Among the areas that could or should be studied from the perspective of critical communication, popular music is among those that have received the least attention. As Taylor and Laing have remarked: "popular music remains poor relation in cultural theory, usually being tagged onto a list in which film or television takes pride of place." A reason for this neglect, Taylor and Laing continue, "is its lack of status...which has the effect that rock is usually studied or taught in odd corners of the curriculum...In addition, music as such poses great problems in the determination of meaning and signification" (Taylor and Laing, 1979, 43).

The purpose of this article is to examine the actualities and possibilities of teaching popular music as a critical activity within academia. Given the present situation of popular music studies, the term 'critical' carries two related connotations. First, the teaching of popular music at any educational level is an activity which in itself cannot help but lead to critical assessments of the departments and programs in which it takes place. A major argument of this article will be that surprisingly little popular music teaching and research takes place within academia because of the problematics of host disciplines and programs. Second, if the teaching of popular music is to be established in academia other than as an addendum to already existing programs of study, then due consideration must be given to the skills and orientations necessary for adequate critical assessment of the subject-matter. If one conclusion of this article is that the dominant ideology of historical musicology is inherently unsuited for adequate critical analysis of popular music, then it is necessary to be equally prepared for the conclusion that popular music should neither be reduced to 'pure' social practice, nor made to fit unquestioningly into analytic frameworks already established within the field of critical communication.

This article is critical of the major disciplines which either host or could host popular music studies. Such criticisms are, however, inevitable not only because the introduction of critical popular music studies into universities in a manner that is phenomenologically and hermeneutically satisfactory will likely challenge the problematics of host disciplines, but, relatedly, because such introduction may also
bring into question certain assumptions and premises traditionally fundamental to the Western academic enterprise. For reasons that will become apparent, there are currently considerable gaps in the understanding of how certain technical characteristics important to the expressive power of various popular music genres can hold, retain and articulate social and cultural signification. Characteristics such as un-pure timbres and melodic, rhythmic and harmonic inflections are not only highly fluid and extremely difficult to 'pin down' with an degree of 'accuracy.' They are also circumambient and circumjacent experientially, an aspect of their communicative power which challenges normal academic desires to hold objects of study passively at a distance and examine them as if they were 'dead' lepidoptera. More than most cultural forms, many genres of popular music, with their emphasis on the vibratory, tactile and olfactory dimensions of sound, remind us of the way the everyday world rubs up against us and stimulates us to active participation. As Young has so pertinently pointed out, high status knowledge within the academic world has to do with:

...literacy, or an emphasis on written as opposed to oral presentation...abstractness of the knowledge and its structuring and compartmentalizing independently of the knowledge of the learner...and...the unrelatedness of academic curricula, which refers to the extent to which they are 'at odds' with daily life and common experience. (Young, 1971, 38)

Against these criteria popular music inevitably emerges as low status knowledge. Any attempt to formulate a knowledge base that would close the chasm that presently exists between the problematics of historical musicology on the one hand and social and cultural theory on the other is therefore likely to meet with forms of both overt and hidden resistance that must be overcome if the critical study of popular music is to become a reality for students in any meaningful fashion. A principal task of this article is to lay out a taxonomy of problematics as a prelude to confronting issues involved in creating a critical pedagogy for popular music.

POPULAR MUSIC AND ACADEMIC MUSIC

It is possible to make two generalizations concerning the situation of popular music teaching within university music departments. First, given contemporary patterns of 'serious' and 'popular' music consumption, it is grossly under-represented. Secondly, if it is included in the curriculum, its presence is controlled in one of two ways. Either it is subjected to examination in terms of categories derived from traditional academic discourses in music, or it is marginalised and exploited. It is noticeable, for example, that while a significant number of music departments in North America mount under-
graduate level, historical survey courses in popular music which attract high enrollments, many of these same departments make it extremely difficult, if not impossible, for students to have a topic in popular music accepted as the subject for a doctoral thesis.

The issues which result in popular music occupying the positions it does vis-a-vis academic music are discussed infrequently within the discipline of historical musicology. However, the attempt to introduce popular music into the secondary school curriculum has led to these issues being focussed rather more sharply in another, not unrelated context. In order to understand the problematicas of historical musicology as they affect the study of popular music, it is instructive to consider debates surrounding the introduction of popular music into institutionalized education as they have been framed at the secondary level.

In a series of publications (Vulliamy, 1975, 1976a, 1976b, 1976c, 1977a, 1977b; Vulliamy and Lee 1976, 1982a, 1982b), Graham Vulliamy has argued strongly for the inclusion of popular music in the secondary school curriculum. Vulliamy's arguments were motivated in part by a Schools Council (U.K.) publication (Schools Council, 1968) which established that, out of fourteen subject areas, music was perceived by young school leavers as the most boring and the least useful. The widely publicized problems that British school music teachers were experiencing with teenage students at the time were put down by the music teachers themselves to the cultural, linguistic and musical deprivation that certain students brought with them to the classroom from their home backgrounds (Vulliamy, 1977b). Such commonsense explanations for these problems on the part of the music teachers squared with the structuralist functionalist accounts of educational failure, which considered the supposedly deprived home culture of certain classes of students as little more than an inadequate version of a mainstream culture deemed common to modern, liberal democratic, Western society. Vulliamy, drawing on his background in the 'new sociology of education' (Young, 1971; Keddie, 1973), turned these arguments on their head by focusing on the school curriculum rather than the home culture of students as the site of educational failure. He argued that popular music was not simply an inadequate and inferior expression of musical processes more definitively and successfully enshrined in the traditions of 'serious' or 'classical' music, but a series of musical traditions which, although linked historically and technically to 'classical' music, had their own culturally specific set of aesthetic and technical characteristics. By insisting on a musical curriculum drawn almost exclusively from the tradition of 'classical' music, British music educators were effectively imposing one culture, that of the bourgeoisie (DiMaggio and Useem, 1982), on many students whose prime cultural experiences were specifically non-bourgeois.

This critical, sociological approach to music education requires two qualifications. First, like much work emanating from the 'new sociology of education,' Vulliamy's thesis approached the central ques-
tion of cultural relativity in terms of class to the relative exclusion of other variables such as age, gender and ethnicity. This omission was subsequently addressed by both Vulliamy and myself (Shepherd, 1984a, 1984b; Vulliamy and Shepherd, 1984b; Vulliamy, 1985). Secondly, Vulliamy's fieldwork was carried out exclusively in Britain, where the insistence on a music curriculum was drawn overwhelmingly from the tradition of 'classical' music effectively limited the generalizability of his conclusions to other areas of the world, such as North America, where the secondary school music curriculum is not so constituted. In North America, the secondary school music curriculum tends to be drawn from traditions such as "white" jazz, show and television music, and light classical music. While not the music of youth cultures and youth subcultures, a significant proportion of this music nevertheless displays many technical characteristics, such as 'dirty', un-pure timbres, melodic, rhythmic and harmonic inflections, and improvisation, which have something in common with the characteristics of musics more intimately associated with various youth cultures and subcultures. It seemed reasonable to assume that the typical secondary school music curriculum in North America would not be as alienating of certain groups of students as the equivalent curriculum clearly was in Britain. To explore this hypothesis, I replicated Vulliamy's research in one Ontario high school system and found that while 'culture clash' was not an overt phenomenon in music classrooms, it existed below the level of explicit teacher-student interaction, and seemed to be linked to the way in which teachers framed popular music in terms of criteria drawn from the tradition of 'classical' music (Shepherd, 1983). We are therefore able to conclude that despite differences in actual curricula, the means by which the knowledge content of music classrooms in Britain and North America is controlled tend to be the same (Shepherd and Vulliamy, 1983).

A critical sociological analysis of school music curricula therefore reveals a cultural repression and alienation of students that occasioned disciplinary problems, educational failure and marked inertia and apathy in the classroom. A remedy for such problems, failure and apathy, argued Vulliamy, was the inclusion in the school curriculum of musical genres which spoke more directly to the daily cultural experiences of students. However, the 'new sociology of education' perspective on which these arguments were based was itself criticized from two directions, one conservative, the other radical. The conservative criticism, mounted by philosophers of education (Pring, 1972; Lawton, 1975; Flew, 1976), maintained that notions of cultural relativity which supported the 'new sociology of education's' arguments for the inclusion of alternative forms of knowledge in school curricula were highly suspect since they were not valorised through a set of explicit criteria matching those which entrenched traditional forms of knowledge. These criticisms can be offset by arguing the aesthetic and technical characteristics of different musical genres are specific to the cultural and social realities of which they form an integral part (Vulliamy, 1978 and 1980).
Other criticisms raised the issue of the location and modus operandi of meaning and signification in music (Swanwick, 1979, 110). The important site of meaning and signification in music for Swanwick lies not at the level of langue or competence, but at that of parole or performance.

We cannot say that all classical symphonies, for example, are merely a 'coding' of the same ideology and social reality just because they work to the tonal system and may display certain conventional similarities in musical form and style. Some of these works seem stronger than others. It is what happens inside a given conventional framework that counts; the deviations from normality, the particular personal gestures of a composer or performer (Swanwick, 1984a, 53).

The personal rather than the social is, then, important to meaning and signification in music. Further, Swanwick warned against "a startling and naive form of referentialism, a fallacy well understood in aesthetics and untenable, even in more subtle forms than found here" (Swanwick, 1984a, 52).

In contrast to Swanwick, I would, following Nutch (1981), argue that personal creativity is a central and essential aspect of social process, that personal identities and realities can in no way be conceived as lying outside processes of social construction (Shepherd, 1982a), and that the deviations and personal gestures translate into transformations or reinscriptions of fundamental musical materials, these thus being equally important to a meaning and signification in music which is inherently and pervasively social.

Another difference has to do with how music can be conceived as having meaning and signification. The issue for the traditional problematics of historical musicology and music aesthetics is that if meaning and signification in music are appreciably detached from social process in being essentially personal, then any social significance will depend on a reference outside itself. Given the traditional problematics of historical musicology and music aesthetics, such a mode of signification for music is unthinkable. Aestheticians and musicologists (Langer, 1942; Meyer, 1959 and 1973) have argued that as essentially dynamic and abstract phenomena, meaning and signification in music are processes resting essentially on pattern, form and morphology rather than on the discrete embodiments of the material and reified world. Pattern, form and morphology are not thought of as being in any way important or fundamental to the social world.

The difficulties raised from within the traditional problematics of historical musicology and music aesthetics with regard to theories for an inherent and pervasive social significance 'in' music can be overcome by refusing to make the kind of unqualified distinction between musical and social process that is implied through our separate
categories of 'music' and 'society,' and by realizing that as well as displaying a material and reified dimension having to do with discrete people, artifacts, symbols and concepts, social process displays another, perhaps more fundamental, dimension that is essentially dynamic, abstract and relational to which similar qualities of 'musical' process can as a consequence 'speak' directly.

It would be inappropriate to pursue these issues further in the context of this article. They are complex and have been discussed at length elsewhere (Swanwick, 1984a, 1984b; Vulliamy and Shepherd, 1984, 1985). The point is rather to trace the sequence of exchanges which led, seemingly inevitably, from Vulliamy's initial arguments for the inclusion of popular music in the secondary school curriculum to a discussion of issues perceived as central to the field of music aesthetics, and so to illustrate that the introduction of popular music at any level of institutionalized education unavoidably raises difficulties for the problematics of historical musicology.

It is these difficulties which explain both the marked exclusion of popular music studies from the curricula of university music departments and their inclusion in a manner which tends to be either distorting or marginal. The difficulties have two principal and related sources. First, it has to be acknowledged that there does exist a genuine difficulty for the traditional problematics of music aesthetics in positing any kind of fundamental social or cultural significance 'in' music. Structuralist and semiological accounts of signification inevitably involve 'denotative' and 'referential' starting points without which more subtle and sophisticated levels of analysis to do with the dynamic and creative reinscriptions of purely abstract structures would not be possible. While it is not to be disputed that some musics of the world, for example, that of the Kaluli of Papua, New Guinea (Feld, 1982), do display aspects of signification that may legitimately be approached using established modes of structuralist and semiological analysis, it is equally the case that many other musics of the world, for example, that of the functional tonal tradition, display a central core of signification that does not admit of such analysis. For musics displaying this core (and it is arguable that most do), it is necessary to evolve modes of analysis that take as their starting point not only purely abstract and structuralist notions of signification, but also an understanding that there exist important tactile dimensions to signification in music. Impediments to developing such modes of analysis are rooted not only in the traditional problematics of historical musicology, but, relatedly, in traditional categories of understanding specific to post-Renaissance thought (Shepherd, 1977 and 1979).

Since it is genuinely difficult, from within the traditional problematics of historical musicology, to comprehend how music can have a signification rooted in any fundamental way in a social world assumed to be exclusively 'material' and 'reified,' that discipline has tended to understand the signification in music as a realm quite distinct from signification both in other cultural forms and everyday communication
in general. Many musicians and musicologists pride themselves on the 'unique qualities' of their 'art-form', assuming these qualities to be ultimately inscrutable and inviolable in the face of established and developing modes of sociological, semiological and structuralist analysis. It is further assumed that these qualities receive their most pristine expression through 'classical' and 'serious' music. 'Good' music, in other words, is assumed to be inherently asocial in its signification (Shepherd, 1976 and 1979).

In these terms, the introduction of popular music into university music departments in a manner that both gives such music equal status with that in the 'classical' and 'serious' traditions and guarantees it treatment that is neither distortive nor exploitive, must be viewed as threatening. It inevitably invokes culturally relative criteria for evaluating music which compromises the legitimation of 'classical' and 'serious' music as approaching the condition of 'music' itself. Socially grounded evaluative criteria cannot easily be divorced from theories which approach signification and meaning in music as themselves being socially grounded, a relationship further emphasized through the difficulty of denying the obviously social character of meaning and signification in many genres of popular music. It is precisely the attempt to maintain 'classical' and 'serious' music as pristine expressions of 'musicality' in the face of challenges from various genres of popular music that leads to these genres being devalorized in terms of their obvious sociality. Political processes of the social control of knowledge and genuine difficulties in the field of music aesthetics are thus mutually supportive (Shepherd, 1979 and 1981) in propagating popular music studies that are 'satisfactory' both phenomenologically and hermeneutically.

Although historical musicology tends to be the dominant discipline in university music departments from the point of view of studying music as historical and cultural process, it is not the only one. Ethnomusicology, as a cross-fertilization of the fields of historical musicology and cultural anthropology, has faced and continues to face many of the issues and problems currently experienced by popular music in attempts to establish itself in a satisfactory manner within university music departments. On the one hand, ethnomusicology tends to be marginalised. Although many excellent doctoral programs in ethnomusicology are firmly established, so, too, are an even greater number of single, isolated ethnomusicology courses at the undergraduate level. On the other hand, ethnomusicological scholarship has been co-opted within traditional academic discourse in music. The result of this co-option has been to highlight a trend discernible also within ethnomusicology as practiced in departments of anthropology, namely, a propensity to examine the musics of 'traditional' societies in terms of concerns emanating from Western academia rather than from the societies themselves. Charles Keil has addressed this issue in his work on the music of the Tiv of Nigeria. Extant musicological theory is criticized as largely ethnocentric, unable to absorb the fact that many African societies possess neither a semantic category, 'music', nor the concern
of Western musicologists for frozen, abstract notions such as 'rhythm' and 'harmony'. Categories of analysis as applied by ethnomusicologists to 'pre-literate' musics as often as not have little in common with categories of 'musical' understanding developed by 'pre-literate' societies themselves. Dominant trends in cultural anthropology are also criticized as 'idealistic' in assuming that "styles' of expression have a life and logic of their own" (Keil, 1979, 7), "floating symbolically above the events of everyday life" (Keil, 1979, 6). This lack of full social contextualisation allows much ethnomusicology, in Keil's view, to become a servant of Western academic discourse. Keil concludes therefore, that "Western thought has been, is, will always be, the primary obstacle between me and Tiv ima [song]" (Keil, 1979, 182).

Despite a close association with a social science from its very inception, ethnomusicology has thus been surprisingly slow to ground analyses of the music of 'traditional' societies in categories immanent to the music and culture of the societies themselves, and to be ethnically responsive to the situation of 'traditional' societies as being subject to fast, radical and uncontrollable change through Western economic and cultural imperialism (Wallis and Malm, 1984). 'Traditional' musics have tended to be discontextualised from the social and political realities in which they are embedded, becoming, in the words of Keil, "'ethnographic presents' given from one anthropologist to others in an endless kula ring of professional reciprocity" (Keil, 1979, 5).

The overwhelmingly idealist orientations of historical musicology to its subject matter is thus echoed, in a more subtle fashion, within ethnomusicology, although the work of scholars such as Blacking (1973), Keil (1979) and Feld (1982), together with the striking of an Issues Committee by the Society for Ethnomusicology, does speak to changes in direction more compatible with the concerns of critical theory. It is this more subtle form of idealism that explains why the study of popular music occupies a position within ethnomusicology not dissimilar to the one it occupies within historical musicology. As John Baily attests, "despite their claim to have the conceptual tools appropriate for the study of all music, ethnomusicologists have been conspicuously absent from the investigation of North American and Western European popular music" (Baily, 1984, 303). While notions of cultural relativism seem inoffensive when grounded in distant societies whose cultural features can be presented for the benefit of Western academic discourse divorced largely from considerations of political economy, they become remarkably less acceptable when grounded in a form of cultural expression that frequently articulates critical social and political questions less easy to distance from the actualities of everyday existence. The flaccid nature of concepts of cultural relativism as often implicit in ethnomusicology are neatly encapsulated by François-Bernard Mache. In one breath he asserts that "sound recording...brought to ears which were...willing to hear...the voices of other musical civilizations, thus calling to mind the relativity of aesthetic dogma" (Mache, 1973,
In another he confesses that the output of 'serious' music "is almost insignificant as compared with the vast mass of sonorous banality liberated by the advent of the musical industries" (Mache, 1973, 101). For Baily, this paradox is understandably, if regrettable, since ethnomusicologists often regard popular music "as the cause of the demise of the traditional musics they sought to preserve" (Baily, 1984, 303).

**POPULAR MUSIC IN NON-MUSIC DEPARTMENTS**

It is equally the case that little popular music teaching and research is carried on outside music departments. Supporting the impression and research of Taylor and Laing that "rock is usually studied or taught in odd corners of the curriculum," Simon Frith (1984) has noted that although isolated courses on popular music are taught in North America in a wide range of departments and programs, e.g., American Studies, Anthropology, Black Studies, Canadian Studies, Communication, Cultural Studies, Education, History, Journalism, Law, Philosophy, Physics, Politics, Popular Culture, Psychology, Sociology, and Women's Studies), the definitions and understandings of popular music formulated by such departments and programs tend to be influenced by the problematics of their own discipline. As a consequence, issues identified for discussion tend to be issues of importance to individual disciplines rather than issues necessarily central to the practice and criticism of different genres of popular music. A similar situation obtains in Britain. The study of popular music in non-music departments in Britain, reports Frith (1984), is concentrated in departments of sociology on the one hand, and programs in media studies and communication on the other. However, popular music as an object of study tends to be defined in terms of theories currently developed for the critical analyses of culture generally. Thus, in the late 1970's and early 1980's, much analysis of popular music by non-musicologists in Britain was conceived in categories derived from youth subcultural theory (Wills, 1978; Hebdige, 1979; Brake, 1980).

It is not appropriate, given the expertise of the writer and the scope of this article, to engage in a critical evaluation of the study of popular music as it is affected by the problematics of the many 'non-music' host disciplines. It will suffice, for illustrative purposes, to refer to an issue perceived as important to the study of popular music within the problematics of one host discipline, particularly since this issue relates to observations previously made regarding problems in elucidating meaning and signification in music through categories of analysis specific to semiological and structuralist discourses.

With sociological analyses of popular music, observes Frith:
There is a temptation to analyze the words at the expense of the music: words can be reproduced for comment with comparative ease, rhymes are better understood than chords; sociologists of popular music have always fallen for the comparatively easy terms of lyrical contents analysis (Frith, 1978, 176).

Commenting on this trend, Terry Lovell makes a connection between the categories of analysis that sociology typically brings to bear on cultural forms and sociology's studious avoidance of popular music as music which is instructive for an understanding of why popular music tends to be neglected as an object of study in non-music departments:

Content analysis -- the categories of analysis being drawn from the categories of social life itself -- is biased in favour of the representational arts. We have little in the way of sociology of music. Sociology of 'pop' music is uniformly restricted to analysis of lyrics. When there are no lyrics, we may get trivial results (Lovell, 1972, 329-330).

Any analysis of popular music as a cultural form must acknowledge that popular music makes a central if not exclusive impact as sound. As Frith has noted:

A word-based approach is not helpful at getting at the ideology of rock; the fans know, in Greil Marcus's words, that "words are sounds we can feel before they are statements to understand." Most rock records make their impact musically rather than lyrically -- the words, if they are noticed at all, are absorbed after the music has made its mark; the crucial variables are sound and rhythm (Frith, 1978, 176).

Categories of analysis need to be tailored accordingly. We need, in Lovell's opinion, "a sociology whose categories are more broadly applicable, drawn in the first instance from categories immanent to the works themselves" (Lovell, 1972, 330). Enlarging on this theme with specific references to the music of bikeboy subculture, Paul Willis has argued that "a really adequate account of the internal parameters of...music and its specific ability to hold and retain particular social meanings must be more technically rigorous than [it] has been" (Willis, 1978, 76).

However, this technical rigour is difficult for non-musicologists to achieve. As Frith observes in the context of rock music:
What serious musical criticism of rock there has been...has come from outside rock culture and has little influence on it. The most obvious reason for this state of affairs is ignorance. Most rock musicians lack formal musical training and so do almost all rock commentators...As a sociologist I share this ignorance and vagueness... (Frith, 1978, 176)

But to claim, as Willis does, that "musicology in the discipline which has the formal resources for this task [of elucidating social meanings from within the internal parameters of music]" (Willis, 1978, 76) is to make an unfounded assumption for reasons previously discussed. While it is true that historical musicology has developed a formidable range of analytic techniques and terms for coming to grips with the internal parameters of 'music', such techniques and terms have a very limited application. It is not possible, for example, to agree with a musicologist so sympathetically disposed to popular music as Wilfrid Mellers that "musical facts necessarily are susceptible to explanation through a terminology 'which has been evolved by professional musicians over some centuries'" (Mellers, 1973, 15 - 16). Musical 'facts' are socially located, and musical analysis, like social and cultural analysis, must be grounded in categories immanent to the object of enquiry. Failure to understand this can lead to technical analyses of popular music which, although well-intended and sympathetic, are nevertheless distorting (Vulliamy, 1977a, 194; Shepherd, 1982b, 147).

SOME REQUIREMENTS FOR TEACHING POPULAR MUSIC AS A CRITICAL ACTIVITY

While isolated, multidisciplinary and 'non-musical' approaches to the study of popular music may reveal valuable insights into different aspects of social and cultural signification, the value of such insights will be compromised to the extent that they are not integrated into more holistic and global analyses that take complete popular music genres as their foci of attention rather than popular music genres as simply expressions, for example, of youth or gender or ethnicity. None of these 'variables' exist independently of one another. It is perhaps for this reason that Frith (1984) has argued that popular music should not be studied within the confines of established academic disciplines or disciplines which focus on but one aspect of social and cultural realities, but rather within the context of programs such as American Studies and Cultural Studies that operate in terms of take-for-granted assumptions of inter-disciplinarity.

However, while Frith's suggestion would obviate drawbacks which result from locating popular music studies in more traditional and specialized disciplines, it would not overcome another, more intransigent difficulty previously identified by Frith (1978) and discussed in this article in the context of the traditional problematics of music aesthetics. This difficulty has to do with the 'musicality' of 'music.' While it is necessary to avoid the trenchant idealism of historical musicology, it is equally necessary to accept that if our rather
unsatisfactory linguistic and epistemological category of 'music' means anything at all, then it speaks to an acknowledgement that one channel of social and cultural communication is constituted through a medium, sound, that does not inevitably involve visual, denotative and referential levels of signification. If, as has been suggested in this article, prevalent modes of sociological, semiological and structuralist analysis are not suited, ab initio, to adequate deconstructions of signification within music (for a current account of semiological analyses of popular music, see Tagg, 1984), then there is a distinct possibility that the study of popular music within critical communications programs could result in such music being reduced to 'pure social practice' and treated as an inscrutable 'black box'.

A major issue for popular music studies can thus be summarized as follows. First, the tools available from historical musicology for the analysis of popular music are not totally appropriate to the task, since they are grounded in the tradition of 'serious' music and the majority of popular musics possess technical characteristics and criteria significantly different to those of the 'serious' tradition. It is for this reason that analyses of popular music such as those of Mellers (1973) can be misleading. Secondly, even if such tools were appropriate at a 'purely technical' level, they would not address the central question of how 'music' articulates from within its very structure and processes social and cultural meanings. This is why music poses for cultural analysts great problems in the determination of meaning and signification. On the one hand, historical musicology cannot provide critical theory with adequate analytic tools for elucidating the social and cultural meanings immanent to different musical forms. On the other, much critical theory, through its pre-occupation with the visual and referential, has not developed concepts that would challenge the idealism of historical musicology and force it to view technical analysis as a route to the elucidation of social and cultural meanings. It is thus hardly surprising that "rock is usually studied or taught in odd corners of the curriculum," or that "popular music remains a poor relation in cultural theory."

It is to the credit of scholars such as Frith and Willis that they recognize the limitations implicit in the problematics of their home disciplines where the study of popular music is concerned. However, assistance from musicologists in removing those limitations is not liable to be forthcoming until historical musicology as a discipline addresses the limitations of its own problematics. There is currently little reason for historical musicology to undertake such a drastic self-evaluation. As long as that discipline views its task as perpetuating the study and practice of 'music' as essentially divorced (although, albeit, 'affected by') social and cultural processes, then the unavoidable and undeniable 'sociality' of most genres of popular music will inevitably lead to the conclusion that popular music primarily serves ends other than those which are essentially 'musical' and should therefore be studied in departments other than music departments. The propensity of non-music departments to approach the internal structures
and processes of popular music as 'black box' will not typically concern historical musicologists since they hear little in such structures and processes symptomatic of 'musical value.' The conclusion of those few musicologists involved with the critical study of popular music may be that a frightening number of historical musicologists are impervious to the significance of alternative musical practices, but such imperviousness, unfortunately, does not compromise the internal consistency of their logic.

The inevitable sight of intervention for the advancement of popular music studies is the discipline of historical musicology. It is clearly impossible for critical theory to engage in a dialogue with historical musicology with a view to developing categories of analysis appropriate to 'musical process' if historical musicology keeps the door firmly shut. Since an adequate, critical study of popular music within music departments will of necessity involve musicologists in a fundamental reorientation in the manner in which they study music in the 'serious' tradition, it is necessary, as Richard Middleton (1984) has argued, not just to include popular music studies alongside serious music studies as an adjunct to already existing curricula, but to develop a "critical musicology", which implants popular music within the study of the whole musical field, thereby subverting received musicological assumptions." Middleton sees two principal lines of development within his suggested 'critical musicology.' First, there should be initiative within 'semiology, broadly defined and stressing the social situation of signifying practice: this should take over from traditional formal analysis." Secondly, there should be an "historical sociology of the whole musical field, stressing critical comparison of divergent sub-codes of the 'common musical competence': this should take over from liberal social histories of music."

The value of the global nature of Middleton's suggestions where the discipline of musicology is concerned can be grasped in the light of experiences in introducing the study and practice of popular music into the secondary school curriculum. It is not so important what is taught, runs the criticism, but how it is taught. If a curriculum change aimed at valorizing student culture is not accompanied by a more egalitarian power relationship between teacher and students that weakens traditional authority structures implicit in the world outside education, then the student culture will effectively be devalorized and any oppositional potential it possessed neutralized. In order to maintain traditional authority structures inside the classroom, teachers are under subtle but persuasive pressures to apply to alternative forms of knowledge associated with student culture criteria drawn from a knowledge base which is essentially theirs and not the preserve of students. Shepherd observed such practices in the music classrooms of one Ontario schoolboard (Shepherd, 1983). Compromises centering on tensions between the 'overt' and 'hidden' curriculum have also accompanied the introduction of popular music studies in some British schools (Vulliamy and Shepherd, 1984b).
Lessons learned at the secondary level may be valuable in developing the kind of 'critical musicology' envisaged by Middleton. Not only is it important that a critical pedagogy of popular music as historical and cultural process incorporate categories of analysis appropriate to the object of study. It is also necessary that the practical theory components of undergraduate music degrees are adjusted to include the wide range of technical characteristics which are specific to different genres of popular music and not often to be found within the tradition of 'serious' music. A positive feature of many undergraduate degree programs in historical musicology is a reluctance to allow students to graduate without achieving a respectable level of competence as a practicing musician. There is a feeling that although Literature and Art History departments typically allow students to graduate without being required to experience at first hand processes of creative writing and painting, such an approach would be ill-advised with 'music' since, as a form of signification its embodiment in dynamic and abstract sound patterns and textures is so much at odds with the static and reified, visual and literate categories prevalent within Western academic discourse. While the literate and plastic arts rest to a large sense on the sensory channel, vision, that, as McLuhan (1962; 1964) has pointed out allows and indeed encourages the static and distanced pinning out of the world in discrete and passive units, music rests on several sensory channels, aural, tactile, that are dynamic and active in bringing the world into the recipient. In studying and writing about music within an academic setting, it is thus important to be reminded constantly about what 'music' feels like as a creative art. This principle is especially pertinent in the case of popular music. As a cultural form which is essentially non-notated and therefore non-visual in its mediation, popular music more than 'serious' music makes its impact as 'raw sound' that 'rubs up' against the recipient and constantly reminds them that they are an alive and sentient being. Some kind of musical practice relevant to the technical characteristics of different popular music genres is therefore essential if these genres are not to fall uncritical prey to the inscrutable and silent categories of semiological and structuralist analyses. As Pelinski (1984) has recently pointed out, semiological analysis is not helpful at getting at the cultural signification implicit in the way in which tango singers seem to 'taste' words before giving them to the world.

Given the present chasm that exists between critical theory and musicology, it is difficult to be more specific concerning pedagogies for the critical study of popular music. Clearly, students will need to be exposed to existing bodies of knowledge within social and cultural theory as well as to much knowledge and practice currently available within departments of music. Although the study of popular music is inadequate purely in terms of categories drawn from the 'common practice' of 'classical' music, such categories nonetheless remain applicable and appropriate to the more syntactic elements of the many popular music genres that have in their histories some kind of cross-fertilization between non-Western and 'classical' musics. The labels 'popular' and 'classical' are, indeed, inherently inadequate. Although 'popular'
music genres do display technical and cultural characteristics specific to themselves, there is no one set of musical, cultural and social criteria appropriate for subsuming all 'popular' music genres and excluding all 'serious' music genres. The label 'popular' emerges as little more than a catch-all in terms of which to refer to all those kinds of music developed or consumed within the Western world on some kind of mass basis which are not typically included in the concert hall repertoire or the curricula of university music departments. The inadequacy of such labels underlines the importance of developing a critical musicology as opposed to simply including certain popular music genres within the curriculum in the hope that their putative, oppositional qualities will magically result in alternative, radical educational practices (Shepherd, 1985). As Middleton concludes:

If we don't study popular music in such a way that we transform musicology, we shall not only misunderstand popular music but also we shall be marginalised in terms of intellectual and institutional politics--placed in a half-forgotten, half-patronised 'homeland'. (Middleton, 1984)

If a knowledge base for the critical study of popular music is to be developed and made available to students, then it is important that these kinds of initiatives are themselves constantly monitored. It is to be expected that where innovations in education are proposed, those that threaten the status quo most will be the most difficult to implement (Papagiannis et al., 1982). The introduction of critical, popular music studies into the university curriculum will not only require a re-evaluation of the problematics of major host disciplines. They will also strike at many beliefs and assumptions dear to the heart of Western academia. There is much to learned from the recent work of American curriculum scholars (Anyon, 1980; Apple, 1979, 1982a, 1982b; Giroux, 1981a, 1981b, 1981c, 1983; McNeil, 1981; Wexler, 1982) in their advocacy of a constant, critical, theoretical and empirical assessment of pedagogies themselves intended to be critical.

REFERENCES


Mache, F. B. Musical Composition Today, Cultures, 1 (1), 101 - 111.


Nutch, F. Emergence and Creativity, Human Affairs, 1981, 1, 14 - 27.


Pelinski, R. Perspectives methodologiques pour l'analyse du tango, paper presented at annual meeting of the Canadian Branch of the International Association for the Study of Popular Music, Departement de Musique, l'Universite du Quebec a Montreal, 16 November 1984.


