# Leisure or Work?: Amateur and Professional Musicians' Perception of Rehearsal and Performance

# Susana Juniu, Ted Tedrick and Rosangela Boyd Temple University

This investigation examined amateur and professional musicians' perceptions of rehearsal and performance as either work or leisure along the dimensions of intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and perception of choice. Seventyfour subjects participated in this study. Thirty-four were professional musicians and 40 were amateur musicians. The results showed a relationship between the type of musician and the perception of rehearsal and performance as either leisure, leisure/work, or work. Significant differences were found between the subgroups' (leisure, leisure/work, and work) intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and perception of choice during rehearsal. Amateur and professional musicians differed on the variables intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and perception of choice during rehearsal. During performance, differences were found in the musicians' extrinsic motivation. These results suggested that amateur musicians viewed rehearsal and performance as leisure, motivated by intrinsic factors, while professional musicians perceived the activities as work, motivated primarily by the pay-off.

KEYWORDS: leisure perception, intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, perception of choice, music, work

# Introduction

The relationship of work and leisure has been the subject of inquiry for many researchers in the field of leisure studies. One of the main concerns of these studies is the definition and conceptualization of leisure and work (Iso-Ahola, 1979; Kelly, 1972, 1978; Mannell, Zuzanek, & Larson, 1988; Neulinger, 1974, 1981; Roadburg, 1983; Wagner, Lounsbury, & Fitzgerald 1989). Most frequently, leisure has been defined as: (a) a form of activity (Dumazedier, 1967; Kraus, 1984); (b) unobligated time (Kaplan, 1975; Kraus, 1984; Murphy, 1981); or (c) a "state of being" (de Grazia, 1964), the classical view. Leisure has also been defined as compensatory, where the individual chooses an activity to satisfy those needs unmet during work; in contrast to the spillover view where leisure is viewed as a continuation of work (Wilensky, 1960). These explanations assume that leisure and work should be perceived as separate entities rather than being defined as part of a continuum.

Neulinger (1976) offered a model which dealt with factors that characterize and distinguish leisure and nonleisure experiences. This psycholog-

Susana Juniu is a doctoral student in the Department of Sport Management and Leisure Studies, Temple University, Box 062-62, Philadelphia, PA 19122. Rosangela Boyd and Ted Tedrick are professors in same department. This paper was presented at the Leisure Research Symposium on October 22, 1993 in San Jose, California.

ical model is concerned with the analysis of a state of mind, not with people, activities, or life situations. His model examines the effects of perceived freedom, constraint, and motivation (intrinsic and extrinsic). Neulinger's (1981) perspective of leisure emphasizes the participant's behavior rather than the activities and conditions. Neulinger's conceptualization was derived from the classical view, i.e, leisure as a state of mind or an experience.

Neulinger's model suggested that *perceived freedom*, defined as the freedom to choose whether or not to participate in an activity, is closely related to and considered the basis of leisure. *Perceived constraint*, defined as the feeling of obligation, responsibility, and commitment towards the activity, is related to work. The primary characteristic that distinguishes leisure and nonleisure is made along the dimension of perceived freedom, and a second characteristic is made along the dimension of motivation (intrinsic or extrinsic). For Neulinger, the source of satisfaction determines whether motivation is intrinsic or extrinsic. Unlike Kelly (1972) and Parker (1971), this model treats work as part of a continuum rather than in opposition to leisure (Neulinger, 1981).

Considerable research has explored the definition of leisure and work and their relationship according to the actors' own experiences. Brook (1993) studied managers' perceptions of work and nonwork. She noted that work and non-work have similar characteristics such as creativity, challenge, mental activity, and self-development. Non-work also has other characteristics, e.g., freedom of choice, socially-oriented, and discretionary. Roadburg (1983) compared the perceptions of individuals who were paid and those who were not paid when participating in a given activity (soccer). He found that those who received remuneration were more likely to perceive the task as work. Furthermore, those who perceived the task as work were more willing to put up with things that were hard, boring, and repetitive because of external motivators that resulted from their performance (e.g., pay, status, and camaraderie). The unpaid players perceived the task as enjoyable and fun; in this case, individuals experienced a greater sense of freedom and relaxation. However, the unpaid players were also less likely to tolerate the boring and repetitive tasks.

Ryan (1980) compared student athletes on scholarship and not on scholarship on their level of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation with relation to their participation in their sports. The findings showed that scholarship athletes listed more extrinsic reasons for participation and reported less enjoyment of sport than nonscholarship athletes.

An extension to Ryan's work was undertaken by Wagner, Lounsbury, and Fitzgerald (1989). They compared high school and college/university basketball players who were on scholarship to those who were not. The results showed that the scholarship athletes were less likely to regard basketball as leisure (9% to 24%). Those participants who perceived the activity as leisure were more likely to be intrinsically motivated, and derive satisfaction, enjoyment, and fulfillment from their involvement in the activity itself. In contrast, those who perceived the activity as work were motivated by the extrinsic rewards (such as remuneration) received after the experience. The results of these studies are consistent with the overjustification hypothesis (Lepper, Greene, & Nisbett, 1973) which postulates that individuals who expect a reward show less intrinsic interest in the activity than those who do not.

Differences have also been found between amateurs and professionals. Amateurs may be serious in their participation, investing time in training; they might even be paid at times. Amateurs can be just as committed to the activity as professionals. They are serious in their participation, but they do not make a living from the activity. Stebbins (1982) suggested that activities which are freely chosen, which require effort and commitment, and for which there are extrinsic reasons to participate should be referred to as "serious leisure." Furthermore, Stebbins (1992) defined serious leisure as "a systematic pursuit of an amateur, hobbyist, or volunteer activity that is substantial enough for the participant to find a career there in the acquisition and expression of its special skills or knowledge or both" (p. 3). Amateurs make up one category of serious leisure and they "... are the skilled and knowledgeable leisure counterparts of the professionals in the cultural field of art, science, sport, and entertainment" (Stebbins, 1992, p. 132).

Ethridge and Neapolitan (1985) utilized Stebbins (1979) conceptualization of amateurism in a study to determine if amateurs differed from professional and dabbler craft-artists. Amateurs were more serious about their activities than dabblers, and amateurs had more training and had read more craft magazines. Dabblers, on the other hand, said that the satisfaction derived from their craft was the "diversion from daily routines." Amateurs also showed a higher level of commitment than dabblers, and reported less production and market pressure than professionals. Ethridge and Neapolitan (1985) concluded that professionals "play" at their "work" and "work" at their "play." On the other hand, amateurs "work" at their "play", but their play is not connected with their occupation. For amateurs, the intrinsic reward from the activity itself and the recreational orientation are greater than they are for professionals.

Drinker (1967) defined a musical amateur as "one whose interest and participation in music is prompted primarily by his love for music and by no ulterior consideration" (p. 75). The differentiation between amateurs and professionals is not always clearly defined. It is common to say that professionals make a living from the activity and amateurs engage in an activity just for fun. For Drinker, professional and amateur musicians are not opposites. While a professional musician earns his/her livelihood by music, he/she may at the same time be an amateur if what motivates him/her is the love for music. Within the realm of experience between amateurs and professionals musicians, two situations (rehearsal and performance) may influence their perception of music: rehearsal being a formal practice of music and a preparation for performance, and performance being the playing of music for an audience.

The focus of this study was to explore the perceptions of rehearsal and performance among amateur and professional musicians, and to understand the criteria that differentiate both rehearsal and performance as either leisure, leisure/work, or work. Musicians were divided into subgroups according to whether they viewed rehearsal and performance as leisure, leisure/ work, or work. By using a common activity to differentiate leisure from work, the focus was on the conditions that influence leisure and work experiences and not on the activity itself. People often undertake activities as a means of recreation and/or leisure, but find that the demands are so high that they can no longer perceive the activity in the same way. The question then becomes: When can an activity be referred to as leisure and when is it work?

# **Research Problems**

The study was organized into the following research questions:

1. Is there a relationship between type of musician (amateur or professional) and the view of rehearsal or performance as either leisure, leisure/ work, or work?

2. Are there differences between individuals who perceive rehearsal or performance as either leisure, leisure/work, and work along the dimensions of intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and perception of choice?

3. Are there differences between amateur and professional musicians' views of rehearsal or performance along the dimensions of intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and perception of choice?

# Methodology

#### Subjects and Procedures

The data were collected during the Summer of 1992 from a convenience sample of 40 amateur musicians (24 female, 16 male) and 34 professional musicians (19 females, 15 males). Two symphony orchestras from the Delaware area were contacted over the phone and a letter of permission was sent to the orchestras' managers. One orchestra represented professional musicians who gained at least 50 percent of their livelihood from their performances; members of the other orchestra represented the amateur musicians whose principal income came from elsewhere. Self-administered questionnaires were mailed to the two orchestras with a 53 percent response rate. The age range for the amateur musicians was 24 to 76 years (M = 48); and for the professional musicians 21 to 69 years (M = 42). Amateur musicians had an average of 35 years of playing music; while professional musicians had played music for fewer years, with an average of 20 years. There were no significant differences between amateur and professional musicians' age and years of playing music.

# Instrument

The "Music Motivation Survey" (MMS), a three part questionnaire, was developed to assess the following information: (a) demographic background

(8 items); (b) perception of choice (6 statements), intrinsic motivation (5 statements), and extrinsic motivation (4 statements); (c) musicians' views of performance and rehearsal as either work, leisure, or both (2 statements); and (d) two open-ended questions asking under what conditions musicians perceived rehearsal and performance to be leisure, work, or both leisure and work. Questions assessing intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and perception of choice are shown in Figure 1. Scores for each subscale ranged from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree).

Musicians' views of rehearsal and performance as either leisure, work, or both leisure and work, were measured on two separate seven-point Likert scale, where 1 represented *pure leisure* and 7 *pure work*. The musicians were instructed to indicate their perception of rehearsal and performance as leisure or work by choosing a number that best fit their perceptions, with 1 and 2 representing *leisure*, 3 through 5 *leisure/work*, and 6 and 7 for *work*. They were then asked to respond using as a reference the definitions of leisure and work given by the investigator. Leisure was defined as "an activity freely engaged in and performed for its own sake, pleasure, and satisfaction,"

## **Intrinsic Motivation**

I do it because it gives me pleasure I do it because it is challenging I do it because it is relaxing I do it because it is exciting I like to do this activity for its own sake, not because it necessarily leads to something else

I like to do this activity because of the satisfaction I get

I like to do this activity because I get a sense of self-expression

I like to do this activity because I get a sense of creativity

## **Extrinsic Motivation**

I do it because of the remuneration I get I do it because of the recognition I get I do it because it helps me improve my music skills I like to do this activity because it may lead to something better

#### **Perception of Choice**

I engage in this activity because I am committed to do it I engage in this activity because it is my responsibility I engage in this activity because I have no obligation to do it I engage in this activity because I am free to choose whether or not to do it I engage in this activity because I have to do it I engage in this activity because I have to do it I engage in this activity because other people expect me to do it

Figure 1. Items of Subscales Intrinsic Motivation, Extrinsic Motivation, and Perception of Choice and work was defined as "an activity, labor, task, or duty engaged in under constraint and performed for the payoff resulting from it." Based on the responses to these two questions, the subjects were placed into three subgroups: leisure, leisure/work, and work.

Validity of the instrument was demonstrated by (a) theoretical support from relevant literature, and (b) agreement from a panel of experts that the items of the instrument items would tap the relevant areas. The review of literature was conducted to determine the significant dimensions closely related to the concept of work and leisure.

The questionnaire was read by a panel of experts to establish face validity. The seven person panel was asked to assess the items used to measure intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, and perception of choice. They were also asked to comment on the questionnaire format. As a result of the discussion with the panel, the items that assessed perception of choice were reversed for scoring, while intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation were measured as two different subscales and no reverse items were used.

The reliability of the scale was assessed through the coefficient alpha analysis, which provides an index of internal consistency. Reliabilities of subscales for rehearsal were .85 intrinsic motivation, .64 extrinsic motivation, and .87 perception of choice; for performance, reliabilities were .92 intrinsic motivation, .60 extrinsic motivation, and .77 perception of choice.

## Analysis

Two Cross-tabulations were used to analyze the relationship between type of musician (amateur or professional) and the view of rehearsal and performance as either leisure, leisure/work, or work. Two oneway ANOVAs were performed to analyze differences between the leisure, leisure/work, and work subgroups in intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and perception of choice during rehearsal and during performance. Two MANOVAs were carried out to determine whether overall differences in the perception of rehearsal and performance existed between amateur and professional musicians. The alpha level of .05 was used for all tests.

## Results

# Perception of Rehearsal and Performance as Either Leisure, Leisure/work, or Work

According to the subjects' responses, amateur and professional musicians were placed into three different subgroups: leisure, leisure/work, work. A cross-tabulation was used to analyze the relationship of type of musician (amateur or professional) and the perception of rehearsal as either leisure, leisure/work, or work. The same procedure was employed to analyze performance perceptions.

*Rehearsal:* The results of the Cross-tabulation (Table 1) indicated that there was a significant difference on the frequencies of amateur and professional musicians' perceptions of rehearsal as leisure, leisure/work, or work  $X^2(2, N = 74) = 22.8, p < .00001$ . The magnitude of the association (cor-

	Amateurs		Professionals	
	N	%	N	%
Rehearsal*				
Leisure	14	35	0	0
Leisure / Work	21	52	15	44
Work	5	13	19	56
Total	40	100.0	34	100.0
Performance**				
Leisure	13	33	1	3
Leisure / Work	21	52	16	47
Work	6	15	17	50
Total	40	100.0	34	100.0

 TABLE 1

 Leisure, Leisure/Work, or Work Perceptions

 $\chi^{2} = 22.8, p < .00001$  $\chi^{2} = 15.8, p < .001$ 

rected contingency coefficient) between the two variables was .71. Fifty-six percent of professional musicians regarded rehearsal as work, compared to the 13% of amateurs. Hence, professionals were four times more likely than amateurs to regard rehearsal as work. On the other hand, 35% of amateurs view rehearsal as leisure. There was, however, a large percentage of the musicians that perceived rehearsal as leisure/work; 52% of the amateur musicians and 44% of the professionals musicians were in this category.

**Performance:** Similar patterns were also found during performance. Table 1 presents the results of the Cross-tabulation. There was a significant difference on the frequencies of amateur and professional musicians' perceptions of performance as leisure, leisure/work, or work  $X^2((2, N = 74) = 15.8, p < .001)$ . The magnitude of the association between the two variables was .61. Thirty-three percent of the amateurs perceived it as leisure, while only 3% of the professionals did so. Professionals were more likely to perceive it as work (50%), while only 15% of the amateurs saw it as work. On the other hand, 52% of the amateur musicians and 47% of the professionals perceived it as both leisure and work.

# Differences Between the Leisure, Leisure/Work, and Work Subgroups

Two one-way ANOVAs were undertaken to assess differences between leisure, leisure/work, and work subgroup's intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, perception of choice, for perception of both rehearsal and performance. **Rehearsal:** Analysis of variance procedures showed significant differences between the leisure, leisure/work, and the work subgroups on the three dimensions: intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and perception of choice. Tukey's HSD procedure showed that the leisure subgroup (M = 20.6) and the leisure/work subgroup (M = 19.7) had statistically significant higher scores on *intrinsic motivation* than the work subgroup (M = 15.8). Not surprisingly, the leisure/work subgroup (M = 11.4) and the work subgroup (M = 11.6) scored significantly higher on *extrinsic motivation* than the leisure subgroup (M = 20.5) and the leisure/work subgroup (M = 14.0). These results are depicted in Table 2.

*Performance:* As represented in Table 2, no statistically significant differences were found between the leisure, leisure/work, and work subgroups' *intrinsic motivation and perception of choice.* In terms of *extrinsic motivation*, a significant difference was found between the subgroups. Tukey HSD test indicated that the work subgroup (M = 12.7) had significantly higher scores than the leisure subgroup (M = 9.78).

# Difference Between Amateur and Professional Musicians' Intrinsic Motivation, Extrinsic Motivation, and Perception of Choice

*Rehearsal:* The multivariate analysis of variance for intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and perception of choice indicated a statistically significant difference between amateur and professional musicians in their per-

		Leisure /			
	Leisure  M	Work	Work	F-Value	df
		М	М		
Rehearsal					
Intrinsic	20.6	19.7	15.8	10.011***	(2,73)
Extrinsic	7.9	11.4	11.6	10.348***	(2,73)
Choice	20.5	17.9	14.0	8.386**	(2,73)
Performance					
Intrinsic	20.5	20.5	19.26	1.077	(2,73)
Extrinsic	9.8	11.9	12.65	3.147*	(2,73)
Choice	15.9	15.9	13.65	1.459	(2,73)

 TABLE 2

 Differences Between the Leisure, Leisure/Work, and Work Subgroups

\*Significant at .05 level

\*\*Significant at .001 level

\*\*\*Significant at .0001 level

ception of rehearsal (Pillai's significance less than .001). According to the univariate F-tests for each dimension, amateur musicians were significantly more intrinsically motivated and perceived more freedom in rehearsal than professionals. On the other hand, professional musicians were significantly more extrinsically motivated than amateurs. Table 3 represents the musicians' means and F-values for the three dimensions.

**Performance:** The results of the MANOVA yielded a statistically significant difference between amateur and professional musicians perception of performance (Pillai's significance less than .001). The univariate F-tests shown in Table 3 indicated a statistically significant difference between amateur (M = 10.2) and professional musicians' (M = 13.6) extrinsic motivation. Professional musicians were significantly more extrinsically motivated than amateurs. No statistically significant difference was found between amateur and professional musicians' intrinsic motivation and perception of choice.

## Reasons for Describing Rehearsal and Performance as Leisure or Work

Two open-ended questions were used to ask the musicians under what conditions they perceived rehearsal and performance as leisure or work. Table 4 gives the reasons why rehearsal and performance were perceived as leisure or work. The most frequently mentioned reason for perceiving rehearsal and performance as leisure was the feeling of pleasure, fun, enjoyment, and freedom. On the other hand, the reasons for perceiving rehearsal and performance as work were related to remuneration, commitment, obligation, stress, and repetition.

	Amateurs	Professionals	
	М	М	<i>F</i> -Value <sup>1</sup>
Rehearsal			
Intrinsic	19.9	17.0	8.85*
Extrinsic	9.7	12.1	14.71**
Choice	19.8	13.9	29.10**
Performance			
Intrinsic	20.1	20.1	.01
Extrinsic	10.2	13.6	21.39**
Choice	16.1	14.1	2.84

 TABLE 3

 Mean Scores and F-Value for Amateur and Professional Musicians Intrinsic

 Motivation, Extrinsic Motivation, and Perception of Choice

<sup>1</sup>Univariate F tests for each dimension, df = 1,71.

\* Significant at .01 level

\*\*Significant at .001 level

	Rehearsal		Performance	
Conditions	N	%	N	%
LEISURE				
Fun / Enjoyment / Pleasure / Satisfaction	21	43	24	49
Freedom / Not Pressure	9	18	9	18
Unpaid	0	0	7	14
Relaxing	0	0	1	2
Confidence	0	0	1	2
Exhilarating	0	0	1	0
WORK				
Commitment / Obligation / Pressure	10	20	14	29
Remuneration	9	18	13	27
Concentration	0	0	8	16
Pleasure	0	0	6	12
Stressful	4	8	4	8
Serious	0	0	2	4
Bad Conductor	2	4	2	4
Challenging	0	0	1	2
Repetitive	3	6	1	2
Not Challenging	2	4	0	0
Boring	3	6	0	0

 TABLE 4

 Conditions Which Influence Perception of Rehearsal and Performance as

 Leisure or Work

## Discussion

Rehearsal and performance were more likely to be viewed as leisure by amateur musicians. On the other hand, professional musicians were more likely to perceive rehearsal and performance as work. These results are congruent with previous theories that emphasize that categorizing an activity as either work or leisure depends on the individual experience (Neulinger, 1981).

Distinctions among the three subgroups (leisure, leisure/work, and work) arose in the analysis of questions about rehearsal. The leisure subgroup scored higher on intrinsic motivation and perceived more freedom. This finding is consistent with leisure theories which consider intrinsic motivation and perception of freedom as elements closely associated with leisure experiences (Neulinger, 1981; Iso-Ahola, 1979a). Those musicians who perceived their experience as leisure were motivated by intrinsic motivation factors such as the fun, enjoyment, and satisfaction derived from the activity. On the other hand, those musicians who viewed rehearsal as work were motivated by the pay-off received from the activity. They also perceived obligation and responsibility as connected with their participation. During performance, the distinction between the leisure and work subgroup was based on extrinsic motivation (Tables 2 and 3). This may be explained by examining the musicians' responses to the open-ended questions; remuneration was among the most frequently cited condition influencing perception of performance as work. The investigators also found that for musicians, leisure displayed characteristics such as freedom, fun, satisfaction, unpaid activity, while work tended to be characterized by commitment, obligation, and a paid activity. However, according to the musicians, leisure and work shared the common characteristic of pleasure. These results indicated that musicians' experiences during performance cannot be defined strictly as pure leisure or pure work. Perceptions of work include factors that may be independent of perceptions of leisure (Roadburg, 1983). Leisure experiences are not limited to periods of time that are designated as free time (Ingham, 1986).

Although musicians who perceived performance as leisure did not mention any condition of constraint, findings indicated that amateur and people in the leisure situation experience less choice as they went from rehearsal to performance. Stebbins (1992) describes "serious leisure" as an activity which requires effort and commitment. In this case, performance may display some of those characteristics.

An interesting finding was that professionals musicians and people in the work subgroup had a higher level of intrinsic motivation during performance than during rehearsal. These results can be compared to the findings from Brook's (1993) study. She found that work-liked activities were more stimulating, creative, challenging, while work-disliked activities tended to be routine, unstimulating, and stressful. From this study, it can be suggested that rehearsal has clear elements of disliked work activity, and performance has some elements of most liked activity. These results may be explained using the musicians' descriptions of rehearsal and performance. For example, rehearsal was most likely to be stressful, tedious, and sometimes boring due to the lack of continuity. Performance, however, was considered to be challenging, and pleasurable, with enjoyment coming from the satisfaction of performing well and for an audience.

Amateur and professional musicians also differed in intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and perception of choice during rehearsal. These results highlight a difference between amateurs and professionals; whereas the amateur participated in an activity for the sake of pleasure (intrinsic motivation), the professionals were more strongly influenced by the remuneration that they received (extrinsic motivation). This observation supports and extends the findings of Ryan (1980) and Wagner, Lounsbury, & Fitzgerald (1989) who found that athletes who perceived the activity as leisure were more likely to be intrinsically motivated, while those who perceived it as work were motivated by extrinsic rewards.

The fact that amateurs and professionals differed little in how they felt about performance is in line with Stebbins' (1992) findings. According to Stebbins, a variety of rewards and thrills attract amateurs and professionals

54

in their pursuit. In serious leisure and professional work, thrills are many; for example, just to be on stage and performing for an appreciative audience could be one of the main thrills that motivate the participant to stick with the pursuit. Thrills and rewards can be a powerful motivation foundation for work and leisure.

The findings from this study could be utilized to aid music directors and musicians in making rehearsals more animated and fun; some elements of leisure will help the musicians to enjoy the activity, feel less stressed, and experience pleasure while playing music. For example, avoiding repetition and including a new repertoire can provide motivation and challenge; bringing a small audience to view the rehearsals might motivate the musicians, since performing is one of the musicians' primary goals. Conductors could use positive reinforcements as rewards during rehearsal to make musicians' experience more pleasant. As Stebbins (1992) suggested, thrills and rewards "... are important because they motivate the participants to stick with their pursuit in the hope of finding similar experiences again and because they demonstrate that diligence and commitment can pay off." Feelings of selfactualization, self-enrichment, enjoyment during rehearsal might motivate musicians to repeat the experience. Enjoyable rehearsals might increase attendance and improve performances. These same implications might well be transferable to activities having similar characteristics to music practice such as sports and dance.

Based upon the results of this study, it is recommended that future research should examine other activities that entail practice and performance, such as professional sports, dance, and theater. Future research should also examine the effects of years of participation on participants' perceptions of music, and the differences between males' and females' perception of rehearsal and performance. Replication of this study should consider measuring musicians experience by applying the self-initiated-tape-recording method (SITRM), a qualitative assessment technique, to measure immediate experiences (Lee, Dattilo, & Howard, 1994). A qualitative approach would allow the participants to communicate their own meanings and experiences of the activity without the limits of a fixed survey. Future efforts to generalize the findings should examine other orchestras and musicians including a larger number of subjects. Also recommended is the use of an experimental design using some of this study's recommendations, to explore the possibilities of improving the quality of rehearsal and making it more interesting.

#### References

De Grazia, S. (1964). Of time, work and leisure. New York: Anchor Books.

Drinker, H. S. (1967). Amateurs and music. Music Education Journal, 9, 75-78.

Banner, D., & Himelfarb, A. (1985). The work/leisure relationship. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 6(4), 22-25.

Beard, J.G., & Ragheb, M.G. (1980). Measuring leisure satisfaction. Journal of Leisure Research, 12(1), 21-33.

Brook, J. A. (1993). Leisure meanings and comparisons with work. Leisure Studies, 12, 149-162.

Dumazedier, J. (1967). Toward a society of leisure. New York: Free Press.

- Ethridge, M., & Neapolitan, J. (1985). Amateur craft-artists: Marginal leisure roles in a marginal art world. *Sociological Spectrum*, 5, 53-76.
- Gunter, B. G., & Gunter, N. (1980, Summer). Leisure styles: A conceptual framework for modern leisure. The Sociological Quarterly, 21, 361-374.
- Ingham, R. (1986). Psychological contributions to the study of leisure Part One. Leisure Studies, 5, 255-279.
- Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1979). Some social psychological determinants of perceptions of leisure: Preliminary evidence. *Leisure Sciences*, 2, 305-314.
- Juniu, S. (1993). Music: Leisure or Work? Amateur and Professional Musicians' Perception of Rehearsal and Performance. Unpublished Master's thesis, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA.
- Kaplan, M. (1975). Leisure: Theory and policy. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Kelly, J. (1972, Winter). Work and leisure: A simplified paradigm. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 4, 50-62.
- Kelly, J. (1978). A revised paradigm of leisure choices. Leisure Sciences, 1(4), 345-363.
- Kraus, R. (1984). Recreation and leisure in modern society. Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Lee, Y., Dattilo, J., & Howard, D. (1994). The complex and dynamic nature of leisure experience. Journal of Leisure Research, 26(3), 195-211.
- Lepper, M. R., Greene, D., & Nisbett, R. E. (1973). Undermining children's intrinsic interest with extrinsic reward: A test of the "overjustification" hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 28(1), 129-137.
- Mannell, R. C., Zuzanek, J., & Larson, R. (1988). Leisure states and flow experiences: Testing perceived freedom and intrinsic motivation hypotheses. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 20(4), 289-304.
- Murphy, J. F. (1981). Concepts of leisure. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Neulinger, J. (1974). The psychology of leisure. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas.
- Neulinger, J. (1981). The psychology of leisure. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas.
- Neulinger, J. (1981). To leisure: An introduction. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Parker, S. (1971). The future of work and leisure. New York: Praeger Publishers, Inc.
- Roadburg, A. (1983). Freedom and enjoyment: Disentangling perceived leisure. Journal of Leisure Research, 15, 15-26.
- Ryan, D. E. (1980). Attribution, intrinsic motivation, and athletics: A replication and extension. In C. H. Naderu, W. R. Halliwell, K. M. Newell, & G. C. Roberts (Eds.), *Psychology of motor behavior and sport* (pp. 19-26). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Press.
- Stebbins, R. (1979). Amateurs: On the margin between work and leisure. Beverly Hill, CA: Sage Publications.
- Stebbins, R. (1982). Serious leisure: A conceptual statement. Pacific Sociological Review, 25, 251-272.
- Stebbins, R. (1992). Amateurs, professionals, and serious leisure. Montreal, McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Wagner, S. L., Lounsbury, J. W., & Fitzgerald L. G. (1989). Attribute factors associated with word/leisure perceptions. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 21(2), 155-166.
- Wilensky, H. L. (1960). Work, careers and social integration. International Social Science Journal, 12, 543-560.