Deviant Behavior

Are You Kynd? Conformity and Deviance Within the Jamband Subculture

Pamela M. Hunt [a]

[a] University of West Georgia, Carrollton, Georgia, USA
Version of record first published: 15 Jun 2010.

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

are you kynd? conformity and deviance within the jamband subculture

Pamela M. Hunt
University of West Georgia, Carrollton, Georgia, USA

I use measures of interpersonal involvement specific to differential association theory to explain variation within the jamband subculture. Specifically, I examine the relationship between the differential association modalities (frequency, intensity, priority, and duration) and the affective meanings (evaluation, potency, and activity) associated with six behaviors that are relevant to that subculture. I expect the modalities to be related positively to the evaluation and potency of four prosocial (what I term ''kynd'') behaviors (to barter, to follow a band, to share, to trade music) and negatively to the evaluation and potency of two ''unkynd'' behaviors (to talk down, to threaten). Using data from self-administered surveys ($n = 379$), I find that frequency and intensity predict variation in the affective meaning of kynd and unkynd behaviors. However, priority and duration generally do not predict variation in the affective meaning of kynd and unkynd behaviors.

INTRODUCTION

Numerous studies have documented the distinctive subculture among the Grateful Dead followers (''Deadheads'') and more recently among members of the related jamband subculture (e.g., Epstein and Sardiello 1990; Ritzer 2000; Whitman 2005). These studies have shown that members of both subcultures value sharing and reciprocity, values that often translate into communal behaviors such as pooling resources, bartering, and trading (rather than selling) music (Pearson 1987; Sheptoski 2000; Wilgoren 1999). These studies qualitatively show that well-integrated members value kindness, generosity, tolerance, and acceptance. In fact, members of these subcultures use the term ''kynd'' to emphasize the compassionate collective aspects of their culture (Ritzer 2000; Shenk and Silberman 1994).[1] Well-integrated members, according to qualitative studies of the jamband subculture, tend to conform to expectations of kyndness. Yet, those members who are *less* ideologically and interpersonally integrated into the subculture tend to misinterpret and sometimes violate the kynd values and expectations within the subculture. In other words, these studies have qualitatively shown that subculture participants exhibit both conformity and deviance toward the subculture's normative attitudes and behaviors.

Conformity then, is not an axiomatic truth within the jamband subculture. Some members conform to behavioral expectations while others deviate. Yet, the extent to which members conform or deviate has not been examined quantitatively. At what levels of integration and interpersonal association do members conform or deviate from the normative attitudes and behaviors of the subculture? I begin to explore the issue in this study. Specifically, I investigate

---

[1]This word is spelled both distinctly (''kynd'') and traditionally (''kind'') within the subculture as are other words such as ''phriendly'' (to denote a person who is friendly and ''phan'' to indicate a fan of the band Phish). I use the distinctive (kynd) spelling in this study. The article title ''Are You Kynd?'' refers to the phrase ''Are you kind?'' from the lyrics of ''Uncle John's Band,'' a Grateful Dead song. This phrase was printed on stickers by a group of fans dedicated to ''making the scene a happier, safer, more responsible atmosphere'' after the popularity of the Grateful Dead skyrocketed in the late 1980s (Shenk and Silberman 1994:169). It is meant for Deadheads to ask themselves if they are being as good to the scene as it has been good to them (Shenk and Silberman 1994:169).

how measures of interpersonal association adapted from differential association theory can be used to explain individual variation in behavior definitions within the jamband subculture. To be clear, this study is an application of measures from the theory, and is not meant to be a test.

I conduct this study for several reasons. First, many studies have compared subcultures and have found variation in attitudes and behavior, but few studies have examined within-subculture variation (one exception is Hunt 2008). Further, studies that have examined within-subculture variation have done so qualitatively (Andes 1998; Fox 1987; Wood 2003). Therefore, a quantitative investigation into subcultural socialization is needed, especially with respect to normative and non-normative behavioral expectations. Finally, it is important to examine variation in behavior definitions because these definitions, or meanings as I measure them, are important predictors of behavior (Heise 1979, 2007; MacKinnon 1994; Matsueda 1982). Investigating possible within-group variation in the affective meanings of behaviors as a result of interpersonal association may lead to a more nuanced understanding of conforming or deviating behavior within a group.

Next, I briefly describe the jamband subculture and the principles of differential association theory. Then, I review literature on the relationship between subcultural involvement and the development of shared meanings. Specifically, I address two debates in the deviance literature.

THE JAMBAND SUBCULTURE

The jamband subculture is a contemporary version of the subculture of the rock music band the Grateful Dead. Similar to the Grateful Dead subculture, jamband subculture members follow bands across the country on tour and share a temporary community outside the venues at which bands perform (Budnick 2003). Generally, four characteristics tie the jamband and Grateful Dead scenes together. In both scenes: fans follow bands on tour, fans share a temporary community in venue parking lots, the bands perform live improvisational jamming techniques, and the bands enforce taper-friendly policies. The Grateful Dead and jambands allow fans to freely tape and trade live music.

The community consists of members who travel from concert to concert, including those who vend various items (e.g., handmade clothing, jewelry, crafts, and food) in order to cover travel expenses, and those who visit only local events or weekend-long festivals. This temporary community is where members develop friendships and share a system of values and attitudes different from mainstream U.S. culture (Lehman 2000; Sardiello 1994, 1998; Wilgoren 1999).

DIFFERENTIAL ASSOCIATION THEORY

According to the principles of differential association theory, individuals are exposed, through interaction with others, to behavior definitions both favorable and unfavorable to law violation. An excess of association with individuals who hold definitions favorable to law violation disposes individuals to develop delinquent behavior definitions, which then promotes their own delinquent behavior. Sutherland (1939) intended researchers to think of associations in terms of a ratio: the proportion of associations with individuals who hold delinquent behavior definitions to associations with individuals who do *not* hold delinquent behavior definitions. Further, the influence of the association is a function of the frequency, intensity, priority, and duration of these associations, whether delinquent or non-delinquent. That is, definitions encountered through social interactions that occur frequently (frequency), from a prestigious source (intensity), early in life (priority), and for a long time period (duration) will have greater influence on behavior definitions than those definitions encountered otherwise.[2]

GROUP INVOLVEMENT AND SHARED DEFINITIONS OF THE SITUATION: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

There are two debates in the deviance literature that are relevant to the current study. First, several researchers have

[2]It has been well documented that a true measure of this ratio would be challenging because the ratio of associations that Sutherland originally proposed is extremely difficult to measure (see Warr 1993). In this study, I am not interested in the ratio but rather with the modalities of association as a measure of interpersonal association/socialization and how these measures can explain variation in behavior definitions. For these two reasons, I do not attempt to construct a ratio.

acknowledged a limitation of investigating the relationship between interpersonal associations and behavior definitions. The limitation is that cross-sectional studies are unable to determine the direction of this relationship. Specifically, researchers have debated two variations on the development of shared behavior meanings. Some argue that individuals come to a particular subculture, and as a result of being a member, are socialized to develop the behavior meanings common to the group (Akers et al. 1979; Akers 1985; Reckless 1955). Other scholars argue that individuals hold behavior meanings prior to joining the group and ''flock'' together as a result (Glueck and Glueck 1950). I am unable to add to the literature on this debate because of the cross-sectional nature of the current study. Nonetheless, it is an important debate to acknowledge.

The current study is more relevant the second debate, that between Hirchi's control theory (Hirschi 1969; Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990) and Sutherland's differential association theory. Specifically, Hirschi and his colleagues argue that differential association theory is able to explain how members of subculture deviate from conventional norms, but that the theory is unable explain deviations *within* a subculture. That is, ''cultural deviance theories'' (Costello 1997; Kornhauser 1978) like differential association theory and social learning theory are thought to be useful only for explaining conformity within groups and deviations from the norm. My investigation of within-subculture variation in the affective behavior meanings using indicators from differential association may debunk this idea.

In addition to investigations of the relationship between subcultural involvement and behavior definitions by differential association theory researchers, several scholars have investigated the relationship between subcultural involvement and the meanings of other types of social concepts (e.g., role identities, emotions). For example, Francis (1997) found that over time, exposure to the ideology of divorce and bereavement support groups changed members' negative self-identities and emotions into positive self-identities and emotions. That is, those who are more integrated in the group gave more positive evaluations of their own identities. Similarly, Thomassen (2002), found that six month's exposure to Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) culture influenced

the way members felt about identities relevant to AA, such as the identity ''an alcoholic'' (Thomassen 2002). Also, Heise (2007:24) found that more experience with drugs (similar to frequency and perhaps, duration) is related to positive evaluations of ''sniffing cocaine'' and ''smoking marijuana, hash.'' Finally, King (2001:426) found that the more time individuals spend online per week and cumulative number of years spent on-line are correlated with changes in Web-related concepts. That is, interpersonal association in the on-line culture promotes changes in the meaning of concepts such as the role identities ''a newbie,'' ''an AOL'er,'' ''a hacker,'' ''a cyberpunk,'' and ''a lurker'' (King 2001:428).

In sum, while there is a debate in the literature about the origin of shared meanings within groups, many scholars within the meaning socialization tradition have found that meanings change as individuals become more integrated into a subgroup or subculture. With regard to the first debate mentioned earlier, this line of research suggests that behavior and behavior meanings are learned rather than brought into the group. In addition, and related to the second debate, researchers are finding that while some members conform to group meanings for social concepts, such as identities and emotions, others members do not. The current study aims to further these findings by examining *within*-subculture differences in *behavior* meanings. That is, we know that members of groups develop meanings over time or through socialization in the group, but how do *levels* of integration and interpersonal association within the group affect behavior meanings? Do some members (based on level of interpersonal association) develop an affinity for subculture-normative behaviors while others do not? Similarly, do well-integrated individuals hold significantly different meanings for the non-normative behaviors than those who are less integrated?

In the next section I hypothesize the direction of the relationships between the differential association modalities and the affective meanings of six behaviors significant to the jamband subculture belief system. These hypotheses are supported by empirical qualitative studies of the perception of behaviors within the jamband subculture. I chose these behaviors based on my own and others' observations

and interviews that revealed the centrality of each behavior within the subculture (Hunt 2002; Niman 1997; Ritzer 2000; Shenk and Silberman 1994).

HYPOTHESES

Americans generally value the individual acquisition of status, income, and authority (Bellah et al. 1985; Fromm 1976; Heckert and Heckert 2004; Jones 1998; Poplin 1979; Selznick 2002; Tocqueville [1835] 2000). In the United States, selflessness is often viewed with suspicion (Vela-McConnell 1999). In fact, some studies show that prosocial behaviors such as sharing resources or helping a stranger are considered non-normative in the mainstream, causing individuals on the receiving end to react negatively (Jones 1998). Numerous studies have shown that, like the related Deadhead subculture, jamband subculture members hold countercultural values. That is, well-embedded members of the subculture generally oppose status and authority, and are generally dedicated to communal, self-transcendent values and power equality that encourage prosocial actions (Pearson 1987; Ritzer 2000; Shenk and Silberman 1994). It would follow that subculture members who are *less* embedded are more like the members of mainstream society and therefore, like the mainstream, may feel that prosocial values and behaviors are non-normative. To reiterate, ''kynd,'' prosocial behaviors are considered normative within the jamband subculture. In the next section, I use a kynd/unkynd categorization to develop my hypotheses about the relationship between the differential association modalities and behavior meanings. Below I highlight the behaviors that I investigate in italics.

Kynd Behaviors

Jamband subculture members place high value on *sharing* and *bartering* resources (David 2000; Sheptoski 2000). Members share rides, food, concert tickets (called ''miracles''), water, and other resources with one another, and this generally happens without an expectation of receiving something in return (Wilgoren 1999). In fact, Sutton (2000:122) finds that ''the Deadhead code, or rules for everyday living,''

consists of ''an adherence to an ethic of sharing.'' Sharing and bartering are two of the strongest elements of the Deadhead code (Sutton 2000).

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

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

Unkynd Behaviors

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

Evaluation

Kynd Behaviors

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

Unkynd Behaviors

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

Potency

Kynd Behaviors

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

Unkynd Behaviors

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

association to be related negatively to the potency of unkynd behaviors.

Activity

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

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

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

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

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

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

Similarly, every unkynd hypothesis proposes the same direction of effect: a negative relationship between each modality and the (1) evaluation and (2) potency of unkynd behaviors.

Unkynd Frequency Hypotheses 1–2: Frequency will be related negatively to the (1) evaluation and (2) potency of unkynd behaviors (to talk down, to threaten).

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

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

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

METHODS

Data and Sample

Data were collected with a self-administered survey distributed at jamband events in the Midwest (five events), the Southeast (one event), and the Northeast (two events). I gave respondents options for completing two versions of the survey: paper or on-line. Respondents either completed the survey at the concert or sometime after. Respondents completing the survey at the concert placed the surveys in a secured drop box that was located at two vendors' booths. Individuals completing the survey later were give a paper copy of the survey along with a self-addressed stamped envelope.

Second, I made the survey available on-line. I created two types of correspondence for this version of the survey. Business cards and a large banner, both listing the survey information, were distributed at jamband events.[3] I also posted a link to the survey on an on-line magazine website (www.jambands.com), several jamband-related message boards, and a Dave Matthews Band fan message board.[4] As a result, not all respondents were self-identified members nor were all respondents highly integrated. After several

[3]Respondents solicited at concerts had the option of completing a paper survey or waiting to complete the on-line survey. Only one person completed the paper-based version. Therefore, there is no assessment of whether those who completed the on-line survey systematically differed from those who *might have* completed the paper-based version. Those solicited on-line were more likely to be male, older, and have a longer tenure of involvement than those who were solicited at concerts. However, those solicited on-line did *not* differ systematically with respect to the evaluation, potency, and activity ratings of the kynd and unkynd behaviors.

[4]Budnick (2003) suggests that there are likely crossover fans from The Dave Matthews Band (DMB) in the jamband scene. Because most of my respondents were from jamband events, I used the DMB message board to possibly collect data from less integrated members.

months of low response rates, respondents were given the option to enter their contact information for a chance to win a ticket to a popular jamband festival. The winner was randomly selected and contacted at the end of data collection.

Sample Demographics

The average age of respondents at first jamband event is 18 years ($n=379$ unless noted). Ages range from 18–53 with a mean of 28.6 years. Sixty-five percent of respondents are male and 35% are female ($n=376$). Of the respondents, 80% report being a member of the jamband scene ($n=378$), and 94% reported that they support the values of the jamband subculture ($n=377$). Respondents attend between 1 and 150 jamband-related events per year, with an average of 18 events per year attended. Respondents attended their first jamband-related event between 1 and 37 years ago, spending on average 10.5 years in the sub-culture. The sample is 99.5% white ($n=376$) and 93% non-Hispanic ($n=85$). Sixty-four percent of the respondents hold a bachelor's degree or higher level of education.[5]

Dependent Variables

Behavior Meanings

With deviant subcultures, measuring attitudes explicitly can be intrusive because the researcher is usually an outsider (Fine and Kleinman 1979). To avoid intrusiveness, I operationalize behavior definitions with affective behavior meanings. Behavior meanings in this study are the evaluation, potency, and activity (EPA) ratings of six behaviors significant to the jamband subculture belief system.

Respondents rated behaviors on each dimension using nine-point semantic differential scales (ranging from -4 to $+4$). The evaluation dimension was anchored with the adjective pairs ''good, nice'' and ''bad, awful,'' the potency dimension with ''powerless, little'' and ''powerful, big,'' and the activity dimension with ''slow, quiet, old'' and ''fast, noisy, young.'' The middle point of the scale was marked

---

[5]Number of respondents fluctuates for variables not included in the analyses (membership, support of values, race, ethnicity, and level of education).

neutral, and the circles between the mid-point and each end-point were marked slightly, quite, extremely, and infinitely.

I use affective meanings to represent behavior definitions for several reasons. First, researchers in several substantive areas of study (e.g., gender, emotions, affect control theory) have found that evaluation, potency, and activity profiles provide a parsimonious way of capturing much of the meaning of social concepts (e.g., role-identities, behaviors) (Heise 1979; Kroska 2002; Rashotte 2002; Smith-Lovin and Heise 1988). Second, research in over 20 cultures has shown that most social concepts universally evoke affective meanings along these three dimensions (Osgood et al. 1975; Osgood et al. 1957). Third, as noted earlier, within delinquent/deviant subcultures, measuring attitudes explicitly can be intrusive because the researcher is usually an outsider (Fine and Kleinman 1979). In contrast, affective meanings provide a precise conceptualization of one's attitude without measuring attitudes explicitly, thereby reducing the tendency of respondents to withhold candid responses.

Independent Variables

Frequency of Association

Sutherland states that the meaning of *frequency* is "obvious and need(s) no explanation" (Sutherland and Cressey 1966:82). However, Sutherland evidently meant that frequent (frequency) associations have a greater effect on learning behavior definitions than infrequent and limited associations. Other researchers have measured frequency in this manner (Short 1957; Warr 1993). Thus, I operationalize frequency with three indicators: individuals' attendance at jamband events, their association with individuals within the subculture, and their association with individuals outside the subculture.

Respondents answered three questions in the frequency index, two of which were open ended: (1) "How many jamband type concerts/performances do you typically attend per year?" and (2) "How many people would you no longer see if you stopped being a part of the jamband subculture?" The third question was closed-ended with responses ranging from 1 (very often) to 7 (never): (3) "How often do you get involved with friends who are not in this scene?" I logged

TABLE 1 Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations for Independent Variables and Indicator Variables

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4
1. Frequency	−.04	.93	1.00	.74***	.18***	.09
2. Intensity	−.00	.99		1.00	.15**	.07
3. Priority (logged)	−2.85	.29			1.00	.34***
4. Duration (centered)	−.12	5.98				1.00

$^*p<.05$; $^{**}p<.01$; $^{***}p<.001$ (two-tailed tests).

the first two questions to improve the normality of their distributions. While there were no values of 0 for item 1, I used 1 to represent the value of 0 before logging the second item. The transformation of the first item changes the chi-square for the joint skewness and kurtosis test for normality from $\chi^2 = 368.26$, $p = .000$ to $\chi^2 = 12.98$, $p = .002$. The transformation of the second item changes the chi-square from $\chi^2 = 558.11$, $p = .000$ to $\chi^2 = 23.16$, $p = .000$. I standardized each of these items and conducted principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation on the full sample ($n = 503$) and results indicate that the index has only one dimension.[6] Thus, high frequency represents frequent association with individuals in the jamband subculture and infrequent association with individuals outside the subculture. The alpha reliability coefficient for the index is .52. I use the factor scores for the frequency values. Descriptive statistics for all independent variables in this study are listed in Table 1. Because I use only those cases retained in the analyses to obtain the descriptive statistics, the mean and standard deviation of the factor scores are not 0 and 1, respectively.

Intensity of Association

Sutherland defines *intensity*, ''with such things as the prestige of the source of a criminal or anticriminal pattern and with

[6]Principal components factor analysis results for frequency for the full sample ($n = 503$) and the restricted sample using only cases available in the multivariate analyses ($n = 379$) are very similar. Factor scores from the two analyses are highly correlated, ($r = .99$). Therefore, I use the factor scores from the full sample. I do the same for intensity, for which factor scores from the full and restricted samples were perfectly correlated ($r = 1.0$).

emotional reactions related to the associations'' (Sutherland and Cressey 1966:82). Therefore, I measure intensity as the emotional and relational attachment made to others in the subculture. Specifically, intensity is operationalized with an index pertaining to number of prestigious relationships in the subculture (measured as number of friends) and the extent of emotional investment in these relationships. I gauge prestige with two items: (1) ''How many friends have you made purely as a result of being a jamband subculture member?'' and (2) ''How many people would you miss if you stopped being a part of the jamband subculture?'' I measure emotional investment with a third question that gave closed-ended responses ranging from 1 (not invested at all) to 7 (extremely invested): (3) ''To what extent are you emotionally invested in your relationships with people in the jamband subculture?'' I logged the first two questions to improve the normality of their distributions, using 1 to represent the value of 0. The transformation of the first item changes the chi-square for the joint skewness and kurtosis test for normality from $\chi^2 = 658.46$, $p = .000$ to $\chi^2 = 9.46$, $p = .009$. The transformation of the second item changes the chi-square from $\chi^2 = 638.37$, $p = .000$ to $\chi^2 = 4.47$, $p = .11$. I standardized each variable before conducting principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation on the full sample ($n = 534$) and results indicate that the index has one dimension ranging from high intensity to low intensity. The alpha reliability coefficients for these three items is .82. I use the factor scores for the intensity values.

Priority of Association

Sutherland (Sutherland and Cressey 1966:82) operationalizes *priority* with early, youthful socialization and states that priority is important because any behavior (lawful or delinquent) developed early in life ''may persist throughout life.'' I operationalize priority with the inverse of age (in years) at first jamband event. I developed this measure by subtracting duration (number of years involved in the subculture) from respondents' age at the time of data collection, then multiplying by (-1) so that high values indicate high priority (young socialization). I then logged the variable to improve normality. The transformation of the item changes

the chi-square for the joint skewness and kurtosis test for normality from $\chi^2 = 184.60$, $p = .000$ to $\chi^2 = 72.44$, $p = .000$.

Duration is designed to capture length of association. Therefore, I measure duration with the number of years respondents have spent in the subculture.

RESULTS

Behavior Meaning Structure

I now report the average evaluation-potency-activity ratings of the behaviors for all jamband subculture respondents. These averages inform the reader of how all members feel overall about the behaviors examined. In addition to these findings, the results in the next section suggest behavior meaning variation within the subculture by frequency, intensity, priority, and duration.

As shown in Table 2, jamband subculture members consider kynd behaviors good and, generally potent. Specifically, they rate bartering as slightly good (1.36) and neutral in both potency (.26) and activity (.37). Subculture members

TABLE 2 Mean Evaluation, Potency, Activity (EPA) Ratings and Standard Deviations of Kynd and Unkynd Behaviors ($n = 379$)

	Evaluation	Potency	Activity
Kynd behaviors			
Barter	1.36	.26	.37
	(1.55)	(1.50)	(1.72)
Follow a band	2.34	.84	1.09
	(1.42)	(1.75)	(1.45)
Share	3.17	1.94	−.20
	(1.28)	(1.77)	(1.23)
Trade music	3.07	1.82	.30
	(1.16)	(1.74)	(1.44)
Unkynd behaviors			
Talk down	−3.03	−1.44	.99
	(1.60)	(2.47)	(1.93)
Threaten	−3.46	−.51	1.69
	(1.14)	(2.77)	(2.06)

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

find following a band to be quite good (2.34), slightly potent (.84), and slightly active (1.09). More extreme are the members' meanings for sharing and trading music, both of which members feel are extremely good (3.17 and 3.07, respectively), quite potent (1.94 and 1.82, respectively), and neutral in activity ($-.20$ and .30, respectively). Jamband subculture members generally rate unkynd behaviors as bad, impotent, and active. For instance, members consider talking down to someone extremely bad (-3.03), slightly impotent (-1.44), and slightly active (.99). Members rate threatening someone as extremely bad (-3.46), slightly impotent ($-.51$), and quite active (1.69).

Analysis Plan

To evaluate the hypothesized relationships between the differential association modalities and affective (EPA) behavior meanings, I use hierarchical multivariate linear modeling (HMLM) (Raudenbush and Bryk 2002). To test my hypotheses, I run separate HMLM analyses on (1) each distinct affective dimension (evaluation, potency, and activity) of the kynd behaviors and on (2) each affective dimension of the unkynd behaviors.[7]

I examine six sets of repeated measures: the set of evaluation ratings, the set of potency ratings, *and* the set of activity

---

[7]I use HMLM rather than ordinary least squares (OLS) regression for three reasons. First, running separate regression equations for the relationship between the predictor variables and, the evaluation, potency, and activity of all six behaviors would result in eighteen separate regression equations, increasing the risk of Type I error. Second, if using OLS regression there would be an issue of determining whether my hypotheses were supported. For instance, how many of these relationships would need to be significant for me to accurately state that my hypotheses were supported? With HMLM, I am given a single estimate of the effect of each predictor variable on the entire set of, for example, evaluation ratings for each set of behaviors (kynd and unkynd). This is precisely what my hypotheses are predicting, that sets of behavior meanings, not individual behavior meanings, are related to the predictor variables. Finally, my data are structured in a way that violates an assumption of OLS; specifically, the assumption of uncorrelated errors. I am using a special case of repeated measures HMLM where the measurement repetitions are a way of capturing one broad construct (i.e., kynd behaviors) with several related measurements from each respondent. These repeated measurements serve as the level 1 (within-person) variables, as a way of capturing variation within respondents. Because they are theoretically related in sets (kynd vs. unkynd), they are likely to have correlated errors. HMLM does not operated under the uncorrelated errors assumption, and thus is one approach to analyzing complex error structures (i.e., correlated observations).

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

Preliminary analyses (available on request) reveal that the best fit to the data is provided by models assuming that the structure of the Level 1 variance/covariance is unrestricted; therefore, the parameters from unrestricted models are reported in Tables 3 and 4.[8] Table 3 displays the coefficients for kynd behaviors estimated separately for the repeated evaluation ratings, the repeated potency ratings, and the repeated activity ratings. Table 4 displays the results for unkynd behaviors.

In the first stage of each analysis (Model 1), an uncon-strained model is utilized to estimate the mean level of evaluation, potency, and activity ratings before the inde-pendent variables are entered. The baseline *evaluation* of kynd behaviors is extremely good ($b = 2.648$, $se = .045$, $p < .001$), while the mean evaluation of unkynd behaviors is extremely bad ($b = -3.346$, $se = .054$, $p < .001$). The base-line *potency* of kynd behaviors is slightly potent ($b = .960$, $se = .062$, $p < .001$), while the baseline potency of unkynd behaviors is slightly impotent ($b = -1.084$, $se = .116$, $p < .001$). Finally, the baseline *activity* ratings for kynd beha-viors is neutral ($b = .263$, $se = .046$, $p < .001$), while the baseline activity of unkynd behaviors is slightly active ($b = 1.307$, $se = .085$, $p < .001$).

In the next five stages of analysis (Models 2–6), differential association modalities (frequency, intensity, priority, and duration) are added as Level-2 (between-person) predictors. In Models 2–5 I estimate each modality alone to test the hypotheses. The full model (Model 6) controls for all differ-ential association modalities. Next I review findings for the relationship between the differential association modalities

---

[8]The unrestricted model does not assume that the error variances are constant across each of the respondent's ratings, nor does it assume that the error variances are mutually independent.

TABLE 3 Hierarchical Multivariate Linear Modeling Coefficients of Repeated Evaluation, Potency, and Activity Ratings of **Kynd** Behaviors on Frequency, Priority, Duration, and Intensity of Association in the Jamband Subculture ($n = 379$)

Models	1	2	3	4	5	6
			Evaluation			
Intercept	2.648***	2.638***	2.628***	3.596***	2.648***	3.315**
	(.045)	(.045)	(.044)	(.445)	(.045)	(.465)
Frequency		.175***				.007
		(.067)				(.068)
Intensity			.219***			.204**
			(.044)			(.065)
Priority				.332*		.240
(logged)				(.155)		(.162)
Duration					.004	−.002
					(.008)	(.008)
			Potency			
Intercept	.960***	.971***	.973***	.886	.959***	.612
	(.062)	(.061)	(.061)	(.608)	(.062)	(.610)
Frequency		.144*				−.006
		(.064)				(.094)
Intensity			.191**			.191*
			(.061)			(.090)
Priority				−.026		−.126
(logged)				(.212)		(.213)
Duration					−.0002	.002
					(.010)	(.010)
			Activity			
Intercept	.263***	.262***	.263***	1.128*	.260***	1.838***
	(.046)	(.046)	(.046)	(.452)	(.046)	(.474)
Frequency		−.084†				−.167*
		(.048)				(.069)
Intensity			−.018			.087
			(.046)			(.067)
Priority				.302†		.554**
(logged)				(.158)		(.166)
Duration					−.020**	−.028**
					(.008)	(.008)

Kynd behaviors include: to barter, to follow a band, to share, and to trade music. Standard errors are in parentheses. †$p < .10$; *$p < .05$; **$p < .01$; ***$p < .001$ (two-tailed tests).

TABLE 4 Hierarchical Multivariate Linear Modeling Coefficients of Repeated Evaluation, Potency, and Activity Ratings of **Unkynd** Behaviors on Frequency, Intensity, Priority, and Duration of Association in the Jamband Subculture ($n = 379$)

Models	1	2	3	4	5	6
			Evaluation			
Intercept	−3.346***	−3.346***	−3.350***	−2.957***	−3.343***	−3.082***
	(.054)	(.054)	(.054)	(.531)	(.054)	(.564)
Frequency		.012				.177*
		(.056)				(.082)
Intensity			−.098†			−.228**
			(.054)			(.079)
Priority				.136		.089
(logged)				(.185)		(.197)
Duration					.009	.007
					(.009)	(.010)
			Potency			
Intercept	−1.084***	−1.084***	−1.075***	−2.452*	−1.082***	−1.843
	(.116)	(.115)	(.115)	(1.143)	(.116)	(1.215)
Frequency		−.244*				.007
		(.120)				(.177)
Intensity			−.314**			−.304†
			(.116)			(.170)
Priority				−.481		−.271
(logged)				(.398)		(.424)
Duration					−.018	−.011
					(.019)	(.020)
			Activity			
Intercept	1.307***	1.310***	1.307***	1.007	1.307***	.843
	(.085)	(.085)	(.085)	(.841)	(.085)	(.902)
Frequency		.073				.150
		(.089)				(.132)
Intensity			.010			−.090
			(.086)			(.126)
Priority				−.105		−.165
(logged)				(.293)		(.315)
Duration					.0002	.002
					(.014)	(.015)

Notes: Unkynd behaviors include: to talk down and to threaten. Standard errors are in parentheses. †$p < .10$; *$p < .05$; **$p < .01$; ***$p < .001$ (two-tailed tests).

and the evaluation, potency, and activity of kynd and unkynd behaviors.

Kynd Behavior Hypotheses

Evaluation (1)

Consistent with Kynd Frequency Hypothesis 1, Kynd Intensity Hypothesis 1, and Kynd Priority Hypothesis 1, frequency ($b = .175$, $se = .067$, $p < .001$), intensity ($b = .219$, $se = .044$, $p < .001$), and priority ($b = .332$, $se = .155$, $p = .032$) are related positively to the repeated evaluation ratings of kynd behaviors. However, contrary to Kynd Duration Hypothesis 1, duration ($b = .004$, $se = .008$, $p = .595$) is not related significantly to the repeated evaluation ratings of kynd behaviors.

Potency (2)

Consistent with Kynd Frequency Hypothesis 2 and Kynd Intensity Hypothesis 2, frequency ($b = .144$, $se = .064$, $p = .024$) and intensity ($b = .191$, $se = .061$, $p = .002$) are related positively the repeated potency ratings of kynd behaviors. However, contrary to both Kynd Priority Hypothesis 2 and Kynd Duration Hypothesis 2, neither priority ($b = -.026$, $se = .212$, $p = .904$) nor duration ($b = -.0002$, $se = .010$, $p = .982$) is related significantly to the repeated potency ratings of kynd behaviors.

Activity

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

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

Unkynd Behavior Hypotheses

Evaluation (1)

Inconsistent with Unkynd Frequency Hypothesis 1, frequency ($b = .012$, $se = .056$, $p = .832$) is not related to the repeated evaluation ratings of unkynd behaviors. Consistent with Unkynd Intensity Hypothesis 1, intensity ($b = -.098$, $se = .054$, $p = .070$) is related negatively to the evaluation of unkynd behaviors. However, contrary to both Unkynd Priority Hypothesis 1 and Unkynd Duration Hypothesis 1, neither priority ($b = .136$, $se = .185$, $p = .462$) nor duration ($b = .009$, $se = .009$, $p = .299$) are related to the repeated evaluation ratings of unkynd behaviors.

Potency (2)

Consistent with Unkynd Frequency Hypothesis 2 and Unkynd Intensity Hypothesis 2, both frequency ($b = -.244$, $se = .120$, $p = .042$) and intensity ($b = -.314$, $se = .116$, $p = .007$) are related negatively to the potency of unkynd behaviors. However, contrary to both Unkynd Priority Hypothesis 2 and Unkynd Duration Hypothesis 2, neither priority ($b = -.481$, $se = .398$, $p = .227$) nor duration ($b = -.018$, $se = .019$, $p = .359$) are related significantly to the potency of unkynd behaviors.

Activity

Although I did not advance unkynd activity hypotheses, I report the results of the analyses. None of the differential association modalities are related significantly to the activity of unkynd behaviors.

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

DISCUSSION

Using modified operationalizations of the differential association modalities and of behavior definitions, I investigated

hypotheses that the modalities of association explain variation in behavior definitions within the jamband subculture. The findings address a long-lived debate in the deviance literature. Specifically, the results shed light on the debate about whether conformity and deviance can be explained using measures of differential association theory.

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

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

I also found that, as expected, priority is related positively to the evaluation of kynd behaviors. High priority (associated with youthful socialization in the subculture) is associated with high evaluation of kynd behaviors. That is, individuals who joined the subculture early in life perhaps understand the level of positive value attached to these behaviors. On the other hand, those who joined the subculture later in life may feel that these activities are not as highly valued. Individuals who join the subculture later in life are more

likely to need to balance time spent in the subculture and time spent in other adult roles and commitments. Therefore, individuals low in priority may not be as zealous about bartering, sharing, trading music, and following a band as those who joined earlier in life (Adams and Rosen-Grandon 2002; David 2000).

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

LIMITATIONS

Although this study provides a contribution to the literature on differential association theory, the study nonetheless has limitations that warrant consideration. First, the cross-sectional nature of this study provides only a snapshot investigation of the development of behavior meanings. It would be useful to longitudinally examine the relationships among the modalities of association, behavior meanings, and behavior in a prosocial subculture, as some researchers have investigated these relationships in delinquent sub-cultures (Massey and Krohn 1986; Warr 1993). With longitudinal research, I could investigate questions such as: Do subculture members alternate between subculture friends and non-subculture friends over time, or are their friendships more consistent? Investigating these relationships longitudinally could also provide more insight into my findings regarding the effect of priority and duration on behavior meanings.

TABLE 5 Demographic Characteristics of My Sample vs. Quantitative Studies of Deadheads

	My sample	Lehman (2000)	Adams (2003)
Female	32%	35%	37%
Age	28	24	32
Education	50% bachelor's degree	50% some college	47–50% bachelor's degree
Length of tenure in subculture	11 years	Not reported	10–11 years

Second, there are possible limitations to using an Internet-based survey. Among the most important is self-selection bias. Respondents who select to complete the online survey may be more Internet savvy than those who choose to complete the survey in pencil form (Zhang 1999). Also, Internet survey completion could have an effect on responses based on age and education level (Hardre et al. 2007). However, the respondent base in the current sample was a similar age range and education level as samples used in paper-survey collected studies of the similar Deadhead subculture (Adams 2003; Lehman 2000). Table 5 displays demographic characteristics of my sample versus those found in quantitative studies of Deadheads.

Unfortunately, there was no method to protect the sample from repeated participation. I wanted to ensure that participants could take the on-line survey from a public computer in the event that they did not own a personal computer. Therefore, I did not prohibit surveys completed from the same Internet Protocol (IP) address. I believe that the benefits of including these participants outweighs any costs associated with unlikely repeated participation (the survey took more than 20 minutes to complete in pilot tests).

Additionally, in the future, I am interested in trying to approximate more of a probability sample within the jam-band subculture. I could, for example, conduct a systematic random sampling of individuals at one concert or festival so that I would have a defined population and would therefore know my response rate.

Finally, tests of differential association theory have indicated that the transference of attitudes is not the only

mechanism of socialization within subcultures (e.g., Warr and Stafford 1991). Thus, there may be additional predictor variables (in addition to the modalities of association) that explain the development of distinctive behavior meanings. For instance, social learning variables (Akers et al. 1979; Burgess and Akers 1966) such as imitation or conformity to group pressures may be predictors of behavior meanings in subcultures. Future research should investigate the possibility of additional predictors of jamband subculture behavior meanings.

CONCLUSION

This project contributes to theory and research on subcultures, deviance theories, affective meaning, and more broadly to the study of meaning socialization and culture. Rather than relying on values to identify subculture, I instead used the symbolic interactionist notion that subculture is defined by segregated interactions, and thus, unique meanings. Indeed, subcultures are ''pockets of consensus'' (Heise 2007:21). However, in this study, I have shown that not all members identify with the subculture at the same level and this variation can affect the meanings members give to social concepts.

Most subculture research within sociology is conducted on delinquent or criminal subcultures. In order to understand the full spectrum of human behavior, it is also important to study other types of subcultures. As scholars, we can learn about gender, class, and racial differences by studying prosocial, as well as delinquent, subcultures (Johnson and Sanday 1971). For instance, it has been found that males who perform random acts of kindness to strangers are misinterpreted as homosexual, yet females generate little more than surprise when performing the same act (Jones 1998) . Do individuals in mainstream America avoid prosocial behaviors because they do not want to be viewed as weak, homosexual, or in the case of the jamband subculture, as a hippie? According to affect control theory principles, behavior meanings affect the character of the actor who performs the behavior. For example, an admired person who engages in a hostile, violent action appears less good. Yet, an admired person who performs an act that is ''too positive'' in nature

(e.g., buying lunch for a homeless person or helping a stranger carry their packages to the car) violates mainstream social norms, and may appear to be less good and less potent than before the act. This is an avenue for future research, and may be as important to understanding behavior as the investigation of delinquency.

REFERENCES

Adams, Rebecca G. 2000. ''What Goes Around Comes, Around: Collaborative Research and Learning.'' Pp. 15–47. In *Deadhead Social Science: You Ain't Gonna Learn What You Don't Want to Know*, edited by Rebecca G. Adams and Robert Sardiello. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press.

———. 2003. ''Stigma and the Inappropriately Stereotyped.'' *Sociation Today* 1(1). Available at (http://www.ncsociology.org/sociationtoday/deadhead.htm) (accessed August 1, 2008).

Adams, Rebecca G. and Jane Rosen-Grandon. 2002. ''Mixed Marriages: Music Community Membership as a Source of Marital Strain.'' Pp. 79–100. In *Inappropriate Relationships: The Unconventional, the Disapproved, and the Forbidden*, edited by Robin Goodwin and Duncan Cramer. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Elrbaum Associates, Inc.

Akers, Ronald L. 1985. *Deviant Behavior: A Social Learning Approach*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Akers, Ronald, Marvin Krohn, Lonn Lanza-Kaduce, and Marcia Radosevich. 1979. ''Social Learning and Deviant Behavior: A Specific Test of a General Theory.'' *American Sociological Review* 44:636–655.

Andes, Linda. 1998. ''Growing Up Punk: Meaning and Commitment Careers in a Contemporary Youth Subculture.'' Pp. 212–231. In *Youth Culture: Identity in a Postmodern World*, edited by Jonathon S. Epstein. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Bellah, Robert, Richard Madsen, William M. Sullivan, Ann Swidler, and Steven M. Tipton. 1985. *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Budnick, Dean. 2003. *Jambands: The Complete Guide to the Players, Music, and Scene*. San Francisco: Backbeat Books.

Burgess, Robert and Ronald Akers. 1966. ''A Differential Association-Reinforcement Theory of Criminal Behavior.'' *Social Problems* 14:128–147.

Costello, Barbara. 1997. ''On the Logical Adequacy of Cultural Deviance Theories.'' *Theoretical Criminology* 1:403–428.

David, Michelle. 2000. ''An Erickson Perspective on the Journey Through Deadhead Adulthood.'' Pp. 215–225. In *Deadhead Social Science: You Ain't Gonna Learn What You Don't Want to Know*, edited by

Rebecca G. Adams and Robert Sardiello. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press.

Epstein, Jonathan and Robert Sardiello. 1990. ''The Wharf Rats: A Preliminary Examination of Alcoholics Anonymous and the Grateful Dead Head Phenomena.'' *Deviant Behavior* 11: 245–257.

Fine, Gary Alan and Sheryl Kleinman. 1979. ''Rethinking Subculture: An Interactionist Analysis.'' *The American Journal of Sociology* 85:1–20.

Fox, Kathryn Joan. 1987. ''Real Punks and Pretenders: The Social Organization of a Counterculture.'' *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 16:344–370.

Francis, Linda. 1997. ''Ideology and Interpersonal Emotion Management: Redefining Identity in Two Support Groups.'' *Social Psychology Quarterly* 60:153–171.

Fraser, David and Vaughan Black. 1999. ''Legally Dead: the Grateful Dead and American Legal Culture.'' Pp. 19–39. In *Perspectives on the Grateful Dead: Critical Writings*, edited by Robert Weiner. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Fromm, Erich. 1976. *To Have or To Be?* New York: Harper and Row.

Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck. 1950. *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency*. New York: The Commonwealth Fund.

Gottfredson, Michael R. and Travis Hirschi. 1990. *A General Theory of Crime*. Palo Alto: Stanford University.

Hardre, Patricia L., H. Michael Crowson, Kui Xie, and Cong Ly. 2007. ''Testing Differential Effects of Computer-Based, Web-Based, and Paper-Based Administration of Questionnaire Research Instruments.'' *British Journal of Educational Technology* 38:5–22.

Heckert, Alex, and Druann Maria Heckert. 2004. ''Using an Integrated Typology of Deviance to Analyze Ten Common Norms of the U.S. Middle Class.'' *The Sociological Quarterly* 45:209–228.

Heise, David R. 1979. *Understanding Events: Affect and the Construction of Social Action*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2007. *Expressive Order: Confirming Sentiments in Social Actions*. New York: Springer.

Hirschi, Travis. 1969. *Causes of Delinquency*. Berkeley: Free Press.

Hunt, Pamela. 2002. ''Where the Music Takes You: A Symbolic Interactionist View of Nomadic Vendors in a Music Scene.'' Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Sociology, Athens, OH: Ohio University.

———. 2008. ''From Festies to Tourrats: Examining the Relationship between Jamband Subculture Involvement and Role Meanings.'' *Social Psychology Quarterly* 71:356–378.

Jennings, Stephanie. 2000. ''Becoming a Deadhead.'' Pp. 203–213. In *Deadhead Social Science: You Ain't Gonna Learn What You Don't Want to Know*, edited by Rebecca G. Adams and Robert Sardiello. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press.

Johnson, Norman T. and Peggy R. Sanday. 1971. ''Subcultural Variations in an Urban Poor Population.'' *American Anthropologist* 73:128–143.

Jones, Angela Lewellyn. 1998. ''Random Acts of Kindness: A Teaching Tool for Positive Deviance.'' *Teaching Sociology* 26:179–189.

King, Adam B. 2001. ''Affective Dimensions of Internet Culture.'' *Social Science Computer Review* 19:414–430.

Kornhauser, Ruth. 1978. *Social Sources of Delinquency*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kroska, Amy. 2002. ''Does Gender Ideology Matter? Examining the Relationship Between Gender Ideology and Partner Meanings.'' *Social Psychology Quarterly* 65:248–265.

Lehman, Alan R. 2000. ''Self-Concept and Ego-Extension Among Grateful Dead Fans.'' Pp. 227–239. In *Deadhead Social Science: You Ain't Gonna Learn What You Don't Want to Know*, edited by Rebecca G. Adams and Robert Sardiello. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press.

MacKinnon, Neil. 1994. *Symbolic Interactionism as Affect Control*. New York: SUNY Press.

Massey, James L. and Marvin D. Krohn. 1986. ''A Longitudinal Examination of an Integrated Social Process Model of Deviant Behavior.'' *Social Forces* 65:106–134.

Matsueda, Ross. 1982. ''Testing Control Theory and Differential Association: A Causal Modeling Approach.'' *American Sociological Review* 47:489–504.

Niman, Michael. 1997. *The People of the Rainbow: A Nomadic Utopia*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.

Osgood, Charles, George J. Suci, and Percy H. Tannenbaum. 1957. *The Measurement of Meaning*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Osgood, Charles, William H. May, and Murray S. Miron. 1975. *Cross-Cultural Universals of Affective Meaning*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Pearson, Alan. 1987. ''The Grateful Dead Phenomenon: An Ethnomethodological Approach.'' *Youth and Society* 18:418–432.

Poplin, Dennis E. 1979. *Communities*. New York: Macmillan.

Rashotte, Lisa Slattery. 2002. ''What Does that Smile Mean? The Meaning of Nonverbal Behaviors in Social Interaction.'' *Social Psychology Quarterly* 65:92–102.

Raudenbush, Stephen W. and Anthony S. Bryk. 2002. *Hierarchical Linear Models: Applications and Data Analysis Methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Reckless, Walter. 1955. *The Crime Problem* (2nd ed.). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Ritzer, Jeremy. 2000. ''Deadheads and Dichotomies: Mediated and Negotiated Readings.'' Pp. 241–263. In *Deadhead Social Science: You Ain't Gonna Learn What You Don't Want to Know*, edited by

Rebecca G. Adams and Robert Sardiello. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press.

Sardiello, Robert. 1994. ''Secular Rituals as Popular Culture: A Case for Grateful Dead Concerts and Deadhead Identity.'' Pp. 115–140. In *Adolescents and Their Music: If It's Too Loud, You're Too Old*. New York: Garland.

———. 1998. ''Identity and Status Stratification in Deadhead Subculture.'' Pp. 118–147. In *Youth Culture: Identity in a Postmodern World*, edited by Jonathon S. Epstein. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Selznick, Philip. 2002. *The Communitarian Persuasion*. Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press.

Shenk, David and Steve Silberman. 1994. *Skeleton Key: A Dictionary for Deadheads*. New York: Doubleday.

Sheptoski, Matthew. 2000. ''Vending at Dead Shows: The Bizarre Bazaar.'' Pp. 157–181. In *Deadhead Social Science: You Ain't Gonna Learn What You Don't Want to Know*, edited by Rebecca G. Adams and Robert Sardiello. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press.

Short, James F. 1957. ''Differential Association and Delinquency.'' *Social Problems* 4:233–239.

Smith-Lovin, Lynn and David R. Heise. 1988. *Analyzing Social Interaction*. New York: Gordon and Breach.

Sutherland, Edwin H. 1939. *Principles of Criminology*. Philadelphia, PA: JP Lippincott Co.

Sutherland, Edwin and Donald Cressey. 1966. *Principles of Criminology* (7th ed.). Philadelphia, PA: JP Lippincott Co.

Sutton, Shan C. 2000. ''The Deadhead Community: Popular Religion in Contemporary American Culture.'' Pp. 109–127. In *Deadhead Social Science: You Ain't Gonna Learn What You Don't Want to Know*, edited by Rebecca G. Adams and Robert Sardiello. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press.

Thomas, Lisa and David R. Heise. 1995. ''Mining Error Variance and Hitting Pay-Dirt: Discovering Systematic Variation in Social Sentiments.'' *The Sociological Quarterly* 36:425–439.

Thomassen, Lisa. 2002. ''An Alcoholic is Good and Sober: Sentiment Change in AA.'' *Deviant Behavior* 23:177–199.

Tocqueville, Alexis de. [1835] 2000. *Democracy in America*. New York: A.A. Knopf.

Vela-McConnell, James A. 1999. *Who is My Neighbor? Social Affinity in a Modern World*. New York: SUNY Press.

Warr, Mark. 1993. ''Age, Peers, and Delinquency.'' *Criminology* 31:17–40.

Warr, Mark and Mark Stafford. 1991. ''The Influence of Delinquent Peers: What They Think or What They Do?'' *Criminology* 29:851–866.

Whitman, Marc L. 2005. '''When We're Finished with it, Let Them Have It': Jamband Tape-Trading Culture.'' MA Thesis, Humanities Department, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL.

Wilgoren, Rachel. 1999. ''The Grateful Dead as Community.'' Pp. 191–201. In *Perspectives on the Grateful Dead: Critical Writings*, edited by Robert Weiner. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Wood, Robert. 2003. ''The Straightedge Youth Sub-Culture: Observations on the Complexity of Sub-Cultural Identity.'' *Journal of Youth Studies* 6:33–52.

Zhang, Yin. 1999. ''Using the Internet for Survey Research: A Case Study.'' *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 51:57–68.

PAMELA M. HUNT is an Assistant Professor at the University of West Georgia. Her primary research interests are in the areas of social psychology, subcultures, and meaning socialization. Her most recent research investigates meaning socialization within the jamband music subculture.