CREATIVITIES, INNOVATION, AND NETWORKS IN GARAGE PUNK ROCK: A CASE STUDY OF THE ERUPTÖRS

Gareth Dylan Smith, Institute of Contemporary Music Performance
Alex Gillett, The York Management School, University of York

Abstract

The two authors are members of punk rock trio the Eruptörs. Both also teach in higher education – one in popular music, and the other in management and marketing. Writing from experience in the Eruptörs, we present a case study of the band, and draw on theoretical perspectives from our respective, intersecting fields to explore the Eruptörs' entrepreneurship, collaborations, networks, and creativities in the "DIY" underground punk rock scene. The paper provides cross-disciplinary insights into internal and external cultures of the Eruptörs. Proposing this as a teaching case, the authors conclude that students, scholars, and practitioners in music education, popular music studies, and related disciplines and fields involving entrepreneurship could benefit from engaging in reflexive and entrepreneurial practice which explores and incorporates ideas, models, and syntheses discussed in this paper.

Keywords: Creativities, innovation, networks, DIY, punk rock.

Introduction and Methodology

The Eruptörs is a three-piece rock band, sonically and aesthetically influenced by punk, garage rock, and punk/metal cross-over bands such as Motörhead, Gluecifer, Electric Frankenstein, and The Hellacopters, defining its output as "1000% Rock." The authors of this paper are members of the Eruptörs. Our classic "power trio" instrumentation consists of guitar (Alex Gillett), bass (Geoff Irwin) and drums (Gareth Dylan Smith), with all three of us responsible for vocals. Irwin and Gillett share lead vocals, with Smith joining in for the "gang" vocal sections of some songs. The Eruptörs share creative responsibilities as evenly as possible, working collaboratively in ways that Burnard (2012, p. 43) terms "collective creativity" (writing, rehearsing, and performing music together) and "production creativity" (making recordings and albums together). These intra-band creativities support and are enabled by "entrepreneurial creativity" (Burnard, 2012, p. 71) – marketing our music and carving a niche for the band – in collaboration with external agents, in ways similar to those identified as typical for (necessarily) entrepreneurial musicians for hundreds of years (Hallam & Gaunt, 2010; Menger, 1999; Weber, 2004). In this paper the authors use selected frameworks from scholarship in business and marketing to approach a richer understanding of the Eruptörs' entrepreneurship and multiple creativities.

Rashidi (2012, p. 84) states that punk rock is "a genre formulated on critical thinking" and advocates for "self-awareness." Reflecting Cook's observation (2012, p. 120) that "rock [musicians] prefer an intuitive approach over creativity toolboxes," the account that we present is a reflexive, *post-facto* framing of ways in which the Eruptörs have worked, rather than an explicit re-presentation of past strategies. We do not seek to claim that the Eruptörs' experience exemplifies or epitomizes that of garage punk/metal cross-over bands in the U.K. or anywhere else. Rather, we are aware through our work as a band and in the members' other musical activities (including working in other bands of various sorts and, for one of us, in popular music in higher education) that many bands work with similar – although different and necessarily unique – practices (Burnard, 2012; McKinna, 2014; Shank, 1994; Smith, 2013a). We have in

common with other punk bands and punk musicians an "assumptive frame of reference" (Tiryakian, 1973, p. 199; Jorgensen, 2003, 29); acknowledging the "we-pole" orientation (Tiryakian, 1973, p. 193) or the "emic" perspective (Feleppa, 1986, p. 244) on our ways of working that we share with others in the punk community.

There is an increasing emphasis in the literature in music education, and especially in higher music education, on preparing students for portfolio careers in music (Bennett, 2008, 2013; Halla m & Gaunt, 2012; Parkinson, 2014; Smith, 2013b) and musical lives external to institutional education (e.g. Partti, 2012). With the majority of literature in popular music studies focusing on commercially successful bands and coverage in mainstream media also privileging artists and performers that are highly visible (and audible) to the general public (Smith, 2013b, pp. 29–30), we hope to offer an alternative, authentic (McKinna, 2014, p. 57) account of being in a band. In a statement reflecting the cases of popular music studies and higher music education, John Berger (2002, p. 176) observes that "there is a huge gap between the experience of living a normal life at this moment on the planet and the public narratives being offered to give a sense to that life." Bennett (2013, p. 238) asserts that students in higher education "need to form themselves for entrepreneurship, even while they are studying." The authors thus hope that this paper might help to bridge some of this gap, thereby serving the higher music education and broader higher education community by helping to orient students towards conceiving of themselves as entrepreneurs.

Bresler & Stake (2006, p. 278) advise that "in music education, we have a need for… experiential understandings of particular situations." We argue that these types of understanding, such as we offer in this paper, are likely to be helpful in other educational contexts beyond music. Musicians do not, after all, exist in a field-specific epistemological vacuum, and as such we are reminded of Miles & Huberman's (1984, p. 27) observation that "a 'case' always occurs in a specified social and physical setting: we cannot study individual cases devoid of their context." The context on which we position this paper is cross-disciplinary, involving music, education, and business. We propose, therefore, that this interdisciplinary study may be helpful as a teaching case – in (at least) both marketing and popular music education contexts. In the authors' respective pedagogical contexts of marketing and higher popular music education, applied "real-world" experience as collaborative musician-entrepreneurs affords us what Bourdieu & Passeron (1977, p. 19) have termed "pedagogic authority" – credibility, ascribed by learners, that is arguably essential, and certainly highly beneficial, to teaching in these environments. This is perhaps especially important in the current climate where "employability has become a dominant concept through which the value and purpose of higher education has been rationalized in official discourse in the U.K." (Parkinson & Smith, in press). As Bourdieu and Passeron (1977, p. 19) go on to explain:

> In real learning situations ... recognition of the legitimacy of the act of transmission, that is, of the [pedagogic authority] of the transmitter, conditions the reception of the information and, even more, the accomplishment of the transformative action capable of transforming that information into a mental formation (training).

We therefore encourage colleagues in higher education to discuss and analyze examples of their own and others' interdisciplinary practice (in music or other domains) in similar ways.

The Eruptörs as a Collaborative Innovation Network

In searching for a means to frame the way that members of the Eruptörs collaborate, we

were especially drawn to Peter Gloor's work on collaborative innovation networks (COINs). The COIN model has been applied in fields as wide-ranging as medical research (Gloor et al., 2011) and collaborative editing of wiki sites (Iba et al., 2011). While the concept is often applied to larger-scale collaborations such as these, when introducing the model, Gloor (2006, p. 23) also uses the example of a trio of collaborative musical composer-performers to illustrate the functions of COINs, indicating how the COIN construct can be applicable to musicians (and others) working in networks of various sizes. Gloor (2006, p. 3–4) observes that groups of people have behaved in ways framed in his research for hundreds years – "many of us have already collaborated in COINs without even knowing it." The Eruptörs can be seen as a quintessential example of a functioning "COIN," for the model captures much of what is termed by punk and other musicians as a "DIY" approach, explored further below. Gloor tells us that "in a COIN, knowledge workers collaborate and share in internal transparency. They communicate directly rather than through hierarchies. And they innovate and work toward common goals in self-organization instead of being ordered to do so" (Gloor, 2006, p. 4). This is certainly true of the Eruptörs.

Swarm creativity

The Eruptörs' website (Eruptörs) states that the band members play, respectively, lead guitar, lead bass, and lead drums. We position ourselves all as "leaders," not because we are competitors for superiority, but to show that we are all of equal importance as parts of the whole, all of our ideas have equal validity, and we are all equally in control. None of us can achieve the band's goals without the other members, and we all want to be a part of the Eruptörs. In order to realize our shared (individual and collective) goals, we share expertise, knowledge and skills openly. Gareth Dylan Smith wants to be the drummer in the Eruptörs, and the other two members of the band want his drumming to be a part of what they do in that context. If we each contribute for the collective and individual good then we all gain in ways unachievable on our own; this type of working together Gloor identifies as "swarm creativity" – taken from studies into how insects such as bees and ants work individually and together in colonies – and it is fast being recognized as a highly efficient and productive *modus operandi* for human interaction (Gloor, 2006, p. 75). In Gloor's terms, the Eruptörs "share the same goal and are convinced of the their common cause… COIN members develop new ideas as a team; the whole is much greater than the sum of its parts" (Gloor, 2006, p. 11). In Burnard's terms (2012, pp. 43 & 71), thus does the band realize its collective and production creativities in writing, rehearsing and performing music, and in making and recording albums together.

The Eruptörs is not a money-making project. It is a rock band; it exists to make rock music, which we find inherently worthwhile. Although the Eruptörs is not a financially motivated venture, in order to write, perform, record, produce, and generate interest in the band, it has been necessary to interact with elements of the "business," which we explore in detail, below, with reference to relevant concepts and theories. Our peers (other musicians and fans of the rock and originals band scenes) understand our *raison d'être*. We will probably never have a "hit" song, undertake a major world tour or become household names, but that has never been an objective of the band. This is also a typical COIN characteristic, in that "people initially join COINs because they are fascinated by the challenge and care deeply about the goals… The primary currency of reward is peer recognition" (Gloor, 2006, p. 75). The number of peer-fans of the Eruptörs' music is small, but the band members are all pleased with the music we have produced. Being in the band is to a large extent its own reward (the notion of "unpopular"

popular music like ours is discussed further by Smith, 2013c, p. 33). Ehls describes collaborations such as the Eruptörs' as a "social exchange processes" in which:

> As long as the organizational stimuli (inducements) are greater or in equilibrium with the individual's objectives, the individual will continue to participate (make contributions). In other words, as long as the organization provides sufficient benefits, it will attract participants to contribute to the organizational objective and ensure the success of the coalition. (Ehls, 2014, pp. 45-46)

Dawkins (2010, p. 273) calls this commitment to the band's cause, for its and our own sakes, "the logic of self-fulfilling labor." This ethos is common among "Do-It-Yourself (DIY)" practitioners (Milne, 2008), and is not, of course, limited to punk music scenes. It has been observed among "niche communities" online (Andreini & Cassia, 2009, p. 1), and is theorized in literature across domains including crafting and human computer interaction where scholars have "emphasized the pleasure, expressiveness, and communicative practices involved… rather than the utility of their end products or their ability to generate profit" (Tanenbaum et al., 2013, p. 2604).

Functioning as a COIN

Gloor identifies three characteristics that define the behavior of COINs. Collaborative innovation networks:

1. *Innovate* through massive collaborative creativity
2. *Collaborate* under a strict ethical code
3. *Communicate* in direct-contact networks

(Gloor, 2006, p.12)

We now look at how the Eruptörs meets each of these characteristics.

Innovation through massive collaborative creativity. The extent to which the Eruptörs could be described as "innovating" is debateable from a visual or aural aesthetic perspective; we consciously pay homage in our music to our interests and our influences. As Burnard (2012, p. 44) observes, this is quite normal for a band, for the fact that we are able to identify ourselves as a garage rock or punk outfit places us firmly in a recognizable canon of stylized rock music in which there has been arguably very little real innovation in the several decades during which the music has been around. This being said, the Eruptörs have certainly created "new" music – our songs and albums did not exist until we created them, although the idea of three people on bass, guitar and drums all playing very loudly and fast has not been genuinely novel for over half a century. In this sense, the Eruptörs are, then, in the business rather of renovating rock than of innovating it – we deal in evolution rather than revolution, a type of innovation identified as "sustained" as opposed to "disruptive" (Gloor, 2006, p. 31–32).

In her descriptions of collective creativity in action among originals bands, Burnard (2012, p. 65) finds that:

> Being in originals bands involves players as individuals, but, critically, as members of a long-standing collective of finely tuned musicians, who are able to improvise, embellish, jam, and "pick each other's brains" during group interactions in band rehearsals and performances.

Being in the Eruptörs involves precisely these practices and processes in the contexts that Burnard identifies, as well as in the exercising of our production creativity (Burnard, 2012, p. 43)

in the recording studio, creating the music that later comes to define the experience that others have of us as a collective – on record and "live" at gigs. When the band comes together to record at Eruptörs' HQ in Co. Cork in the Republic of Ireland, our goal is usually to capture as much material as we can in a short time-frame that is usually determined by members' commitments to day-jobs. Our means of writing and learning songs together are the archetypal rock band "informal" writing and learning practices explained so well in Green's classic (2002) text, *How Popular Musicians Learn*.

When we meet to record, we usually also write the songs prior to recording. We have no written guidelines about what an Eruptörs composition should sound like, contain or do, but we all come with the assumption that if an idea comes from an Eruptör then it's worthy of the others' attention and collective creative effort toward realization. Each member contributes anything from a one-bar riff, drum rhythm or lyric idea, which we share to see what the idea will become once it has been experimented with by the collective. Our quality controls – the deciding factors over whether a song is worth recording or not – are a) whether we can all play the song, b) if it feels like an Eruptörs song. Despite being ostensibly a punk/metal band, we recently recorded a couple of tracks that sounded almost country; this is not a problem for us – if we all like it and we all played on it, then it's an Eruptörs song. We share an understanding in the band that no-one tells anyone else what to do.

Eruptörs teach one another riffs and/or song structures that we have written individually, but if another member hears the riff differently, plays it "wrong" or only wants to use half of it, we accept this as part of the group's collective creativity (Burnard, 2012, p. 43). It is because we all understand that it is only because the collective is comprised of precisely these individuals' attitudes, preferences, limitations, predispositions, creativities and musicalities (Burnard, 2012; Smith & Shafighian, 2013) that the Eruptörs sounds like the Eruptörs. We follow a similar process when creating mixes and adding lyrics to songs. If one of us was expecting a mix to sound a certain way, or was sure we had agreed on a certain take of a given song, only to find that one or both of the other members has mixed the song differently or included something that someone else in the band initially disliked, we are able to stand back and say "yes, this is an Eruptörs song, and it sounds like us. I am part of the bigger picture and defer to creativity of the collective." This is swarm creativity in action (Gloor, 2006) – the band's music ends up somewhere that none of the individuals would have wanted, chosen or could have foreseen; but we all accept it as ultimately better for the band.

This type of behavior results from what Sennett (2012, p. 22) identifies as a group collectively operating in the "subjunctive mood," where people allow for possibilities, make suggestions and wait for things to move along by no-one committing to a position. Sennett explains that the most useful kind of discussion is a "dialogic" conversation, defined as "a conversation that does not resolve itself by finding common ground." In the Eruptörs, we combine disparate musical elements and perspectives, creating a new "common ground" rather than all adhering to a preconceived consensus. We all accept the collectively produced outcome and can ultimately agree when we have reached it, but with each little step we might individually refuse to do what would perhaps make the easiest, most closely-fitting musical choice. Our commonality lies in our higher-level, cooperative and tacit, never-before-now-articulated decision that it is our differences that make us work as a whole. Of course, sometimes things proceed more synchronously, and the outcome is more musically obvious – by no means less desirable for it. Working creatively in both of these ways is crucial to the Eruptörs' sound. It is, as Sennett acknowledges (2012, p. 22), in a subtle dance between the dialectic (discussion

moving toward clear consensus) and the dialogic (discussion leading to a more open, more innovative product) that the best creative collaborations occur. As science journalist Ed Yong puts it, "that's the beauty of being part of the swarm: even if you don't know where you're going, you still get there" (Yong, 2013, p. 133).

For Sennett, the most productive and meaningful conversations and collaborations happen in empathic relationships. Empathy is a more mature response to another individual, and is more difficult to manage, than its close cousin, sympathy. In sympathetic exchanges, one person tries to mimic another, to feel, speak or behave similarly. In empathic relationships, by contrast, each person listens and tries to understand the other, but then responds in his or her unique way to the situation, thus inviting – indeed, requiring – a deeper, more considered response in turn. Sennett (2012, p. 19) observes of musicians that "the players do not sound entirely on the same page, the performance has more texture, more complexity, but still the players are sparking off one another – as true in classic chamber music as in jazz [and garage punk/metal cross-over 1000% Rock]." Thus, deeper mutual musical understanding is embedded, and individuals have more opportunity to develop, the collective benefiting exponentially more from what each person brings. Sennett (2012, p. 23) describes empathy as "the sentiment of curiosity about who people are in themselves;" it is on this that the Eruptörs' creativities thrive.

Collaboration under a strict ethical code. The Eruptörs have never discussed a shared ethical code per se. It is tacitly understood that we all wish and intend to succeed in our collaborations, and we each do what we can to help us achieve as a band in the domain of punk rock in what Gloor (2006, p. 71) describes as a "delicate balance of reciprocity" where there is "a normally unwritten code of ethics that is adhered to… the 'Tao of COINs.'" (Gloor, 2006, p. 76). This Tao of COINs constitutes a shared understanding that we all pull our weight because we are motivated deeply and intrinsically by our shared goals in the band. Burnard (2012, p. 46) observes that "the practice of group composition [and broader group collaboration] inspires the popular musician with a sense of higher purpose." As Partti explains, "the more generously an individual contributes [his] expertise to improve the practice of a community, the more [he] may benefit from participating in the practice of that community… at the junction of generosity and self-interest" (2012, p. 95). As a result of feeling this sense of higher purpose, members of the Eruptörs are each willing to contribute resources discovered independently of the band for the group's collective benefit, and when one member is able to offer an opportunity or resource for the good of the ensemble we are all eager to take advantage of this as it benefits us collectively, and – therefore – individually (because we all relish the process and product of participation in the band). Members are each connected to a range of third parties, all making us many times more capable as a whole – this is explored further below. It is the assumption of each member of the band – as part of the Tao of COINs – that each of the others will use his network of contacts to the mutual benefit of the collective. We each feel a strong sense of having a stake in the band because of our own individual networks of contacts; each is thus valued all the more by each other member of the band, since the connections of the individuals make possible the better work of the whole. This is the Eruptörs' entrepreneurial creativity (Burnard, 2012, p. 43) at work.

Alex Gillett (6-string lead electric guitar, vocals) is connected with the visual artist who created the artwork for the Eruptörs' first two albums and who designed and printed our merchandise (including t-shirts and underwear); it was a connection of Alex's that also saw a compilation of our songs released in Japan under the title of *Microwave Massacre* (named after the record company owner's favorite horror film); Gillett's colleagues at print- and web-based

"zines" saw the Eruptörs' music reviewed in the "underground" music press; and Gillett's knowledge of contemporary marketing strategies saw the band on its way to having a substantial web presence (discussed in more detail below). Irwin (4-string lead electric bass, vocals) has cost-free access to a recording studio in rural Cork that band refers to as "Eruptörs' HQ;" he can access numerous musical instruments, microphones and amplifiers that we can borrow at no cost or hire very cheaply for recording, and a network of very able musicians and actors who have appeared on our recordings to augment the sound-world. Gareth Dylan Smith (lead drums, vocals, "more cowbell"[1]) sourced a bass player who was willing to learn our songs and perform with us live in London; he found the record label that released our first two albums, and facilitated opportunities for us to perform with other popular bands at venues in London. It was initially through mutual membership and individual fandom of another band that the Eruptörs was formed; Irwin and Smith were playing in an Irish punk band in London called Neck, and Gillett attended Neck's gigs in London, so when Irwin and Gillett decided to transform and re-brand their previous band into the Eruptörs, they asked Smith to join. Thus was the Tao of the Eruptörs' COIN established, in spring of 2002.

Communication in direct-contact networks. In Swarm Creativity, Gloor provides a wide variety of case studies in which COINs function in both digital and corporeal realms to actualize what Burnard (2012, p. 43) calls their entrepreneurial creativity, without recourse to management "lines" or consultative hierarchies; members are equally empowered (as in lead bass, lead guitar, lead drums), and thus are at liberty to make all decisions regarding the future of the COIN amongst themselves. The authors elaborate, below, on how this has worked for the Eruptörs, functioning independently of contracts with record companies, marketing teams, agents, promoters and managers.

Gloor emphasizes COINs' utilization of the internet to achieve optimum performance as a team, writing (2006, p. 3–4) that a COIN "is a cyberteam of self-motivated people with a collective vision, enabled by the Web to collaborate in achieving a common goal by sharing ideas, information, and work." It is not that working together in physical space and real time are rejected from the COIN construct; rather, these traditional modes of operation are to be viewed only as part of the essential functionality of a group, for collaborators who embrace the working practices and potentials offered by the internet become more nimble, thereby expanding their opportunities for success.

It is fairly certain that without extensive use of the internet, the Eruptörs would not have survived as a band for as long as it has. The Eruptörs came to function as an internet-savvy COIN, not because we had specifically sought out this way of working, but owing to more mundane factors. Irwin returned from London to live in Co. Cork, Ireland, whence he hailed, because he felt (correctly, as it turned out) that he would find more work as a musician and a better life "back home;" Gillett left London for his native Teesside to be closer to the university where he was studying, and to live less expensively than in London. Smith remained in London because of family, financial and logistical ties, with his band-mates now both at a radius of 250 to 300 miles away. The easiest, cheapest and most effective way for us all to communicate was via the internet, using "democratized technological practices" identified as part of a "broad cultural shift in how people engage with technologies" in "DIY and Maker cultures" (Tanenbaum et al., 2013, p. 2604) such as the punk culture within which the band operates

---

[1] "More Cowbell" references a comedy sketch from NBC's *Saturday Night Live*, aired on April 8, 2000.

(discussed further below). It remains via email that the three of us work on musical collaborations, and that two of us wrote this paper, underlining some of the parallels that Rashidi (2012, p. 84) observes between being a punk musician and an academic.

Since 2005 the Eruptörs have written, arranged, recorded, produced and released three albums – *Bad Time to be Having a Good Time*, *Seduce and Destroy* and *Eruptors/Culo a Boca* (a split album with Californian punk band Culo a Boca) as well as *Microwave Massacre*, a compilation of demo recordings released in Japan. For only one of these albums was the entire membership of the band present during a majority of the recording process; for the first album, we all headed to Eruptörs' HQ in the heart of rural Cork to record drums, guitars and vocals. We did not record many bass guitar parts or lead vocals on that occasion, as Irwin was able to contribute most of these to the recordings after Gillett and Smith had flown home. Post-Cork, we all emailed, downloaded and discussed various takes and mixes, and occasionally even used telephones to confer with one another about the latest music sent by Irwin and what to do with it. Thus did we actualize our production creativity as a COIN.

At times it has proved more effective for the Eruptörs to work online, and at other times it was better "simply" to meet up in the studio. We were, as ever, relying on one another's commitment, motivation and COIN-Tao to get the jobs done. Sennett acknowledges the limits of online cooperation – even with the most effective and mutually understanding of groups – when he writes of another project that, "instead of working online, we increasingly started to board aeroplanes – the hideous torture-tools of modern society – meeting face to face to practice more effective lateral thinking, including everyone fully in the conversation" (2012, p. 28). The Eruptörs, or sometimes two of us, meet up in person often to record drums; we also sometimes, although less frequently, meet in person to mix or master songs. Discussions over mixes are sometimes better conducted face-to-face, for among the Eruptörs, as in other bands, collaborators are often especially sensitive around the engineering and production of recordings where the empathic, dialogic process can be most visibly at work (Sennett; Smith and Shafighian).

Networks and Entrepreneurial Creativity

So far this paper has focussed mostly on the Eruptörs' collective and production creativities (Burnard, 2012, p. 43) *within* the band, underpinned by the COIN framework and Swarm Creativity. To understand more fully how the Eruptörs has functioned, it is important to focus more on the band's entrepreneurial creativity (Burnard, 2012, p. 43) involving other, external Actors such as record labels, artists/designers and so on. Two helpful constructs in this regard are Relationship Marketing (RM) and the associated Service-Dominant (S-D) Logic.

RM theory has emerged internationally to address perceived limitations of "traditional" marketing approaches, although debate remains as to what exactly RM is, as there is no single agreed definition. A useful summary is provided by Gummesson (2008, p. 289) who states "RM is a marketing perspective on the network organization and the network society." Most recent definitions encompass relationships with any stakeholders including not-for-profit, government and voluntary organizations:

> [The purpose of] marketing is to identify and establish, maintain and enhance, and when necessary terminate relationships with customers (and other parties) so that the objectives regarding economic and other variables of all parties are met. This is achieved through a mutual exchange and fulfilment of promises. (Grönroos, 2007, p. 29)

Gummesson (2008, p. 5) summarizes that "relationship marketing is interaction in networks of relationships." Such explanations indicate the fuzzy nature and breadth of scope that characterize

RM theory. Various models exist to conceptualize the scope of RM but again no general framework has been agreed, although a tentative attempt was made by Clarkson et al. (1997); this synthesis has been supported and updated by Gillett (2012). This framework identifies four broad stakeholder groups or "markets:" Customers, Suppliers, Internal and External.

Gillett raises the important point that the four categories are not mutually exclusive and that there are areas of overlap where multiple types of relationship exist between the organization and stakeholder (in Gillett's analysis of local government procurement the example is given of residents as being "customers" as well as internal [e.g.] employees and/or suppliers to local authorities). In the case of The Eruptörs, the scope of relationships is summarized by Table 1, which provides an overview of the most significant parties with which the band interacts. The scope of the Eruptörs' relationships is discussed below.

Those to Whom the Band Supplies (Directly or Indirectly)	Those Who Supply to the Band (Directly or Indirectly)	Within the Band	Outside of the Band/Broader Stakeholders, Including Political, Legal, and Regulatory

• Promoters of live music
• Venues
• Record "companies"/labels to whom we license our music
• Followers/Fans/Consumers of music
  – Pre-recorded
   – Live
• Media/production companies/TV and radio who we supply with music
	• CD manufacturers
	• Social media websites
	• 'guest' musicians
	• Music services, e.g. "mastering" of audio
	• Art/graphic design
	• Merchandise
	• Instruments, equipment, repairs, endorsements
		• Locations
		• Communication
		• Availability
		• Complimentary experience and skill-sets
		• Fairly defined roles.
			•Performance royalty societies (PRS and PPL in the United Kingdom, ASCAP or BMI in the USA)
			• Press/Media/cultural influences
			– Production companies
			– Magazines, radio, websites
			– Other musicians
			• "Day jobs" and education:
			– All university educated
			– Two of the band have Ph.Ds.
			– Author 2 and Author 1 work in academia (some contrast with our identities as musicians)
			•Legal contexts (copyright, etc.)

Table 1. Scope of the Eruptörs' Network of Relationships

RM theory thus provides a useful framework for categorising and identifying the broader

network of interactions and relationships in which the Eruptörs is involved.

The related concept of Service-Dominant (S-D) logic for marketing (Vargo & Lusch, 2004, 2008) is consistent with RM and swarm creativity models. In S-D, Actors create value through service experiences and relationships, co-creating and sharing tangible and intangible resources with one another. From a marketing perspective this is usually applied to co-creation between customers and suppliers, although, as the S-D Logic explains that every organization is in the "service business," the terms "customers" and "suppliers" may be used very loosely to mean any one (or any organization) which exchanges value with others.

Differentiation is made between *operant* resources, which are often invisible and intangible and produce effects such as core competences or organizational processes, and *operand* resources – those upon which an operation or act is performed to produce an effect, such as land, minerals and other natural resources. Because operand resources are often finite, groups that possess them have traditionally been considered wealthy, and a goods-centred logic has dominated where operand resources are considered primary (Vargo & Lusch, 2004). In contrast, S-D logic places greater significance on operant resources, which lead to excellent service where value is co-created between supplier and buyer. A supplier offers value propositions and brings resources together for customers. Organizations and customers interact to co-create value in use, rather than organizations marketing *to* customers. This is a process that Cartwright, Gillett & Smith (in press) refer to as "orchestration."

Applying these ideas to the context of the Eruptörs, it is possible to view the three band members as suppliers of operant resources (e.g. expertise and creativity in their respective areas of instrumentation, access to one another's networks of contacts) as well as operand resources (e.g. drum kits, guitars, Irwin's recording studio, money to finance certain activities such as rehearsals and so on). S-D logic also positions the band collectively as a supplier and co-creator of value with its network of relationships, perhaps most evidently when performing live where co-creation may take the form of song requests or the rapport constructed through iterative responses between musicians and the audience. Thus we see the realization of the Eruptörs' entrepreneurial creativities.

RM and S-D logic in practice

S-D logic highlights the production and entrepreneurial creativities (Burnard, 2012; Menger, 1999) realized in the production of albums. For example, for the *Microwave Massacre* compilation the band (based in the U.K. and Republic of Ireland) wrote, recorded and supplied the music to the record company – Fixing A Hole, a not-for-profit specialist punk label located in Japan. The record company's mission is to champion and make available the music of (particularly English) punk rock bands in Japan. Fixing A Hole then designed the cover art, named the album and mastered the supplied music for sonic consistency. All of these activities were undertaken with constant communication between band members and record company, from the writing and recording of songs through to the distribution for retail of the physical compact disk albums.

The importance of "relationships" within the punk movement more generally is evident, particularly if we consider the marketing activities "promotion" (i.e. advertising and publicity) and "place" (i.e. distribution). Today, social networking websites such as Facebook, Twitter and Punkrockers.com provide platforms for bands and artists to interact with audiences on a global scale. Social networking, though, has always played an important part in punk culture, long before the ubiquity and ease-of-use of the internet (Gordon, 2012; Tanenbaum et al., 2013).

Gillett brought to the Eruptörs insider DIY punk knowledge gained writing for fanzines and purchasing DIY punk, rock and heavy metal records via mail order. Bands operating on an "underground" (non-mainstream) level did so without the investment or involvement of full-time for-profit record companies, thus the DIY approach required artists to self-finance their recordings. Bands would thus often source the physical format (usually cassette tapes or vinyl records) and distribute and advertise releases themselves (Gordon, 2012, pp. 106–107). When fans purchased a record or demo tape from a band it was common also to receive flyers advertising the work of other bands from the "scene," and catalogues from independent/not-for-profit record labels and distributors advertising recordings, fanzines, and even other record labels and distributors. The Eruptörs adopted such an approach.

This DIY approach appears more collaborative than competitive, paralleling the spirit that Galuszka (2012, p. 70) identifies in today's wider music climate (beyond the attention of mainstream media) as one where bands "do not compete for listeners' money but for their attention." Often DIY record companies and distribution services have been operated by people who were members of a band or bands and who had the skills, knowledge, means and motivation to undertake such activities; consistent with S-D Logic, such individuals provided these operant services to their peers. An example is the U.K. band Active Minds, who since 1986 have operated a mail-order (and latterly also internet-based) record label and distribution network called Looney Tunes Records (2014). Active Minds' approach is common across sub-genres such as death metal and grindcore as well as the DIY punk scene, which typically do not distribute through mainstream channels. As well as furthering the music and the message of the bands, and enabling them to gain recognition internationally, the economies-of-scale achievable through a global reach can make the self-financing approach more achievable.

An important factor illustrating the blurred lines between stakeholder categories of Customers, Suppliers, Internal and External (mentioned above), is that many of the consumers of the music in DIY scenes tend also to be active within the subculture as musicians and/or distributors, record labels, merchandisers, providers of artwork services, written media and so on, and would forward flyers and catalogues to other people with whom they corresponded by post or at live events. Therefore, bands have developed and maintained multiple types of relationship with others within the networks. An individual may, for instance, be a supplier of music via their own band's recordings, a distributor of their friend's band's records, as well as a consumer and audience member of other artists' music.

The authors contend that it is appropriate to view garage punk rock culture as a niche, international service-economy for which social networking has been an important means by which it has sustained itself, despite having only minimal exposure to mainstream marketing channels. The exchange of operant resources between bands and others in the network of relationships – such as expertise and access to contacts (and thus audience "reach") and the win-win nature of RM and S-D Logic – has been essential for the Eruptörs and for other entrepreneurial underground punk genres more generally. Operand resources of "material" products such as records, cassettes and CDs, and the financial means to produce them, are a secondary means to existence in a DIY music culture. In this mostly not-for-profit culture, the fundamental resources are the music and, in some cases, a "message" or value-set (often political) which the artists and bands purvey, and co-construct with their audiences.

Conclusions and Implications

In this paper we have, through integrating the constructs of creativities, COINs, swarm

creativity, Relationship Marketing and Service-Dominant Logic, provided perspectives on the DIY habitus (Bourdieu, 1984) of the Eruptörs. The Eruptörs is arguably not an archetypal COIN, inasmuch as this model tends to be more readily applicable to larger groups of collaborators than the power trio comprising the band. However, the ways in which Gloor (2006) describes COIN behavior and characteristics have illuminated and provided new ways to understand aspects of the Eruptörs' collaborations that might not have been apparent without the affordances of this theoretical framework. The fact that Gloor uses a musical (jazz) trio as en exemplar COIN helps to position his model between, on the one hand, understandings of DIY punk scenes (Gordon, 2012) and musical creativities developed by Burnard (2012), and, on the other hand, the business-derived relationship marketing theory of Gummesson (2008) and Gillett (2012), and Service-Dominant Logic (Vargo & Lusch, 2004, 2008). We acknowledge the broader context of maker cultures and other DIY communities across demographics and domains, within which the Eruptörs' case exists, and hope that focusing, as we have done in this paper, on this single case will help serve to help enrich discussion in classrooms and publications.

Figure 1 shows in diagrammatic form how the theoretical constructs explored in this paper combine to describe activities in the case of the Eruptörs.

Figure 1. Creativity Innovation Networks

At the core of the model is the COIN of the Eruptörs (Gloor, 2006), understood in RM theory

(Gillett, 2012) as internal relationships. The next layer of the model shows the immediate collaborative workings of the band: our collective and production creativities (Burnard, 2012), and innovation and collaboration – two of the operational modes of Gloor's COIN. The third layer shows the tools and context for the band's outward-focused behavior, understood as the communication mode of the COIN and as RM's supplier, customer and external relationships. The outer layer houses the enabling entrepreneurial creativity, through which the band realizes the benefits of its other activities, where the energy and output of all the inner layers combine to support the Eruptörs' broader mutual aims – in entrepreneurial creativity. In addition to the "collective," "production" and "entrepreneurial" creativities discussed above, the authors acknowledge our own respective and collaborative "scholarly creativities" in writing this article. These scholarly creativities are very closely connected to those other creativities that we exercise as musician-entrepreneurs in the Eruptörs.

Peter Cook (2012, p. 16–17) urges people in business across sectors to learn lessons from musicians' approaches to their art and craft. We hope that scholars and students in popular music studies and music education (and other peers across our range of networked relationships) might find the example of the Eruptörs a useful one upon which to build and whence to develop understandings of how musicians, educators and others can realize creativities individually and collectively, across networks, to mutual benefit. Beginning to think in terms of the multiple, overlapping and intersecting creativities of individuals and ensembles, of COINs and swarm creativity, may help those working in diverse fields and disciplines – from music to marketing and across cultural domains – to imagine freshly creative and innovative successful futures for themselves and their businesses, bands and brands. As indicated in Cartwright, Gillett & Smith (in press), looking in this way at networking and what those authors describe as "orchestration" within networks to achieve the best results for all, could be helpful to help the "emerging musicians" of which the higher education popular music sector is comprised. We hope our work will also provide a springboard for further research among scholars of popular music and popular music education, who have tended to focus research on mainstream mass culture (Smith, 2013c, pp. 29-30). There is life in the underground, and it is vibrant with relationships, creativities and entrepreneurship. Hoskyns (2012) warns commentators and academics that "the most authentic scenes will be those we [the public and academia] know nothing about" – unless we involve ourselves in the mutually sustaining, S-D logic, RM networks of authentic DIY (1000% ROCK) music.

Music educators (Bennett, 2013; Gaunt & Hallam, 2012; Shafighian & Smith, 2013) have been calling for institutions and students to embrace awareness of current practices, to be entrepreneurial, to be creative in construing and constructing careers in an uncertain musical landscape. COINS and new creativities, within and without the academy, are developing all the time. There are lessons – positive, negative, discursive and thought-provoking – to be learned from the discussion of the Eruptörs' case presented in this paper. We hope, therefore, that the study we have presented here may be of use in classroom situations. In the increasingly vocational context of higher education, this case could serve to provide discussion points regarding practice and conceptualization of students' own creative projects, and positioning these as viable, collaborative entrepreneurial projects – in music, marketing and myriad fields and (inter-)disciplinary approaches. Citing Tuan's (1977) discussion of "space" and "place," Smith & Shafighian (2013, p. 258) advocate for "transformation of [institutional] place through a creative pedagogical approach to… learning, into a more liminal 'space', brimming with creative potential;" such a democratic and facilitative pedagogical ethos is likely, we contend, to enable

students to benefit the most from the present study. Scholars, educators, students, punks and others could benefit from understanding these through engaging in perpetual reflexivity to ensure that practices, perspectives, teaching, curricula in music education, popular music studies and beyond remain relevant and salient. Through reflexive practice and awareness of one's and others' positionalities in a landscape of intersecting creativities, networks and relationships should continue to work in innovative ways to mutual benefit and development.

References

Andreini, D. & Cassia, F. (2009, October). The long tail perspective for niche communities online: A framework for brand loyalty measurement. Paper presented at the meeting of 9th Global Conference on Business and Economics, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, U.K.

Bennett, D. E. (2008). *Understanding the classical music profession: The past, the present and strategies for the future*. Aldershot, U.K.: Ashgate.

Bennett, D.E. (2013). The role of career creativities in developing identity and becoming expert selves. In P. Burnard (Ed.), *Developing creativities in higher music education: International perspectives and practices* (pp. 224–244), London, U.K.: Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Berger, J. (2002). *The shape of a pocket*. London, U.K: Bloomsbury.

Bourdieu, P. and Passeron, J-C. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. London, U.K.: Sage Publications.

Bresler, L. & Stake, R. (2006). Qualitative research methodology in music education. In R. Colwell (Ed.), *MENC handbook of research methodologies* (pp. 270–311. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Burnard, P. (2012). *Musical creativities in practice*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.

Cartwright, P.A., Gillett, A. & Smith, G.D. (in press). Valuing networks for emerging musicians. In V. Lejeune (Ed.), *Les tendances technico-économiques de la Valeur*. Paris, France: 'l'Harmattan.

Clarkson, R.M., Clarke-Hill, C.M. & Robinson, T. (1997, July). Towards a general framework for relationship marketing: A literature review. Paper presented at Academy of Marketing Conference, Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester, U.K.

Cook, P. (2012). *The music of business: Business excellence fused with music*. Marston Gate, U.K.: Amazon.

Dawkins, N. (2011). Do-it-yourself: The precarious work and postfeminist politics of handmaking (in) Detroit. *Utopian Studies*, *22*(2), 261–284.

Ehls, D. (2014). *Joining decisions in open collaborative innovation communities: A discrete choice study*. Wiesbaden, Germany: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden.

Eruptörs. (n.d.). Retrieved March 2, 2014, from http://www.eruptors.com/.

Feleppa, R. (1986). Emics, etics, and social objectivity. *Current Anthropology, 27*(3), 243–255.

Galuszka, P. The rise of the non-profit popular music sector: The case of netlabels. In Kärjä, A.-V., Marshall, L. & Brusila, J. (Eds.), *Popular music and the Nordic region in global dynamics* (pp. 329–339). Helsinki, Finland: International Institute for Popular Culture.

Gillett, A. (2012). *Local government procurement in England: A relationship*

marketing approach (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Teesside University Business School, Middlesbrough, U.K.).

Gloor, P.A. (2006) *Swarm creativity: Competitive advantage through collaborative innovation networks.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Gloor, P.A., Grippa, F., Borgert, A., Colletti, R.B., Dellal, G., Margolis, P. & Seid, M. (2011). Toward growing a COIN in a medical research community. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 26*, 1–17.

Gordon, A. (2012). Building recording studios while Bradford burned: DIY punk ethics in a field of force. In A. Furness (Ed.), *Punkademics: The basement show in the ivory tower* (pp. 104–124). New York, NY: Minor Compositions.

Green, L. (2002). *How popular musicians learn: A way ahead for music education.* Aldershot, U.K.: Ashgate.

Grönroos, C. (2007). *Service management and marketing* (3rd ed). Chichester, U.K.: Wiley, 2007.

Gummesson, E. (2008). *Total relationship marketing*, (3rd ed). Oxford, U.K.: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Hallam, S. & Gaunt, H. (2012). *Preparing for success: A practical guide for young musicians.* London, U.K.: Institute of Education.

Hoskyns, B. (2012, September). This must be the place: Holy grails and musical meccas. Paper presented at conference of the International Association for the Study of Popular Music (U.K. and Ireland Branch), University of Salford, Manchester, U.K.

Iba, T., Nemoto, K., Peters, B, & Gloor, P. (2011). Analyzing the creative editing behavior of Wikipedia editors: Through dynamic social network analysis. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences. 2*(4), 6441–6456.

Jorgensen, E.R. (2003). Toward a social theory of musical identities. In B. Stålhammar (Ed.) *Music and human beings: Music and identity*. Örebro, Sweden: Universitetsbiblioteket.

Looney Tunes Records (n.d.). Retrieved October 2, 2014, from http://looneytunescds.

McKinna, D.R. (2014). The touring musician: Repetition and authenticity in performance. *IASPM@Journal*, *4*(1), 52–76.

Menger, P.-M. (1999). Artistic labor markets and careers. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *25*, 541–574.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Milne, A. (2008). *What makes a maker: Common attitudes, habits and skills from the do-it-yourself (DIY) community*. (Unpublished master's thesis). McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada.

Parkinson, T. (2014). *Values in higher popular music education*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertaton). University of Reading, Reading, U.K.

Parkinson, T. & Smith, G.D. (in press). Towards an epistemology of authenticity in higher popular music education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*.

Partti, H. (2012). *Learning from cosmopolitan digital musicians: Identity, musicianship, and changing values in (in)formal music communities*. Helsinki, Finland: Sibelius Academy.

Rashidi, W. (2012). Punk rock docs: A qualitative study. In Z. Furness (Ed.), *Punkademics: The basement show in the ivory tower* (pp. 66–85). New York, NY: Minor Compositions.

Sennett, R. (2012). *Together: The rituals, pleasures and politics of cooperation*. New

York, NY: Penguin.

Shank, B. (1994). *Dissonant identities: The rock 'n' roll scene in Austin, Texas*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.

Smith, G.D. (2013a). *I drum, therefore I am: Being and becoming a drummer*. Farnham, U.K.: Ashgate.

Smith, G.D. (2013b). Pedagogy for employability in a foundation degree (FdA) in creative musicianship: Introducing peer collaboration. In H. Gaunt & H.M. Westerlund (Eds.), *Collaboration in higher music education* (pp. 193–198). Farnham, U.K.: Ashgate.

Smith, G.D. (2013c). Seeking "success" in popular music. *Music Education Research International, 6*, 26–37.

Smith, G.D. & Shafighian, A. (2013). Creative space and the "silent power of traditions" in popular music performance education. In P. Burnard (Ed.), *Developing creativities in higher music education: International perspectives and practices* (pp. 256–267). London, U.K.: Routledge.

Tanenbaum, J. G., Williams, A. M., Desjardins, A., & Tanenbaum, K. (2013). Democratizing technology: Pleasure, utility and expressiveness in DIY and maker practice. *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 2603-2612.

Tiryakian, E. A. (1973). Sociology and existential phenomenology. *Phenomenology and the Social Sciences, 1,* 187–222.

Tuan, Y.-F. (1977). *Space and place: The perspective of experience*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Vargo, S.L. & Lusch, R. (2004). Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing. *The Journal of Marketing, 68*(1), 1–17.

Vargo, S.L. & Lusch, R. (2008). Service-dominant logic: Continuing the evolution. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 36,* 1–10.

Vargo, S.L. & Lusch, R. (2011). Service-dominant logic: A necessary step. *European Journal of Marketing, 45*(7/8), 1298–1309.

Weber, W. (2004). The musician as entrepreneur and opportunist, 1700–1914. In W. Weber (Ed.), *The musician as entrepreneur, 1700–1914: Managers, charlatans, and idealists* (pp. 3–24). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Yong, E. (2013, May). As new: How the astonishing power of swarms can help us fight cancer, understand the brain and predict the future. *Wired (U.K. edition),* 126–133.