Bonding and Bridging: Perceptions of Social Capital in Community Music

This case study describes and explores four participants’ experiences with community music (CM) workshops in Austria intended for the university, community, and growing immigrant and refugee populations. The Austrian government encourages cultural integration, potentially furthered through musical activities. Social capital theory, specifically of bonding and bridging, as well as democratic rights of inclusion, enhancement, and participation frame this inquiry. The purpose of this study was to investigate participants’ perceptions of bonding or bridging capital in CM workshops. Research questions included, (a) What are participants’ experiences of bonding or bridging? (b) What are their perceptions and experiences of inclusion, enhancement, or participation? and (c) What role might music play in fostering relationships among diverse participants? Data were collected primarily through interviews and observations and analyzed by coding transcripts for themes that were then compared across participants and with relevant literature. Data suggest community-building activities and purposeful collaborations might create capital, yet bridging capital depends on a confluence of circumstances, including empathetic leadership and activity structures that take virtual needs into account. Implications include the capacity for those with social capital to become bridging people.
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Introduction

How might people of diverse backgrounds engage and connect in meaningful ways? This question lies at the heart of community music (CM). CM exists in all societies, including among the earliest humans,1 but has been notably difficult to define.2 Shippers and Barleet describe CM as a flexible and

inclusive social musical activity. Leglar and Smith categorize CM into three purposive categories, including education; performance with an educational component; and culture, socializing, or entertainment with no specific educational objective. There are also therapeutic aspects of CM as a social and cultural phenomenon that can build individual and communal expressivity. CM can play a role in maintaining cultural resilience and building community vitality as well as contribute to sustainability for groups who are isolated or exist in small numbers.

This study describes a CM workshop series in Austria developed with the intent to foster inclusive musical opportunities among the university school of music, local community, and growing immigrant and refugee populations. The Austrian government encourages integration of language and values, goals that are potentially furthered through participation in social activities such as music. European traditions of Bildung, or the German tradition of self-cultivation through personal and cultural maturation, have centered on music and the arts in general and have played a critical role in socialization and enculturation. Bildung, in fact, may have the potential to disrupt hegemonic structures in music and education. Though the Austrian CM group is designed to be voluntary, inclusive, and welcoming, scholars have raised concerns with a passive acceptance of CM activities as inherently good,
prompting critical inquiry into how CM is situated, who names its successes, and how those successes are determined.\textsuperscript{10}

In this pilot study, I investigate CM participants’ perceptions of social capital,\textsuperscript{11} considering specifically categories of bonding and bridging capital.\textsuperscript{12} Three categories of potential participants emerge: university members (e.g., students and professors), refugees and immigrants, and Austrian community members. Research questions included, (a) What are participants’ experiences of bonding or bridging in the CM workshops? (b) What are participants’ perceptions and experiences of inclusion, enhancement, or participation? and (c) What role might music play in relationships among diverse participants in a CM workshop?

This paper begins with an introduction of the topic and the research questions. The Literature Review follows, providing an overview of scholarship related to CM, theory of bonding and bridging capital and democratic rights of participation, which frame this study.\textsuperscript{13} The third section, Methodology, details site and participant selection, my relationship as researcher to the participants, and what and how data were collected for analysis. In the Results section, I present data relevant to the research questions. I follow this in the Discussion section with a thorough analysis of the data, aiming to provide answers to the research questions. Finally, the Conclusion section reviews key findings and implications for future research and for CM.

**Literature Review**

In this section, I aim to provide an overview of the definitions and purposes of CM established in the literature as well as discussions of cultural identity and resilience as they relate to CM. I then outline the framework for this study, which is based on Bourdieu’s social capital theory and conceptions of bonding and bridging capital.\textsuperscript{14}


Community Music

Despite the ubiquity and long history of CM globally, a generally accepted definition remains elusive. A mostly unquestioned, therefore problematic, assumption of CM’s inherent goodness of enhancement and empowerment nonetheless persists notwithstanding its equivocality.

According to the Community Music Activity Commission of the International Society for Music Education, CM is a universal right, and that beyond involving people in music-making, CM activities “provide opportunities to construct personal and communal expressions of artistic, social, political and cultural concerns; contribute to the development of economic regeneration; enhance the quality of life for communities; encourage and empower participants to become agents for extending and developing music in their communities.” CM is commonly considered one way by which political and public participation can better people’s situations.

Gibson and Gordon note that CM can play a role in maintaining cultural resilience and building community vitality as well as contribute to sustainability, specifically for those experiencing isolation or a lack of critical mass in their communities.

Though the definitions are vague, authors generally describe CM as flexible and inclusive social musical activities that may involve the following three aspects: music of a community, communal music-making, or an organized musical group with a leader from the community.

---
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Smith define purposes CM may have: education; performance with an educational component; and culture, socializing, or entertainment with no specific educational objective. Kertz-Welzel highlights the transformative musical vision of CM, “characterized by social justice, cultural democracy, participation, and hospitality,” but notes that establishing a close collaboration between CM and school music scholars “could be useful in order to implement the notion of everybody’s musicality more thoroughly in the discourse and practice of music learning.” Stige et al. also describes therapeutic aspects of CM, including relationships between music and wellbeing, and social circumstances.

Social Capital

Bourdieu developed the theory of capital, a concept of power and access in social life involving forms of cultural, social, and economic capital and focusing on categories of class, supremacy, conflict, and the ways in which capital might be formed. According to the theory of social capital, relationships are a resource secured by material or symbolic exchanges. Through these exchanges, reciprocity and trustworthiness grow with continual investment into building and maintaining social capital. Jones describes social capital as “a disposition toward and practice of cooperating with others.” Mutual cooperation may therefore enhance goals of diversity and inclusion. Although initial results of diversity can promote distrust and exclusion however, interactions can potentially create understandings and bonds.

Associations, as in groups people join, which can promote friendships, memberships, and connections with others, are an important source of social
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stability. Associating physically, however, has become difficult with the growth in popularity of virtual communications and entertainment that diminish person-to-person interactions. The loss of personal connection and association, and thus social capital, have had repercussions that include weakened social connections and friendships.

Austria has, in recent years welcomed an influx of refugees and immigrants. Although this has historically been the case, new waves of migration began in 2015, making Austria one of the EU countries taking in the highest numbers. The Austrian government has instituted policies and programs that encourage and help refugees socially integrate into Austrian society. Community music offers opportunity for further cultural participation. Music is uniquely situated to foster connections among diverse people because it builds strong social bonding as well as tolerance, cultural understanding, and economic gain. According to Jones, building social capital should stand as an explicit goal of both community music and music education in order to foster intercultural understandings and civic engagement. Jones stakes music as a “perfect mediating space for people of different groups.”

Westerlund, Partti, and Karlsen note the important social role CM can play, despite challenges associated with significant shifting cultural demographics due to migration. Schiavio et al. point out problematic assumptions of Western classical art music as best. As scholars note, these
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views tend to be furthered by connection with institutional values, which may 
marginalize other musical practices, particularly among those with low social 
capital, like immigrants or refugees.\footnote{22}

Benedict highlights problems with assuming CM is inherently good,\footnote{42} 
pointing to a need for critical considerations of how it is good (if it is) and in 
what ways. CM is often assumed to foster positive associations and enjoyable 
music-making opportunities among diverse others, and to guide social justice 
efforts. As a field of practice now defined by academic institutions and their 
accompanying research, rules, roles, degrees, and systems, complexities arise 
in assumptions of CM, that is, as a community activity that was originally 
external to the university, now housed within, and governed by structures 
and traditions of institutions that may fundamentally change it.\footnote{43} Kertz-Welzel 
recommends philosophical inquiry to better understand and implement CM.\footnote{44} 

CM is a culture in and of itself; when it goes unquestioned however, we 
deny our own submission to, and acceptance of, rules and practices that 
normalize and support existing hierarchies of people and musics.\footnote{45} Benedict 
draws on the work of Illich\footnote{46} to point out that these systems, and those ruling 
them, often seek to define those in poverty. Those in power not only tend to 
define others and their supposed needs, but also control the rhetoric, 
resources, and terms in the form of institutional performance.\footnote{47} “If community 
music schools and programs are framed and organized by that which is 
determined legitimate the transmission and rendering of standard, prescribed, 
normative treatments becomes authoritative.”\footnote{48} Control, domination, and 
power, therefore, must be carefully considered in CM contexts.

Bonding and Bridging Capital

Putnam defines two forms of social capital, \textit{bonding} and \textit{bridging}, and 
claims both are necessary for a peaceful society. Bonding capital centers on 
connections of shared characteristics or interests, for example, spirituality, 
race, or age. Bonding capital is a connection among people who share, or who
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are perceived to share such similarities, often in identifiable ways. Shared similarities, however, may be so in only one way, for instance race or gender.\textsuperscript{49} Claridge described bonding capital as inward-looking, which might perpetuate one’s identity and reinforce homogeneous groups.\textsuperscript{50}

Bridging capital, however, involves connections between social groups that may be perceived as different.\textsuperscript{51} People may come from diverse backgrounds, including ethnic, racial, or religious identities.\textsuperscript{52} Bridging connections may result in a broad trust through cooperation and growing familiarity.\textsuperscript{53} While bonding capital is necessary for bridging, it does not guarantee its result because bonding may connect a commonality and encourage participation in a group, without necessarily connecting others perceived as unlike. Bridging capital therefore is outward-looking, promoting connection among diverse people.\textsuperscript{54} Ideally, bridging capital results in collective actions, such as cooperation between groups for mutual benefit.\textsuperscript{55} When opportunities are created for meaningful interactions, diverse group members can begin to perceive shared identities toward bridging.\textsuperscript{56}

**Inclusion, Enhancement, Participation**

This study explored participants’ conceptions of Bernstein’s democratic rights, inclusion, enhancement, and participation, as they relate to CM. Bernstein describes inclusion as a right to be involved not only physically, but also intellectually, socially, and culturally.\textsuperscript{57} This might include, for instance, opportunities for people to see themselves reflected in cultural imagery that demonstrates value for them and their voices. Importantly, inclusion does not imply conformity or acculturation; rather, inclusion encourages autonomy and individuality,\textsuperscript{58} within a state of acceptance and participation.
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Bernstein’s right of enhancement involves tools for critical reflection, not only of what occurs at present, but also of what possibilities might exist into the future. This might include, for instance, a vision of future musical possibilities or a reflection of things one takes for granted. Lastly, participation involves a right to take part, not only in existing structures, but also in those that can be adapted and changed. For example, having opportunities to express opinions—and receiving others’ respect for doing so.59

Methodology

The purpose of this study was to investigate participants’ perceptions of bonding or bridging in the CM workshops they attended or in which they participated. I carried out this case study60 bound by the CM workshop series. Interviews with and observations of the four participants were the primary data sources, but observations and artifacts were also included. I analyzed the data by coding transcripts for themes that I then compared with relevant literature.

Workshops

The site of investigation, the CM workshop series, existed prior to my own participation. It had been intended as an inclusive musical opportunity with a low barrier for participation.61 The workshops addressed two simultaneous purposes: promoting social interactions and stimulating continued musical and artistic interactions that focused on negotiating both individual and group subjectivity.62 It was created as an opportunity for anyone—from any background and of any age—to musically express themselves while socializing with others.63 At the same time, the workshop series also existed as a portion of a university class on music pedagogy (Gande & Kruse-Weber, 2017). Those that took the workshops as a class completed weekly pedagogical reflections with facilitators, and led at least one brief portion of teaching under the guidance of a facilitator. The workshop series

provided open ensembles that revolved among different themes like dance, theatre, choir, and percussion. The workshops were intended for anyone: “refugees and migrants, students, citizens of Graz of all ages including elderly people, university students and sometimes staff.” Prior years also included gamelan but were not offered at the time of this study (held virtually during the COVID-19 pandemic).

Participants

The participants in this pilot study included four university students who I was able to recruit for a sample of convenience. I co-facilitated the course, and teachers included a revolving pool of community members who each taught one of the topics: drumming, singing, or theatre. Students were familiar with, if not also comfortable with virtual classes—most university classes had moved online, using the same platform, during the prior year, and many continued to be held that way. It is possible that community participants may have been deterred by the new virtual format or may not have had the tools for online participation (e.g., technological skills, a device compatible with the hosting platform, a stable internet connection) in a way that was not as difficult for university students.

The four participants were Lillian, Karina, Maya, and Kai. Lillian and Kai were both international students who had moved to Austria from abroad. Karina and Maya were both from Austria. All participants were women in their 20s. The participants had different experiences with the CM workshops and while most were new, it was not uncommon for new people to come in and out of the group. At the time of this study Maya had only attended one session. Lillian and Kai were also relatively new, both having participated in only a few sessions. Karina, however, shared with me that she had not missed a weekly workshop in the past year. Each had previously been aware of the workshops and all began attending due to a course requirement. All reflected they should have attended early-on, expressing their enthusiasm for their experiences. While it is possible they exaggerated their enthusiasm for my benefit as I currently held an instructor role, I got the feeling they were genuine, and none participated as members of my class. All participants were thoughtful and reflective about their experiences of participation in the workshops, providing rich interview data.

Researcher

A year prior to this study, I had been invited by a colleague to provide
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two workshops on topics of my choice. I facilitated both folk dance and creative community singing workshops. These experiences leading my own CM workshops were enjoyable and I wondered about other workshops; teachers and their approaches; program goals; individuals’ motivations; and interactions among attendees. Additionally, at the time of this study, I was a new professor of music pedagogy and had begun co-facilitating the workshop series. While the weekly teachers were external to the university, I provided administration for the program, which included delegating tasks to a student assistant and familiarizing myself with the history of the program and making plans for the future. Though my workshops and administrative role gave me some understanding of the scope of the program and provided an overview of the semester, I considered myself new. While I conducted my research, I also co-administered and participated in the program each week. It is possible my roles within the organization may have influenced participants’ responses. However, no participants were members of the course and therefore did not receive a grade from me. Also, most of the participants were completing their degree programs and had no obvious reason to exaggerate their feelings. Although participants and I saw each other’s faces in the online group, we did not know one another.

Data and Analysis

Interviews and observations were the primary sources for data collection. I conducted semi-structured interviews with all four participants: interview questions provided the base for discussion, and I asked follow-up questions naturally as opportunities arose during the conversation. I attended the workshops as participant–researcher; I took limited observation notes during the workshops as I was also a participant. Students took part in reflection meetings at the conclusions of the workshops, which I also attended. After each, I immediately recorded observation notes based on my experiences in the workshops and reflection meetings. Additional data comprised a collection of artifacts, such as flyers, website promotions and social media posts and comments, and posters. I created transcripts of interview recordings and reviewed them for accuracy. I sent transcripts to participants for member checking to ensure they felt accurately represented by their words. They had the opportunity to omit or further explain any of their words. Only a few minor changes were requested, however. I then coded transcripts and reviewed them with observation notes for emergent themes. I diagrammed these themes and selected relevant, representative quotes, which I present in the Results section below.
Results

Here I present findings from the data. Five categories emerged from these findings: inclusion and sense of welcome, lighting candles, pacing and accessibility, awkwardness and fatigue, and goals. I present participants’ voices in each category below, striving to let them speak for themselves.

Participants had different experiences and circumstances in the CM workshops. Relatively new to the program, Lillian and Kai had only attended a few workshops when I began data collection. Karina, who had attended the workshops weekly for nearly a year, noted that she had some expectations about the sessions based on prior experiences with the teachers and regular attendees. She said, “Last semester I didn’t miss one session as a student.” Maya had attended the fewest sessions—only one. The workshops, however, were designed for drop-in participation—even if only once—I therefore considered her perspective an important source of insight as she was one of many with such limited experience and could speak to her initial feeling and interpretations that might affect continued participation, or not. During this study, the COVID-19 pandemic necessitated that all sessions were held virtually. This factor seemed to play a foundational role in participants’ experiences. Not only were the CM workshops new to most of them, but the online experience of learning and participating musically was also relatively new. As aforementioned, it may have nevertheless been easier for these university students than a typical community member.

Inclusion and Sense of Welcome

Kai expressed that she was initially anxious the first time she logged in concerned that she might be asked to sing alone. She said she grew more comfortable, however when she realized this would not be a pressure on her. Lillian recalled that the first time she attended a workshop, she logged in during an ongoing conversation: “When I came in, he [the facilitator] was already talking to people and asking them how they were doing and things like that. So, I don’t know. I kind of came in, in the middle of a conversation or something and it was with people that I did not know.”

Kai expressed enthusiasm for the choir teacher, who she felt infused the virtual session with musicianship and energy. Kai said, “It’s hard to keep the energy and the motivation of the students up, but I think she did a very good job of doing that, and it felt just as good as an in-person lecture, I thought. And the students, they were, I think also very motivated; there were a couple of people standing up and just swaying to the music while singing, even when they’re on mute.”

Lillian noted that virtual breakout rooms played a positive role for her during other (university) online classes. These were not used in the scope of
data collection for this study, however. Lillian liked the breakout rooms because they allowed connections to form when people got a chance to talk, and therefore offered a sense of inclusion: “When we do lectures online, we are separated into groups and do our assignment for those 10 minutes or whatever. And then we come back into the bigger room. If we incorporated that with music, or to show each other the excerpt that we practiced or something, then that could be a way to maybe get to know people that way.”

Lillian and Kai both said they were not able to connect with others during CM virtual sessions, which focused on large-group skills.

Lillian reflected that her feelings of connection and familiarity with others were important in that they would impact her motivation and confidence to speak to people she did not know. While she did not speak to other members during the virtual sessions, she considered what she would do in-person when given the chance. She said:

If we were live [in-person in a classroom] and there were the water breaks, I definitely would probably go talk to people that maybe I’ve had class with, and then if they were talking with somebody who I didn’t know, then that would be a way for me to be introduced to somebody new. But I don’t think that if somebody were to come up to me, I’m not that kind of person, I think it would just be like circumstances, and that’s how it has to be, it has to be natural. And if, I don’t know, a situation happens and then we’re all just kind of discussing or something, then a conversation also can flow that way.

Kai said that she was glad to see familiar faces the second time she attended. She said, “I’ve seen familiar faces of the same people in both [of the first] sessions. And even though I don’t know them personally—I just met them online—but when I logged in and saw those faces, I was like, “Oh!” I was relieved to see, “Oh, I know her face.” And that just made me feel a bit excited . . . and you can see the names, whereas in person, you would have to remember.”

Karina however, a longstanding attendee, spoke about the ease with which she would be able approach and meet new people. She described former in-person sessions from the year prior, saying,

I think it was nice because the group changed a little bit and you had also other people you can get to know and you just—I love to meet new people. And I think that’s really nice because in this context it’s really easy because you have something to talk about really fast because you’ve all done the same course, or you’ve just sang the same songs, and so you can connect with them. . . . I also find it interesting that there are also some people, they come every time, for example, to the choir, so you see them every three weeks and so it’s also nice to see, “Oh, they are here again,” and yes, I think that’s really a good, good thing.
Lighting Candles

Lillian remembered feeling indifferent to the CM workshops prior to attending. While she was aware of them through advertisements, she said she felt no connection to them at that time. That changed when a friend mentioned them to her, and then she met one of the facilitators who guest-spoke in a university class. She said,

I would see the posters around the university. I’ve been [a student there] maybe a couple of years. And I wasn’t really ever interested because it was just like, I just had so much on my plate already. I think it’s also a difference between people who do music, like as a hobby versus as a profession. So, I think that’s why I was never really interested in it. And then it kind of rang a bell when I met somebody in a program. I randomly saw him and he said, “Oh, I’m doing drum circle,” which drum circle, it wasn’t something that interested me actually. He was like, “Yeah, I’m doing for music thing,” … then that kind of like, I guess shed a little bit of um, because otherwise I would just see the posters. And then that was a few years ago. The professor’s name just slowly started coming into my world, you know, a little bit. And he also did a talk, he was a guest speaker in one of our classes. So, then we really got to know him there. And then, that’s how that all started coming. I guess it has to do with getting to know people, I guess that’s where it all starts. … I just imagine, you know, like he lit one candle and then you just light another candle and then slowly that’ll kind of spread.

Participants seemed to “light candles” for one another in other ways, too. Raina expressed feeling a little nervous the first time she attended, but told me one thing that helped her gain comfort and a feeling of welcome was watching other participants get involved. Despite that during the choir session participants were on mute, Kai described watching others sway or dance. She felt their engagement helped her. She said, “the students, they were, I think very motivated. There were a couple of people standing up and just, you know, swaying to the music while singing, even if they’re on mute . . . watching that made me feel, you know, more secure, not embarrassed or anything.” Kai also noted that the instructor herself was motivating in a similar way. She described her as “very social, very energetic—uplifting. She naturally motivates the students to be creative. She’s very creative herself, I think.”

Pacing and Accessibility

During choir, Lillian told me she felt uncomfortable singing alone in her apartment even though she was a vocalist. While Kai was similarly worried about that initially, she said she had fun doing it in the moment, referencing the backtrack to which participants sang along. Kai acknowledged that others
might feel differently. While describing how accessible the drum circle felt to her, Lillian laughingly stated that she had not realized how much she liked it until she started describing it to me and reflecting on her experience:

I didn’t realize I liked it so much, but I think he was super accessible to non-musicians. He made it in such a way where he didn’t make you feel like you’re taking a step backwards as a musician. He still challenged us. It would have been interesting for non-musicians, but I’m not sure because I’ve been a musician all my life, so I can’t speak for them. But, for me it was broken down in such an intelligent way and an accessible way that I felt extremely comfortable. If I compare that, for example, with choir, I felt even as a musician, it [choir] was too fast for me.

Lillian juxtaposed the accessibility she felt when drum circling with the fast pace of the choir:

I asked myself, did I miss a session? Because like I had the feeling that I missed something, because I felt like she was, I don’t know, five steps ahead, and that some other people were also with her, with those five steps. Yeah. And then I was like, I thought this was one of the first classes, but apparently not as I was a little confused about that. And then like, as if everybody, and then of course we just zoomed through, literally, we really went through it.

Other participants, however, like described their enjoyment of choir, and the pace at which the instructor led them. Karina however, had participated in choir before, with the same instructor. Maya knew the instructor previously in other contexts, and may have had some familiarity because of it. Kai did not know her and lacked previous experience but described enjoying it nonetheless.

Awkwardness and Fatigue

When reflecting on the choir experience that she felt had been too fast-paced, Lillian noted that it had felt awkward:

It was for me, honestly, a little awkward to sit in my room, and, you know I have my headphones on and I’m just piecing out these exercises and I’m sitting in my chair, you know? And I think if we were live, ... I think singing is a like, I’m not saying that other instruments are not as connecting, but I’m saying that in this choir setting where it is a non-soloistic singing, which means that we are dependent on the person next to us to create sounds, I think it was kind of a missing that element that one would want in any music session. I was just at home, sitting in a chair, singing these tones; it felt awkward.

For Kai however, who had attended the same session, the pace and
accessibility felt right. She said it was fun for her but she felt it would also be accessible for others even if they did not read music. She noted that although the instructor used standard notation, it did not appear to concern attendees. The instructor played each part and Kai felt it would possible for someone to learn entirely by ear. Kai also told me that she had looked forward to CM participation because she personally enjoyed informal music making, even when at a lower level of complexity than what she studied at the university. She seemed to appreciate musical activities that involved all levels of musicianship. She recalled living at home and enjoying such activities. She said, “My dad has a couple of friends who play instruments, not professionally, or they just started the guitar. So, I would often go along with him to play in a group with just simple chords. And for me, I enjoy that the most, you know, playing just simple chords, but with people who just love music.” For Maya, involvement, accessibility, and participation boiled down to attitude. She said, “I think to really enjoy these kind of things, you have to be at least a bit open or interested in something. I think that’s a complex, or complexes are a really big part of that. Have a lot of them and you feel more uncomfortable being there than comfortable, then. Yeah. But that’s, that’s of course an individual thing.”

Both participants spoke about the ways technology interfered with what would otherwise be normal, spontaneous interactions, for instance the problem of audio lag as individuals unmuted or re-muted themselves to offer a thought, or technical issues that could delay the session (e.g., audio failure, internet problems). Karina said,

I think that’s also something that, um, causes that you can’t just talk, so you have to be, “Oh, okay. I want to say some things, so I’m going to turn on the microphone,” and it’s not so spontaneous. Like, if you just talk and then, “Oh yeah, sure, I just wanted to jump in there.” So [now] it’s more, “Oh, is it okay? Or, is someone else going to say something?” It also causes some breaks. And that’s also not so good in online is when there are problems like technical issues, and you just have to wait…. It’s also like “really?”

Karina mentioned her feelings of fatigue that could quickly set in when interacting virtually. She said, “You have to talk to the whole group … so it’s like you have to concentrate more and it gets like, we have to focus. I do get tired [in a] shorter time. So, if it’s important, then it’s okay. I can concentrate for two hours, but in, in front of the laptop I get just a little headache.”

Goals

It was not always clear to participants what the facilitators’ goals were, which could have been because teachers were able to set their own tone for their workshops, and these likely differed among them and perhaps among
their own sessions depending on who or how many attended any particular session. Some teachers provided an overview of their workshop to participants at the beginning, which may have helped participants understand the pacing of the session and the decisions they made in order to accomplish end goals, like singing a four-part vocal arrangement with accompaniment track as a concluding activity.

The overarching goals of the CM workshops differed a great deal from students’ other university courses, and they expressed appreciation for the inclusivity and connections these workshops could offer. Karina said, “The idea why it started is really nice, that they just wanted to open the university so that everybody has something he can come to and experience. And it’s not only for the students.” Lillian similarly stated, “It gives people a chance to do music for free and, you know, come as you are and come and go as you please. I think the concept is great. I think it’s inviting.” Maya noted the possibility for insecurity to interfere with people’s participation, however. She stated that making workshops accessible should be an explicit program goal if it was not already, saying, “Everybody has their own thing, you know, to the parts of play, just, we’re all the same, I think. And so, I think it’s very important for workshops to be at a level that is equal enough that everybody can kind of follow and understand.”

Discussion

I organized the data in this study with a construction of bonding and bridging capital as a frame. Bernstein’s pedagogic democratic rights (i.e., inclusion, enhancement, and participation) can be supportively enacted to promote both forms of capital. I correlate bonding capital with the right of inclusion and bridging capital with both rights of enhancement and participation.

*Inclusion* involves physical, intellectual, social, and cultural connections; a reflection of oneself in cultural imagery; feelings of value for voice and self; and autonomy. These pillars could guide practice toward building bonding capital through shared and identifiable characteristics and interests. *Enhancement* concerns critical reflection and a consideration of future possibilities as well as attempts to gain perspective of one’s own norms. *Participation* means having voice, expressing opinions, and contributing to adaptation and change within a group. Both enhancement and participation rules can guide practice toward bridging capital. Bridging capital, as a goal,

---

requires trust and cooperation with others to connect and grow in familiarity. Importantly, these outcomes ideally promote possibilities for collective action through shared identities that benefit the group. I explore two larger themes that emerged from this study: connections and transformation.

Connections

Data suggest that community-building activities and purposeful, collaborative opportunities might foster bonding capital. Bridging capital, however, depends on a confluence of circumstances, including a sense of belonging, empathetic leadership, activity structures, and perceived benefits of social positioning. Both forms of capital were manifest in the workshops to varying degrees, though the recent loss of in-person workshops due to the COVID-19 pandemic impacted the manner in which they appeared.

Lillian connected comfortably with fellow music students participating in the workshops because she identified with them as musicians and students. Although she was interested in meeting participants from outside that sphere, like community participants, she stated that she would only feel comfortable engaging them if a familiar peer were already speaking or working with them. To make herself comfortable, Lillian relied on a bridging person, or a person with whom she had built bonding capital, to connect her with others she did not know and perceived as unalike. Karina conversely described comfort and motivation to meet new people. She described appreciating this aspect of the CM workshops as much as the musical aspects. Karina would likely be a bridging person for participants like Lillian, helping them make the social connections Schippers and Barleet describe of inclusion, support, and networking.66

Karina appeared to possess a great deal of both cultural and social capital, according to Bourdieu’s descriptions.67 She was living in her own country, speaking her first language, and had attended the workshops for a significant amount of time. She was familiar with regular attendees and was aware of the occasional or choral-only attendees, as well as new people, like Maya. She had made friendships and acquaintances with other attendees as she bonded with them, and had developed some expectations of what different teachers’ sessions would be like and what would be expected of her as a participant. This provided her both power and access, outcomes of social and cultural capital.68 This could have contributed greatly to Karina’s comfort in approaching unfamiliar people, although it could also be an aspect of her

68 Bourdieu, 248–249.
personality that gave her confidence to engage others beyond her familiar social circle. It may have been both capital and personality. Nevertheless, comfort and confidence in approaching others provides additional social capital, which can be used as a resource in the development of social strata. Karina’s growing relationships created reciprocity and trustworthiness over time that contributed to feelings of social stability.

The right of inclusion is involvement physically, intellectually, socially, and culturally. Participants in this study participated virtually, but workshops included physical involvement, like dancing, synchronizing movements and actions with a backtrack or drum, and games. While teachers encouraged physical involvement in my observations, the nature of virtual platforms somewhat restricted users’ range of motion when attempting to remain in the video frame.

Teachers also encouraged intellectual participation through questioning and discussion, although these primarily took place after the workshops for only the students who participated as a course member. Nevertheless, there were some attempts to allow participants to speak, albeit limited. According to Karina, who had previously taken the course, contribution in discussions was considerably easier when in-person. She said she held back in virtual discussions because it was difficult to avoid inadvertently interrupting someone, and the discussion sometimes felt unnatural in the clunky process of unmuted and re-muting microphones. Some groups may also have been uncomfortable or less experienced with technologies, hindering participation. Students who took the workshops for class, however, also participated in a designated reflection time after the close of the workshops each week and contributed to a discussion forum. These participants had additional opportunities for reflection and discussion with one another and the teacher, though mediated either through an online written platform, or online video platform.

Socially, the CM workshops seemed designed to initiate connections. Karina described past in-person sessions that had included time to speak informally in the beginning and end as well as a water break halfway through, where participants and the teacher got to know one another, where they were able to group up and chat in their own ways. The nature of virtual meetings, however, made informal conversations—crucial for bonding connections—difficult to fully achieve. As participants described, when one or two people
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speak, they dominate “the virtual floor,” inhibiting others’ opportunities to connect with any others. Lillian described her first workshop as slightly awkward, as she joined during an informal conversation between the teacher and a participant and therefore could not introduce herself to anyone new, say hello to someone familiar, or be welcomed by the teacher. However, Lillian also described the helpful presence of breakout rooms in her other classes, which allowed for small groups to speak more freely, informally, and candidly than they could otherwise, mimicking a similar kind of chat they might have in an in-person moment. These insights are significant as diminished personal connections can deeply effect people and societies, both culturally and economically.

Participants spoke about involving their friends. Lillian pointed out the importance of organic connections, opportunities to involve others through one’s own intrinsic interest. While she felt posters and advertisements were helpful in spreading a level of awareness, she felt that participants responded more readily to personal invitations from someone familiar (including participants asked to come by professors or for a class assignment). This was the case for Karina, who had later continued to come out of her own interest. These moments of so-called candle lighting may be some of the most valuable bonding opportunities. Feelings of inclusion and welcome may be greatly enhanced when specifically asked to attend, particularly when that person is at least somewhat known or perhaps bonded in some way.

Although Jones stated that CM activities should explicitly intend to bring about intercultural understandings, the workshops in this study were complex. They involved overlapping areas of cultural intersection that included the cultures of the university, the country of Austria, the city, immigrants or refugee groups, curricular and extracurricular students, and so on. Participants may have seen their own cultural reflection in different musical practices like drumming, singing, or theatre. They may also have seen themselves reflected in other cultures (e.g., with particular teachers or professors), like Kai and Lillian, who were not Austrian, and the choir teacher, who was also a foreigner. However, it is also possible they did not see important cultural aspects of themselves displayed at all, coming from entirely different countries than the choir teacher. This is one of the big challenges of CM, due to changing cultural demographics in the city and university, while
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adhering to differing attendees from week to week. The culture of university music schools is also a significant consideration when attempting CM endeavors, which may exist in tension with a dominance and prioritization of Western classical art music in these spaces, for instance the pervasive use of standard notation. While this was expressly comfortable for participants in this study, they were all university music students who knew and made use of standard notation extensively. While participants felt the sessions would nonetheless be accessible for others, this cannot be addressed with study data.

Transformation

Bridging connections may result in a broad feeling of trust through cooperation and growing familiarity. For those who had only attended virtual sessions, like Lillian, bridging connections were more challenging to achieve. Karina had been able to draw on connections she had made in-person prior to the shift to virtual workshops. During the in-person sessions, informal conversations (e.g., during water break, pre-session time, ending time), the ability to be an active member of discussions, collective musical activities (e.g., games, singing together, drumming together), and interactivity (e.g., partner activities, small group discussion, musical arrangement, practice time) had helped her make connections.

Ideally, bridging capital results in collective action to mutually benefit all groups involved. Opportunities for meaningful interactions between groups can foster shared identities. The virtual-only nature of the workshops during this study likely hindered these opportunities. Despite the challenges of the virtual workshops, study participants seemed to find meaning in them and continued to attend. It cannot be said whether the group shared a sense of identity, but as Karina reflected, “I want it [the CM workshops], so I really have fun to be a part of it. It’s just nice. So, every week I see those people and I get to get to know them a little better.”

Bernstein’s right of enhancement states that people deserve to have tools for critical reflection, not only for the present, but also for their future. Critical reflection was one goal of the workshops, at least for the students enrolled in it as a course. At the end of each weekly workshop, the students met with the teacher and dialogued in a facilitated reflection. For those not taking the workshop as a course, like Karina, it is unclear the extent of their reflection. Interestingly, Lillian said she was surprised by her own reflective
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insights during an interview with me. Lillian spoke highly of the drum teacher and reflected about why his process was impactful for her and what she noticed about his pedagogical approach. She noted, “I didn’t realize I liked it so much.” This suggested to me that reflection (albeit through study interview) was helpful for her and refined the ways she thought about her experiences.

The workshops gave participants an opportunity to consider music in ways that broadened beyond the university music school culture. Both participants spoke about program goals as inclusive, flexible, and intended for participation rather than musical perfection. They appreciated this aspect of the program, and though they were aspiring professional musicians participating in an open-level program, they expressed satisfaction with the ways they were still challenged musically. Although the musical challenges they experienced during CM workshops were different than ways their university music studies might challenge them, it likely broadened their overall musicianship.

The right of participation is the right to take part not only in existing structures, but also in those that can be adapted and changed. While the students in the class had opportunities to prepare and execute a short CM teaching opportunity under the guidance of one of the teachers (of their choosing), it was not clear to what extent they were empowered to adapt or make changes to the program or within the workshops. Although this was possible, Karina noted that she wanted to fit her prior lesson into the framework established by the teacher. She also said she would want to be sure she really had something to say before unmuting her mic and offering a thought to the group. In contrast, Karina said she was an active participant in the live discussions of the prior year, where fewer barriers existed to contribute (i.e., freed from the un-mute button and limitations of the meeting platform). Karina, a high achieving musician who appeared to have significant social capital in the CM workshops as a university member (student), former course member, regular attendee, and friend or acquaintance of others in the group, was hesitant to adapt or change existing structures. This may indicate that other community participants with less capital would be all the more hesitant to contribute, even if they had reflective insights that could benefit the group. This is worth considering however, because Gibson and Gordon point out that CM could positively impact cultural resilience and community vitality. This likely depends on participants’ willingness to share their perspectives, particularly when they have less social capital and therefore might offer a very different perspective. Conversely, it is also possible that
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those less enculturated into the workshop series might actually have more proclivity to suggest change or improvement, if, that is, they are willing to share it, as they may not take the norms of the workshop for granted yet, and therefore see different possibilities. Not only must participants be willing to share however, but their views must be met with acceptance, respect, and be valued enough to be deeply considered, which may also be furthered through social capital and bonding and bridging connections.

Conclusions

This was a small study with only four participants. While the limited number of participants allowed me to gain in-depth data on their personal experiences, it also limited the data to deeply decontextualized reflections. These limitations are appropriate in a qualitative study, yet they must be taken into consideration when interpreting findings. Also, all participants were women and university students. Further studies should seek a broader participant group that includes diverse community participants and gender identities. Any conclusions I have drawn from the limited data are not generalizable but may nevertheless be informative in developing future studies. Additionally, this study took place during the COVID-19 pandemic; all workshops and interviews took place virtually. An in-person experience, as noted by participants, would have been a different experience and would likely have yielded different data. However, as Lillian said, “Look, we’re in this situation, let’s do with it what we can.” While all participants expressed desire for in-person workshops, it could be that these workshops were particularly meaningful during this pandemic time, as musical connections—even when only virtual—could take on heightened meanings in times of increased isolation.

Despite these qualifications, some implications may be useful for future studies or similar CM programs. Continuity appears to be a key factor in building bonding capital and perhaps bridging capital as well. Longer-range projects that span months or years and provide multiple kinds of opportunities to connect with others can be helpful in creating varied for community-building. It might take multiple opportunities to see the same faces before attendees finally speak and connect. Program facilitators like myself, and teachers, must encourage members of groups to recognize commonalities, which we can do in part through musical interactions themselves. Considerations must be made however, about the types of repertoire, pedagogical practices or assumptions, and reflections of culture they therefore provide. In order to sensitively consider these factors, of course, the attendees themselves must be taken into account, a difficult feat when membership shifts from week to week. Bridging people, who not only have
social capital themselves, but who are also able to share it with others, may be an excellent resource in developing interactions and building familiarity among community members. In this study, students participating as part of a class could perhaps have become bridging ambassadors, purposefully fostering connections among themselves and with others beyond their typical social circles. Personality also may play a role as connections must be genuine, that is motivated by the potential to connect with others, rather than coercion or obligation to do so.

Bridging may be necessary musically as well. While musical skills, preferences, and prior experiences can differ widely, instructors can offer varied possibilities for participation so that participants are able to self-select a comfortable level. It is best to make no assumptions about what people already know, for instance, both of university students and community members. Some university students for example, found some CM activities challenging because the musical skills and practices differed from their everyday practices and therefore challenged them when paced quickly. While they had musical capital, they did not have expertise in all types of musical activities. That is, their musical capital had limitations. All individuals have limitations on their varied sources of capital, and therefore recognition of this fact is an ideal way to create commonalities and acknowledge the diverse strengths and weaknesses in any group. All participants—musically prepared or not—may face moments of challenge or even frustration, and this creates some degree of commonality.

It is important for teachers to get to know participants at each workshop. While some may be repeat attendees, the group as a whole, changes weekly. This demands extreme flexibility and a willingness to be vulnerable on the part of teachers. Taking the time to gain a sense of the group every time can inform facilitators about who participants are, what experiences they have, and what they hope to gain from the session. At the same time, getting to know participants can foster feelings of acknowledgement, respect, and welcome that build rapport and connection.

It is possible some attendees may feel uncomfortable with the technology needed to safely interact in a virtual workshop. As Lillian noted, organic connections are worthwhile. Members who are comfortable with the technology could build connections with those who need assistance. This initiative would establish a collaborative sense of responsibility and care for one another that focuses on the group rather than the individual (How can I help you participate?) Similarly, attendees can welcome, invite, and bring along friends, neighbors, and others from within and beyond the university community, as Lillian and Karina had done in the past.
Opportunities for discussion and reflection were important for participants in this study and could lead to what Bernstein describes as enhancement, and what Putnam notes could result in bridging. While students in the class indeed engaged in weekly reflection and discussion, it could also be instructive to invite (and actively include) community members in these discussions, as well as make use of breakout rooms in order to foster increased informal dialogue that was notably lacking in the virtual workshops.

While these implications are certainly an important starting point, they alone cannot suffice in that they attempt to define others, a potential outcome of hierarchies implicated by social systems that include universities and scientific research. Systems and those who organize them—including university systems—may seek to define those in poverty or seek to define those without social capital in a particular space. This can occur despite intentions of helpfulness and inclusion. As Benedict notes, those in power not only tend to define others and their needs, but often control the rhetoric, resources, and terms for helping them as a kind of institutional performance.

The very nature of trying to improve community music without input from the entire community—all types of participants—is itself a problem to acknowledge. Any community without voice is then stripped of its right to participation. In order to seek others’ diverse voices and perspectives, however, they must not only be welcomed and included, but actively involved. One can open the door, as well as the floor, by inviting others to share themselves, by giving space for informal connections, and by respecting and valuing diverse voices, opinions, perspectives, repertoire, and practices. With explicit intentions, we are more likely to gain insights that could move musical encounters toward transformation—adapting and changing practices beyond any one (dominating) culture. It is important to build musical community and foster connections beyond one’s own sphere. To do so is to enhance our own lives and musicianship as well as to identify and enact shared goals that move communities forward together—not for them, but with them.
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