

RALF VON APPEN,
MARIO DUNKEL (HG.)

**(DIS-)
ORIENTING
SOUNDS
MACHTKRITISCHE
PERSPEKTIVEN
AUF POPULÄRE MUSIK**

[transcript]

GfPM | Beiträge zur Populärmusikforschung 45

Aus:

Ralf von Appen, Mario Dunkel (Hg.)

**(Dis-)Orienting Sounds –
Machtkritische Perspektiven auf populäre Musik**

Oktober 2019, 310 S., kart., Dispersionsbindung, 34 SW-Abbildungen

23,99 € (DE), 978-3-8376-5058-7

E-Book:

PDF: 21,99 € (DE), ISBN 978-3-8394-5058-1

Populäre Musik macht Angebote zur soziokulturellen Orientierung und Positionierung ihrer Hörer_innen. Damit verbunden sind Machtstrukturen – etwa im Verhältnis der Geschlechter, der Generationen, Ethnien oder sozialen Milieus –, die populäre Musik reproduzieren, aber auch aufbrechen kann, sodass Des- oder Neuorientierungen entstehen können. Die Beiträge dieses Bandes analysieren solche Prozesse kritisch und auf mehreren Ebenen: vom Neosexismus in Indie Rock und feministischen Gegenstrategien, über sexualisierte Afrika-Bilder und osteuropäische Hardbass-Szenen bis zum Entwurf posthumaner Welten in Videoclips. Darüber hinaus werden Leitvorstellungen der Musikpädagogik hinterfragt und Vorschläge für methodologische Neuorientierungen der wissenschaftlichen Auseinandersetzung mit populärer Musik formuliert.

Ralf von Appen (Dr. phil.) ist Professor für Theorie und Geschichte der Populärmusik an der Universität für Musik und darstellende Kunst Wien. Seine Arbeitsschwerpunkte sind Geschichte, Theorie, Analyse und Ästhetik der populären Musik.

Mario Dunkel (Prof. Dr.) arbeitet am Institut für Musik der Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg.

Weiteren Informationen und Bestellung unter:
www.transcript-verlag.de/978-3-8376-5058-7

© 2019 transcript Verlag, Bielefeld

INHALT

Editorial

Ralf von Appen und Mario Dunkel | 7

I. MUSIKPÄDAGOGIK

**Between Saviours and Disillusionists.
(Dis-)Orientations in (Popular) Music Education**

Petter Dyndahl | 11

**Tabu und Affirmation: Desorientierende Orientierung
im poplarmusikalischen Umgang mit dem Tod aus
musikpädagogischer Sicht**

Peter Schatt | 31

**Ethnie und Nation als semantische Reservoirs virtueller
musikbezogener Differenzkonstruktionen**

Malte Sachsse | 47

II. INTERSEKTIONALITÄT

**Klitclique und »Der Feminist F€m1n1\$€t«:
Konzeptuelle Desorientierung als Empowerment**

Magdalena Fürnkranz | 79

**»Natürlich nur ironisch und nur so nebenbei.«
Teilzeit-Solidarität, Neosexismus und Humor im Indie,
Punk und Rap**

Katharina Alexi | 105

**Human*. Posthumanism and the Destabilizing of
Identity Categories in Music Videos**

Katharina Rost | 133

Hardbass: Intersectionality, Music, Social Media, and the Far-Right on the European Periphery

Ondřej Daniel | 153

Von *weißen* Massais, Hexen und Löwinnen. Sexualisierungen afrikanischer Musiken in Erlebnisromanen deutschsprachiger Autorinnen

Nepomuk Riva | 167

III. NEUE WEGE DER POPULARMUSIKFORSCHUNG

**Musikanalyse als Mediendispositivanalyse –
Perspektiven einer Neuorientierung für die
Popmusikforschung**

Steffen Just | 187

**Praxisbezogene Jazz- und Popmusik-Studiengänge als
Orientierungspunkte für die Populärmusikforschung in
Deutschland**

Nico Thom | 211

**Die Erfindung des Rockkonzerts in der Provinz.
Ein praxeologischer Blick auf das Soester
»Karussell der Jugend« 1959-1971**

Peter Klose | 233

**Suchtgenese und Selbstkonzepte:
Zum Potential biographischer Fallrekonstruktionen
für die Popular Music Studies**

Melanie Ptatscheck | 261

**Remixe. Remixen. Populärmusikforschung:
Potentiale für methodologische Neugestaltungen**

André Doehring, Kai Ginkel und Eva Krisper | 283

Zu den Autor*innen | 305

EDITORIAL

»Sich *orientieren* heißt in der eigentlichen Bedeutung des Worts: aus einer gegebenen Weltgegend (in deren vier wir den Horizont einteilen) die übrigen, namentlich den *Aufgang* zu finden. [...] Endlich kann ich diesen Begriff noch mehr erweitern, da er dann in dem Vermögen bestände, sich nicht bloß im Raume, d.i. mathematisch, sondern überhaupt im *Denken*, d.i. *logisch* zu orientieren.«¹

Um sich in der Welt zurechtzufinden, braucht man im wörtlichen wie auch im übertragenden Sinn ein Koordinatensystem. Als Kompass in der Welt der Werte dienen uns auch Kunst und Kultur, insbesondere in der Jugend, wenn Teenager immer seltener von den Eltern »eingemordet« werden und zunehmend Peers und Stars die Richtung vorgeben. Wer aber sagt, wo's langgeht, der hat Macht – und je subtiler und unbewusster solche Wegweisung erfolgt, desto weniger wird dieses Machtverhältnis in Frage gestellt.

Auffällig ist, wie variabel »orientieren« in der deutschen Sprache verwendet werden kann: Wir sind orientiert, orientieren uns an etwas, werden orientiert. Wir können uns nicht nur orientieren, sondern auch um- oder neuorientieren. Desorientiert fühlen wir uns in der Regel nicht wohl. Politisch können wir links- oder rechts-, progressiv oder konservativ, gemeinschafts- oder marktorientiert sein. Und auch Sexualität wird durch den Begriff der Orientierung beschrieben. Der Titel des Bandes versucht diese Vielseitigkeit des Begriffs zu erfassen. Klänge können gleichzeitig Antrieb und Gegenstand von Orientierungs- und Desorientierungsprozessen sein.

Als zentraler Bestandteil menschlicher Erfahrung erfolgen solche (Um-/Neu-/Des-)Orientierungen nicht immer absichtsvoll. Ganz im Gegenteil: Oft orientieren wir uns an Dingen, die wir nicht oder kaum bemerken, in einer Weise, die wir möglicherweise für selbstverständlich halten. Dies trifft auf das alltägliche, räumliche Orientieren in unserer Umgebung ebenso zu wie auf das kulturelle oder das politische. Es betrifft Dimensionen von Gender und Sexualität genauso wie Ethnizität, Nation, Migration, soziales Milieu und deren gegenseitige Verschränkungen. Gleichzeitig gibt es Orientierungen,

1 Immanuel Kant (1977 [1786]). »Was heißt: sich im Denken orientieren?« In: *Werke in zwölf Bänden*, Bd. 5. Hg. v. Wilhelm Weischedel. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, S. 267-283, hier S. 269f.

über die wir uns sehr wohl im Klaren sind und in die wir durch bewusstes Des-, Neu-, Um-Orientieren intervenieren können. Auch das Bewusstmachen unbewusster Orientierungen kann eine solche Intervention darstellen.

Die Ausrichtung dieses Bandes ist von Sara Ahmeds Studie *Queer Phenomenology* (2006) inspiriert, in der sie Orientierung als eine grundsätzliche Funktion menschlichen Erlebens beschreibt. Laut Ahmed folgen unsere »Lebenswege« bestimmten Orientierungen, die nicht immer bemerkt werden und dennoch bedingen, wie wir unsere Gegenwart und Zukunft imaginieren:

»The concept of ›orientations‹ allows us to expose how life gets directed in some ways rather than others, through the very requirement that we follow what is already given to us. For a life to count as a good life, then it must return the debt of its life by taking on the direction promised as a social good, which means imagining one's futurity in terms of reaching certain points along a life course. A queer life might be one that fails to make such gestures of return.«²

In ihrer Mehrdimensionalität bedingen Orientierungen, wie Fremdheit, Vertrautheit, Normalität, Zugehörigkeit und Verdrängung erfahren werden. Als Funktionen, die sich auf Arten des »in-der-Welt-Seins« auswirken, können sie daher als Weichen in der Verteilung von Macht und Kontrolle betrachtet werden. Es gehört zu den Aufgaben kritischer Kulturwissenschaften, diese Orientierungen »herauszustellen« (ebd.) und zu hinterfragen.

Musik interagiert nicht nur mit verschiedenen Orientierungsfeldern, sondern sie dient auch als Medium zur Darstellung und Hervorbringung von Orientierungen. Sie führt uns Männlich- und Weiblichkeitsideale vor, zeigt, was es heißen kann, sich cool, rebellisch oder frei zu fühlen. Die Beiträge in diesem Band verbindet insbesondere ihr Interesse an der Frage, inwiefern populäre Musik – als kulturelles, pädagogisches und wissenschaftliches Feld – ein Medium für Orientierungen sein kann. Sie fragen nach Orientierungsprozessen durch und von populärer Musik in drei Perspektiven: einer musikpädagogischen, einer intersektionalen und einer wissenschaftsspezifischen.

Die erste Sektion erforscht bewusste und unbewusste Orientierungsmuster der Musikpädagogik. Die Beiträge fragen nach den impliziten und expliziten Orientierungen von Musikpädagogik in verschiedenen Bildungssystemen. Dabei gehen sie u.a. der Frage nach, wie sich grundsätzliche musikpädagogische Leitlinien durch die zunehmende akademische Akzeptanz populärer Musik verändert haben und inwiefern sich Musikpädagogik umorientieren muss,

2 Sara Ahmed (2006). *Queer Phenomenology. Orientations, Objects, Others*. Durham u. London: Duke University Press, S. 21.

um Fragen intersektionaler Differenz und transkultureller Musikvermittlung inner- und außerhalb der Schule gerecht werden zu können.

Die zweite Sektion, Intersektionalität, befasst sich mit der Frage, inwiefern populäre Musik musikalische und kulturelle Differenz herstellt und wie zugleich die Konstruktion von kultureller Differenz sich auf Musik auswirkt. Gefragt wird nach der Intersektionalität in Diskursen zu bspw. Gender, ›Rasse‹, Ethnizität, Klasse, Nationalität und Sexualität. Dabei interessiert die Verfasser*innen insbesondere die Art und Weise, in der Machtdynamiken zur Konstruktion und Dekonstruktion von Differenz beitragen. Die Beiträge verbinden queer-feministische, postkoloniale und posthumanistische Perspektiven.

Die Beiträge in Sektion drei, Wege der Populärmusikforschung, beschäftigen sich schließlich mit der Weiterentwicklung der Popular Music Studies als ›interdisziplinäre Disziplin‹. Ausgehend von der Analyse historischer Entwicklungslinien machen sie Vorschläge für andere inhaltliche Schwerpunktsetzungen, den Einbezug neuer Fragestellungen und Methoden und geben so Anregungen, wie eine Zukunft der Populärmusikforschung gestaltet werden könnte.

Die Beiträge dieses Bandes sind Schriftfassung von Referaten, die vom 16. bis 18. November 2018 auf der 28. Arbeitstagung der GfPM, »(Des-)Orientierungen populärer Musik«, an der Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg gehalten worden sind. Organisiert wurde die Tagung von Susanne Binas-Preisendörfer und Mario Dunkel. Susanne Binas-Preisendörfer sowie den zahlreichen Unterstützer*innen der Tagung, darunter Hannah-Malaika Gasirabo, Christoph Hinxlage, Björn Jeddelloh, Niva Kriege, Raina Niemeyer, Léon Raschen, Finja Schreiber und Simon Wehber sei hier noch einmal ganz herzlich für die überaus gelungene Tagung gedankt. Wir bedanken uns außerdem beim Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, dem Projekt Biographieorientierte und Phasenübergreifende Lehrerbildung in Oldenburg (OLE+), dem niedersächsischen Ministerium für Wissenschaft und Kultur sowie der Universitätsgesellschaft Oldenburg (UGO) für die großzügige Unterstützung der Konferenz. Für ihre wichtige ehrenamtliche Arbeit zu danken haben wir auch wie in jedem Jahr den 14 Gutachter*innen des Peer Review-Verfahrens, die leider, aber selbstverständlich ungenannt bleiben müssen.

Möge der Band zu neuen Orientierungen und – vielleicht wichtiger – zu so mancher konstruktiven Desorientierung führen!

Ralf von Appen und Mario Dunkel
Bremen, im August 2019

BETWEEN SAVIOURS AND DISILLUSIONISTS. (DIS-)ORIENTATIONS IN (POPULAR) MUSIC EDUCATION

Petter Dyndahl

Introduction

In this chapter, I will address music education issues related to orientations and/or disorientations in popular music. This approach allows me to reflect critically on some of the ways in which popular music has become part of music education internationally. In this context, two cases will be presented as examples of different orientations towards popular music. These are, on the one hand, a predominantly Anglo-American tendency to ascribe to popular music the role of an absolutely necessary renewal of not only the content of music education but also its epistemologies and forms of learning. On the other hand, there is a long-standing Scandinavian tradition of incorporating popular culture into music education and research, which has led to the fact that Nordic music education has largely been dominated by certain forms of and approaches to popular music. However, this in turn has led to a rather disillusioned attitude among some music educators, including myself, regarding popular music's ability to, for instance, ›democratize‹ music education.

I take the notion of *aesthetic cosmopolitanism* as a point of departure. From there, I go into the details of the idea of *informal music education* as well as its application and dissemination. Accordingly, I will present and discuss the concepts of *cultural omnivorousness* and *musical gentrification* respectively, both representing quite different orientations towards popular music than the informal music education paradigm, before I conclude with an attempt to consider the educational consequences.

Aesthetic cosmopolitanism and the process of *pop-rockization*

Any scholar writes from a specific, situated point of orientation. My outlook is from a Scandinavian context, in which popular music has nowadays become a ubiquitous and legitimate part of cultural policies, public institutions, and the media, as well as music education at all levels. Moreover, the Nordic countries take part in the pervasive global spread of popular culture that is designated in Motti Regev's (2013) notion of *aesthetic cosmopolitanism*. Following up Dick Hebdige's (1990) declaration that, in late modernity, »everybody is more or less cosmopolitan« (1990: 20), Regev develops his concept, analyzing how the extensive field of popular music becomes a common reference for aesthetic perceptions, expressive forms, and cultural practices shared by different social groupings around the world. Furthermore, Regev examines what he describes as the global *pop-rockization* of music with regard to the exponential growth of pop-rock styles and the hybrid tendency within pop-rock music to merge and fuse with other styles and genres, as well as the general trend among musicians and producers to adopt and implement several practices associated with pop-rock, thus making pop-rock aesthetics a dominant global force in today's music. Although Regev is not directly concerned with music educational actions or institutions, it is obvious that these instances are at least as influenced by the spread of aesthetic cosmopolitanism and the process of pop-rockization as any other social institution and field of practice. To some extent, one can even argue that music education facilitates proliferation.

Theoretically, Regev builds primarily on Bruno Latour's (2005) Actor-Network Theory, supplemented with several sociological orientations. Latour emphasizes that both human subjects (·actors·) and non-human objects (·actants·) have agency or, rather, the ability to have a variety of effects on other humans and non-humans. This implies that everything in the social and natural worlds exists in constantly shifting networks of relationship, which, in turn, requires paying attention to moments of visibility of objects in different networks. For Regev, this approach applies to what he sees as sonic embodiment and materiality, which can be understood as the material presence of music, anchored in and with resonance in the body, and with particular relevance to the perception of recording, production, and playback technologies, in addition to the sound of—in this case—processed musical instruments.

While Latour is also concerned with objects that have receded into the background of networks, Sara Ahmed (2006) goes a step further in orienting

her attention towards the processes that make something fall into the background, what she denotes as *acts of relegation*. Her critical point is to bring into view what is being bracketed in order to reorient the gaze towards hidden power relations. Regev focuses on networks and objects that mediate »new ways of experiencing the body, new styles of consciousness and modes of embodiment, new designs of the public musical sphere« (2013: 177), mainly in terms of spatial, geographical dimensions. Beyond that, I hope to bring to mind some dimensions that have seemingly been ›left behind‹ in the inclusion of popular music in international music education. This applies in particular to cultural distinction, social status, and power.

Against this background, I recognize aesthetic cosmopolitanism and the pop-rockization of music cultures as valid descriptions of the contemporary status, obviously within the music industry and the media, but which can also be detected in cultural policies and public rituals as well as in a variety of educational contexts. These latter items I expand upon below.

Informal music education

The presumed ›saviours‹ of music education, as referred to in the chapter title, were in many ways welcomed by Lucy Green's 2002 book *How Popular Musicians Learn: A Way Ahead for Music Education*, in which the author examined what she perceived as the learning practices among self-taught popular musicians. This, in turn, led her to identify five key principles of *informal music learning*, which were presented in her follow-up book on the same topic, *Music, Informal Learning and the School: A New Classroom Pedagogy* (2008).

Here, Green claims that, firstly, informal learning always begins with music chosen by the learners themselves. According to Green, this music provides a greater degree of recognition, enjoyment, and identification potential than the music that is offered in »most formal educational settings, in which the main idea is to introduce learners to music that they do *not* already know, and which is usually selected by the teacher« (ibid.: 10, emphasis in original).

Secondly, within informal learning, the main method of repertoire and skill acquisition involves the aural imitation of recordings by ear, which is an approach that has rarely, if ever, been employed as a learning method in the music classroom, Green states. She continues to assert that ›[t]his is very different to learning through notation, or some other form of written or verbal instructions and exercises lying beyond the music itself« (ibid.).

Thirdly, peer and/or self-directed learning constitute an important part of informal learning processes, which according to Green leads to several forms of acquisition and sharing of knowledge and skills through listening, observing, imitating, and discussing music and musical practices:

»Unlike the pupil–teacher relationship in formal education, there is little or no adult supervision and guidance. Along with this, friendship and identification with a social group such as a particular sub-culture or other markers of social identity form an important part in the choice of music to be played. These factors are also central to negotiation over music-making and music-learning practices amongst the members of the band« (ibid.).

Fourthly, in the informal realm, musical skills and knowledge are likely to be assimilated in »haphazard, idiosyncratic and holistic ways, starting with ›whole‹, ›real-world‹ pieces of music« (ibid.), Green claims. This stands in opposition to the tendency of the formal approach to follow a planned progression, with exercises and facilitated pieces, which, under the guidance of a knowledgeable tutor, should bring the student from beginner level to advanced practitioner.

Finally, informal music learning typically involves »a deep integration of listening, performing, improvising and composing throughout the learning process, with an emphasis on personal creativity« (ibid.), rather than formal music education's tendency to focus on just one of these activities at a time, which, at the end of the day, has a propensity to emphasize reproduction more than creativity, according to Green.

It is obvious that Green's notion of informal learning represents an attempt at reorienting or decolonizing the traditional music education that is closely related to the classical tradition. What is more, with the intention of developing an alternative pedagogy for the music classroom, she conducted a study involving 13- to 14-year-old pupils in post-primary schools in the greater London area from 2001 onwards, in which the above five principles were systematically applied. This resulted in the British music education project and, later on, in the organization Musical Futures (2018), funded by the Paul Hamlyn Foundation from 2003. The Paul Hamlyn Foundation trustees agreed in 2014 to provide a £1.2 million transition grant to support Musical Futures to become an independent non-profit organization during the period from 2014 to 2017. Musical Futures has provided and continues to provide online music education resources and training courses for teachers, schools, and communities built on the above principles as well as on the further pedagogical applications Green developed in her 2008 book. Today the Musical Futures organization can also be found in Australia (Musical Futures Australia

n.d.) and Canada (Musical Futures Canada n.d.), and workshops are held in many countries worldwide.

In North America, an elaboration of the same principles was initiated with a Canadian forum for teachers, musicians, and scholars, entitled *Progressive Methods in Popular Music Education* (n.d.), which held its first symposium in 2018, and in the United States there is a fairly comparable organization called Little Kids Rock (2017). Moreover, the latter has recently established an arena for research publication with the *Journal of Popular Music Education* (Intellect 2018), first published in 2017. All in all, these efforts must be regarded as a now-established movement in today's music education, especially in the Anglo-American world but also elsewhere, and with the potential of global propagation or, I would argue, pedagogical cosmopolitanism. Informal music education has also become an emerging strategy for popular music teaching and learning in higher education, as researchers of music education have demonstrated with regard to Brazil (Narita/Azevedo 2016) and Greece (Wright/Kanellopoulos 2010).

This raises some issues. At one level, informal music education represents an alternative pedagogical orientation in terms of discursive positioning. However, in the extension of this, its practical implementations have been criticized for establishing some new dispositions and hegemonies on the subject of music. For example, in the Nordic countries, Alexis Kallio (2014) as well as Petter Dyndahl and Siw Graabræk Nielsen (2014) have been concerned with what types of popular music have been included and what types have been excluded, for what reasons, and with what consequences. With such issues, the authors imply that new hierarchies can easily arise. In that context, Eva Georgii-Hemming and Maria Westvall (2010) point to the fact that the large emphasis on popular music in Swedish compulsory school music education has limited its repertoire, its contents, and its teaching methods. It is primarily white male rock band music that becomes dominant when informal music education is implemented. In that respect, Cecilia Björck (2011), Gro Anita Kamsvåg (2011), and Silje Valde Onsrud (2013) discuss the gendered implications of popular music education in Sweden and Norway with respect to, for example, the limited access of girls to any roles other than those of vocalist or dancer. Complementing this, Lauri Väkevä (2010) suggests that it is time to consider the pedagogy of popular music in more extensive terms than conventional rock band practices have to offer. He therefore considers it necessary to expand and redefine informal music pedagogy to include digital music culture, for instance in the forms of DJing, remixing, collective online songwriting, producing music videos, and so on.

Criticism of pedagogical practices is timely and can also lead to an updating of informal music education. Notwithstanding the fact that the music educational practices that sail under this flag are—at least from a Scandinavian point of view—still astonishingly tradition-bound in most Anglo-American contexts, Green's overall principles should be flexible enough to allow that.

However, there is another, more fundamental criticism that may be raised as well. Although Green (2008) suggests that pupils might also produce performances in music traditions other than popular music, such as the classical music tradition, by imitating recordings, it seems quite obvious that her informal classroom pedagogy is meant to represent a radical option, emerging as more democratic, participant-driven, community-based, holistic, and integrated than traditional approaches to music education. The belief that popular music and its assumed educational principles represent an improved »new classroom pedagogy« (cf. Green 2008) and an unambiguous »way ahead for music education« (cf. Green 2002) can therefore be considered as an example of the posture as »saviour« indicated in the title of this chapter.

This inclination can be seen as parallel to a tendency David Hesmondhalgh (2008) has observed and criticized in some influential music research in recent decades. He claims that there is a dominant conception of music, emotion, and personal identity in sociologically informed analyses of music, which sees music primarily as a positive resource for active self-making. Hesmondhalgh's targets for criticism are the three pivotal scholars Ruth Finnegan (1989), Simon Frith (1996), and Tia DeNora (2000, 2003), whose conceptions he accuses of resting on a problematic, excessively optimistic understanding of music which implicitly sees music as somehow independent of negative social and historical processes. To make a longer argument short, Hesmondhalgh summarizes this condition by stating that:

»The dominant conception rightly emphasises the social nature of music and of self-identity, but if music is as imbricated with social processes as the dominant conception suggests, then it is hard to see how people's engagement with music can be so consistently positive in their effects, when we live in societies that are marked by inequality, exploitation and suffering« (Hesmondhalgh 2008: 334).

Without going into his actual objects of criticism, I would argue that this criticism is, if possible, even more accurate regarding dominant *music educational* trends and conceptions. Green's ambition seems to be to connect music education more closely to the learner's personal, social, and cultural experiences and identities, that way recognizing that it is of the utmost importance for the individual and the community. However, I believe that if

music and music education are so essential, it is crucial to acknowledge that the music in question cannot only have positive outcomes, but must necessarily also be connected to undesirable social and historical processes. In other words, »music can be bad for you,« to quote Chris Philpott (2012: 48)—one of very few music education scholars who dares to take such an ambiguous orientation into account. This is a perception I will pursue in the following sections. However, to do so I need to return to a more sociological approach.

Aesthetic cosmopolitanism revisited

As mentioned above, aesthetic cosmopolitanism points to the gradual formation of global cultures into a single interconnected entity. In that regard, Regev (2013) emphasizes the significance of what he denotes ›expressive isomorphism,‹ or the process through which national and/or ethnic uniqueness is standardized so that the expressive cultures of various nations, or of prominent social sectors within them, come to consist of similar—although not necessarily identical—expressive forms, stylistic elements, and aesthetic idioms:

»While in the past national cultural uniqueness was organized around the principle of striving towards totally different expressive forms and stylistic elements, with expressive isomorphism it becomes organized around proximity, similitude, and overlap of art forms and stylistic elements between nations« (Regev 2013: 11f).

It is important, in this context, to recall that these processes comprise various expressions, genres, and styles that are increasingly related to popular music idioms and aesthetics. Another important building block in the concept of aesthetic cosmopolitanism is the term ›institutionalized patterns of cultural value,‹ indicating what cultural forms, stylistic elements, and aesthetic idioms should be adopted in order to count as candidates for recognition, participation, and parity among those with such a cosmopolitan orientation.

Both of the above notions provide, jointly, a conceptual framework for a general sociological understanding of aesthetic cosmopolitanism, according to Regev. By referring to Pierre Bourdieu's (1984) dual understanding of the social role of culture, Regev suggests that the institutionalized patterns of cultural value operate within the theoretical structures of distinction and cultural capital, and that expressive isomorphism has Bourdieu's theory of the fields of art as its conceptual framework:

The theory of distinction outlines the role of cultural capital in the production and maintenance of inequality, superiority, and prestige. The theory of the cultural field delineates the social dynamic of struggles and changes in fields of cultural production, whereby new forms and styles gain legitimacy and recognition, while the old ones either decline or retain their dominant, consecrated position (ibid.: 12).

However, Regev firmly claims that Bourdieu's own empirical studies are limited to historical types of cultural capital, based on the traditional division of high and low culture and their institutional fields. According to Regev, Bourdieu thus lacks nuanced analytical categories to interpret fine distinctions and trends within contemporary popular culture, including changes in its orientation and status. This criticism may, of course, be justified as seen from today's perspective. Nevertheless, several sociologists have found Bourdieu's concepts productive to explore the new meanings of popular music. In this regard, substantial attempts to update and reorient the Bourdieusian terminology have been made, as will be explained below.

Cultural omnivorousness

Speaking of history, there is no doubt that Bourdieu's description of what constitutes *legitimate culture* was directly aligned with his investigation of the highly divided French society of half a century ago. However, legitimate culture will change over time, thus changing the preconditions for what accumulates cultural capital. Consequently, in the 1990s, Richard Peterson and colleagues reported that openness to aesthetic and cultural diversity began to replace the exclusive preference for high culture as a hallmark of class distinction. The empirical basis for this claim was two studies, conducted in 1982 and 1992 respectively, focusing on cultural consumption and taste in the United States (Peterson 1992, Peterson/Simkus 1992, Peterson/Kern 1996). Hence, Peterson described the changes in elite taste as being increasingly associated with a preference for, and participation in, a broad range of cultural genres and practices. He labelled these cultural practices *cultural omnivorousness* and argued that an omnivorous taste had largely replaced the traditional highbrow one as a central criterion for classifying elitist cultural habits and styles of consumption. The question is therefore whether an open-minded and inclusive attitude towards cultural consumption across conventional hierarchies has gained a foothold in Western societies (cf. aesthetic cosmopolitanism) and thus affects cultural and educational institutions in fundamental new ways. This seems to be confirmed by the significant position

popular culture has achieved in many countries' music education and research at all levels, as well as within cultural institutions and the public sphere as a whole. So, while those who possessed high cultural capital according to Bourdieu's *Distinction* (1984) consumed and participated in a selection of highbrow artworks and activities, Peterson's studies demonstrate that an extended kind of cultural intake later became a legitimate way of achieving the same goal.

However, there will still be genre boundaries that are not easily crossed. The genre of classical music, for instance, is mainly cultivated by the dominant classes. On the other hand, there are forms of popular music that are generally considered to be unambiguously lowbrow and that still appear to be stigmatized, even for cultural omnivores. This is why, a decade after completing his two major surveys, Peterson came to the conclusion that no one can be omnivorous in a literal sense. Thus, in 2005, he realized that »it seems wisest not to bind breadth and brow-level together by definition, but to see omnivorousness as a measure of the breadth of taste and cultural consumption, allowing its link to status to be definitionally open« (Peterson 2005: 263f). Notwithstanding this, although musical omnivores may be found across social hierarchies and especially among younger generations, Peterson found that the elite group members still differentiate themselves from other classes by *how* they conduct their musical consumption. Regardless of whether they consume popular music or what has traditionally been considered high culture, they behave completely in line with Bourdieu's informants of a few decades earlier, showing their sense of belonging and involvement through a certain knowledgeable and educated, limited enthusiasm, rather than through devoted connoisseurship or passionate fandom.

Peterson's research has undoubtedly revealed that the hegemonic relationship between traditional high and low culture has been upset, allowing popular music to achieve new status. However, one can question whether it has meant as much to understand the hierarchies that exist within popular music itself, something that has been called for by researchers like Sarah Thornton (1995), who coined the term *subcultural capital*, in that way reorienting the capital concept towards the micro level, which is well-adapted to studying youth subcultures defined by specific music styles. For my own part, I have been involved in developing the notion of *musical gentrification*.

Musical gentrification

The starting point for developing this concept was a desire to investigate how and why popular music has become such an integral part of Norwegian academia over the last 40 years. The metaphor of musical gentrification is obviously based on the term *gentrification*, which in urban geography and planning refers to the phenomenon that people of a certain wealth and/or high cultural status begin to settle in low-income and working-class neighbourhoods, thus raising both the building standards and the status of the areas and the properties. This usually causes many of the original residents to move out, both for economic reasons and because they might feel alienated from a neighbourhood that used to be familiar. Transferred to the field of music education and research, musical gentrification shall therefore be understood as complex processes with both inclusionary and exclusionary outcomes by which musics, musical practices, and musical cultures of relatively low status become objects of acquisition by experts or experts-to-be who, in the academic sense, hold higher or more powerful positions. What is more, successful musical gentrification might lead to significant changes in the academic systems of classification. On the one hand, this might imply that time-honoured hegemonies are set aside and replaced by new distinctions that apparently disturb the traditional balance between high and low culture. On the other hand, as both concepts of aesthetic cosmopolitanism and cultural omnivorousness indicate, there will be a tendency for the heterodox value systems to become approved and even consecrated over time. This has evidently happened in music academia (see Dyndahl 2015a, 2015b; Dyndahl et al. 2014, 2017, 2018). Moreover, the processes of academization and institutionalization of popular music can cause relatively profound changes in the musical communities as well as the musics, practices, and cultures that are subjected to gentrification. Within the framework of the research project »Musical Gentrification and Socio-Cultural Diversities,«¹ such processes have been investigated in relation to reorientations in the programming and audience composition of a state-supported country music festival (see Vestby 2017), as well as regarding how, in Norway, musicians with an immigrant background have had to reorient their career trajectories to satisfy the prevailing educated-

1 The project was jointly funded by the Research Council of Norway's funding scheme for independent projects (FRIPRO), Hedmark University College, and the Norwegian Academy of Music for the period 2013-2017. It comprised four senior researchers, one post-doctoral researcher, one Ph.D. candidate, and two visiting scholars.

class values that characterize the cultural policies and their funding schemes (see Hara 2017, 2018).

Regarding music education and the academization and institutionalization of popular music in the Nordic countries, a long list of research publications could be referred to (see Dyndahl et al. 2017: 438ff), demonstrating that popular music has gained a solid foothold in higher music education and research, and in that way confirming the general image of openness towards this kind of music that Scandinavian music education has, in some cases, been praised for.

One of the earliest manifestations of this practice was witnessed in Sweden, where the then-innovative music teacher education programme SÄMUS, implemented at the University of Gothenburg in 1971, welcomed jazz, pop, rock, and folk music as radically new elements of content. However, Olsson's (1993) study of the implementation of the programme fully demonstrates the paradoxes of musical gentrification: The inclusion of the above genres led to the transformation of the new content into established institutional configurations, since the traditional teaching methods, learning objectives, and assessment criteria of the art-music conservatory tradition still regulated the field of higher music education as such, and thus pushed the newcomer genres into its established values, forms, and practices.

In the following paragraphs I will take a closer look at the situation in Norwegian higher music education. What is especially interesting to examine is which jazz and popular music genres and styles have been gentrified and which have not, or only to a small extent. In addition, I enquire what forms the musical gentrification has taken, as well as which actors and institutions have been the most active in this respect.

As with the abovementioned SÄMUS programme in Sweden, when Norwegian higher music education gradually opened up to students with backgrounds from jazz, rock, pop, and the like, it welcomed groups and communities that had long been marginalized or excluded from higher music education and legitimate culture. This is, obviously, the inclusive effect of musical gentrification within academia. However, there must have been some gatekeepers who first opened the gates. The motives of these heterodox actors have probably been equally inclusive, though it gradually emerged that such an apparently ›activist‹ attitude could also serve as a clever approach to accumulating cultural capital (see Dyndahl 2015a). In this way, musical gentrification can also be considered a strategy for social positioning, a lesson some of the newly included students had probably also learned when some of them entered postgraduate programmes and were likely to follow their research interests in the direction of popular music. I will come back to both

strategic manoeuvres and the role of gatekeepers or gentrifiers later in the chapter.

First, a short review of the extensive data material from the »Musical Gentrification and Socio-Cultural Diversities« project may be needed (see also Dyndahl et al. 2017). The data comprises the entire corpus of Norwegian master's theses and doctoral dissertations in music education, music therapy, ethnomusicology, musicology, music technology, and music performance, as well as their respective sub-disciplines, for a total of 1,695 works approved during the period from 1912 through 2012. The first Norwegian thesis within the field of jazz and popular music was submitted to the University of Oslo in 1974. This was a work on jazz, and since then, there has been a consistent increase in the amount of written academic output dealing with various popular music genres and styles. The proportion of Norwegian master's theses and doctoral dissertations that relate to popular music reached close to 20 % in 1980 and stayed around that level for several years. The first time the amount surpassed 30 % was in 2006, a level that remained stable as long as our data reaches—that is, until 2013, but there is reason to believe that it is still ascending. If we look at the hundred-year period as a whole, we see that 23.8 %, or 404 theses, focus on popular music.

Within popular music in the broad sense, the most prevalent styles in Norwegian music academia are mainstream and contemporary jazz, rock, and pop, while there are few or no examples of country music, blues, rock and roll, punk rock, contemporary R&B, or Scandinavian dance band music. In particular, the latter style constitutes an interesting case. Scandinavian dance band music is widespread in Norway and Sweden, but first and foremost among so-called ›ordinary people.‹ This does not mean that academics have not been interested in Scandinavian dance band culture. On the contrary, there has been a growing interest, but rather from researchers in fields such as culture and media sociology, and not from music academics, who evidently do not want to be associated with this unmistakably lowbrow music. In other words, it does not seem that simply any kind of music can be gentrified. Often, it also seems like a popular music style must be well established in the music culture before it can become an object of gentrification. For instance, the first example of an academic treatment of punk rock was found in 2012, well over 40 years after it occurred in the history of popular music.

In general, the researchers found a couple of more or less effective strategies among the master's and Ph.D. students in their academic approach towards popular music genres and styles. One that has not proven very useful in accumulating academic capital is to create a new variant of the frequently used music-historical genre ›The Man and His Work,‹ namely ›The Band and

Its Catalogue. Another strategy, which was most prevalent in the first phase of musical gentrification, is to relate to those forms of popular music that apparently have a certain credibility, sophistication, or complexity about them and therefore can be explored with similar methodologies to traditional classical music. For a while, this worked quite well in relation to harmonic analyses of jazz music. A related approach is to research genres and styles that have had some social and cultural impact in Norwegian society, such as political music, native-language or dialect rock, and hip-hop. A more recent strategy, which has proven quite successful in achieving academic positions, has been to apply sophisticated theories and meta-perspectives on, for instance, a chart pop or middle-of-the-road-oriented popular music repertoire, in that way compensating for introducing genres and styles that might be perceived as illegitimate in this particular field. Hence, a fairly strong tradition for exploring popular music in the light of theoretical frameworks such as gender and queer studies or feminist and performative studies has emerged, well-supported by key supervisors. The fact is thus confirmed that it is at least as important *how* one examines a topic as *what* one is investigating.

As mentioned above, the role of supervisors as gatekeepers and/or gentrifiers must be assumed to be of great importance. A total of 70 supervisors have been involved in the popular music-related material, which may indicate a generally open orientation towards this music. However, only 11 supervisors have been responsible for ten or more theses each, and together those 11 have supervised 231 of the 404 popular music theses. Consequently, relatively few academics have acted as the leading gatekeepers in this specific field. From a gender perspective, it turns out that, of the 11 supervisors in question, only one is female. Therefore, it should not be surprising that supervision within almost all popular music styles is dominated by males. Two exceptions are contemporary R&B and electronic dance music. However, most female supervisors have contributed to the miscellaneous category, suggesting that their engagement has not been genre-specific, but rather to introduce popular music in general into music education and therapeutic contexts, which have indeed been important arenas for the gentrification of popular music.

Regarding the authors, when looking at the 1,695 theses covering all genres found in the material, 51.1 % were written by men and 48.8 % by women (Dyndahl et al. 2017: 447). However, the proportions change significantly when it comes to only the 404 popular music theses. Of these, men have authored 63.1 % and women 36.9 % (ibid.). The significance of gender is expressed in a somewhat different way when looking at who introduced a new

popular music style to Norwegian music academia for the first time. Of all popular music styles included in master's theses and doctoral dissertations until 2004, 13 were introduced by men and only three by women (ibid.: 448). In the period from 2005 to 2012, however, an interesting change took place, as five new styles were introduced by women and only one by a man. Unfortunately, the quantitative material does not provide an answer as to whether this entails a shift in the gender-related hegemony, but the discussion on interrelations between gentrification and what might be called 'genderfication', or the production of gender norms and gendered divisions related to status hierarchies, will in any case be continued in the qualitative research results to come from the project.

Three institutions dominate the Norwegian music academic production in terms of master's theses and doctoral dissertations: the two largest universities in Norway (the University of Oslo and the Norwegian University of Science and Technology, responsible for 46.2% and 20.4% of the total amount respectively), and the Norwegian Academy of Music, whose share is 17.5% (Dyndahl et al. 2017: 448). Those institutions have also been the main driving forces in the gentrification of popular music. However, there is a dividing line between the universities on the one hand and the academy on the other. The universities have clearly been more active when it comes to innovative gentrification, both in terms of introducing new genres and new perspectives on popular music, and might therefore be seen as the key changemakers in the field. The majority of theses by students at conservatories, in turn, focus on popular music in one way or another within the music education and music therapy programmes, often implied as a general part of those disciplines.

Against the above description of results from the comprehensive research project, musical gentrification can be summed up as holding the potential to address both the destabilization and the restabilization of systems of classification and positions in music academia. First, Norwegian higher music education has gradually oriented itself towards other musical genres than those stemming from the Western art-music tradition and has thus demonstrated a distinct inclusive trait. The consequence is that—in this case—popular culture has been included into legitimate culture. Second, during these processes, certain exclusionary selections occur within popular music, through which something and someone will be marginalized, omitted, or excluded. The result is that different styles, sub-styles, and cultural practices achieve very different degrees of recognition and status. And, third, the gentrified musical styles and cultures are not only included but are often modified and adapted to the new purposes and contexts. In other words, recontextualization is a significant feature of musical gentrification. What is more, if we turn our

attention from higher music education and research to the music communities, the school, and the classroom, some of these alterations might be so extensive that one can question whether there is a danger that the social and cultural ties to the musical cultures in question may be weakened or broken for some of the first-hand cultural participants. Therefore, what may seem like the inclusive and democratizing tendencies of musical gentrification may, in subtle ways, mean that inclusion takes place only in specific forms and under certain conditions, through which some individuals and groups gain higher status and power while others are still marginalized or excluded. The irony is that this can happen by means of what was originally their own culture, which, as a result of musical gentrification processes, has changed in character and been adopted by new participants. In the worst-case scenario, this can cause those who feel excluded or marginalized to experience education, school, and cultural institutions as irrelevant and prepare a breeding ground for contempt for the cultural elite that have deprived their culture. The consequences of this include a general rejection of knowledge, education, and research that could ultimately threaten the knowledge society and the welfare state.

Conclusion

Obviously, the two cases of popular music orientation and implementation presented above are not directly comparable. The first one—informal music education—can undoubtedly demonstrate theoretical reflections that are both sophisticated and innovative, represented by the writings of, among others, Ruth Wright (2014), in addition to Lucy Green's own comprehensive work. However, most publications seem to have a predominant character of justifying and legitimizing specific practices instead of demonstrating an inquiring, open-ended orientation towards the complex roles and functions of popular music in education and learning. Hence, I conclude that the informal music education paradigm is primarily about developing a new classroom pedagogy—or *Didaktik*, to employ a central concept in both German-speaking and Scandinavian education. This approach is also more didactic in the prescriptive sense, compared to the other case—the gentrification of popular music in Scandinavian music education and academia—whose orientation is mainly descriptive, analytic, or *didactological*, to use Frede V. Nielsen's (2005) neologism, thus focusing on the conditions under which the didactics can be implemented. However, in addition to the didactological demand to develop meta-reflections of didactics as a research discipline and methodological

field, a more extensive field of *cultural didactic studies* has been proposed by Petter Dyndahl and Live Weider Ellefsen (2009). According to them, what should characterize cultural didactic studies must be the recognition that music education practices already always take place in culture, that music education phenomena and practices inevitably also (re-)construct culture, and that, in doing so, they contribute to the constitution of their own socio-cultural foundations (ibid.: 22). Furthermore, the authors argue that no matter what didactic identity it claims for itself or is interpreted to convey, the educational subject of music is unavoidably obliged to constitute an aesthetic-functional field of constructing, performing, and negotiating meaning and power. However, the particular and different didactic identities are essential with respect to which meanings and whose power will become dominant or marginal respectively. Thus, as part of its didactic—and didactological—reflexivity, (popular) music education should be aware of what kinds of cultural power and meaning it is dealing with in different circumstances and contexts (ibid.: 24).

Today's international situation, with its increasing social and cultural instability and polarization, is of the utmost importance for music education. Ten years ago, one of the central findings from the comprehensive cultural sociological study »Culture, Class, Distinction,« conducted by Tony Bennett and colleagues in the United Kingdom, was that music »is the most divided, contentious, cultural field of any that we examine and is central to our concern with probing contemporary cultural dynamics and tensions« (Bennett et al. 2009: 75). However, realizing that (popular) music education may involve marginalization and exclusion as well as integration and inclusion does not in any way imply a warning against or a reduction of music's presence in education. On the contrary, the purpose should be to bring out its power and strength as a cultural force in every sense of the term. This, however, must mean that it is not sufficient to develop pedagogy in the narrow sense, without critical and self-reflexive deliberations concerning the complexities and contradictions that are implicated in the actual pedagogical practices. Perhaps needless to say, but nonetheless contrary to the accustomed requirements for music education to provide solutions to challenges and prescriptions for action, the aim of this chapter has rather been to submit an indication of what forms of analysis and theoretical development would be required for music educators in order to orient in today's cluttered landscape. Because, as Ahmed (2010: 235) reminds us, orientations matter: »To be oriented in a certain way is how certain things come to be significant.«

Bibliography

- Ahmed, Sara (2006). *Queer Phenomenology: Orientations, Objects, Others*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Ahmed, Sara (2010). »Orientations Matter.« In: *New Materialisms: Ontology, Agency, and Politics*. Ed. by Diana Coole and Samantha Frost. Durham: Duke University Press, pp. 234-258.
- Bennett, Tony / Savage, Mike / Silva, Elizabeth / Warde, Alan / Gayo-Cal, Modesto / Wright, David (2009). *Culture, Class, Distinction*. New York: Routledge.
- Björck, Cecilia (2011). *Claiming Space: Discourses on Gender, Popular Music, and Social Change* [Doctoral dissertation]. Gothenburg: University of Gothenburg.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1984). *Distinction. A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- DeNora, Tia (2000). *Music in Everyday Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DeNora, Tia (2003). *After Adorno: Rethinking Music Sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dyndahl, Petter (2015a). »Academisation as Activism? Some Paradoxes.« In: *Finnish Journal of Music Education* 18 (2), pp. 20-32.
- Dyndahl, Petter (2015b). »Hunting High and Low. The Rise, Fall and Concealed Return of a Key Dichotomy in Music and Arts Education.« In: *The Routledge International Handbook of the Arts and Education*. Ed. by Mike Fleming, Liora Bresler, and John O'Toole. London: Routledge, pp. 30-39.
- Dyndahl, Petter / Ellefsen, Live Weider (2009). »Music Didactics as a Multifaceted Field of Cultural Didactic Studies.« In: *Nordic Research in Music Education Yearbook* 11. Ed. by Frede V. Nielsen, Sven-Erik Holgersen and Siw Graabræk Nielsen. Oslo: NMH-publikasjoner, pp. 9-32.
- Dyndahl, Petter / Karlsen, Sidsel / Skårberg, Odd / Nielsen, Siw Graabræk (2014). »Cultural Omnivorousness and Musical Gentrification: An Outline of a Sociological Framework and Its Applications for Music Education Research.« In: *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 13 (1), pp. 40-69, act.maydaygroup.org/articles/DyndahlKarlsenSkårbergNielsen13_1.pdf (access: 24 June 2019).
- Dyndahl, Petter / Karlsen, Sidsel / Nielsen, Siw Graabræk / Skårberg, Odd (2017). »The Academisation of Popular Music in Higher Music Education: The Case of Norway.« In: *Music Education Research* 19 (4), pp. 438-454, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14613808.2016.1204280>.
- Dyndahl, Petter / Karlsen, Sidsel / Nielsen, Siw Graabræk / Skårberg, Odd (2018). »Was kann als legitime Forschung gelten? Sozialisationsmuster und ihre Bedeutung für die norwegische höhere Musikbildung.« In: *Soziale Aspekte des Musiklernens* (= Musikpädagogische Forschung 39). Ed. by Bernd Clausen and Susanne Dreßler. Münster: Waxmann, pp. 27-42.
- Dyndahl, Petter / Nielsen, Siw Graabræk (2014). »Shifting Authenticities in Scandinavian Music Education.« In: *Music Education Research* 16 (1), pp. 105-118, DOI: 10.1080/14613808.2013.847075.
- Finnegan, Ruth (1989). *The Hidden Musicians: Music-Making in an English Town*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Frith, Simon (1996). *Performing Rites. On the Value of Popular Music*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Georgii-Hemming, Eva / Westvall, Maria (2010). »Music Education – A Personal Matter? Examining the Current Discourses of Music Education in Sweden.« In: *British Journal of Music Education* 27 (1), pp. 21-33.
- Green, Lucy (2002). *How Popular Musicians Learn: A Way Ahead for Music Education*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Green Lucy (2008). *Music, Informal Learning and the School: A New Classroom Pedagogy*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Hara, Mariko (2017). »Sustaining the assemblage: How migrant musicians cultivate and negotiate their musicianship.« In: *Nordic Research in Music Education Yearbook* 18. Oslo: NMH-publikasjoner, pp. 295-315.
- Hara, Mariko (2018). »Muting the Koto: Exploring musical pathways as a DIY artist in a new country.« In: *Music Education Research* 20 (5), DOI: 10.1080/14613808.2018.1445209.
- Hebdige, Dick (1990). »Fad to the Future.« In: *Marxism Today* 34 (Jan.), pp. 18-23.
- Hesmondhalgh, David (2008). »Towards a Critical Understanding of Music, Emotion and Self-identity.« In: *Consumption, Markets and Culture* 11 (4), pp. 329-343.
- Intellect (2018). *Journal of Popular Music Education*, <https://www.intellectbooks.com/journal-of-popular-music-education> (access: 24 June 2019).
- Kallio, Alexis Anja (2015). »Drawing a Line in Water: Constructing the School Censorship Frame in Popular Music Education.« In: *International Journal of Music Education* 33 (2), pp. 195-209, DOI: 10.1177/0255761413515814.
- Kamsvåg, Gro Anita (2011). *Tredje time tirsdag: musikk. En pedagogisk-antropologisk undersøkelse av musikkaktivitet og sosial organisasjon i ungdomsskolen* [The Third Lesson on Tuesday: Music. An Educational-Anthropological Study of Music Activity and Social Organisation in Lower Secondary School] [Doctoral dissertation]. Oslo: Norwegian Academy of Music.
- Latour, Bruno (2005). *Re-assembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Little Kids Rock (2017). *Little Kids Rock*, <https://www.littlekidsrock.org/> (access: 31 December 2018).
- Musical Futures (2018). *Musical Futures*, <https://www.musicalfutures.org/> (access: 31 December 2018).
- Musical Futures Australia (n.d.). *Musical Futures Australia*, <https://www.musicalfuturesaustralia.org/> (access: 31 December 2018).
- Musical Futures Canada (n.d.). *Musical Futures Canada*, <https://www.facebook.com/musicfuturescan/> (access: 31 December 2018).
- Narita, Flávia / Azevedo, Maria Cristina de Carvalho Cascelli de (2016). »Informal and Non-Formal Musical Practices at the Universidade de Brasília (Brazil): Collaborative Learning as an Attempt to Counterbalance Neoliberal Values.« In: *21st Century Music Education: Informal Learning and Non-Formal Teaching*. Ed. by Ruth Wright, Betty Anne Younker and Carol Beynon. Waterloo, ON: Canadian Music Educators' Association.
- Nielsen, Frede V. (2005). »Didactology as a Field of Theory and Research in Music Education.« In: *Philosophy of Music Education Review* 13 (1), pp. 5-19.
- Olsson, Bengt (1993). *SÅMUS – en musikutbildning i kulturpolitikens tjänst? En studie om en musikutbildning på 70-talet* [SÅMUS – Music Education in the Service of Cultural Policy? A Study of a 1970s Teacher-Training Programme] [Doctoral dissertation]. Gothenburg: University of Gothenburg.

- Onsrud, Silje Valde (2013). *Kjønn på spill – kjønn i spill: En studie av ungdomsskoleelevers musisering* [Gender at Play – Gender in Play: A Study of Lower Secondary School Students' Music-Making] [Doctoral dissertation]. Bergen: University of Bergen.
- Peterson, Richard A. (1992). »Understanding Audience Segmentation: From Elite and Mass to Omnivore and Univore.« In: *Poetics* 21 (4), pp. 243-58.
- Peterson, Richard A. (2005). »Problems in Comparative Research: The Example of Omnivorousness.« In: *Poetics* 33 (5), pp. 257-282.
- Peterson, Richard A. / Simkus, Albert (1992). »How Musical Tastes Mark Occupational Status Groups.« In: *Cultivating Differences*. Ed. by Michele Lamont and Marcel Fournier. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 152-186.
- Peterson, Richard A. / Kern, Roger M. (1996). »Changing highbrow taste: From snob to omnivore.« In: *American Sociological Review* 61 (5), pp. 900-907.
- Philpott, Chris (2012). »The Justification of Music in the Curriculum. Music Can be Bad for You.« In: *Debates in Music Teaching*. Ed. by Chis Philpott and Gary Spruce. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 48-63.
- Progressive Methods in Popular Music Education (n.d.) *Progressive Methods in Popular Music Education*, <https://www.facebook.com/pmpme2018/> (access: 31 December 2018).
- Regev, Motti (2013). *Pop-rock Music: Aesthetic Cosmopolitanism in Late Modernity*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Thornton, Sarah (1995). *Club Cultures: Music, Media, and Subcultural Capital*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Vestby, Stian (2017). *Folkelige og distingverte fellesskap. Gentrifisering av countrykultur i Norge – en festivalstudie* [Vernacular and Distinguished Communities. Gentrification of Country Music Culture in Norway – A Festival Study] [Doctoral dissertation]. Elverum: Høgskolen i Innlandet.
- Wright, Ruth (2014). »The Fourth Sociology and Music Education: Towards a Sociology of Integration.« In: *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 13 (1), pp. 12-39.
- Wright, Ruth / Kanellopoulos, Panagiotis (2010). »Informal Music Learning, Improvisation and Teacher Education.« In: *British Journal of Music Education* 27 (1), pp. 71-87.

Abstract

This chapter addresses music education issues related to contrasting orientations towards popular music, in particular through the motifs of »saviours« and »disillusionists«. The former orientation is represented by a predominantly Anglo-American tendency to ascribe an important role to popular music in the renewal of music education content and methods. This tendency is often linked to the idea and application of *informal music education*. The latter orientation refers to a long-standing Scandinavian practice of including popular music in music education, which, however, has led to doubt regarding its merits. In the critical opposition, the notion of *musical gentrification* is particularly emphasized as an approach to popular music that differs significantly from the informal music education paradigm. Following a review and

discussion of both approaches, the chapter concludes with considerations of the prerequisites in order for music education to adapt amidst social and cultural instability and polarization. From this perspective, popular music must inevitably be seen as part of both the powers and dangers of music education.