult transitions from one life stage to another, and that the decline or disappearance of such rites (or, at least, of the meaningfulness of such rites) in Western society has led people, especially young people, to create their own rites of passage, which may include many hazing activities (Fleischer, 2005; Garrison, 2004; Grimes, 2002; Hollmann, 2002; Kessler, 2000; Mahdi, Christopher, & Meade, 1996; Stokrocki, 1997). Other authors do not cite any such lack but do use Van Gennepe's theoretical framework (at least in part) in examining hazing (Howard & England-Kennedy, 2006; Johnson, 2011; Waldron & Kowalski, 2009).

Johnson (2011) applies the theoretical framework of Van Gennepe and (especially) Turner in examining the liminal stage of initiation—and hazing—for sports teams. Supported by quantitative and qualitative findings, Johnson suggests that initiations are important to group cohesion, and, according to Van Gennepe, it is crucial that initiates are, at least symbolically, separated from their past and broken down before being re-introduced into their new order. However, in anthropological studies of initiation rites, the elders are supportive of the initiates, even as they insist upon the sometimes-harsh stages of liminality in initiation. This, it is suggested, is one of the crucial differences between hazing and successful initiation processes: the difficulty of the “ordeal” can be presented in a manner that is safe and positive for the initiates, who experience *communitas* (Turner in Mahdi, 1987), a sense of intimacy specific to sharing a liminal experience, with their fellow initiates while feeling support from the veterans.

Hazing

Hazing Defined

Before entering into any discussion of hazing, it is necessary first to define hazing. Often, hazing is thought of as a form of bullying; however, bullying, like hazing, is usually conceived of as one form of behavior within the broader category of peer victimization. Researchers and scholars of peer victimization have come mainly to use Dan Olweus' (1993) definition of bullying as the standard: "A [person] is being bullied . . . when he or she is exposed, repeatedly and over time, to negative actions on the part of one or more other[s]." Olweus goes on to clarify that there must be intentionality to the negative actions and that there must be an "asymmetric power relationship" between bully and victim (pp. 9–10).

When considering hazing, then, the power differential and intentionality are undoubtedly present, but the third key feature of Olweus' definition—repetition over time—is not; at least not in the same sense that one might apply to bullying. This is especially true when one considers that hazing is generally directed at neophytes, or "outsiders," who will (or believe that they will) become "insiders" and may even, in turn, become the hazers for future generations of neophytes. In this sense, one could, perhaps, apply Olweus' definition of bullying to the *classes* of individuals involved in typical hazing situations: the institution—the group inducting newcomers—is the bully, and the neophyte class is the victim.⁶ The power imbalance is apparent; the incumbents hold the keys to inclusion. The repetition happens with every new

⁶ "Victim" is acknowledged to be a word that carries semantic baggage; many times, people who are hazed give their (implicit or explicit) consent to engage in the activities. Despite this, it will be used hereafter to refer to persons/people upon whom hazing is enacted.

group of newcomers (often on an annual basis), even though there are different individuals in the two classes involved, and some individuals may have even changed class.

One could broaden the meaning of “repeated” to include institutions along with individuals or apply it to the common practice of enacting multiple victimizations upon neophytes over a relatively short induction period. However, even if one were to accept the premise that hazing is a form of bullying, we can no more use Olweus’ definition for hazing than we could use the definition of a rectangle to identify a square. A working definition must attempt to not only include every behavior that is hazing, but it must also attempt to *exclude* all behaviors that are *not* hazing.

For example, Moe—the stereotypical schoolyard bully in the comic strip *Calvin & Hobbes*—does not engage in what one would call *hazing*. No, Moe is a *bully*—he uses his physical size advantage, leveraged as power over Calvin to extort lunch money, playground real estate, or whatever else he wants. His behaviors fit Olweus’ definition of bullying very neatly. He will *not*, however, let Calvin into his peer group (whatever unseen group that may be) after a certain amount of victimization, or in a matter of time; nor does Calvin have any belief that this will happen. Moe would, until the end of time or the comic strip’s run, continue to exert his power over Calvin without any intention or pretense of including him.

So, Moe bullies Calvin, but no one would say that what Moe does is hazing. Even if we were to posit that all hazing is bullying—and I do not—we still must see, via the example of Moe, that not all bullying behavior is hazing. Whether or not hazing is considered bullying, hazing requires, at the very least, a definition that sets it apart—whether from other forms of bullying or from bullying itself.

Unlike bullying research, hazing research does not enjoy widespread agreement on a single definition (at this time, hazing research does not enjoy *anything* on a widespread basis—there is not enough of it). As a starting point, then, Webster’s Dictionary defines hazing as:

to intimidate by physical punishment; to harass [as a ship’s crew] by extracting unnecessary, disagreeable, or difficult work; to harass or try to embarrass or disconcert by banter, ridicule, or criticism; to subject [as a freshman or fraternity pledge] to treatment intended to put in ridiculous or disconcerting positions. (Gove, 1981)

Parsing this definition out helps lend some clarity: the action verbs included are intimidate, harass, embarrass, disconcert, and subject (to treatment). All of these words carry negative connotations, with the possible exception of “subject;” however, assuming a person of free will with the capability to make their own decisions is the recipient of that subjection, one can infer negativity in the actions they were subjected to: no one says that they were subjected to a piece of delicious cake. The adjectives used include unnecessary, disagreeable, difficult, ridiculous, and disconcerting. Again, although an argument could be made for possible positive interpretations for several of these, the connotations of the collective would almost certainly be seen as negative—at least for the recipient.

The first requirement that I will set forth for a working definition of hazing, then, is that the actions defined as hazing have actual or likely outcomes that can reasonably be considered detrimental, physically or otherwise, for the recipient. Because almost any action will have some result that might be considered negative, it is necessary to include the modifier of “reasonably,” with the acknowledgment that this word is subject to interpretation (as, indeed, all words are).

In their study of hazing on college campuses, Campo, Poulos, & Sipple (2005) offer this definition:

Hazing is any activity, required implicitly or explicitly as a condition of initiation or continued membership in an organization, that may negatively impact the physical or

psychological well-being of the individual or may cause damage to others, or to public or private property. (p. 137)

This definition extends the reach of detrimental outcomes of activities to other people or property. This extension is intriguing; one can imagine scenarios in which initiation (or other hazing-type) activities may not include or risk direct harm to a coerced participant (the person being hazed) but do include or risk harm to others or property. One could use the logic that, in harming others or property, the coerced participant is exposed to likely outcomes detrimental to themselves in the form of legal or other punishment, or at least in the form of feelings of guilt or remorse. However, it seems plausible that there could be cases wherein the coerced participant faces almost no chance of being “caught,” and experiences no significant negative feelings as a result. One might argue that this is an outcome that would be detrimental to the participant’s moral self, but if the definition relies on “reasonable” as a modifier, such a convoluted path to self-detriment will not stand. Therefore, I include in my definition the extension of “or is likely to damage others, or property [without free consent].” The addition of “without free consent” seemed necessary, lest traditions such as the smashing of plates at celebrations in some cultures, the breaking of a piñata, or even popping of balloons be included—indeed, the destruction of property in these cases cannot reasonably be considered as a patently negative outcome.

Hank Nuwer is, by far, the most prolific and most cited author on the subject of hazing.

He includes the following definitions of hazing:

Hazing involves a group’s request [or the request of individuals within that group that the person in a subservient position perceives to be important] that a newcomer takes some action in order to be held in esteem by the group and/or to gain entrance into an organization. (2001, p. 37)

[Hazing is] any action required by full-status members of low-status, probationary members that in some way humbles newcomers that lack the power or wit to resist. (2004, p. xvi)

Hazing occurs when veteran members of a class or group require newcomers to endure demeaning or dangerous or silly rituals or to give up status temporarily, with the expectation of gaining group status and acceptance into the group, as a result of their participation. (as cited in Oliff, 2002, p. 22)⁷

In one sense, the last definition opens up new territory, as “silly” rituals are not patently negative for the recipient; however, Nuwer’s approach in his campaign against hazing is to cast a wide net and then attack all behaviors therein. This approach has not been very successful (by his admission). Nuwer is not alone in attempting to expand the definition of hazing in this way.

Guynn and Aquila (2005) cite the Fraternity Insurance Purchasing Group’s definition:

Any action taken or situation created, intentionally . . . to produce or cause mental or physical discomfort, embarrassment, harassment, or ridicule. Such activities may include but are not limited to the following: use of alcohol; paddling in any form; creation of excessive fatigue; physical and psychological shocks; quests, treasure hunts, scavenger hunts, road trips . . . kidnappings . . . wearing of public apparel which is conspicuous and not normally in good taste; engaging in public stunts and *buffoonery* [emphasis added]; morally degrading or humiliating games and activities; and any other activities which are not consistent with academic achievement, fraternal law, ritual or policy, or the regulations and policies of the educational institution, or applicable state law. (pp. 1–2)

In the context of the present study, “buffoonery” is just one of many problems with this definition. As stated earlier, a definition for research must not only include the “right” things, but it must exclude the “wrong” things. This problem is common in definitions created to be “catch-all” cures for hazing: a laundry list of possible hazing activities is given, with the “or any other” caveat included afterward. While this kind of definition may be effective for insurance purposes, a laundry-list approach is wrong for this study, as is the inclusion of “silly” activities, “buffoonery,” or other language that seeks to expand the definition of hazing in order to include

⁷ Oliff’s citation was not complete, and, since I could not find this definition in Nuwer’s works, I am operating under the assumption that Oliff quoted Nuwer’s website, which has since changed.

what might be considered borderline hazing behaviors. In this context, I believe it better to exclude some acts that might be hazing than to include acts that are not.

It is important at this juncture to point out that I am *not* stating that activities in the “not-quite” borderlands of hazing are, by their omission, positive or harmless. I am simply attempting to draw boundaries around that which is included in the term “hazing,” and the exclusion of activities from that definition in no way implies my condoning of said activities; e.g., bullying was excluded from this definition earlier, and I certainly do not condone those kinds of activities.

There are two crucial factors in Nuwer’s definitions that do separate hazing from other forms of victimization: “veteran members” act upon “newcomers” ...and “with the expectation of gaining group status and acceptance into the group, as a result of their participation.” A more inclusive recasting of the first of these factors might be “an individual or group in the more powerful position within an unequal power relationship acts upon individuals or groups in the less powerful position in that relationship.” Many authors have included descriptions of hazing recipients as “new” in their definitions. Abdulrehman (2007) states that hazing “is meant to serve as a rite of passage whereby *new members of a team* [emphasis added] are made to feel like they have shown their desire to be a member of the team by tolerating aversive experiences” (p. 7). Cimino (2011) states that “hazing is the abuse of *new or prospective newcomers* [emphasis added]; the generation of induction costs that appear un-attributable to group relevant assessments, preparation, or chance” (p. 241). Interestingly, both clearly state that newcomers are the recipients, but neither mentions the enactors of hazing, leaving that side of the power relationship to be inferred from the status of the recipient as “new.”

These authors also mention the initiation factor. Abdulrehman calls hazing a “rite of passage,” while Cimino refers to “induction costs.” However, even though the unequal power

relationship is *often* one of veteran acting upon newcomer, hazing is not limited to acts upon newcomers. Rather, it is acts of the more powerful upon the less powerful, in situations where the less powerful desire to, and believe that they can and will, become—or remain—part of the group. These groups may or may not be the officially sanctioned group that is often thought of at first consideration. Indeed, in most cases of hazing (college fraternities and sororities notwithstanding), individuals are already members of the official⁸ organization before they are hazed. Athletes are officially members of their teams, soldiers and sailors are officially members of their unit, and instrumentalists are officially members of the band, with or without hazing activities. It is most often a form of *unofficial* membership—the difference between being a member on paper and a *real* member in the view of one’s peers—that is sought and promised through hazing activities; unfortunately, the unofficial status of these groups can make definition of the in- and out-group challenging to ascertain for the researcher.

Christopher Zacharda (2009) acknowledges this factor in his definition of hazing:

Any method of initiation or pre-initiation into a student organization or student body, *whether or not the organization or body is officially recognized by an educational institution* [emphasis added], which is likely to cause serious bodily injury to any former, current, or prospective student of any school, community college, college, university, or other educational institution in this state (p. 4).

Two clarifying points can be drawn from the case of the hazing death of Robert Champion at the hands of fellow members of the Florida A&M University’s marching band:

⁸ *Official* is used in this exercise in definition as that knowledge or status that is sanctioned by the public institution (*e.g.*, if the high school administration lists a student as a member of the marching band, he or she is *officially* a member). *Unofficial* status may or may not correlate. Although some hazing cases have resulted in accusations of tacit acceptance of *unofficial* groups and rites by *official* leaders of institutions (*e.g.*, claims that the high school band director knew of hazing activities, yet did nothing to stop it), the fact that said acceptance was tacit (versus explicit) maintains the status of said groups and rites as *unofficial*.

hazing is sometimes endured to maintain, rather than gain, “membership.” As will be discussed in detail in the next chapter, power relationships are both fluid and dynamic. At the time of his death, Champion was a junior—not a newcomer—and, he was a drum major: an appointed student leader of the band. However, in a complex and secretive system of unofficial hierarchy within the band culture, Champion was considered subject to the rulings and hazing of some of the band members that he was, at least in an official capacity, leading. In order to remain (or perhaps become) a member in good standing of the band *as determined by the unofficial member leadership*, he was bound to cooperate with the activities demanded of him by the same unofficial member leadership.⁹ Thus, the power relationship between individuals in hazing cases cannot be simply determined as a permanent or even temporarily fixed situation; power may shift instantly depending upon context.

Therefore, the next two factors in the working definition of hazing are that hazing is enacted within an unequal power relationship, from the more powerful upon the less powerful; and that hazing consists of acts understood by the victim to be necessary to gain *or* maintain membership or status in a group, regardless of official membership or status.

Lipkins (2006) claims that hazing “maintains a hierarchy within a group.” This is an important aspect of power relationships to consider, and Lipkins does acknowledge that an unequal power relationship must exist in order for hazing to take place. What makes this

⁹ In a fascinating example of how “official” and “unofficial” membership status can conflict, one of the main defendants in the Champion homicide court case was officially dismissed from the band for earlier hazing incidents before the night of Champion’s death; he was no longer performing nor traveling with the group. However, based on testimony, he appeared on the band bus that night, and still wielded significant power as a member of the “Red Dawg Crew,” the unofficial, unsanctioned group that purportedly participated in enacting the hazing that resulted in Champion’s death (Hudak, 2012a, 2012b).

statement problematic, however, is that hazing does not *always* maintain hierarchies, at least not among individuals. As an example, there are many cases of college fraternity hazing in which the initiates, having completed the hazing rituals required of them, are considered and treated as equals with the same members that enacted their hazing. Likewise, high school groups often haze ninth-grade members only; once members reach their sophomore year, they are no longer subject to hazing. Lipkins also acknowledges this phenomenon: “Upon completion of the initiation process, the newcomer is transformed from a newbie, with no rights and privileges, to a member with a higher status” (p. 15). So, the hierarchy that is established is one of institution, not individuals. The primacy of the institution over the individual may be established and maintained by hazing, but the hierarchy of individuals over individuals may or may not. Therefore, the hierarchy may be within the group, or *of* the group (over members).

The other four bullet points of Lipkins’ definition are also problematic, at least for this study:

- Involves a repetition of tradition
- Is a process
- Intends to create closeness in a group
- Involves psychological and physical stress (p. 13)

Each of these points has merit in understanding hazing but fall short in defining hazing. “Involves a repetition of tradition” may be true of all hazing at some level, as one could make the argument that hazing has prehistoric, anthropological roots;¹⁰ in this sense, hazing itself is a centuries-old (if not millennia-old) tradition. However, on the individual case level, this is a

¹⁰ This will be explored later in this chapter.

logical fallacy—a newly formed group may have hazing activities from their first year of existence when there is no tradition to be repeated. While tradition is a common trait of hazing, it cannot be included in the definition for this study.

“Is a process” may also be true at some level of all hazing—just scratching your nose, for example, is a process—but not at the level that Lipkins gives in her extended description. She states that “hazing involves planning that often takes weeks or months to carry out,” and describes a process beginning with an invitation to newcomers. However, in the context of high school band programs, students are often simply registering for classes, and hazing may take place with no further “joining” occurring. I have personal experience with hazing activities that were, for all practical purposes, spontaneous. Lying in our sleeping bags on a school cafeteria floor while on a high school marching band trip, someone said, “Hey—what can we do the freshmen?” which led to “I have shaving cream in my bag,” which led to applying that shaving cream to ninth-grade boys’ hair, all in the space of about 10 minutes. Admittedly, there had been chatter about initiation for the ninth-grade boys¹¹ in the week leading up to the overnight trip, but, to my knowledge, no one had come up with an actual plan for what we might do—just a vague notion that we would “pick on” them a little.

“Intends to create closeness in a group,” I believe, mistakes excuse for intention. Later in this chapter, I will review literature that provides a stronger rebuttal of the efficacy of hazing in

¹¹ Interestingly, only boys were initiated in my high school band program. The girls slept in a separate room, but I have asked my spouse, whom I dated through high school, and was told that the girls did nothing to initiate newcomers during our high school years. The possibility of hazing having origins in masculinity will be discussed later in this chapter and others.

creating closeness in a group.¹² However, my current point of rebuttal is that hazing is certainly not always “intended” to create closeness within the group. While some mildly humiliating hazing activities may, indeed, be intended to create closeness, it is almost unfathomable that anyone could sodomize someone with pinecones covered in Mineral Ice (as Lipkins reports having happened at a high school football camp) in the hopes of creating closeness—the perpetrators know that this is patently cruel. I can once again call upon personal experience to provide a non-example. Creating closeness was not at all in my mind when I helped smear shaving cream on ninth-graders’ heads. I experienced the feelings of power that came with asserting my (perceived) dominance as an upperclassman, along with the giddy adrenaline rush at doing something that I knew to be against the rules, hoping we could get back to our sleeping bags before the shouting brought chaperones running in to turn on the lights. I am fairly certain that none of my “partners in crime” thought that they were bringing us closer to those ninth-grade boys, either. The *excuse* of attempting to bring team members closer together is given quite often; doubtless, it is genuinely believed by some hazers. However, this bullet point statement, too, would exclude many acts that I believe are hazing.

The last point, “involves psychological and physical stress” is, besides the hierarchy point, the least problematic statement of the group, but it would exclude many acts of hazing, if only because of the conjunction “and.” In order to meet this point of the definition, hazing would have to include BOTH psychological and physical stress; often, physical stress is absent, especially in humiliating hazing. Further, some hazing activities cause neither in significant

¹² Lipkins does not claim that hazing creates closeness; to the contrary, she states that, while it may create closeness among those doing the hazing, it has the opposite effect between hazers and victims.

amounts. If victims are excited about the opportunity to perform in a manner which hazers, perhaps, thought would be humiliating (or not),¹³ there is no psychological stress involved.

Another vital factor to consider is that because of the unequal power relationships involved in hazing, victims often participate in such activities with implicit or explicit consent to participate, or for such activities to be enacted upon them. Alfred University published two major research surveys regarding hazing, using the following definition of hazing: “Any humiliating or dangerous activity expected of (newcomers) to join a group, *regardless of willingness to participate* [emphasis added].” (Hoover & Pollard, 2000).

Kirby and Wintrup (2002) explore the issue of consent within hazing in some depth, exploring the sometimes subtle differences between coerced consent, spontaneous consent, and obligatory consent. They ask if it is possible for individuals to consent to the unknown (since details of hazing activities are rarely revealed to those to be hazed beforehand) and examine the legal issues around consent. They point out that under Canadian law¹⁴ coerced consent or consent under duress is not legally considered to *be* consent.

This issue is of key importance in the present exploration of hazing. Shelby Hinkle (2005) makes the most obvious reference to this in her definition of hazing, which she crafted after those of Kirby & Wintrup, and Nuwer:

[Hazing is] an activity that may include, but is not limited to, racial or sexual insults and/or taunts, physical pressure or undue physical stress, and/or sexual abuse, harassment, or the diminishment [of] the sense of one’s femininity or masculinity that

¹³ In his extended description of his definition of bullying, Olweus includes intention as a prerequisite of bullying. I choose to leave intention out of this definition for two reasons: Intention can be difficult or impossible to discern, and intentions do not always determine outcomes. Since I would argue that outcomes determine the acceptability of behaviors, intention becomes less important.

¹⁴ Also as under U.S. law.

involves veteran team members ordering rookies to engage in, or suggest that they engage in, that in some way humiliates, degrades or embarrasses the rookies and recklessly endangers their mental or physical health or safety for the purposes of admission to a team *where the rookie lacks the power to resist because he or she wants to gain membership to the group* [emphasis added]. (p. 10)

Hinkle created this definition with a particular area of study in mind (“veteran,” “team,” and “rookie” certainly imply a sports study), and there are multiple other problematic issues within the definition for this study. One is the specific nature of the description of the power relationship. While power relationships will be examined within the theoretical framework established in Chapter Three, “lacks the power to resist” oversimplifies the complex and multi-layered issue of power relationships, especially in cases where the victim claims, even decades later, that they wanted or even enjoyed the treatment that they received, even if it seems patently negative to most people.

As has been discussed, there are reasons why this consent (and later re-affirmation or repudiation of this consent) may or may not be considered valid, and the line between coercion and choosing out of free will can be very difficult or impossible to pin down. Therefore, my working definition will not specify whether or not a victim was powerless to resist or made a free choice to participate; the salient factor is that, as stated earlier, the victim had reason to believe that a failure to participate would result in a loss of membership or status in the group. My working definition will consider acts otherwise meeting the definition to be hazing *regardless* of whether or not the victim consented to participate.

Some researchers have worked toward defining hazing by surveying college students. Ellsworth (2004) surveyed college students for their definitions of hazing; his research indicated that members of different campus organizations held different views as to what types of activities qualified as hazing and that some of the differences could be due to the types of activities that are

inherent within each organization. ROTC members, for example, did not view forced calisthenics as hazing so much as did members of other groups, and marching band members did not view forced public performance as hazing so much as others did. Ellsworth suggests that this may be due to the “necessary parts of the culture” of those organizations.

Tokar and Stewart (2010) used a survey that divided activities required of high school student-athletes into three categories. One category was “positive” team activities included such items as “keeping a specific grade point average” or “doing volunteer community service”. The use of this adjective brings up an important point: while the “positive” or “negative” attributes of any activity could certainly be debated, for this exercise in definition, “positive” activities will be those activities that would be considered positive by an overwhelming majority of the general population. Tokar and Stewart further found that high percentages of the physical education majors they surveyed responded that they, as high school athletes, had experienced “being yelled, cursed or sworn at.” As the authors point out, this survey item could be misleading, as “being yelled at” could be construed as part of what athletes being taught by coaches in a loud environment (or, more pertinently to this study, band members being taught while playing at high volumes in an outdoor setting), experience as part of normal practices. Indeed, coaches and band directors often shout encouragement, which could be considered both as a positive event *and* as “being yelled at.”

These surveys point to a critical component of a working definition of hazing: I will not consider positive activities to be hazing, nor activities that could reasonably be justified as directly necessary to or benefitting the overt purpose of an organization. Under this component of the definition of hazing, then, football players being assigned extra calisthenics (so long as the level was not dangerously excessive), or marching band members having to demonstrate their

memorization of music by playing alone in front of their section, would not be considered hazing. It should be noted that supposed *indirect* benefits such as “team cohesion” will *not* disqualify an activity from being included as hazing.

Finally, since this study will be focusing on hazing in the context of high school band programs, my working definition will reflect the limited population of people and contexts involved. The following, then, is my working definition of hazing for this study.

Acts performed upon (or by) band student(s) (“victims”), by (or at the suggestion of) other band student(s) who are in a more powerful position than the victims (“hazers”).

These acts must also meet all of the following criteria:

- The victims are given reason to believe that these acts are necessary to gain or maintain membership or status (official or unofficial) within a group (official or unofficial), regardless of the victims’ apparent willingness to participate.
- There are actual or likely outcomes that can reasonably be considered detrimental, physically or otherwise, to the victims or other persons, or that damages property (without free consent).
- The activity cannot reasonably be considered to serve the overt purposes of the band.

I acknowledge that this definition, like any definition, has flaws—it may exclude some acts that would pass the “smell test” as hazing and may include some acts that would not pass muster. It does not include direct hazing by band *teachers* (which is acknowledged to be a real possibility, although my literary research turned up no such case). This omission is intentional. One reason was to exclude officially required activities which might otherwise fit within the above definition, because knowledge of these activities is presumed to be easily accessible to parents and administrators and are therefore subject to control by administrators and school

boards. Even if there are cases of band teachers covertly requiring hazing activities,¹⁵ this is not reported as a common phenomenon, and there are mechanisms in place to help protect against this. This is not to say that no argument can be made that teachers could commit hazing; indeed, in Chapter Five, I will present data that suggests that teachers may engage in activities not much different from hazing. However, since teachers engaging in hazing was not a focus of this research, phenomena of that type will not be explored here.

Further, the modifier of “reasonably” is acknowledged to be subjective, because there are no boundaries to what is “reasonable” that would be considered objective: what is reasonable to one is completely unreasonable to another. However, all words are open to interpretation, including the words that are modified by “reasonably” in this definition. Without the admittedly nebulous modifier, the last two points of the definition would allow for almost any act (“could be considered detrimental”) and almost no act (“cannot be considered necessary”), respectively. Although these modifiers do open up a window for greater leeway of judgment on the part of the researcher, believe this to be preferable to the wholesale inclusion of acts that are patently NOT hazing into the mix due to a misguided attempt to be linguistically bulletproof in my definition. The ultimate result of such a folly would be including either everything or nothing in the definition, which would undoubtedly be less desirable than exposing the research to debate—debate, at least, might lead to greater understanding of the issue.

¹⁵ One might consider sexual relationships between band teachers and their students—unfortunately, there have been many known cases of this—as a form of hazing, if the student believes that participation is required to gain or maintain status in the group in the eyes of the director. However, this does not fit within the purview of this study, and would almost certainly be considered as a separate phenomenal category.

Hazing Literature

According to a 2000 survey by Alfred University—still, the only national survey of high school students on high school hazing—48% of all high school students have experienced hazing. Within that population, 22% of students involved in a music, art or theatre group were hazed in connection to that group. While this percentage is lower than some other categories, when combined with the fact that 39% of all students belong to a group in this category, the result is that 8% of ALL high school students are hazed as part of a music, art or theatre group. Of school-sponsored group categories, only sports (24%) ranked higher as a percentage of the total high school student population experiencing hazing (Hoover & Pollard, 2000).

Alfred also surveyed NCAA college athletes about hazing (Hoover, 1999). A University of Maine study on hazing found that, of college students reporting that they belonged to a performing arts group, 56% reported that they had been hazed in connection to that group—only sports teams (both varsity and club) and fraternities and sororities had higher rates of hazing. Although no national survey singled out band from other arts organizations, this study did specifically name “marching band” as an example (Allan & Madden, 2008). However, a more recent, similar survey suggested much lower levels of hazing in the category of “band or other performing arts organization”: just over 27% (Allan, Kerschner, & Payne, 2018, table 2).

Hazing does take place in high school bands (Freer, 2012), but the literature on hazing in *any* bands is quite limited, and literature on hazing in *high school* bands is all but absent. The present study aims to start filling in this gap in our knowledge base.

The body of scholarly literature on hazing is relatively small and even smaller outside of those focusing on those kinds of organizations in which hazing is most prevalent: “The extant literature is thin regarding the characteristics of those participating in hazing beyond athletes and

fraternity and sorority members—even though documented exceptions to these groups exist” (Campo et al., 2005, p. 138).

Unlike bullying literature, the body of hazing literature includes few authors with multiple publications on hazing. One of these few is Hank Nuwer, who is easily the most widely-cited author on hazing. Nuwer is a professor of journalism at Franklin (IN) College, and, as might be expected of a journalist, Nuwer’s writing on hazing tends to be mainly reportage.

Almost every author that writes about hazing includes a healthy dose of real-life examples; perhaps this is because the topic of hazing is written about so little that authors feel the need to engage their audience or to make them care about the topic, by using some of the most sensational stories of hazing available.¹⁶ Many writings, however, do not move significantly beyond reportage, stopping at the stage of making readers aware that the issue is, indeed, relevant and important.

Nuwer’s first book on hazing, *Broken Pledges*, (1990) is an example. It is written in the style of narrative non-fiction. Centered around the story of Chuck Stevens, a college student that died in a hazing incident in 1978 at the Klan Alpine fraternity at Alfred University (NY), it continues with the story of his mother, Eileen, who became an anti-hazing “crusader,” creating the Committee to Halt Useless College Killings, and speaking out against hazing at colleges and universities around the country. Through the process of telling Eileen’s story, Nuwer ties in various other hazing incidents in several other college and military settings but does not enter into any substantial analysis of hazing. Nuwer’s second book, *Wrongs of Passage* (2001),¹⁷ also

¹⁶ Unfortunately, there seems to be no shortage of sensational hazing cases.

¹⁷ The date of this citation is correct for the edition used; however, the first edition of *Wrongs of Passage* did precede *High School Hazing*.

contains heavy doses of the kind of creative reportage of college hazing found in *Pledges*, although this book covers more incidents in less detail, and does move into other facets of hazing study.

High School Hazing (2000), Nuwer's third authored book on hazing (he has also edited additional books on hazing) is similar in style to *Wrongs*, except that the focus is on high school hazing rather than college hazing. While the book's organization is broken down into various facets, this mostly serves as a means to report on more examples of hazing incidents. Disappointingly, the book contains almost as many reports of college hazing as there are of high school hazing.

Nuwer (2000) implies (but offers no supporting evidence) that high school hazing is on the rise, both in frequency and intensity. Other authors repeat this claim, as well (Bushweller, 2000; Edelman, 2004, 2005; Lipkins, 2006)—all but Lipkins cite Nuwer as their source. Other authors claim only that the intensity (violence level) of high school hazing is rising (Guynn & Aquila, 2005; Stuart, 2013). Interestingly, some authors feel the need to remind readers that high school hazing is not a thing of the past (DeWitt & DeWitt, 2012), while one claims that high school students started joining hazing “in recent years” (Chmelynski, 1997). Since there has been only one national survey of high school hazing, it is difficult to make a case for increasing rates of high school hazing, except on anecdotal evidence, or from the increasing frequency of reported incidents. With the explosion of media availability in recent years, this is a difficult data source to interpret.

Hazing History.

In historical terms, hazing has been happening since the middle ages, or as far back as “ancient” societies (Campo et al., 2005, [citing Nuwer]; Ellsworth, 2004, [citing Nuwer]; Lipkins, 2006; Nuwer, 2000), or, as suggested by evolutionary psychology, even in pre-historic times (Cimino, 2011). Historical context is also provided in specific accounts of pre-twentieth century hazing incidents (Barber, 2012; Nuwer, 2000, 2001). Barber also documents how hazing in colleges in the 1870s consisted of class-on-class hazing, carried out in large-scale physical confrontations called “rushes.”¹⁸ When college administrators banned this practice, hazing transitioned to a more secretive, small-organization-based practice.

Ellsworth (2004) consolidated passages from Nuwer (1990) to present a very brief historical perspective on hazing in marching bands. These stretch from early twentieth century incidents at Gettysburg College to publicized cases of hazing injuries at Florida A&M in the 1980s.¹⁹ It also includes excerpts from a 1984 *Chronicle of Higher Education* article in which the director of the University of Southern California’s Trojan band spoke positively of the hazing traditions in his group. More comprehensive histories of hazing in college marching bands have not been compiled, with the exception of journalistic background research in the wake of the Champion case at FAMU (e.g., Kam, 2011), most of which focused solely on that specific university, although there are occasional mentions of other hazing incidents in college marching

¹⁸ Barber does not state whether or not this is the etymological origination of the term “rush” as a name for applying for membership to a Greek organization.

¹⁹ Remarkably, 21 years before Robert Champion’s hazing death, Nuwer wrote about an incident another nine years earlier (three decades before Champion died), when Dr. Julian White (the same band director relieved of his duties as a result of the Champion case) suspended four members of the band after a 17-year-old member was sent to the hospital due to injuries suffered during hazing activities.

bands (e.g., Ruffins, 2009). More recently, Silveira and Hudson (2015) surveyed college students specifically about hazing in college marching bands. While 30% of respondents reported witnessing some type of hazing in their marching band program, only “Sing/chant by self or with select others in public in a situation that is not related to an event, rehearsal, or performance” and “Being yelled, cursed, or sworn at” gathered more than 10% response rates. Severe or dangerous forms of hazing were reported at very low levels.

While high school hazing is mentioned in many sources, specifics on high school band hazing are few. As mentioned earlier, the Alfred University survey certainly suggests that hazing in high school bands is happening, and at least one district suspended high school marching bands after discovering a history of hazing within (Freer, 2012). However, within the sources I consulted, there was only one mention of a specific high school band hazing incident (Edelman, 2005).

Most of the literature on topics surrounding high school band hazing, then, falls into one of two categories: either it is about high school hazing, but not about band hazing (mostly, this literature focuses on sports hazing), or it is about band hazing but at the college level.²⁰ This would seem to be an omission on the part of academic literature, as a brief internet search (examining only the first 50 results) for “high school band hazing” found a half-dozen news reports of high school band hazing (Associated Press, 2003; Beaver, Ty, 2013; Bishop, Leith & Goodwin, Sue, 2011; Butler, Jim, 2013; Gartner, 2013; Lloyd, Devyne and Allen Martin, 2012).

²⁰ It should be noted that, as at the high school level, the amount of literature on college sports hazing is far greater than on college band hazing, and college fraternity/sorority hazing literature is as great or greater yet.

Theories of Hazing.

In looking at the causes of hazing in general, there is no clear consensus among authors on the subject, although most social science theories fall into one of three categories: hazing increases group solidarity, hazing is an expression of dominance, or hazing allows for the selection of committed group members (Cimino, 2011). Some authors point to a single source, but most acknowledge the multiplicity of forces at play. It should be noted that almost every author that examined hazing closely enough to analyze the motivations behind the phenomenon acknowledges in some fashion that these categories are not mutually exclusive; I would go so far as to say that they are inextricably intertwined. However, most choose a single thrust for their analysis of hazing.

Psychology literature.

As expressed by Cimino (2011), a basic commitment theory of hazing states that hazing exists in order to test a newcomer's commitment to the group. By submitting to unpleasant ordeals with little or no promise of personal benefit (exclusive from gaining group status), the newcomer demonstrates their commitment to the group, and the group is protected from giving benefits to those not committed to the group. Cimino points out, however, that hazing is often coercive, which would at least partially negate the effectiveness of any test of commitment. Secondly, he points out that hazing takes place in situations with non-voluntary participation, such as in some cultures wherein all males are hazed into adulthood.²¹ Finally, Cimino questions

²¹ I acknowledge that such rituals would not fall under the definition of hazing for this study, as set forth earlier. Since this study is limited to U.S. high school bands, the question of deciding whether or not widely accepted social rituals within cultures outside the U.S. might be hazing is considered moot.

why hazing is unidirectional if its motivation comes from a desire to determine commitment—that is, if the purpose of hazing is to establish commitment, newcomers should also haze veterans,²² to test their reciprocal commitment.

Cimino next describes a basic dominance theory of hazing, in which hazing is considered to be an expression of dominance of the hazer over the hazed. This theory would explain the unidirectional element of most hazing, but Cimino points out that there are problems with this theory as well. Many, if not most, hazing activities include elements of ceremony or ritual, which serve to separate the activities from everyday life, and therefore introduce ambiguity as to whether the dominance established therein is applicable outside of the ritual. Perhaps more importantly, newcomers often gain status and power within the group by completing hazing activities, which would defeat the purpose of hazing, if that primary purpose were dominance.

Cimino presents his own theory, called automatic accrual theory, that hazing is motivated by an evolved psychological response to newcomers. This theory is based on the assumption that early coalitions of humans shared benefits and costs, but were wary of short-term “free-riders,” who would take more benefits than contribute toward costs. Cimino conjectures that two free-riding strategies could be used: accruing benefits without costs until successfully excluded or feigning less ability to contribute in order to reduce costs in the short term. In this theory, hazing evolved to increase up-front costs of group entry, which would reduce or eliminate motivation to attempt short-term free-riding.

Cimino designed an experiment to test his theory, in which participants were given an imaginary scenario of a group of which they were a part and asked to rate how much they desired

²² This phenomenon, called reverse hazing, has been documented, though it is not common.

to haze newcomers and how severe they desired that hazing to be. After controlling for non-automatic benefits of group membership, there was a significantly higher desire to haze and more severe hazing desired for strongly cooperative groups than for weakly cooperative groups. Individuals who were given imagined roles as high contributors to the group had slightly (but significantly) more desire to haze and desired more severe hazing. Automatic benefits of group membership explained unique variances in the severity of desired hazing in all groups, except one.

Interestingly, the one group for which automatic benefits did not explain unique variance was a club in which it was described that individuals competed with each other. Cimino suggests that this is due to benefits (status) being accrued by individual effort, which would decrease the automatic benefits of the group since status would be gained via internal competition versus group membership.

The case of Robert Champion seems to support these results. As pointed out by Khadaroo (2011), at historically Black colleges and universities, playing in the band often carries more status than playing on the football team. Since there are few means of identifying individual members of the band from the audience (this is the ostensible purpose of uniforms), this status becomes the high automatic benefits of membership, which Cimino had predicted would result in more severe hazing.

Cimino claims that his is the first experimental research on hazing motivation. While the results of the experiments did seem to support Cimino's theory of hazing motivation, he acknowledges that there are several reasons why this suggests, but does not prove, that his theories are correct. I would add to that list: evidence that higher automatic benefits of group membership increase the desire to haze and the severity of desired hazing does little to prove any

evolved psychology. One must be extremely careful in assuming that demonstrated psychological effects are due to evolutionary features versus socialized responses. As has been demonstrated repeatedly, the “nature versus nurture” debate is exceptionally complex, and perhaps impossible to resolve.

One other major study combined two of the three major theories of hazing motivation. Keating et al. (2005) also performed psychological experiments, but rather than motivation, they researched the effectiveness of hazing on accomplishing hypothesized goals. These hypothesized goals were cultivating group-relevant skills and attitudes; stimulating social dependency (both related to solidarity theory); and reinforcing group hierarchy (dominance theory).

The second goal (stimulating social dependency) relates to two theories often cited in hazing research. The first is attachment theory (Bowlby, 1982), which suggests that, in times of threat (real or perceived), humans develop affiliation behavior and affective bonds with those experiencing the same threat, or even to the person providing the threat. The other is cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1954), which suggests that differences between two or more cognitions create psychic tension and discomfort, which humans resolve by adjusting either, both, or all cognitions to align them. As applied to hazing, this theory suggests that when the personal cost of initiation is higher than the benefits of group membership, individuals will either overvalue membership, downplay the costs of initiation, or both.

The results of the research by Keating et al. (2005) regarding reinforcing group hierarchy were mixed: social deviancy in hazing did result in higher perceived power differences between leaders and newcomers; however, harsh treatment during hazing resulted in lower perceived power differentials. In terms of group solidarity, the results suggested that different groups’ chosen initiation activities did, indeed, match the groups’ skill and attitude sets (athletic groups’

initiations involved more physically demanding and painful activities, while fraternities and sororities chose more socially deviant activities), suggesting that this hypothesized goal may be an underlying motivation for hazing. Social dependency was shown to increase (in terms of greater dependency on group opinions) with discomforting initiations, which would seem to reinforce the notion that cognitive dissonance helps explain the motivation to haze.

Cognitive dissonance, as applied to initiations, had been widely held to be validated by the experimental work of Aronson & Mills (1959), who created artificial initiations and groups in laboratory settings to show that more stressful initiations resulted in greater liking of the group whose membership was attained through said initiations. Hinkle (2005) also found evidence of cognitive dissonance impacting college athletes' perceptions of the severity of the hazing they endured to "join" their teams.²³

Lodewijckx & Syriot (1997), however, found that group attractiveness did *not* increase with severity of initiation when data was gathered from real-life group initiations (versus Aronson and Mills' artificial context). Van Raalte, Cornelius, Darwyn & Brewer (2007) also raise questions about how applicable cognitive dissonance is to group initiations. Their research on sport team initiations suggested that hazing did not affect social cohesiveness and had an adverse effect on task cohesiveness, whereas socially acceptable team-building activities (dressing up for games/matches, maintaining GPA, et cetera) had a positive effect on social cohesiveness.

Another psychology theory that is sometimes applied to hazing is the idea of groupthink, a process first proposed by Janis (1972; also described by Janis within Nuwer, 2004). In this

²³ Hinkle also found that athletic commitment played a role in this process; however, she looked at commitment impacting hazing, and not vice versa.

process, individuals within a group feel the need to create consensus within the group, and thereby lose motivation to think critically of group decisions while gaining motivation to discount input from outsiders. This process results in group decisions that would be considered flawed by the same individuals if they were separated from the group. After interviewing Janis about the connection between groupthink and hazing, Nuwer (2001, 2004) coined the term “Greekthink” to describe the process as applied to college fraternities and sororities.²⁴ Likewise, Kirby & Wintrup (2002) coined the term “sportthink” to describe the process as applied to sports teams.

Another psychology theory that has not been applied to hazing (to my knowledge), but seems to be worth considering for such work, was constructed by Blanton & Burkley (2008). A theory of group psychology of the 1960s theorized that people feel a need to fit in, backed up by experimentation that found that people would give answers that they knew to be incorrect in order to fit in with a crowd. The seemingly contradictory theory from personality psychology of roughly the same time said that people feel a need to create their own, unique identity by differentiating themselves. Hypotheses that created a compromise between these two theories began to take shape, first with uniqueness theory, and then optimal distinctiveness theory. These theories held that people seek to find a balance between fitting in and creating an individual identity.

Blanton & Burkley present their own theory: deviance regulation theory (DRT). This theory has only two principles. The first is that any action becomes more informative as it moves further from social norms. The second principle is that reference groups determine when a

²⁴ Nuwer offers no substantive difference, in terms of psychological processes, between Janis' groupthink and his Greekthink, save the subjects.

deviant act is seen as meaningful. They describe two kinds of norms: “ought” norms, from which deviations are negative and, therefore, punished by society; and “ideal” norms, from which deviations are positive and, therefore, rewarded by society. They demonstrate how using negative messages about undesired actions give a secondary message that the correspondingly opposite, positive action is the norm since punishment in contemporary Western society is reserved for “ought” norms. Likewise, using positive messages to promote desired actions gives a secondary message that the correspondingly opposite, negative action is the norm since society does not praise people for doing what is expected.

Therefore, negative messages about negative behaviors work better when the opposite behavior is the norm; positive messages about positive behaviors work better when undesirable behavior is the norm. Blanton & Burkley’s research supported this hypothesis. However, they also point out that if positive messages do work against negative norms, they eventually undermine themselves by creating a new, positive norm. At this point, positive messages become ineffective or even counter-productive. Negative messages have no such instability, although they are theorized (and demonstrated) to be less effective, ineffective, or even have the opposite effect when the norm is also negative.

The applicability to hazing lies in prevention strategy: the most frequently recommended strategy involves a negative message about a negative behavior (i.e., “Do not haze”). However, Blanton & Burkley’s research suggests that if high school hazing is common (as is suggested by Hoover & Pollard), then a more effective strategy might be to present positive messages about positive (non-hazing) initiation behaviors.

Finally, Lipkins (2006) presents what she terms a “perfect storm of hazardous hazing” theory (elaborated on her website, InsideHazing.com (n.d.)). This theory holds that there are

several elements that, if brought together simultaneously, can result in hazardous hazing. These elements include the group environment, the characteristics of the individuals involved, and the internal psychological processes happening during hazing. While there are parts of Lipkins' model that are problematic (e.g., the very first element listed on the website version is "Human Nature," the very existence of which, as noted earlier, is debatable), this is one of the only models found that presents hazing as a complex interaction with many factors coming in to play.

Other Facets of Hazing.

Many authors write about hazing in relation to other human interactions. The most common topic of such writing is the intersection of gender and hazing. Johnson and Holman (2009) examine sport and gender socialization. Based on the observations of many authors that North American sport principally operates as a male-defined and male-dominated institution, they show that female initiations in sports have become harsher as acceptance of female sports has grown.²⁵ They speculate that in the early years of female sports teams in schools, the negativity directed at female athletes bonded teammates together, negating the motivation to haze. They further suggest that female athletes have increasingly taken on male ideals of sport. They also point out that both male and female hazing emphasizes heterosexual norms, with cross-dressing being used to humiliate male athletes, and provocative ("slutty") dress being used to humiliate female athletes.

Abdulrehman's (2007) findings exploring the links between sexual abuse and sport hazing appears to support this, noting that male-on-male hazing is much more likely to be

²⁵ The increased severity of female initiations is also noted by Nuwer (2000, 2001, 2004).

sexually abusive than female-on-female hazing.²⁶ Tiger (in Nuwer, 2004) also points to this difference, noting that male hazing often has homo-erotic elements, which he likens to male-on-male dominance mounting in animal behavior, while female initiations stress purity.²⁷

Allan (in Nuwer, 2004) also notes these differences but cautions that the perception that female hazing is less violent is based more on gender stereotypes than empirical data, which is limited. However, the data from the Alfred University hazing survey of NCAA athletes did show that female hazing consisted of “unacceptable” acts less frequently than did male hazing (Hoover, 1999).²⁸ Allan & DeAngelis (in Johnson & Holman, 2004) apply gender theories to hazing, stating that while male voyeurs are usually present during the simulation of heterosexual sex acts as part of female hazing, women are rarely present during the simulation of homoerotic sex acts as part of male hazing. They use this data to support their claim that hazing tends to reinforce gender stereotypes. They go so far as to state that “hazing contributes to the social reproduction of masculinity and femininity,” and suggests that female hazing that subordinates women negates the potentially transformative power of female sports (p. 54).

Anderson, McCormack, & Lee (2012) found that at one United Kingdom university, hazing activities moved away from male-on-male sexual activities as homophobia decreased in the surrounding society. This suggests that the use of male-on-male sexual abuse is intended, paradoxically, to discourage (in other instances) male-on-male sexual activity. This suggestion reinforces the findings of Johnson and Holman (2004) in applying gender theory to hazing: as

²⁶ Curiously, incidents of mixed-gender hazing are relatively rare.

²⁷ Tiger’s original essay was written in 1969. As noted, several authors claim that the severity of female initiations has been on the rise in recent decades.

²⁸ Allan also acknowledges this fact.

masculine stereotypes have changed, hazing appears to have changed in kind. Lenskyj (in Johnson & Holman, 2004) also examines the links between male sport hazing and sexual assault against women.

Another intersection explored by multiple authors is that of race and hazing. Rogers, Rogers, and Anderson (2012) looked for a possible link between hazing and long-term commitment to Black Greek-letter organizations (BGLOs) but found no significant correlation between being hazed into a BGLO and continuing membership among alumni. DeSousa, Gordon & Kimbrough (in Nuwer, 2004) write that eight of the largest BGLOs have, at the national level, banned the practice of “pledging,”²⁹ yet the practice continues underground, seemingly as frequently and severely as ever.

Nuwer (2001) states that, during the late 1980s and the 1990s, hazing deaths in historically Black fraternities more often resulted from physical beatings, while hazing deaths in historically White fraternities were more often the result of alcohol abuse. Jones (in Nuwer, 2004) examines physical violence in pledging rituals of BGLOs through the lens of anthropology, which is in turn viewed through a lens of Afro-centrism. While he states that levels of physical violence in Black Greek organizations have risen higher than those of other Greek organizations, he does not offer any explanation for this. He does advocate for the reduction or elimination, if possible,³⁰ of physical violence in pledging ceremonies of BGLOs.

²⁹ The authors state that the term “pledging” has become synonymous with “hazing.”

³⁰ Jones expresses some doubts as to whether the elimination of physical violence in these rituals is possible based on the theoretical need for sacrifice established in anthropological literature.

Prevention.

A substantial portion of the existing literature on hazing concerns prevention. Of this literature, the majority focuses on administrative avenues to prevention via rules, laws, and punishment.

There is a surprising amount of legal literature on the hazing, considering the dearth of literature on hazing in general. Much of this literature focuses on enacting new, or stricter, anti-hazing statutes at the state level (Cohen & Brust, 2012; Dixon, 2001; Edelman, 2005; Nuwer, 2000, 2001; Pelletier, 2002). Lipkins (in Hosansky, 2013) advocates for a federal anti-hazing law.

Some authors also suggest implementing “duty to act” legislation that would obligate school personnel to take preventative measures against hazing, and to report hazing activities (Dixon, 2001; Edelman, 2004); others claim that this duty is already in place (Crow & Rosner in Nuwer, 2004). Stuart (2013) also suggests making school personnel more responsible, but through the use of Title IX, a United States federal law usually known for requiring gender equity in school athletics. However, Title IX also addresses sexual harassment, which Stuart argues includes most hazing activities. She promotes using Title IX as both a proactive (preventative) and reactive (litigation) measure in combatting hazing. Crow and Rosner (in Nuwer, 2004) also briefly cite Title IX as an anti-hazing law. Kuzmich (1999) examines the legal aspects of civil versus criminal liability in cases of alcohol-related hazing.

Hosansky (2013) examines both sides, giving equal time to suggestions that more anti-hazing laws are needed, and those who claim that hazing laws have not made a significant impact in reducing hazing. Khadaroo (2011) also points out that past hazing lawsuits, amounting

to millions of dollars paid out by Florida A&M University, have not stopped hazing at that institution.

Many authors published in media aimed at education professionals (or para-education professionals and practitioners, such as coaches) suggest schools develop anti-hazing policy, and, consistent with the legal recommendations of more severe punishment, also suggest including zero-tolerance policies and increased punishment for offenders (Fierberg, 2000; Guynn & Aquila, 2005; Hollmann, 2002; Kirby & Wintrup, 2002; Crow & Rosner in Nuwer, 2004; Taylor, 2001). Hollmann (2002) also suggests other avenues of prevention, including educational programs. Oliff (2002) quotes other authors suggestions; however, she also points to reportedly successful measures taken by high schools that were previously hit by major hazing incidents. These measures include more education and support measures beyond increased punishments.

Lipkins (2006) approaches prevention measures in a manner aimed at parents and other adults working with young people. Unlike many authors on hazing, she does not advocate for stronger laws, policies or punishments;³¹ rather, she stresses education and communication between young people and adults, and, importantly, teaching young people to question authority figures, since hazing relies on the victim's acceptance of the authority of the group, or of individual members within the group. A more recent study suggested a research-based model of hazing prevention based on examining data from hazing-prevention programs at eight universities over three years (Allan, Payne, & Kerschner, 2018). As the authors point out, this helps to fill a gap in the existing literature on hazing prevention, as they claim to be the first data-driven framework for hazing prevention (p. 2).

³¹ This does not imply any condemnation of anti-hazing laws, policies, or punishments; instead, these are remedies that are exhaustively suggested and examined in other sources.

Belonging

There are several reasons why belonging in high school bands is an important topic for study. One reason would be belonging's relation to retention; that is, in efforts to keep as many students as possible enrolled in what are most often elective courses. As suggested by my data and further discussed below, a sense of belonging is an essential factor in students' decision-making process as they choose whether or not to re-enroll in band classes from year to year. If music educators truly believe that music education is for all, and is beneficial for all, then it follows that efforts to retain students – all students, not just the students that make themselves into or find themselves having become 'above average' music performers – are a critical piece of the music education mission. This, however, is not the only reason for the importance of study of belonging in high school bands.

There is an educational rationale for placing importance on students' sense of belonging beyond retention concerns. Carol Goodenow found that a sense of belonging within their school was important to students' academic motivation and achievement (1993). William Glasser went so far as to call a sense of belonging one of only five basic human needs (1986). However, at least one source suggests that many adolescents do not readily find a sense of belonging anywhere in their lives (Academic Innovations, 1997, p. 3). Considering, then, the importance to every student of having a sense of belonging along with the apparent scarcity of opportunities for some students to find this sense of belonging, I submit that the importance of examining belonging in high school bands goes beyond the concerns of band directors attempting to keep up their enrollment numbers.

As when I defined (or perhaps explained) the term "in" earlier in Chapter One, I will attempt to provide some contours for "belonging" rather than a definition. The boundaries of

both terms, as used in this study, were largely set by participants. While I used the term “in”³² as part of my interview script, “belonging” does not appear. This absence makes it even more difficult to pin down in some ways; however, it also makes it all the more remarkable that so many participants used the word in their narratives.

Karen Osterman (2000), in her review of the literature on students’ need for belonging in their school community, defines a “sense of community as a feeling of belongingness within a group.” She goes on: “A community exists when its members experience a sense of belonging or personal relatedness. In a community, the members feel that the group is important to them and that they are important to the group” (p. 324).

While much of the literature that Osterman reviews uses “belonging” in the broader sense of peer social relationships in the school writ large, I want to focus on the last part of the preceding quote: “The members feel . . . that they are important to the group.” This is crucial to my understanding of how participants came to feel belonging in their high school bands. While several spoke of peer relationships in terms of friendships, this did not appear to be the source of their sense of belonging within the band. As participant Felicity stated, “I realized that I would still be friends with these people even if I wasn’t in band.”

Rather, belonging within the band came from cooperation, much as described by Beck and Malley (1998): “Cooperation promotes a sense of belonging because all members of the classroom work together to achieve a common purpose. When goals are achieved, every member experiences a sense of accomplishment.” (n.p.)

³²During interviews, I sometimes gestured “air quotes” while saying “in,” and almost every utterance of the term included a strong accentuation of the term to try to set “in” apart from the more common usage of the word, in. It is impossible, however, to know exactly how participants interpreted my spoken performance of the term “in.”

Putting together Osterman's statement that community belongingness involves the members feeling important to the group, and Beck & Malley's description of how cooperating to achieve goals promotes a sense of belonging, I claim that a sense of belonging within a band program stems from a belief by the member that what they contribute to the success of the group matters. That is, that they are not merely a person associated with the group, but that they are active participants in making the group's achievements happen.

John Shotter, speaking in terms of citizenship in a broader community, indicates that contributing to the group in this sense may still come up short of full belonging:

However, this is still not enough to provide one with a 'sense of belonging,' with a sense of 'being at home' in the reality which one's actions help to reproduce. To live within a community which one senses as being one's own, as 'mine' as well as 'yours', as 'ours' rather than 'theirs', a community for which one feels able to be answerable, one must be more than just a routine reproducer of it; one must in a real sense also play a part in its creative reproduction and sustenance as a 'living' tradition. (in Coupland & Nussbaum, 1993, p. 6)

Applied to a high school band setting, Shotter's additional requirements for achieving a sense of belonging seem impossible to meet; the long-term "reproduction and sustenance" of the band cannot rest on students that spend only four years within the group. Students can, however, "leave their mark" on a band program and sense that they have, in some small or big way, changed the program in doing so. My observations give me reason to believe that this is true, as reflected in the framed collections of senior pictures, paint-autographed walls, and collections of senior band member quotes that I have seen hanging on the walls of music rooms around the United States.³³ Perhaps this, then, is the high school band version of playing a part in the

³³ It may be reasonably asked how many high school music rooms I have seen. Between work as a music teacher and as a student teacher supervisor, and twelve years as a member and then staff with drum and bugle corps, I would conservatively estimate the number to be several hundred high school music rooms.

“reproduction and sustenance (of) a ‘living’ tradition”: since repertoire, drill, concert schedules, and, most of all, the student body will change from year to year, students know that they are part of a unique segment of the organization’s history, and they leave some remembrance of themselves displayed in perpetuity in the organization’s “home.”

Wolfgang Kraus (2006) writes of the difficulties in belonging to a group, and of sustaining belonging:

People do not simply choose affiliations, they have to negotiate them with others and are positioned within them by others. Their distance to some collective identities or their closeness to others must be expressed by them—and affirmed or rejected by present others. This does not entail the individual not disposing of concepts of belonging which are available in a specific situation, but rather that belonging must be negotiated, tested, confirmed, rejected or qualified again and again and not simply shown. (p. 109)

Relevant to the current study, this means that belonging in a high school band or band program is not a permanent state without maintenance. Belonging can be gained and still lost again, as did happen to one of my participants—Felicity—who, based on her narrative, certainly would have chosen to keep her sense of belonging if it were possible to simply choose to belong.

Felicity’s experience—desiring a belonging which she was unable to keep—echo the words of Elspeth Probyn (1996), speaking of the word itself, and the “longing” part of “belonging”:

I think the term [belonging] captures more accurately the desire for some sort of attachment . . . and the ways in which individuals and groups are caught within wanting to belong, wanting to become, a process that is fueled by yearning rather than the positing of identity as a stable state. (p. 19)

Self-concept

In order for one to belong, then, one must have a self-concept that is capable of belonging. This is not a simple, one-way relationship, as Cillessen and Bellmore (1999) point

out: “The causal arrow between peer relations and self-perceptions can be reversed. Not only may relationships influence social self-perceptions, but social self-perceptions may also influence relationships” (p. 652).

To paraphrase for the context of the current study, band relationships, including comparisons of oneself to others, influences self-conceptualization as a music performer, and self-concept as a music performer influences how one constructs relationships with others in the band, including their sense of belonging in band.

Self-concept is a complex idea, encapsulating notions of ways of knowing who one’s self is. To a certain extent, one can choose to change how they conceive of themselves; however, their choices are limited by the construction materials they have at their disposal. These choices in construction are limited by others, who have the power to accept or to reject, to confirm or deny another’s self-concept. This is not to say that other people have total control over an individual’s self-concept. Other people, however, deliver messages to the individual that may or may not align with an individual’s desired, or previously held, self-concept. For example, it is difficult to hold a self-concept of “popular” when one is outcast by their peers. Media sources, too, can provide messages that affirm or rebut self-concept. For example, most people in the United States receive constant input from popular media about the concept of “beauty.”

Shotter puts it this way: “In creating and negotiating the complex and detailed time-space relations between ourselves and others, we also craft our own unique selves. In other words, we become, and are ourselves, only in relation to others.” However, he goes on: “We cannot just position ourselves as we please; we face differential invitations and barriers to all the ‘movements’ (actions and utterances) we might try to make” (in Coupland & Nussbaum, 1993, p. 6-7).

Positioning Theory

Positioning addresses the “saying” of self-concept. Positioning Theory, introduced by Harré and van Langenhove, asserts that speakers position and reposition themselves in conversation, whether as they wish or as they are so compelled: “A position in a conversation, then, is a metaphorical concept through reference to which a person’s ‘moral’ and personal attributes as a speaker are compendiously collected” (1998, p.17). Harré and Langenhove write about the ‘roles’ that speakers position themselves within; however, in other articles, they further theorize that social identity can be and is (re)created through conversational positioning (1998, 32-52).

Positioning Theory, then, forms the basis for my assertions of key components from this set of findings. I assume that participants positioned themselves within their conversations with me, and that, in doing so, participants were, in part, communicating self-concepts that they had constructed from the materials available to them and, quite possibly, specifically for that conversation. By analyzing participants’ words, I can make a case for how parts of their self-concept were exhibited through their speech, even when the words were not, on the surface, speaking of self-concept.

Again, I turn to Shotter for to eloquently summarize: “Through the analytic unit of the utterance, [we] study the different ways in which people in practice, at different times, in different contexts, resolve the dilemmas they face, and formulate the lines of action they pursue” (in Coupland & Nussbaum, 1993, p. 6).

Narrative and Self-Concept

Many researchers and theorists specifically look to narrative as the source for these utterances. Kraus (2006) states that “[The self] must be understood as processed, socially

embedded, and *readable through the self-stories* [emphasis added] in which it discursively manifests itself’ (p. 106). Each participant told me a story (or stories) in which they were the main character. In these self-stories, they presented a version of themselves. That presentation of the self is, admittedly, not the same as their self-concept; that is impossible for others to know fully. Nor is it assuredly an accurate reflection. That presentation, however, is the readable version of the self that is available.

Further, I argue that, in a context in which participants are constructing their presentation of self in an extemporaneous fashion—such as unrehearsed research interviews where the questions are previously unknown to them—it is unlikely or impossible for a participant to present a version of self that does not reveal some degree of their self-concept. That is, in the process of telling their stories, participants may have been shaping their presentation of self toward the version that they wished to be seen by the listener, but the totality of the readable self—or all of the portion of the self that is presented and revealed in the telling—will inevitably shed light on the self-concept held³⁴ by the storyteller.

Belonging in High School Band

To my knowledge, there is currently no literature focused on belonging in high school band. Adderly, Kennedy, and Berz (2003) address belonging as part of their investigation into the world of the high school music classroom. Parker (2010) examined student perceptions of belonging in a high school choir setting. Middle school band played a significant role in

³⁴ “Held” may be an inadequate verb for this statement, as it implies permanence, where self-concepts are impermanent. Thus, in this context, “held” should be read only as referring to the self-concept that was in the conscious and sub-conscious mind of the participants at the time of their meetings with me; a self-concept that may well have been subtly changing even through the course our discussions.

Schnorr's (1997) study of belonging and students classified as having significant disabilities.

There are many studies of belonging in the broader context of the school; however, none that I found focused on high school band, and most use quantitative methods to explore relationships between various contextual factors and students' feelings of belongingness, and between those feelings and academic outcomes.

Chapter Summary

There is a modest body of literature on social inductions within the psychology subfield of group processes; however, most of this work is focused on small, unofficial groups rather than larger, official groups (e.g., high school bands). The body of literature specifically about hazing is relatively small. In terms of context, much of it focuses on colleges and universities and, within them, on sports teams and Greek Letter Organizations. Much of the most-cited hazing literature is in the style of reportage. When suggestions for improvement are made, these suggestions are most often based on regulation and punishment with the goal of reducing or eliminating hazing behaviors.

To my knowledge, there has been no published qualitative research specifically focused on induction processes in United States high school bands (or high school bands elsewhere). Because this induction process may be critically linked to student retention and student well-being, the present study helps to fill a gap in the literature in ways that are important to the fields of induction and hazing research and especially to music education research.

Belonging is crucial for an individual to stay in a group and having a sense of belonging in some area of one's life is seen as a basic need of humans. Many adolescents in the United States have a difficult time finding a sense of belonging anywhere in their lives.

Belonging requires feelings of important-ness to the group, and cooperation helps foster feelings of belonging. I claim that, in a larger group with shared goals, an individual must feel that they are sufficiently contributing to the accomplishments of the group—cooperating and establishing their importance—in order to feel a sense of belonging. Belonging is also negotiated between people; it cannot simply be claimed. Belonging is impermanent and can be lost.

Self-concept is important to belonging. It shapes and is shaped by relationships with others. While it is impossible to know another's self-concept fully, there are many ways in which clues to self-concept are given in the performance (or telling) of narrative wherein the teller is the main character. Positioning Theory provides an additional lens for examining the version of the self that is presented by the speaker. Narrative has been cited as a particularly rich source for investigating the self-concept of the teller.

Although there are many published studies on school belonging, and several that focus on or at least address school music in relation to belonging, there are no published studies, to my knowledge, that address belonging specifically in the high school band.

CHAPTER THREE - THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Power

The concept of power is central to the theoretical underpinnings of my study. Power is evident in the phenomenon of hazing, as evidenced by how often power is mentioned in hazing literature.³⁵ Power may seem less apparent in other forms of induction, and even irrelevant to the concept of belonging. However, I will show, both here and in Chapters Five and Six, that power is critical to my understanding of all three of these phenomena.

In order to do so, it is first necessary to discuss what constitutes power. Clearly, power extends beyond physical force, economic leverage, and official decree. In order to better understand power, especially in relationship to the phenomena under study here, I turn to philosophers with extensive literature on the subject of power.

Two of the most prominent Western thinkers of the twentieth century examined and wrote of power: Pierre Bourdieu and Michel Foucault. They were both *agregés* in philosophy at Paris' École Normale Supérieure in the mid-1950s (Steinmetz, 2011), yet their works can often be seen as a kind of spirited debate; indeed, Bourdieu sometimes even responded to Foucault's writing specifically within his own works (Foucault, however, does not mention Bourdieu.) Their respective works have profoundly influenced several academic fields, especially within what is known as the social sciences. In examining the mobilizations of power, Bourdieu and Foucault both provide theoretical lenses to consider.

³⁵ Among others, Hank Nuwer (1999) writes that "hazing demonstrates a group's power" (p. 39), and Susan Lipkins (2006) uses the word "power" 33 times in just 155 pages of her book on hazing.

Bourdieu and Power

Pierre Bourdieu is known as an anthropologist, a sociologist, and a philosopher. His experience as a conscripted member of the French army in Algiers inspired him to study and write about the people and culture he experienced; these experiences would influence all of his future work (Jenkins, 2013, p. 14). Although the subjects of Bourdieu's intellectual gaze are varied, from the Kabyle of Algeria, to art photography, to French culture, and even the very post-secondary educational institutions that he worked within, his body of work as a whole focuses on a relatively consistent theoretical framework focused on similar issues regardless of the subject:

The manner in which the routine practices of individual actors are determined, at least in large part, by the history and objective structure of their existing social world, and how, inasmuch as the nature of that social world is taken to be axiomatic, those practices contribute—without this being their intention—to the maintenance of its existing hierarchical structure. (Jenkins, 2013, p. 141)

Bourdieu believed that most of the actions—the routine actions—that a person takes are determined by their existing context. These actions help to maintain the existing hierarchical structure. Understanding the means through which Bourdieu believed this determination takes place require a brief explanation of another term that he used.

Habitus

In order to understand Bourdieu's conceptualization of power, it is necessary to examine the foundations of his philosophical worldview. In Bourdieu's view, a person's behavior is largely determined by their *habitus*. Habitus, in the simplest terms, is the sum of a person's day-to-day actions and the subconscious motivations that produce those actions. For Bourdieu, habitus is both a product and a producer of itself: actions are shaped, maybe even pre-determined, by habitus, yet those actions, in turn, shape, along with the actions of those around the individual, the subconscious ideas and motivations that are the embodied habitus. Bourdieu

(1977) defined habitus as “the durably installed generative principle of regulated improvisations”

(p. 78). Bourdieu also stated his definition more clearly:

[Habitus is] the product of the work of inculcation and appropriation necessary in order for those products of collective history, the objective structures (e.g. of language, economy, etc.) to succeed in reproducing themselves more or less completely, in the form of durable dispositions, in the organisms (which one can, if one wishes, call individuals) lastingly subjected to the same conditionings, and hence placed in the same material conditions of existence. (p. 85)

It is tempting to over-simplify Bourdieu’s habitus by saying that it is synonymous with “culture;” however, to do so would understate the power that Bourdieu granted to habitus. The above quote hints at the degree of power he believed habitus could hold; his allowance that some might wish to call the “organisms” he is observing “individuals” is telling. Here, Bourdieu made the implication that humans are less different from the other organisms in the world than is often assumed. In Bourdieu’s estimation, most (or all?) of what we do is determined by our habitus, just as other organisms might be assumed to respond to stimuli, without conscious thought or free will. This viewpoint is also implied by Bourdieu’s use of so-called scare-quotes around “choice” and “choices” (Bourdieu, 1990b; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990). Clearly, Bourdieu wanted his readers to know that choice is not as potent a tool as is commonly believed.

Bourdieu as Structuralist?

Bourdieu denied the accusation of rigid determinism but deflected, rather than refuted, the charge. The closest indication his work gives to how choice, or free will, enters into his theory is to say, in essence, that only in freely admitting that we have no freedom can we find freedom:

How can it escape notice that by expressing the social determinants of different forms of practice, especially intellectual practice, the sociologist gives us the chance of acquiring a certain freedom from these determinants? It is through the illusion of freedom from social determinants...that social determinations win the freedom to exercise their full

power...And so, paradoxically, sociology frees us by freeing us from the illusion of freedom, or, more exactly from the misplaced belief in illusory freedoms. (Bourdieu, 1990a, pp. 14–15)

If Bourdieu's theorization of power does not allow for choice, can we, then, apply parts of Bourdieu's theoretical framework to the present study without driving the metaphorical bus off the cliff of pre-determinism? Does Bourdieu's theoretical framework hold up when certain parts are removed or are those parts so integral to the structure that the framework collapses when they are removed? Even if the structure holds after said excision, is it then the most reliable framework available to us?

Instead of trying to use Bourdieu's macro-theories of power, it might be more useful to focus his work upon a smaller scale. Instead of removing parts from the larger structure and hoping the larger structure still stands, the excised parts themselves may remain intact and fully capable of holding up to examination.

Symbolic Violence

Looking for specific concepts of power within Bourdieu's work, scholars often start (and sometimes end) with his notions of symbolic violence and symbolic power. Because "violence" is so often conceptualized as only physical violence, an English reader's first impulse, upon considering the word choice, might be to think that the translation (Bourdieu wrote in his native French language) imparts subtle changes to meaning; however, "violence" is the same word in both languages. Bourdieu seemed to be expressing his negative view of what would seem to be a power that could, like many other powers, be used in a violent or a non-violent way (as will be discussed below, symbolic power is a different concept for Bourdieu, but that terminology was created after that of symbolic violence). Alternatively, perhaps Bourdieu felt that any

mobilization of this power is inherently violent, even though many of the outcomes of said mobilizations would not be commonly perceived to be violence.

Bourdieu and co-author Jeanne-Claude Passeron laid out their conceptualization of symbolic violence in Book One of *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture* (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990). The authors provided a brief definition: “[Symbolic violence is] every power which manages to impose meanings and to impose them as legitimate by concealing the power relations which are the basis of its force” (p. 4).

The authors stated that symbolic violence is a form (or forms) of power. As they expounded upon the concept, it becomes clear that one of their main areas of focus for symbolic violence is pedagogic action. Although they focused on schools, they made clear that pedagogy begins in the home with family and continues throughout life through society at large. Implicitly or explicitly, individuals are taught, by parents, teachers, and peers, how the world is and how the world works, and, importantly, to stop asking, “Why?” In this manner, symbolic violence creates a worldview in which conditions that might objectively (in whatever sense that may be used) be considered detrimental to an individual instead become “natural” and thus not for questioning or resisting. This construction works to the benefit of the maintenance and reproduction of existing systems and institutions.

This applies directly hazing, induction, and belonging in high school bands. Newcomers and the group are involved in a complex negotiation of how much each is willing to change in order to join together. Newcomers may have to decide whether or not they will submit to hazing activities. In each case, symbolic violence can be seen as obscuring the power relations in play. In this way, the power of the group to self-maintain is protected from newcomers’ questions of “why?” Not only does this make power expenditures by the group more efficient, it also puts the

group in an advantageous position in the aforementioned negotiations, as anything seen as “natural” is also seen as non-negotiable.

Symbolic Power

Another form that power takes in Bourdieu’s theoretical framework is symbolic power. As with many of Bourdieu’s theoretical concepts, it is difficult to pin down an exact introduction point for symbolic power, as it grew out of earlier writings. The most complete construction of this notion is found in *Language and Symbolic Power* (Bourdieu, 1991), a collection of Bourdieu’s writings on language from the two decades previous to its publication. However, a fairly straightforward (for Bourdieu, at least) definition can be found in his essay “Symbolic Power”:

[Symbolic power is] power to constitute the given by stating it, to show forth and gain credence, to confirm or transform the worldview and, through it, action on the world, and hence the world itself, quasi-magical power which makes it possible to obtain the equivalent of what is obtained by (physical or economic) force. (Bourdieu, 1979, pp. 82–83)

In essence, Bourdieu’s notion of symbolic power is that words, in and of themselves, do not have power, but rather are vehicles of power for those that communicate them. Thus, the power of the speaker (or author, et cetera) is vested in the symbols of language, but only when received as coming from a person with that power:

Most of the conditions that have to be fulfilled in order for a performative utterance to succeed come down to the question of the appropriateness of the speaker—or, better still, his social function—and of the discourse he utters. A performative utterance is destined to fail each time that it is not pronounced by a person who has the ‘power’ to pronounce it, or, more generally, each time that the “particular persons and circumstances in a given case” are not invoked; in short, each time that the speaker does not have the authority to emit the words that he utters. (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 111)

The notion that words can convey the power of the person uttering them seems fairly simple, but Bourdieu dug further. In examining a controversy over the appropriateness of

changes to the traditional ritual of the Eucharist in Catholic religious services, he noted that the voices of church officials were not granted authority:

By focusing exclusively on the formal conditions for the effectiveness of ritual, one overlooks the fact that the ritual conditions that must be fulfilled in order for the ritual to function and for the sacrament to be both *valid* and *effective* are never sufficient as long as the conditions which produce the recognition of this ritual are not met: the language of authority never governs without the collaboration of those it governs, without the help of the social mechanisms capable of producing this complicity, based on misrecognition, which is the basis of all authority. (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 113, emphasis in original)

This claim can easily be applied to the phenomena under study here. One instantiation might be found in the differences between “official” membership and “unofficial” membership noted in Chapter Two. Individuals are often (or, in the case of high school bands, almost always) “officially” members of the group before any hazing or induction takes place, and long before any sense of belonging is achieved. This occurs when the institution of the school lists them on the class roster or otherwise gives their stamp of approval to their membership. However, this “official” membership is rarely perceived to be enough; both the veterans and newcomers, on some level, that the newcomers are *not* truly members until they have, to a sufficient degree, adapted the norms and customs of the group. The authority of the school, although “official,” is not sufficiently recognized by those within the group to instill a feeling of being “in” or of belonging.

Whether or not Bourdieu’s assertion that all authority is based on misrecognition is valid is a debate for another venue; however, one could certainly make the argument that there is some form of misrecognition occurring in hazing instances. A simplistic reading might be that the school, as the “official” governing body recognized by the adult world, *should be* the recognized authority for students and that students are misrecognizing their situation by investing authority in those that would, potentially, humiliate or hurt them.

This reading is far too simplistic for this endeavor—a statement on a level with the “just say no” approach to drug abuse. Bourdieu may or may not have been correct in claiming that all (or, at least, very nearly all) of humankind is being duped into accepting any authority. However, I refuse to believe that if some authority is legitimate, then those that do not simply accept “official” membership are too foolish to recognize the “true” authority of the school versus the authority structures of their (near) peers. Several decades removed from my own experiences as a high school student, I remember quite vividly that, in my day-to-day interactions with the population of students, the “official” representatives of the school (teachers, principals, et cetera) were very nearly powerless to help me navigate the society of teenaged students. While said officials may have enforced the rules and regulations that kept me above a baseline safety level, their authority did not extend far into the very real, unofficial society I operated within, the kind that exists inside the halls of probably every high school.³⁶ Therefore, to say that students misrecognize *only* the authority of their peers is to forget or ignore the reality of a student peer society that operates with its own authority structure. This authority structure is one that is, admittedly, often unclear. It only partially recognizes the authority of the “official” representatives of the school. If there is misrecognition of authority involved, it is either a complete misrecognition, as Bourdieu believed, or, if only some parties are misrecognizing authority, that misrecognition is more to be found in those that trust entirely in the authority of the school officials. Still, the concept of symbolic power may prove useful in the examination of the phenomena under study in the present project.

³⁶ At least within the United States; I cannot claim enough familiarity with the student culture within any other schools to make such an assertion.

Rites of Institution

In the same volume, Bourdieu specifically addressed what he called “rites of institution.” He stated that, with this terminology, he was exploring the same family of phenomena that Van Gennep and Turner described as rites of passage (see Chapter Two). Bourdieu used a different label because he theorized that these rituals are not really about separating what came before from what comes after (as “passage” would imply):

One can ask oneself whether, by stressing the temporal transition—e.g. from childhood to adulthood—this theory [of Van Gennep] does not conceal one of the essential effects of rites, namely that of separating those who have undergone it, not from those who have not yet undergone it, but from those who will not undergo it in any sense, and thereby instituting a lasting difference between those to whom the rite pertains and those to whom it does not pertain. (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 117)

Bourdieu clarified this idea through the example of male rites of passage, such as circumcision, which he claimed are not so much about creating an artificial line between boy and man, but between male and female. In this way, the most feminine man and the most masculine woman are separated into arbitrary categories that are necessary to maintain and reproduce the institutions of society.

Bourdieu (1991) also claimed that rites of institution serve a further purpose: to keep the initiated in:

The Great Wall of China was meant not only to stop foreigners entering China but also to stop Chinese leaving it. That is also the function of all magical boundaries . . . to stop those who are inside, on the right side of the line, from leaving, demeaning or downgrading themselves This is also one of the functions of the act of institution: to discourage permanently any attempt to cross the line, to transgress, desert, or *quit*. (p. 122, emphasis in original)

Can this theory, then, be applied to hazing, induction, and belonging? Recall that, in all of these phenomena, newcomers are almost always already members, at least in an official capacity, of the group. If hazing and other ceremonial induction activities are not about becoming a

member, then perhaps they are, to paraphrase Bourdieu, actually about separating those that are part of the group not from those who are becoming or are yet to become a part of the group. Instead, it is about separating those in the group from those that never will be a part of the group.

One could argue that this application does not logically hold up since, unlike the openly publicized rituals of broader society, which could serve to mark such divisions for all to see, hazing is almost always private, and usually secretive. If it is meant to separate members from non-members, why would it not be a public display? The answer, of course, is that the separation is not for the benefit of outsiders—it is for the benefit of the group members themselves. Recall Fontaine’s (1986) words from Chapter Two: “Initiation rituals are ‘for’ those already initiated as much as for the novices” (p. 104). In short, hazing and other initiation ceremonies could serve as a self-demarcation, a ritual to remind (or, perhaps more accurately, reassure) members that they are, indeed, part of something special, marked as such because outsiders have not undergone the ritual(s) that they have.

Whether or not initiation serves this purpose is, perhaps, a question for further research. After all, Bourdieu also cited as fact the psychological theories (discussed in the previous chapter) that claim that group attractiveness is increased with the severity of the initiation costs; however, more recent research has called these theories into serious question. Thus, it is reasonable to be skeptical of this claim; however, it is also worth considering as a possibility when examining hazing.

Summary of Bourdieusian Theories of Power

Bourdieu’s theoretical framework surrounding issues of power does hold some usefulness for an examination of hazing, induction, and belonging in high school bands. However, it is, on the whole, the framework of a structuralist, built for examining larger-scale societies. While an

argument can be made for ways in which this framework can be scaled back to apply to a small group, I find this exercise to be too unwieldy, as if cramming square pegs into round holes.

Rather, I choose to take Bourdieu's notions of symbolic violence, symbolic power, and rites of institution, each of which seems to apply to one or more of the phenomena in question, and search elsewhere for a more applicable overarching theory of power.

Foucault and Power

Although he was a history enthusiast as a young student, later a professor of psychology and French language, and still later an administrator of institutions of French culture, Michel Foucault is now known most widely (perhaps almost exclusively) as a philosopher. Like Bourdieu, he was an *agregés* in philosophy at l'École Normale Supérieure in Paris. As Bourdieu's experiences as a member of the *petit bourgeoisie*, and as a soldier in the Algerian war helped shape his philosophical work by providing some of the subjects of his work, Foucault's experiences as a frustrated student from a wealthy family, as a homosexual (in a time and place quite hostile to homosexuality) and as a patient of a mental health clinic, helped to provide the subjects of many of his archaeologies, and, later, his genealogies (Eribon, 1991).

Archaeologies and Genealogies

These—archaeologies and genealogies—are the titles Foucault used to describe his historical investigations into particular subjects through which his philosophical theories emerge:

Foucault's archaeologies and genealogies are . . . explicit attempts to rethink the subject. The subject is not an autonomous and transparent source of knowledge, but is constructed in networks of social practices which always incorporate power relations and exclusions...it is possible to contest and ultimately transform oppressive and degrading identities when they are exposed as social constructions rather than as expressions of natural facts. (Oksala, 2007, p. 14)

Foucault, then, focused on the historical development of discrete subjects, such as madness, sexuality, and prison, to provide a greater understanding of the larger world. Unlike Bourdieu, who used his examination of discrete subjects to support his theories about power relationships that overarched entire societies and which operated from the top down, “Foucault conceived of his books as a toolbox that readers could rummage through to find a tool they needed to think and act with” (Oksala, 2007, p. 7).³⁷

If Foucault’s books are a toolbox, then in rummaging through his tools, it becomes clear that Foucault did not conceive of power as a one-way proposition:

The task therefore is one of a description of the control, regulation and discipline of the body that promises to reveal the conditions and limits of resistance . . . these modifications of traditional interpretations of the relation between power and subject-individual add up to the understanding of power as a horizontal phenomenon. (Warner, 2008, p. 12)

Power, in Foucault’s view, cannot be reduced to a model as simple as class-on-class, or dominant and dominated. Where Bourdieu saw macro-structures of power, Foucault also saw micro-structures: power operates on a multitude of levels and in multiple directions, and the ways in which it does so can vary depending upon the context examined (Oksala, 2007, p. 40).

When applied to the phenomenon of hazing, Foucault’s theories of power may seem less useful than Bourdieu’s. It seems easy to see that hazing (usually) involves veterans and newcomers—two classes, one with the power and one without the power. Bourdieu’s theories easily lend themselves to such an interpretation. However, what is easy to see is often not all there is to see.

³⁷ This is not to say that there is no unification of theory across Foucault’s works.

Let us, again, return to the case of Robert Champion. If power relations in hazing were as simple as two classes, “veteran” and “newcomer,” Robert Champion would never have been subjected to hazing on the night of his death: he was, at the time, a junior and a drum major. If the division were as simple as “members” versus “non-members,” the same result applies: while Champion had almost completed his third year with the band, one of the accused leaders of the hazing had already (officially) been kicked out of the band. Thus, it becomes apparent that power relations are both fluid and dynamic. In this case, an individual that appears to be in a powerful position in one setting (i.e., as a drum major during official band performances) is, hours later, dying as a result of beatings that, at some level, he allowed himself to be submitted to, because, at some level, he accepted that he lacked the power to resist.

This example starts to show some of the problems in using Bourdieu’s model of power as a lens for hazing and supports Foucault’s notion that power is best studied not just from the top down but also from the bottom up; not just at the macrostructural level but also at the microstructural level. To quote Foucault (1980a), “It is often difficult to say who holds power in a precise sense, but it is easy to see who lacks power” (p. 213).

This is even more apparent in the broader phenomena of induction and belonging. That is, who holds power is difficult to pinpoint, but it is easy to see that the newcomers lack power. Veterans may not exhibit any application of power upon newcomers, and yet, newcomers feel pressure to conform. There must be power applied that exerts this pressure, but the source of this power is not readily visible.

Defining Power

The most concise definition of power that I find in Foucault’s work is in *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction* (1978):

It seems to me that power must be understood in the first instance as the multiplicity of force relations immanent in the sphere in which they operate and which constitute their own organization; as the process which, through ceaseless struggles and confrontations, transforms, strengthens, or reverses them; as the support which these force relations find in one another, thus forming a chain or a system, or on the contrary the disjunctions and contradictions which isolate them from one another; and lastly, as the strategies in which they take effect, whose general design or institutional crystallization is embodied in the state apparatus, in the formulation of the law, in the various social hegemonies. (pp. 92–3)

This description of power does not simplify any power relations because Foucault understood power to be irreducible to a simple model. As his definition points out, power involves “multiplicities of force relations,” and “ceaseless struggles and confrontations.” Unlike Bourdieu, Foucault’s theoretical take on power allows for struggle and change at any level: power may reinforce the status quo, or it may change things. Force relations (a building block of Foucault’s notions of power) may work together or in opposition to one another. In short, power works in a very complicated manner, much as it can within physics, at least when considered on a large scale. Indeed, Foucault (1995) referred to the “micro-physics” of power (pp. 26–9). This language is important, as Foucault saw any possible grand effects of power as originating from the effects of a multiplicity of much smaller power relations.

The most complete yet direct outline that Foucault gave of his theoretical framework of power can be found in the “Method” chapter of Part Four of The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1 (1995). In it, Foucault laid out five basic tenets of power:

- Power is not something that is acquired, seized, or shared, something that one holds on to or allows to slip away; power is exercised from innumerable points, in the interplay of non-egalitarian and mobile relations.
- Relations of power are not in a position of exteriority with respect to other types of relations...but are immanent in the latter; they are the immediate effects of the divisions, inequalities, and disequilibriums which occur in the latter, and conversely they are the internal conditions of these differentiations; relations of power are not in superstructural positions, with merely a role of prohibition or

accompaniment; they have a directly productive role, whenever they come into play.

- Power comes from below; that is, there is no binary and all-encompassing opposition between rulers and ruled at the root of power relations . . . the manifold relationships of force that take shape and come into play . . . are the basis for wide-ranging effects of cleavage that run through the social body as a whole . . . major dominations are the hegemonic effects that are sustained by all these confrontations.
- Power relations are both intentional and nonsubjective . . . they are imbued, through and through, with calculation: there is no power that is exercised without a series of aims and objectives. But this does not mean that it results from the choice or decision of an individual subject . . . the logic is perfectly clear, the aims decipherable, and yet it is often the case that no one is there to have invented them.
- Where there is power, there is resistance and yet this resistance is never in a position of exteriority in relation to power . . . these points of resistance are present everywhere in the power network . . . there is a plurality of resistances, each of them a special case . . . Are there no great radical ruptures, massive binary divisions, then? Occasionally, yes. But more often, one is dealing with mobile and transitory points of resistance. (pp. 94–6)

If there were any doubts that Foucault's notions of power were different from those of Bourdieu, this (relatively) brief passage should lay them to rest. Where Bourdieu saw a binary system of power, wherein some have power and others do not, Foucault saw a tangled web of power. Bourdieu saw those with power wielding it over those without it. Foucault saw power coming from the bottom up, from the individual—power which cannot be held, and which has intentionality without an inventor. This tangled web produces effects that cannot be traced to individuals. Bourdieu laid out a system so all-encompassing that he takes to using “choice” in scare-quotes; Foucault explicitly stated that where there is power, there is resistance. This resistance, however, is most often small in scale—unlike many other philosophers, Foucault did not hold out for a grand solution. Instead, he posited that resistance and ruptures are always possible, though they may be small in scale, and coming from multiple points in the web of power.

Power/Knowledge

In order to understand how Foucault's disciplinary power works, it is necessary to start with his idea of power/knowledge. Foucault found these two—power and knowledge—to be inextricably intertwined, as power helps shape which knowledges are considered legitimate. Those legitimated knowledges—Foucault referred to these as discursive fields—in turn, help to determine how power operates. Specifically, by instilling the belief that certain conditions of being are “natural,” rather than a social construct, discursive fields can lead individuals to accept said conditions rather than struggling against them. This form of power and this knowledge are then, practically, one and the same: power/knowledge (Foucault, 1980b, pp. 92–108).

This concept echoes Bourdieu's concepts of symbolic violence and symbolic power, as well. However, Bourdieu's symbolic power is only effective, theoretically, when language symbolizes the actual power, *physical or economic*, of the sender. What, then, is the physical or economic power at play within hazing, induction, or belonging in the context of high school bands? Certainly, veterans in high school bands, as slightly older teenagers, would be physically stronger, on the whole, than younger newcomers. However, while physical strength has obvious implications in hazing,³⁸ it would appear to have little to do with most other induction processes, nor with belonging.

The existence of social constructs that lead newcomers to picture their condition as “natural” seems to be a more likely explanation. In this case, “natural” refers to what is often called “human nature.” Foucault rejected the idea of an inborn human nature, pointing instead to social constructs, traceable through historical inquiry (hence, archaeologies and genealogies),

³⁸ However, physical strength does not play as much of a role in hazing as might be guessed at first consideration: most hazing is not physically forced upon newcomers.

that have become so ingrained as to seem natural—and, therefore, something against which struggle is considered pointless. Aided by this worldview, the group can more easily employ power over newcomers. So long as those newcomers believe that adapting to group norms and customs is “just part of being accepted,” the group has less need to exert external power upon the newcomer. Metaphorically speaking, there are guns both at newcomers’ heads and inside their heads (J.E. Koza, personal communication, December 2, 2013).

Disciplinary Power

Understanding how, in Foucault’s theoretical framework, power/knowledge works to create and maintain social constructs, we can now look at how disciplinary power functions. Foucault argues that modern society has (had) created this new kind of power. Unlike sovereign power (which came before, but did not disappear with the advent of disciplinary power), this new form of power is enforced not with intermittent displays of violent force so much as with constant surveillance. (Foucault, 1980b, pp. 104–105). It is also maintained through voluntary compliance, upheld through power/knowledge that makes compliance seem “natural.”

Disciplinary power operates quite differently from juridical power. Juridical power operates, more or less, on a binary of what is legal and what is illegal (permitted and forbidden): legal acts are all the same in the eyes of the law, and illegal acts are punished. Disciplinary power, however, operates on a scale, wherein individuals are compared to each other and the whole, sorted and labeled, rewarded for conforming and punished for deviancy. While there are rewards for exceedingly positive behaviors, the real goal of disciplinary power is normalization (Foucault, 1995, pp. 182–183).

Panopticism.

Foucault used the example of the Panopticon as a model for disciplinary power. Originally a theoretical design for a prison, the Panopticon placed every prisoner under the constant (potential) gaze of a central guard tower. While the original intent may have been security from the vantage point of the guard(s), another result is the constant pressure of surveillance upon the inmate. Foucault related this to physical models in place in schools and other institutions, but also to what he terms “panopticism,” or the application of the principle of constant surveillance, in physical or other forms, to other facets of life. Some of these applications may be seen in the workplace, where laborers are often under constant, direct supervision, or else subject to it at any time; or even to society as a whole, where the role of police forces have shifted from one of mostly response to crime to mostly patrolling (surveillance) to prevent crime (Foucault, 1995, pp. 195–228).

All of this may seem distant from the phenomena of hazing, induction, and belonging in high school bands, and from the concept of power/knowledge. Power/knowledge, though, is the way in which panopticism can operate on a grand scale, across an entire society. While Orwell may have envisioned a genuinely panoptic state in the sense of being under actual constant surveillance, Foucault’s power/knowledge makes possible individuals that feel surveillance even when no actual surveillance is taking place. In an instantiation of power/knowledge, a discursive field is created in which individuals feel near-constant pressure to conform to society’s norms (at least when in public view). While there may be no one watching, this particular example of power/knowledge creates a sense that someone *could* be watching and a fear of being seen as other-than-normal.

With this concept of panopticism, we can return to the application of disciplinary power to the phenomena under study. While the “official” operation of a high school band (indeed, most aspects of modern Western schooling) would provide more apparent examples of the mobilization of disciplinary power, the ever-present pressure to conform has obvious impacts upon the process of becoming part of a group. Throughout life, people are pressured to conform by many of the most important institutions in society (family, school, and religion, not to mention peer society). This same pressure to conform applies to newcomers as they go through induction processes, possibly face the choice of “consenting” to hazing activities,³⁹ and often attempt to find a sense of belonging in the group.

Bio-power

Another form of power that Foucault described is *bio-power*. Bio-power is a recently created form of widespread social power, as is disciplinary power; however, where disciplinary power is concerned with what the human body can produce, bio-power is concerned with the health and reproduction of the human body—both individually and as a population—and the administration of life and death (Foucault, 1978, pp. 139–141). While mobilizations of bio-power have a productive outcome, often seen as contributing positively to human health and safety, these mobilizations often come along with impingements on personal choice and freedom. Bio-power operates so as to provide security for the population as a whole, even as it may harm some. Societal pressure to vaccinate children could be considered a form of bio-power: while vaccinations have been proven to keep most children safer, some children are (very

³⁹ I used scare quotes around “consenting” because, as discussed in Chapter Two, consent under duress is not legally considered as consent, nor do I consider “consent” to be a mitigating factor in my definition of hazing.

rarely) seriously harmed by vaccinations. However, since the population, as a whole, gains more security against the threat of serious diseases, vaccinations are all but demanded by social pressures and administrative hurdles.⁴⁰ Foucault described bio-power as the second pole (disciplinary power being the other) in a bi-polar power system in modern society.

While bio-power does not seem to have the same applicability to the phenomena under study as does disciplinary power, it can still be seen to impacting the greater *milieu* of hazing research and activism. As noted frequently in the preceding chapter, the prevailing strategy for preventing the adverse effects of hazing is to work toward the prevention of hazing altogether, and, in turn, the prevailing strategy for hazing prevention is more and stricter rules and more and harsher punishment. Here, one can see the intersection of disciplinary power and bio-power: a need for enforcement meets the impetus of bio-power to administrate and protect the health of young people. As with many instantiations of bio-power, this results in fewer choices for those involved. Also, as in some medical cases, the mobilization of bio-power, intended to help, may hurt when power/knowledge has created a paradigm based on limited understanding of the contextual reality;⁴¹ or, perhaps, has created a paradigm based on some as-yet-undefined need to misunderstand that reality.

Foucault and Sex / Gender

The concepts of sex and gender are also important aspects of Foucault's theoretical understanding of power. These are examined in *The History of Sexuality, Volume I* (Foucault, 1978). Foucault, through his historical examination of sex and sexuality, demonstrated how our current dichotomous (male/female) conception of "sex" has been constructed through human

⁴⁰ This should not be misunderstood as in any way representing my position on vaccinations!

⁴¹ Acknowledging that Foucault might ask, "Whose reality?"

history, even as much of this conception is considered to be “scientific fact.” Foucault (1980b) is not the first to have cast gender as a social construct, but he moves one step further and questions whether there is such a thing as a “true sex” (pp. vii–x). As much as one might try to separate the social construct of gender from the “scientific fact” of sex, Foucault would argue that, until we see that a “scientific fact” is still a social construct (at least inasmuch as those facts are granted legitimacy in social mobilizations), it is impossible to extract gender from sex. This is especially true given the bio-power of the medical and psychological establishment, which has consistently and continually offered up “scientific” differences between men and women, based upon the assumption of a complete dichotomy.

As noted in a preceding chapter, many authors have made linkages between hazing and gender, and of those, several have pointed to male domination in sport as a critical component in hazing. Specifically, homoerotic hazing seems to be used, paradoxically, as a means to enforce heterosexual male norms within sport. This connection may seem unrelated to high school band. However, marching band has a strong military heritage, and military organizations are also, historically and to the present, bastions of male domination. While marching band is not the whole of high school band, I hypothesize that the data from a large-scale, quantitative study would suggest that marching band hazing accounts for an inordinately large percentage of high school band hazing.⁴²

⁴² The masculinity within the military heritage is not the only reason for this suspicion: marching band provides something akin to Susan Lipkins’ “perfect storm” (Lipkins, 2006, p. 38) of hazing: hyper-masculine roots, strong group identity, prestige (especially with competing bands), lack of individual recognition in comparison to group recognition, and contextual opportunity for hazing (travelling, lack of supervision).

There are other, less-apparent connections between sex / gender and the phenomena of induction and belonging in high school band. I have written throughout this section about newcomers trying to “fit in” to their new group, both in terms of induction and in establishing a deeper sense of belonging. “Fitting in” in any group in current Western (and perhaps any current) society involves fitting into the group’s norms for males, or norms for females. The differences between these sets of norms may be minute or they may be great. They may parallel the norms for binary notions of gender in broader society, or they may involve gender norms specific to the group. It is hard to imagine a case, however, where gender roles did not play any part in conforming to the norms of a group.

Foucault, through his archaeology of sexuality, showed (in part) how the socially entrenched notion of masculinity has been constructed. While it may be a stretch to believe that teaching students about gender and sex as a social construct would be a useful tool in the reduction of hazing violence or the construction of a more welcoming, inclusive environment, it may be a starting point. As Foucault (1988) stated, “Since these things have been made, they can be unmade, so long as we know how it was that they were made” (p. 37)—a destructive concept of masculinity can be changed to something potentially less destructive, if only those that would maintain the construction could be led to understand the way in which it was constructed.

Bourdieu versus Foucault: Choosing a Theoretical Lens

Foucault theorized power in terms of the micro-relations which can and do work together to create large-scale power relations. Thus, just as Bourdieu’s lens can be tightened to apply a theory designed for society (writ large) to a much smaller scale, Foucault’s lens can be widened to apply to a much larger scale. However, understanding the macro as a collection of the micro,

when researching on the micro level, makes far more sense than understanding the micro as part of the macro. That is, in studying hazing in a high school band setting, it makes more sense to understand what is happening at the level as it is and apply that to larger-scale applications rather than attempting to understand what is happening on a grander scale and then casting the particular case as some part of a much larger system of power.

My first take on the power theories of Bourdieu and Foucault led me to lean toward Bourdieu as the more useful of the two. The large power structures that Bourdieu theorized seemed to provide a target for which to produce change, while Foucault's notion of a near-infinite network of power relations seemed too daunting to provide any opening for change. However, upon closer examination, I have to come to reject Bourdieu's theories of power as an overarching lens for this project because I agree with his apparent conclusion that there is little room for resistance if one were to accept his theoretical framework as a whole. Foucault, on the other hand, is explicit: where there is power, there is resistance. Admittedly, because Foucault was examining power relations at the level of microphysics, his theory gives no foothold for taking action in one fell swoop, as Bourdieu's structures might seem to offer tantalizingly. However, the allure of the macro-structure as a target for change quickly evaporates as one realizes that Bourdieu created a structure with no apparent space for making the *choice* to work for change.

Foucault's micro-physics of power, at first, seem like a target for a fool's errand: micro-relations leave room only for micro-changes. Further, Foucault contended that such relations are continually shifting, meaning that today's small gains could be wiped out, almost at random, by tomorrow. However, those gains are what is possible; unlike Bourdieu, Foucault was clear in

stating that resistance is not only possible but that it is inevitable. This is the space for resistance that we find, as small as it may be:

Where there is a space between the position of subject offered by a discourse and the individual interest, a resistance to that subject position is produced...the discursive constitution of subjects, both compliant and resistant, is part of a wider social play for power. (Weedon, 1987, pp. 112–113)

Foucault did not provide a diagram for a grand solution; in fact, his theory would make any such complete change, at least within the foreseeable future, impossible. Here, perhaps, is the point at which many abandon Foucault as a useful theory. If one is looking for the master tool, it is not to be found in Foucault:

Foucault's work suggests that power can no longer be seen as a convenient, manipulatable and deterministic resource. It is more than just something that 'A' does to 'B' to make 'B' do something that 'B' wouldn't otherwise do. One cannot simply argue that power can be explained as 'A; making 'B; do something against 'B's' interests. (Gordon, 2009, p. 156)

However, is this—the cumulative impact of many small actions—not how humans have accomplished many great works?⁴³ On a physical level, we have accepted that, in order to construct the Great Wall of China or the pyramids of Giza, one block had to be laid on another, again and again, and again. Moreover, whether this was known to the builders or not, we know now that all we build, at least in the physical sense, will also one day crumble. Knowing this, why should we look for anything different in terms of social conditions? Whatever it is that we think of as a positive outcome will only occur because resistances at the individual level were mobilized.

⁴³ “Great” in this context refers only to the scope of the accomplishments; it is not used as the superlative of “good.”

Foucault (1978) provided further clues toward the means by which this may be accomplished: “Power is tolerable only on condition that it mask a substantial part of itself” (p. 86). Perhaps, instead of attempting to provide the resistance on behalf of everyone who might be negatively impacted by a particular discourse, one need only peel up the corner of that mask, and then let adversely impacted individuals provide their resistance for themselves. For this project, then, I choose Foucault’s overarching theories of power as more useful than Bourdieu’s.

Theory in application

Taking a Foucauldian approach to power in this study necessitates the clarification of several key points. The first of these is that when power is discussed in this study, it is to be understood that said power, as Foucault described it, is difficult to pin down to a simple, static, unidirectional thing. This is why, in my definition of hazing, I chose to say that hazers are “in a more powerful position” rather than granting that power to the actual persons involved. This language is still inadequate to fully grasp the intricacies of power relationships that a Foucauldian reading of the phenomena under study might demand; however, I must balance my attempts to describe said power relationships more fully with the need for clarity. I acknowledge, then, that any attempt to describe power relationships will come up short of the full complexity of those relationships, and that any assignment of power to one person over another is temporally and contextually based (i.e., impermanent and based upon positionality).

Foucault, Power, and Belonging

My comparative analysis of Bourdieusian versus Foucauldian theories of power only scratches the surface of the applications of Foucauldian theories of power to the phenomena under study. Since it seems to involve the least apparent instantiations of power of these three

phenomena, I would like to further explore how Foucault's notions of power play out within the phenomenon of belonging in high school bands.

Foucault's (1978) claim that "power is everywhere" (p. 93) is critical to an understanding of belonging. Whereas hazing involves, in the final analysis, individuals interacting in obvious and visible ways,⁴⁴ belonging is not an action. Actions of individuals that impact the sense of belonging in others or themselves are visible; so are actions that give evidence of a sense of belonging (or a lack thereof). However, these actions are not the phenomenon in and of itself. "He was hazing her" makes sense; "She was belonging him" does not. Yet, while belonging is something that one can reject from a group, it is also not something that one can simply choose.

As Kraus (2006) states, "Belonging must be negotiated, tested, confirmed, rejected or qualified again and again and not simply shown" (p. 109). However, these processes—negotiating, testing, confirming, rejecting, and qualifying—of one's belongingness are not, in general, deployed openly as such. That is, while in some settings there are official hearings to debate the belongingness of an individual, this is not a feature of most informal social groups. In this way, belonging, like hazing, has official and unofficial layers; a student that has met prerequisites for enrollment in the band course and appears on the roster may "officially" belong in the band, but this does little to guarantee the acceptance of that student by his or her peers.

These peers can negotiate, test, qualify, confirm, or reject the belongingness of said student regardless of his or her official status. In many (most) cases, then, these processes are deployed subtly, even unconsciously. The lack of an obvious interaction means that the

⁴⁴ This is not to say that "power is everywhere" does not apply to hazing power relationships. The obvious and visible interactions of individuals, in some ways, serve to mask and distract from the multiple ways in which power is enacted and employed in hazing incidents.

applications of power within those processes are also subtle, even invisible. If “power is everywhere,” however, then power is involved in belonging, and it can be revealed, if one knows where to look.

One of the ways in which attention to power is often misdirected is to look for the person or persons who are responsible for the deployment of that power; the person or people “in charge.” Let us recall that Foucault (1978) pointed out that to do so is to look in the wrong place:

Power relations are both intentional and nonsubjective . . . there is no power that is exercised without a series of aims and objectives. But this does not mean that it results from the choice or decision of an individual subject . . . the logic is perfectly clear, the aims decipherable, and yet it is often the case that no one is there to have invented them, and few who can be said to have formulated them. (pp. 94–95)

Power relations, in terms of belonging, are not nearly so simple as any person or even every person in a group making the choice to accept or deny another as belonging. Surely, individual choices are being made in either condition, but the network of power relations acting upon the individuals influences the choices that they make, and influences and limits the possibilities from which they could choose.

What power relations could influence the choices of individuals in negotiating, testing, confirming, rejecting, or qualifying the belongingness of another? Foucault (1980) looked to discourse, which shapes and is shaped by the societies that create it:

Truth is a thing of this world: it is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraint. And it induces regular effects of power. Each society has its regime of truth, its “general politics” of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true. (p. 131)

In terms of belonging, the power of discourse may not be clear if one is focusing on individual, interpersonal relationships for the confirmation or rejection of another. However,

when looking at the group as a whole, and who does or does not belong, Foucault's power/knowledge plays a more obvious role: the boundaries of the group are shaped by who is or may be a member versus who may not be a member. That is, what the group is, is determined by who the members of that group are, and who the members of the group are is determined by what the group is. In negotiating both what the group is and who can be members, individuals in the group are comparing potential members (or even current members) against what it is that they believe the group is; concurrently, what they believe the group to be is shaped by their understanding of who the members of the group are.

These "truths"—the discourse that constructs the meaning of the group and its members—are constructed, contested, de-constructed, and re-constructed both by members within the (micro)society and without. Even as these truths shift over time, they tell who can and cannot be a member of a group. They speak to members when making choices of acceptance or rejection; they speak to non-members in identifying the boundaries of the group from the outside; and they speak to potential members, telling them, inside their own minds, whether or not they are fit for membership.

These exercises of power, as Foucault said, have intentionality: they are defending or attacking the boundaries of the group in order to preserve or remake the meaning of the group, and attacking or defending the meaning of the group in order to preserve or reshape its boundaries. These actions are not, however, the result of the intention of one individual or small group of individuals; it is the collective force of myriad actions and utterances made by individuals in and out of the group. The choices made to take those actions and make those utterances are influenced by the individual's perceptions of the "truth" of the group, whether

they be inside or outside of the group. Also, that “truth” is shaped by the collective perceptions of the individuals in and out of the group.

Within this milieu, an individual must navigate the contested meaning of the group, as well as the contested limitations of which individuals can or cannot belong to the group, in order to construct a sense of belonging to that group. All of these navigations are true both within the collective of the group (and the society surrounding the group) and within their own conscious and sub-conscious thoughts.

Lest the previous paragraphs lead the reader to believe that the individual ability to belong is predetermined, I also recall Foucault’s (1978) statement that “where there is power, there is resistance” (p. 95). While an individual may or may not be able to find belonging in a group, the meaning of the group and the boundaries of membership are constantly negotiated. While members may have greater influence in these negotiations, outsiders also have influence, by virtue of the fact that any group must exist in relation to, and often within, other groups. In almost every case, the group functions within a broader society, and, as such, is shaped by (as well as shapes) the discourse of that broader society.

While belonging in a particular group may not be possible for some individuals, there are also many individuals for which belonging is a contested possibility; that is, there is always gray area in the boundary territory of any group. Belonging may not come as easily to those individuals whose legitimacy as members is contested, but it may not be impossible to achieve, either. In achieving a sense of belonging, such individuals (re)make the meaning of the group and (re)shape the boundaries of membership. However, the costs involved in the struggle for belonging may sometimes convince the prospective member to withdraw from the group entirely.

One such potential cost (or benefit, depending upon perception) is the changing of the self in order to become one who can legitimately belong, in the circumstances and in the ways in which this is possible. This change, itself, must also be deemed legitimate. While some may desire the changes which they make for the sake of belonging, others may desire membership without change, and consider the changes to be a necessary cost of belonging. These things—the constitution of what is a legitimate member, what are legitimate changes, and when changes are necessary—are all constructions that are made, contested, and remade through the collective actions and utterances of individuals both within and outside of the group.

To summarize, Foucault theorized that all larger applications of power are constructed of a vast network of smaller exercises of power, and that these micro-applications of power are everywhere. Power is vested in knowledge, but knowledge is created by power. Like all things created through power, both the discourses deemed to be “truth” and the processes through which they are deemed as such are constructed, negotiated, and remade by the collective of the people in that society and, often and to a lesser extent, by the collective of the people outside of that society.

Analysis of Conceptualizations of Power in Hazing Literature

Power is not as apparent in the phenomena of induction and belonging in high school bands. Perhaps this is why power is not written about as often in the literature for those phenomena as it is in the literature on hazing. Further, because there are readily apparent power relations in the phenomenon of hazing, authors on the subject have tended to write about power in more simplistic, straight-forward terms. For these reasons, I now turn to a brief analysis of conceptualizations of power within hazing literature.

In almost all cases, veteran or in-group members are conceptualized as being in positions of more power (within the context of the group in question), which is wielded over newcomers. This is demonstrated by Keating et al. (2005): “Initiations provide early opportunities for group leaders to establish power over newcomers to the organization” (p.107). I question whether initiations establish power so much as make visible and reinforce through ceremony the power positions already perceived by both veterans and newcomers.

Johnson (2011) makes a similar claim: “The initiation places the rookie within the culture of the team hierarchy and power-based structure” (p. 212). Again, the initiation may serve to *demonstrate* where newcomers fit into the “power-based structure.” An argument could be made for the initiation holding what Bourdieu calls symbolic power; however, Bourdieu conceptualized symbolic power as *spoken word* symbolizing *physical or economic* power. Therefore, I am not convinced that this applies directly.

According to Kirby and Wintrup (2002), initiations, as opposed to everyday activities, inherently involve unequal power relationships: “The activities are not consensual amongst peers, but rather, are between the rookies who have no positional power and the veterans who have positional authority Not only are the rookies and veterans unequal but the setting is one of unequal power”.⁴⁵ Here, the modifier of “positional” does suggest that the authors have considered that these power relationships are not fixed but are due to the positions within the group of both the veterans and the newcomers. However, in the second sentence of the quote, they specifically state that the newcomers and veterans are, themselves, unequal, implying that

⁴⁵ I was unable to access this article paginated as published in The Journal of Sexual Aggression. I used the full-text HTML version (via researchgate.net), which scrolled, unbroken, through the entire text of the article. I estimate this quote to be on or around page 59 in the original publication.

the power difference is more than positional. Further, a Foucauldian interpretation of power relationships does not allow for claims that an individual has “no positional power”—there is always room for resistance.

Schnur (2007) takes the all-or-nothing approach to power a step further: “Hazing, by definition, is hierarchical, occurring between one set of members that is all-powerful, and a second set that is completely powerless” (p. 56). Schnur seems to conceive of power as a finite commodity, with set levels between veterans and newcomers, fixed in the hierarchy. I classify “all-powerful” and “completely powerless” as hyperbole, but hyperbole that speaks to a conceptualization of power with no room for resistance.

According to Anderson et al. (2012), hazing takes place within a power hierarchy, but it also serves to preserve and reinforce that hierarchy: “Hazing initiations . . . become an avenue through which [the] power structure is maintained” (p. 429). I question how hazing initiations maintain power structures, as well as how said power structure is conceived.

Stuart (2013) also claims that hazing maintains power structures: “The participants . . . use athletic hazing to maintain the power hierarchy” (p. 12). Again, I question how hazing maintains the power structure or the hierarchy. If not through Bourdieu’s symbolic power, perhaps this is an instantiation of Foucault’s power/knowledge. If it has been accepted, at some point, that veterans are in a more powerful position than newcomers,⁴⁶ then those in power influence what is considered to be knowledge. In turn, the “knowledge” that veterans are in a more powerful position than newcomers reinforces itself.

Few, if any, authors on hazing, initiations, or inductions conceptualize veteran power as a

⁴⁶ In Chapter Five, I will discuss fear and anxiety among newcomers, which could work to reinforce newcomers’ feelings of powerlessness.

social construction. Often, it is stated as a fact that veterans are in a more powerful position. Because it is stated as a fact by so many, it is widely held as truth and becomes real for anyone that does not question the construction of that fact. That is, veterans *are* in a more powerful position than newcomers, but this is not an intractable fact of nature, but rather a construction that humans have created and made real. Moreover, as Foucault says, this can be unmade, but only if we can see how it was made in the first place.

Howard and EnglandKennedy (2006) take a more nuanced approach toward power relationships within groups: “Such systems of power can be egalitarian or hierarchical” (p. 362). This statement acknowledges that a hierarchical structure favoring veterans is not a given. I would submit that the power structure of any group grows from concepts of group membership that are contested or accepted, questioned or affirmed, and otherwise struggled with by the members. Egalitarian, hierarchical, or anywhere in between, the power structures within a group will always be open for contestation and questioning and subject to change.

Research also suggests that hazing does not always reinforce a power hierarchy, at least between individuals. Keating et al. (2005) reported that while deviant activities in hazing did increase power differentials within the hierarchy of a group, harsh treatment during hazing reduced the power differentials.

There could be many factors at play in this particular finding, but I will point to Weedon’s (1987) interpretation of Foucault: “Where there is a space between the position of subject offered by a discourse and the individual interest, a resistance to that subject position is produced” (pp. 112–3). Perhaps there is a tipping point at play, where the space between the construction of submissive newcomer and an individual newcomer’s interest in avoiding harsh treatment grow so far apart as to produce more resistance than domination.

Hazing, Power, and Gender

Stuart (2013) claims that one of the hierarchies of power involved in hazing is (heterosexual) male domination: “Sexual exploitation is a natural consequence of athletic hazing because it is both a means of establishing one’s masculine *bona fides* and a successful tool for maintaining the power structure through the humiliation of the less powerful members of the team” (p. 26). This quote demonstrates well what Foucault would call the social construction of masculinity. Moreover, the construction invoked is of the variety known in current parlance as “toxic”: a construction of masculinity that is given a stamp of authenticity for acts of sexual exploitation. Note, too, that Stuart uses the words “natural consequence,” echoing Foucault’s position that power/knowledge maintains compliance by making certain social constructions seem “natural.”

According to Johnson and Holman (2009), the shift in female hazing toward something more resembling male hazing is an example of a power hierarchy that both makes possible and is reinforced by hazing: “Females who adopt male hazing practices that emphasize the sexualization and subordination of other females . . . contribute to the entrenchment of male hegemony” (p. 7). Female hazers seem to be accepting not only a particular construction of masculinity but are also buying into the notion that said construction is one that is more powerful than others, including, apparently, available constructions of femininity.

The remedies suggested for reducing the adverse outcomes of hazing often ignore the complexity of the power relations involved. Sweet (in Nuwer, 2004) recommends that college advisors and administrators “limit . . . the power of fraternities and sororities [to haze]” (p. 12). The author has nothing to say about *how* to limit this power, other than one recommendation that is actually about limiting the opportunity to haze, demonstrating an apparent lack of attention to

a conceptualization of power. A Foucauldian interpretation of power would not allow for a limitation of power; power can only be exercised, not held nor taken.

Further, the statement speaks of the power of fraternities and sororities, not of the power relationships between the individuals that make up those organizations. I suggest that such simplistic interpretations of power miss the more complex network of power relationships between people and the discursive fields that both shape and are shaped by their actions and words. Thus, interventions based on such interpretations are more likely to fail to achieve their intended outcomes.

Chapter Summary

In comparing the theoretical works of Bourdieu and Foucault, I show how either can be used as a lens for examining the concept of power. Between the two, I choose a Foucauldian approach, as I find Bourdieu's conceptualization of power to be more applicable to a broader (i.e., societal) scope than to a more focused, individual case approach. Since I am analyzing individuals' narratives, I find Foucault's conceptualization to fit my needs more closely. Also, my desire to see this research lead, eventually and in some way, to improvements in the lives of others is thwarted by Bourdieu's ultimate conclusions about humans' ability to make choices. Foucault's theories of power, on the other hand, provide space for resistance and change.

I examined selected mentions of power from the body of both hazing and, to a lesser extent, belonging literature and found that the majority of authors have expended little to no effort examining their conceptualizations of power. Instead, many use the term "power" in a manner that suggests that it is conceptualized as a fixed and relatively simple dynamic. Using Foucault's theories of power, I conceptualize power as fluid, ever-changing, and extraordinarily

complex, sometimes operating on grand scales but always built from the collective force of uncountable smaller applications of power. One of the contributions of the present study is this exercise in examining the conceptualization of power in the context of induction, hazing, and belonging in high school bands.

CHAPTER FOUR - METHODOLOGY

Methodological Influences

I chose a qualitative design for this study because I find that the body of existing literature on hazing (as well as other forms of social induction) is lacking in both quantity and depth. This lack of quantity results in an incomplete examination of all of the factors, both subtle and overt, that make up the phenomena surrounding hazing and other inductions. In the absence of research on so many facets of the phenomenon of hazing (and surrounding phenomena), qualitative research provides a means to discover new research openings for future work—an essential task for an emerging field.

The lack of depth refers to the relatively simplistic ways in which hazing has been considered in much of the existing research. This is not to say that said research was carried out poorly; instead, it is a reflection of the fact that most of this work was quantitative in design. By its nature, quantitative work simplifies complex concepts in order to categorize; in order to count numbers of things, one must define the differences between one thing and another. In order to make categories meaningful, categories must be relatively broad—and therefore simpler—in order to populate the category: a quantitative study in which every category had $N=1$ would be a useless study. Since my goal was to gain a deeper understanding of an underexamined phenomenon, I deemed it prudent to use qualitative methods in order to leave room for previously undiscussed concepts and ideas that may impact the phenomena in previously unconsidered ways.

In particular, the design of the present study is based on three qualitative research traditions: phenomenology, phenomenography, and narrative inquiry.

Narrative Inquiry

According to Clandinin and Connelly, “Narrative inquiry is a way of understanding experience. It is a collaboration between researcher and participants Simply stated . . . narrative inquiry is stories lived and told” (1999, p. 20).

As a research methodology in the present context, narrative inquiry emerged in the late 20th century (Pinnegar & Daynes in Clandinin, 2006, pp. 5–6). While there are many forms of narrative study, they share one thing in common: “What narrative researchers hold in common is the study of stories or narratives or descriptions of a series of events” (Clandinin, 2006, p. 4).

There are many debates as to what, precisely, constitutes narrative inquiry. One of these debates is what practitioners of narrative inquiry are or should be studying. One can study the content of the descriptions of experience given by participants in the form of narrative, or study the linguistic structures of the narrative; or, as Clandinin puts it, “We are studying either lived experience as a storied phenomenon or the stories people tell about their experiences” (2006 p.xiv).

The present study makes use of the former method: I present and analyze data that was shared with me in semi-narrative form, but I do not analyze the narrative structures *per se*. I do, however, analyze what Stone-Mediatore calls “tension between experience and language” (in Narayan, Harding, & Harding, 2000, p. 122). That is, I analyze the lived experience as storied phenomenon, but I also include some analysis of the language that participants used and the ways that the chosen language shaped the construction of their narrative. I also analyzed what those choices signaled to me that the language itself, perhaps, did not say.

An important part of the approach to narrative in the present study is that it is understood to be reflexive; that is, I understand that the narratives shared with me by participants are not

taken as *prima facie* evidence, but as a story, performed by a participant who is aware that they are telling a story to their audience (me). This does not (necessarily) mean that the stories are fiction, but that they are based on memories, shaped by time and experience, and told as shaped by the teller's fears and desires, and understood through my own. Langellier and Peterson speak of reflexive performativity in storytelling: "Storytelling is performative in that possibilities for our participation are marked out in advance, so to speak, by the discourse and by our material conditions" (2004, p. 4).

Stories are built from a limited selection of possibilities. This selection may sometimes seem vast, nearly infinite; yet, because some choices are not possible, it is still limited. This limitation reflects, in many ways, the limited choices that are available in constructing self-concepts (see Chapter 6): One cannot build a story, or a sense of self, with materials to which they do not have access. Sometimes access is limited by one's inability to conceive of a particular storytelling character, plot, or even their own role in telling particular stories; other times one may be limited by the messages they receive that tell them what roles they are and are not allowed to fill. Perhaps this is why narrative is a particularly useful form of data collection when one is interested in self-perception: "Narrative stories tell of individual experiences, and they may shed light on the identities of individuals and how they see themselves" (Creswell & Poth, 2016, p. 69).

Some scholars have set more or less strict boundaries for what constitutes the "narrative" in narrative inquiry. Ochs and Capps, in making their case for a wider definition of narrative, describe the (formerly) canonical boundaries of narrative for narrative inquiry:

A coherent temporal progression of events that may be reordered for rhetorical purposes and that is typically located in some past time and place. A plotline that encompasses a

beginning, a middle, and an end, conveys a particular perspective and is designed for a particular audience who apprehend and shape its meaning. (2009, p. 57)

In the last few decades, however, the field of narrative inquiry has seen a departure from such rigid boundaries of narrative fit for study. Although there are ongoing debates about so-called “big stories” versus “small stories,” the use of narrative texts that lie outside of the canonical boundaries has become widely accepted and widely deployed (see Bamberg, 2006; Georgakopoulou, 2006). The present study makes use of these so-called “small stories,” as I did not ask my participants to prepare a master narrative of their high school band induction. Instead, I asked them to answer open-ended questions through storytelling.⁴⁷ Some of the longer narrative responses that I received may have qualified as stories within the strict canonical borders; others most certainly would not. However, all of the narratives that were shared with me, big or small, were considered as important data for analysis.

Phenomenology

Like many kinds of qualitative research, this study did not start with any hypothesis or presupposition: “In phenomenological studies the investigator abstains from making suppositions, focuses on a specific topic freshly and naively, constructs a question or problem to guide the study, and derives findings that will provide the basis for further research and reflection” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 47).

I claim that this study draws from phenomenology because it was designed to carefully examine a particular phenomenon (i.e., becoming a part of a high school band in the United States) by asking participants who have experienced that phenomenon to talk about that

⁴⁷ Storytelling, here, is used in the context of the general population, not in the context of linguistic structures. “Tell me the story of becoming a part of the high school band” asked for a general narrative response rather than a narrative that fit specific structural requirements.

experience; to gather rich, detailed descriptions of the phenomenon and surrounding experiences. Phenomenological methods also include “reflecting on essential themes” (Manen, 2016, p. 32), which was also a part of this study. The coding process (described in more detail later in this chapter) began with a holistic, eclectic coding process in order to find common themes.

Some practitioners of phenomenology might not consider this study to be phenomenological, based on some of the most prevalent definitions of this methodology. Van Manen describes the essence of phenomenology:

Phenomenology asks, “What is this or that kind of experience like?” It differs from almost every other science in that it attempts to gain insightful descriptions of the way we experience the world pre-reflectively, without taxonomizing, classifying, or abstracting it. (2016, p. 9)

Likewise, Moustakas states that “Phenomenology is committed to descriptions of experiences, not explanations or analyses” (1994, p. 58). Based upon these statements of what phenomenology is – or perhaps more importantly, what it is not – I do not claim that this study is a “big P” phenomenological study. Rather, I draw from the phenomenological tradition in many ways, including the study of a particular phenomenon through participants’ rich descriptions of their experiences. I diverge from these traditions in my analysis of these descriptions. One method of analysis that I used is classification – an important part of phenomenography.

Phenomenography

Another methodological influence upon the current study is phenomenography, a lesser-known and newer research tradition that has branched off from phenomenology.

Phenomenography is “a research specialization concerned with qualitative differences in how we see the world and how it shows itself to us” (Marton, 2014, p. 106).

Like the phenomenological tradition from which it grew, phenomenography produces data through open-ended interviewing of participants. The critical difference between the two is that while the former attempts to discover the essence of a phenomenon, the latter attempts to create “categories of description” (Marton, 2014, p. 107) of meanings that participants provide. That is, participants provide their unique descriptions of what a phenomenon means to them, and the researcher looks for patterns in said descriptions that facilitate categorization. “Phenomenography investigates the qualitatively different ways in which people experience or think about various phenomena” (Marton, 1986, p. 31).

Phenomenography was developed as a method of research to improve education; specifically, to find out more about how students make meaning of concepts taught in the classroom. In the act of categorizing the descriptions of those meanings, researchers hoped to learn more about ways in which students created meanings alternative to those that were intended when the concepts were taught. In other words, in studying the classroom setting, phenomenography explored the multiple, individual meanings created from the experience of being a student being taught a particular lesson. In many of these studies, the goal was to help discover means to help more students to reach the intended meaning of the concept being taught.

The above statement, at first consideration, seems sensible when considering the example of teenaged students’ understanding of “how one sees.” If the goal of a science lesson is for students to understand that our eyes receive stimuli from light reflected off of objects—as opposed to an understanding in which our eyes shoot out beams that reflect to us (Marton, 1986, p. 31)—then there is at least a widely agreed-upon intended meaning to be found.

Other applications of phenomenography have no such starting point; no established, “correct” meaning from which to start. While this may be a departure from earlier uses of the

methodology, there is nothing inherent in phenomenography that requires any such central or pre-determined category of meaning. To the contrary: phenomenography can be more useful in situations where there is no single, widely accepted meaning to the phenomenon being studied.

In this study, I constructed categories from the data: categories of types of induction processes, categories of social milestone markers, and so forth. These are categories of description since what I am categorizing are not the actual events, but rather the descriptions of those events that participants provided.

There are valid criticisms of phenomenography. Perhaps the strongest and most common is that there is a lack of attention to reflexivity in much phenomenographical research (Marton, 1986). Put into simple terms, this is a lack of awareness of the part that the researcher or analyst plays in the production of meaning. Some phenomenographers have worked to alleviate this concern by defining experience as non-dualistic (Hasselgren, 1996, p. 11).

In understanding the term “non-dualistic,” it helps first to understand what a dualistic conception of experience is. In a dualistic understanding of experience, a person (subject) receives information from the world (object) and then creates meaning from that information. A non-dualistic understanding of experience says that there is no distance between the subject and the object; that the person is part of the world that they are experiencing and from which they make meaning. The world is an experienced world, and the meaning that each person creates from that experience changes the world as they experience it (Marton, 2014, pp. 107–108).

Taken a step further, this means that the categories of meaning created by the researcher/analyst, based on the descriptions of experience provided by participants, are, themselves, based on the perceptions of meanings which the researcher/analyst built from the descriptions given. They are not based on the meanings held by the participants themselves since

no two people can truly hold the exact same meaning of anything. In other words, the end product of phenomenography is a categorization of what the researcher/analyst *thinks* are the meanings held by participants, based upon the participants' descriptions of experience. The meanings that are supposed to have been described, then, are also dependent upon the researcher's positionality, shaped by their lifetime of experiences.

While these criticisms are valid, they do not invalidate the methodology as a whole. Indeed, Hasslegren does make space for the validity of phenomenographical methods that he categorizes as Hermeneutic and Phenomenological (Hasselgren, 1996, pp. 19–24). Although these categories are not exhaustively described, I believe that the current study falls closer to these categories than any others given, at least in its analytical underpinnings.

Many qualitative methodologies collect and analyze data in ways that cannot avoid researcher bias. I accept that my interpretation and analysis of the words spoken by the participants in this study have been subject to my own biases, especially those that I am not conscious of (see “Researcher’s positionality,” below). Just as the participants can only make sense of their experiences using the sense-making tools available to them, I can only make sense of the data by using those sense-making tools available to me.

Researcher’s positionality

In this study, I hold the roles of interviewer and analyst. In order to encourage open sharing in the interviews, I did not remain distant during the interview process; while I tried to let the participants fill the majority of the interview time and transcripts, I did not refrain entirely from conversational speech. As Douglas points out, “interviewing...involves the use of many strategies and tactics of interaction, largely based on an understanding of friendly feelings and

intimacy, to optimize *cooperative, mutual disclosure and a creative search for mutual understanding.*” [italics in original] (Douglas, 1984, p. 25). A typical exchange of close to one page, selected for both its typicality and for its lack of any potentially identifying subject matter, is included in Appendix C.

While I attempted to interact with participants as a relatively familiar equal, I did remain cautious of saying things that might break confidentiality for other participants, as well as anything that might exert undue influence upon what the participants shared. I acknowledge that, regardless of precautions taken, my very presence, as a white, older (than the participants) male exerted some level of influence on responses—this is impossible to avoid altogether in any face-to-face interview situation. However, presenting a cold, aloof front would *also* exert influence over participants’ responses, potentially in a chilling manner (i.e., inhibiting sharing). I chose to accept the risks of influence due to friendly interactions over the risk of undue participant inhibition.

It should also be noted here that I have been a participant in hazing activities, both in high school band and in drum and bugle corps. The former was quite mild; the latter could, at times, reasonably be considered brutal. I was also part of a member-leadership group within that drum and bugle corps that later chose to formally end the practice of a particular form of physically abusive hazing, which had, for at least several years before my induction, been universally applied to newcomers. I do claim a desire to help reduce or eliminate harmful forms of hazing, although I acknowledge that that classification is not universally agreed upon, nor do I claim to know precisely how this would best be accomplished.

Other than the unavoidable power relations between interviewer and participant, I do not believe that there were substantially impactful power differences involved in this research. I

readily acknowledge that there are power issues involved in my position as a white, cisgender male, and as an older doctoral student interviewing younger, mostly undergraduate participants. Although not particularly on display, it is entirely possible that participants could have inferred an economic difference between us, as well. However, the only substantial, readily-seen power leverage I had over participants was the release of the \$25 gift card to each participant as compensation at the end of the interview process, which participants understood would be provided regardless of the content of their descriptions.

Study Design

Participants

I recruited 23 participants between the ages of 18 and 25 from a large, Midwestern research university. All had participated in high school band. The number of participants was partly chosen based on a loose goal of 25 – this is the number cited as an approximate number of interviewees that would begin to reach saturation (Seidman, 2015, p. 58). I chose the age range of 18-25 for several reasons. The lower limit was set to avoid interviewing students who were still in the organization that was being discussed. I excluded that situation hoping to avoid the withholding of information out of any sense of loyalty to the group.⁴⁸ I also wanted to explore ways in which participants' perceptions and attitudes toward their induction process may have changed over time. The upper limit was set to limit the fading of memory over more than about a decade since joining high school band.

⁴⁸ As discussed in Chapter 2, many induction rituals include secrets.

I did not select based on other participant demographics (with a few exceptions, outlined below); indeed, the only other information I received from most respondents before selection was their name and e-mail address. The final sample included fifteen females and eight males (gender was self-identified from an open question). Race or cultural self-identifications included 16 White/Caucasians,⁴⁹ one American Indian, one Asian, one Black, one Filipino, and one Multi-racial. Race or cultural identification was also an open-ended, participant-identified field. I also asked participants where they attended high school; 21 attended high school in the Midwest, one on the East Coast, and one in the Southeast.

The first two waves of participants were recruited via a recruitment letter (see Appendix D) that I sent to professors or instructors who taught band at the university from which I recruited. The letter was then forwarded via e-mail to students registered in band classes during two consecutive semesters. From these recruitment efforts, every respondent was invited.⁵⁰

An initial review of the transcripts from these interviews revealed that a large portion of the participants reported positive induction processes into their high school bands; further, all of them reported remaining in their high school band program for all four years of high school (n=17)

The last wave, therefore, was recruited via a different recruitment letter (see Appendix E), which was sent to all students registered at the same university, except those outside the age range of 18-25, and those who had opted out of the university's mass e-mail program. The letter

⁴⁹ As the only race/culture category to have multiple respondents, I chose to aggregate this category under the two terms given by participants. Some participants added "non-Hispanic" or "non-Latino."

⁵⁰ Except delayed responses that came in after the decision had been made to move to students who had less than four years of high school band involvement.

asked for participants who had been in their United States high school band, but for fewer than four years.

From this wave of responses, I selected from those that met the recruiting criteria (several respondents did not) on a first-responding, first selected basis, with one exception (discussed below). Five of these respondents left their high school band program before graduation, and one joined for just their senior year.

I used purposeful selection (Maxwell, 2012, pp. 97–99) both in choosing to add participants that had fewer than four years of high school band participation and more specifically to “skip ahead” down the list, out of the order of receipt, for two respondents. Although I did not ask for any identifying information in the recruiting letter, several respondents did include some such information. I invited one respondent that identified as transsexual; however, they were not able to meet with me and dropped out of the study. I also invited a respondent that mentioned that they had participated in a nationally-competitive marching band. Since one of my informal hypotheses has been (and is) that hazing would be more prevalent in more competitive environments, I invited this person, and they became one of the full participants.

Both undergraduate and graduate students participated. Undergraduate majors and graduate degree programs were quite varied, though it bears noting for the study topic that only two of the participants were music majors (both in music education).

Upon completion of their part of the study, participants were compensated with a \$25 gift e-card to Amazon.com, purchased at my own expense. Gift cards were sent to the e-mail address of each participant's choice.

Data Collection

Initial interview appointments were made via e-mail exchange; subsequent appointments were sometimes made in person before leaving the first meeting, or sometimes made in additional e-mail exchanges. With the exception of two participants who did not continue the study to the second interview (one female, one male, both four-year high school band participants in midwestern high schools) and two participants who agreed to a supplemental, third interview for an added question (see next page), all participants took part in two interview sessions,

While Seidman (Seidman, 2015, pp. 20–22) advocates for three interviews in order to develop trust between the interviewer and the participants, I chose to go with only two, for several reasons. The most obvious reasons were practical: finding two times to meet with (mostly) undergraduate students presented some difficulty, and two participants did not even attend the second interview session (these participants were not compensated). Also, self-funding the research presented limitations on participant compensation, and three sessions would have called for a more substantial amount of compensation.

It is impossible to know to what extent the lack of a third interview session limited the trust—and, therefore, the data shared—from the participants. The interview guide script (Appendices A & B), by design, never mentions the word “hazing.” The rationale for this was that hazing was thought to carry a connotation of negativity such that participants might shy away from describing hazing-like behaviors if they thought that I, or readers of this work, would

harbor negative opinions about them⁵¹ for taking part in something carrying a socially unacceptable label. In order to try to avoid the greatest effects of this social desirability bias (Edwards, 1957), I asked participants to “tell me the story” of their high school band induction. I used this form of indirect questioning to try to avoid making participants wary of the questions (Saldana, 2015, p. 166).

When the first wave of interviews produced no descriptions of activities that could be defined as hazing, I decided to add a question: “Do you feel that there were any elements of peer initiation in your induction?” This question was asked, retroactively and via e-mail, of the first wave of participants. Three participants responded, one declining to say anything about the question, and two who agreed to meet with me for a quick, third interview. Both of these participants said that they did not believe that there were any elements of peer initiation in their high school band induction.

However, when it was asked as an integrated part of the second interview session with later participants, several mentioned hazing specifically in clarifying questions (e.g., “Do you mean like hazing?”), supporting my assumption that this question would lead participants more directly to any hazing-like behaviors in their remembered stories. However, this result also supported my fears that the question was close enough to direct questioning about hazing that it may have had similar chilling effects as would merely using the word hazing.

An informal assessment of participants’ comfort with me as an interviewer would suggest mixed results. In general, participants who had completed all four years of high school band

⁵¹ Participants understood that they would be described and quoted only with the use of pseudonyms; however, social desirability bias has been shown to impact even totally anonymous surveys (Edwards, 1957).

were, not surprisingly, more enthusiastic in their narratives about their time in high school band than were participants who had left their band programs before graduation. The one participant who started high school band as a senior was, perhaps, the most enthusiastic, and demonstrably the most talkative—transcripts of her interviews covered twice as many pages as the average participant.

However, enthusiasm does not necessarily equate with openness. One participant, when asked at the end of the final interview if they had any other questions for me, asked “What’s your study *really* about?” while another asked, “What’s your hypothesis?” These kinds of questions could indicate some level of demand characteristic bias, (Orne, 1996) as well as a possible level of suspicion and closedness.

Study Context and Location

All interviews took place within 10 miles of the university through which participants were recruited. The specific locations were negotiated between the participants and me, though I almost always agreed to their first suggestion. I gave participants guidelines before asking for their suggestion, including that the location was at least semi-public (no apartments or dorm rooms), and quiet enough to carry on our conversation without undue noise interference.

Interviews took place during a fall semester, a spring semester, and a summer break. All participants were either students at the university or, in a few cases, less than three months removed from graduating from the university.

The largest gap between the events described and the interview in which they were described was approximately ten years; the shortest was just under two years. The only participant with any significant, ongoing involvement in the high school band program in which

they were inducted was a college student that was still teaching summer band camp for his former high school.

As is the case at most major universities in the United States, the university from which participants were recruited has a marching band that is quite recognizable and carries on numerous traditions, both in performance and in social activities. This fact has some bearing on the study, as many participants compared their high school band experiences against this group.

I also expected that this location would result in a higher number of participants having attended high school in the Midwest (it did). This population characteristic impacts the study in that Midwestern high schools, as a whole, have fewer competitive marching bands and compete at a lower level than high school bands from the southern half of the United States.

Data Analysis

All interviews were recorded using duplicate, non-network capable, handheld digital recorders. Some interviews, or portions thereof, did not record on both units due to battery failure or full memory capacity; however, all interview sessions resulted in at least one complete recording. The consenting procedure (see “Ethics” below) was not recorded, nor were any supplemental conversations (e.g., scheduling the next interview).

Digital recordings were uploaded to my personal, university-hosted, cloud-based secure account, and links to individual recordings, identified only by initials, were sent to Rev.com, an online transcription service, where they were professionally transcribed at my own expense. I then checked the transcriptions against the recordings, simultaneously removing any possible identifying features (e.g., city or state names). Once de-identified transcripts were completed and saved to both my personal laptop and my university cloud account, the audio recordings were deleted.

The transcripts were then loaded into an NVivo qualitative analysis software file, within which I did all of my coding. Before beginning actual coding, each participant was established as a case, and case classifications were created and entered for each participant for age, gender identity, race/culture identity, high school location, high school place (e.g., rural, suburban, urban), high school size, high school diversity (as described by the participant), band program size (in students). I also classified based on the characteristics of participants' band programs, including the number of concert bands, the number of jazz bands, the inclusion of marching band, whether that marching band was competitive, and an estimated number of overnight travel days per year. Most of these classifications were given directly by participants in response to direct questions; however, some were inferred from responses (e.g., overnight travel days, based on descriptions of what kind of trips were taken, and how often). In instances where I did not have this information, or when complications made the classification difficult (such as with the participant that went to two very different high schools), the classification was left empty,

The initial round of coding could be called an eclectic, holistic method of coding. Although Saldana mentions that the coded unit in holistic coding can be "as small as one-half a page," he also mentions that "a 'middle-order' approach, somewhere between holistic and line-by-line, is also possible as a Holistic Coding method" (Saldana, 2015, p. 166). In this case, I chose to use each paragraph of participant talk from interview transcriptions as my unit for this first round of coding. Short answers from the first part of the first interview for each participant (e.g., age, gender identity, high school location) were not coded but were instead used for classification (as described above). I made exceptions when participants responded to these questions with longer responses if they made any mention of social relationships.

In keeping with the exploratory nature of the initial round of coding, I used an eclectic set of codes that I developed as I coded. For each unit of coding, I chose at least one code to describe the “main idea” of the unit. The codes that were created were mostly Concept Codes (Saldana, 2015, p. 119), but these codes were sometimes represented with *in vivo* quotations. If a coding unit contained more than one existing code, or if I found two (or more) new, important ideas in one unit, I simply assigned it more than one code. This was not infrequent, but most units were assigned only one code.

Once the initial round of coding was complete and themes began to emerge, I began several focused rounds of coding. The first was simply coding passages containing descriptions of any activities that bore any resemblance to hazing, using categories of hazing activities from Hoover and Pollard’s survey instrument (Hoover, 1999, pp. 8–10) as well as elements of rites of passage as described by Fontaine (1986, p. 186).

Next, I went back through one of my initial codes, “Moment they felt ‘in,’” and created second-level codes to create a collection of events and activities at which participants reported feeling fully “in” their high school bands. Finally, I went back to code each mention of skill level, ability, or talent, and cross-checked each of these with mentions of feeling “in,” belonging, knowing their place, or other cues for social bonding.

Ethical Considerations

This study presented many ethical considerations, some of which extend beyond the typical considerations for “human subject” research. In the beginning stages of planning this study, I briefly considered requesting Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval to use misdirection in order to gain access to high school students by representing my study as being about student leadership patterns. I quickly rejected this idea, in no small part due to the

enormous difficulties such a proposal would face gaining approval from the IRB, but mostly due to my reluctance to build relationships with local high school band directors and school administrators only to put those relationships in serious risk through deception.

I did not believe, however, that I would be granted access to speak directly with high school students if their teachers and administrators knew that I was examining induction practices, especially with a focus on hazing activities.

I settled, then, on the idea of speaking to legal adults about their high school band induction experiences. In order to be honest and ethical in my approach, and in order to help ensure the usefulness of the study in the event that no hazing activities were described to me, I chose to widen the scope of my study to all high school band induction processes. I made this choice because I had already decided that asking directly about hazing was likely to result in significant withholding of information due to social desirability bias.⁵² Although I was still most interested in hazing and hazing-like activities, my research truly was examining whatever kinds of high school induction activities that would be described to me during interviews.

The research protocol was submitted to the IRB, and after minor changes, approved (see Appendix F). The only changes made after the study began were the inclusion as mentioned above of an additional question and an extension on the original maximum number of participants (from 20 to 25).

To ensure that each participant was aware of their rights and what their participation involved, I went through the IRB-approved consent form (see Appendix G) with each participant

⁵² In an earlier pilot study, conducted with a single high school marching band, questions around the topic of hazing were also asked without specifically mentioning hazing. Several participants gave strong indications that there was something along the lines of an initiation happening, but then stated that "we're not going to talk about that."

immediately after meeting them for the first time, and before any of the research questions were asked, or recordings started. They then signed the form and initialed it to indicate their consent to be quoted anonymously in this and any subsequent publications arising from this research. Before the second (and sometimes third) interview session, I reminded participants of these rights, that we were still under the previously signed consent form, and then asked if they wanted to go over the consent form again (none did).

CHAPTER FIVE – FINDINGS AND ANALYSES ON INDUCTION

The result of successful social induction of a person into any group is a feeling on the part of the newcomer that they are fully part of, or “in” a group. In exploring induction activities, it was important to first guide participants to their own recollections of their participation in this process without offering labels—beyond induction itself—such as hazing. This process was essential to avoid influencing participants in the choice of their own particular concepts of induction. However, since induction, in the context of social groups, is not a familiar term for most people, it was also necessary to guide many toward the broader meaning of social induction, as defined for this study.

As part of the interview script, participants were asked (twice, if they completed both interview sessions) to tell the story of becoming “part of” their high school band. In clarifying statements, many were asked to think of when they really felt “in” their band. Through their narrative responses to these prompts, participants described the ways and moments in which they came to feel fully “part of,” or fully “in” their high school band. Their responses revealed several different ways of feeling “in,” and identified many different markers for reaching this point.

“In” Was Not a Given

Although I assumed that all participants were officially registered in their school’s system as being “in” the class, this was not identified by any participant as a marker for being fully “in” the band. Only one participant indicated that she felt fully “in” when she first began participation with her high school band. Other participants named some point later in their timelines as a marker of being fully “in,” ranging from the end of band camps—several days to several weeks

after first participation—to over a year later. Still others reported that they had never achieved a feeling of being fully “in.”

Times and Types of Markers of Being “In”

The following section is organized in a synchronized chronology; that is, although my participants were actually participating in high school band over a range of years, I have organized the descriptions of how and when they felt “in” based on how soon after their initial activity with their high school bands they felt “in.” Concurrently, I will describe the types of activities that they described as marking their arrival at feeling “in.” These descriptions help inform my analysis in the next section of the chapter.

The timeline for feeling “in” was widely varied, ranging from within the first few days to points up to and even slightly exceeding a year. No participant reported first reaching a feeling of “in” beyond that time; those that had not achieved a feeling of being “in” by the middle of their tenth-grade year never found that feeling in band. Not surprisingly, participants who had not found a sense of being “in” their high school band by the end of tenth grade left their band program before their eleventh-grade year.

“In” early.

Every participant was asked to “tell the story” of their high school band induction process. Most, but not all, identified a more or less specific point in time that they felt fully “in” their high school band. Some identified more than one point or event, but none specifically identified their first participation with the high school band as their moment of being “in.”⁵³

⁵³ I acknowledge that the very act of asking for participants to “tell the story” of becoming a part of their high school band could imply that I was looking for a process that was more than merely

Ginny, the only participant to report feeling completely “in” as soon as high school band began, had already participated in her high school concert band as a musically advanced eighth grader. Although the start of summer band rehearsals before her ninth-grade year was the point to which she referred as “starting” high school band, her first participation with the high school band was almost a year earlier. Ginny had several other advantages in achieving a feeling of being “in,” including having an older sibling already in the band, and also being friends with her sister’s upperclass friends, who were also in the band.

Almost every participant reported required band activities during the summer, meaning that their first participation with the high school band occurred before their first day of high school classes. Many participants named some other time during the summer before ninth grade as the point at which they felt like they were fully “in” their high school band; in each of these cases, this point was either during or after “band camp”—a period of several days to a few weeks of intensive rehearsal. For almost all of these participants, band camp was not their first participation with the high school band, as there had been shorter band rehearsals earlier in the summer. Three participants felt like they were fully “in” at some point in the middle of their first high school band camp.

Leo could not point to a specific marker but said that it was “early” in the week of band camp that he realized that he was then part of the group:

So, then you show up and you start learning how to march for the upcoming marching band season. And finally, standing amongst the rest of them, I guess, would be in my mind when I kind of . . . when it clicked, like, I’m part of this band now. It wasn’t, there was no competition for a spot on the field at all. So, it basically, once that band camp started, it was a very physical, I’m seeing this, I’m part of this, therefore I’m in the band, the high school band.

showing up on the first day. This may have led participants to change their perceptions to match the expectations that they, then, assumed that I held.

Leo was one of the few participants who gave a response that cited a matter-of-fact awareness of his situation as the moment of realizing that he was “in” as part of the group; that is, other participants mentioned social exchanges or emotional reactions as keys to their moment of being “in”. Perhaps Leo’s fairly unique response had something to do with how he felt welcomed from his first interaction with the high school band: a preview night during his eighth-grade spring. He specifically mentioned that his two section leaders at the event were very welcoming and kind.

Hannah was vague about a specific point in time at which she felt “in” but pointed to band camp sectionals—breakout sessions working in smaller groups of like instruments—as a key to gaining a feeling of being “in.” She said (as did many other participants) that it was easier to get to know other band members in a smaller setting.

Rick reported that he felt “in” almost immediately upon beginning high school band activities. However, he did not talk about feeling a part of the band as a whole, focusing instead on interpersonal relationships with a few people. His statement near the end that he “wasn’t fully encapsulated by marching band” casts doubt upon whether he truly felt “in” so soon:

So, marching band, I couldn’t go to because I spent summer traveling. But I went there for really just the . . . one or two days prior to the start of high school. So, I went there, and I just instantly made friends with the people in the clarinet section . . . this guy who was my friend instantly. We just talked about it. And I had a friend. And some people from my math class were also in the band. So, I made connections through that . . . So, in marching band, I had missed a few days, so I wasn’t fully encapsulated by marching band. So, I feel like I really started to feel a part of it once the school year started. And I could really immerse myself into the culture of the people and everything like that.

Stella’s situation was unique in that she joined her high school marching band in the summer before her twelfth-grade year, after several years of playing violin in the orchestra program. For her moment of feeling in, she pointed to a weekend pool party with her percussion

section, sandwiched between two weeks of percussion camp that had just ended and the two weeks of full band camp that was about to begin. She said, "We had - after percussion camp ended, we had a pool party at my friend's house, and it was like, 'Percussion camp's over.' Then we still had two weeks of band camp, but we tried to not think about that."

The end of a participant's first high school band camp was a commonly identified point of becoming "in." Curiously, all but one participant that so identified the end of band camp also identified a later time as a second moment of being "in." These later points varied widely. Zack identified, as his first such moment, a performance for parents at the end of band camp: "So it's almost like you finish your first performance at the end of it and it's like you're all together, you're all one band because you've all done this performance for the parents together."

However, he also pointed to the first performance in uniform at football halftime:

Another one would be probably the first football game. Just because you're doing the performance together. Who cares what grade you are, it's your first, you get to be with this group on the field. You only get a finite number of times. It's like, this is your first one and wow, this is a big deal. You're on the field marching and everything.

In Zack's case, both of the identified markers of belonging fit the same pattern: a public performance with the group.

Kelly did not cite a performance at the end of band camp, but rather a game played with upperclass students on the last day of her ninth-grade band camp. She indicated that figuring out the secret to the game was a key to feeling like part of the group:

And then on the last day, all of the sophomore through seniors came in and we played some more get-to-know-you games. And there was one in particular that, I don't know where my band director found it, but it's called Chicken, Chicken, Little Red Chicken. He had a yardstick, and we would have to tap it on the ground and just say, "Chicken, chicken, little red chicken," and there was something that you had to do for it to be considered right. And a lot of the freshmen would try and wouldn't get it. But the secret was, you had to cough before you said it, so you had to go [coughing noise] and then say it. And so, it's kind of like, once I was a sophomore through senior, it was funny

watching the gears turning in the freshmen heads. I didn't really feel like I was fully a part of the group until I figured it out.

Like Zack, Kelly also cited the first performance at football halftime as a second marker of being "in," even specifically mentioning a sense of belonging: "My first football game was really cool, 'cause we marched onto the field and then we performed, and it was really awesome. I had a sense of belonging because it felt really good to be performing and be with my friends."

Larry first identified the end of band camp as a marker of being "in". His description made this sound as though participants had passed a test of sorts:

By the end of the week it's the freshman, section leaders, the rest of the band, everyone knows their part, everyone knows the music. I think that transition through all the sectionals and through the music practices and the long days, I think that's where you become a member of the band. At least in my eyes, that's where you become [*sic* / end of spoken sentence].

He later also added participation in his first multi-night band trip, mentioning that the end of band camp marked his entry into the band in terms of performance, and that the band trip marked his full entry into the band socially.

Mickey also identified his first point of becoming "in" as a first performance - a concert at a downtown summer festival in his hometown:

You're in a really small town where most people know most people. So, people come and then they see "oh, there's so-and-so. And they're in the band."

And then we all had the same t-shirt that said Pleasantville⁵⁴ High School Band. High. School. Band.⁵⁵ There's this introduction like: "Hello, we're the high school band and we're here to play some song for you."

And then people see you and it's always just kind of, being not only...you just kind of feel like you're part of the group, but then someone says explicitly "this is the group," and you're there and part of it.

⁵⁴ Location name changed to preserve anonymity.

⁵⁵ Mickey gestured with his hands at this point, as if placing the words across an imaginary t-shirt.

Mickey remembered this during our second session; at the first session, the explicit identification of the band also came up. He said, “We took a picture and it went into the yearbook. So, it was not only this implicit group, but it was also defined, like ‘That’s the band.’” Also, in the first session, he identified an annual band trip that took place just before the school year started:

As far as when I felt like a member, I feel like after we went on our first trip. The first Six Flags trip. Then the first couple performances we did. After that, it was just kind of like “Okay, yeah. This is a group of people that I’m pretty comfortable with.

Barbara identified the end of band camp, but as a very objective marker, rather than anything to do with any social interaction:

If you want like a real point of induction, it’s when you got your uniform for marching band...Because I needed that to do band. You know, no one could really be in band if they didn’t march, like I said. So, if you don’t have...if you weren’t given the stuff, you weren’t able to do it.

“In” ...but months later.

Several participants said that they did not feel that they were fully a part of their high school band until after the school year had started. In many cases, the specific marker identified for being “in” related to marching band. This connection is not surprising, as in each case, the summer and the first part of the school year were devoted to preparing for either football halftime performances or marching band field competitions.

For Belinda and Felicity, it was the first few home football games of their ninth-grade years, but the time spent in the stands with their band peers meant more than the actual performance. Belinda specifically mentioned being welcomed during this timeframe, saying, “[the specific point was] probably the first few football games where they, the people in my

section went, ‘Belinda, we’re excited you’re here.’ Something like that. That was, it felt good to be a part of a group.”

Felicity’s descriptions of her ninth-grade football games with the marching band were vibrant and intense. She was animated and smiling while describing this time in her life, describing many of the game-night traditions of her band, including one particular chant. She said, “Whenever someone came into the band section during football games, we would chant, “Out, out, out, out, out, out,” at that person until they left the section. So, it was nice to be a part of a group.”

Patti’s high school marching band was very involved in competitions, and she identified both the first performance and the last competition as markers of being “in”:

There wasn’t any activities we did together to make the freshmen feel like part of the band or anything like that. And maybe it wasn’t until like the first football game and your first performance where you felt like, “Yeah, okay. I’m doing this, and I’m like a member of this group, and they need me to be there because there’s no one else to take my spot if I’m not there!” So, I think maybe that first football game, and then kinda like started to slide me into like feeling like I belonged. And it wasn’t maybe until like capping it off at like the state competition is when I felt truly like this is what makes it worth it.

Nancy’s marker was also related to marching band performance, but it was not a specific public performance; instead, Nancy felt like she was “in” sometime in late September or early October when she had achieved a skill level that allowed her to march and play well at the same time:

It took, I think, until I could play and march at the same time that I felt a part of the group. I struggled with that at first. I felt that the people in my section looked down on me because I couldn’t do it when really the people in my class, we were all at the same level. I just had this perception that people aren’t going to like me if I can’t do it. I’m going to hold the group back. I’m never going to, whatever. Once I started to feel comfortable with marching and playing, which was probably a month or so into my freshman year, I started to feel a little bit more a part of the group because I was focusing less on the mechanics of what I was doing and more about the bigger picture and also the social aspect of it.

Carmen was unique in identifying the act of joining jazz band (also in September or October of her ninth-grade year) as the point at which she felt like she was “in.” She was not the

only participant to mention that it was easier to feel a sense of being fully part of a smaller group than it was in the larger groups:

Part of feeling like I was in the band was finding which band I felt the most a part of, I guess, so, I think, definitely one answer to that was when I decided to join jazz after having been in the marching band program in the fall for a month, I don't know how long the auditions were into that, but once I joined that and started doing band in an extracurricular way, I felt a lot more a part of it. Because it was a lot more of an encouraging thing to me to practice and keep up with it as a . . . as something that I was proud of than something that I was just a part of, just in.

Max grew up attending his older brother's basketball games at the high school he also eventually attended. He said he had not previously considered playing with the pep band at a basketball game as a point of full entry into the high school band. However, the novelty of "doing" school in the building well after school hours, along with the memories of hearing many of the same songs that he was now playing, triggered new feelings:

And so, I remember when I was a freshman actually sitting in the pep band section playing. For a second it was actually kind of weird, because I, since I was maybe . . . My brother's eight years older than me, so since I was seven maybe, I was seven or eight, I was going to his games, when we were watching, I'd always see these, didn't even seem like people to me because they were so much older than me. But you know, this band always playing, always sitting in the same spot even, playing the same songs pretty much. And that was one of the big things, I was like . . . You know when you hear a song a bunch and it's just in your head and you don't even really think about it? Yeah, so I'd actually, when I sat down in the pep band section and saw the music and started playing, I was like "Wow, these are the songs I've been hearing for the last eight, nine years."

And it was just, it was kind of weird to sit there and think about that. It was kind of . . . I had a sense of growing up like this is something I never even thought that I would be doing, but I'm here. So, I was really like "Oh, well, so this is what being in the band is like."

It took a long time to get to "in."

Some participants eventually reached a feeling of being "in," but it took many months or even more than a year to get there. In some cases, there were exceptional circumstances that led to an extended induction period. Cameron missed most of his high school's summer band camp,

due to a miscommunication between his private middle school and public high school. He only showed up for any part of it because he could hear the band rehearsing outside from his house and decided that he should check to see if this was an activity in which he was supposed to participate.

As a result, he missed many of the activities designed to help acclimate new members, and he was also feeling behind throughout most of his ninth-grade marching band season. Even with the transition into concert band, he said that he never really felt like he was fully part of the band until the spring band banquet:

We had a band banquet in the spring. And they would give awards out from the drum majors at the banquet. And I don't remember what the award was, but I got an award. And I think that was the time that I was like, yes, I am part of this band. I feel like I belong here. 'Cause it just felt like it was recognition of all the hard work I had put in throughout the whole year.

It took Amber until the last day of her ninth-grade year to feel like she had made it "in." Although she spoke of several escalating markers toward this feeling, she indicated that the big jump was making the top band in her school:

I was originally put into the middle band, which is symphonic band. I remember thinking, oh man it's not what I wanted. Symphonic band as a sophomore is just really average, and I wasn't really that happy about it. Then on the last day of the last quarter of school I got pulled into the band office and they told me that one of the trombones in wind ensemble had to drop out, because he's taking some special math class and it was at the same time and he couldn't take it anytime else, so they had an open spot and I was the next person in line, so then I got moved up to wind ensemble.

It is interesting that nothing had changed, in terms of her performance: her new band assignment came about because of another student dropping out, not any change in Amber's skills. Still, she cited this event as being one of the biggest keys to her feeling fully "in" her high school band.

Charlise and Teresa each said that it took until their sophomore year to feel fully part of their respective high school bands. For Teresa, it was being able to be a part of the marching band – something that was not available to ninth-graders at her school. Most important to her in this new opportunity were the interactions with upperclass people: in her band program, all ninth graders were assigned to a ninth-grade only concert band. Without the possibility of being in the marching band, this meant that ninth-graders in her band program did not have any opportunities (within the band program) to be around any older students.

Charlise's situation was unique among participants. Although she, like Ginny, had an older sister already in the high school band, she reported being subjected to regular bullying⁵⁶ incidents during band throughout her ninth-grade year.⁵⁷ This bullying made her feel the opposite of being "in." She said, "It really made me feel excluded...for the first two months I felt really excluded and I didn't really want to be in the program either because of what was happening."

She reported that in her sophomore year when the bullying stopped (after most or all of her bullies had graduated), she finally felt like she belonged:

A real sense of belonging - like I was valued, had a relationship with my teacher, everything like that - probably wasn't until sophomore, junior year, when I was able to establish myself, and have leadership positions, and be able to have one-on-one time with my band director and kind of talk to her and make a difference in the band program.

⁵⁶ Charlise specifically mentioned several times that she would not call it bullying, but the actions that she described were undoubtedly within the definition of bullying set forth by Olweus (see Chapter 2).

⁵⁷ Charlise's experiences with bullying will be discussed in greater detail later in this chapter.

Never in.

Barbara identified receiving her band uniform at the end of band camp as her marker of being fully “in.” In further statements, however, she made it clear that she only joined band her ninth-grade year to go on an extended trip, saying, “It was like I just finished training, here’s my uniform, now I can get in the class, like the Florida trip I wanted to go on.”

Since she needed a uniform to perform and performing was necessary to get her on the trip, she saw this as a marker that she was as “in” as she needed to be to go to Florida with the band. She also made clear that she did not feel a social bond to the group; to the contrary, she made sure to characterize her high school band as “lame” several times. She also thought that perhaps the social attachment she saw others have in band was due to their lack of other social outlets:

I think because they didn’t do sports, and (the band) was the group they could associate themselves with in high school, it was probably a lot bigger for them. But I was already on the cheer team and I was already doing traveling soccer, so I already had my niches at the school, if that makes sense. But I think for the kids that band might’ve been their only extra-curricular in middle school, it probably meant a lot more to them.

Rhianna spent several years attending school in another country before returning to the United States late in eighth grade. She joined her high school band for ninth grade, but only stayed in it for one year. When I asked her to tell me the story of becoming a part of the high school band, she replied, “But what if I never felt really part of it, I didn’t have a connection?”

Like Barbara, Rhianna felt stronger bonds to other high school groups:

When I came back to America for the end of eighth grade there was a band, I was there for a couple months, and there was a band that I played in. I think I enjoyed that way more because . . . (my) middle school was connected to the high school that I went to. But everyone fun did band. Band was the cool thing to do, at least at that middle school. So, the people there, I connected with way more. Whereas in high school, it’s like I just didn’t. I was more with the athletic crowd, with all the sports and stuff. So, I really couldn’t connect well. ‘Cause a lot of the people in this band, I felt like they felt outcast,

or they didn't like . . . 'Cause there was a lot of beef between the athletic crowd and the band crowd. I don't know. I just didn't really connect with anyone.

Getting “in” does not always mean staying “in.”

Several participants who described their moment of feeling “in” their high school band also described the circumstances and their feelings leading to their departure from high school band before graduation. Max said that he had felt “in” his high school band when he played at his first basketball pep band event, but his band director's teaching style did not work for him, and he grew disenchanted with band. Late in his second interview session, when asked what he thought the purpose was (if there was one) of his high school band induction, Max instead asked me about my own high school band induction. After I told him that part of my story, he reflected on the differences between our experiences:

Yeah, we had actually nothing like that. Honestly, we didn't have any camps, anything like that . . . So, there's essentially no induction process. I guess you could say the lack of an induction process, that might have hurt the interest of a lot of people. Because, I can tell you, from hearing your stories, that sounds pretty fun to me. At that age, that sounds pretty fun. I would have been interested in it if my friends were there, too, and we got to interact with the upper grades and stuff like that. I think that would be really fun, but not having that, I think, caused a lot of people to not be as interested as they could be.

Since he had mentioned playing sports in high school, I asked Max if he felt that sort of camaraderie within his athletic teams; he responded that he had. Whether having that feeling in band would have been enough to overcome his disenchantment with his director is, of course, impossible to know. In his telling of his story as it was, however, his feeling of being “in” his high school band lasted only a few months.

Felicity described feeling like she was most “in” during football game performances.⁵⁸

Felicity was especially animated when describing her experience of chanting “out” at non-members that wandered into the band’s section of the bleachers. She also felt like she was fully a part of the band when carrying out other traditional rituals that her high school band had developed, including a saxophone section routine that she had to teach herself, as there was no sheet music for it, and none of the upperclass students volunteered to teach it to her. However, she reported that she never felt a strong attachment to the music during concert band. This was unlike her choir experience, where she felt attached to the music but did not feel a strong social bond. Because of this lack of musical attachment, she avoided practicing the oboe and fell behind her friends (who, she was surprised to discover, were practicing much more). Her friends auditioned into a higher band at the end of their ninth-grade year, and Felicity said that she felt “left behind” in the lowest skill-level concert band:

I never felt completely included with the cool, older students, especially my freshman year. So, I guess just finally being at the games with the other freshmen and talking to them. Chanting “out” really helped too. But then, I think I didn’t end up auditioning for symphonic band because I never practice, I knew this wasn’t for me. So, I did do band again my sophomore year. But all of my friends really had moved up to symphonic band. So that was really much less fun to not have all my friends in this class anymore. Even when we were doing marching band and we were all together, they were still in symphonic band, which felt isolating.

Rick explained that he had been in band in seventh grade, out of band in eighth grade, back in for ninth grade (but missing marching band), then opting to leave band again for tenth grade. He cited the dysfunctionality of the band program, going through three directors just in his

⁵⁸ Marching band, especially at football games, provided some of the most intense feelings in *both* directions among participants. While Felicity and several others cited marching band as the strongest bonding element of their high school band experiences, Barbara and Rhianna cited it specifically as something that drove them away.

ninth-grade year, as his reason for leaving at that time. He said that he intended to return for his eleventh-grade year, but his audition did not place him in the top ensemble, and he then chose to stay out of band for the rest of his high school years.

It is noteworthy that disruptions of band social situations due to band and chair placement were such commonly-cited catalysts for participant choices to leave band (i.e., “quit”). This is a particularly complex issue for music educators: on the one hand, skill-based ensemble placement can be used as a way to help keep students in their zone of proximal development (Vygotskij, Lloyd, & Fernyhough, 1999) since repertoire can be chosen for ensembles of differing skill levels based on the difficulty of those pieces. As seen in some of the above cases, however, this process can come at a cost.

Grade retention, or “holding back” students to repeat a grade is a controversial practice. This is in large part because research has shown that, while students may end up in a placement that is better on a strictly academic basis, the rupture in their social situation often causes greater problems in their schooling situation than did their skills and knowledge deficits. Indeed, grade retention is one of the most powerful predictors of dropout status. (Jimerson, Anderson, & Whipple, 2002) Considering, then, that high school band classes are highly social environments, it should not be a surprise that the band equivalent of being “held back” often results in students “dropping out” of band.

Foucault’s Disciplinary Power and “In”

Foucault’s concept of disciplinary power is a useful analytical tool in the examination of induction. Disciplinary power, as described in Chapter Three, is a form of power that operates by encouraging individuals to govern themselves. The goal of disciplinary power is conformity of

the individual to societal norms. Disciplinary power is exercised through power/knowledge, or discursive constructions that have been made to seem “natural.”

Although each participant chose their own meaning of being “in,” an analysis of the phenomenon through the lens of disciplinary power suggests that part of being “in” is to find a way to conform to certain norms of the group. That is, getting “in” means fitting in. However, this is not an automatic accomplishment. Since the social norms of the group are not often made explicit, a newcomer must decipher what those norms are through observation. In addition, which norms are required, how often they are required, and the extent to which they are required are all things that a newcomer must sort through from their first experiences with a group.

I point out that Foucault’s concept of disciplinary power does not necessarily include enforcement in the traditional sense; indeed, it is more often self-enforced. That is, conformity to the social norms of a group is not often enforced by explicit decree or through apparent displays of force (what Foucault might call violence). Rather, power/knowledge exerts force upon individuals in such a way so as to encourage them to enforce social norms upon themselves.

Information about norms is sometimes provided intentionally by veterans but is most often transmitted passively; that is, by going about their normal business of the group, veterans are demonstrating how to be part of the group without any intention of doing so. The passive nature of transmission adds to the difficulty of accurately inferring a group’s norms.

It takes time for a newcomer to sort through all of the information that they are receiving from their experiences with their new group. This is a time of disconcert with the group for the newcomer, because they have learned throughout their lives that they “should” conform to the norms of any group of which they are a part. With this instantiation of power/knowledge exerting pressure upon them to conform, newcomers are caught between a compulsion to fit in and a lack

of knowledge regarding how to do so. This is a position of discomfort and, sometimes, fear (which I will discuss later in this chapter).

As the narrated experiences of participants demonstrate, there are many different ways that one can feel “in,” but I claim that all of these include a sense that one has achieved a certain level of conformity to the group’s norms.

Categories of Description: Markers of Being “In”

The goal of phenomenography is to tease out “categories of description” from the collected data. In this study, I found that there were several distinct categories for the events or milestones, which participants cited as marking their first feeling of being “in” their high school band. At the broadest level, there were two categories of these markers: performance-related, and non-performance related. Within these categories, markers of being “in” included performing together in public, finding or achieving a particular place in the ranking and ordering within the band, and other performance-related markers.

Performance-related

The category of performance-related markers includes all those that dealt with aspects of performance as related to the overt goals of the organization; that is, music (and sometimes marching) performance. Although some high school band programs may have social outcomes as part of their unspoken or even expressed goals, I am only considering, for this study, the overt goals of the high school band *writ large*: that is, to teach music, especially performance on band instruments. Marching is included in this category because of the amount of official organization time (i.e., rehearsal) spent on learning to march, and because it is part of the public performances included with that part of the program.

Public performances.

Although performance-related events are not all public performances, many of those identified were. Mickey's was his first marching band concert in the town square:

And that may not have been a necessarily inclusive event, but I just remember 'hey, this is an event that's, like, I'm part of the band and I'm playing.' So, it felt like this is maybe an induction event just because it felt like I was doing something with the band for the first time.

As mentioned earlier, Zack named both the first marching band performance for parents and the first performance in uniform at a football game. Kelly also identified the first football game marching performance: "And my first football game was really cool 'cause we marched onto the field and then we performed, and it was really awesome. I had a sense of belonging because it felt really good to be performing and be with my friends." It is interesting to note that Kelly hits on both performance and social markers in the same sentence.

Patti mentioned several marker points along the way of her ninth-grade year, starting with the first football game performance, then the first marching band competition, but finally settled on the last marching band performance of her ninth-grade year:

I don't think I felt truly, truly in the band, until probably the state competition... after that outcome, whatever it may be, that's when you feel like you did it. That's when I really felt like I'm in this band and like completely in, you know, now this is the last performance of the seniors and now it's our turn to help whoever's coming in next, with this process of being in the band.

That participants would cite a public performance with the band (often their first) as a marker of first being "in" is not surprising. Performing in public marks members in the eyes of outsiders as being part of the group. In this context, many of those performances were in some sort of uniform, which can also serve to mark members publicly.

Another possibility, one that will be explored further in the next chapter, is that shared accomplishment promotes group bonding. While the “work” of a public performance is mostly done well before the actual performance, the performance is, in a way, the ceremonial celebration of that work. In this way, it is like the graduation ceremony: the accomplishments were achieved before the ceremony, but the ceremony marks the celebration of the accomplishments. Likewise, the work of learning and practicing may have been done earlier, but the public display of the results is the moment to celebrate those accomplishments. In the band context, the practice is sometimes individual, but the performance is a group effort. Note, too, that none of the earlier possibilities is precluded by accepting shared accomplishment as a factor: all of these possibilities can work together.

Internal rating and ranking.

As noted above “performance-related” is used in this instance as the performance - the *doing* - of all activities directly related to music performance; it should not be confused with *public* performance (as differentiated from rehearsal). Therefore, many of the performance-related markers were not part of a public performance. For several participants, feeling “in” came with a particular achievement of rank—whether auditioning into a certain band, or achieving a specific chair placement—or, in some cases, just knowing where they fit into the rating and ranking structure of their band program.

Amber, as quoted earlier, said that she felt like she was “in” when, on the last day of her ninth-grade year, she was notified that a spot had opened up, and she would be in the “top” band. Earlier in the interview, when I asked her how she felt as a member of the band, she had talked

about the internal pressure that she had felt to contribute to the musical performance of the group, and how that impacted her feelings of being “in”:

I felt like I was a part of the group, because I think you feel more included if you're better. If you were one of the top chairs versus if you were the last chair. If you're last chair it can feel hard, like you fit in or not, because I personally felt like if I'm last chair then everyone's going to think I'm bad at playing my instrument and they're going to judge me.

A similar idea of becoming “in” by contributing was shared by Nancy, although she reported finding a comfortable level of contributing much sooner in her ninth-grade year. As quoted earlier, Nancy felt like she was “in” when she could march and play well at the same time.

Like Amber, Nancy described feeling a fear that upperclass people would dislike her—or at least *not* like her—if she did not perform at a certain level. Both cases can be viewed through the lens of disciplinary power: neither Amber nor Nancy described any evidence to support their feelings that they would be judged or disliked for not attaining a certain level of music performance ability, yet they both described feeling this pressure.

This pressure is the force of power/knowledge at work. Power/knowledge has intention, but rarely has an identifiable instigator. This reflects Amber and Nancy's experiences, as they clearly felt pressure to conform to norms—and even to exceed them. Recall that disciplinary power sometimes rewards exceptionally positive behavior. This is the double-edged sword of disciplinary power in these instances: fear of social punishment for failure to conform, and social rewards for excelling.

One way in which performance norms can be easier to meet is that performance norms are more explicit than other social norms. While the specific performance level required may not

be clear, the expectation that there *are* performance requirements is obvious. Knowing *what* is required leaves the newcomer fewer variables (e.g., the required level) to discern.

Hannah described similar feelings; however, unlike Amber and Nancy, she did not cite fear of others' opinions of herself as motivation for wanting to achieve higher rankings. She was motivated instead by the rewards of excelling. She was very clear that "being good" was important to her sense of being "in," but also seemed to imply that only the better players in the group contribute to the "quality" of the band: "I want to say that competition and stuff was important to me, as far as feeling a part of the band. Just actually being good and contributing to the overall quality of the band."

Hector indicated that it was not necessarily being closer to the top of the rankings, but rather just knowing where he fit in that led to a stronger sense of being "in":

I guess we were, like, part of the band, but I wouldn't say that's when I felt I was officially part of the band. I would say that didn't necessarily come until later, in maybe September or early October, when chair replacements for concert band were . . . And I feel like shortly after that was maybe where I kind of got started getting a sense of, this is . . . I'm now part of this band, because, like I said, you kind of started to associate more with one of the concert bands because that was the group you were spending the most time with. So, once I got put into one of those, and, I guess, started making relationships with the people in that concert band, because you'd be spending more and more time with them, that would kind of be the point in my mind where I'm like, oh, okay, I'm friends with these band people, and I've kind of got everything under control, and I'm placed in the band, and, like, now I can say, yeah, this is where I kind of am.

If getting "in" means fitting in, then Hector needed to know *where* he fit in so that he could go about conforming to the norms of the group for his place within that group. Having found his place, he had a better sense of what was expected of him and could fit in accordingly.

Part of Ginny's achievement of feeling "in" almost immediately upon starting high school band stemmed from moving directly into the top concert band in her high school. She talked about how others encouraged her:

People were like, “You can do this (be part of the top band). Technically, freshmen aren’t allowed to be in the wind symphony, but we need you for this concert so how about you just play?” . . . As I was quickly getting involved with a lot of the programming that the band was doing, I also was invested in playing my instrument and taking advantage of those things so that was fun.

The markers in this category work in different ways. The achievement of a recognized status as a performer (top band, first chair) has obvious implications for feeling that norms are being achieved; in the case of music performance in band, exceeding the norm is (mostly) encouraged. The achievement of certain performance milestones (marching and playing well at the same time) serves the same purpose in terms of conforming to these performance norms, which might be called “at least” norms: the requirement is not to be average, but to be above a certain level. The interesting other was merely knowing one’s place in the ranking of the bands by getting audition results, regardless of placement level. As discussed above, this knowledge of position relieves anxieties of the unknown, and allows the newcomer to shape his or her behavior accordingly to match group norms. However, referring back to the discussion of the issues surrounding band placement results, simply knowing one’s place is not always a comfort to all students.

Other performance-related markers of being “in”.

Participants cited several other performance-related markers for feeling fully “in” their high school bands. For Leo, it was the physical reality of rehearsing with the group. He said, “Once that band camp started, it was a very physical, I’m seeing this, I’m part of this, therefore I’m in the band, the high school band.”

Carmen said that the point at which she felt like she belonged was when she joined the jazz band, about a month or so into the school year:

Once I joined that and started doing band in an extracurricular way, I felt a lot more a part of it. Because it was a lot more of an encouraging thing to me to practice and keep up with it as a . . . As something that I was proud of than something that I was just a part of, just in. So, I think that that's definitely at least one that I felt like there was a shift and band became a lot more important in my life, and I realized that I was playing music that I really enjoyed, that I listened to. So, then I started picking that up more and enjoying that.

Like many other participants, Carmen spoke of how it was easier to feel a sense of belonging in a smaller group, where it was easier to get to know everyone in the group.

However, the preceding quote indicated a stronger emphasis on performance; that it was Carmen's playing, rather than socializing, with the jazz band that made her feel like she was "in."

Greater ease of feeling "in" with a smaller group fits perfectly within a disciplinary power analysis of the phenomenon. With fewer members and fewer member interactions and behaviors to observe and interpret, the social norms of the group become more readily apparent.

Cameron spoke of receiving an award at a band banquet in the spring of his ninth-grade year. While this event, in and of itself, did not involve performance, Cameron said that "it just felt like it was recognition of all the hard work I had put in throughout the whole year," indicating that he believed that the award was the result of his performance-related activities. Cameron received feedback that he perceived to confirm his attainment of performance norms. This changed his perception of how he was conforming to the group, and helped him feel that he was "in."

Finally, while Max identified his first high school pep band performance as his moment of realizing he was "in" his high school band, it is difficult to ascertain from his comments if his performance was any key to this realization. He talked instead about the memories of attending his older brother's basketball games, memories that the music sparked in him.

Non-performance-related markers

The non-performance-related markers of being “in” did not fit into neat categories as well as did the performance-related markers. Perhaps this is due to the centrality of music performance to band class, while other activities, events, and milestones reside in the orbit—a wide-spread and sometimes far-flung territory—of this central activity. In any case, many participants cited non-performance events or milestones as markers of feeling fully “in.” In some cases, these were the same participants who also spoke of other, performance-related markers.

Belinda, like Kelly, referred to the first (or first few) football halftime performances, but Belinda focused more on the social aspects, saying it was “probably the first few football games where the people in my section went, ‘Belinda, we’re excited you’re here.’ Something like that. That was, it felt good to be a part of a group.” Although the moment may have happened at a public performance, her description of what, specifically, made her feel “in” clearly indicates that the public performance itself was not as important to her sense of being “in” as the social interactions that took place because of the performance.

Just as Cameron received feedback that he perceived as affirming his attainment of performance norms, Belinda received feedback that she perceived as affirming her conformity to other social norms in her band. Note that she equates this event with feeling like “part of a group.” It is my interpretation that positive feedback about being part of a group—welcoming—was the reinforcement that Belinda needed to affirm that she was doing what was needed to fit in.

Charlise’s narrative provided strong evidence that she was contributing to performance aspects of her high school band almost immediately: she was placed in the top-auditioned band (into which ninth-graders were not normally allowed) and then challenged her way to roughly

the middle of her section. However, her markers for feeling like she belonged in the band were more social. She said that after enduring daily bullying in band during her ninth-grade year, things changed for her in tenth grade:

Sophomore through senior year, when people were treating me like a human being, I was like, ‘Wow! This is really great!’ Since I was with my friends, I just became a little less competitive . . . Not as a musician, but just in high school band, because nothing got easier. It’s just that I didn’t feel like I needed to match up to these people who were older and bigger than me, and it was like, ‘Now we’re all moving up together as an ensemble,’ kind of thing.

While other participants spoke of internal competition (e.g., chair or ensemble placements and auditions) as something that made them feel more a part of the group, Charlise indicated that she felt the opposite; that reduced competition – or at least a reduced feeling of needing to compete – made her feel a greater sense of being part of the group.

It is also telling that Charlise indicated that merely being treated “like a human being” was enough to make her feel “in.” Although an analysis of power relations related to her bullying experiences will come later in this chapter, I will suggest that Charlise knew well that she was exceeding every performance norm required in her band but could not feel like she fit in to the band as a whole so long as members of her own section were actively working to make her feel unwelcome. Absent the negative feedback of her ninth-grade year, feeling that she fit in was easy during her tenth-grade year.

Felicity explicitly stated that she desired the social bonds that she saw between others in her high school band but attaining them—and especially keeping them—proved to be difficult for her. She said that she found a musical connection in choir, but not in band. However, she said that choir did not provide the social bond that she was seeking:

I never felt a place in concert band. Yeah, it’s interesting now to be thinking about it in comparison to choir musically, at least, because I never felt particularly a part of the

social group with choir, but I felt very a part of it musically. And as we sang together, I felt a part of this harmony and the unison but when I was playing the oboe, I never felt that I was a part of a greater song.

She found that social place in marching band, but only temporarily. When her friends auditioned up, and she was “left behind by choice,” she realized that even marching band was not fulfilling without her friends in rehearsals:

I wanted to be a part of this big thing, and it looked like everyone was having so much fun. Even in concert band, it looked like they were having so much fun and I just never really connected to it and, yeah - I don't know if that's just because I didn't enjoy the instrument playing part of it quite as much, or if it was just social dynamics.

Felicity faced multiple challenges in conforming to the norms of her band. Not only did her music performance levels not meet the required “at least” level for a tenth-grader (at least in her perception—she said that she never auditioned), but one result of that perceived shortcoming was being placed in an ensemble in which she was one of very few students older than ninth-grade. This meant that she could not to conform to the expected norm for a tenth-grader (moving up to the next band). During ninth grade, her perceived lower performance level was not enough to keep her from feeling “in,” but when that perception avalanched into a more tangible deviation from the norm for her class, the aggregate effect was enough to take away her sense of being “in.”

Greta felt like her social induction did not happen until tenth grade. Although she had been in the band for a full year, that year was spent playing and socializing in band only with other ninth-graders. Things changed for Greta in tenth grade:

I feel like administratively, structurally, I joined high school band my freshman year, but socially, I didn't feel like I had completely joined until now I'm part of the trumpet section my sophomore year, and now I'm interacting with all these people that weren't just friends my own age, but now people older than me and people younger than me. It was really more sophomore year when I think of like the social aspect.

She spent much of her narrative describing these social aspects of her band, saying, “There (were) all these fun inside jokes, and cultural things that came with the band my sophomore year that I had not done my freshman year.” Greta may have been conforming to norms for her class, but she perceived “band” as being all four classes (ninth through twelfth). In this way, she was an outsider, unable to conform to the norms for upperclass band members because she was unable to interact with them, or observe, learn, and implement those norms.

Kelly was one of the participants that mentioned both performance and social markers for being fully “in” the high school band. She particularly noted the “team-building” game that was an annual tradition at the end of the ninth-grade week of band camp, wherein only the upperclass people know the rules of the game, and the ninth-graders must figure out what is happening. She said, “It’s kind of like, once I was a sophomore through senior, it was funny watching the gears turning in the freshmen heads. I didn’t really feel like I was fully a part of the group until I figured it out.”

A deeper analysis of the power relations within this event will follow in Chapter Six. Here, I will only note the influence of Foucauldian power/knowledge, and the ways in which it is made to seem “natural.” On a logical level, it seems that Kelly’s ability or inability to figure out a game (which had no direct relation to the overt purposes of the band) would have no impact on her feelings of being a part of the group. However, the game and the secret of how to “win” it was invested with the power of the director and all of the upperclass members making the implication that it was a requirement of fitting in. This is exactly how power/knowledge works: that the game mattered was a discursive element made “truth” by being uttered by those in powerful positions.

As mentioned earlier, Larry cited an earlier performance-related marker for being “in” his band, but being fully “in” in the social sense took until his first band trip:

I think that maybe not to say one was the other but that the band camp was definitely more of a business-like induction. Just being required and being so, this is what we’re gonna do this hour, this is what we’re gonna do this hour for a few days and then, like I said, you come out knowing your part. There’s the mingling, but it’s pretty businesslike and everything’s so new, you’re still pretty timid and not completely known to everybody. Yeah, I would say the trips were, now that I’ve thought about it more, I would say they were primarily a social induction. And I’d mentioned before that once you get to go on your first trip and that’s all everyone talks about is, how much fun the last trip they went on was, now you can be part of the social conversation. Like, “Hey I did that too. I was there too.”

Larry perceived that the norm in his band was talking about experiences on past band trips. He could not conform to this norm until he, too, had been on a band trip and was thus able to join in those conversations. Once this happened, he felt that he conformed enough to feel fully “in” on a social level.

Stella did not join band until the summer before her senior year of high school. She described having many of the same kinds of anxieties about joining a new group that most of the participants reported feeling when joining their bands in ninth grade. Stella reported that a feeling of being “in” came with a pool party for her section during the weekend between a two-week percussion camp and a two-week full band camp. This led to feeling “in” with a smaller group, which, as I wrote earlier, presents an easier path to feeling “in”:

So, we had a party and that’s when I really got to know all the people that I was with...so it was fun. I was like, ‘Oh, well now, these are like . . . Even within the band, these are my people, and I can just stick with them, and so, it’s good.’ Then I felt like I was in this little group, which was nice.

Like Greta, Teresa said that her high school band program isolated ninth-graders, who did not participate in marching band and who were almost entirely relegated to an all-ninth-grade band. Teresa also felt like her time of truly being “in” in high school band did not begin until

she started having interactions with upperclass students within the band. As I wrote earlier, fitting in with other ninth-graders does not lead to feeling “in” the band if one’s perception of the band as a group includes upperclass members.

Although they do not fit as well into neat categories as did performance-related markers of being “in,” these participant descriptions of non-performance-related markers demonstrate that social relationships within the band but outside of musical performance are an important part of the high school band experience for many, if not most, band members. In several cases, these non-musical social environments and events caused disruptions severe enough for the participants that they either left or strongly considered leaving their band programs; for others, the non-musical social bonds were what kept them in (and “in”). In sum, given the powerful impacts that these non-musical social interactions appear to have, music educators would be well-served to be aware of these kinds of relationships within the ensembles that they direct.

These two categories of description for the kinds of markers that participants cited for feeling “in” their high school bands—performance-related and non-performance-related—may be relatively unremarkable in and of themselves. However, further analysis (presented in Chapter Six) of the patterns here established bore intriguing results.

Types of Social Induction Activities

Participants described a wide variety of social induction activities⁵⁹ that they experienced, whether through participation—as an inductee, an inductor, or both—or as a witness. However,

⁵⁹ A working definition of “social induction activities” can be found in Chapter 1.

not every participant described such activities; indeed, almost half of the participants (ten) did not describe any social induction activities at their high school.

Teacher-led (official) social induction activities

Several participants described social induction activities that were organized, led, or sanctioned⁶⁰ by teachers. These activities mostly fell into two categories: a welcoming or exploration event for prospective members to get an experience with high school band and to socialize with high school band students; and team-building or “get-to-know-you” games and activities, almost exclusively conducted during summer band rehearsals (i.e., band camp).

Exploration events.

Leo said that he was considering quitting band in his eighth-grade year until he went to a “preview night” for band at his high school. He relayed that in addition to playing with the pep band at the game that night, participants ate pizza and were encouraged to socialize with high school band members:

There’s pizza and stuff beforehand and you socialize with people in your section and in the band in general. In the high school also, so you can kind of see what it’s like. You can talk to them; you can meet them. You also got to interact and experience the high school band director... And then the whole night you could just talk and ask questions and stuff.

The eighth-grade pep band night that Ginny described sounded very much like Leo’s experience:

There was always one middle school pep band night where they encourage all eighth graders to come to the high school, see what...we were all encouraged to go mingle, eat pizza with the high schoolers, and talk about their experiences, things like that.

⁶⁰ Activities that involved all or most of the present students during a teacher-scheduled rehearsal were assumed to be teacher-sanctioned, even when led by student leaders (e.g., drum majors).

Cameron told of a similar event at his high school; however, his exploration event focused on marching band instead of pep band:

We did have one day in the spring where all the middle school kids would come in who were planning to do marching band in the fall. It was mostly organized by the band director and then the drum majors helped facilitate bringing the kids in and introductions and stuff like that, introducing them.

Stella's marching band also had an introductory meeting for potential newcomers, but the activity she described placed almost no emphasis on the social aspect, apart from meeting her soon-to-be section colleagues:

I think in April of my junior year, we had this mini-camp, is what they call it, like an introduction to our band. And so, I had to meet with everyone and that was the first time I met all the people in pit percussion who I'd be playing with, and I was so scared 'cause I didn't know any of them.

These introductory activities that introduce the high school band experience to potential newcomers were mostly reported as positive events. Stella's experience should serve as a cautionary tale, however: an introduction that makes potential newcomers "scared" may be more likely to dissuade them from joining. Stella also said that the introductory event she attended largely ignored the social aspect of the group, whereas the others described "get-to-know-you" activities as part of their introductory events.

Team-building games and other extra-musical activities.

The most commonly reported social induction event among those that were teacher-led or sanctioned were games or other activities focused on team-building. Most often, these activities were performed during summer rehearsals or band camp. Rhianna said that her high school band had team-building exercises during band camp but did not elaborate. Hector recalled that his

high school band program did their team-building games on the first day that the full band was in rehearsal:

We introduced ourselves and, like, said a fun fact or something like that...once the rest of the marching band came we also had a couple different team building activities, like a little kind of Olympics thing that we did, and just got paired into random groups...And there were activities like that to kind of get everybody acquainted with each other, and comfortable with each other.

Leo reported that his high school band program took a similar approach to team-building activities during band camp:

Throughout the week, they did a lot of ice-breaker stuff and introduction stuff and intermingling stuff to get the freshmen integrated into the rest of the group. But on breaks and stuff, and they would have an hour or so scheduled into every day, where it was like, okay, we're gonna play a game to have people meet each other and stuff. So, they did try to integrate people before the school year started.

Kelly said that her high school band director led them in get-to-know-you games during ninth-grade-only portions of band camp, and then added the aforementioned "team-building" game when upperclass students arrived. Stella told me that the team-building exercises for her high school's marching band started in the late spring with activities for incoming band members. While most of the incoming eighth-graders already knew each other, Stella was a junior:

They (told us to) split up into your sections and do this and they counted us off, and then "all of you go over here," so then I was in a group with a flute player and a tuba player, and they were all younger than me. I had never seen any of (them) before. And they were like, "Who are you?" I was like, "My name is Stella, hi."

The prevalence of "team-building," "icebreakers," and other activities aimed at the non-musical, social connections between band members demonstrates that, on the whole, band directors *do* understand or at least recognize the importance of the social aspect of the band program. As I will discuss later in this chapter, however, "team-building" exercises can have

effects that are quite the opposite to what one would assume was the intention of their deployment.

Other teacher-led or sanctioned social induction activities.

Participants described a handful of other teacher-led induction activities. Greta said that almost all of the induction activities in her high school band were student-led. When I asked if there were any adult-organized activities, she remembered that there was a “leadership day,” at which the drum majors, having returned from drum major camp, would relay their new-found activity ideas to the section leaders for implementation. Rhianna recalled being assigned a “band buddy,” an upperclass band member that was supposed to help her acclimate to the high school band—a task at which she said her assigned band buddy failed.

Mickey reported that his school band traveled to a theme park—but not to perform—every summer just before school started. When I asked if he thought the purpose of the trip (since it was not for performance) was for induction, he did not seem to think so:

I never took it that way. I guess maybe now thinking back on it, it’s possible...But I guess it was probably seen as just an added perk. We also, on top of this fun experience, get to have, it’s also an inclusivity kind of activity. But I’m not sure that it was the goal of it.

Ginny and Teressa, when asked about adult-organized social induction activities, both pointed instead to spaces and opportunities for social bonding within the band, which they felt were purposely provided by their band directors. Asked about the purpose of induction activities in her band program, Ginny was sure that her band directors intended to build community:

It was clear that they [the directors] care about us as individuals and want us to be there and have a good time, so I think trying to make spaces where people felt comfortable coming back and eating their lunch there or finding friends and having that be a good space to do that was important as well. And so, I think making time for building some of those connections with peers...I think [that] was a goal.

Teressa was effusive in describing the efforts her band directors took to help students to bond into a cohesive social group:

I know that they ended up changing the rules to support it. Because we weren't supposed to be able to have food in the band locker room, but there was never any playing or instruments that were out in the band locker room, and they were like, "You guys wanna eat lunch in there every single day and bond and just sit there and be friends and just chill every single day? All right, fine, you can have food in there, just come eat your lunch here." They would change the way that some pep band things would go just so that we could specifically be all together for longer periods of time, and they fought for us to be able to have different, not rights, but to be able to pass in between the band room and the lunch room so that we could specifically be together for that lunch period, because they started to understand how big of a group it was, and it wasn't an issue until things started changing, they were like, no, this is an important group.

This should be, not fought for I guess, but they stood up for us when things started changing. Just to try and keep that group as something that can keep happening. Like the locker room was filled with people sitting against the lockers, with their backpacks by their feet, their lunches in their laps, and everyone talking all at once. They fought for that to be able to happen once everyone started becoming really close friends. I can't speak to how it was before I was there, but they were super hesitant to allowing food in, which makes sense. But then they were like, "You need lunch, so if this is gonna happen..." they set up specific rules for specifically allowing these friendships to keep forming.

Acknowledging how big of a family it was starting to become. Within this different group. There was just a huge turnover from, there was a lot of people who had just graduated, like a lot of amazing, confident, strong players who were really close friends who had all graduated, and there's a bunch of us idiot sophomores and freshmen who had no clue what we were doing. As soon as we started forming that, it took a while but then it immediately clicked with them again that, okay, this is something that we need to have. I don't think they necessarily did anything on their own, but they had such a strong supportive role that was just keeping enabling us to be something that would grow further and further.

Like the "team-building" activities, these teacher-led or sanctioned activities demonstrate that many or most high school band directors understand the importance of the social aspect of high school band. In each of the above three cases, it would appear that the directors purposely provided opportunities outside of rehearsal or performance for students to engage in less-

structured social time, possibly or even probably with the hope that these activities might promote group bonding.

Student-organized social induction activities

Participants also described several student-organized social induction activities. I did not include in this category social activities in which the only relationship to band was that some or all participants were also band members. Ordinary teen social activities, such as going out for pizza, were not included unless they were described as a function of the band. Thus, a band section (e.g., the trumpet section) all going out to eat together would be included, whereas two friends who both happened to be in band going out to eat together would not be included.

While some participants named a single such activity, a few participants provided the majority of such descriptions. Patti was among the former; the only student-organized social activity that she named was that sections in her marching band would choose, purchase and wear “section-wear,” such as t-shirts, sweatshirts, and other clothes that would identify the wearer as a member of said section (e.g., clarinets) in her high school band. Belinda did not describe any such activities in which she participated, but she did tell a brief story of another section in her band surprising the ninth-graders in that section with a water-balloon attack during band camp.

The rest of the descriptions of student-led social induction activities all came from just four of the participants. One of the activities that Stella described as key to her induction process was a pool party for the percussion section of her marching band. Although this could otherwise be considered usual teen social activity, she described it as open only to percussionists in the marching band and timed to celebrate the end of two weeks of percussion camp. When asked if there were any elements of peer initiation in her band experience, she told the story of receiving the suggestion that, since she was new, she should carry the largest bass drum down several

flights of stairs from the band rehearsal field to the band room. This story led to the story of another newcomer, the “little kid,” being dared to push a large marimba – normally a two-person job – up the steep ramp to the rehearsal field. Both of these stories were presented as “not really an initiation,” but Stella also was clear that both she and the “little kid” were selected for these tasks because they were newcomers. These portions of Stella’s narrative will be explored in more detail in the next section.

Greta told of how, in her ninth-grade year, band was something close to “just another class,” but that this changed when she became a sophomore and got to interact socially with the juniors and seniors in band. Most of the student-organized social induction activities she described were section-based: the nicknames that people in her section had, how they made up alternate commands to make marching band commands (e.g., parade rest, horns down, et cetera) pirate-themed, and the breakfast “sectionals” at the local 24-hour restaurant chain. At the end of the season, her section would hand out “paper-plate awards” to each member of the section. Also, her grade-based band group (not her section) had movie nights after every home football game, and bonfires after every marching band competition.

Teressa told a similar story of her ninth-grade year in band being less exciting than when, in her sophomore year, she got to socialize with the juniors and seniors in band. She spoke many times of how a large portion of the band would eat their lunch together, sitting on the floor of the band room between the instrument storage lockers. When asked about peer initiations, she told of how her band would come up with themes for pep band nights, and members would dress up to match the themes. One night that was repeated several times a year was called, “Pillage the Village.” The local thrift store had “village” in its name, and the tradition was to make a trip to the thrift store with band friends and buy the tackiest outfit possible – sometimes matching with

another band member. Teressa cited this as an initiation because the ninth-grade band members were not told what “Pillage the Village” was until they were on their way to buy clothes:

No one knows what it looks like until you are, like, ‘I’ll let you in on this secret. I’ll let you know what’s up with this,’ and everyone ends up finding out. It’s like this specific thing of like, ‘All right. We’re all one group. We all know what’s up here,’ and eventually, throughout the year we’ll have pillage days.

Felicity described several student-organized social band activities, including section-wear, and making locker signs for the students in their sections on marching band performance days. She described a series of activities that had become band traditions at football games, such as her saxophone section playing a specific song after the third quarter of each football game. She also mentioned several times that the band would chant, “Out! Out! Out!” at any non-members that wandered into the band’s section of the bleachers. She spoke reflectively about the band’s traditions:

They always just seemed to do band and that’s what they did. I didn’t know that many people who were particularly passionate about band. People took the idea of band very seriously, I think, as a result of that induction. Well, took the traditions seriously. People liked being a part of it. Yeah, I think the induction just really legitimized some of the somewhat arbitrary traditions in a way that, there’s nothing wrong with them but there’s a way that things are done, and people would just respect that because it becomes the right way to do things and it’s their tradition now.

Although there may have been “nothing wrong with” the traditions that Felicity described, the same cannot be said for all student-organized social induction activities.

Hazing in Band Inductions

Within the broader realm of social inductions, hazing was a particular focus of this study. Based on a national survey about high school hazing (Hoover & Pollard, 2000), I expected that several examples of hazing activities would be described among twenty-three participants. However, this was not the case: no participants described any activities that they identified as

hazing, and of all of the activities described, only a few incidents met the criteria given the working definition of hazing crafted for this study. As a review, that definition is as follows:

Acts performed upon (or by) band student(s) (“victims”), by (or at the suggestion of) other band student(s) who are in a more powerful position than the victims (“hazers”).

These acts must also meet all of the following criteria:

- The victims are given reason to believe that these acts are necessary to gain or maintain membership or status (official or unofficial) within a group (official or unofficial), regardless of the victims’ apparent willingness to participate.
- There are actual or likely outcomes that can reasonably be considered detrimental, physically or otherwise, to the victims or other persons, or that damages property (without free consent).
- The activity cannot reasonably be considered to serve the overt purposes of the band.

Incidents that met the criteria of hazing

Stella joined her high school’s nationally competitive marching band in the spring before her senior year. She had previously been part of the string orchestra program, and so had music reading skills, but had never played in the band program before joining the marching band, where she played an electronic keyboard in the front-ensemble (in which non-marching instruments, such as timpani and keyboard instruments are played). As such, she was considered part of the percussion section. She described an incident before a summer percussion camp practice:

Peer initiation...Okay, well, there’s one dumb thing. It didn’t really...it wasn’t really, I guess, an initiation. But they were like, “Oh, Stella, you’re new. How about you carry fifth bass all the way down to the band field?” And the guy who played fifth...you know, the huge one and everything, and it had the shoulder strap, and I’d never carried a drum

like that before. I'm like 5'4", I was average height, and but, gosh, it was so big. I couldn't see over it, and so usually it's this big guy who, in our marching band that plays fifth bass. He's so tall and he's like 6'4", and he's just muscly and huge. He was like, "Yeah, here. Here's my drum." He puts it on me, and I'm like, "Oh my God. I can't, this is so heavy." And to get to our band field from our band room, is like, up a hill. And so, you have to come down, five flights of stairs. And then walk down this ramp. Then there's more stairs, and you have to go over this road and then onto the band field. I was dying by the time, cause you know, you are trying to walk down. And my knees are hitting the drum. So, I'm going, walking sideways down the stairs. And they were all joking, they were like "Stella if you drop that drum, you're gonna die." And everything. And so, then I got to the bottom and then I took it off. And they're like "Good job." And then our percussion director was like "Okay kids it's time to start." And so, then we did that, so that was like the first day of percussion camp. They made me carry the drum. So, it was kinda, something like that. At least they didn't push me down the stairs.

Wondering if this was a pattern for newcomers in her band, or if, perhaps, this was something unique to Stella, as the only senior newcomer, I asked her if they did this to other newcomers, or if it was just her:

Yeah. The little kid, they would make him. It wasn't, they didn't force him to do it. But so, we have our marimbas, and they're huge. They're really heavy. So, we would have a ramp, it's stupid. We had to push them across the grass obviously. And then when you get. . . cause there's a road that goes up, and then you turn, and it goes up again. It kind of, the ramp goes like this, up. But the stairs go here, so with the bass drum, I could walk down the stairs. But the marimba, you have to go up the whole ramp. And everything. So, he. . . they were like "We bet you can't push that marimba up that hill by yourself." 'Cause usually it takes like two people. You have to, there's one person steering in the front.

And then just someone shoving it up the hill. And then he's like "Yes I can!" No, he's like, oh my gosh. I don't even know if he cracked five feet tall. He was literally so short. So, he's up there, and he's just running. Pushing that marimba. And everyone's like, he's gonna. . . there's no one steering it. He just gonna hit something. And he's not gonna be able to turn it.

TS: And this is probably a twelve-thousand-dollar instrument.

STELLA: Oh my god yeah. They're so expensive. And they were like "You better be careful!" Our percussion director was not there for that, otherwise, I don't think he would have let it happen. He got kind of like, around the bend. Then he looked back at us and said: "It's gonna roll back on me if someone doesn't come help!" So, someone, one of the senior marimba players she ran up there, and she was steering it for him. Then we helped him push it the rest of the way. There were kinda little things like that. But that one was pretty funny. Cause he was like "I'm gonna break this thing if no one comes out."

When I further asked Stella if this was something that all newcomers were subjected to, she said, “Yeah, that’s kinda how it was...[everybody got] a little somethin’ that they had to do...It was kinda funny. Yeah, mine was carry the bass drum. The kid had to push his marimba up the hill.”

Belinda described a hazing incident that she witnessed, to which other ninth-grade students were subjected:

I know certain sections had initiation events that were outside of band. Just different things that they did as tradition to get people, to have them join. But that was all based on what the students wanted to do. None of that was inside band. I guess most of it is just for fun. I know one year one of the sections did, they’d use water balloons and, when the freshmen didn’t know, they’d attack them with it. Something that’s kind of harmless ‘cause it’s in the summer, so everyone was fine with it. Just something fun that kind of like, okay, you’re freshmen.

Neither Stella nor Belinda identified these incidents as hazing; in fact, Stella specifically said that it “wasn’t really...an initiation” Yet, she brought it up when the question “Do you feel there was any element of peer initiation during your process?” was asked without further elaboration. It is not surprising that Stella did not identify either of her described incidents as hazing. In both cases, the newcomer (Stella and “the little kid”) took part without much apparent peer pressure to do so, and the outcomes of the incidents were not particularly harmful to the newcomers (although the risk of harm, to both people and expensive property, was certainly present). Belinda stated that she felt that the water balloon attack was “harmless.”

However, when held up against the criteria of the definition of hazing that I am using, these incidents do qualify as hazing – with one caveat: it is not clear that the newcomers believed that these tasks (or the attempt at the task, in the case of “the little kid”) were necessary to become or stay part of the group. However, it is clear that they were performed (or suggested) by veteran members of the group upon newcomers, and it is clear that these activities focused on the

newcomers – Stella was identified as “new” before her physical trial was suggested, and the “little kid” was identified by Stella as another newcomer who had a similar trial. Belinda noted that the ninth-graders were the focus of the water balloon attack and said that it was done “to have them join.” The fact that the activities were clearly focused on newcomers also provided them with probable reason to believe that their participation or acceptance was a necessary condition for achieving “in” status with the social structure of the organization.

One could argue that none of these activities resulted in any harm to people or property; however, the criteria states that activities only need to have “*likely* outcomes that can reasonably be considered detrimental, physically or otherwise, to the victims, or to other persons, or that damages property.” Stella was carrying a drum oversized to her body down several flights of stairs, putting both the drum and her body at risk, while the trial of the “little kid” also put both a student and an expensive instrument at significant risk. The water balloon attack at Belinda’s school may have been “harmless” as Belinda states, but the lack of consent⁶¹ from the newcomers made the possibility of detrimental results much more likely: items like instruments, smartphones, and even clothing could be damaged by water. Additionally, a surprise attack carries a greater risk of unintended damage or injury due to spontaneous reactions (e.g., running blindly into other students or tripping). Certainly, none of the described activities could reasonably be construed as serving the overt purposes of the band(s).

⁶¹ The criteria clearly state that lack of consent is not a qualification for hazing; in this case, however, consent would have also implied expectation, which would have mitigated much of the potential for detrimental outcomes.

Hazing and disciplinary power.

The force of Foucauldian disciplinary power can lead individuals to act against what would objectively be determined to be their best interests. While the ninth-graders in the hazing incident that Belinda described didn't seem to have a choice as to whether or not to participate, both Stella and "the little kid" put themselves and expensive instruments at risk at the *suggestion* of veteran members. Stella's request was worded as, "How about you carry the fifth bass drum?" while "the little kid" was challenged that he couldn't push the marimba up the hill by himself. Stella even says, "they didn't force him to do it." While "they" (the veterans) may not have forced either newcomer to engage in the potentially dangerous or damaging activities, there was power at play that compelled each of them to comply with the suggestions.

The expectation that one will conform to the norms of the group along with the perception that veterans are in a position of more power gave the suggestions the force of disciplinary power, through the vehicle of power/knowledge. These power relations were hidden; I am confident that, if asked, both Stella and "the little kid" would claim that they were not "forced" to engage in the hazing behaviors. However, they were subject to the application of power. Foucault says that power operates from the bottom up, and these are excellent examples: the power that compelled Stella to take the hazing suggestion came not from the few veterans that suggested it, but from the acquiescence of every member of the band to the perception that veterans are in a more powerful position; of every past member that had passed this perception on; of every member of the broader society that perceived and made real the discursive construction that tells of how conformity to the group is required.

Hazing incidents compared to national survey rates.

While this is not a quantitative study, it bears noting that Hoover and Pollard's national survey of high school students regarding hazing (Hoover & Pollard, 2000) indicated that 39% of respondents involved in "music, art or theatre group" experienced hazing as a member of that group. Of course, this category is much broader than just high school band, and so it is possible that hazing rates were higher in other organizations within the broader category. It is also true that assuming the hazing rates suggested were accurate AND that they hold relatively even through the different categories of organizations within each broader category, the relatively low incidence of hazing reported among the participants in this study could be a coincidence made more probable by the small sample size.

It could also be that social desirability bias (Edwards, 1957) influenced some participants to omit hazing incidents that they experienced or witnessed from their narratives. Social desirability bias would seem to be more likely to influence participants in a face-to-face interview, especially with the knowledge that the interviewer is also a student on the same campus at which the participants are students—there was a realistic chance that they would interact with me again.

Induction activities bearing resemblances to hazing

There were several other induction activities described that bore strong resemblances to hazing. While most of these lacked clearly harmful results, there was one striking description of activities that fall under the heading of a similar peer-victimization phenomenon that, by definition, shares many traits with hazing.

Bullying.

Charlise started playing the trumpet at the age of seven (her school district started band in the fifth grade, roughly three years later). She was so advanced entering ninth grade that her middle and high school directors agreed to place her, without audition, in the top band class at her high school, which was usually restricted to students in grades ten through twelve.

However, without an audition, she was arbitrarily placed as the last chair, or lowest-ranking, performer in her section. Charlise did not believe that this placement accurately reflected her ability as compared to the other students in her section and asked to have the section re-auditioned. Her director, however, told her that she would have to chair-challenge (a one-against-one audition process) to move up in her section. Charlise proceeded to challenge, and best, four students in her section, of which three were senior boys. They did not take kindly to Charlise afterward:

They basically hated me for that. It really made me feel excluded and my sister was also in the wind ensemble, at the time, and she was a junior when I was a freshman, she's two years older than me, and so she would have to tell them to stop, not bullying me but, stop being mean to me basically. Like they would sit in my chair at the beginning of rehearsal so I would have to ask them to move, and that's classic high school you know, boys not being mature. But then that brought discourse between my sister and her colleagues, so it was just kind of like a lot of weird dynamics happening so, for the first two months I felt really excluded and I didn't really want to be in the program either because of what was happening.

Yeah, they were high school boys at the time, so naturally immature. But I think that when I would walk into band and they would be sitting in my chair, or they would move my music or just stupid little pranks that boys pull, I think that was all intentional and purposeful, just because of the way they were feeling.

So I don't think they were trying to be mean to me directly, but that they wanted so badly to sit in their normal chair and sit by their friends, that they didn't really think about how I would feel if they would refuse to get out of my chair or refuse to hand me my music, or whatever it may be. So, I don't think it was them intentionally trying to make me feel bad; I think it was just their routine was screwed up by me, so they just wanted to keep their team, no matter what, even if it did happen to make me not feel good.

Well, at the time, I hated being in . . . like, I was honestly afraid to go to band sometimes, because I would have to be so confrontational and basically go tell on the people in my section, or I told you that my older sister was in the group when I was, as well. So, I'd have to go and ask her to ask her friends to not be mean to me, which seems really silly, now that I'm looking back at it. But I just had a bad feeling every day.

I think it was first hour; that wind ensemble was. And I just had a bad feeling going in every morning, because I know I'm gonna have to deal with something. And we had block scheduling, so it was like an hour and a half of dealing with something. It wasn't like 45 minutes, or whatever. So, it was bad, because having a negative connotation to wind ensemble kind of sucked, I would say. Especially as a little teenager, already having that feeling, like "Okay, I'm probably not gonna make it in music because I don't like going to music class because of this."

At first consideration, Charlise's described experiences starting high school band might be considered to be hazing. The senior perpetrators were in position of perceived power relative to a ninth-grader.⁶² Charlise's dread of attending band each morning is clearly a detrimental outcome in and of itself, even without considering the impact it may have had upon her ability to learn, or upon her mental and even physical health. While none of the earlier described hazing incidents were reported to have bothered the newcomers, Charlise was so bothered by the bullying behavior that she seriously considered quitting band after one year—no small thing for a woman that went on to major in music. The acts described clearly did not serve the overt purposes of the band.

The critical omission from the criteria is that Charlise was not "given reason to believe that these acts (were) necessary to gain or maintain membership or status." She had no reason to believe that she would ever be accepted in the social structure of the trumpet section, regardless

⁶² The power dynamics of the male/female relationship could certainly also be a factor here, and may well be worth examining in another setting; however, the position of "senior" as almost-universally perceived as more powerful than "ninth-grader" already establishes the power difference, and discussion of the gendered aspects of this relationship is beyond the scope of this study.

of her acceptance or resistance to the malicious behavior of the other members. Absent that key criterion, these acts were not acts of hazing—instead, Charlise was the victim of bullying.

Olweus' (1993) definition of hazing includes, "A (person) is being bullied . . . when he or she is exposed, repeatedly and over time, to negative actions on the part of one or more other(s)."

(p. 9) This was true of the activities that Charlise described, even though she directly said that it was not bullying.

She also says that these activities made her feel excluded, and it is clear that the intention behind the described activities was not to include Charlise or make her feel "in" the band, on a social level. Therefore, these activities would not even be considered induction activities, although they were part of Charlise's induction process. Her earlier "anti-induction" experiences greatly influenced her perceptions of her experiences in her sophomore year:

At the time, [the bullying] felt awful. But then it also made me feel thankful for having people who weren't terrible to me in my section. Because they were straight up not nice to me. And so, sophomore through senior year, when people were treating me like a human being, I was like, "Wow! This is really great!"

Foucault and bullying.

This study is not "about" bullying, but since bullying played a significant role in Charlise's induction, I will apply Foucault's disciplinary power as an analytic lens to this particular instantiation of the phenomenon.

As noted earlier, Charlise knew that she was exceeding any performance norm requirements in her band. However, in doing so, she was committing what I will call "unacceptable" breaches of other social norms. Being placed into the top band without an audition (though not by her choice) in combination with her chair-challenges of senior boys proved to be greater deviation from the norm than could be tolerated by some. Not only was a

ninth-grader challenging and defeating twelfth-graders on a one-to-one basis, she was also breaking up their social clique by sitting in a chair that split up the group of older boys.

These deviations strayed too far from the norms that were required of a ninth-grade band student, at least to the senior boys in her section. While disciplinary power often operates on a pastoral—or self-enforcement—basis, that power was clearly not working on Charlise. The group (the senior boys in the trumpet section, not necessarily the larger band) came to the conclusion, either explicitly or implicitly, that this transgression of the norms must be punished. This led to the bullying activities that Charlise experienced.

The bullies' perceptions of band norms and the needs and means to defend them were not uncontested. Charlise clearly was contesting both, but other older students in the band (usually her older sister) would also intercede on Charlise's behalf when the bullying behaviors reached a certain point. However, the lack of intercession at lower levels of bullying indicates that even Charlise's sister was not prepared to transgress all band norms (and, perhaps, high school norms as well).

Foucault (1995) claims that disciplinary power works by comparing individuals to each other and the whole, and rewards for conformity and punishes deviancy (pp. 182–183). The level of punishment, and at what level it is warranted, varies upon the context, shaped by the population within the group. In Charlise's case, the rewards for exceeding the norm did not outweigh the punishments for deviancy.

Other student-led induction activities bearing resemblances to hazing.

Other described activities that bore resemblances to hazing met all of the criteria except for the being “reasonably...considered detrimental, physically or otherwise, to the victims, or to

other persons, or that damages property.” Of course, this is the linchpin of the hazing definition—the breakfast “sectionals” that Greta described, for example, meet all of the other criteria for this definition. However, I believe that most people would not consider this situation—in which senior trumpet players suggested to everyone in their section that they should get together for breakfast—to be anything like hazing.

However, the incoming students (sophomores, in the story that Greta told) may have had reason to believe that choosing not to attend would result in being considered something less than fully a part of their section—and, if everyone else in the section is participating on a regular basis, I would argue that this would almost certainly be the case. At that point, this activity is only one criterion from being considered hazing (it is not potentially dangerous or damaging).

To be clear: I am not suggesting that such activities be forbidden or discouraged. Instead, my point is that *many* otherwise innocuous, student-led, social induction activities *not* related to music performance could reasonably be considered to meet the criteria for my hazing definition, minus the “dangerous or damaging” criterion.

Indeed, if the category of person “in a more powerful position” is expanded to include teachers, then the same could be said of some teacher-led social induction activity described, as well. The question, then, is: if so many induction activities meet two out of three criteria for hazing, then which activities described bear a *greater* resemblance to hazing, and what additional criteria make it so?

To answer this question, I chose to look for activities that more closely resembled initiations. The criteria that I chose are from Jean Sybill la Fontaine’s (1986) descriptions of initiations (see Chapter 2):

- Initiation rituals are “for” those already initiated as much as for the novices. (p. 104)

- Initiation rituals have much in common with plays. They are artificial experiences, created by the people concerned and performed in a manner, time, and place which the participants choose...like theatrical performances, rituals make use of deceptions and “special effects” to create impressions...nor must one ignore the element of entertainment provided by these rituals. (p. 181)
- Shared secrets create a bond. This bond is the basis of the solidarity of members. (p. 186)
- Initiation rituals include . . . elements which may be called tests . . . What seems to be significant is that they all entail proper responses to the initiators, demonstrating submission to the authority which the initiates now accept. (p. 186)

These additional criteria were compared to each of the non-hazing induction activities described. As an example, the trumpet section breakfasts described earlier would be an obvious match with only the first of Fontaine’s descriptions: “for” the already initiated as much as for the novices (assuming that the senior trumpet players like going out for breakfast). One could also make an argument for the last criteria, claiming that showing up at the restaurant demonstrates submission to the seniors; however, going out to breakfast hardly seems like a test, beyond, possibly, the early morning wake-up call for sleep-deprived teenagers. There is no evidence in Greta’s story that there were any elements of theatre nor any secrecy involved in the trumpet breakfasts. Therefore, I would not qualify the trumpet section breakfasts as resembling hazing.

The “Pillage the Village” event described in Teresa’s story, however, matches up well with each of these criteria. It was obvious that Teresa, as an upperclass band student, thoroughly enjoyed these events – quite possibly more than the newcomers, since she had already gained the knowledge of what it entailed. She probably was also more comfortable with the whole event, having participated in similar events several times earlier. Thus, the event was almost certainly

as much for those already “in” as the newcomers. There are elements of theatricality, as the outfits were chosen for their ability to gain attention, not for functionality. Teresa explicitly stated that there was an element of secrecy involved in the first event of each year with newcomers left in the dark until they arrive at the thrift store to buy an outfit. Moreover, since the bizarre outfits were to be worn during a public performance (pep band), there is an element of testing involved: the newcomers needed to be willing to wear what might otherwise be considered a humiliating outfit in front of a gym full of spectators.

What is not clear from Teresa’s narrative is whether or not newcomers felt compelled to participate in this activity. This leaves room for questioning how close to hazing the activity really was. Depending upon the participation saturation level (did all or almost all band members participate?), and especially upon the perceived power level of the particular veterans leading the activity, it is entirely reasonable to believe *either* that newcomers did or did not believe participation was necessary for being fully part of the band. If participation *felt* mandatory for newcomers, this activity could be considered to resemble hazing.

Even if that were the case, however, there is one clear difference between this activity and others that seemed closer to hazing: veterans took part in the activity in the same way that newcomers did. That is, veterans dressed in outfits just as goofy as those that the newcomers wore. This detail could make all the difference between an activity that is welcoming newcomers into a quirky part of a band’s internal culture and an unwelcoming induction activity that comes closer to hazing. That difference is in perceived power relationships: if veterans freely participate in the activity in the same way as newcomers, then, at least within that activity, newcomers and veterans occupy the same positional space. This is not to say that, because veterans dressed up in goofy clothes, it must follow that doing so was a positively received experience for everyone.

Instead, it is essential that hazing involves newcomers being pressured to do something that veterans are not readily willing to do. When both veterans and newcomers participate equally, the activity becomes a real full-group activity.

Greta's trumpet section activities as a whole—including nicknames, awards, and the pirate identity, also bear many of these same resemblances, though perhaps not as clearly. The seniors were described as instigators of most of the activities, and there was nothing said to suggest that they did so as some service to the newcomers. The pirate nicknames (e.g., Captain Gingerbeard and First Mate Neckbeard) that were said to inspire the pirate persona of the trumpet section suggest theatrics. As Fontaine states, the initiation experiences are artificial and entertaining. This criterion also pertains to the “paper plate awards” ceremony at the end of the season, with titles that played on the names of the members.⁶³ The shared secrets are not quite as obvious, but the pirate-themed alternate marching band commands, I would argue, serve that purpose: while the rest of the band has one set of commands, the trumpet section had their own set of commands—which, while not kept secret, were shared only within their smaller group. The element of testing is, perhaps, the weakest element in this case; however, it is quite reasonable to suspect that any newcomer that chose not to adopt the pirate theme—to reject a pirate nickname, or refuse to respond to the alternate commands—would not be considered as much a part of the group as those who did.

Once again, however, the critical difference is whether veterans were imposing their perceived power upon newcomers or welcoming them into their unique section culture within the

⁶³ While some of the award titles described by Greta could have buttressed my claim of theatricality (and were also quite clever), I believe that sharing them here would violate confidentiality agreements, since they were based on the real-world names of Greta and her classmates.

larger band. In context, it seems to be the latter. Although the seniors created and gave out the mock awards, Greta implied that it was the newcomers that gave the seniors their pirate nicknames, giving the impression that the creation of this sectional sub-culture was more democratic than would be a hazing-like activity. It is not entirely clear from Greta's narrative, but it seemed as though newcomers and veterans participated in similar, if not the same, ways. Like "Pillage the Village," it may technically meet the criteria, but it is also within the grey border areas, where more nuanced scrutiny is demanded. Without additional information, it is not possible to say whether these activities were an imposition of power upon newcomers or a sharing of internal culture by veterans.

Newcomer Anxiety.

When discussing why newcomers might feel that certain activities would be required to be "in" or to fully be a part of a group on a social level, it helps to understand the context within which these activities are occurring. I have presented my argument that United States high school bands are social groups that share more of a bond than do most other classes, setting the stage for why social induction should matter. An additional component that should be considered is the perceived power imbalance between newcomers and veterans.

While the assumption that veterans would be in a more powerful position than newcomers may seem common-sensical, it behooves us to look more carefully at this power relationship. What is it about the veteran-newcomer dynamic that makes veteran advantage in power positioning inherent? Part of this advantage could be physical reality: seventeen- and eighteen-year-olds are, on average, bigger and stronger than thirteen- and fourteen-year-olds.

Another part might be found in population numbers, in that the veterans in grades ten through twelve would usually outnumber newcomers in grade nine.

An unintended finding in my research might provide another clue, even though, upon presentation, it seems obvious: newcomers are anxious and uncertain about their new social surroundings. By my coding, 16 of my 23 participants spoke 55 times about being nervous, anxious, or scared when they started high school band. I find this saturation remarkable, especially because I never specifically asked about being nervous or scared. Participants used the words “anxious,” “nervous,” “uneasy,” “uncomfortable,” “confused,” “awkward,” “insecure,” “nerve-wracking,” “scary” or “scared,” “intimidated” or “intimidating,” “freaked out,” “terrified” or “terrifying,” and “living in fear” to describe their experiences starting high school band.

If most newcomers are experiencing significant anxiety in their new social situation, most veterans are almost certainly feeling more settled in theirs, as I wrote about earlier when introducing the Foucauldian concept of disciplinary power to getting “in” high school band. Further, the veterans *know* that the newcomers are anxious, because they were, themselves, newcomers not many years earlier. This situation presents an advantage to the veterans, if they were inclined to use the newcomers’ fear and anxiety as leverage. As I shall discuss next, some induction activities seem designed to take advantage of and even exacerbate this anxiety and uncertainty among newcomers.

Teacher-led activities that bore resemblances to hazing.

Perhaps the participant-described activity that most resembled hazing without necessarily reaching the level of “reasonably considered to be detrimental” is Kelly’s story of the team-

building activity led by her band director. To review, new band members had just finished several days of newcomer-only summer rehearsals, and veteran band members were participating for the first day of the week-long band camp. During a rehearsal break, the band director led a game in which the means of success were secret – everyone did the same basic performance: tapping the floor with a yardstick, then saying, “Chicken, chicken, little red chicken”, but only those who coughed just before saying the phrase were announced as having done it correctly.

Kelly said, “Once I was a sophomore through senior, it was funny watching the gears turning in the freshmen heads,” indicating that she enjoyed it more as a veteran student than as a newcomer. The shared secret is clear: the key to successful performance is known only to insiders. Kelly verified the importance of the shared secret, saying, “I didn’t really feel like I was fully a part of the group until I figured it out.” The test here may seem certain—the newcomers have to puzzle out the secret means for success. However, Kelly also reported that, eventually, the veteran students would give more and more obvious hints to help the newcomers who were not figuring it out. So, what was the test? As Fontaine points out, it is giving a proper response to the veterans (and, in this case, the band director); that is, to demonstrate submission. The newcomers were expected to continue making further attempts at the ritual, rather than simply quitting, even though being unable to determine what made a performance of the (otherwise pointless) ritual successful was frustrating for many. The very fact that the ritual was pointless *is* the point, because this means that the experience is artificial, and the newcomers’ performance of the ritual and their accompanying reactions were on full display for the veterans’ entertainment. Note again that Kelly said, “It was *funny* watching the gears turning in the freshmen heads.”

“Funny” is important not only in establishing the entertainment value of the newcomers’ frustration and potential humiliation. It is also important in establishing a link back to a described

induction activity that *did* meet the criteria for hazing: the “little guy” trying to push the too-big marimba up the hill, as described by Stella, who *also* said “It was funny” in describing watching the newcomer struggle. In both cases, the artificiality of the activities may have made observers feel that they had license to laugh; they could rationalize that since the activity is artificial and, therefore, should hold no real meaning to the newcomer, they are not laughing at real failure. Perhaps more importantly, the newcomers are not failing at the actual, core activity of the group: since that kind of failure would hold the group back from meeting its goals, the failure would no longer be a laughing matter to those invested in the success of the group.

It should be noted that Kelly not only described this activity as an annual event but also told of another, similar game in which newcomers were deceived:

We also had another game called The Story Game where all the freshmen leave the room and then the upperclassmen are coming up with a story that the freshmen will have to guess. But there’s not actually a story: the rule was if a freshman asks...they have to be yes or no questions, so freshmen ask questions. And if they ask a question that starts with “is”...like, “Is Beyonce involved?”—Beyonce came up in a lot of them—then we’d say yes. And if the question didn’t start with “is” then we would say no. And so, they kind of built their own story, but they thought they were trying to figure out our story. And that one was really fun ‘cause also, you could tell a couple of them were starting to figure out what we were doing...so I really was looking forward, when I was a freshman, I really looked forward to having the experiences as an upperclassman and getting to initiate the new members with all of these games. And it wasn’t mean or anything, it was just a good team-building.

In Kelly’s narrative, her band director led not one, but at least two games billed as “team-building” that involved public displays of newcomers’ ignorance. Their lack of insider knowledge guaranteed this ignorance. Importantly, Kelly directly identified this activity as a kind of initiation, implying that she saw it as more than (or perhaps something other than) the “team-building” game as which it was billed. Kelly gave hints that it did not feel good to be a

newcomer in this activity, yet she looked forward to participating as a veteran when she could be entertained by the “artificial” failure of newcomers.

Perhaps, more to the point, she looked forward to being in a position of feeling powerful: As Foucault points out (see Chapter 3), knowledge and power are inextricably intertwined; to have knowledge that others do not is a form of power. Moreover, and closer to Foucault’s original meaning of power/knowledge, the insiders created that knowledge. That is, the key to successfully performing the activity was not otherwise significant. It was knowledge made “official” by those in positions of power (especially the adult director). In this way, power created knowledge and knowledge bestowed power.

A final described activity that bore a resemblance to hazing, in a different way, was also a teacher-led activity, as described by Stella.⁶⁴ She told of a moment when one of her band directors asked for all of the new members to come to the auditorium, separate from the rest of the band. Stella described what happened next:

Our band director asked a question: “Whose favorite ice cream is mint chocolate chip?” And there were like six kids in the front that just raised their hands. He said “Great, you wanna go paint lines on the field?” They (the kids) said, “What? No!” So, they had to go out there and they had to get their lines and the white spray paint, and they were doing everything. Painting lines on our band field. It was funny.

The elements involved are slightly different, here—the secret is not a shared one, but there is deception involved. The test is not so much designed to be passed as it was to select a smaller group. The person in a position of higher positional power is not a veteran peer, but a

⁶⁴ I will note here that of all participants, only Stella told stories of more than one activity that met all of the criteria to meet my definition of hazing. One hypothesis that I held before this research, and that I would still like to study, is that higher levels of external competition, especially in marching bands, will correlate to higher rates of hazing. Stella was the only participant to report that her marching band competed at a national level.

teacher: an officially authorized non-peer. However, it would certainly seem that the method of selection was designed for entertainment; Stella even said, “It was funny,” a common thread among several hazing and hazing-like activities. Most importantly, newcomers were singled out for an undesirable job. The director could have requested volunteers from the band at large or used another method to choose randomly, even from the smaller group. Why use a deceptive method to select from only newcomers?

This demonstrates an important difference from Greta’s pirate-themed section and Teresa’s “Pillage the Village” activities: the differences between newcomers and veterans are made explicit, and exploited, at least in part for entertainment value, but perhaps mostly for the demarcation of who is “in” and who is not yet “in.” These are not activities where veterans are participating in the same ways as newcomers; they are not *full-group* activities. A question, then, that should be asked in future research is: *why* did these kinds of activities seem acceptable to these teachers? What social constructions have made invisible to most the power-positioning of veterans and newcomers within these activities; or, perhaps made the inclusion of such activities seem like part of the “natural order” of things?

Recently a colleague, knowing that I was working on a dissertation that dealt (at least to some extent) with hazing told me that, as a high school athletic coach, he had always made the freshmen boys carry the team gear. He asked if I thought that this was hazing; I could tell that he thought that it was not. I regret that I said merely that it was probably in a grey area: technically true, but not addressing what I now believe needed to be addressed.

Adult leaders in educational settings have a responsibility to model the kind of behavior in which they expect their students to participate. I thought long about freshmen boys carrying gear, and about the mint chip ice cream story Stella told. I have come to believe that both

practices could encourage hazing because they seem designed to let newcomers know that they are *not yet* fully part of the group; at least not part of the group on the same level as the veterans. The coach said as much; something to the effect of “they have to pay their dues.” By singling out newcomers for undesirable duties, by letting all members know that newcomers have to “pay their dues,” and by treating them as less-than others through deceptive selection practices that turned students’ enthusiasm against themselves, these adult leaders may well have been signaling (one would hope unknowingly) that veteran members also have the right to expect their *own* share of dues from the newcomers, and the right to treat them as less-than.

Foucault, “In,” and Welcoming

I claim that the desire to be “in” (as opposed to merely part of) stems from disciplinary power, as described by Foucault (1995), and that one substantial obstacle to being “in” is understanding how to fit in to the social norms of the group. Part of the difficulty of navigating this path is that these norms are not made explicit (although music performance norms are made more so than others). Because they are not made clear, newcomers are not only made to decipher what is required, they are left to wonder if they have achieved (or are continuing to meet) an acceptable level of conformity to the group. This uncertainty leads to anxiety and even fear, which is exploitable by upperclass members (or even directors).

Foucault (1995) claims that “where there is power, there is resistance,” but he goes on to say, “and yet this resistance is never in a position of exteriority in relation to power” (p. 94). This is crucial to examining means of alleviating some of the negative outcomes of high school band inductions. Disciplinary power *is* subject to resistance, but only within the systems of power that already exist. In this case, one might resist certain aspects of how one is expected to fit into a

group, but to change the paradigm that one must, to some certain degree, conform to the norms of a group may be too great of a change to expect, at least in the short term, within Foucauldian understandings of power.

Foucault (1995) claims that all great power comes from a collective of smaller power relationships, which makes “great, radical ruptures” (p. 96) uncommon. In this case, such a rupture would require dramatically shifting a construction that is known as “true” by most of the population—certainly not an easy task, and most likely a near-impossible one.

However, I propose that there is a strategy that can be taken to help mitigate some of the outcomes of induction that are commonly held as negative (e.g., fear, anxiety, exclusion, and hazing). It is based on the experiences described by Cameron and especially Belinda. Cameron finally felt “in” when he received affirming feedback about his music performance. Belinda felt “in” when veterans simply said, “We’re excited that you’re here.”

As I claimed when I described these events-as-narrative, the feedback of others affirming one’s place within the group helps to ease anxieties about the unknown norms of the group. Welcoming acts provide this kind of affirming feedback. The simple statement, “We’re excited that you’re here” made such an impression on Belinda that she remembered it five years later. Welcoming words can have profound effects.

In this way, resistance works within existing power frameworks, as Foucault claims it must. Rather than working to dismantle an entrenched application of power/knowledge (i.e., veterans are in a more powerful position than are newcomers), welcoming is a subtle shift in the applications of that power. That is, it does not change (nor attempt to change) the power relationship established by the paradigm, but instead attempts to apply that power in a way that

has fewer outcomes generally perceived as negative, and potentially more that are perceived as positive.

These are the kind of small changes—the micro-physics of power, as Foucault terms them—that, over the course of many instantiations, can make a cumulative large-scale change in force relations. In this case, such a change could make a significant difference in the way that newcomers perceive their induction and how they come out of it, as well. A newcomer who feels welcomed, who has support for his or her claim to a place in the group, and whose fears and anxieties about joining are eased by reassurances is far more likely to find a feeling of “in.”

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, I presented my findings in answer to my first three research questions. I also made additional analysis of factors that may have impacted participants’ perceptions and experiences-as-narrated to influence participants to construct their narratives as they did.

Did participants feel a sense of being fully “in” their high school bands immediately upon taking part in high school band activities?

Feeling “in” was not a given. Participants did *not* feel a sense of being fully “in” their high school bands immediately, although some reported reaching this milestone within several days. I claim that one reason for the delay between the first activities with the high school band and a feeling of being “in” is the time needed to observe, process, and acclimate to the norms of the new social group. This is an instantiation of what Foucault calls disciplinary power, as newcomers feel compelled to “fit in.”

If not, how long did it take for participants to feel like they were fully “in” their high school band—if ever?

There was a relatively even distribution of induction lengths reported, clustered in three groups: those that felt “in” at some point during summer band activities, those that felt “in” at some point in the fall semester, and those that felt “in” within a few months, either way, of one year since joining. Some participants never felt “in,” and others found but then lost that feeling. Every participant that lost or never found a feeling of being “in” left their band program before eleventh grade, demonstrating that feeling “in,” through musical or extra-musical means, is an essential factor in student retention.

What do participants cite as markers for knowing and/or realizing that they were fully “in” their high school band?

There were many different such markers cited, but they were about evenly divided between the categories of “performance-related” and “non-performance-related,” where “performance” refers to the overt purposes of the band (usually music performance, but in some cases marching as well). Among the performance-related markers cited, two specific categories emerged: public performance (often the first of some kind), and internal ranking and sorting, although some performance-related markers fit in neither category.

Possible factors behind public performance marking the start of feeling “in” the band include the public marking of the group via announcements, uniforms and so forth, as well as the sense of group accomplishment reflecting both individual and group work. I claim that results of internal ranking and sorting often serve as affirmation that an individual is attaining “at least” normative levels of music performance. Again, disciplinary power leads newcomers to strive to conform to these group norms. Most participants citing internal ranking as their marker did so in reference to being identified as “better-than”; e.g., auditioning into the most advanced ensemble

or top chair. Even results of ranking and sorting exercises that would be considered neutral helped participants to fit in to the band by identifying their place in that particular structure.

Non-performance-related markers varied widely but shared a common thread in their relation to non-musical, social events and milestones. The volume of such responses supports the assertion that social relationships and bonding within a United States high school band program is more important to members than in other classes.

What types of social induction activities do participants describe having occurred in their high school band?

A wide range of induction activities was described, both teacher-led (official) and student-led (unofficial). Among teacher-led activities, there were three clear categories. These included introduction activities, events intended to introduce potential newcomers to the high school band, usually through marching or pep band activities. For some participants, such an activity changed their mind in favor of joining high school band; others described such an event as “scary.”

Do any of these types meet the working definition of hazing, or bear other resemblances to hazing?

Participants described a small number of hazing activities, far below what would be expected based on national surveys. Social desirability bias (Edwards, 1957) is one of the possible reasons for this difference. No participants identified hazing activities as such, possibly due to the lack of visible harm to people or property (although the risk of such harm was not insignificant in some hazing activities).

I analyzed the hazing incidents through the lens of Foucauldian disciplinary power. I claim that this conception of power helps to explain the readiness with which participants and

others described took part in hazing activities that were difficult and posed real risk of personal injury or damage to property.

One student narrative described a case of bullying, which is similar to hazing, but importantly different in that bullying victims are not given reason to believe that they will be welcomed into the group beyond the victimization. I also examined this participant's narratives about bullying and claim that this is another instantiation of disciplinary power, in which the bullying served as punishment for significant deviation from the norms of the band as perceived by the bullies.

Two student-led activities bore resemblances to hazing, based on Fontaine's (1986) descriptions of initiation. Two main factors were examined for each of these activities: pressure to participate felt by newcomers, and (un)equal participation between newcomers and veterans. In each case, this examination cast doubt on whether the activities involved a clear perception of power difference between newcomers and veterans. After reporting the saturation of participants describing anxiety or fear during their band induction, the role of fear in newcomer and veteran relationships was briefly examined.

Several teacher-led induction activities bore stronger resemblances to hazing, based not only on Fontaine's descriptions, but also in that they positioned newcomers as separate-from and, to an extent, less-than the veterans. Activities that make clear power position differences between newcomers and veterans may establish a culture within which hazing becomes more likely.

Finally, I (re)make the case that Foucauldian theories of power leave only small spaces for resistance. Larger changes in power relationships can only happen through the cumulative impact of these applications of the micro-physics of power. I suggest that welcoming, as a small

change in the application of power relationships, might be one way in which to work toward positive outcomes within the constraints of power as Foucault describes it.

CHAPTER SIX – FINDINGS AND ANALYSES ON BELONGING

Concepts of belonging are crucial to understandings of both the induction process and of hazing. Successful inductions are a precursor to a sense of belonging in the group. One of the most likely motivations to submit to hazing activities is the desire for belonging. In this chapter, I will show how my analysis suggests that high school band members conceive of their belonging in different ways according to their self-concept as a music performer. I will concurrently make an argument for what students need in order to be able to construct a sense of belonging in their high school band.

The majority of this chapter is organized by participant narrative. These narratives, in turn, are organized by their place in my categorizations of participant self-conceptualization as a music performer. Both of the main analytical thrusts of this chapter are based on the ways of belonging in high school band that were described to me in participant narratives. These were categorized between belonging through music performance (and directly related activities) and belonging through other, extra-musical, social connections within a band program. It is important to note that these two categories are not mutually exclusive; that is, although most participants showed a tendency to speak about belonging in terms of one category or the other, many gave evidence of having at least some sense of belonging via both categories.

Two Ways of Belonging

Participants that remained in their high school band program often spoke of a sense of belonging – not just getting “in,” but staying “in.” For most participants, this sense of belonging was based on feelings of connections more or less directly through music; a bond built on shared

goals and shared accomplishments in performance. Many constructed their sense of belonging around their musical contributions to these shared accomplishments.

Some participants, however, found other means to arrive at a similar sense of belonging. Most of these participants, I will argue, conceived of their musical skills and abilities as less than those of others; leaving them unable⁶⁵ to contribute musically to the group at a level that would help them feel belonging based upon musical contributions alone. These participants focused on other social connections within their band programs; more importantly, those that stayed in band throughout their high school years tended also to construct a “band self-concept” that allowed them to believe that they were contributing to the band’s success through extra-musical means. Those participants that did leave their band programs before graduation either did not describe finding a sense of belonging in band or else they described losing that feeling.

Based on these findings, I suggest that a successful induction—one that leads to a sense of being “in,” the band program—must also result in a sense of belonging in at least one of the two categories described above in order for students to remain in the group from year to year. Further, I submit that the paradigm of success as being “better-than”—ubiquitous in United States culture in general and in its high schools in particular—presents obstacles that may make it difficult or impossible to create a context in which *all* students conceive of themselves as

⁶⁵ “Unable” is based upon their circumstances, including the choices that they made. That is, I am not saying that, with time and concerted effort, these participants would not have, eventually, been able to make strong musical contributions to their high school band. I am saying that these participants did not feel that they were able to contribute, based on their self-assessment of their skill and ability levels in music performance.

adequate music performers in band.⁶⁶ Therefore, I suggest that attention to these extra-musical constructions of belonging is important for music educators.

Ways of Belonging Varied by Category of Self-Conceptualization as Performer

As I sorted out the descriptions of induction activities from the interview transcripts, I started to notice that the two categories of description—those directly related to music performance, and those related to other social events—were told to me by participants that spoke in noticeably different ways about their band experiences. Initially, I noticed that those participants that cited social induction activities and events that were not directly related to music performance seemed to be more enthusiastic when talking about their high school band. These participants spoke extensively about the non-musical social connections within their band, while those that cited music performance-related activities tended to talk less about these social connections.

When I re-read the transcripts examining these categories of description, I discovered that there was also a strong connection between participants' apparent self-concept as a band performer and the type of induction activities that they cited as their marker(s) of being "in." As I reread the transcripts, focusing more attention to how participants in each category spoke of their high school band induction, it became clear that there was also a difference in how they constructed their sense of belonging as members of their band.

⁶⁶ I am not suggesting, however, that band directors (and other educators leading music performance ensembles) should not try to create such a context. Indeed: although in-depth discussion of the means of creating an inclusive environment that fosters a sense of belonging for all students through musical performance is beyond the scope of this study, I would certainly advocate for the attempt to create such an environment.

Self-Concept Related to Musical Performance Skill and Ability Levels in Band

Since I did not ask participants about their self-concept as a music performer in band, I had to make inferences from the data that I did have. This data included any statements that the participants made that gave me some level of insight into said self-concept. Some of these statements were more matter-of-fact, such as those regarding audition results, solo and ensemble festival results, or participation in advanced ensembles (e.g., local youth symphonies). Some of the statements were even more direct: a few participants told me directly that they were—or were not—very good players in high school.

Other statements that I used to infer a category of self-concept as a musical performer were less direct. One participant said, “I don’t audition well, and I’m not that confident of a scale player” while another spoke of how her co-section leader “was a really good player, and then I was the one that wanted to make sure everyone had fun and had a good spirit”—implying that, in contrast, she was not a really good player.

In each case, these statements provide insight into the participant’s self-concept in regard to their skills and abilities as a musical performer in band. It must be remembered that none of this data can provide any direct evidence about their actual, measurable abilities as a band performer—even that data that told of participant accomplishments in adjudicated events. Ignoring all of the variables that could come into play in those situations (e.g., competition level, adjudicator biases, et cetera), I had only the participants’ descriptions of their experiences and no further evidence. I am not suggesting that any participants simply made up stories of their musical accomplishments—though this possibility cannot be wholly discounted. Rather, I am bearing in mind that memory is a sometimes-variable thing, subject to change, distortion, and loss. Simply put, I am not attempting to make any connection with musical performance

abilities—whatever metric one might use to measure them—but rather a connection with self-concept as a musical (band) performer. As such, the actual musical ability levels of participants are rendered moot: my concern is only with how participants conceptualized their ability.

Of course, self-conceptualizations of musical ability cannot be directly measured, either, even with direct questioning. In some ways, making inferences from the statements given could be considered to provide more authentic evidence than direct questioning, since consciousness of providing answers to direct questions could have impacts upon what participants said (e.g., the aforementioned social desirability bias (Edwards, 1957)). For these reasons, I chose to use statements that spoke to participants' self-concept as a band performer as evidence to classify participants as self-conceptualizing as weaker, neutral, or stronger music performers. I acknowledge that these broad categories leave room for debates of scale and boundaries of each category; that this is so provides additional rationale for further research as to the connection between these two variables.

Self-conceptualizing as a Stronger Musical Performer

In this section and the next, I will present several findings from my analyses via focused examinations—vignettes, if you will—of individual participants. Through this approach, I hope to present a stronger sense of how each participant conceived of his or her musical skills and abilities in different ways and how that self-conceptualization affected their means of finding a place in their high school band program in which to belong. While I acknowledge that every individual will construct, understand, and feel these things uniquely, it is also essential to find the ways in which individuals share certain commonalities, for it is in the commonalities that it is possible to begin to understand the phenomenon—or, perhaps, this cluster of phenomena—in ways that allow for informed decisions in real-life settings.

Participants who self-conceptualized as stronger music performers connected music performance or related events with being “in.”

Many of the participants made statements that suggested a self-concept as a stronger band performer. Not surprisingly, all of the participants classified as such also stayed in band for all four years of high school. This does beg the question of whether my impression of the participant, colored by my knowledge of whether or not they stayed in band, impacted my classifications of their self-concept category. I cannot say that this is impossible; however, my placement of participants into these categories was, at least on a conscious level, based solely upon data from the interview transcripts and not my impressions of the participants. I will present data for each of the participants supporting the category in which I placed them.⁶⁷

Amber

Amber was the participant who was placed into her school’s top band when an older member left the program after auditions. Although this turn of events did not change her skills and abilities, she felt that “that was pretty cool, because, oh, now I’m one of the good people.” Regardless of actual ability level, this quote shows how her self-perception changed as a result of circumstances that had no immediate impact on her actual performance level.

Amber also talked about other musical accomplishments in her high school band career, including auditioning to be first chair in the top band at her high school and second chair in the top jazz ensemble, playing for two years in all-state bands, and winning “best of room” honors at

⁶⁷ In most cases, those participants that were categorized as "neutral" did not provide enough evidence for either of the former classifications to merit placement in either category. In a few cases, the data provided off-setting evidence (roughly equal support for both categories), in which case I also left the participant’s classification as “neutral.”

solo and ensemble festival. These were all things that led me to categorize Amber as self-conceptualizing as a stronger music performer.⁶⁸ She made it clear that feeling like a good player helped her feel more “in” with the band. After talking about the audition process, she said that “being good made me feel more included.”

In the very next paragraph of the transcription, Amber described her “best in room” award, and how she felt afterward, when the band director(s) wrote the award on the whiteboard in the band room: “Now everyone must really know that I’m a good player, hopefully I can stop feeling pressured.” This is an interesting twist: not only did feeling like a good player help her feel more included but being publicly acknowledged as having official credentials as a good player led to hopes that she might feel less pressure.

In the next paragraph, Amber described making the all-state band, and how doing so meant that her name would be inscribed on a permanent plaque in the band hallway: “I liked feeling like I was categorized as one of the top players, and I never really felt . . . excluded in band by my junior and senior year, just because people know I’m good at my instrument.”

Amber never mentioned that she had felt excluded in band during her previous two years; however, she spoke several times about feeling pressure or anxiety about her performance level, and how that impacted her relationships with other (usually older) band members.

Amber did mention non-performance (but still music-related) social relationships when talking about starting marching band in the summer after her ninth-grade year, and how this made her feel a new level of “in”:

⁶⁸ These achievements only matter to my classification because Amber reported them, not because they factually happened or not. By her inclusion of these achievements in her narrative, Amber gives evidence of her self-concept as a musical performer. How anyone else might rate her as such does not matter, except as those opinions shaped Amber’s self-concept.

The marching band is such a big thing. I mean, it's not the main thing I guess, but there's just so many people in it. I think there's 150, roughly, people in the marching band, so that's almost half of the band in just one marching band. So, it made you more comfortable when you walk into the band room. You don't feel like you're walking on thin ice or anything. You just feel like this is where your second home is, and you can relax and be yourself. You know people there . . . It gave you a sense of belonging. You have to find your niche in the school, it's hard to be in-between all these groups and you don't really know who your people are. I think I realized sophomore year, after joining marching band, [that] band people are my people.

However, Amber's narrative made it clear that she was motivated by others' perceptions of her as a music performer. She talked about starting as a ninth-grader, and how self-perceptions as a musical performer started to change as soon as she auditioned into the second (of three) jazz bands:

I wasn't super confident in myself freshman year, but I was second chair as a freshman of my ensemble. So, I remember I tried out for jazz band I thought, "Oh, I'll make jazz three just like all the other freshmen do" and I made jazz two. So that was kind of like "Oh, I must be pretty good if I made jazz two." And then I tried out for marching band and they put me on the first part. And so, yeah, I think I realized I must be better than other people. Then I wanted to do more.

Earlier, I wrote about how Amber's change in ensemble placement changed her self-perception, even though the only thing that had changed was another person dropping band and not her ability as a band performer. Her statement above—"I must be better than other people"—makes it clear that her basis for believing that she was a good player was competition. She believed that she was more included because she was better at band than others, not because of any particular level of musical ability divorced from others' ability levels, nor because of any level of improvement in her musical abilities.

Amber's level of insecurity about what her place in the band would be had she not been an above-average player was on full display when I asked her what contextual conditions made her induction process possible:

I think it would have been different if I was bad at playing the trombone, because once the upperclassmen saw, "Oh, she can—she's pretty good, she can play her instrument."

Then I think they respected me a little bit more rather than if I was bad, then you might have a harder time getting involved and earning that respect from other people. It's kind of like, rather than "Oh, she's just another freshman," like, "She's a freshman, but she's pretty good, so she can hang with the big kids."

In the end, Amber's continuing success as a musical performer was enough for her to feel a sense of belonging based on her musical contributions to the group. Amber cited auditioning into the wind ensemble as her moment of being in; if this constituted her induction, then it was a successful one, as it led to the sense of belonging that lasted throughout her high school years.

Amber repeatedly positioned herself as a strong player, but also as a "better" player. "Better-than" was an essential part of Amber's self-concept as a music performer, one that allowed her to feel belonging. However, this is a model of success that is not transferable to all students—Amber's self-concept as a stronger music performer was predicated on systems of competition that do not allow for all students to receive the same reinforcements to self-concept that Amber received.

Carmen

In many ways, Carmen's narratives seemed like an echo of Amber's: quite similar, but less intense. Both played in the second jazz band as ninth-graders, then moved up to the top jazz ensemble as sophomores; both auditioned into the top concert band as sophomores, and both

enjoyed marching band. Carmen, however, did not mention many of the other credentials that Amber gave—there was no mention of all-state or solo and ensemble festival results.

Likewise, Carmen's words describing the connection between her playing ability and her sense of inclusion in the band were less intense. She spoke of how her time in jazz ensemble compared to and influenced her concert band experience:

My relationships were definitely strengthened with a lot of people in those smaller groups more than they were in the larger group, but I guess the “not being so much of a face in the crowd” was really nice. But I guess probably the most would be that I felt this kind of level of expertise after being in these smaller groups. I really had to be, technically, a lot better of a player. I couldn't really rely on the fact that I was in a giant group. So that made me a little bit more proud of my playing and more confident. With all of that, I took it a lot more easily, so I brought that into the bigger group from the smaller groups. I wouldn't say that the larger ensembles (were) where I developed techniques and some of my skills in playing. I would say that that came from the smaller groups . . . because you're an individual and you have to be good, and you have to practice.

Carmen believed that she was a “better” player, but not necessarily better than anyone else—just better than she had to be in the concert band. Her confidence in herself as a player is evident, but she did not show the same attention to internal competition—competition with others in the same band program—that Amber did. She talked about how band members shared a bond, regardless of playing ability:

I feel like you can get along with anyone, because you automatically have something in common: you all play an instrument, and you've all had your lessons, and you all had to have your one-on-ones with the director. There [were] things that you automatically have in common with people that made it really easy to talk to new people and get along with new people about.

Where Amber exhibited insecurity that required ever-increasing affirmations of her playing ability to bolster her confidence, Carmen displayed confidence that seemed to flow from her personal growth, rather than any comparison to others. She positioned herself as a strong, confident musician:

It made me feel important. Like I said, I felt like I was a part of something, but being in the smaller group, I felt like I was being heard more, and I felt more encouraged to play better, and work on it, and build myself. So, I felt like it helped a lot with my confidence in general, and with playing an instrument, a lot.

Both Amber and Carmen barely mentioned the non-performance social relationships within the band, although Carmen mentioned her relationship with her directors several times. As did Amber, Carmen seemed to connect her feelings of inclusion more with the performance-related aspects of being in the band program:

Part of feeling like I was in the band was finding which band I felt the most a part of . . . once I joined (jazz band) and started doing band in an extracurricular way, I felt a lot more a part of it.

Carmen also talked about the feeling of being a part of a smaller ensemble versus the larger concert band. She cited being proud of her membership as something more than being “just a part of, just in” an ensemble:

It made the people in jazz band feel a little bit more special, too, because you’re not in a group of 100 people, you’re in a 15-piece jazz band . . . (it was) something that I was proud of, (more) than something that I was just a part of, just in.

I cannot say for sure what Carmen meant by that last sentence, but it seems that she was parsing out the difference between the formality of being officially in the band—as one would be the moment that their name was entered into a computer roster for the high school course—and being truly “in” the group. Alternatively, perhaps, this is the difference between induction—getting “in”—and belonging, which is necessary for staying “in.” In either case, for Carmen, a big part of that next level was pride. From the lack of any mention of interpersonal relationships with other band members when talking about her induction process, I infer that

pride—presumably in performance—was a bigger part of that next level of being “in” than were other social relationships.

If, indeed, Carmen’s sense of belonging was based on pride in accomplishment and especially in her personal growth as a musician, her construction of belonging fits in a model that is available to a broader range of students than that construction which Amber described. While it is impossible for every student to be above-average—and, thus, very difficult to construct a musical performer self-concept as such—it is possible for every student to grow and improve as a musical performer, and to feel a sense of musical contribution to the group. This is a possible way in which music educators can work to shape the attitudes and beliefs of their group(s) membership: in opposition to outside paradigms that suggest that success in music is based upon being better than someone else; to dispel the dichotomy of winners and losers.

Hannah

Hannah barely mentioned the outcomes of her competitions—internally or externally to her band⁶⁹—but she stated explicitly the connection she felt between her perceived level of musical performance and her sense of being “in” her band. She said, “Competition and stuff was important to me, as far as feeling a part of the band. Just actually being good and contributing to the overall quality of the band. That felt really good.”

⁶⁹ Hannah talked to me about two different bands in which she was involved, since she transferred to a different school after tenth grade. All references to Hannah’s band are to the band program in her first school. I did not use her descriptions of her second school’s band program in this project. The justification for this omission is in the size of the program: Hannah’s second band consisted of only three students – too small of a group to provide the kind of social dynamics found in the vast majority of United States high school band programs.

I classified her as self-conceptualizing as a stronger music performer on the basis of statements like the above, and the following:

I learned about chairs, and at first, I was like, “Oh, that’s kind of weird.” But then I got into it and it was more of a burst of like, “Oh, this is cool!” And then that stayed there, that same level of competition, and the same level of, like, “We’re all in this together.” Which maybe isn’t a super healthy way to think about it, into competition, but I don’t know, that was just me. It was kind of a bummer, because for me, in middle school, I was first, and then obviously, in high school, I went down, because there’s seniors and juniors and sophomores in front of me. But I guess you could say that it [her chair placement] was really high and then it lowered a bit, and then it got high.

Hannah said a lot in that quote. She implied that she was the best player on her instrument in middle school and that she rose through the ranks in high school reasonably quickly (since she left the program after tenth grade; see footnote 69). She reiterated the connection she felt between competition, “being good,” and feeling like a part of the band. She also wondered aloud if being so “into competition” was a healthy way to approach her band experience.

Most curiously, she said in the same sentence that she maintained this level of competitiveness regarding chair placements and the same level of “we’re all in this together.” It is possible that she was referring to the members of her band all being together in the chair placement process; however, my interpretation—supported by the questioning of the healthiness of the internal competition that immediately follows—is that she was positioning herself as both a strong competitor as well as a good bandmate. She attempted to mediate the projection of her level of competitiveness by stating that there was, at the same time, a strong sense of camaraderie.

Is it possible to have the best of both worlds? That is, is it possible to create a culture within a group that allows competitive students like Hannah to feel accomplishment through her

success in internal competition without excluding space for success for those that come out on the other side of these competitions? This is a question that exceeds the scope of the present study yet touches on the issues at play.

Like Amber and Carmen, Hannah made minimal reference to interpersonal relationships in her descriptions of her high school band induction. All three focused almost exclusively on music performance-related aspects of their connection to their high school band programs.

Participants that self-conceptualized as stronger music performers framed social connections in terms of music performance.

Of the participants that I classified as self-conceptualizing as stronger music performers, all spoke of their connection to their bands via music performance. However, some of the participants in this category spoke of other social connections within band about as often as they spoke of their musical performance-related connections.

Ginny

I classified Ginny as self-conceptualizing as a stronger music performer based on her stated self-assessment (“Starting more in middle school, I became a serious musician.”), as well as her statements that she played in community youth music groups; and that, as a ninth-grader, she auditioned into the top band at her school, which otherwise excluded ninth-graders. When I asked her to describe the culture in her band program, she spoke of being “good at” band as a reason why some students were more connected within the band program:

You have the people who were really, “Music is what I like to do and I’m good at it, it’s something I like; I’m going to eat lunch in the band room”, and they were more connected with everyone and it wasn’t just, “Because I’m in wind symphony doesn’t mean I can’t talk to someone in concert band” or do anything like that. It was definitely more of an inclusive community.

While Ginny exhibited an enthusiasm for band through her speech rate, inflections, and gestures—things that do not appear in the transcript—the words that she spoke reflected less of this enthusiasm, once transferred to the page. Her descriptions are different from most others in that she spoke little about either her music performance or specific social interactions. Instead, she spoke about the mechanics of band performances (e.g., how the band schedule worked throughout the year, what kind of performances they had, et cetera), and her social interactions on a general level:

We do one new field show and a few parades, so we start with a week-long band camp over the summer, so that's the new freshmen's first introduction to joining a high school band and seeing what that looks like.

I know in my friend group, 'cause we were all friends, we were happy to be there, it's just another space where we can hang out, honestly. I think, I mean, so I surrounded myself with people that were excited to be there.

In this way, Ginny's narrative was unlike those of participants in either of the categories of self-conceptualization of music performance abilities; most of the participants spoke in more strongly emotional terms about either performance or social events, respective to their category. The one area that Ginny seemed most passionate about, based on the number of times that she mentioned it, was her sense that band was a place to belong, even if she did not specifically mention her sense of belonging:

It was clear that they [the band directors] care about us as individuals and want us to be there and have a good time, so I think trying to make spaces where people felt comfortable coming back and eating their lunch there or finding friends and having that be a good space to do that was important as well. And so, I think making time for building some of those connections within peers, then also getting to know the directors, I think was a goal as well.

I think it was trying to make it available as an option if people wanted to use it in that way, but it wasn't necessarily use it to "make all your friends here!" you know? I think it was, this is a space where you can if you want to, trying to make that as accessible as possible, but [it's] up to you if you're going to use it as a space or if you're just going to show up, play, and then leave.

Ginny constructed her sense of belonging both through her musical contributions and through her extra-musical social connections. She created space for students that use either construction when she said that the band room was a place that people could hang out in for extra-musical social connection, or “to show up, play, and then leave.”

While Ginny seemed quite confident in her success as a musical performer, she did not focus much on her success in terms of internal competition. Her statements about getting into the top-level ensemble as a ninth-grader seemed to be made by way of explanation of her situation, rather than as an attempt to position herself as a stronger music performer.

Nancy

Nancy was one of the participants that only completed one interview session, but she said a lot in that one session. When I first started ideating the categorization of participants based on their self-conceptualization as music performers, my initial perception was that Nancy would be a counter-example. This was because she spoke so much and so passionately about the social connections within her band. However, after re-reading her transcripts several more times with an eye toward the categories of description in use (performance-related and non-performance-related), it became clear that Nancy did fit the pattern of strong performers through her descriptions of performance-related connections to being “in”:

Once I started to feel comfortable with marching and playing . . . I started to feel a little bit more a part of the group because I was focusing less on the mechanics of what I was doing and more about the bigger picture and also the social aspect.

An interesting difference in Nancy’s narrative was that she framed her performance-related issues as insecurities that she needed to address before being able to focus on social connections within the band. This came up several times:

The concert band, I think right away I felt like I was part of the group, especially because I made it into the top group as a freshman . . . Most people start out in the second group . . . I think there was a little bit of me feeling kind of the same thing, like I wasn't going to be good enough which held me back, socially, a little bit.

As soon as I was playing the parts and succeeding, I felt like I was more a part of the group. I guess for me personally it was really about the skill level. I don't think it was ever really a social thing that I felt a part of the social group. It was myself perceiving whether or not I was good enough and whether I was ready enough to be a part of the group. I don't think anybody else really actually put that upon me. I just kind of put it upon myself.

Nancy's descriptions of the social aspects of her high school band program align with the ways that other participants who were categorized as self-conceptualizing as strong performers talked about social connections (if at all): she did not talk about individual, interpersonal relationships, but rather about the connections that bound the group as a whole:

We felt very much like a family throughout all four years. There were people in the band that I didn't talk to as much. There were people I would talk to more. For the most part everybody was kind of one group. We all had certain goals that we were all working towards and certain expectations of each other, too, that we were all working towards.

Nancy said something in the above quote that is critical to understanding how participants understood their social connections in band: "We all had certain goals that we were all working towards and certain expectations of each other, too, that we were all working towards." Nancy constructed her high school band's social bonds as having a *raison d'être* directly related to their performance goals. This was confirmed at several other points in her narrative:

Our directors, they fostered an environment that really pushed welcoming everybody and wanting everybody to feel like it was a family. Because it's such a strong program, I think when you're really good at something, that group tends to be pretty close. A lot of people are the same kind of ideology, the same kind of mindset, all working towards the same goal.

Nancy's narrative also suggests that a focus on excellence in performance alone might not be enough to foster the kind of strong group bonds that were evident in her descriptions of her high school band. She spoke of how her directors emphasized the social aspects of band at the same time that they emphasized strong performance: "Then they talked as I got older and became more of a leader within the group, they would talk to us specifically about including everybody, welcoming everybody, being nice to everybody, being willing to help out if needed."

Like Ginny, Nancy constructed belonging in both musical and extra-musical ways. As much as possible, then, fostering both of these dual constructions of belonging among members of a band program might provide the strongest "safety net" of belonging. Students in a situation wherein they feel such a dually funded sense of belonging might be able to endure the loss of one or the other source without losing the overall sense of belonging. This is an important consideration, since, as a participant's narrative later in this chapter will show, it is entirely possible to construct one sense of belonging that is undercut by shifting realities.

Patti

I classified Patti as self-conceptualizing as a stronger performer. This was based upon her auditioning into the top jazz ensemble as an underclass-person (something that she indicated was relatively rare in her school) and being a section leader in marching band, which she said was an assignment predicated mostly on being able to play well.

Patti's narrative followed many of the same contours as did Nancy's: both were in high school band programs that had strong competitive marching bands, and both spoke of how their feelings of being "in" were tied to performance-related aspects of their experiences. Both also talked about the non-musical social aspects of their band programs, and both made the

connection between the overall bonds of the band as a social group to the shared goals and values of the group. The biggest difference between the two narratives was that Nancy specifically credited her directors with making efforts to make the group inclusive, while Patti indicated that she thought that the inclusivity and social bonds in her group were secondary to the performance aspect:

There weren't any activities we did together to like make the freshmen feel like part of the band or anything like that. And maybe it wasn't until like the first football game and your first performance where you felt like, "Yeah, okay. I'm doing this, and I'm like a member of this group, and they need me to be there because there's no one else to take my spot if I'm not there!"

The last statement hints at a way in which all students in her marching band—not just those that performed at a higher level—could construct a sense of belonging. Visually, if not musically, her absence would leave a literal hole in the group, a noticeably out-of-place gap between other band members. This aligns with Osterman's (2000) statement on belonging: "The members feel that the group is important to them and that they are important to the group" (p. 324). Patti cited several performance-related events during her ninth-grade marching band season that gave her escalating feelings of belonging: "It's those performances I think that made me feel like I belonged."

In Patti's narrative, older students (section leaders) were assigned to help lead each smaller group of instruments. It was clear that section leaders played a significant role in the inclusion (or non-inclusion) of newcomers to the band:

I think without that kind of camaraderie within your section, this whole induction wouldn't be possible. You'd just feel super lost just because the band is so large. In terms of doing that, that meant having section-wear or whatever it is . . . [which] further makes you feel like you belong in a group within an even larger band.

After confirming that Patti had been a section leader later in her time in high school band, I asked if, as was evident in Nancy's narrative, section leaders at her school were encouraged to make sure that newcomers were welcomed. She was quick to respond to the contrary, but during her extended response, she seemed to think about why so many section leaders came to be so welcoming even without encouragement from the directors:

It's not like they were being told by the director like, "Hey, you need to make the freshmen part of the group," but that's what they naturally did . . . when I came [to] my senior year, I took note of things. Like what did I really like from my previous section leaders, and what don't I want to be, either? . . . The facilitation of a conducive, friendly environment came secondary, but it also came with it too, if you're trying and taking the time.

Performing the role of section leader well required "the facilitation of a conducive, friendly environment," even if the director did not explicitly say it. The aggregate performance of earlier section leaders made this a part of the role. Note also, the use of the word "naturally," harkening back to Foucault's notions of power/knowledge, making certain ways of doing seem like the "natural order of things."

She also made apparent connections between the social connections of the band and the unity that the members felt in shared accomplishment, saying, "You had this common, binding interest." This is an important point to consider. While I am claiming that students holding self-concepts as a stronger music performer tend to connect being "in," and even belonging, to things related to music performance, this does not mean that these self-conceptualized stronger performers felt that social bonds were unimportant, or that they were ignoring social bonds in their focus on musical performance.

Earlier, I wrote about labeling the category of things that were connected to feelings of being "in" and belonging among students who self-conceptualized as weaker music performers. I

wrote that I gave this category the label of “other” social connections, because music performance is, itself, a social activity. Here is the importance of that distinction: strong performers often find the social bonds that they need for a successful induction and ongoing belonging through music performance and the activities directly related to it.

Patti provided testimony to this when speaking about why the time immediately after her first state championship marching band performance was such a crucial moment in her arrival at feelings of fully “in”:

When you’re in competition mode, you’re gonna be all in, and you have to put your focus out, your very best. But then after that, it’s like everyone is in the same train of thought in terms of, we’re waiting for a score and we want the best outcome for what we just did. I mean, people would have mixed feelings of the performance, but it was that whole . . . all of us standing together in the cold after taking our uniforms off and just waiting to hear back, whether it was at a local competition or the statewide competition. It was just those moments of anticipation, just thinking, “Hey, we did everything we could, and we did it together.”

It’s a lot of feelings of accomplishments but also a unity because it’s a collective accomplishment . . . everyone’s feeding off each other’s energies, so it’s just this whole bubble of energy and excitement about being in, about feeling like you’re part of the band. And accomplishing this thing together.

Patti’s successful construction of a sense of belonging was based, in part, on her perceived strength as a music performer. However, as the statement about the impact that her absence would have upon the band suggested, part of her sense of belonging was simply having a role that no one else could fill—at least not without days of teaching someone else to march her spot in the drill. Although this construction of belonging is not as directly applicable to concert band, where the visual aspect of performance is far less important, the attitude that every member is vital to the performance and not easily replaced can still be promoted as a means to provide a path for all students to reach a sense of belonging.

An induction deferred – Charlise.

Charlise was the participant whose narrative told of being bullied in band throughout her ninth-grade year.⁷⁰ It was easy for me to categorize her as self-conceptualizing as a strong performer: a central part of her story was being placed in the top band as a ninth-grader when that band was usually not accessible to ninth-graders. Also, she spoke of starting lessons years before the other students in her band, being involved in all-state bands, and participating in a local youth ensemble, into which only advanced students could audition successfully. Perhaps most telling was that, upon being placed as the last chair in the top band at her school, she proceeded to chair-challenge (a head-to-head audition process) several players that were seated above her, because she “just wanted to play the parts that I thought that I deserved.”

Speaking of her band program in general—before any mention of the bullying incidents—Charlise indicated that her band program did have cohesive, social bonds: “Everyone got along pretty well. I think we had a really good sense of community. People would go into the band room for lunch breaks and just kind of hang out.”

Like every other participant whom I categorized as conceptualizing as a strong performer, Charlise made connections between music performance and being “in”:

We [Charlise and ninth-grade band friends] got to be all around each other in marching band, which was great because I got to be with people that I know. There was a point where someone who had the trumpet solo for that year got his wisdom teeth out, so I got to take his place. My sister also had a solo and so we were kind of soloing at the same time on the field. It felt cool but also it felt like I was in it rather than just present.

⁷⁰ Again, though she claimed it was not bullying, I claim that it fits the definition of bullying quite well.

Here, Charlise made clear that being “in” was different from merely being present with the rest of the band. It is also telling that, by way of contrast, she inferred that she did *not* feel “in” for most of the time during her ninth-grade year of band. This was soon made even more explicit:

A real sense of belonging, like I was valued, had a relationship with my teacher, everything like that probably wasn't until sophomore, junior year, when I was able to establish myself, and have leadership positions, and be able to have one-on-one time with my band director and kind of talk to her and make a difference in the band program. It took me a while, but I feel like my situation was a little different compared to people my age. I'm sure there are people in my age group, I'm sure they felt more [of a] sense of belonging because they got to rehearse together and do all these things together and I was kind of like the odd ball out.

As with many other participants in the strong performer category, Charlise experienced feelings of belonging that were connected to personal contributions to the success of the group. She said that she felt a sense of belonging, in part, because she could “make a difference in the band program.” She also suggested that perhaps other ninth-graders in her program felt a sense of belonging due to rehearsing together, but it is not clear whether she thought that this would be so because of the time they spent together or because of the shared purpose in working toward a performance.

However, Charlise said that she did not experience these feelings regularly until her tenth-grade year. It is impossible to say whether, absent the bullying she experienced, she would have felt “in” or a sense of belonging in the company of the older students in her concert ensemble during her ninth-grade year. Perhaps the bullying was the root cause of her feelings of exclusion, or perhaps it only exacerbated the feelings of isolation caused by the absence of her same-age friends. In either case, it is apparent that Charlise's full induction into the social side of her high school band program was delayed by a year. While other participants reported feeling

like they were not fully “in” for most or all of their first year in band, Charlise was the only one to say that she regularly felt the opposite of being included—being actively excluded—during that time.

Like Amber and Hannah, Charlise cited internal competition as something that motivated her in her early years of band. Charlise, though, said that this changed for her through her years in her high school band:

I think it (being the only ninth-grader in her band) made me work harder, just because I was with a lot of older people. Being the younger one, I thought that I had to stay level with everyone or beat them. Just naturally competitive. But I think I worked a lot harder to prove myself because I was with these older people.

And then I think that when the years progressed...it's not that I didn't try as much, but I started joining groups like [Metro] youth symphony orchestra, and other things like that. So those were my new challenges, versus wind ensemble being my new challenge.

So, it's not that I threw it off to the side or anything, but since I was with my friends, I just became a little less competitive, I'd say, in that specific ensemble. Not as a musician, but just in high school band, because nothing got easier. It's just that I didn't feel like I needed to match up to these people who were older and bigger than me, and it was like, “Now we're all moving up together as an ensemble” kind of thing.

“Now we're all moving up together as an ensemble” echoes Hannah's statement of “We're all in this together.” Where Hannah was speaking of this in a setting concurrent to her internal competitiveness, however, Charlise was indicating that she had moved away from a strong sense of internal competitiveness to a sense of shared purpose and goals. She said that she no longer felt like she “needed to match up,” which freed her to buy in more strongly to the concept of group accomplishment.

Whether this change was a matter of an evolving attitude or an actual response to the removal of a perceived threat cannot be readily discerned. In any case, however, it is interesting

to take note of Charlise's transition in her attitudes toward internal competition within her high school band.

Finally, the negative experiences that Charlise experienced during her ninth-grade year were not passed on, according to her narrative:

It also helped when younger people came into . . . the wind ensemble; I would do the opposite of what people did to me, because it made me feel terrible, so I never want to make anyone else feel terrible . . . I think that it honestly changed my life and how I view accepting people and making sure that everyone feels included, and I guess I'm just more of an inclusive person over all, because of that one year.

A critical point to take from Charlise's narrative is that even a student with the most firmly-held self-concept as an exceptionally strong musical performer can be excluded from a sense of belonging within the band program: Charlise said that she seriously considered discontinuing her participation in band at the end of her ninth-grade year.

Between two categories: Kelly.

I classified one other participant, Kelly, as self-conceptualizing as a stronger music performer, by her reporting that she had taken a solo to the state contest twice. This was, in my judgment, the weakest justification for said classification among all the participants so classified. Kelly's position at or near the border between the strong performer category and the neutral category may have been a factor in the mixed ways in which Kelly felt "in." However, as I will claim later, director leadership may have also played an important role in this.

As with every other participant whom I classified as self-conceptualizing as a strong music performer, Kelly cited performance-related events as moments when she felt fully "in" her high school band:

My first football game was really cool 'cause we marched onto the field and then we performed, and it was really awesome. I had a sense of belonging, because it

felt really good to be performing and be with my friends. And it was really cool to see our progress from when I first started, and we were all first learning how to march to our big performance . . . I'd say the first time I felt like I was actually a full member of the band was after our first football game because I had performed and they cheered for us . . . it just felt good to be a part of a group of 60 or 70 people all having a common goal.

In the last sentence, Kelly directly spoke to the unifying influence of having a shared goal. This is a common theme among participants self-conceptualizing as strong performers, and Kelly used the same language more than once:

I think it definitely made me feel like more part of the group just because everyone was mostly pretty welcoming. And like I've said before, we were working towards the common goal of the Fourth of July parade or the homecoming show. There were definitely times I was like, "I don't want to go to band practice. I don't want to march today." But I always felt good after it because I felt like we had accomplished something.

Shared goals and shared accomplishment are both mentioned in the above quote, and I claim that these are important factors in forming a sense of belonging in high school bands, based on how often these things were mentioned or alluded to in participant narratives.

However, this was not the only way in which Kelly felt "in." As described earlier, Kelly told the story of a game, ostensibly for team-building, that her band director had led them in. The game was one of deceit, where the actual keys to success were unknown to newcomers but known to all of the veterans. Kelly said that she felt "in" after she had figured the game out, and she described it as a fun activity that she believed built camaraderie.

There were hints in her narrative that she did not necessarily believe that this game was always fun for the newcomers. She said, "You'd see everybody smirking at the people who didn't understand it," and also mentioned it as one of the hardships that were made easier by

having friends in band with her: “It made me feel good that I wasn’t the only person going through being out in the sun all day, and not being able to figure the tricks of the games that we played.”

Kelly also gave mixed messages about how welcoming the veterans were being to newcomers. She said that “the upperclassmen were so welcoming” and, “I think probably the way that we were welcomed into the band made me more willing to put in the effort,” but also, “I think even if the upperclassmen weren’t necessarily inclusive to everybody ... I mean, they tried their best.”

What is to be made of the mixed messages from Kelly, and the mixed ways in which she talked about feeling “in” her high school band? As mentioned earlier, it is entirely reasonable to conclude that Kelly’s position nearer to the “neutral” classification on the scale of self-conceptualization as a music performer may explain the way in which she straddled the two different categories of feeling “in.”

Possible effects of adult leadership style.

The “team-building” games that Kelly described point to another possible factor: director (teacher) influence upon the band culture in Kelly’s high school. Kelly was clear that the games she described had come from her director (“I don’t know where my band director found it”), and that he had led the band in playing them. He apparently encouraged the veterans to keep the secrets of the games from the newcomers.

The narratives of the last three participants provide a comparison: Nancy said her directors encouraged excellence in performance, but also explicitly encouraged student leadership to be welcoming and inclusive of newcomers. Patti said that her directors made no

explicit effort to encourage veterans to be welcoming to the newcomers but did encourage excellence in performance—and that the section leaders, for the most part, were welcoming as a function of encouraging performance growth. Kelly did not talk extensively about excellence in performance and said her director used a game that deceived and frustrated newcomers (albeit temporarily) as a “team-building” exercise.

All of these three participants described feeling a sense of being “in” and belonging based upon their musical performance contributions to the band. Nancy felt that being welcoming and inclusive to newcomers was important, at least in part because she had been explicitly told that it was so. Patti felt that being inclusive and welcoming happened “naturally” when members of a group were working together toward excellence in performance. Kelly gave mixed messages about the welcoming level in her band and took some measure of delight in seeing newcomers struggle, just as she had struggled when she was a newcomer.

At the end of the previous chapter, I alluded to the impact that an authority figure, such as a teacher, could have on the culture of the band program, even when the teacher is not directly involved in certain activities. By providing a model in which newcomers are welcomed, in part, based on their passage through a test that is completely unrelated to the explicit goals of the organization (i.e., music performance) a standard is set that could encourage further, unsupervised tests for newcomers, up to and including hazing.

Any time that newcomers are treated as “less-than” by adult authority figures, the door is opened for veterans to also treat newcomers as “less-than,” even if said authority figures explicitly instruct the veterans not to do so; it is widely accepted that “Do as I say, not as I do” is not a useful leadership model. This issue will be revisited at the end of the section on participants whom I classified as having self-concepts as weaker performers.

Summary of the category of self-conceptualizing as a stronger performer.

Woven throughout the narratives of the participants whom I categorized as strong performers are several key similarities. Based on these findings, I make the following claims:

- These participants described music performance (or directly related) events or milestones, and especially their contributions through music performance, as being central to their feelings of belonging to their high school bands.
- These participants sometimes referred to non-musical, social connections and related events in band. These connections were most often cited as a result of shared group goals and accomplishments.
- These participants rarely mentioned friendships with individuals or specific, interpersonal relationships. Instead, they often referred to whole-group bonds. Variations of the phrase “We’re all in this together” were often used concerning group bonds.

Self-Conceptualizing as a Weaker Musical Performer

As stated earlier, one of the difficulties I had in categorizing participants based on their self-concept as a musical performer was the absence of direct-response data. Since I did not have any pre-research ideas of the connections between self-concept as a musical performer and the ways in which participants thought about being “in,” I did not write questions in my interview script to ask participants how they thought of themselves as a musical performer.

However, as I also have argued earlier, this could be considered a blessing in disguise, especially when it comes to the participants whom I categorized as self-conceptualizing as weaker performers. In addition to my suspicions that the aforementioned social desirability bias (Edwards, 1957) might directly lead participants to avoid answering in ways that made them

look “less-than” others, I also suspect that possible additional insecurities would alter further responses on the part of the participants. That is, after a participant has “admitted” to being a weaker musical performer in their band (at least within their self-concept), they may be even more self-conscious of the image that they are presenting to someone that they know to be pursuing a doctorate in music education: likely an accomplished musician and almost certainly a music teacher of some sort. Put simply, I think that the specter of admitting to the band director that one did not practice⁷¹ would loom over any responses after answering such a question.

The other positive aspect of the absence of direct questioning is that, without any added self-consciousness about their musical abilities, some participants said things that painted a picture of their self-concept as a music performer that was more nuanced than anything that direct questioning could have achieved. For example, Stella (whom we will hear from later in this section) might have responded to direct questioning about her performance abilities by saying that she was a strong musical performer, based on her earlier years of orchestra experience. However, her narratives about starting band during her senior year showed significant insecurities about her ability to perform in a new and different (band) context. On the whole, this also demonstrates the elegance of narrative methods of research: the participants provided data for which I did not even realize I was looking.

Participants who self-conceptualized as weaker music performers often quit band in the first two years.

Many of the participants whom I categorized as self-conceptualizing as weaker music performers did not stay in band past their tenth-grade year. The correlation between the category

⁷¹ This is not to suggest that all of the participants in this category failed to practice.

and the result may seem obvious; however, I do not believe that this is a trivial detail. Students that leave (i.e., do not re-enroll in) music performance classes may not have any other music education during high school. This is an issue for anyone who believes that all students can benefit from music education. Further, as we will see later in this section, it is far from a given that students who self-conceptualize as weaker performers will leave their high school band programs. Several participants in this category stayed in band throughout their high school years, and some even went on to play in concert or marching bands at their university.

Finally, there is a relevant saying about education: tulips bloom in the spring, and mums bloom in the fall. This saying is a reminder that all students have potential, but some “blossom” later than others. While it is all but certain that some students will choose not to re-enroll in elective band classes, creating an environment and culture in which all performers can find a way to be “in” and to belong could result in more students staying in band longer. Moreover, it may result in some of those who believe that they are weaker performers changing their self-concept when the time comes for them to “bloom.”

Max

It was not an obvious choice to categorize Max as someone who self-conceptualized as a weaker musical performer because there were not strong implications to that end from any one thing that he said. However, as I went over his narrative several times, I realized that many things pointed in the direction of a self-concept as a weaker player. One was his description of his band program when asked about the culture within it:

It was not as dedicated as it could have been. Meaning, there's a lot of people that are just in it to be in it. Not to say a lot of people were, but there was a good amount of people like that and there's always the kids that were in it to really...they were really passionate about it. Sometimes they voiced their

frustration about the people that weren't exactly, "taking it seriously," is how they would put it.

The hints about Max's self-concept that can be found in this quote are subtle ones. It is apparent that he was positioning himself outside of the people that were "really passionate" about band. He also spoke of the people that were "in it just to be in it," but he did not refer to this group as "they," as he did for the passionate band members. Max would appear to have been positioning himself in the middle of this spectrum of band attitudes, but his language suggests that he identified more with the "in it just to be in it" category than he did the "really passionate" group.

Max played clarinet, which he "really hated," for three years in middle school so that he would be eligible to play saxophone in high school:

So, when I finally could play the saxophone, I was pretty happy, and I did take pride in that part of band . . . [but] it kind of faded, I want to say halfway to two-thirds of the way through the school year. My freshman year just kind of faded. I wasn't as into it. I just really didn't...I was just there because I was...I was there. So, I didn't go any extra mile or anything. I stopped practicing as much at home. I would usually practice when I wanted to play because that's why you play an instrument; it's fun. But when I lost interest in playing my saxophone, then it was just impossible for me to practice because I didn't want to; it wasn't interesting to me. So, I didn't want to force myself to do it. So, I stopped playing it as much and I kind of just lost any attention for band, I could say, about two-thirds of the way through my freshman year.

When Max's excitement faded, he was "just there because I was there"—almost exactly as he had described the students that were "in it just to be in it" earlier. To be sure, enthusiasm about band does not directly equate to one's self-concept as a music performer; however, a pattern is being established. When his enthusiasm faded, so did his practice time, along with any extra effort that he once might have put into band.

Max may be the closest to the category of “neutral” among the participants in this category. His narrative, however, provides rich data in several ways, regardless of the category in which I placed him. Whether or not he viewed himself as a weaker band performer, he did view his connections to band in ways that were quite similar to others in the category of those who did.

Max had said that he finally felt “in” at his first basketball pep band performance—about a third of the way into his ninth-grade year—and then said that he lost his enthusiasm about two-thirds of the way through ninth-grade. I asked him what it felt like to be “in.” I asked, “Did you feel like, ‘this is my group?’” He responded hesitantly, starting and stopping his response several times:

No, not like that. It wasn’t like, “Oh wow, I found my calling,” or anything like that. It was more like ... more like in ... I saw ... I viewed band as like a part ... a bigger part of being in high school, so I was kinda like, “Oh, so this is what it’s like to be in ... in high school now.”

This is very unlike the ways in which the participants that self-conceptualized as stronger performers talked about being “in.” When Max told the story of his first pep band (as recounted in the last chapter), the feelings that he described seemed more like nostalgia than belonging. The above quote suggests that Max had a concept of what high school would be like, and part of that included being in the band while playing the songs that he grew up hearing at basketball games. This begs the question: did Max feel “in” the band, or “in” the high school at that moment? It certainly seems, from his own words, that it was the latter.

Other than the aforementioned pep band performance and his professed love for the saxophone, Max did not speak of music performance at all during his narrative. He did not

mention shared goals or accomplishment, nor any kind of bond with his band as a whole, although he did speak of enjoying having his friends in band with him:

It was actually pretty fun. It was a good time. All my friends, one of them played alto saxophone and the rest played percussion so we were never in kind of close proximity to each other, but when we were, it was a good time. It's not like we were constantly hanging out during band because the band, it was pretty big. Marching bands are ordered, so percussion go behind. But I still had a good time. I enjoyed myself with my friends.

This emphasis on friendship and having fun, rather than full-band unity and shared goals and accomplishments is something that will come up often in the narratives of the participants whom I categorized as self-conceptualizing as weaker music performers. This is not offered here as evidence that Max belongs in that category, but rather as a contrast to the ways in which those that self-conceptualized as stronger performers spoke of being “in” and belonging. Also, this lack of feeling a group bond is not inherent in the person. When I asked Max if he had felt a social bond with his sports teams, he said, “Yeah, absolutely.”

After talking about our experiences a bit more, I said, “I was going to guess that when you said that, that you felt that bond because you were all going for the same thing, but it was absent...for whatever reason, it was absent for you in band.”

Max replied, “It was. Other people had the feeling, I could tell. The group I was talking about that really enjoyed band, I could tell they had that cohesiveness but...I'd say in sports, yeah, absolutely.”

In summary, Max spoke of the times that he enjoyed in band in terms of the fun that he had with his friends, not in any terms of music performance. He said that he did not feel a cohesive bond in band, but that he thought that others in the band did feel such a bond. In the

end, Max left the band program after his tenth-grade year, failing to find a sense of belonging either through music performance or through extra-musical social connections.

Finally, although race is not an area of focus in this study, I want to point out that Max was the only participant in the study that identified as Black, and, more importantly, that he said that there was only one other Black student (one of his best friends) in his band. While some may claim that race should not play a part in whether or not students feel a sense of belonging in high school band, to ignore the fact that it *does* play a part is to do a disservice to students like Max, who live the reality of a minority population in an overwhelming majority context. It strains credulity to suggest that being one of only two Black students in a band of approximately 50 (mostly White) students (based on Max's narrative) would have no impact on one's construction of a sense of belonging. Whether, in the end, this played a significant role in Max's departure from band is unknown, but to completely ignore the dynamics of race in this situation would be to ignore the elephant in the band room.

Rhianna

Rhianna and her family moved back to the United States during her eighth-grade year. She faced several challenges related to moving back just before she started high school, not the least of which was that, because her school in England did not have a band program, she had only taken private lessons on flute, and found that she was well behind the skill level of the other students in her band:

I remember the music was so ... I got it a week before and I had to learn it. The music was so hard for me. I just couldn't do it. I played the flute, and the flute can be really loud. If you mess up, it's really loud. I would honestly just finger the [parts]. I wouldn't play it or blow through the flute 'cause I was just so scared of messing up. So, I think I felt disconnected 'cause I wasn't actually playing the music at all.

Same with during class, 'cause you're kind of like ... I was right next to people and right next to ... This sounds stupid, but there were boys in my grade that I thought were cute and they were sitting behind me and I didn't want them to hear me mess up. So, I was not really playing. So, I think I was just never really connected and then, yeah, I never really tried to play the music.

With this evidence, I felt quite confident in placing Rhianna in the category of participants who self-conceptualized as weaker players. However, there is more in this quote to which to pay attention. In the first paragraph, she said that she felt disconnected when she was not playing the music, and in the second paragraph, she reiterated that she never really connected because she was not really playing. Although she did not say it explicitly, it is apparent that Rhianna knew, at some level, that there is a connection to other band members that can be found when playing music together. She never felt that connection, though, because she was usually not playing, choosing the safety of going through the motions over the potential embarrassment of having her mistakes heard.

Rhianna did not mention that this was a missing component for her, however. She said, "I think I enjoyed meeting different people, but [band] wasn't really for me," focusing on the non-musical, social aspects of band. At no point in her narrative did she come so near to tying musical performance to any kind of social bond as she did in her first quote (previous page); although, as we will see later, there were further hints that she knew that there were connections on which she was missing out. Instead, she focused on other factors that led to her unsuccessful induction into high school band:

I didn't have that much confidence as a freshman, so it was so embarrassing for me to dress in that uniform and march in the parade. I didn't particularly like it. I think as you get older you get more confidence. I think if I did it now, I'd be more like, "Yeah, this is a group I'm in. I'm really enjoying being part of this community." But at the time, I was just like, "Oh, I'm just going to wait till the end of the year." Yeah, the uniforms and doing marching band and stuff (were the

worst). I generally really like music, so I did enjoy playing the different songs and stuff.

Rhianna believed that had she had more confidence at the time, she would have found a place in the band community. Certainly, this may have been the case, especially if that confidence had been parlayed into actually playing her flute; she did say that she liked music and that she enjoyed playing.

Later, Rhianna hinted again at the bonds formed through common purpose that many others spoke of:

So, it's not like I was ever alone, it was just I never really felt part of the group, honestly, throughout the whole year. Maybe marching band, during the performance. Maybe that was the only time where I was like, "Oh, we're all doing this together."

I found this curious since she had said earlier that wearing the uniform was "so embarrassing" for her and that she did not like doing so. When I asked her about this seeming contradiction, she said, "I guess it's like, 'Yeah, this makes me anxious and it sucks.' But then looking back, it's like, 'Well we all had to do that. We were all doing this together.'"

Rhianna, when questioned about when she first felt a part of her band, had asked, "But what if I never felt really part of it, I didn't have a connection?" Yet she used words in the previous quote that are very similar to those used by many of the participants who felt a strong bond with their band – we were all in it together. In addition to shared goals and accomplishments, this indicates that shared hardships can also have unifying effects among group members.

Although this chapter is not "about" hazing, I acknowledge here that the claim that shared hardships have unifying effects does, in some ways, support one rationale sometimes given for hazing. However, there is a crucial caveat: if only newcomers are sharing that hardship,

then only the newcomers will experience any unifying effects. In a context where veterans and newcomers all share hardships on a relatively equal basis, this unity is also shared, and the likelihood of hazing is far less (see Chapter Five).

Rhianna knew that there was a bond that could be found in band, but, for various reasons, she lacked the security in her social interactions and the skills in playing her instrument to experience that bond fully. Later, she came close to saying this outright:

I told you about the uniform and marching, I was insecure about that, [but] I think it made me feel a little better about it because I was like “okay, we’re all doing this,” but at the same time it was like – I dreaded it because I only knew one girl and I was like, “I hate this.”

Rhianna felt some of the group bonds provided by sharing experiences, especially difficult experiences. However, she lacked the musical skills to participate at a level that would allow her to feel a connection through shared achievement, and she lacked the other social connections to people in her band to carry her past her lack of a musical connection:

I also didn’t have any close friends in band. So that was another thing that impacted my band experience was I didn’t have any friends really in there. I had some, but no one close . . . I was still learning people and making friends. I definitely was very anxious when I moved back. Just having all these people form all these opinions of me all at once, ‘cause nobody knew who I was. It was very anxious for me . . . I mean there were clear friendships within band, it’s just I never found that.

There was one more factor that worked against Rhianna’s chances of a successful induction into her high school band—the friction between sports and band at her high school:

Band was the cool thing to do, at least at that middle school. So, the people there, I connected with way more. Whereas in high school, it’s like I just didn’t. I was more with the athletic crowd, with all the sports and stuff. So, I really couldn’t connect well. ‘Cause a lot of the people in this band, I felt like they felt outcast, or they didn’t like . . . ‘Cause there was a lot of beef between the athletic crowd and the band crowd. I don’t know. I just didn’t really connect with anyone . . . my school is like divided in the sports program and the fine arts program . . .

I feel like for other people who are really into band, it really gave them a group of friends because I know a lot of the people who were really into fine arts and band, they were together, they were always friends, they would date each other, that kind of thing. So, I think it probably gave them just a sense of belonging because they didn't fit in with the sports kind of stuff.

Rhianna felt that she had to choose between the athletic crowd and the fine arts crowd. Her narrative suggests that, at her school, belonging in both crowds was difficult or impossible, at least for her. Perhaps being a member of the athletic crowd in her school required exhibiting negative feelings about the members of the fine arts crowd, and *vice versa*. The last paragraph hints that the sports crowd was the more desirable of the two, at least for Rhianna (acknowledging that membership in either group may influence perceived desirability in favor of one's own group). She prefaced the last paragraph of her above quote by saying, "I don't know if this sounds mean, but..." This caveat implies that she recognized the potential that her suggestion—that band students needed band as a place to belong because they could not fit in with the sports crowd—might be taken as a slight. As a brief aside, friction between athletics and band was mentioned often by participants—thirty-five times by thirteen participants, according to my coding, making "Sports conflicting with band" the sixth most commonly coded node in my data.

As appeared to be the case with Max, Rhianna was missing a part or parts of the musical skill set and abilities needed to be able to construct a self-concept as a stronger music performer that, in turn, allowed her to feel fully a part of the band via music performance contributions. Unlike Max, Rhianna did not have even a few close friends in band to serve as a social anchor. Unable to construct a sense of belonging through music, nor through extra-musical social connections, the result was the same as for Max, only a year sooner: Rhianna left her high school band program.

Felicity

I also categorized Felicity as self-conceptualizing as a weaker player. She said, “I’d never practice, so I wasn’t good at it.” She reiterated this when she told me about her reasons for not auditioning for the upper-level band at her high school: “I didn’t practice so they could’ve rejected me easily, and I think it was a fear of rejection and I didn’t want to be rejected, and I didn’t want to try in order to not be rejected.”

Where Rhianna had no real friends in band and Max had only a few, Felicity had no shortage of friends with whom to make connections in band:

All my friends were in band, so I really liked the people in band. I had a lot of fun . . . every instrument would make their [locker] signs especially during marching band, a lot of groups got t-shirts. They were very visibly in band and it was a fun thing The older students would drive me around and we got t-shirts and it was just really fun. It was nice to be a part of a group, part of the team, have the older students to look up to. They were like rock stars to me, to a certain degree.

Felicity’s narrative was particularly fascinating because she experienced what seemed like—and perhaps even was—a successful induction into her high school band. As the earlier quoted portions of her narrative showed, she loved being in the band on a social level. However, this was not enough to keep her in band throughout high school. When she did not audition for the upper-level band after her ninth-grade year, and all of her age-group friends moved up without her, Felicity was bereft of much of her non-musical, social sense of belonging, and she found that the occasional football game was not enough to carry her past her lack of connection through music performance:

I never felt a place in concert band. Yeah, it’s interesting now to be thinking about it in comparison to choir, musically, at least, because I never felt particularly a part of the social group with choir, but I felt very a part of it musically. And as we sang together, I felt a part of this harmony and the unison, but when I was playing the oboe, I never felt that I was a part of a greater song. I struggled more to hear how the song integrated into itself. I did feel that in marching band, though –

that's interesting. Where you can just be part of this big wall of sound and that's very unifying, for lack of a better word.

Felicity, then, found herself in her tenth-grade year in daily rehearsals without her close friends or a sense of connection through the music (at least not during concert band). Her perception that she was "less-than" due to her failure to move into the upper-level band—or, perhaps, due to her realization that so many of her classmates had done so while she had not—tainted even the enjoyment that she once found during marching band:

It was pretty tough my sophomore year to just feel very alone and left behind. I had to remember that I didn't audition for the higher group. But my friends had these little jokes and I don't think they looked down on me personally, but they certainly were pleased with themselves to be in this higher band that they had worked to be in. And it was a little isolating to feel like they were all hanging out without me.

I felt it in the fall, even during marching band season because we rehearsed at different hours and my friends weren't in this class with me anymore, but even at the big events they were still symphonic band and there was a certain level of otherness and specialness associated with that . . . even though I was a sophomore, I'd done it before, I'm still in the band with all the freshman.

Felicity had the metaphorical rug pulled out from under her, and it took away her sense of belonging. While she knew that taking a pass on the audition process guaranteed her placement in the lower-level band, she had not considered the possibility that all of her friends would move to the upper-level band. This disruption of her social world within band rendered her unable to construct a means of belonging via extra-musical social connections. This is not to say that it was impossible for anyone in a similar situation to recover a sense of belonging, but for Felicity, that belonging seems to have been dependent upon the confidence of having her friends around her daily. It was further disrupted by the feelings of inadequacy brought about by being one of few tenth-graders in a majority ninth-grade ensemble and exacerbated by her friends' teasing, even as much as Felicity said that it was not personal. For Felicity, this loss was no small thing:

I can really only think of the ways that losing that induction has impacted my life. From whether it was really feeling isolated in my sophomore year or feeling like I had lost this thing. And then looking around and seeing other people being inducted, or what I saw as they were being inducted, they're having a great time, why am I not having a great time?

Even in college, [choir] wasn't the social experience I hoped it would be. We just were never as cohesive as the band. So, it was losing this band career that could've been if I was passionate about my instrument. It really is a loss of something that I don't think I ever had. I enjoyed band, but I wanted to enjoy it more.

If I could've enjoyed the music more, if I could've even enjoyed the social experience more, it just always seems like people in band were having more fun, even when I was in choir and enjoying that, it seems like the band was so much more fun. And I wanted my experience to more reflect that, but it didn't.

Felicity indicated that maybe a real bond within the band was "something that I don't think I ever had." However, when I asked her what was different in her ninth-grade year, her response shows that she did, indeed, have a sense of belonging, using the same words that so many participants used to describe the social bonds of their bands: "We were all freshmen; we were in it together."

Participants who self-conceptualized as weaker performers and who stayed in band constructed a different way of belonging.

Greta

I placed Greta in the category of participants who self-conceptualized as weaker music performers based on several supporting items from her narrative. The most straightforward was her band placement record: at Greta's school, all ninth-graders were placed in one band, and tenth- through twelfth-graders auditioned into one of two bands, according to skill level. Greta reported that she stayed in the lower-level of these two bands all three years.

Throughout her narrative, however, more hints emerged as to the complex conceptualization of 'being good at band' that Greta had constructed. Often, her words would

contradict something else that she had said at another time, adding to the difficulty of untangling what, perhaps, she meant to convey. What seems certain is that band was an important part of Greta's high school experience:

I was much more enthusiastic than other people were, especially when it came to marching. I was a section leader, I dated people in the band in high school, my best friends were in the band, we did so many band activities, so I very strongly identified as a band kid. That was like...band kid, theater kid, was kind of my thing in high school.

Since belonging needs to be “negotiated, tested, confirmed, rejected or qualified again and again” (Kraus, 2006, p. 7), Greta needed to find a way to construct a sense of belonging that fit her circumstances, both those that she chose and those imposed upon her.

The evidence provided to Greta through the judgment of experts (auditions) and direct comparison to others via first-person experience suggested to her that she was not a strong music performer. Greta constructed an alternative way of belonging, one in which she could still contribute to the success of the group and, in that way, share in its accomplishments. Her way of belonging was built upon her enthusiasm and effort in marching band, and her ability and willingness to help others to have fun and to have “good spirit”:

The biggest thing was that with the trumpet section there was just a lot of really good players because if they were good players a lot of times, they cared a lot more. There was that kind of cycle. It was essentially like my co-section leader was a really good player and then I was the one that wanted to make sure everyone had fun and had a good spirit.

In the above quote, Greta positioned herself as the social leader of the trumpet section, but also as the counterpart to her co-leader who was the “really good player.” She positioned herself as having an important role to fill, alongside—but not less-than—the role that the stronger trumpet player filled as the musical leader of the section. To be clear, this is not to say that Greta's construction was in any way unrealistic or less-than: since we can only know what

Greta told us, we must accept that, in her narrative, her role WAS an important one in the section.

If we do not question the musical contributions of participants who self-conceptualized as stronger music performers based on their narrative, we should not question Greta's contributions via her construction of belonging. Further, I submit that the only reason one would question Greta's construction—any more than one would question a construction in which music performance outweighed these other contributions—is that the prevailing paradigm of what is important in band disagrees with Greta. That is, high school band students (and others) often view music performance as the most valuable contribution to be made to their band program. For these reasons, I do not mean to throw the accuracy of Greta's narrative into doubt; indeed, the factual accuracy of participant narratives is not my concern.

Instead, I use Greta's narrative as an example of how participants constructed their sense of belonging within their narratives. I chose Greta because the role that she describes is not one that fits the image of a leader in a musical ensemble that is typically held by those within the band world; that is, not a part of the paradigm mentioned above (see Harry, 2018). Indeed, I would suggest that it is this juxtaposition of Greta's self-constructed band belongingness, held up against the common concept of stronger musical performers being more valuable to the band organization, that led to cognitive dissonance on Greta's part. In turn, this both led to and is suggested by Greta's contradictory statements.

Greta forged a sense of band belonging based on her extra-musical contributions to the group. In order to belong, these contributions needed be valuable to the group. However, the messages that Greta received regularly may have suggested that music performance contributions were more important than those that she offered. Considering that musical

performance is the implied (if not explicitly stated) main goal of most performing ensemble classes, it would be more surprising if said messages were *not* received. The security of Greta's sense of belonging, however, relied upon a belief that her extra-musical contributions were just as valuable, even if the messages she received may have contradicted that belief.

The participants whom I categorized as self-conceptualizing as stronger performers did not face the same challenges in constructing a sense of belonging that fit their circumstances. The contributions which they perceived themselves as bringing to the band (stronger musical performance) were those that were already valued according to the messages that they received on a regular basis. These messages might include placement by audition, increased prestige with higher-level band and chair placement, grades based on playing skill assessments—the list could go on, but it does not take a great deal of imagination to understand how strong musical performance skills are valued in a high school band setting.

In the previous quote, Greta says “If they were good players a lot of times, they cared a lot more.” Consider that against what she says below about the relationship between playing ability and caring:

It was just "Okay, how much am I gonna show that I care?" 'Cause there were some people, I'm thinking of the trumpet section especially, who were phenomenal players, who were always like “Oh, nah”, very relaxed about it, and very “Oh, I'm not gonna try as hard”, but they were incredible players. Me and my friend notice how those who tend to be the more naturally talented tried less, and it was the other way around. It was like those who had more enthusiasm for band, just weren't as good. That was kind of like the strange paradox with people in the trumpet section mostly.

The two statements seem to directly contradict each other, especially when they are talking about the same section (trumpets). The former quote reflects the prevalently held concept among band students, directors, and others—that, on the whole, those who perform better

musically also care more. This is supported by the research of Harry (2018, pp. 96–97). The latter quote sets forth the idea that effort and enthusiasm—areas of contribution to the band in which Greta feels very competent—are things that are not being provided by those that are stronger players. In such a construction, Greta’s value to the band—and, therefore, her level of belonging—is increased because the stronger musical contributors are unable or unwilling to provide these essential contributions to the band.

Greta’s narrative provides several other examples in which she emphasizes the importance of the kind of contributions that she made, positioning herself as a valued contributor to the band’s success:

You didn’t necessarily need a persona in the band, but I think it was more of . . . just not showing as much enthusiasm. You could tell people enjoyed their instruments, and enjoyed playing music, and plenty of people love concert band way more than marching [band]. Whenever I think of high school band, I will always refer it back to marching pretty much, ‘cause concert band, I was like “Eh”. I wasn’t a huge fan of that, and it’s a lot easier to just put in the correct level of effort for concert band, ‘cause you’re just sitting and playing. Versus the correct level in marching requires so much more energy that plenty of people would just walk on the field when they should have been upright marching, you know.

So, it was so much more obvious during marching season of who cared and showed effort versus concert band, when everyone is sitting down, and you can visibly show the same amount of effort as someone else who’s showing none at all.

In the above quote, Greta downplays the effort required for concert band—“you’re just sitting and playing”—while playing up the scarcity of members willing to put forth the effort to march correctly during marching band. Once again, the contributions that Greta feels competent in making—marching well, in this case—are positioned as more valuable than the contributions made by the stronger players (i.e., stronger musical performance).

Greta spoke about how, at first, her band final exams were merely a group rehearsal, but later involved being tested on playing for final exams in band. She railed against this change:

Starting my sophomore or my junior year, you actually were graded on accuracy of the piece and your tone and what not, and articulation. You would never study for band. Practicing is studying obviously, but I never practiced. There were plenty of people who did, but that's the thing. Practicing is different from studying. Band homework was practicing versus written homework, and music theory was a separate class from band. Also, the social aspect was so much different compared to just kids in a math class. You dedicated the same amount of time during the school day, but it was so much more of your friends, and everyone had the same lunch, because that's just how band fell during the day. Especially, during marching season, but like different bonding activities that you do with your section. It's nothing like a math study group.

There is a lot to untangle in this quote. It was clear from Greta's tone of voice that she was opposed to having grades based on tests of playing skill, but her arguments against it seem to contradict themselves, making it difficult to ascertain what she believes. However, it seems evident that she was emphasizing the differences between band and other classes, and also the importance of social aspects of the band over music performance skills. This should not be a surprise at this point: again, Greta was positioning herself within a narrative in which her contributions are those that are valued while arguing against a playing test, which is an explicit valuation of the skills that she felt others contributed more strongly than she did.

One more contradiction comes up in the above quote when Greta said, "But I never practiced." This statement falls in line with her positioning of herself throughout her narrative. However, below, she also seemed to associate a lack of practice with a lack of caring:

I think it was definitely what you choose to make of it. You get as much out as what you put in, like that saying. The more people invested their time in the band, the more they enjoyed it. I felt the more they had stronger friendships with people versus those who were in the band who would not necessarily ... just kind of was there just for that easy "A", didn't really practice, didn't really care, you know. They did have their friends in band, but it didn't have, at least looking on the

outside, it didn't look like it had as much of an impact on their lives. So definitely the more people put in the more they enjoyed it.

This stands in contradiction to the ways in which she positioned herself as someone who does not practice but does care, and also to her earlier assertion that better players did not care. However, one central construction remains: Greta cared about band more than others did, so her contributions were still valuable. She also revealed that she felt that what people got out of their investment in the band was stronger friendships with people. This reflects one of the ways in which participants whom I categorized as self-conceptualizing as weaker performers talked about social relationships in band differently than did those categorized as self-conceptualizing as stronger performers: the latter tended to speak of whole-group bonds, while the former tended to speak of friendships and individual, interpersonal relationships. This will be reinforced with examples from other participants.

Greta emphasized the importance of the extra-musical, social aspects of band many times. Greta did not feel “in” the band until she could socialize with members in other grades:

My sophomore year, once I started to do field shows with everyone else and was interactive with people in different grades, I really enjoyed that. That's when I kind of truly felt like I was part of the band in terms of part of the marching band, part of the social world of band.

Earlier, Patti had said that she thought that the social aspects of band happened “naturally” in the course of the activities leading to excellence in musical performing.

Greta implied in the following quotes that the relationship is reversed: the social relationships were necessary for, and led to, improved musical performance:

I think it definitely stemmed from the drum majors and the directors cause they were like “Hey, make sure people enjoy themselves, ‘cause then they're gonna work harder. So that was definitely something where I think that in high school the main thing was, we just wanna have fun, but by doing that it's like, okay, let's

make sure there's a purpose. By having that purpose, it will make it better for everyone in the long run.

. . . I think back to [breakfast at local restaurant] sectionals or the other things that we did, and I don't think I necessarily thought we had to do this because this will make us better on the field; we have to do this for this reason. I think we were mostly just like, we just wanna have fun, and so now later I realize the benefits of all those things we did.

. . . At the time we did wanna be a better section, but at least in my mind's frame set, it was that we just wanted to have fun. I think is the biggest difference. There's a lot of things that I strive for in college band where a lot of times we do the bonding because we do realize that makes us work together, more coherently as a team and as a band. Yeah. I think that's the best example I can give you is that we just kinda wanted to enjoy ourselves. We did want to do well in terms of competitions, but I didn't think of the benefits of eating breakfast together as translating to being successful on the field.

Greta was interested in having fun as part of band, and she felt that this was an important goal and outcome of the band program. She implied that her directors also believed in the importance of students enjoying themselves. She said that now, with hindsight, she sees that these things actually made her section—and, by extension, her band—better in performance, even though she did not consider it at the time. Finally, in contrast to the participants self-conceptualizing as stronger performers, Greta conspicuously avoided mentioning music performance.

While her construction of a way of belonging may have been quite different from those of the participants that self-conceptualized as stronger music performers, Greta's induction was also successful and long-lasting: she remained in band through all four years of high school and went on to be a part of a college band, as well.

Teressa

Teressa left no mystery regarding her self-concept in terms of her musical playing level, saying, "I'm not a very strong player." Like Greta, Teressa constructed a sense of belonging

based on extra-musical contributions to the band. However, Teresa exhibited none of the self-contradiction that Greta did. One interpretation of this is that Teresa was more confident in her sense of belonging. There is evidence that would support this interpretation: Teresa did not make statements that called into question the value of contributions by any other members of the band. The closest Teresa came to this was in speaking of those who took on leadership roles in the band: “There [were] a lot of people who were upperclassmen who were just like, ‘I don’t really care.’ Like, ‘I’m just here.’ They’ll have fun, but they wouldn’t actually lead people.”

While Teresa did frame the act of leading people—something that she spoke of doing within her band program—as a valuable contribution that not everyone provided, she did not seem to be de-valuing other kinds of contributions to the band. However, like Greta, Teresa emphasized more often the kind of contributions that she made to her band. She spoke at length about people “being taken under someone’s wing” within her band:

There’s definitely a huge . . . culture [of] someone specifically taking you sort of under their wing. At some point, [they] became your band mom. There would be weird little family trees of people who were taken under people’s wings, but that’s definitely the way that I felt taken in because my freshman year, all these people who were in this one band . . . and it doesn’t matter if you really care or if you’re just kind of there because your mom made you. You’re all in the same band.

Before citing other examples of Teresa’s focus on taking people under wing, it is important to notice that, once again, a participant used this familiar language: “You’re all in the same band.” Being “in,” it seems, requires being part of the “all” in the various “we’re all in this” statements that participants made.

In the above and below examples, Teresa used the “under wing” and maternal images almost interchangeably:

There was this little tiny group of seniors who took all of us sophomores and were like, “We’re going to show you how cool this is. We’re going to show you how

you march, how you play in a concert band, and actually develop technique and not just play the songs.” We had these small ensembles that we would form with them and it was just having a very small group of people who just mothered this giant group of sophomores saying, “This is how you become involved within this community.”

Teressa made “band mom” part of her role in the band when she reached her senior year. Certainly, this is a different deployment of “mom” than that she—or just about anyone else—would use in describing an actual parental figure. In fact, in the first of the two “under wing” quotes, Teressa used both iterations: “band mom” to describe upperclass band members⁷² who took on the role of guiding younger band members in the ways of the band, and just “mom” when talking about students who were only in band because their parents required them to enroll.

However, the “band mom” role served Teressa well in allowing to feel that she contributed to the band through her expertise, without calling upon her abilities in playing her instrument, which she perceived of as being limited. Teressa talked about how her kind of leadership role was taken on, not assigned:

The role of section leader wasn’t assigned. We didn’t audition for section leader like that. There was the first chair, [which] was kind of separate, where the first chair...they are the person who had the solos and might designate them to other people within the concert band. But the section leader is still a leader within the symphonic band, the concert band, all that stuff . . . being someone that someone looks to for organizational support, and “Hey, I need help with this music and this part, and I don’t know how to talk to our director about this.” You’re still someone that people go to, even if you’re not the first chair leader. That responsibility is sort of shared, so it’s like there’s no official designation of who the section leader is. When you start marching band, it’s whoever picks up the responsibility and says “I’m gonna do this, and I’m gonna be this person.” It can sometimes shift around; it can sometimes switch. You can have more than one, and it’s kind of just the section parent, whoever steps up to do this, and it might not necessarily be the strongest player who auditions best.

⁷² It would have been interesting to ask Teressa about the gender identities of these “band moms” – did they all identify as female, or were there “band moms” that identified as male, too? Alas, the question was never asked.

Here again, Teresa referred to a parental image of being a peer leader. Perhaps because she was speaking in a broader sense about her band program, she switched to “section parent” instead of “band mom,” but the imagery remains. Like Greta, Teresa pointed out that her contributions are important and not necessarily available from the best players. Unlike Greta, Teresa used a softer approach, saying that “it might not necessarily” be that the stronger players can offer these same contributions, whereas Greta implied that her type of contributions was rarely found in the stronger players.

Teresa’s narrative also demonstrated a shared belief with Greta that social bonds are necessary to improved performance, although Teresa spoke less about “fun” and more about group bonds:

I think that you definitely can’t have a band that is not a cohesive unit. I think that there’s a difference that you can feel while you’re rehearsing, between any other band that I’ve been in, and between a tight-knit group formed over multiple years.

. . . Having these bonds makes it so that, I can look to you. I know what you’re doing, and even if we screw up, that’s fine, we’ll screw up together and that’s okay. I would rather play confidently with what we think is right rather than just not play.

Teresa understood these bonds as necessary in building trust, a critical component of higher-level ensemble music performance (at least within the paradigm of United States high school bands). She also spoke of how her experiences in bonding with other band students through their work together carried over into other parts of her life:

You had to bond with people and work to make these connections, you have to work on something together in a very unique way. I think anyone who’s gone through something like that could speak to how that changes people and how they go about doing group projects, even. Once you work and have to make a piece work for your quartet, every group project that I’ve done afterwards has been different. I like being in charge, and after that it didn’t seem like, “I’m just gonna take charge, I’m gonna just do it, you guys just do whatever.” It seemed like, okay, we have to work together otherwise it’s not gonna work.

Greta said that her band directors wanted people to have fun so that they would be willing to work harder. This mirrors what she valued in her band experience, as indicated in her narrative. Teressa valued the bonds of friendship within her band, and when she spoke of her directors, she indicated that she believed that they held the same values: “They want as many amazing people as possible, not just because they want the bands to be good. Because they are a very supportive community, they want people to be there, enjoy what they’re doing.”

Here, Teressa came close to describing these bonds through the lens of shared goals and accomplishments. However, she explicitly did so in speaking about how other classes produced bonding, and how they were different from band: “There [are] classes in which you’ll be challenged together, and you’ll become friends sort of out of a challenge and you get tighter-knit . . . [but] there’s nothing where you have to become anything for anyone else.”

In the context of her narrative, it was clear that her last statement was referring back to band class being a place where one did have to become something for someone else. It is not clear precisely what she thought one had to become, but in the next paragraph, she spoke of her sense of obligation to give back to the band, where she felt no such obligation in science – even though she went on to major in a science field. Perhaps, then, she was referring to becoming a “band mom,” since this was the role she constructed for herself wherein she could give back to the band. This idea of giving back was reflected in part of her description of what section leaders did to help the underclass students:

They’d also help with genuine life issues and actual relationship things, like actual friends. It just became a huge, tight-knit circle of friends that you were welcomed into warmly and then have a, I’ll say opportunity, and that’s really what it was. To help get other people back into that.

Finally, fitting the pattern of participants whom I categorized as self-conceptualizing as weaker music performers, Teresa spoke little of playing music, and much more about interpersonal relationships within band. Teresa often spoke of friends and friendships within her band: “I was definitely surrounded by my best friends the whole time. That’s what it felt like. I say there’s 150 people in the marching band and it was like 150 good friends that you were with every day.”

“In,” but not quite belonging: Stella.

Stella was the participant who joined her high school’s marching band during the summer before her senior year of high school, having never played in band before. Although she knew how to play the piano, and her part in the band was playing a synthesizer in the front ensemble (the non-marching section of the band, often referred to as the “pit”), she often spoke of how she did not feel confident about her performance level in this new setting. This is why I categorized her as self-conceptualizing as a weaker player. Whether or not she believed this about herself in other contexts is irrelevant; in her band setting, she had serious doubts about her playing ability:

I was like, “I don’t know how to march, I don’t know how to play any of these things.” And they were trying to convince me that they could teach me how to play the clarinet overnight and that I could march, and I was like, “I don’t think it, like that’s not gonna work, it’s not going to fool anybody” . . . Oh my God. I have no idea and don’t know what I’m doing.

Of course, every self-conceptualization is unique, but Stella’s insecurity was a different sort of belief about music performance ability than that displayed by Greta and Teresa, both of whom had a six-to-eight-year school band “career” to construct their self-concepts as band players. Also, Greta and Teresa presumably had many kinds of feedback about their musical performance abilities along the way—feedback that had a significant role in shaping those self-

concepts. Stella, however, had very little time in her new context to receive much feedback; she had no audition results, no chair placements, no contest results, and not even more than a few weeks to compare herself to peers. Therefore, her self-concept as a band player, as I categorized it, skewed toward weaker performer based on insecurity more than a more firmly-held, well-established belief, as were those apparently held by Greta and Teresa.

This insecurity about her playing came through when Stella spoke of how other band members were confused by her appearance in the band as a senior:

I mean, I play the piano, but I'm not gonna claim that I'm amazing by any means, I'm really not. I just can play. But I was always better at playing the violin or something. Then they were like, "She must be amazing that they let her in." I was like, "No, no, no, no, no, I'm not that good."

However, there was something that gave Stella's confidence as a player a bit of a boost, even though the means of finding that confidence—building her self-concept up in comparison to the failings of another—could also be seen to reveal her insecurities:

There was only one other guy who played the same instrument as I did, and he wasn't necessarily that good...that sounds bad. He knowingly admitted to me on the first day of band camp. He was like, "Sometimes, I just don't play the more difficult parts." I was like, "What? You've been playing this instrument since eighth grade." He's the only one who's played synthesizer for the past four years, and you just admitted to not playing it if it's hard. What? You can't just not play it. Oh my gosh . . . I think that helped me to kind of assimilate into [the band], because I was a good piano player and everything, and I could pick it up pretty quickly, and do my part. They were like, "Oh, well that's great. Now we have like a fully committed synthesizer player." So, that was good. So, his downfalls, kind of helped me a little bit. I think that was good. Like my getting in there, they were like, "Oh, okay. So, she's at least willing to play her part. That's great."

This passage shows Stella's mixed feelings about her music performance abilities. Here, she said outright that she was "a good piano player," the strongest testament she made as to her ability to play her part in the band. This, though, is the only peer comparison that she could make since there were no other students in her band playing electronic keyboards. Further, the only

point of comparison was judged as falling quite low on the scale of possible music performance levels. While this made Stella feel more confident that she was not the worst music performer, it did not give her much more upon which to build her self-concept as a band performer.

Stella did not have time to form a more concrete idea of whether or not she was contributing to the band through her musical performance. Even if she had concluded that her musical performance was not adequate for belonging, she did not have time to fully construct a sense of belonging based upon extra-musical contributions. In this sense, it is not surprising that Stella spoke confidently of being “in” but was more ambivalent about whether or not she belonged. I asked her if “band member” became a part of her identity in her brief experience:

I don't know if I would say that it did because, although it was very important to me, I always, in the back of mind, I'm like ... and also because I joined as a senior, so it was like I was already old and everything. They definitely made me feel included, but it was just kind of my thing. Like, “Oh, I haven't been doing this. I'm not actually one of them.”

Stella felt included, but also “not actually one of them.” This language is quite telling. She said she *felt* included, which could be interpreted as a weaker statement than if she had said that she *was* included. However, when she spoke of her belonging, she left no question: “I'm not actually one of them.” Further, the inclusion of “actually” implies that she believed that there was a false appearance that she was “one of them.” Finally, there is the dichotomous language of “I” versus “them,” leaving little doubt that Stella saw herself, at least in some ways, as an included outsider.

Stella confirmed that she was by no means excluded: “It was like you really did feel included in everything. Even though I didn't know everyone to begin with, they really made me feel welcomed in.” Between this statement and her narrative account of the moment she felt truly

“in” at the pool party, there is strong evidence that Stella did, indeed, feel “in” her high school band. However, she also explicitly stated that she did not feel that she belonged:

I think throughout the whole band thing I felt like somewhat of a “I don’t belong here;” like I’m glad they’re having me, but this isn’t like...someday someone would be like, “Do you actually like, have you been in this band?” And I would be like, “No I don’t really belong here.”

Perhaps this should not be surprising. Patti, one of the first strong performers discussed in this chapter, said that she strongly considered not coming back to her high school marching band after her first year, even though she ended up loving marching band enough to stay in her high school marching band all four years and go on to be in a college marching band. Also, although there was a critical difference in the stress that Charlise’s first-year situation presented, I will note that she too almost left band after her ninth-grade year and that she also went on to stay in band all four years of high school and participate in college bands. For Stella, the difficulties of being a newcomer were compounded by her unique status as a senior newcomer. She shared the experience of her “rookie” year with many other students, and the experience of her senior year in the marching band with a different group of students, but none shared both with her.

This suggests that, while it is apparent that newcomers face challenges and difficulties in getting “in” and belonging to their high school bands, these struggles may often continue throughout their first year. It follows, then, that music teachers should be aware that students’ challenges in successfully feeling a sense of belonging in a group, especially in the first year, are ongoing and not limited to their initial induction period.

As might be expected for someone whose self-concept wavered in terms of how strong her musical performance skills in her new band context were, Stella exhibited characteristics of

both categories of participants. She did find some sense of belonging through her musical contributions, as evidenced when I asked how her induction process made her feel:

I felt good, and they wanted me to be there, which was nice. Even though I wasn't necessarily needed beforehand, when I presented it [the idea of joining], they were like, "Oh, okay. Well now we have this [additional synthesizer] part" The sound effects were way more of a big deal than I thought they were going to be And so, [the director] was like, "You need to do this right." and everything. I'm like, "Oh yes, okay. I will do ..." "Then he would be like, "Good. You did a good job."

Her words became a bit jumbled, but the idea came through: Stella took satisfaction in knowing that her part, although created for her when she joined, was a vital part of the band's success and she received feedback from her director that she did it well. The band was important to Stella, and she was important to it. Perhaps because she had less time and, presumably, fewer instances like this one to reflect upon, she did not tell me in a more direct fashion that contributing to the accomplishments of the band led to a bond with her fellow band members, or to a sense of belonging. However, this quote demonstrates that, while she may not have realized how this one incident fit the larger pattern—one wherein contributing toward shared goals and accomplishments leads to bonds between group members and a sense of belonging—she certainly felt good about playing her part in it.

Stella also gave hints that, perhaps, she was also starting to construct a band role through which she could contribute to the group in extra-musical ways:

I was the oldest in our little section, and so they all [younger members] just came to me. They would always ask me questions about school and stuff, and they asked me for help with classes, so it was nice. I got to know them, and I guess I was that for them, even though I didn't know as much about band, but I knew about school.

Here, Stella took on just a bit of the "band mom" self-concept that Teresa had formed more completely. She may not have been a strong performer in her first year, but she did have

experience and knowledge in the broader field of their high school, and she was the expert in her section for all high school things outside of band. It may not have been a strong part of her sense of belonging, but “it was nice” for her to feel that she was helping her younger section colleagues.

Like most of those whom I categorized as self-conceptualizing as weaker performers, Stella spoke more of friendships and extra-musical social relationships than she did about things directly related to music performance:

I think I mentioned this before, but the idea of becoming part of the band, and then walking through the halls at school, and just knowing that there’s probably going to be someone in the band that you see that you can like wave to, or there’s always someone in the lunchroom that you could sit with.

To Stella, the social aspect of the marching band was essential. Sometimes, her words gave hints that she knew on some level that marching band activities had a primary focus on working toward performance. On a personal level, however, the importance of the social part of the activity came first:

I think band camp was, that was more of like a social activity, kind of. Obviously not that, but it was like, “Okay, here’s getting to know your peers. This is what we do, and we’re going to teach you how to march.”

She half-corrected herself, as if, upon hearing her own words, she realized that the idea—that a two-week marching band camp at which students learn a significant part of that season’s show would be more of a social activity than it was for learning the marching and musical parts—perhaps sounds crazy. However, she reiterated the importance of the social part of band camp by starting the short list of things that happen at band camp with, “getting to know your peers.”

When I asked Stella what impact her induction into her high school marching band had upon her, she spoke of the extra-musical social aspects again:

I wouldn't say I've always been the best at making new friends, necessarily But then through this process [of joining the band] I was like, "Oh well I'm gonna be stuck with these people for four months so I better actually get to know them. And become friends with them." So, I got a lot better at that. Because I was like "Oh, well I want to know things about them." So, we would exchange stories, we would hang out. We would have parties and everything. It was kind of like I was part of the group.

It is almost painful to read her last line, an addendum to the story that feels like a caveat. After speaking of how her marching band experience helped her learn how to make new friends more easily, she added that it was "kind of like" she was a part of the group. After a complete season with all of her band colleagues, she still felt that it was only "kind of like" she was "in".

The last quote that I will include from Stella perfectly encapsulates, I feel, many of the ways in which her narrative related to the issues addressed in this chapter. Like other participants that I categorized as self-conceptualizing as weaker performers, she emphasized friends and fun. She knew that she contributed to the group's success (though she felt the need to add the modifier of "technically") and she did take satisfaction in her contribution as a part of a successful—winning—group. However, in the end, her insecurities shine through:

I think looking back now . . . I made so many good friends, and I had a fun time. That we went to state, and I technically helped them when we won our state competition, and then we went on to place [in the top 25] at nationals. So, that was a big deal and I was like, "Okay, I didn't bring them down." I actually was a part of this winning band. Because, I was so terrified that I was like, "I'm gonna mess it up, because I don't know what I'm doing." I was constantly terrified that someone's gonna...[have] you ever heard of imposter syndrome?

Summary of the category of self-conceptualizing as a stronger performer.

There are several key similarities woven throughout the narratives of participants that I categorized as self-conceptualizing as weaker performers. Based on these findings, I make the following claims:

- These participants often left their high school band program before graduation. Many of these participants never constructed a sense of belonging in band. Other such participants constructed a temporary sense of belonging, but one which proved too fragile to withstand events or situations that challenged their sense of belonging.
- These participants who stayed in high school band until graduation often presented non-musical, social events and milestones, and especially their contributions through means other than music performance, as being central to their feelings of belonging. This way of belonging is different from that constructed by the participants that I classified as self-conceptualizing as stronger performers.
- The prevailing paradigm within high school band membership is that musical performance contributions are the most valuable contributions members can make. This added to the difficulties faced in constructing a way of belonging for participants who self-conceptualized as weaker performers. This is because the feedback that they receive does not affirm their extra-musical contributions to band as valuable.
- Participants whom I categorized as self-conceptualizing as weaker performers rarely referred to their music performance-related contributions. They also rarely spoke of shared goals and accomplishment although many uttered some variation of the phrase, “We’re all in this together” in connection with feelings of belongingness.

Belonging in High School Band and Foucauldian Conceptions of Power

I return, now, to Foucault's concept of power/knowledge and apply it to the findings in this chapter. Power is imbued in the construction of the meaning of the group and the construction of the legitimate member. Members (and others) construct the meaning of the group in ways that are limited by and limit who is or can be a member. These constructions are created from power and imbued with power; the knowledge of who can be a legitimate member, and how, exerts power as it influences the negotiation of belongingness, both between members and prospective members and within each. I will focus specifically on the collective construction of the meaning, or *raison d'être*, of the band, and the construction of the legitimate band member, and how these two constructions shape and are shaped by each other. In addition, I will focus on how these constructions impacted participants within their experiences-as-narrated.

First, I will address the construction of the meaning of "band" on the broader scale of United States high school band programs. The paradigm of high school band—what it is, what it should be, what it is about, and what its purpose is—is, like all "truths," always contested and shifting to some degree. However, I claim that there are certain central components to the collective construction of "band" across high schools in the United States. This is not to say that all or any parts of this construction are held by everyone involved in high school bands throughout the country. Instead, these components are part of the constructions of "band" at a high enough saturation level to be considered a part of the nation-wide construction.

Among these components of construction is that band is a performance class, and, as such, performance is central to its meaning. While the level of importance of performance varies from school to school and band to band, its centrality to the meaning of "band" is such that the legitimacy of the title of "band," if used for a class that included no performance, would certainly

be questioned.⁷³ Performance, and especially public performance, often interact with notions of competition, both internal and external and both explicit and implicit, to produce the constructions of “stronger” and “weaker” band music performers, as I have deployed earlier in this chapter.

Another aspect of performance that plays heavily into the broadly held construction of band is that the music learning that is most valued in band classes centers on performance skills. Once again, this is not to say that all bands, all band directors, or all band members value performance skills over other musical skills and knowledge (e.g., composition, music history, et cetera). However, I argue that the aspect of high school band programs that is most often cited as a marker of quality is the excellence (or lack thereof) of its musical performances. To be clear, this does not imply that excellence in musical performance precludes excellence (or lack thereof) in any other facet of a band program. I am arguing that performance is easily the first, and sometimes only, metric used to evaluate high school band programs in the United States. Since excellence in performance is so highly valued, individual music performance skills are also valued above other skills and knowledge.

With this understanding of the broad construction of “band” as a backdrop, I claim that this construction is a form of power/knowledge. It was constructed from power and is imbued with the power of legitimizing or delegitimizing both people and practices. This power operates on a mostly hidden basis, as these constructions of “band” and the people who can belong in band are so widely held as to appear “natural.”

⁷³ Keeping in mind that “performance” need not include public performance; although it almost always does, in this context.

Belonging as a Function of Music Performance Level

I now turn to individual participants' narratives in order to explore how notions of power can be seen to come into play in their stories. While many participants spoke of feeling belonging as a function of contributing to the musical performance of the band, some participants reported feeling pressure to perform at a certain level in order to belong. However, there was no mention in their narratives of any other individual directly applying this pressure; the pressure to perform was applied from within. To paraphrase Koza (2013), there were guns both at the head and in the head, and there were roses both outside and inside the head. Others needed not directly exercise power: the boundaries of the group were also maintained by internalized constructions of who may and who may not belong. These constructions, as noted above, operate as a form of power/knowledge.

Amber was the participant who, after getting a playing award, said, "Now everyone must really know that I'm a good player, hopefully I can stop feeling pressured."

Nancy said, "I think there was a little bit of me feeling kind of the same thing, like I wasn't going to be good enough which held me back, socially, a little bit." Both felt like their ability to fit in socially, to belong, was contingent upon a certain level of performance; indeed, for Amber, it seemed like that level was always higher than that which she found herself at the time.

For Amber and Nancy, the constructed meaning of band as a performing group shaped their construction of a legitimate member, worthy of belonging. For Nancy, there was a specific, minimal level needed to be that legitimate member (i.e., marching and playing at the same time). For Amber, the construction of a legitimate member seems to have kept morphing into

something just beyond where she was at the time, leaving her perpetually on the edge, fearful of falling out of a state of belonging.

This construction of the legitimate band member often worked to the benefit of participants whom I categorized as self-conceptualizing as stronger performers. As a whole, these participants described fewer struggles in finding belonging and also seemed to struggle less to describe their belonging. I claim that this is due to the alignment of their conception of belonging (through music performance contributions) with the prevailing paradigm, or broadly-held construction, of band as a performance-based group. As well, their apparent self-perceptions as strong performers fit the paradigm of the legitimate member. Their self-perception and construction of a way of belonging (through music performance contributions) matched up well with the construction of an ideal member and how that ideal member would contribute. Power/knowledge, in the form of these constructions, widely held as “natural,” directed power in a way that aided, rather than hindered, these participants in finding belonging. Thus, there was little resistance for them to overcome in finding a sense of belonging in their bands.

Belonging Through Extra-Musical Means

Greta was the participant whose way of belonging hinged on her contributions to her band in a mix of enthusiasm, marching skill, and leadership, and not so much through musical performance. Her narrative was full of contradictory statements, but, on the whole, tended to reinforce the importance of the contributions of the type that she was able to make, and downplayed the importance of musical contributions. Since I have described these in detail earlier, I will not go into great depth here.

Unlike the participants whom I categorized as self-conceptualizing as stronger performers, Greta had to work against, rather than with, the power imbued in the paradigmatic

construction of the ideal band member. As noted earlier, she did not describe herself as performing at a high musical level for her band. Since the messages she received about her playing abilities shaped her apparent self-concept toward that of a weaker music performer, she was unable to construct a sense of belonging based solely on her music performance contributions to the group. Her sense of belonging was constructed on the basis of her contributions through marching performance, leadership, and enthusiasm.

Since neither she nor her way of belonging aligned with the paradigmatic construction of the ideal band member nor an ideal way of belonging, Greta had to struggle for belonging, working against the power of the widely-held construction rather than with it. Where strong performers seemed to exert little or no effort in positioning themselves in their narratives, Greta's narrative seemed to labor with the effort of creating a position for Greta's character to fit the story as a member worthy of belonging. Further, the numerous contradictions within her narrative could well have come from the cognitive dissonance of wanting to believe in her own construction of belonging, but having that construction refuted by the messages that she received in support of the paradigmatic construction of belonging in band.

As Foucault (1978) said, "Where there is power, there is resistance" (p. 95). Greta demonstrated resistance to power in forging her own means of belonging, even as she acquiesced to power in her need to find a means of belonging through contributions. That is, there is also power imbued in the notion that one must contribute to the group in order to belong; Greta did not offer any apparent resistance to that instantiation of power/knowledge, because her interests did not require it.

This can be explained by Weedon's (1987) interpretation of Foucault, as she writes about the locations of resistance:

Where there is a space between the position of subject offered by a discourse and the individual interest, a resistance to that subject position is produced...the discursive constitution of subjects, both compliant and resistant, is part of a wider social play for power. (pp. 112–113)

Greta held an interest in belonging, but she found herself unable to find that belonging through the means that were offered by dominant discourse. This difference—this distance—produced the resistance. However, that resistance does not apply to all aspects of the prevailing discourse, only those in which the individual interest does not align with it. Greta did not need resistance to much of the discursive constitution of the ideal band member, since it was possible for her construction of self to line up with much of it. The differences between the discursive construction of a member worthy of belonging and her self-construction combined with her desire to belong, creating a space in which resistance was formed.

Belonging Contested and Denied

Some participants found that achieving a sense of belonging was difficult or complicated. Some persisted, and others found the resistance too great to continue. In all of these cases, the paradigmatic constructions of band and band member worked, in varying degrees, against the interests of the participants.

Stella was the participant who joined her high school marching band between her eleventh- and twelfth-grade years. Her narrative revealed that she felt a conflicted sense of belonging. This conflict was between the prevalent discursive construct of a marching band member at her school and her reality. Specifically, Stella speaks of how other students had been in marching band for years, or, if they were new, had years to still give to the organization. Stella, however, did not join until she had only one year to be part of the group. In this way, she

fit neither the discursive norm of a newcomer with years to go nor that of a senior with three (or more) years of experience under his or her belt.

In this way, the effects of power worked against Stella's sense of fully belonging to her high school band. She cites no other reason for her mixed feelings about belonging; only her perceived differences from other students and, so, from the prevalent construction of a "true" marching band member.

Both Barbara and Rhianna spoke of the conflict between the social groups involved in music and those involved in sports at their schools. This could be yet another instantiation of power/knowledge: if the paradigmatic construction of "athlete" and "band member" at these schools came with mutually exclusive boundaries, then Barbara and Rhianna would have to struggle against those constructions in order to belong in both groups. Barbara appeared to have no interest in this struggle, whereas Rhianna did appear to have some desire to belong in band. In the end, however, neither offered enough resistance to find belonging in band.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, I analyzed participants' narratives to examine belonging in high school bands. While friendships and fun within band can contribute to students' enjoyment of membership, my findings suggest that a real sense of belonging grows out of the bonds of shared goals and accomplishments. In order to truly share in the group goals and accomplishments, a member must feel that they are contributing (or have contributed) to the success of the group.

In what ways do participants construct a sense of belonging in their high school bands, if at all?

Participants who successfully constructed a sense of belonging in their high school band did so, at least in part, by believing that their contributions toward the shared goals and accomplishments of the group were valued and valuable enough to make the participant worthy of belonging in the band. The contributions of these participants were usually through music performance. This fit the paradigmatic discursive construct of both the purpose of band and the band member worthy of belonging. Both constructs are instantiations of Foucauldian power/knowledge. They are imbued with the power to affirm or deny aspects of an individual's construction of belonging.

Some participants constructed a sense of belonging based upon extra-musical contributions to the group. These participants had to work against, or resist, the application of power from the discursive construct of the paradigmatic band member worthy of belonging. Some participants were unable or unwilling to construct a sense of belonging. At least one participant constructed some sense of belonging, but new circumstances challenged that construction, and her sense of belonging was consequently lost. At least one participant felt some sense of belonging, but that sense of belonging was contested by the power of paradigmatic constructions of a band member at her school.

How do participants' self-perceptions of skill level or ability as a music performer relate to their constructions of belonging in their high school bands?

Participants whom I categorized as self-conceptualizing as strong performers constructed belonging through musical performance contributions toward the shared goals and accomplishments of the group. Because they were able to self-conceptualize as a performer

capable of such contributions, they were working *with* the power of the common discursive construct toward belonging. Participants whom I categorized as self-conceptualizing as weaker music performers were not able to conceive of themselves as capable of making music performance contributions sufficient for belonging. Unable to work *with* the power of the common discursive construct of a band member worthy of belonging, some worked *against* the power of said construct to create an alternate way of belonging. Others in this category did not construct a sense of belonging and subsequently left the band program.

CHAPTER SEVEN – SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND DISCUSSION

Summary

The purpose of this study was to collect and analyze participants' narratives telling of their recollections of their experiences involving high school band induction, with an intended analytical focus on hazing. A second purpose was to explore participants' understandings of belonging in high school band. Although several studies have been conducted on hazing in high school (e.g., Allan, Kerschner, & Payne, 2018; Allan & Mary Madden, 2008; Nadine C. Hoover & Pollard, Norman J, 2000) and some studies have been conducted on hazing in college band (e.g., Ellsworth, 2004; Silveira & Hudson, 2015), to my knowledge no studies on high school band hazing have been carried out. Further, no extent research on hazing has examined connections between the broader phenomenon of induction and hazing through narrative methods.

One of the aims of this study was to explore participants' perceptions of being fully "in" their high school band. What types of social induction activities did participants describe having occurred in their high school band? Did any of these types meet the working definition of hazing, or bear other resemblances to hazing? What did participants cite as markers for knowing or realizing that they were fully "in" their high school band? Did participants feel a sense of being fully "in" their high school bands immediately upon taking part in high school band activities? If not, how long did it take for participants to feel like they were fully "in" their high school band—if ever?

The other aim of this study was to examine participants' understandings of belonging in high school band. In what ways did participants construct a sense of belonging in their high

school bands, if at all? How did participants' self-perceptions of skill level or ability as a music performer relate to their constructions of belonging in their high school bands?

I interviewed young adults, aged 18 to 25 years, about their experiences in joining their high school band, encouraging narrative responses to open-ended questions. I analyzed their responses through the lens of Foucauldian conceptions of power. Specifically, I used Foucault's concepts of disciplinary power and power/knowledge to examine the power relationships at play in these phenomena.

I found that participants described a diverse range of experiences in becoming, trying to become, or even avoiding becoming fully part of the social constellation of their high school bands. In answer to the research questions with which I began, a feeling of being "in" was not a given, and subject to an incubation period of anywhere from a few days to over a year, in cases where it was ever achieved. Also, reaching a feeling of being "in" was not a guarantee of keeping it. Participants named many different events, milestones, or other moments that marked their perceived entry into a feeling of "in." Roughly half of these were performance-related, while the rest were related to social interactions not directly related to music performance. Participants also described a wide variety of induction activities. Teacher-organized, or official, induction activities were more common, and student-led activities tended to be less organized and more spontaneous. A small number of hazing activities were described, milder and fewer in number than existing literature would have predicted.

I claim that disciplinary power, in the form of pressure to conform to the norms and customs of the band (both performance and non-performance), often led participants to seek affirmation that they were meeting certain norms. Events or situations that provided this affirmation were those cited by participants as the moment that they felt "in."

A pattern among participants who identified performance-related markers of feeling “in” piqued my curiosity. This curiosity led me to analyze participants’ narratives to examine belonging in high school bands. Supported by literature on belonging (e.g., Shotter in Coupland & Nussbaum, 1993; Kraus, 2006) as well as my own initial findings, I worked from the assumption that a durable sense of belonging in a high school band relies upon the perception that one’s contributions to the shared goals and accomplishments of the group are valuable and valued. I claim that within the prevailing paradigm, or discursive construct, of band is an instantiation of Foucauldian power/knowledge. Within this construct, music performance contributions are the most highly valued. Because of this, participants who were able to construct a self-concept including the trait of “strong music performer” were more easily able to negotiate a sense of belonging based on their music performance contributions. Participants who were unable to construct such a self-concept, presumably due to feedback received about their musical abilities, needed to believe that they contributed to the group’s shared goals and accomplishments in extra-musical ways in order to feel a durable sense of belonging. Participants who were unable or unwilling to construct either such way of belonging left their band program within the first two years of high school.

Hazing

As both the original impetus for the research project and as a phenomenon with clear implications for student safety, hazing in high school bands was a specific area of focus within the broader examination of high school band induction. While few described incidents met my full definition for hazing (see p. 36), there were several interesting results related to hazing within my findings. The first is the lack of hazing incidents described relative to what would be predicted based on the existing literature. While I know of no research directly aimed at high

school band hazing, three national surveys of either high school students or college students asked about high school hazing by group (Allan, Kerschner, et al., 2018; Hoover, 1999; Nadine C. Hoover & Pollard, Norman J, 2000). The findings of these three surveys varied, but all suggested a higher rate, and greater severity, of high school band hazing than that which could be extrapolated from the experiences described to me by participants.

There were several possible factors for this difference.. One is in the large representation of the upper-Midwest among high schools my participants reported attending. Differences in general culture between regions of the United States are complex and varied, but one key difference pertinent to the present study is the relatively low emphasis on competitive high school marching band in the three states in which all but two of my participants attended high school. Another factor could be social desirability bias (Edwards, 1957) influencing participants' willingness to describe hazing activity. The dissonance between the commonly held perception that hazing is a negative activity and one's desire to be seen in a positive light could account for the withholding of descriptions of hazing experiences. Finally, there is the possibility that, despite the recent (and, I may add, unsupported) assertions among hazing authors that high school hazing is on the rise (see pp. 40-41), the lower rate of descriptions of hazing in the present study may actually represent a reduction in hazing rates and hazing severity across United States high school bands. However, it is also important to remember that, while twenty-three participants may be a sufficiently large population for a qualitative study, it is an insufficient number from which to draw any statistical conclusions.

Perhaps the most intriguing explanation for the difference, however, was that participants had limited time to get to know and trust me and may have withheld potentially sensitive information. A suggestion for future qualitative research on hazing, then, would be to increase

the number of interview sessions to three or even more, in hopes of establishing a relationship between researcher and participant that would allow for discussion of hazing. Whether this would have made a difference in my study is unknown, of course—there may have been no more hazing experiences among my participants than what was described, or perhaps discussion of hazing is a taboo strong enough to compel silence beyond several interview sessions. In either case, further research could help shed light on the topic.

One participant's narrative described a case of high school band bullying. Although bullying differs from hazing by definition, it is another form of peer victimization—one perhaps even more likely to negatively impact victim well-being and band retention. While the individual behavior of the bullies, in this case, is an obvious factor, it should not be ignored that skills-based ensemble placement resulted in the placement of the participant in a classroom setting in which she was separated from her peer group. This result was a catalyst for the bullying.

I analyzed the bullying behavior as a result of power/knowledge. Since the placement of a ninth-grader into the top band, and her subsequent challenging of twelfth-graders, did not fit the older students' discursive construct of how band "worked," they acted so as to preserve that construct by encouraging the transgressor to either conform or get out. This encouragement almost worked: the participant reported that she nearly the band program due to the bullying behavior.

I also analyzed participant descriptions to determine which described activities most resembled hazing. I accomplished this through further analysis of all activities that met all of the criteria for the definition of hazing used, save the reasonable risk of obvious harm. I compared described activities against Fontaine's (1986) descriptions of initiations. I made further comparisons by examining newcomers' inferred feelings of compulsion to participate, and

veterans' equal participation in the activities. Surprisingly, the described induction activities most resembling hazing were teacher-organized and led. I suggest that adult leadership's explicit endorsement of hazing-like activities sends a signal to students that it is acceptable to treat newcomers as less-than—as not fully belonging—until the fulfillment of obligations that are outside of the overt purposes of the organization. Given that high school students' ability to consider the consequences of their actions are generally underdeveloped, such an endorsement could foster a culture of harmful hazing.

Induction: Reaching a State of “In”

Participants described a wide variety of experiences in their high school band induction processes. In terms of time needed to reach a feeling of being fully “in” their high school bands, participants described needing anywhere from a few days to over a year from their first participation in high school band activities. The clusters of times that participants reported reaching this feeling, relative to their starting date, largely corresponded to significant events in their band calendar year: summer band camp, first marching band performances in the fall, spring auditions for the following year's ensemble placement, and the beginning of the tenth-grade year in band.

I believe that it is of particular importance to note two points regarding the most extended times reported to reach feelings of being “in.” First, among participants that remained in band for all four years of high school, a significant portion—about one in four—took most or all of their first year of high school finding their way to feeling fully “in” their band. This has major implications for music educators and their choices in interacting with their students. Many participants described teacher-organized activities ostensibly designed to increase positive social connections between band members. However, such activities occurred almost exclusively

during summer band rehearsals. If a significant portion of students in the ninth-grade class are still working toward a feeling of being “in” the band through most or all of their first school year, I suggest that high school band directors (and teachers and directors of other high school performing ensemble classes) should not stop their team-building work when the school year begins. Since some tenth-grade students are just reaching a feeling of “in” even as a new ninth-grade class is entering, attending to the social connections within high school bands is a year-round concern.

The second important point is that every participant who said that they found a feeling of being fully “in” their high school band did so no later than a few months into tenth grade. This timeline suggests that the window for induction is limited to approximately the first year of participation. Since I also claim that a member’s sense of belonging is necessary for continued participation in high school band (see Chapter 6), and that a sense of belonging is contingent upon first feeling “in”, this window is critical to student retention and, therefore, to their music education.

One other finding within this topic is something that I believe should be further examined by music education scholars: in participants’ narratives, the most-cited disruption event leading to a departure from the band program, or, in some cases, to near-departures was skills-based ensemble placement. In pointing this out, I am neither suggesting the abandonment of this practice nor am I endorsing it. The comparison to the practice of grade retention (see Chapter 6) is relevant: while there are valid educational arguments in support of both practices, research on grade retention continues to suggest that there are also many valid educational arguments against grade retention. In the context of high school band, it seems that in many ways, skills-based ensemble assignment has become something made to seem “natural” as opposed to socially

constructed. I would like to see the metaphorical curtain pulled back on this practice to see what is at work behind it.

Bernadette Baker (2002), in examining dis/ability issues in education, asked, “Why are norms taken for granted as objective? What restricted image of ‘the ideal citizen’ do norms for development embody?” (p. 688). I paraphrase her in order to trouble the assumed “natural-ness” of skills-based placements: Why is a certain set of music performance skills taken for granted as the objective standard for ensemble assignment? What restricted image of “good band student” do norms for music performance skills embody? I have no need to change Baker’s final question: “How might this devalue those excluded from such images?”

I suggest that debates about skills-based versus grade-based ensemble would be well-served by further research into the overall impacts of either practice. I would caution, however, against any approach that attempts to bifurcate music-learning outcomes from social outcomes. As the data from this study show, these two things are inextricably intertwined. The simplest question that I can imagine demonstrating this entanglement is this: if a practice improves music learning for one student but leads to the exclusion of another student from music learning, is it an acceptable result?

Belonging in High School Band

In the present study, I claim that one task of self-concept construction within high school band is finding ways for the individual to perceive that they are contributing to the shared goals and accomplishments of the group. This sense of contribution, I further claim, is required for a sense of belonging within the group. The most obvious means to construct such a self-concept is around the construction of music performer, since music performance is central to the overt

purposes of the high school band.⁷⁴ The “overt-ness” of this purpose is part of the prevalent paradigm, or discursive construct, of band. This construct is an instantiation of Foucauldian power/knowledge and is imbued with power to affirm or deny individuals as members worthy of belonging. The most obvious path, then, in the absence of other factors, is the most accessible path as well.

Construction of alternative self-concepts to serve the same purpose require the effort of convincing the self (and, to some degree, others, as they provide feedback) that this alternate self-concept is a valid one to contribute adequately to the goals and accomplishments of the group. Those who self-conceptualize as stronger music performers do not face this difficulty: since the paradigmatic construction of a valid band member is one who contributes through music performance, no such convincing is required.

Some participants were able to construct a self-concept wherein their music performance contributions were sufficient to feel a sense of belonging in the band. These participants received feedback from others, both official (e.g., audition and festival results) and unofficial (praise from directors, comments from other students) that supported or affirmed their self-concept as a strong music performer; or, at the least, did not present enough feedback in opposition to make its construction difficult or impossible for the individual. Likewise, they found support from self-feedback via comparison of their music performance abilities to those of others, or in comparison to self-constructed standards based on the totality of messages received regarding what it means

⁷⁴ This is not to say that music performance is the *only* purpose, nor even the most *important* purpose of the high school band (as a nation-wide institution, not as an individual program). Instead, music performance, in the broad sense that includes rehearsal and individual practice in addition to public performance, is the most observable product of the individual learning that is, ostensibly and overtly, the primary purpose of the high school band program.

to be a strong (or at least adequate) music performer. With self-concept construction materials available that permit the construction of a self-concept as a strong performer, and in consideration that this most obvious path was also the easiest (working with rather than against power/knowledge) these individuals constructed self-concepts as such, and, in the absence of other factors presenting additional obstacles, found belonging in their high school band.

Other individuals faced greater or even insurmountable obstacles in constructing a self-concept capable of belonging. Where “strong music performers” received feedback that supported or affirmed their self-concept as such, other individuals received feedback that opposed or denied that self-concept. Since self-concept is negotiated between the individual, the group, and the greater society, this denial of a particular category of self-concept carries a force that cannot simply be ignored. Even in cases where the feedback received is not sufficient to make impossible the construction of such a self-concept, it may make that construction more difficult than the construction of an alternate, but still viable, self-concept. In these cases, if the individual desires to belong in the band enough⁷⁵ to put forth the investment—emotional, psychological, even physical or monetary, depending upon circumstances—needed to construct such a self-concept, they may construct one wherein their extra-musical contributions to the group are perceived as sufficient to gain a sense of belonging. Their perceptions of whether said contributions are sufficient shapes and is shaped by the perceptions of the same among others, in and even out of the group.

⁷⁵ This desire, of course, shapes and is shaped by many other factors, including the availability of belonging in other groups, and the perceived desirability of belonging to/in various groups, as well as the perceived value to self of being able to include these belongings within one’s overall identity.

Belonging in High School Band: “We Were All In It Together.”

Belonging in the high school band—durable belonging, capable of withstanding disruptions to other facets of belonging—can only come, I claim, from the perception that one’s contributions toward the shared goals and accomplishments of the group are sufficient for such a payback. As one participant stated, “I think it was definitely what you chose to make of it. You get as much out as what you put in, like that saying. The more people invested their time in the band, the more they enjoyed it.”

While this participant said that the payback on that investment was enjoyment, I suggest that this enjoyment is, at least in part, caused by and is, itself, part of belonging to a larger group. I do not claim (nor deny) that belonging in smaller friend groups or a family unit is dependent upon the same sense of investment; any differences between these kinds of belonging is beyond the scope of this study. I do claim that belonging to a group that has overt, shared goals of accomplishment (as opposed to, say, a fan club, which perhaps shares only interests) does require the perception of contribution to the group.

In support of that claim, I point to words spoken by both Hannah and Zach—“we’re all in this together”—and to other participants’ utterances that echo the same: “We were in it together,” “we’re all moving up together,” “we had been through so much together,” “everyone has to sacrifice something and you’re all there,” “we had all gone through the whole process together,” “we all came up through the program together,” “we did it together,” “accomplishing this thing together,” “we’re all doing this together,” “we were all doing this together,” and “you all suffered in the heat together.” Shared effort or struggle was a common thread through participants’ descriptions of their band experience;

This, then, is why contributions to the group matter to belonging: one can't be part of the "we," not part of the "all," not "in," and not "together" unless they are perceived, by some certain critical mass of self and others, as contributing to the group in some way. If one were to claim that "we did this" without contributing to the doing of whatever "this" is, the response from others in the group might be, "Who is this 'we'?"

Discussion and Implications

In this study, I claim that students entering high school band face a path to inclusion and belonging that can be long, difficult, and even impossible based on their circumstances. Specifically, incoming band students must not only negotiate their (mostly) new social world in the environment of the high school at large, but they must also negotiate their path to belonging in the band, if they are to remain part of the group throughout high school. Assuming that they desire to remain in band (and, as at least one participant showed, this is not a given), an incoming member must construct a self-concept of who they are in the band, the validity of which is negotiated with fellow members, band directors, peers outside the band, and others. This self-concept must allow for a sense of valued and valuable contribution to the shared goals and accomplishments of the group. Within the prevailing paradigm of high school band, the first choice of valid self-concepts in band centers on the construct of music performer. However, other choices are available, even if at a higher cost of construction.

As part of that negotiation of self-concept with other band members, newcomers will experience applications of power, often invisible, from a tangled network of peers, teachers, and others. Sometimes this power becomes more visible, as is often the case in hazing incidents. Sometimes it remains mostly hidden, as was the case with the described hazing-like, teacher-led

activities billed as team-building games. These are the kinds of forces that shape band self-concepts through construction (which is always ongoing, to a greater or lesser degree), and the kinds of forces that each self-concept, even those of newcomers, exert upon others' ongoing self-concept construction.

I also believe that this model of belonging is applicable to other organizations. One might fairly ask whether a sports team should be concerned with providing a sense of belonging when the overt goal is to win games. I suggest that the overt goal of quality music performances can be just as strong in bands as the goal to win is with sports teams; just as a high school band must balance this goal with the mission of educating students, many youth organizations must balance their overt goals with the well-being and positive development of their charges.

High school band teachers and other music educators who work with groups with strong social bonding should be aware of these dynamics as they make decisions regarding the larger structure of their programs and their day-to-day pedagogical choices. The purpose of the present study is not to examine the efficacy of particulars of these things; if this study is of usefulness to practitioners (and I hope that it might be), it will not be via direct recommendations of practice. Effective⁷⁶ music educators (indeed, effective educators in any field) make decisions, big and small, every day, hour, even every minute that they are engaged in the work of teaching (including planning). These decisions, especially those made more or less spontaneously in a classroom with somewhat predictable but ultimately unknowable variations (e.g., student behavior), cannot be reduced to a right or wrong answer pre-determined by research. In order to make the best choice in the specific context and circumstances of any given pedagogical

⁷⁶ Acknowledging the "loaded-ness" of that term, I will leave the interpretation to the reader.

decision, an educator must consider all of the relevant information and insight that they can accumulate. However, most such decisions must be made by those that know the most about the context in which the decision is made and in which the results of the decision will play out; that is, the teacher in the classroom.

Attentiveness to how adult leaders' actions can shape organizational culture is crucial. Whether space is provided or denied for particular self-concept constructions, whether necessary self-concept construction materials are made abundant or scarce, and whether belonging is something offered to all or withheld from some are all significantly impacted by the actions of adult leaders. As much as it may (or may not!) be wished so, adult leaders are not in control of the group culture at any given moment. Over time, however, their cumulative actions can shape the ongoing and ever-shifting negotiations between individuals that make up the group culture. Through the lens of Foucauldian concepts of power, we can see that, in the tangled web of power and influence between all of these individuals,⁷⁷ a band director cannot impose a group social culture, but through ongoing, considerate choices that constitute micro-applications of power relations, a band director might effectively shape group culture to a certain—often considerable—extent. Put simply, I believe that band directors (and other adult leaders) can make a positive difference by being attentive to student social structure within their group, and by then making better-informed decisions for the benefit of the group.

⁷⁷ It cannot be ignored that all of these individuals are not isolated in a band room vacuum; what each member brings to the group shapes and is shaped by outside factors. Since an adult leader in this context cannot possibly (and, I hope, would not want to) control outside aspects of students' lives, they must, therefore, cede no small level of control over group culture.

Limitations and Future Directions

The present study has several limitations. Among the most obvious were those due to the near-homogeneity, in several ways, of the participants. Participants were all recruited from a pool of university students, eliminating the population of band members who did not go on to college; future studies could draw from this population as well, as such participants may well have very different concepts and experiences of induction and belonging in high school band. Almost three-in-four participants stayed in band for four years, a rate that is easily higher than the retention rate of the average United States high school band program. Future studies could include more participants who left their high school band program early; an understanding of failed inductions can shed light on how to support more successful induction and inclusion. Finally, almost all of the participants in this study (21 of 23) attended high school within just three upper-Midwest states. Future research could be expanded geographically, allowing any possible differences in regional culture in general, and regional band culture specifically to be examined.

I also want to note that, while I asked participants to describe themselves to me in terms of race or culture and gender, I did not find (nor directly look for) differences based on these classifications. I do, however, acknowledge that race, gender, and sexuality are among the absent presences in this study; that is, participants spoke little or not at all about these things in relation to the topics that were discussed in interviews. Yet, I know that each of these plays an undeniable role in how one navigates their day-to-day world. Whether the absence of discussion of these things in interview transcripts is due to a conscious repression or a subconscious process of forgetting, I acknowledge that these things almost certainly played a role in the experiences described.

I collected these demographic data along with information about participants' high schools and high school band programs because I did not enter into the research project with a particular hypothesis of what might show correlations with hazing or induction practices. While my sample did not shed light on any remarkable connections between any of these categories and hazing, induction, or belonging, I do believe that there are ample research opportunities to explore these possible connections.

In addition, while I did not ask participants about their own socio-economic status, it is clear that the ability to participate in band, especially in programs with extensive summer practice time and travel, is influenced by the ability to limit one's paid work in the summer and for families to pay for the equipment and travel required. Therefore, my participant parameters may have tacitly excluded many whose families were on the lower end of the socio-economic scale while they attended high school.

Another limitation was related to the number of interviews with each participant. According to Seidman, the ideal number of interviews for this kind of research would be three (2015, pp. 20–22). While two interviews with most participants gave me a great deal of rich data from which to work, it may not have been enough to breed the kind of familiarity and trust necessary to divulge any experiences thought to be embarrassing or even traumatic. This may have led to the omission of participant narratives regarding hazing. Future research may be well-served by an expansion to three interviews per participant.

Finally, the data that I collected led me to examine belonging in high school band, but I did not set out upon the current study with that concept specifically in mind. Because of this, I did not ask questions in the interview script (see Appendices A and B) that were designed to address belonging. Further research into belonging in high school band could be designed with

research questions specifically for this area of study, and by designing research methodology accordingly.

I suggest that the concepts of induction, hazing, and belonging are still under-examined within the field of high school bands. While the present study is not designed to make specific recommendations for practice, I propose that, along with further studies to develop theoretical understanding of belonging in a high school band (or similar) settings, research on practical applications of these understandings would also be useful. Teacher practices in many areas—social bonding activities, introduction to high school band activities, and skills-based ensemble placement, to name a few that came up in this project—could be studied for both their effectiveness in terms of individual learning and their impact upon group dynamics. Using theoretical research into belonging to guide and inform practical application research on issues such as induction, hazing, and retention could precipitate significant and positive changes in how we teach music performance ensemble classes in the United States and elsewhere.

APPENDIX A – INTERVIEW SCRIPT I

INTERVIEW SCRIPT GUIDE – INTERVIEWER SCRIPT IN BOLD

(After completing IRB notifications and consenting procedures, and providing emergency counseling contact information)

*Remember that this is cooperative research, and that members are participants, not subjects.

“This is a research study on high school band induction processes. This is a topic that can be tough to define, so you should know that induction is not always a formal event (although it can be). Induction, for the purposes of this study, refers to a time (or times) near the beginning of your high school band “career,” at which you felt that you became fully a member of the band. This may be different from the time that you “officially” became a member; for example, getting registered for band in a computer system may have made you “officially” a member, but this may not have been the event that made you *feel* like a member.

“You should also know that this is a collaborative effort. Although I am considered the researcher, and I will be doing the data gathering, analysis, and writing, you are an important part of this research. As a partner, you are free to ask me questions during this conversation, and I will answer as much as I am comfortable doing so. I may also tell you parts of my story to help you tell your own.

“Remember that any information that would make you identifiable will be removed or generalized in any data or documents that are shared or published, and that you always have the right to decline to answer any questions, and to end the interview at any time.

“Let’s start with some background information about you...”

(ask directly)

__current age

__major or occupation

__career goals

__gender identification

__race/culture identification

“Is there anything else about you, in general, that you think I should know?”

Please tell me what your high school was like, in general.

(check off items as they are mentioned)

__location (state is enough)

__urban, suburban, rural

__school size (guesstimate in hundreds if unknown)

__diversity (or lack thereof)

*Follow up to clarify any of these that were not clearly mentioned.

Please tell me about the school culture in general. Some examples of school cultural aspects might be what the social scene was like; how accepting, or not, students were of others; how much students kept to their own class (frosh, sophomore, etc.).

Please tell me about your high school band program. Again, please start with what you feel is important to tell me, and I will follow up with questions about specific things if they don't come up.

(check off items as they are mentioned)

__size of band program/total students involved

__kinds of bands:

___concert (how many?) ___competitive?
 ___jazz band (how many?) ___competitive?
 ___pep band
 ___marching band ___competitive? ___how? (parade, field show, etc.)
 ___others?
 ___was there any travel involved?

*Follow up to clarify any of these that were not clearly mentioned.

Now please tell me about the culture of your high school band program. You can think of culture like we did in the question about your high school in general. One way to think of this is: how did you feel as a member of the band?

*Follow up as needed to explore the question, but specifically try to glean out how strongly students identified as members, how close the group felt...how the band made the member feel).

(The next question may be answered as part of the previous question...if so, clarify, or skip)

How did the band fit into the general school culture? Some examples of how the band fit in to the general culture might be if the band culture were different from the general school culture, and if membership in band was a positive, negative, or neutral factor in social status within the greater school culture.

*Follow up as needed to explore the question.

Now I'd like to hear about your induction into your high school band. I'm talking about when you "joined" the band – what was that like? Was there anything different from starting other high school classes? I'd like to hear your STORY of induction in your high school band – it could be your own, or the induction of others.

(if stuck...)

This may seem a little bit vague, so don't worry about "getting it right"...different people may have different ideas about what constitutes induction. If nothing sticks out, just tell me the story of you starting in high school band...sometimes, induction is a longer, subtle process, and won't necessarily involve any specific, memorable moments.

*Follow up as needed to explore the question. Some possible follow up questions AT ANY TIME during the broader question:

__Official /unofficial

__adult/ student organized

__ public / secret

- How did this make you feel?
- Why do you think this happened?
- What do you think others thought of this?

End first interview session here – if possible, schedule interview two.

APPENDIX B – INTERVIEW SCRIPT II

Start second session by reviewing IRB notifications, consenting procedures, and emergency counseling information.

Give a brief reminder of what was covered at the first session.

Ask if there was anything that the participant thought of since the first session and wanted to add.

Proceed with additional questions:

(The following question was added, with an IRB approval of the change of protocol, after the first round of interviews (N=9) were complete. Three of those nine participants responded to a request to answer this additional question; two agreed to a brief (ca. ten minutes) follow-up interview session, and one declined. Six did not respond.)

Do you feel that there was any element of peer initiation, whether by individuals or a larger group, during your high school band induction? If so, would you tell me about that?

*Follow up as needed to explore the question.

What kind of impacts do you think the induction process or events had on you?

*Follow up as needed to explore the question.

What kind of impacts do you think the induction process or events that you just described had on others, and the program in general?

What do you think the purpose (if it was purposeful) of this induction process / event was?

*Follow up as needed to explore the question.

**What contextual conditions do you think made your induction event or process possible?
Or, to put it another way, what might be some things, without which your induction
process or events would have been quite different?**

*Follow up as needed to explore the question.

**Now I'd like you to try to remember what you thought about the induction at the time it
happened. How do you think your perception or opinions of this process or events has
changed over time – if at all?**

*Follow up as needed to explore the question.

**Is there anything else that you'd like to tell me about anything that we've talked about
today?**

**I want to thank you for your time and your sharing of your story today. I will be in contact
again soon to ask if you have thought of anything else that you'd like to add, just in case
you realize over the next few days that there is more that you wish you'd said, or that you
wanted to change how you said something.**

Again, thank you! (don't forget the gift card!)

APPENDIX C – INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT SAMPLE

(Selected for typicality, lack of material repeated from analysis, and lack of information potentially making participant identifiable)

TS: Okay, so the first question today is the same one as the last question last time, which is...go back and actually read it here...telling me the story about induction into high school band, and it's your story, but it could be when you were going through induction, it could be when you were an upperclassman and somebody else was going through that process, but just kind of telling me your story again.

AMBER: I guess, we had a lot of bands at my high school. You had the marching band and pit orchestra and jazz band and concert band and all kinds of things. You could do pep band, and I think the more involved you were, the more likely you were to feel a part of the community. So, I think freshmen coming in might feel a little excluded because they don't really know what's going on. They might not do a lot of things. They might not do marching band, or they might not do a lot of pep bands, might not do jazz band. But I found once I joined marching band sophomore year, you get to know all these people, and then you have to do...so the older you get, the more people you know, and you're better at your instrument, so then you get to be in better ensembles. There's no formal procedure, it's more of just, I think, if you feel included or not. I think you feel included when you know a lot of people and you like them, and they like you back.

TS: So, remind me, was there a freshman-only band?

AMBER: Yeah. There's a freshman-only concert band. There was freshman wind ensemble and varsity band, freshman wind ensemble is the better one. We had three jazz bands, and jazz three was mostly just freshman also.

TS: Going back to something you said, that a lot of freshman just didn't know as many people because they were kind of locked into their freshman group and didn't get to know the upperclassman if they weren't in, say, marching band.

AMBER: Yeah, if they weren't in marching band, they probably didn't know a lot of upperclassmen. That's kind of how it was for me. What...I mean, a little bit different, because I was in jazz two, which is a little bit more of upperclassmen, but if you were someone who was in all the freshman things and you're not in marching band, then you're only gonna know freshmen.

TS: Right. Okay. So, thinking about the whole process, it sounds like what you're describing is kind of an unofficial induction process; that there wasn't an official...the directors or school administration or whatever didn't provide for anything other than the registration and so forth.

AMBER: Right. I guess, you could get a letter. You could letter in band. You have to earn certain amount of points; you have to do...if you're in some kind of concert band you have to do solo and ensemble contests and you have to do a certain amount of pep bands. I don't know if you're required to do jazz band or not, I don't think that would really be fair for the people who don't play jazz instruments, but I know you have to do solo and ensemble contests and you have to do pep bands.

APPENDIX D – RECRUITMENT LETTER I

(Sent to all students enrolled in band classes at a large, Midwestern university)
(Date)

Re: High School Band Induction Study – Tobin Shucha

Dear [University redacted] Band Students:

I am recruiting research participants that are between the ages of 18-25 who participated in high school band, in order to conduct research into the induction – or group joining – process in US high school band programs. The induction process refers to an event, multiple events, or a period of time near the beginning of a student's membership in a high school band program. It may be official or unofficial, teacher-led or student-led, a single event or an ambiguous length of time. I am gathering participants' stories of induction in order to learn more about the process.

I am extending this invitation to all [redacted] band students because it is assumed that the vast majority will have participated in their high school band programs. The only other eligibility criteria are that participants are between 18 and 25 years old, legally able to give their own consent to participate, and are not currently and have not previously been in a significant relationship with me (e.g., my former students).

Participation involves an initial verification of eligibility via e-mail or phone, two 30-60-minute interview sessions at a location convenient to participants (in the [redacted] area, unless negotiated with me), and a follow-up phone call (>15 minutes). Participants who complete the study will receive a **\$25 gift card** (Amazon.com; others may be available if requested).

Please note that volunteering for the study does not necessarily mean that you will be selected as a full participant, nor does it obligate you to take part in or finish the study. Participants are free to leave the study at any time.

If you are interested in taking part in this study, please contact me at:

[e-mail redacted]

...please include **“Induction”** in the subject line.

Please note that I do not have your e-mail address until you contact me...I do not have access to registration or e-mail address lists.

Thank you for your consideration!

Tobin Shucha
PhD Candidate, Curriculum and Instruction
University of Wisconsin – Madison

APPENDIX E – RECRUITMENT LETTER II

(Sent to all non-opt-out 18-25-year-old students at a large, Midwestern university)
(Date)

Re: High School Band Induction Study – Tobin Shucha

Dear [university redacted] Students:

I am recruiting research participants that are between the ages of 18-25 who participated in high school band for fewer than four years in order to conduct research into the induction – or group joining – process in US high school band programs. The induction process refers to an event, multiple events, or a period of time near the beginning of a student's membership in a high school band program. It may be official or unofficial, teacher-led or student-led, a single event or an ambiguous length of time. I am gathering participants' stories of induction in order to learn more about the process.

I am extending this invitation to any [redacted] students that meet the above criteria of participating in high school band for fewer than four years. The only other eligibility criteria are that participants are between 18 and 25 years old, legally able to give their own consent to participate, and are not currently and have not previously been in a significant relationship with me (e.g., my former students).

Participation involves an initial verification of eligibility via e-mail or phone, two 30-60-minute interview session at a location convenient to participants (in the [redacted] area, unless negotiated with me), and possibly a follow-up phone call (>15 minutes). Participants who complete the study will receive a **\$25 gift card** (Amazon.com; others may be available if requested).

Please note that volunteering for the study does not necessarily mean that you will be selected as a full participant, nor does it obligate you to take part in or finish the study. Participants are free to leave the study at any time.

If you are interested in taking part in this study, please contact me at:

[e-mail redacted]

...please include **“Induction”** in the subject line.

Thank you for your consideration!

Tobin Shucha
PhD Candidate, Curriculum and Instruction
University of Wisconsin – Madison

APPENDIX F – PROTOCOL APPROVAL

**Education and Social/Behavioral Science IRB**

10/4/2017

Submission ID number: [2017-0464-CP001](#)
Title: Induction Patterns in High School Bands: a qualitative study of 18-25-year-olds' perceptions of welcoming or initiation patterns in their high school bands.
Principal Investigator: JULIA E KOZA
Point-of-Contact: TOBIN CHRISTOPHER SHUCHA
IRB Staff Reviewer: LAURA CONGER

A designated ED/SBS IRB member conducted an expedited review of the above-referenced change of protocol application. The change of protocol application was approved by the IRB member. The change of protocol application qualified for expedited review pursuant to 45 CFR 46.110 and, if applicable, 21 CFR 56.110 and 38 CFR 16.110. You must log in to your ARROW account in order to view the specific changes approved by the IRB.

To access the materials approved by the IRB, including any stamped consent forms, recruitment materials and the approved protocol, if applicable, please log in to your ARROW account and view the documents tab in the submission's workspace.

If you requested a HIPAA waiver of authorization, altered authorization and/or partial authorization, please log in to your ARROW account and view the history tab in the submission's workspace for approval details.

Please review the Investigator Responsibilities guidance (http://www.irb.wisc.edu/documents/Principal_Investigator_Responsibilities.pdf) which includes a description of IRB requirements for submitting continuing review progress reports, changes of protocol and reportable events.

If you have general questions, please contact the Education and Social/Behavioral Science IRB at 608-263-2320. For questions related to this submission, contact the assigned staff reviewer.

APPENDIX G – CONSENT FORM

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON Research Participant Information and Consent Form

Title of the Study: Induction Patterns in High School Bands

Principal Investigator: Julia Koza (phone: [redacted])

Student Researcher: Tobin Shucha

DESCRIPTION OF THE RESEARCH

You are invited to participate in a research study about high school band induction activities.

You are being invited because of your participation in high school band.

The purpose of the research is to explore the perceptions that former band students hold about induction patterns, and how these relate to students, and to various characteristics of their band program.

Participants will be 18-25 years old and will have participated in high school band.

Interviews will be conducted at locations convenient to the interviewee and will be arranged after initial contact.

Audio recordings will be made of your participation. Only the interviewer and/or transcription professionals will hear the audio recordings. Recordings will be kept only until de-identified transcripts have been made by the interviewer, after which they will be deleted.

De-identified data will be kept after the completion of this study.

WHAT WILL MY PARTICIPATION INVOLVE?

If you decide to participate in this research, you will be asked to answer questions about your perceptions of your high school band experience.

Your participation will consist of two 30 to 60-minute interview sessions, with the possibility of a shorter follow-up interview (probably via telephone).

ARE THERE ANY RISKS TO ME?

There is a minimal risk of breach of confidentiality.

ARE THERE ANY BENEFITS TO ME?

There are no direct benefits for the participants.

WILL I BE COMPENSATED FOR MY PARTICIPATION?

You will receive a \$25 gift card for completing participation this study.

HOW WILL MY CONFIDENTIALITY BE PROTECTED?

While there will be publications as a result of this study, your name will not be used.

If you participate in this study, we would like to be able to quote you directly without using your name. If you agree to allow us to quote you in publications, please initial the statement at the bottom of this form.

WHOM SHOULD I CONTACT IF I HAVE QUESTIONS?

You may ask any questions about the research at any time. If you have questions about the research after you leave today, you should contact the student researcher, Tobin Shucha, at [redacted]. You may also call the Principal Investigator, Julia Eklund Koza, at [redacted].

If you are not satisfied with the response of the research team, have more questions, or want to talk with someone about your rights as a research participant, you should contact the Education and Social/Behavioral Science IRB Office at [redacted].

Your participation is completely voluntary. If you decide not to participate or to withdraw from the study, you may do so at any time.

Your signature indicates that you have read this consent form, had an opportunity to ask any questions about your participation in this research and voluntarily consent to participate. You will receive a copy of this form for your records.

Name of Participant (please print): _____

Signature

Date

_____ I give my permission to be quoted directly in publications without using my name.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abdulrehman, R. Y. (2007). *The cycle of abuse in sport hazing: Is it simply a case of boys being boys?* Retrieved from
<http://md1.csa.com/partners/viewrecord.php?requester=gs&collection=ENV&recid=8964402&q=abdulrehman+hazing&uid=789410558&setcookie=yes>
- Academic Innovations, Publisher of Career Choices. (n.d.). Retrieved from
<http://www.academicinnovations.com/int19.html>
- Adderley, C., Kennedy, M., & Berz, W. (2016). "A Home away from home": The world of the high school music classroom. *Journal of Research in Music Education*.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/3345373>
- Allan, E. J. (2009). *Hazing in View: College Students at Risk: Initial Findings from the National Study of Student Hazing*. DIANE Publishing.
- Allan, E. J., Kerschner, D., & Payne, J. M. (2018). College student hazing experiences, attitudes, and perceptions: Implications for prevention. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19496591.2018.1490303>
- Allan, E. J., & Mary Madden. (2008). *Hazing in View: College Students at Risk*. Retrieved from
http://www.hazingstudy.org/publications/hazing_in_view_web.pdf
- Allan, E. J., Payne, J. M., & Kerschner, D. (2018). Transforming the culture of hazing: A research-based hazing prevention framework. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19496591.2018.1474759>

- Anderson, E., McCormack, M., & Lee, H. (2012). Male team sport hazing initiations in a culture of decreasing homophobia. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 27(4), 427–448.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558411412957>
- Aronson, E., & Mills, J. (1959). The effect of severity of initiation on liking for a group. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 59(2), 177–181.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/h0047195>
- Ashforth, B. E., Sluss, D. M., & Saks, A. M. (2007). Socialization tactics, proactive behavior, and newcomer learning: integrating socialization models. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 70(3), 447–462. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2007.02.001>
- Associated Press. (2003, November 11). Marching band hazing incident leads to lawsuit against education board. Retrieved from The Michigan Daily website:
<http://www.michigandaily.com/content/marching-band-hazing-incident-leads-lawsuit-against-education-board>
- Baker, B. (2002). The hunt for disability: The new eugenics and the normalization of school children. *Teachers College Record*, 104(4), 663–703. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9620.00175>
- Bamberg, M. (2006). Stories: Big or small: Why do we care? *Narrative Inquiry*, 16(1), 139–147.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/ni.16.1.18bam>
- Barber, J. P. (2012). “Ever after strictly and rigidly obeyed -- With some exceptions”: Administrative responses to hazing in the 1870s. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors*, 7(1), 1–21.

- Beaver, T. (2013, November 1). Complaints filed about sexual harrassment by Kennewick High band students | Local News | Tri-CityHerald.com. Retrieved from <http://www.tri-cityherald.com/2013/11/01/2653913/complaints-filed-about-sexual.html>
- Beck, M. & Malley, J. (1998). A pedagogy of belonging. *Reclaiming Children and Youth: The Journal of Strength-Based Interventions*, 7(3), 133–137.
- Bishop, L. & Goodwin, S. (Producers) (2011, December 21). Talk of the Nation [radio program]. Washington, DC: National Public Radio. Retrieved from <http://www.npr.org/2011/12/21/144077864/brutal-incidents-shine-light-on-band-hazing-culture>
- Blanton, H., & Burkley, M. (2008). Deviance regulation theory: Applications to adolescent social influence. In *Duke Series in Child Development and Public Policy. Understanding peer influence in children and adolescents* (pp. 94–121). New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. New York, NY, US: John Wiley & Sons
- Blumenkrantz, D. G., & Gavazzi, S. M. (1993). Guiding transitional events for children and adolescents through a modern day rite of passage. *Journal of Primary Prevention*, 13(3), 199–212. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01352926>
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1979). Symbolic Power. *Critique of Anthropology*, 4(13–14), 77–85. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0308275X7900401307>
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Harvard University Press.

- Bourdieu, P. (1990a). *In Other Words: Essays Towards a Reflexive Sociology*. Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990b). *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2001). *Masculine Domination*. Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (1990). *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. SAGE.
- Bowlby, J. (1982). Attachment and loss: Retrospect and prospect. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 52(4), 664–678.
- Brown, R. (1988). *Group Processes: Dynamics Within and Between Groups*. Cambridge, MA, US: Basil Blackwell.
- Bushweller, K. (2000). Brutal rituals, dangerous rites. *American School Board Journal*, 187(8), 18–23.
- Butler, J. (2013, October 29). Alleged VP band “deckline”; hazing under investigation. Retrieved from <http://www.eunicetoday.com/state/alleged-vp-band-deckline-hazing-under-investigation>
- Campo, S., Poulos, G., & Sipple, J. W. (2005). Prevalence and profiling: hazing among college students and points of intervention. *American Journal of Health Behavior*, 29(2), 137–149.
- Chmelynski, C. (1997). Handling high-school hazing. *Education Digest*, 63(3), 60.
- Cillessen, A. H. N., & Bellmore, A. D. (1999). Accuracy of social self-perceptions and peer competence in middle childhood. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 45(4), 650–676.

- Cimino, A. (2011). The evolution of hazing: Motivational mechanisms and the abuse of newcomers. *Journal of Cognition and Culture*, 11(3), 241–267.
<https://doi.org/10.1163/156853711X591242>
- Clandinin, D. J. (2006). *Handbook of Narrative Inquiry: Mapping a Methodology*. SAGE Publications.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1999). *Narrative Inquiry: Experience and Story in Qualitative Research*. Wiley.
- Cohen, D. L., & Brust, R. (2012). Clearing up hazing. *ABA Journal*, 98(10), 14–18.
- Corenblum, B., & Marshall, E. (1998). The band played on: Predicting students' intentions to continue studying music. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 46(1), 128–140.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/3345765>
- Coupland, N., & Nussbaum, J. F. (1993). *Discourse and Lifespan Identity*. Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2016). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*. SAGE Publications.
- Cusick, P. A. (1973). *Inside High School: The Student's World*. Retrieved from
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED079832>
- DeWitt, D. M., & DeWitt, L. J. (2012). A case of high school hazing: Applying restorative justice to promote organizational learning. *National Association of Secondary School Principals. NASSP Bulletin*, 96(3), 228–242.
- Dias, D., & Sá, M. J. (2014). Transition to higher education: The role of initiation practices. *Educational Research*, 56(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2013.874144>
- Dixon, M. (2001). Hazing in high schools: Ending the hidden tradition. *Journal of Law & Education*, 30(2), 357–363.

- Douglas, J. D. (1984). *Creative Interviewing*. SAGE Publications.
- Edelman, M. (2004). *Addressing the High School Hazing Problem: Why Lawmakers Need to Impose a Duty to Act on School Personnel* (SSRN Scholarly Paper No. ID 1291983). Retrieved from Social Science Research Network website: <http://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=1291983>
- Edelman, M. (2005). How to prevent high school hazing: A legal, ethical and social primer. *North Dakota Law Review*, 81, 309.
- Edward, N. S. (2016). First impressions last. *Active Learning in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14697874030043003>
- Edwards, A. L. (1957). *The Social Desirability Variable in Personality Assessment and Research*. Dryden Press.
- Eliade, M. (1965). *Rites and Symbols of Initiation: The Mysteries of Birth and Rebirth*. Harper & Row.
- Ellsworth, C. W. (2004). *Definitions of hazing: Differences among selected student organizations* (M.A., University of Maryland, College Park). Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.library.wisc.edu/pqdtft/docview/305175876/abstract?accountid=465>
- Eribon, D. (1991). *Michel Foucault*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations*, 7(2), 117–140. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872675400700202>
- Fierberg, D. E. (2000). High school, where hazing is amazing. *Education Digest*, 66(4), 48.
- Fisher, R. J. (1993). Social desirability bias and the validity of indirect questioning. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20(2), 303–315. <https://doi.org/10.1086/209351>

- Fleischer, L. (2005). The development of authentic identity: implications for the soul of education. *Reclaiming Children and Youth: The Journal of Strength-Based Interventions*, 14(3), 179.
- Fontaine, J. S. L. (1986). *Initiation: Ritual Drama and Secret Knowledge Across the World*. Manchester University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1980a). *Herculine Barbin*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1980b). *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1988). *Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings, 1977-1984*. Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M., Bouchard, Donald F. (1980c). *Language, Counter-memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*. Ithaca, N.Y., US: Cornell University Press.
- Freer, P. K. (2012). From the academic editor: Hazing in our midst. *Music Educators Journal*, 98(3), 12–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0027432112438172>
- Garrison, R. (2004, July). Developmental pathways as rites of passage. Retrieved from <http://www.cyc-net.org/cyc-online/cycol-0704-garrison.html>
- Gartner, A. (2013, August 9). North High seeks new band director following alleged hazing incident. Retrieved from <http://www.news-herald.com/general-news/20100819/north-high-seeks-new-band-director-following-alleged-hazing-incident>
- Georgakopoulou, A. (2006). Thinking big with small stories in narrative and identity analysis. *Narrative Inquiry*, 16(1), 122–130. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ni.16.1.16geo>

- Glasser, W. (1986). *Control theory in the classroom*. In *Control Theory in the Classroom*. New York, NY, US: Perennial Library/Harper & Row Publishers.
- Goodenow, C. (1993). Classroom belonging among early adolescent students: Relationships to motivation and achievement. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 13(1), 21–43.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431693013001002>
- Gordon, R. (2009). Power in organizational behaviour. *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Behavior: Volume II Macro Approaches*, 150–161.
- Gove, P. B. (1981). *Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language, Unabridged*. Merriam-Webster.
- Grimes, R. L. (2002). *Deeply Into the Bone: Re-Inventing Rites of Passage*. University of California Press.
- Guynn, K. L., & Aquila, F. D. (2005). *Hazing in High Schools: Causes And Consequences*. Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.
- Harré, R., & Langenhove, L. V. (1998). *Positioning Theory: Moral Contexts of International Action*. Wiley.
- Harry, A. G. (2018). *America's Got Talent? Interrogating Students' Constructions of Musical Ability* (Ph.D., The University of Wisconsin - Madison). Retrieved from
<http://search.proquest.com/pqdtlocal1006298/docview/2043559446/abstract/45188C509A254AA4PQ/1>
- Hartley, L. A. (2016). Influence of starting grade and school organization on enrollment and retention in beginning instrumental music. *Journal of Research in Music Education*.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/3345443>

- Hasselgren, B. (1996). *Phenomenography, a “good-for-nothing brother” of phenomenology? : or, phenomenography is what phenomenographers do when doing phenomenography*. Retrieved from <https://search.library.wisc.edu/catalog/999902277102121>
- Hernandez, A. (2011, November 22). FAMU hazing probe death Robert Champion: After sheriff cites hazing in FAMU death, parents say band was abusive - Orlando Sentinel. Retrieved from http://articles.orlandosentinel.com/2011-11-22/news/os-famu-hazing-probe-robert-champion-20111122_1_hazing-band-director-julian-white
- Hinkle, S. L. (2005). *Cognitive Dissonance in Athletic Hazing: The Roles of Commitment and Athletic Identity (dissertation)*. Retrieved from <http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.wisc.edu/pqdlink?vinst=PROD&attempt=1&fmt=14&startpage=-1&ver=1&vname=PQD&RQT=309&did=1068219371&exp=05-04-2015&scaling=FULL&vtype=PQD&rqt=309&TS=1273033400&clientId=3751>
- Hogg, M. A., & Hardie, E. A. (1991). Social attraction, personal attraction, and self-categorization: A field study. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 17(2), 175–180. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014616729101700209>
- Hollmann, B. B. (2002). Hazing: Hidden campus crime. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2002(99), 11–24. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.57>
- Homans, G. C. (1958). Social behavior as exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*, 63(6), 597–606. <https://doi.org/10.1086/222355>
- Hoover, N. C. (1999). *National Survey: Initiation Rites and Athletics for NCAA Sports Teams*. Retrieved from http://www.alfred.edu/sports_hazing/
- Hoover, N. C., & Pollard, N. J. (2000). *Initiation Rites in American High Schools: A National Survey. Final Report*. Retrieved from http://www.alfred.edu/hs_hazing/

- Hosansky, D. (2013). Preventing hazing. *CQ Researcher*, 133–156.
- Howard, A., & EnglandKennedy, E. (2006). Breaking the silence: Power, conflict, and contested frames within an affluent high school. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 37(4), 347–365. <https://doi.org/10.1525/aeq.2006.37.4.347>
- Hudak, S. (2012a, May 3). FAMU Champion hazing surrender: More FAMU hazing suspects surrender in beating of Robert Champion - Orlando Sentinel. Retrieved from http://articles.orlandosentinel.com/2012-05-03/news/os-famu-champion-hazing-surrender-20120503_1_hazing-death-florida-a-m-university-students-famu
- Hudak, S. (2012b, May 14). FAMU hazing bria hunter: Accused FAMU band member Aaron Golson will admit to hazing incident - Orlando Sentinel. Retrieved from http://articles.orlandosentinel.com/2012-05-14/news/famu-hazing-bria-hunter-20120514_1_famu-band-hazing-death-hobson-and-harris
- Ingersoll, R. M., & Smith, T. M. (2016). Do teacher induction and mentoring matter? *NASSP Bulletin*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019263650408863803>
- Janis, I. L. (1972). *Victims of Groupthink: A Psychological Study of Foreign-Policy Decisions and Fiascoes*. Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Jenkins, R. (2013). *Pierre Bourdieu*. Routledge.
- Jimerson, S. R., Anderson, G. E., & Whipple, A. D. (2002). Winning the battle and losing the war: Examining the relation between grade retention and dropping out of high school. *Psychology in the Schools*, 39(4), 441–457. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.10046>
- Johnson, J. (2011). Across the threshold: A comparative analysis of communitas and rites of passage in sport hazing and initiations. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 36(3), 199–228.

- Johnson, J., & Holman, M. (2009). Gender and hazing: The same but different. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 80, 1–9.
- Johnson, J., & Holman, M. J. (2004). *Making the team*. Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Kam, D. (2011, December 11). FAMU band hazing: A long culture of violence. Retrieved from <http://www.palmbeachpost.com/news/news/state-regional/famu-band-hazing-a-long-culture-of-violence/nL2MZ/>
- Keating, C. F., Pomerantz, J., Pommer, S. D., Ritt, S. J. H., Miller, L. M., & McCormick, J. (2005). Going to college and unpacking hazing: A functional approach to decrypting initiation practices among undergraduates. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 9(2), 104–126. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2699.9.2.104>
- Kelchtermans, G., & Ballet, K. (2002). The micropolitics of teacher induction: A narrative-biographical study on teacher socialisation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18(1), 105–120. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(01\)00053-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00053-1)
- Kessler, R. (2000). Initiation: Saying good-bye to childhood. *Educational Leadership*, 57(4), 30–33.
- Khadaroo, S. (2011, December 2). Death by hazing? Why even tragic FAMU case won't end such rituals. - CSMonitor.com. Retrieved from <http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Education/2011/1202/Death-by-hazing-Why-even-tragic-FAMU-case-won-t-end-such-rituals>
- Kinney, D. W. (2009). Selected nonmusic predictors of urban students' decisions to enroll and persist in middle school band programs. *Journal of Research in Music Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022429409350086>

Kirby, S., & Wintrup, G. (2002). Running the gauntlet: An examination of initiation/hazing and sexual abuse in sport. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 8(2), 49–68.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13552600208413339>

Koza, J. E. (2013, December 2). *Re: question*. Retrieved from

https://wisemail.wisc.edu/iwc_static/layout/main.html?lang=en&2-6.01_002019&

Kraus, W. (2006). The narrative negotiation of identity and belonging. *Narrative Inquiry*, 16(1), 9.

Kuzmich, M. J. J. (1999). In vino mortuus: Fraternal hazing and alcohol-related deaths.

McGeorge Law Review, 31, 1087.

Langellier, K., & Peterson, E. (2004). *Storytelling in Daily Life: Performing Narrative*.

Retrieved from <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/wisc/detail.action?docID=669502>

Levine, J. M., & Moreland, R. L. (1994). Group socialization: Theory and research. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 5(1), 305–336.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/14792779543000093>

Lipkins, S. (2006). *Preventing hazing*. John Wiley and Sons.

Lipkins, S. (n.d.). Inside Hazing. Retrieved from <http://www.insidehazing.com/why.php>

Lloyd, D. & Martin, A. (2012, February 27). Band hazing can be deadly | The New Bullying.

Retrieved from <http://news.jrn.msu.edu/bullying/2012/02/27/band-hazing-dead/>

Lodewijckx, H. F. M., & Syroit, J. E. M. M. (1997). Severity of initiation revisited: Does severity of initiation increase attractiveness in real groups? *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 27(3), 275–300. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-0992\(199705\)27:3<275::AID-EJSP822>3.0.CO;2-S](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-0992(199705)27:3<275::AID-EJSP822>3.0.CO;2-S)

Mahdi, L. C. (1987). *Betwixt & Between: Patterns of Masculine and Feminine Initiation*. Open Court Publishing.

Mahdi, L. C., Christopher, N. G., & Meade, M. (1996). *Crossroads: The Quest for Contemporary Rites of Passage*. Open Court Publishing.

Manen, M. van. (2016). *Researching Lived Experience: Human Science for an Action Sensitive Pedagogy*. Routledge.

Marton, F. (1986). Phenomenography—A research approach to investigating different understandings of reality. *Journal of Thought*, 21(3), 28–49.

Marton, F. (2014). *Necessary Conditions of Learning*. Routledge.

Maxwell, J. A. (2012). *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach*. SAGE Publications.

Moreland, R. L., & Levine, J. M. (1982). Socialization in small groups: Temporal changes in individual-group relations. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 15, pp. 137–192). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60297-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60297-X)

Morrison, S. J. (2001). The school ensemble. *Music Educators Journal*, 88(2), 24.

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological Research Methods*. SAGE.

Narayan, U., Harding, S. G., & Harding, S. (2000). *Decentering the Center: Philosophy for a Multicultural, Postcolonial, and Feminist World*. Indiana University Press.

Nuwer, H. (1990). *Broken Pledges*. Longstreet Press.

Nuwer, H. (1999). *Wrongs of Ppassage: Fraternities, Sororities, Hazing, and Binge Drinking*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Nuwer, H. (2000). *High School Hazing: When Rites Become Wrongs*. Franklin Watts.

Nuwer, H. (2001). *Wrongs of Passage*. Indiana University Press.

- Nuwer, H. (2004). *The Hazing Reader*. Indiana University Press.
- Ochs, E., & Capps, L. (2009). *Living Narrative: Creating Lives in Everyday Storytelling*. Harvard University Press.
- Oksala, J. (2007). *How to Read Foucault*. London: Granta.
- Oliff, H. (2002). Lifting the haze around hazing. *Education Digest*, 67(8), 21–27.
- Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at School: What We Know and What We Can Do*. Wiley.
- Orne, M. T. (1996). Demand characteristics. In P. Banyard & A. Grayson (Eds.), *Introducing Psychological Research: Sixty Studies that Shape Psychology* (pp. 395–401).
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-24483-6_59
- Osterman, K. F. (2000). Students' need for belonging in the school community. *Review of Educational Research*, 70(3), 323–367. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1170786>
- Parker, E. C. (2010). Exploring student experiences of belonging within an urban high school choral ensemble: an action research study. *Music Education Research*, 12(4), 339–352.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14613808.2010.519379>
- Pelletier, A. (2002). Regulation of rites: The effect and enforcement of current anti-hazing statutes. *New England Journal on Criminal and Civil Confinement*, 28, 377.
- Probyn, E. (1996). *Outside Belongings*. Psychology Press.
- Putallaz, M., & Gottman, J. M. (1981). An interactional model of children's entry into peer groups. *Child Development*, 52(3), 986–994. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1129103>
- Reichers, A. E. (1987). An interactionist perspective on newcomer socialization rates. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(2), 278–287. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.1987.4307838>

- Rogers, S., Rogers, C., & Anderson, T. (2012). Examining the link between pledging, hazing, and organizational commitment among members of a black greek fraternity. *Oracle: The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors*, 7(1), 43–53.
- Rosenholtz, S. J. (2015). Workplace conditions that affect teacher quality and commitment: Implications for teacher induction programs. *The Elementary School Journal*.
<https://doi.org/10.1086/461584>
- Ruffins, P. (2009). Hazing refuses to go away. *Diverse: Issues in Higher Education*, 26(19), 6–6.
- Saldana, J. (2015). *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. SAGE.
- Schnorr, R. F. (1997). From enrollment to membership: “Belonging” in middle and high school classes. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*, 22(1), 1–15.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/154079699702200101>
- Schnur, S. (2007). *Fraternity Hazing: A Multi-Perspective Analysis of a Universal Phenomenon (dissertation)*. Retrieved from
<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.wisc.edu/pqdlink?vinst=PROD&attempt=1&fmt=14&startpage=-1&ver=1&vname=PQD&RQT=309&did=1414121701&exp=05-04-2015&scaling=FULL&vtype=PQD&rqt=309&cfc=1&TS=1273033117&clientId=3751>
- Seidman, I. (2015). *Interviewing as Qualitative Research: A Guide for Researchers in Education and the Social Sciences, 4th Ed.* Teachers College Press.
- Silveira, J. M., & Hudson, M. W. (2015). Hazing in the college marching band. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 63(1), 5–27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022429415569064>
- Smith, T. M., & Ingersoll, R. M. (2016). What are the effects of induction and mentoring on beginning teacher turnover? *American Educational Research Journal*.
<https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312041003681>

- Sprogøe, J., & Rohde, N. (2009). Practicing induction: A generative dance between newcomers and organizations. *Learning Inquiry*, 3(1), 47–66. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11519-008-0036-2>
- Steinmetz, G. (2011). Bourdieu, historicity, and historical sociology. *Cultural Sociology*, 5(1), 45–66. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1749975510389912>
- Stokrocki, M. (1997). Rites of passage for middle school students. *Art Education*, 50(3), 48–55. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3193697>
- Stuart, S. P. (2013). Warriors, machismo, and jockstraps: Sexually exploitative athletic hazing and title IX in the public school locker room. *Western New England Law Review*. Retrieved from http://works.bepress.com/susan_stuart/2
- Taylor, K. R. (2001). Is hazing harmless horseplay? *Education Digest*, 67(2), 25.
- Tokar, K., & Stewart, C. (2010). Defining high school hazing: Control through clarity. *The Physical Educator*, 67(4). Retrieved from <http://js.sagamorepub.com/pe/article/view/2103>
- Van Gennep, A. (2004). *The Rites Of Passage*. Psychology Press.
- van Raalte, J. L., Cornelius, Allen E., Linder, Darwyn E., & Brewer, Britton W. (2007). The relationship between hazing and team cohesion. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 30(4), 491–507.
- Vygotskij, L. S., Lloyd, P., & Fernyhough, C. (1999). *Lev Vygotsky. 3. The zone of proximal development*. Routledge.
- Waldron, J. J., & Kowalski, C. L. (2009). Crossing the line: Rites of passage, team aspects, and ambiguity of hazing. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 80(2), 291–302.

Warner, A. W. (2008). *How to Read Foucault* (Thesis). Retrieved from

<https://cache.kzoo.edu/handle/10920/8119>

Weedon, C. (1987). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory*. Oxford, UK ; New York, NY, USA: B. Blackwell.

Wilcox, Andrew. (1997, October). Hazing is not a rite. *U.S. Naval Institute*. Retrieved from

<http://www.usni.org/magazines/proceedings/1997-10/hazing-not-rite>

Zacharda, C. S. (2009). *How Peer Leadership Impacts Hazing in the Arena of Non-Revenue Generating College Athletics*. Retrieved from

<http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.wisc.edu/pqdlink?vinst=PROD&attempt=1&fmt=14&startpage=-1&ver=1&vname=PQD&RQT=309&did=1851722091&exp=05-04-2015&scaling=FULL&vtype=PQD&rqt=309&TS=1273035201&clientId=3751>