Sleepwalkers, Beware:
Towards a Post-Structuralist Critique of Popular Music in Higher Education

Zack Moir[1+2] and John Hails[1]

1. Edinburgh Napier University
2. University of the Highlands and Islands

Introduction

This chapter deals with higher popular music education (HPME) and has a particular focus on the teaching and learning of composition. Our interest in this area derives from our practice as musicians and educators, and our deeply-held mutual belief that *creative* engagement with music should be central to music education for all (Kaschub and Smith 2009, Kratus 2016, Allsup 2013, Moir 2017; Moir and Medbøe 2015;).[1] In writing this chapter we have borrowed from the language and ideas of post-structuralism, focusing particularly on the work-concept (discussed below).[2] Although this movement could be said to relate principally to literary theory (most famously the writings of Roland Barthes (1977) and Jacques Derrida (1998), specific applications to the field of music (particularly those of Lydia Goehr (1992)) have served as a touchstone for our thinking.

We both lecture in composition at Edinburgh Napier University, UK, but on opposite sides of a 'divide' between the two undergraduate music programmes offered by this institution.[3] Specifically, in terms of composition lecturing duties at least, Moir lectures on the BA Popular Music programme, and Hails, on the BMus Music programme. It could be stated, crudely, that we work on either side of a 'classical' versus 'popular' music split in the department. However, this 'divide' (if it exists at all) is far from binary, such that it may not even be sensible to talk about any difference in our respective perspectives and practices in relation to the 'types' of music in which our students specialize.[4]

In order to understand our philosophical position, readers may find it instructive to understand more about the authors' musical, educational, and professional backgrounds. Hails received piano lessons from the age of six, clarinet lessons from the age of eight, before discovering his musical 'home' in listening to classical repertoire. Composition lessons followed from the age of seventeen before he matriculated onto a traditional music degree programme that focused on common practice classical music repertoire. Moir accidentally fell into saxophone lessons at school at the age of 14 and he grew up avidly listening to a great deal of popular music. His undergraduate degree was in popular music performance (as a saxophonist), but he graduated

with a hunger for the further study in a more traditional university setting. For Hails, a Master's programme in composition felt entirely comfortable. For Moir, studying for a Master's in musicology at an ancient university – which was a hugely positive and inspiring experience – had the unfortunate side-effect of creating something of a perceived distinction between those who *compose* serious music, and those who merely *write* music, as part of a wider range of musical activity. At the time, this led to some minor insecurity with regard to the use of the term 'composer' as a description of his identity.[5] Moir's PhD (2011) was not in the field of composition but it involved writing a great deal of music. Without formal training in composition, he regards himself as being enculturated in compositional practice through osmosis and autodidacticism. By contrast, Hails' PhD was in notated composition, and much of his commentary focused on the specifics of this notation. His teaching at Edinburgh Napier University (ENU) on the classical programme focuses on supporting students interested in writing 'unconventional' music, particularly involving live electronics. Moir began teaching on the popular music programme at ENU with a philosophy to move beyond the tradition of songwriting (i.e. focusing on the writing of hit tunes, hooks, etc.) which had been the approach of some colleagues, to develop a more holistic approach to teaching composition in the context of PME. Despite the apparent differences in our backgrounds in terms of educational and professional/compositional experience, we (the authors) share a lot of ideas and values when it comes to composition education, and its place within music education in the widest sense. These ideas form the basis of the argument set forth in this chapter.

Problematic Definitions

One of the main issues faced when discussing problems in the area of PME is that definitions of our terms are continually problematic. For example, the very nature of this discussion means that it is necessary for us to use terms such as 'popular music', and (often subconsciously as an antonym) the term 'classical music'. As mentioned above, we recognize that in practical terms, such a clear-cut distinction between these two areas of music is impractical and does not hold up to scrutiny. This is because the very terms 'popular' and 'classical' are so broad, and encompass so many different styles, approaches and practices. However, the fact remains that people do use these terms consistently, not only in everyday parlance, but in scholarly and educational contexts too – particularly the label 'popular music'. For example, this chapter finds itself in a volume on *popular music* education; many higher education programmes in the UK specifically focus on *popular music*; and there is a commonly head understanding among colleagues in this area that, although this may not actually refer to anything specific, what it does mean, particularly in an educational context, is 'not classical'.[6] Thus, the term 'popular music' is used to connote difference or otherness from that which is commonly described in educational contexts simply by the term 'music' (Bennett 2017). Consider, for example, the

way in which undergraduate programmes are advertised – it is almost unheard of to encounter degrees in 'Classical Music'. This, of course, is because classical music, whatever that may mean, is generally the norm within the academy and the term 'popular' is required to delineate an area that differs in some way from that which is commonly referred to as 'classical'. The same is true of programmes in, for instance, folk music, musical theatre or jazz.

We recognize that this chapter is somewhat polemical in nature. However, it is not our intention to directly criticize colleagues working in the area of composition education ('classical' or 'popular') but to deliberately stoke the fires of a critical discussion that is taking place in the literature (Smith 2014; Parkinson and Smith 2015; Moir and Medbøe 2015; Moir 2017; McLaughlin 2017; Warner 2017; Parkinson 2017 & 2014, amongst many others) about the nature and value of HPME.

Same Thing, Different Tunes?

A common way for people to make distinctions between PME and classical music education is in terms of debates surrounding formal and informal learning. Green (2008, 10) outlines five fundamental principles of informal popular music learning and explains how they differ from normative practice in most formal educational situations. She suggests that, in informal popular music learning: (1) learners often start with music they already know and enjoy or identify with, as opposed to being introduced to music chosen by the teacher (2) students learn about music and develop skills through listening and copying recorded music, as opposed to learning mainly through reading notation (3) learning can take place individually, and in peer groups and does not require teacher supervision/guidance, (4) learning takes place in haphazard, idiosyncratic ways, rather than through pre-planned, structured lessons, and (5) there is an emphasis on personal creativity, which is developed through performance, improvisation, listening and composition, for example, rather than reproduction of existing musical works. While Green's defining characteristics are very helpful in helping us to understand the nature of informal popular music learning, it would be a mistake to assume that HPME is necessarily based on these, or similar, principals.

In practice, it would be naïve to assume that teaching and learning activities in HPME will develop competencies through informal musical learning, while classical music (because of its strong links to notation), will forever be associated with formal learning. However, such distinctions are made (by colleagues and students alike) and one can sympathize with the tendency, or even desire, to conceive of these complex issues in this simplistic dichotomous way. However, we are mindful of Folkestad's (2006) warning (a similar point is made by Green 2002, 4) that this way of thinking betrays a 'misconception and prejudice' and that 'the most

important issue might not be the content as such, but the approach to music that the content mediates' (142).[7] The notion of popular music being taught and learned in an informal way, mostly by ear and through largely autodidactic means is entirely representative of some contexts/situations (see Green 2002, Green 2009, D'Amore & Smith, 2016, and Moir 2016, for example) and many young people can and do develop musically in this way. However, given the way in which popular music has developed within institutions in recent decades, for many students, the purely aural and autodidactic transmission of popular music is essentially an overly-romanticized caricature that serves to muddy the waters in this area and to perpetuate stereotypes and false dichotomies. From our experience of working with school pupils and undergraduate students with an interest in popular music, the vast majority have learned to play (popular music instruments such as guitar, bass, keys, and vocals, for example) in school in a formal manner (certainly when considered according to Green's principles, above), using instrumental method books that deal specifically in popular music, and sitting performance exams, for example, in a very similar way to their peers who have studied 'classical music'.[8] Are we fooling ourselves to consider PME, as it exists in the academy, as a distinct area of practice with different rules and customs (see Henson and Zagorski-Thomas, this volume)? Or has it reached a stage (in the UK, at least), through its own formalization and academicization (or 'schoolification', see Cremata, this volume), that it behaves in the same way as 'classical' music education, but with different tunes?

Since entering the academy, popular music has often been treated as material or content that can be subjected to the same pedagogies and assessment practices as that which we refer to as classical music (Green 2002, Kratus 2015, Smith 2014). This has, for a number of practical, social, and pedagogical reasons, led to a scenario in which popular music in the academy could be viewed as a metaphorical 'square peg in a round hole' (Moir and Medbøe 2015 148). The problem, we contend, is not the fact that popular music exists within the academy, but rather that it is being inserted as mere content into a system that does not allow it to function as a meaningful, autonomous area of study.[9] Indeed, as Kratus (2015) notes, the vast majority of tertiary music education culture in the 21st century largely replicates 19th century pedagogies and practices associated with preparing students for orchestral employment. Given the reality that very similar models are employed in a many popular music programmes around the world, one might question the relevance of such an approach, and a cynical reading of the situation may lead us to question whether HPME is simply training students to be the next generation of wedding band performers.[10]

Work, Canon, and The Composer

There exists a cultural tendency to think of a composer as the singular 'genius' (see Nettl 2015, 57–59 for a discussion of the role of 'culture heroes', and Burnard for a) who produces an object that is played by performers and consumed by a (usually) discerning and knowledgeable audience (see Burnard, 2012 for a detailed discussion).[11] Indeed, Nettl singles out Western art music as being unusual in that the student is expected to engage directly with 'the work' in its notational linked form before hearing their teacher play it (Nettl 2005, 391). The work, and the associated authority or genius of the composer, are generally unquestioned by educators and students alike, and are therefore rigid. For sake of clarity, when using the terms 'work' or 'work-concept' in this chapter we do so in reference to Goehr's (1992) definition/conception. She explains that we have a tendency to:

> See works as objectified expressions of composers that prior to compositional activity did not exist. We do not treat works as objects just made or put together, like tables and chairs, but as original, unique products of a special, creative activity. We assume, further, that the tonal, rhythmic, and instrumental properties of works are constitutive of structurally integrated wholes that are symbolically represented by composers in scores. (2)

The work-concept has had an enormous influence on modern understandings of, and attitudes towards, music 'since its emergence around 1800' (Beard and Gloag 2005, 190). As Strohm (2000) notes, '...the work-concept has, of course, deeply influenced our musical culture; it is as 'real' as any aesthetic idea can be, and many generations of musicians have believed in it' (128). We find it particularly interesting to note the use of the term 'believed' in this context, as it serves as a reminder that what is being discussed here is, indeed, a *concept,* i.e. an abstract idea*.* The problem is, however, as Goehr (1992) states:

> 'a concept can become so entrenched within a practice that it gradually takes on all the airs and graces of necessity. Thus it has become extraordinarily difficult for us nowadays to think about music—especially so-called classical music—in terms other than those associated with the work-concept.' (13)

The cultural hierarchization that is imposed by the work-concept is, at least in part, responsible for the development of a canon of musical works – that is to say, works (and in turn, their composers) – that have been deemed worthy of celebration, and importantly, preservation and *conservation* (as is the root of the terms 'conservatoire' and 'conservatory', for example). Such preservation/conservation allows for future performance, musicological analysis, and also provides material for teaching students about music and, in turn *methods* for teaching music.[12] Unequivocally, the notion of canon is clearly linked to ideas of value (aesthetic, cultural, political etc.) and thus, those works that could be considered as belonging to the canon are

assumed to be more valuable cultural artefacts, often because of structural qualities, and adherence to preconceived ideas of compositional value. The consequence of the development of a canon (which functions as a powerful cultural force) is that types of music that do not conform to such ideals become marginalized, and perhaps even fade into obscurity because they are not preserved for scholarship, analysis and performance. While it is clear that the formation of canons allows for works to be preserved, studied and performed, the relationship is cyclical in that the performance and study of certain works, cements their place in the canon through ascribing value to them. In this way, canon formation serves to crystallize or petrify living culture and establish 'a central repertory that distill[s] the society's central values' (Nettl 2015, 356).

In popular music practice, however, the notion of the work concept is far from central, and we cannot point to any sensible equivalent. That said, it could be argued that popular music is not entirely free of work-focused thinking (Middleton 2000) and that recordings (usually albums) are regarded by some to have a similar status to 'works'.[13] Similarly, we can see some parallels to ideas surrounding canon formation in such lists which purport to detail the '100 greatest albums of all time', for example. However, as Horn (2000) argues, popular music practice:

> 'is not generated not by a work-concept but by a different set of precepts arising from the interactive nexus of performer-performance-performed. This nexus is capable of generating debate about the concept of the work – not the other way round' (34).

The work-concept has been challenged in recent decades and in the words of Strohm (2000) has "been 'on the run' for a considerable time now" (130). For example, Barthes (1977) makes the distinction between 'text' and 'work', a formulation that includes a performative distinction. 'Text' for Barthes is open to multiple interpretations rather than a single interpretation and the independence of the text from the writer and he posits that text is a 'social space' (164). This distinction is also explored by Derrida (1998), heralding the end of '[t]he idea of the book [which] is the idea of a totality' (18) and welcomes the age of the text that is at once destructive and creative, active and 'disruptive' (18). Transposed into the field of music, Goehr's (2007) exposure of the problematic nature of the work-concept demonstrates how music from earlier eras have been granted definitive form and 'work status' enforcing '[c]onstancy and standardisation' (247) goes some way in establishing a post-structural framework for us to consider canon.

Having noted the decline in the dominance of the work-concept, at least through the lens of post-structuralist philosophy, readers may question how relevant it is for us to continue with this discussion in the context of the current chapter. We believe that there is much value in

continuing with this line of thought because of the enormous impact on historical developments, and contemporary approaches to music education of work-focused music education. In the case of classical music education particularly, the tradition of studying 'great' composers and their 'masterpieces', and learning repertoire associated with one's instrument, for example, is practically integral to the endeavor. It would be fair to suggest, as Parkinson (2014) does, that 'a symbiotic, mutually perpetuating relationship' (15) exists between the classical music canon and (classical) music education. Our worry is that something similar is happening in many areas of HPME and could be in danger of seriously undermining the value of popular music in the academy.

Composition Education

To engage in a cultural practice like learning a specific style of music, involves learning how it works on a structural level, but also submitting to, and thereby perpetuating those values, beliefs and ideologies that pertain to associated educational practices. Within the academy, this has typically involved engaging with canonical works and, as discussed above, which has something of an ossifying effect on the works in question and the practices and pedagogies by which they are taught, learned, and transmitted – usually from 'master' to 'student' (Lebler 2007). As Allsup (2013) notes, this ossification can be said to have some advantages:

> 'Innovative knowledge gets quickly codified, procedural know-how apprenticed and passed on, technologies are protected from large-scale change, practice-specific meanings become inherited through repetition and obedience, and mastery is easily recognized and celebrated' (60)

However, such codification, master-apprentice transmission/inheritance of knowledge and practice, and repetition etc., leads to a situation in which many people designing education programmes believe that it is their duty to do so in a way that upholds such practices. Thus, programmes were – and arguably still are – developed in universities and conservatories that enshrined particular practices, pedagogies, ways of learning, and materials studied, in accordance with canonic norms (Bennett 2017 discusses similar issues). This is also enforced by the publication and continued use of certain texts, for example, the near-ubiquitous textbooks on harmony (e.g. Piston 1987) or orchestration (e.g. Adler 2002), for example that are staple volumes for undergraduates – particularly composers on classical programmes. When educators prescribe certain texts and encourage or even *require* their students to use them they are, often unquestioningly and perhaps inadvertently, reifying the composers and the techniques employed in their work, discussed therein. This is a clear example of the way in which the work concept has permeated the academy and influenced pedagogic practice.

However, while there may be advantages (if only in terms of pedagogical expedience) for educational programmes that place the study of canonic repertoire at the heart of most areas of practice, we believe that curricular design that is unquestioningly influenced by the work concept might well have the effect of stifling creativity, individuality, and the sense of exploration and experimentation that we would like to instill in our students.

There is an unfortunate tendency, in many areas of HE music study, to see canonical Western classical music as something that is more 'worthy' and 'prestigious' than other more recent types of music (including popular music), perhaps because of its association with the academy and consequent formalized pedagogies. Many of the expectations, 'engrooved practices' (Trowler *et al.* 2013), behaviours, and procedures that are inherent in HE (i.e. pedagogies, assessment practices, the need for grading and ranking of students, the focus on product etc.) perpetuate a proclivity towards teachers and students dealing with music in a way that easily fits within existing institutional structures (for more discussion on institutionalization see Hebert et al 2017, 467-468). As such, we would like to respectfully suggest that many people dealing with composition education within HE, on both sides of the classical/popular music divide, are at risk of sleepwalking into a situation in which their practice, the educational experiences of their students, and the general cultural perception of 'composition' as a musical practice/phenomenon – particularly in the domain of popular music – are being undermined. As Smith and Parkinson (2015) note, 'higher popular music education has necessarily accommodated to the expectation and norms of the HE context in which it has set up home' (97), and this, we argue, is the very root of many of the problems in HPME. By doing things 'the way that they have always been done', or uncritically adopting pedagogic practices, and ways of working that were developed for other forms of music, HPME runs the risk of rendering itself invalid and subjecting itself to the type of ossifying canonization that has been more associated with classical music and that is, in our opinion, antithetical to popular music practice. While there may be historical/political/social reasons for this enduring tendency towards crystallization in classical music (and further discussion is beyond the scope of this chapter), we argue that the tendency for HPME to follow suit due to institutional norms and convention is missing an opportunity to capitalize on myriad cultural, processual and contextual differences in the world of popular music. It is important to remain ever mindful that, 'in the everyday language of popular music practice ... the term 'work' is rarely, if ever, found' (Horn 14). Why, then, should our educational practice be so influenced by such a concept?

Although we have, over the last three decades or so, seen a considerable increase in the number of HE and FE institutions offering programmes in popular music in the UK 'there is considerable continuing debate regarding what is meant when we refer to "popular music

education"' (Moir 2017, 37) and it is clear that, on a global level, the field is characterized by a great deal of variety. This fact has been discussed elsewhere (Cloonan and Hulstedt 2102; Mantie 2013; Smith 2014) and it is not within the scope of this chapter to discuss it in greater depth. Suffice to say, the variegation that characterizes this area of music education reflects fact that the very notion 'popular music' is in itself nebulous and indefinable, and '...represents an impossibly wide umbrella that encompasses a huge variety of styles, making it difficult to quantify musically (Shuker 2012: 261). As such, we do not attempt to define popular music in stylistic, demographic, or commercial terms - indeed, the authors admit to frequently considering whether or not the word 'popular' is particularly useful and whether it has become more of a problematic identifier, than a meaningful indicator of a particular *type* of music.

Popular music composition (PMC) (Moir and Medbøe 2015) does not have a long history in the academy and some may even find the use of the word 'composition' alongside the term 'popular music' an uneasy juxtaposition.[14] The term 'songwriting' is more commonly encountered (Kratus 2016) when referring to activity surrounding the origination of new music within HPME, but we are reluctant to rely on that term because the implication of the centrality of 'songs' does not reflect the creative experience of a great many people working in this area. Composing music is so closely aligned with, and indeed embedded in, the practice of popular music that it is problematic to separate writing/creating, and playing, in many ways. As Moir (2017) states:

> In popular music, the composer/performer dichotomy is usually less pronounced as artists regularly perform their own music. Popular music practice is more associated with creativity and production, and less with learning, interpreting, and performing the works of great composers. (40)

This said, it is of increasing concern that many popular music programmes are designed and structured in ways that do not adequately reflect the nature/values of popular music, but that prioritize those approaches to pedagogy and assessment, for example, that already sit comfortably within the structure of HE institutions. By way of example, it is not uncommon in the case of solo and ensemble performance classes in popular music programmes, for lecturers to provide set repertoire for students to learn and perform for exams/recitals.[15] This, in the context of the history of institutionalized music education, may not seem unusual or even problematic. However, if we (as a field) are truly interested in creating meaningful and relevant popular music programmes then it is important to question the value of pedagogies that prioritize the learning and performing of pre-existing music over the origination of music due to the tacit dominance of the work-concept in music education.

Conclusions: Sleepwalkers, Beware

We suggest that two key factors influence this discussion. Firstly, institutionalized music education has been structured in more-or-less the same way for centuries (as discussed above), and popular music programmes have merely adopted the course design, pedagogy, approaches to assessment, and values of (classical) music courses. In doing so, many of the values of this way of learning music have tacitly and subconsciously been adopted, for example, the notion of the 'work' (Barthes 1977; Goehr 1992) and the 'genius' of the composer which leads to the implicit, but keenly felt, hierarchical relationship that exists between the composer, the performer, and the audience. By extension, this very construction renders the idea of composition as something specialist and not related to the everyday practice of performing musicians. Musicians learn the work of the great composers and musical training involves students becoming encultured or inducted into the ways, customs, and values of the musical traditions that they (may wish to) learn. After all, we would argue that there is clearly no such thing as one (sensible) universal understanding of what constitutes musicianship, or music theory, or performance, or any of the areas that music students tend to study. Any such study pertains directly to the tradition in which they are being trained.

Our deliberately provocative use of the word 'sleepwalkers' has been with the intention of evoking the idea of educators in this area unquestioningly, even subconsciously, deferring to routine procedures and ways of working. While this is problematic in any area of education it is particularly problematic in HPME as, although this is a relatively new area, we believe it is in danger of becoming standardized, crystallized, work-focused, and author centric through adherence to educational systems that are arguably unrelated to the everyday practices of popular music. We argue that this is true of many areas of HPME, but particularly so when considering composition, which many people view as a rarified activity that is integral to music (i.e. someone has to write the music we play), but essentially divorced from the everyday activity of music making. We suggest that by sleepwalking into the situation described above, we are missing the opportunity for composition to be a way of learning for all music students, rather than an awkward specialism that fosters isolated, work-focused, author-centric values and practices. This is an important consideration for educators on both sides of the conceptual pop/classical divide, but, given the less pronounced composer/performer dichotomy in many areas of popular music, and the fact that popular music (in the broadest cultural sense) is less concerned with the proliferation of canonic material, and associated approaches to its study, then this is *especially* important for HPME in terms of the design of programmes and learning experiences.

In an educational landscape in which we move away from a reliance on the study of works, we would also see a 'de-specialization' of the notion of composition and composers – towards something more aligned with popular music practice and culture. Creation and performance would not be seen separate activities, but rather, teaching and learning would be built upon the notion of originating music in all areas of the curriculum. Indeed, its centrality would guide students in their study and the very notion of the term curriculum would be challenged. We are, in no way, suggesting that a move away from the work-concept should invalidate the practice of creating music, nor would moving towards a text-focused approach to PME discourage educators from teaching students about traditions and their rules and structures. It would, however, allow for the creativity, the personal experiences and ambitions of the learner, and their prior knowledge to be celebrated as assets to their learning which should not be quashed by (or seen as subservient to) tradition and canonic 'rules', upheld by teachers, institutional norms, and cultural traditions. Although he was not directly referring to HPME, Allsup's (2013) words when advocating for a 'compositional turn in music education' are particularly resonant in the context of the current discussion:

> 'the social contract upon which the praxial philosophy of music education was built has now been turned on its head, with the curiosity-seeker in charge, not the teacher, not the author-composer'. (65)

It is our firm belief that we, as a community of popular music educators, should be mindful of our practice and continually engage in honest and thorough critique.[16] In doing so, we should consider those aspects of our approach to education that exist because of, and are perpetuated by, the preoccupation of our field with (and cultural conditioning to unquestioningly believe in) the work-concept. We believe that meaningful HPME should enable all students to: view the origination of music as a normative practice; be free from the strictures of codified musical practices defined by rules and norms of particular types of music; and to empower students to learn through creative exploration in a manner that holds their ideas as central, not to view them as deficit learners who must faithfully study the work of masters in order to have an appropriate music education. The needs of the creative learner should shape the educational experience – not the structures, histories, and traditions of certain musical forms. This will require some bold action, and for many educators this could be an uncomfortable suggestion. However, to continue the sleepwalker metaphor, we need to wake up to the social reality in which popular music practice exists and to stop forcing the music that our students are passionate about into inappropriate pedagogical pigeon holes, that serve nothing other than the perpetuation of established models.

References:

Adler, Samuel. 2002 The Study of Orchestration (Third edition) Westminster: W. W. Norton & Company

Allsup, Randall Everett. 2013. "The Compositional Turn in Music Education: From Closed Forms to Open Texts". In *Composing our Future: Preparing Music Educators to Teach Composition*, edited by Michelle Kaschub and Janice P. Smith. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Arnold-Forster, Tom. 2017. "Dr. Billy Taylor, "America's Classical Music," and the Role of the Jazz Ambassador". *Journal of American Studies,* 51(1): 117-139.

Barthes, Roland. 1977. *Image, Music, Text.* Translated by Stephen Heath. New York: Hill and Wang.

Beard, D. and Kenneth Gloag (2005). *Musicology: The key concepts*. London: Routledge.

Bennett, Joe. 2017. "Towards a framework for creativity in popular music degrees" in *The Routledge Research Companion to Popular Music Education*, edited by Gareth Dylan Smith, Zack Moir, Matt Brennan, Shara Rambarran, and Phil Kirkman. London: Routledge.

Burnard, Pamela. 2012. Musical Creativities in Practice. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Cloonan, M. and Lauren Hulstedt. 2012. *Taking Notes: Mapping and Teaching Popular Music in Higher Education*, York: Higher Education Academy.

D'Amore, A. and Gareth Dylan Smith. 2016. "Aspiring to music making as leisure through the Musical Futures classrrom". In *The Oxford Handbook of Music Making and Leisure*, edited by Roger Mantie and Gareth Dylan Smith, New York: Oxford University Press.

Derrida, Jacques. 1998. *Of Grammatology*. Translated by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Folkestad, Göran. 2006. "Formal and Informal Learning Situations or Practices vs Formal and Informal Ways of Learning." *British Journal of Music Education* 23(2): 135–145.

Frith, Simon. 1996. Performing Rites: On The Value of Popular Music. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Goehr, Lydia. 1992. *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works: An essay in the philosophy of Music*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Green, Lucy. 2002. *How Popular Musicians Learn: A Way Ahead for Music Education*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Green, Lucy. 2008. *Music, Informal Learning and the School: A New Classroom Pedagogy*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Hebert, David G., Joseph Abramo, and Gareth Dylan Smith. 2017. "Epistemological and sociological issues in popular music education" in *The Routledge Research Companion to Popular Music Education*. Edited by Gareth Dylan Smith, Zack Moir, Matt Brennan, Shara Rambarran, and Phil Kirkman: London: Routledge.

Horn, David. 2000. "Some Thoughts on the Work in Popular Music", *The Musical Work: Reality or Invention?*, edited by in Michael Talbot. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Kaschub, Michelle and Janice Smith. 2009. *Minds on Music: Composition for Creative and Critical Thinking,* Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Education.

Kratus, John. 2015. "The role of subversion in changing music education." *Music education: Navigating the future*. 340-346.

Kratus, John. 2016. Songwriting: *"A New Direction for Secondary Music Education" Music Educators Journal. 102(3), 60-65*

Lebler, Don. (2007). "Student-as-master? Reflections on a learning innovation in popular music pedagogy". *International Journal of Music Education, 25*(3), 205-221.

Mantie, Roger. 2013. "A comparison of "popular music pedagogy" discourses", *Journal of Research in Music Education*. 61(3), 334–52.

McLaughlin, Sean. 2017. "Mediations, Institutions and Post-Compulsory Popular Music Education," in *The Routledge Research Companion to Popular Music Education*. Edited by Gareth Dylan Smith, Zack Moir, Matt Brennan, Shara Rambarran, and Phil Kirkman: London: Routledge.

Middleton, Richard. 2000. "Analysing Popular Music: Theory, Method and Practice", in *Reading Pop: Approaches to Textual Analysis in Popular Music*, edited by Richard Middleton. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Moir, Zack. and Haftor Medbøe. 2015. "Reframing popular music composition as performance-centred practice", *Journal of Music, Technology & Education,* 8(2), 147–161.

Moir, Zack. 2016. "Popular Music Making and Young People: Leisure, Education, and Industry", in *The Oxford Handbook of Music Making and Leisure*, edited by Roger Mantie and Gareth Dylan Smith. Oxon: Oxford University Press

Moir, Zack. 2017. "Learning to Create and Creating to Learn: Considering the Value of Popular Music in Higher Education", in *The Bloomsbury Singer Songwriter Handbook*, edited by Justin Williams and Katherine Williams. London: Bloomsbury.

Nettl, Bruno. 2015. *The Study of Ethnomusicology: Thirty-Three Discussions, (Third Edition)*, Urbana, Chicago, and Springfield: University of Illinois Press.

Parkinson, Tom. 2014. "Values of Higher Popular Music Education: Perspectives from the UK," Unpublished PhD Thesis: University of Reading.

Parkinson, Tom, and Gareth Dylan Smith. 2015. "Towards an Epistemology of Authenticity in Higher Popular Music Education". *Action, Criticism & Theory for Music Education*, 14.

Parkinson, Tom. 2017. "Dilemmas of purpose in higher Popular Music Education: A critical portrait of an academic field", *Journal of Popular Music Education, 1*(2), 133-150.

Piston, Walter. 1987 *Harmony, Fifth Edition*, Westminster: W. W. Norton & Company

Shuker, Roy. 2012. *Popular Music: The Key Concepts*. London: Routledge

Smith, Gareth Dylan. 2013. "Seeking "Success" in Popular Music", *Music Education Research International,* 6 (1):26-37*.*

Smith, Gareth Dylan. 2014. "Popular music in higher education", in *Advanced Musical Performance: Investigations in Higher Education Learning*, edited by Ioulia Papageorgi and Graham Welch. United Kingdom: Ashgate, pp. 33–48.

Strohm, Reinhard. 2000. "Looking Back at Ourselves: The Problem with the Musical Work-Concept", *The Musical Work: Reality or Invention?*, edited by Michael Talbot. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press

Trowler, Paul, Murray Saunders, and Peter Knight. 2003. *Changing Thinking, Changing Practice*. York: Learning and Teaching Support Network.

Warner, Simon. 2017. "Where to now? The Current Condition and Future Trajectory of Popular Music Studies in British Universities" in *The Routledge Research Companion to Popular Music Education*, edited by Gareth Dylan Smith, Zack Moir, Matt Brennan, Shara Rambarran, and Phil Kirkman. London: Routledge.

Weale, Sally. 2015. Sgt. Pepper and Santana added to music GCSE curriculum, The Guardian [Online], 13th of May, 2015 https://www.theguardian.com/education/2015/may/13/sgt-pepper-beatles-santana-music-gcse (accessed 5 February 2018)

Weber, William. 1992. *The Rise of Musical Classics in Eighteenth Century England: A study in canon, ritual, and ideology*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Weber, William. 1999 "The History of Musical Canon", *Rethinking Music*, edited by Nicholas Cook and Mark Everist. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Notes:

[1] We have emphasized the word creative in this sentence as we feel that a great deal of music education is far from creative in nature, despite commonly held beliefs that music is a fundamentally creative subject.

[2] A definition of post-structuralism is certainly beyond the scope of the current chapter. However, for the purposes of this discussion, we conceive of this as a philosophical movement which essentially rejects the possibility for the objective study of meaning. Simply put, post-structuralism embraces subjectivity and argues for the validity of the readers' interpretation in constructing meaning. Structuralists aim to derive or decipher meaning from the relationship of the constituent parts to the whole, whereas a post-structuralists locate meaning in the mind of the reader (or listener, in this case).

[3] See http://www.edinburghnapiermusic.co.uk for more information about our programmes.

[4] We have used the word 'types' here, in a deliberate attempt to avoid the use of the word 'genres' which, we believe, becomes messy and problematic when dealing with such meta-classifiers as 'popular' and 'classical', each of which encompasses a great many styles that could be considered as distinct genres.

[5] We are both very much aware there is a tacitly implied qualitative difference between the verbs 'compose' and 'write' with regard to the origination of music. 'Compose', is much more aligned with the Western classical tradition, whereas 'write' tends to refer to many of the same practices but in other areas.

⁶ See Frith (1996) and Smith (2014) for discussion pertaining to difficulties surrounding definitions of popular music.

⁷ This issue is also discussed by Lucy Green (2002, 4).

⁸ Consider the books and materials in the 'Rockschool' (https://www.rslawards.com/rockschool) or Trinity Rock and Pop (http://trinityrock.trinitycollege.co.uk/) series, for example, which effectively provide printed (and, importantly *graded*) material for students to study, learn, and perform under exam conditions.

⁹ We believe that we, as a field, are guilty of developing and perpetuating educational structures, materials, ways of learning, transmitting, and engaging with popular music that, as Green (2002) suggests, bear little resemblance to the culture and social contexts in which it exists.

¹⁰ This is, in no way, intended to be pejorative and it is not our intention to belittle the practice of function band performance. However, we do (unapologetically) question whether or not the kind of approach to HPME that favours such practices is particularly relevant or meaningful, and whether we are missing other important opportunities if proceeding in this way.

¹¹ It would be remiss to fail to acknowledge that this 'genius' composer is also almost always white and male. While we can point to a number of examples where this is not the case, it is not unreasonable to suggest that this is the prevailing conception.

¹² For a more detailed discussion of canon formation see Weber (1992 and 1999).

¹³ If one views the roots of popular music as a moment of expression of resistance under the yoke of the dominant class of its time, it is tempting to diagnose the history of its industrialization in the 20th century as a control mechanism leading to the establishment of a new canon with *Sergeant Pepper's Lonely Hearts Club Band* on the curriculum in high schools (Weale 2015).

¹⁴ When using the term PMC in discussions with some colleagues in other institutions that offer popular music programmes, Moir has sometimes faced questions about what it actually means and how it is taught. Perhaps more concerningly, it has on occasion been treated with a degree of condescension with the tacit (but clear) implication that the very notion of 'composition' as it pertains to popular music may be considered as 'quaint' or an inherently non-serious 'novelty'.

¹⁵ It could be argued that even the nature of performance exams as an assessment form in this area is somewhat unsuitable, and such approaches enforce certain ways of teaching, learning, and working, that focus mainly on perfecting a performance of pre-existing material. Additionally, one might even draw attention to the terminology surrounding such practices, for example 'repertoire', 'ensemble', 'recital' - none of which are at home in the everyday lexicon of popular music, other than as a result of imposed institutional norms.

¹⁶ Given that the focus of this volume is on PME, our conclusions are mostly focused on this area but many of the ideas, suggestions, and warnings would be equally applicable to classical music education. Given the relatively recent advent of PME, however, we see our suggestions as more of an intervention, than a call to fundamentally alter the nature of traditional music education.