SMITH, ELAINE K., Ph.D. A Descriptive Analysis of High School Choral Teachers'
Inclusion of Popular Music in Current Teaching Practices. (2016)
Directed by Dr. Brett Nolker. 259 pp.

The purpose of this study is to provide a descriptive analysis of high school choral

teachers' inclusion of popular music in current teaching practices by (a) determining the

frequency of inclusion, (b) developing a profile of teachers, schools, and choral programs

that include popular music in the curriculum, (c) determining which demographic

characteristics affected the amount of popular music included, and (d) developing a

profile of popular music implementation details. The *Popular Music Survey,* a researcher

designed online survey, was developed to collect demographic data and information

concerning the participants' inclusion of popular music in their high school choral

classrooms. Participants were high school choral teachers in the Commonwealth of

Virginia ($n = 104$). Data were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics for Macintosh,

Version 22.0.

Results of the study revealed that 100% of participants include popular music in

the choral curriculum as performance literature and/or instructional materials.

Descriptive statistics of demographic data of the teacher, school, choral program, and

ensemble were used to develop a profile to describe the typical high school choral teacher

who includes popular music. Descriptive statistics were also used to develop a profile to

describe how high school choral teachers included popular music in the choral classroom.

The majority of participants ($n = 91$, 87.4%) responded that the percentage of

popular music performed was 30% or less of their total performance literature. Pearson

Chi-square and one-way analysis of variance were used to determine the extent to which

popular music was included in the high school choral curriculum. The achievement of a master's degree was the only teacher characteristic that significantly affected the amount of popular music included in the high school choral curriculum ($p = .028$). Participants with a master's degree included more popular music than participants who did not have a master's degree.

Implications for music education were discussed in relation to the findings of the current study. Recommendations were made for future research regarding the inclusion of popular music in choral classrooms, as well as in other areas of music education.

A DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF HIGH SCHOOL CHORAL

TEACHERS' INCLUSION OF POPULAR MUSIC

IN CURRENT TEACHING PRACTICES

by

Elaine K. Smith

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of The Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Greensboro
2016

Approved by

_____
Committee Chair

To Mom and Dad, with love

This dissertation, written by Elaine K. Smith, has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of The Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Committee Chair    <u>D. Brett Nolker</u>

Committee Members    <u>Donald A. Hodges</u>

<u>Constance McKoy</u>

<u>Patricia E. Sink</u>

<hr>

Date of Acceptance by Committee

<hr>

Date of Final Oral Examination

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Dr. Brett Nolker, thank you for your loving attention throughout my undergraduate, masters, and doctoral degree programs.  Your unwavering faith in me has carried me through the dissertation process.  I will be forever grateful that God sent us to UNCG at the same time.

To my Doctoral Committee Members, Dr. Patti Sink, Dr. Don Hodges, Dr. Connie McKoy, thank you for your help and guidance throughout my undergraduate and graduate studies.  I have learned so much from your years of experience, and hope that my students think as highly of me as I do of you.

Thank you to my students who inspire me every day to be the best teacher and person whom I can be.  I have learned more from my students than they could ever imagine.  I am grateful to my students for making me love going to school every day and for making my research part of my reality.  My students will always be my favorite musicians!

To my band colleagues, David Bennett, Trey Harris, and Matt Dowell, thank you for being encouraging through difficult teaching and graduate school days.  Knowing someone supported me at school has allowed me to continue teaching for most of graduate school and kept me calm while finishing the dissertation.

Throughout this process, Melissa Pugh's optimism frequently reminded me to "just keep swimming."  I have learned so much from Melissa about music education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

# LIST OF TABLES

# CHAPTER I

# INTRODUCTION

## Background of the Problem

Popular music is pervasive in our lives, the lives of our students, and in contemporary society. Music is experienced in all forms of media, in public spaces, and in our private lives. Many people, especially teenagers, use portable electronic devices that create an ongoing self-selected soundtrack of music. Regardless of the ubiquitous nature of popular music, there is still much debate over its inclusion in formal music education and specifically in the choral classroom.

Historically, the addition of popular music to the choral classroom has been a slow and laborious process. From the first decades of the twentieth century, music education leaders have taken steps that paved the way for the inclusion of popular music. Textbooks began including 'ethnic songs' and professional music education organizations began to promote world understanding through music (Volk, 1998). Leaders in American music education have been calling for the use of contemporary music since the Young Composers Project in 1959 (Contemporary Music Project, 1968), and specifically including popular music since the Tanglewood Symposium in 1967 (Choate, 1968).

After the 1969 Music Educators National Conference (currently named the National Association for Music Education) Youth Music Institute, research on popular

music in the curriculum flourished (Isbell, 2007). Many articles justify the use of popular music (Evans, 1983; Farmer 1976; Fowler, 1970; Housewright, Longfield, & Willens, 1970; Kern, 1977; MacCluskey, 1969a, 1969b, 1979; Roem, 1968; Willis, 1970). More recently, Wang & Humphreys (2009) identify music education literature that has provided philosophical justification for including popular music into K-12 and teacher education programs (Bowman, 2004; Elliott, 1995; Green, 2001; Humphreys, 2004; Jorgensen, 1996, 1997; Regelski, 1998; Reimer, 2003; Rogers, 1990) and historical and social justification as well (Humphreys, 2004; Jorgensen, 1997; Seeger, 2002; Volk, 1998).

> Literature on the relationships between music education and popular music continues to focus on questions of whether popular music should be studied (Cutietta, 1991; Gass, 1992; Newsom, 1998), how this is done (Middleton, 1990; Dunbar-Hall, 1993, 1996; Dunbar-Hall, 1999; Kirschner, 1998; Lowe, 1997), and the position of popular music in the broader context of music education—especially at secondary and college levels (Barry & Walls, 1999; Vulliamy & Lee, 1982; Wemyss, 1999b). (Dunbar-Hall & Wemyss, 2000, p. 23)

Similar discussions concerning popular music in the music classroom have happened in other parts of the world. Countries such as the United Kingdom, Australia, and Finland, however, have been less resistant to change than the United States (Abramo, 2011). Primarily, the inclusion of popular music into the music curriculum of these countries is due to an emphasis on composition, the inclusion of non-traditional classroom instruments, and new teaching practices that are authentic to how each style of music would be learned in its original context (Byrne & Sheridan, 2000; Green, 2008; Lebler, 2008; Väkevä, 2006; Wemyss, 2004; Westerlund, 2006). The Secondary

National Curriculum in the UK, for example, explicitly states, "[music] study should include . . . a range of classical and popular traditions and current trends in music that reflect cultural diversity and a global dimension" (Qualifications and Curriculum Development Agency, 2007, p. 6).

This international openness to including popular music in the classroom is not limited to only music, but it also makes use of music learning strategies consistent with that of authentic popular music learning styles. Popular music 'rehearsals' are often treated informally with communal decision-making (Woody, 2007), an emphasis on listening and ear-based trial and error (Woody, 2007), and a sometimes haphazard approach (Green, 2005). These strategies often are in contrast to a traditional music rehearsal with the teacher being the expert and the students following instructions.

Australia has a conservatorium that includes a degree program in Popular Music Production. This program is a self-directed learning community, or master-less studio. Students are not given formal, private lessons by expert teachers; rather, students learn from their interactions within a community of learners. In this way, collaboration is rewarded. The role of the teacher is that of co-creator and co-assessor. This type of teaching and learning environment allows for independent learning, acquiring and developing broad-based and diverse knowledge and skills (Lebler, 2007).

While many teachers in the United States agree that popular music has a place in music education, and a growing number of programs perform popular music while excluding other styles (Turley, 1989), the inclusion of popular music is still controversial for some teachers. Reasons for not including popular music typically may be categorized

as follows: (a) the music and materials available (Chastagner, 1999; S. Davis & Blair, 2011; Graham, 2009; Green, 2006; Hebert & Campbell, 2000; J. Johnson, 2002; Jorgensen, 2002, 2003; Landeck, 1968; MacCluskey, 1979; Mantie, 2013; Melnick, 2001; Monk, 1959; Pembrook, 1991; Woody, 2007), (b) the teachers and their pedagogy (S. Davis & Blair, 2011; Dunbar-Hall & Wemyss, 2000; Green, 2002, 2006; Hebert & Campbell, 2000; Isbell, 2007; Jorgensen, 2003; MacCluskey, 1979; Pembrook, 1991; Ponick, 2000; Wang & Humphreys, 2009; Warner, 1997; Wicks, 1998) , and (c) student concerns and social issues (D. Baker, 1992; Cuttietta, 1991; Gaitandjiev, 1997; Green, 1988, 2006; Hebert & Campbell, 2000; Jorgensen, 2002; Monk, 1959; Vulliamy, 1977a, 1977b).

Despite the existence and long-time success of other countries' inclusion of popular music, the United States remains behind in the inclusion of popular music (Wang & Humphreys, 2009). Although studies show that many teachers are incorporating popular music in their music classrooms and curricula, the research does not detail how and to what extent popular music is included in the music classrooms and curricula in the United States (Mantie, 2013). The lack of including popular music in music teacher education programs is well documented (Gaitandjiev, 1997; Hebert & Cambell, 2000; Isbell, 2007; R. Johnson, 1997; Pembrook, 1991; Wang & Humphreys, 2009; Wicks, 1998). Mantie (2013) identifies that popular music was neither discussed nor included in recent research studies concerning music teacher education programs and suggests that the topic of popular music should be included when appropriate.

**Need for the Study**

Popular music, as an area of academic study, is becoming widely accepted. Most of the research and professional literature concerning popular music, however, is concentrated on one of four categories: (1) performance studies, (2) factors affecting music preference or selection, (3) detailed analyses of popular songs and/or lyrics, and (4) studies that attempted to justify the use of popular music in public education (Pembrook, 1986). Isbell (2007) and Mantie (2013) concur that future research needs to be conducted that provide information about whether and how popular music is being used in the public schools. Isbell (2007) specifically states,

> There are no existing status reports showing the extent to which or in what capacity popular music is currently being used by public school music teachers. Descriptive studies should be undertaken that provide information about the number of music educators who use popular music in their curricula. (p. 61)

While few educators question the use of popular music as a part of the elementary general music curriculum, the same cannot be said in relation to secondary choral programs (Dunbar-Hall & Wemyss, 2000). There is much debate about whether to include popular music in the secondary setting (Dunbar-Hall & Wemyss, 2000). Even among teachers who include popular music, there is not widespread agreement on the specifics of its inclusion. There are questions as to how popular music should be integrated into the curriculum (Allsup, 2003; Seifried, 2006), especially with concern of how much to include and whether its inclusion is at the expense of other genres (Forbes, 2001; Monk, 1959; Turley, 1989).

Concerns about the materials used to teach popular music are also frequently discussed in relation to quality and quantity (Forbes, 2001; Mantie, 2013; Melnick, 2001). While much of the research in the United States related to the inclusion of popular music is focused on justifying its place in the curriculum, popular music pedagogy is largely overlooked. Having no accepted teaching practices or models for the teaching of popular music in the United States contributes to the continued debate and disagreements about the inclusion of popular music in the curriculum (Green, 2006; Isbell, 2007).

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to provide a descriptive analysis of high school choral teachers' inclusion of popular music in current teaching practices by (a) determining the frequency of inclusion, (b) developing a profile of teachers, schools, and choral programs that include popular music in the curriculum, (c) determining which demographic characteristics affected the amount of popular music included, and (d) developing a profile of popular music implementation details. The researcher-designed *Popular Music Survey* was administered to high school choral teachers in the Commonwealth of Virginia and the responses were analyzed to answer the following research questions:

1. Are high school choral teachers including popular music as performance literature and/or instructional materials?

2. What characteristics of the teacher, school, choral program, and/or ensemble best describe those who include popular music?

3. To what extent is popular music being included in the high school choral curriculum?

4. How is popular music being implemented in the high school choral classroom?

**Definition of Terms**

**Popular Music**

For the purposes of this study, the following definition of popular music was used: "Popular music" is an umbrella term used to cover a wide range of musical genres that are well known by a large number of people.  Genres include, but are not limited to, alternative, country, dance, Disney, electronic, Hip-hop, rap, Indie, Inspirational (Contemporary Christian and Gospel), pop, rock, R&B, and soul.  Popular music does not include art music, jazz, spirituals, or folk songs.  Popular music is likely to be transmitted through the electronic means of radio, television, or the Internet.

This working definition is comprised of work from multiple researchers attempting to describe/define popular music.  The working definition is restated with citations corresponding to each idea.

"Popular music" is an umbrella term used to cover a wide range of musical genres (Ponick, 2000) that are well known by a large number of people (Bowman, 2004; S. Davis & Blair, 2011; Monk, 1959; Ponick, 2000).  Genres include, but are not limited to, alternative, country, dance, Disney, electronic, Hip-hop, rap, Indie, Inspirational (Contemporary Christian and Gospel), pop, rock, R&B, and soul (Pembrook, 1991).  Popular music does not include art music, jazz, spirituals, or folk songs (Bowman, 2004;

Forbes, 2001; Frith, 1987; R. Johnson, 1997; Lebler, 2008; Tagg, 2000; Toynbee, 2000; Woody, 2007; Woody & Lehmann, 2010). Popular music is likely to be transmitted through the electronic means of radio, television, or the Internet (Bowman, 2004; S. Davis & Blair, 2011; Frith, 1987; R. Johnson, 1997; Tagg, 2000; Toynbee, 2000).

**High School**

For the purpose of this study, the term 'high school' is defined as grades nine through twelve. Schools that include other grades are still part of the study if they have a choir comprised only of students in any grades nine through twelve. For example, teachers in schools that serve grades six through twelve would only reply to the survey regarding the choirs they teach that are grades nine through twelve. An alternate example is junior high schools that serve grades seven through nine. Teachers would only respond to the survey if they had a ninth-grade choir.

**Choral**

In the Commonwealth of Virginia, the name given to choral classes is 'vocal/choral music' (Virginia Department of Education, 2013). Therefore, the teachers' title is 'vocal/choral music teacher.' For the purpose of this study, the classes and teachers will be referred to as 'choral' for clarity and ease of readability.

**NAfME**

The National Association for Music Education (NAfME) was known as the Music Educators National Conference (MENC) until 2011. Documents from the organization prior to 2011 will be cited as MENC. Documents from the organization after 2011 will

be cited as NAfME.  The organization will be referred to as NAfME in the text of this document.

## Limitation of the Study

The limitation of the current study is that the findings are not generalizable to the total population of high school choral teachers in the United States.  The findings can only be generalized to the population of high school choral teachers in the Commonwealth of Virginia because this study did not engage in random sampling. Future research is needed to provide more information about the status of high school choral directors' inclusion of popular music throughout the nation.

**CHAPTER II**

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

**Defining Popular Music**

**Introduction**

If you ask students, "What is popular music?" their answers may go directly to whichever artist is being played currently on the radio. Other students will tell you what is popular within their group of friends. Others still will shy away from identifying anything as popular because they like to operate outside of the social and cultural norms. These examples illustrate the difficulty in describing popular music.

Researchers have similar difficulties when trying to formally define popular music. The term popular music was first coined in 1573 (Gammond, 1991). Since that time, many different styles and genres have been classified as popular music. It is important to note that all societies are likely to have had some sort of classification of musical genres (Middleton & Manuel, 2014) even if the term popular music was not associated. "Popular Music is an umbrella phrase that covers many diverse styles of music" (Ponick, 2000, p. 23). Popular music is meant to appeal to a wide audience. It is "music created by, and especially for, the enjoyment and enrichment of everyday people in their everyday lives" (Bowman, 2004, p. 36). Popular music is not attempting to 'transcend time, place, and circumstance' (Bowman, 2004, p. 36). It is meant to be part of the current soundscape, present in the moment of people's lives, and is commercial.

The purpose is very different from art music that is more concerned with artistic expression rather than commercial value (Monk, 1959). In broad interpretations, it now can include pop, soul, country, gospel, folk, R&B, rock, and rap, as well as many others genres (Pembrook, 1991).

There have been many definitions throughout the history of popular music and there continues to be debate about what the definition of 'popular music' is today. There appear to be three approaches to handling the task of defining popular music: popularity through consumption, popularity through social and cultural context, and popularity through means of dissemination (Middleton & Manuel, 2014).

**Popularity through Consumption**

This broad definition of popular music is usually considered any style of music that is currently well known by large groups of people (Bowman, 2004; S. Davis & Blair, 2011; Monk, 1959; Ponick, 2000). Will Schmid describes the historical transition of popular music consumption by stating that "Originally, popular music was spread by oral tradition; later it was influenced by stage productions, traveling musicians, printed music, piano rolls, recordings, radio, television, and the Internet" (as cited in Ponick, 2000, p. 24). This definition brings about concerns because there is no solid method to determine the level of consumption of a particular piece of music.

There are a few common ways to discuss consumption in today's society. The charts from *Billboard Magazine* have been used as one way to determine popularity since 1940. The Top 40 and Hot 100 charts use information about airplay by radios and sales of singles to compile their lists of the most popular songs. The development of new

technologies have enabled *Billboard Magazine* to collect these data through Nielson's Broadcast Data Systems which takes the number of times a song is played and multiplies it by the number of people listening to the station. Nielsen Soundscan tracks sales of music and music videos across 19 countries (The Nielsen Company, 2015).

Popularity is now also measured through the lens of social media sites. Facebook and YouTube are two popular sites used to promote or share music. Users of Facebook 'like' or 'share' music videos or recordings. The site tracks the numbers of likes or shares which can add up quickly, often known as 'going viral.' YouTube popularity is measured in number of views, which is displayed alongside each video. Popular music artists such as Justin Bieber and Austin Mahone were discovered through posting their videos on YouTube.

Sometimes, however, popularity does not necessarily exemplify that people enjoy the product. In the case of Rebecca Black and her video "Friday," mere views do not tell the whole story. As of March 18, 2016, the video had over 91 million views, but more than 1.9 million of those viewers clicked the 'thumbs down' icon indicating that they did not like the video for some reason. These new technologies add to the difficulty of measuring popularity, but provide another piece of information for analysis.

**Popularity through Social and Cultural Context**

"Popular music is best understood within a social and cultural context in order to understand and appreciate its value. Music therefore is culturally bound and is never pure but is constantly transforming to the volatile characteristics of society" (S. Davis & Blair, 2011, p. 26). Social and cultural context is bound, in some ways, by time and

place. Popular music is often linked to social groups (S. Davis & Blair, 2011). If approached from a general popularity viewpoint, popular music may be discussed in relation to a large population. Popular music can also delineate co-cultures within the larger population: goth, new age, LGBT, and surfers, to name a few. One of the most profound differences is that between teenagers and their parents. Teenagers frequently identify with music that is counter to music with which their parents identify (Ponick, 2000). In this manner, Charles Cassara, associate professor at the Berklee College of Music in Boston, defines popular music as "any music that students perceive as separating them from adults, especially their parents" (as cited in Ponick, 2000, p. 24). Cassara goes on to add that this need for separation for teenagers impacts the production, marketing, and dissemination by the music industry (as cited in Ponick, 2000).

Popular music recordings are artifacts of oral history (Cooper, 1998) and carry delineated meanings, or meanings outside of the actual music, and have social, cultural, religious, political, or other associations (Green, 2006). Because of the format of typical popular music recordings, the length of the text is limited. The songs may intentionally or unintentionally address important historical, social, or personal issues. Popular musicians are able to "explain modern history with statements of meaning and substance in their hit recordings" (Cooper, 1998, p. 17) and the popularity of a particular song implies public acceptance. However, looking at only one recording gives an incomplete view. Soundscape researchers listen to many recordings from a particular time period to identify themes, patterns, and ideas that are found consistently (Cooper, 1998). Soundscape research can provide valuable information about a given time period and the

way musicians and music listeners express themselves in relation to contemporary
happenings.

Facebook and YouTube contribute to the social and cultural context of popular
music. Both Internet sites are social media sites where people virtually meet, interact,
and share thoughts, ideas, and recordings. The impact of these types of sites on popular
music becomes increasingly important as the number of users grows and people look to
them as resources for locating and listening to music. Users frequently take cues to
watch or listen based on which postings have the most views.

**Popularity through Dissemination**

In today's society, popular music is almost always disseminated through
electronic means. This is due to popular music's dependency upon "mass production and
distribution for its very essences and survival" (Bowman, 2004; S. Davis & Blair, 2011;
Frith, 1987; Tagg, 2000; Toynbee, 2000). R. Johnson (1997) states that

> [Popular Music] is produced and experienced predominantly through recording
> and other electronic media. For music to exist at all in any public or social sense
> it must be electronically mediated, in effect, a type of popular music. In this
> form, music is highly accessible and portable, accompanying us through our daily
> lives and providing underscoring for our multilayered, sonically filled,
> increasingly virtual environments. (p. 2)

Music of varying styles can become well known through the process of electronic
dissemination. For instance, classical music can be electronically recorded and
disseminated. This practice allows a larger, more diverse audience than the traditional
dissemination practice of live performance by highly trained and skilled musicians.

However, despite the fact that classical music dissemination practices have changed, classical music does not align with other factors that define popular music.

As the number of people who have instant access to recordings rises through music providers like iTunes, free hosting sites such as YouTube, and individual artists' pages, it is increasingly important to include dissemination practices as part of the comprehensive definition of popular music.

**Working Definition of Popular Music**

From the approaches described previously, it is apparent that the definition of popular music is complex and must allow for a variety of perspectives. To rigidly define the term would work in opposition to the very nature of popular music. The complete definition of popular music for this study, which is presented in the next paragraph, was assembled to clarify the term for participants taking the *Popular Music Survey*. Citations corresponding to each idea can be found on page 7.

For this study, the following definition was used: 'Popular music' is an umbrella term used to cover a wide range of musical genres that are well known by a large number of people. Genres include, but are not limited to, alternative, country, dance, Disney, electronic, Hip-hop, rap, Indie, Inspirational (Contemporary Christian and Gospel), pop, rock, R&B, and soul. Popular music does not include art music, jazz, spirituals, or folk songs. Popular music is likely to be transmitted through the electronic means of radio, television, or the Internet.

**Development of Popular Music in Relation to Music Education Conferences**

From the first decades of the twentieth century, music education leaders have taken steps that paved the way for the inclusion of popular music. Textbooks began including 'ethnic songs' and professional music education organizations began to promote world understanding through music (Volk, 1998). Since 1994, the inclusion of popular music in the music curriculum has been a stated objective in the National Standards for Music Education developed by the Music Educators National Conference (MENC, 1994). The following is an overview of the important music education conferences as they relate to the development of popular music in the choral classroom.

Early efforts to include music outside of the western art music tradition were small in number and scope. Classroom music before 1900 was typically from the Euro-Germanic classical tradition. Occasionally a folksong would be included, but the text would be changed to an English text with an uplifting message. This change diminished the authenticity of the music. The Music Teacher's National Association (MTNA) and the National Education Association's Department of Music Education were formed and began presenting multicultural music to its members. However, these teachers did not have the resources to take this information back and include it in their classrooms. Though small in number, these efforts were an impetus for larger changes in the future.

**Young Composers Project and Contemporary Music Project**

The Young Composers Project, funded by the Ford Foundation, began in 1959. This program placed young composers under the age of 35 in public school settings as artists-in-residence. Their job was to compose contemporary music for the specific

ensembles at the school in which they were placed. This allowed music directors to have access to newly composed music that fit the exact needs of their ensemble. The project was meant to directly benefit both the school ensembles and the young composers (Contemporary Music Project, 1968).

During this time period, teenagers were becoming very interested in popular music. One goal of the project was to introduce contemporary music into the classroom that would keep teenagers interested in music in the classical style. Much of the music composed for this project would be considered contemporary music in a classical style and is archived in the library at the University of Maryland (University Libraries-University of Maryland, 2016).

Through this process, it was discovered that there were many music educators that were ill prepared to teach contemporary music; this lack of preparation led to students becoming hesitant to perform contemporary music (Mark, 1986). In 1963, federal funding and money from philanthropists provided for the beginning of the Contemporary Music Project for Creativity in Music Education, which was an outgrowth of the Young Composers Project. The goals of this project included emphasizing the study of contemporary music, identifying talented students, and teacher training. These goals were accomplished through several methods. To address the issue of teachers not being prepared to teach contemporary music identified through the Young Composers Project, the Contemporary Music Project provided workshops and seminars for teachers in order for them to understand contemporary music through analysis, performance, and pedagogy (Contemporary Music Project, 1968).

The Contemporary Music Project's focus on improving the education of music

teachers included the Seminar on Comprehensive Musicianship, held at Northwestern

University in 1965 (Contemporary Music Project, 1968).  This seminar emphasized a

'comprehensive musicianship' approach that would create flexible musicians who would

be able to perform all styles of music (Abeles, Hoffer, & Klotman, 1995).  Basic

principles were established, but methods and materials were not developed at this time

(Mark, 1986).

Elementary pilot classes were used as controlled lab settings.  The pilot classes

were a place where teachers could "determine effective means of using contemporary

music in various grades, to experiment with techniques for providing creative experiences

for children and identify contemporary music that could be used for such experiences,

and to serve as in-service education for teachers" (Mark, 1986, p. 37).  The

Contemporary Music Project reported these conclusions drawn from the seminars and

pilot classes:

1.  Music in the twentieth century idiom is appropriate for and interesting to children at any age level.  The earlier it is presented, the more natural the enthusiasm is likely to be.  Young children should be exposed to the sound of contemporary music before they are able to intellectualize about it.
2.  Activities related to contemporary music, such as compositions for percussion instruments, synthetic scales, and new sound sources provide a unique medium for creativity.  The student with little or no background in theory and harmony can "create" with enthusiasm and success and, thus, gain a first-hand contact with music that he might otherwise miss.
3.  Active involvement with the elements or compositional techniques employed contributes to a more effective listening experience for students at all age levels.
4.  Basic goals and teaching techniques for the use of contemporary music at these levels do not differ appreciably from those used for the successful presentation of any music.  Thus, a skillful teacher of music who possesses or

acquires some knowledge of contemporary music literature should be able to apply it in the classroom situation. Greater emphasis on 20th-century music at the level of teacher education would help teachers feel more secure in presenting this music to children.

5. A background in "traditional" music is not necessary as a prerequisite for listening to 20th-century music; however, approaches need to be adapted to the background of the group.

6. One of the major goals in presenting 20th-century music to children should be to help them grow in listening discrimination, in order that gradually they will be able to be selective in their choice of contemporary music.

7. Additional contemporary selections that are short in length and simple in structure need to be located or composed, in order that they might be incorporated into the larger program of music education. (MENC, 1966, pp. 60–61)

The Contemporary Music Project ended in 1973. The project accomplished its goals and, more importantly, initiated change and innovation in the music education profession (Mark, 1986).

The Young Composers Project and the Contemporary Music Project did not address popular music specifically. However, the program supported the use of newly composed music and music outside of the traditional choral repertoire. It specifically stated that active engagement in contemporary music was appropriate and that the goals and techniques do not differ appreciably from the presentation of any other styles of music. Popular music is contemporary music and therefore, the conclusions drawn from these projects have major implications for the inclusion of popular music in the choral classroom.

**Yale Seminar**

The Yale Seminar was held at Yale University on June 17–28, 1963. The seminar was in response to work done by the National Science Foundation that developed science

curricula when it was determined that the United States was not keeping up with the Soviet Union in space technology. The National Science Foundation saw that many of the more advanced scientists also had musical experience (Palisca, 1964). From this, they determined that music education could help students in science if the student was "exposed to the view of human experience as seen through the arts" (Mark, 1986, p. 41). The National Science Foundation wanted to review the previous decades of kindergarten through twelfth grade music curricula to uncover why the public was not musically literate and musically active (Palisca, 1964).

The Yale Seminar participants, which included musicians, scholars, and teachers, chose two areas to examine closely: music performance and music materials. The music performance discussion centered on individual versus group outcomes. The performance levels of the groups were extremely high, but the development of individuals' skills, musicality, and independence were not being addressed (Palisca, 1964).

The discussion of musical materials was extensive and identified many problems of access and quality. Participants agreed that music materials were of low quality, had a narrow scope that neglected jazz, popular, and folk music, were not interesting, were poorly arranged, were chosen based on teacher limitations rather than on the needs of the students, and were chosen based on not offending anyone (Palisca, 1964). The participants determined that even though there were adequate materials available, music educators were not utilizing the materials and the youth still preferred to listen to popular music (Mark, 1986).

The Yale Seminar made many recommendations including broadening of the musical repertory to include western and non-western music of all periods, including jazz, folk, and contemporary music, developing musicality, developing relationships with surrounding community members and musicians, and teacher training and retraining. Even with the recommendations of the seminar, change occurred slowly, if at all. This is in large part due to the fact that the seminar included very few representatives of the Music Educators National Conference (MENC), known as the National Association for Music Education (NAfME) since 2011, and few people who were directly involved with school music education (Mark, 1986).

**Tanglewood Symposium**

The Tanglewood Symposium was the next significant event that supported the use of popular music in the classroom and the first that specifically mentioned popular music. This symposium was held in Tanglewood, Massachusetts on July 23–August 2, 1967 (Choate, 1968). There were major difference between the Yale Seminar and the Tanglewood Symposium concerning sponsorship and participants. The Tanglewood Symposium was sponsored by NAfME, the Berkshire Music Center, the Theodore Presser Foundation (a private foundation dedicated solely to music education), and Boston University. Participants at the symposium were music educators, sociologists, scientists, corporate leaders and others directly and indirectly associated with music education. The purpose was to discuss and define the role of music education in contemporary society (Choate, 1968). Participants wanted to find ways to make music

education experiences in the classroom relevant to the experiences students were having

outside of school (Isbell, 2007).

Some goals and recommendations agreed upon at this symposium were that music

should be a part of the core curriculum, adequate time should be allowed for music,

developments in technology should be applied to music, greater emphasis should be

placed on helping individual students, and improving teacher training (Abeles et al.,

1995). In relation to popular music, the Tanglewood Declaration stated that

> Music of all periods, styles, forms, and cultures belong in the curriculum. The
> musical repertory should be expanded to involve music of our time in its rich
> variety, including currently popular teenage music and avant-garde music,
> American folk music, and the music of other cultures. (Choate, 1968, p. 139)

This affirmation of the inclusion of popular music in the music classroom was the

first of its kind. It went beyond merely saying "all periods" to specifically name

"currently popular teenage music" as music that belongs in the curriculum. Lacking

ambiguity and having the agreement of the music educators at the Tanglewood

Symposium, this declaration gave the concept of popular music in the classroom the

boost it needed to become a legitimate topic of music study.

The Tanglewood Declaration also stated that, "The music education profession

must contribute its skills, proficiencies, and insights toward assisting in the solution of

urgent social problems as in the "inner city" or other areas with culturally deprived

individuals" (Choate, 1968, p. 139). While this statement does not explicitly address

popular music, when analyzed collectively with conclusions drawn from the

Contemporary Music Project, the inclusion of popular music could be a way to contribute

to meeting the needs of those served by the profession. The Contemporary Music Project's conclusions frequently discuss contemporary music's ability to reach students with little formal musical experience, provide them with opportunities they might otherwise miss, and help them to develop the ability to be selective in their musical experiences so they can choose which types of music they consider to be quality.

**Goals and Objectives**

The Goals and Objectives Project of NAfME took steps toward implementing the recommendations of the Tanglewood Symposium. The purpose of this project was to determine the responsibilities of NAfME in relation to future professional needs. One of the goals and objectives NAfME chose to focus on was to "advance the teaching of music of all periods, styles, forms, and cultures" (MENC, 1970, p. 24).

Because the Tanglewood Symposium had the support of NAfME and active music educators, the recommendations of the symposium in the Tanglewood Declaration carried more influence in the profession. Change still occurred slowly. MacCluskey (1979) wrote an article on how the Tanglewood recommendations were being implemented and stated that there was still resistance to including popular music in the curriculum mainly because of its supposed aesthetic limitations and that colleges and universities did not contribute by promoting change and developing courses that taught how popular music could be included in the classroom.

Since the Tanglewood Symposium, NAfME has adopted the same philosophy about popular music in music education. NAfME has sponsored contests, workshops, and encouraged compositions and arrangements of popular music for music groups of all

ages.  NAfME has also introduced the use of popular music into the National Standards

for Music Education published in 1994.  Standard nine calls for students to have an

understanding of music in relation to history and culture.  This includes music of all time

periods including current, popular music (MENC, 1994).

The literature on popular music in music education contains many reasons given

for the inclusion and the exclusion of popular music in the choral classroom.  While there

are many resources written about the topic of inclusion/exclusion of popular music in the

classroom, there are few empirical studies in which data directly related to the topic were

collected.  Those research studies are presented separate from the remaining body of

literature, which has been organized by topic area.  Three broad categories encompass the

reasons teachers give for including or excluding popular music from the high school

choral curriculum: (a) the music and materials available, (b) the teachers and their

pedagogy, and (c) student concerns and social issues.  Within each of these categories,

subheadings are included to group related ideas and draw parallels between both the

literature pertaining to inclusion and exclusion of popular music from the curriculum.

Two research studies (Forbes, 2001; Reames, 2001) are directly related to

describing the practices of inclusion of popular music performance literature in the choral

classroom.  Repertoire selection is a task in which all choral teachers must participate.

Effective choral music educators have a superior knowledge of choral literature and the

ability to select music that is appropriate for their ensembles (P. J. Baker, 1982; Blosch,

1985; A. P. Davis, 1994; Levi, 1985; Morgan, 1992; Reames, 2001; Szabo, 1993).

Utilizing their knowledge of choral literature and ability to select appropriate literature

will allow choral music educators to construct a range of music literature and materials

that provides the foundation for successful rehearsals and performances for their

ensembles (Bartle, 1993; Herman, 1988; Miller, 1988; Whitlock, 1991). The music

selected for study and performance is the medium through which students learn skills,

concepts, history, and cultural awareness (Forbes, 2001). In general, directors have been

encouraged to select quality music of a wide variety, including musical of all styles and

from all periods (Forbes, 2001).

Selection criteria for music literature can generally be grouped into either the

aesthetic or technical domain (Jansen, 1995). The aesthetic criteria typically help

directors choose music that will increase the interest of choir members because the music

is appealing or interesting. The technical criteria aides the director in choosing music

that will build skill or vocal technique. However, the most effective musical literature

selections are ones that meet the criteria of both the aesthetic and technical domains

(Decker & Kirk, 1995; Elliott, 1995; Lamb, 1988).

Claude Palisca (1964), in the report of Yale Seminar to the Office of Education,

U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, wrote:

> If the goal of elementary and secondary music education is to awaken, increase,
> and refine the child's natural musicality, then the repertory used in most school
> systems in the United States is ill-chosen. It fails for the following reasons:
> 1. It is of appalling quality, representing little of the heritage of significant
>    music.
> 2. It is constricted in scope. Even the classics of Western music—such as the
>    great works of Bach, Mozart, Beethoven—do not occupy a central place in
>    singing, playing, and listening. Non-Western music, early Western Music,
>    and certain forms of jazz, popular, and folk music have been almost altogether
>    neglected.

3. It is rarely sufficiently interesting to enchant or involve a child to whom it is presumed to be accessible. Children's potential is constantly underestimated.
4. It is corrupted by arrangements, touched-up editions, erroneous transcriptions, and tasteless parodies to such an extent that authentic work is rare. A whole range of songbook arrangements, weak derivative semipopular children's pieces, and a variety of "educational" recordings containing music of similar value and type are to be strongly condemned as "pseudomusic." To the extent that artificial music is taught to children, to that extent are they invited to hate it. There is no reason or need to use artificial or pseudomusic in any of its forms.
5. Songs are chosen and graded more on the basis of the limited technical skills of classroom teachers than the needs of children or the ultimate goals of improved hearing and listening skills. This is one of the causes of the proliferation of feeble piano and autoharp accompaniments and of "sing-along" recordings.
6. The repertory of vocal music is chosen for its appeal to the lowest common denominator and for its capacity to offend the smallest possible number. More attention is often paid to the subject matter of the text, both in the choice and arrangement of material, than to the place of a song as music in the educational scheme. The texts are banal and lacking in regional inflection.
7. A rich treasury of solo piano music and chamber music is altogether neglected.
8. The repertory is not properly coordinated with the development of theoretical and historical insights.
9. No significant amount of music composed by children, particularly the children being taught, is included or treated seriously. (pp. 11–12)

Selecting music literature is a great responsibility for choral music educators. It is essential for music educators to have a well-developed philosophy of music education as it has been cited as a prerequisite for successful repertoire selection (Decker & Kirk, 1988; Hoffer, 2001). There are both explicit and implicit value judgments being placed on the music performed or studied. When students are exposed to a wide range and variety of music types, they are able to determine their own standards for what they consider quality music (Isbell, 2007). "Standards exist in music regardless of genre:

there is good and bad rock, good and bad jazz, and good and bad Telemann" (O'Brien, 1982).

Reames (2001), in a study entitled "High School Choral Directors' Description of Appropriate Literature for Beginning High School Choirs" sought to describe the literature being performed with beginning mixed choirs in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Participants were 210 high school choral directors who were current members of NAfME. Participants reporting having a beginning choir ($n = 157$) were used to calculate the frequency findings. While the only statistically significant finding revealed that teachers with more years of classroom experience programmed more Baroque literature for beginning high school choirs [$\chi^2$ (16, $N = 157$) = 22.40, $\rho = .13$, $\rho < .05$], Reames' findings indicated that 68% of teachers used 20th century literature for 20% or more of the music they programmed. Although this study does not specifically mention popular music, it is important to note the prevalence of music composed in the 20th century.

Participants were also asked about literature selection criteria in relation to technical and aesthetic criteria. Eighty-nine percent of the participants responded that both technical and aesthetic criteria were of equal importance when selecting literature for beginning choirs. When selecting music, participants indicated that the most useful source for finding music literature was through live performances of choral music. Choral music reading sessions, personal libraries, and the use of recordings were also used. The least valuable source identified was college methods classes.

Forbes' (2001) study "The Repertoire Selection Practices of High School Choral Directors" published in the *Journal of Research in Music Education,* directly referenced the inclusion of popular music repertoire in the choral curriculum. The purpose of this study was to research the repertoire selection practices of high school choral directors in regard to the nature of the repertoire selected, how it was selected, factors influencing directors' decisions, and to determine whether there was a relationship between repertoire selection and the perceived success of the director by recognized leaders in choral music education. In this study, Forbes identified two groups of high school choral educators. The first group was teachers deemed as 'outstanding' and nominated by collegiate faculty. The second group was comprised of all other not-nominated high school choral educators in the same geographical area. Data were collected through a written survey, telephone interview, and by participants forwarding their fall and spring concert programs.

Statistically significant differences were found between the two groups in regard to five demographic characteristics: (a) school enrollment ($\rho = .030$); (b) choral enrollment ($\rho = .001$); (c) the number of curricular choruses offered ($\rho = .001$); (d) student body minority population ($\rho = .017$); and (e) three measures of teacher experience ($\rho = .001$, $\rho = .000$, and $\rho = .000$).

Directors in the nominated group were generally found in larger schools, with larger choral programs, and more teaching experience. The not-nominated group of teachers was more likely to come from smaller schools with smaller choral enrollments and have less teaching experience. Nominated directors were more likely to teach in

schools with minority populations between 10% and 50% while the not-nominated group had either greater than 50% minority population or smaller than 10% minority population.

The exclusion of popular music from the curriculum for advanced students was higher for the nominated teachers, with 28.9% using zero pieces of popular music. One piece of popular music was included by 31.1% of nominated teachers. By combining these percentages, it is evident that popular music was either not included or minimally included by 60% of those named as 'outstanding.'

Teachers from the not-nominated group used a higher percentage of popular music. However, the results still show that 15.1% used zero pieces of popular music and 17.0% reported using only one piece of popular music in their advanced choirs. Sixty-eight percent of teachers used two or more pieces of popular music. Many of these teachers believed that including a high percentage of popular music would help to keep students enrolled in choir while appeasing community pressure to perform popular music.

Comparing the two groups' overall percentage of popular music literature in relation to beginning and advanced groups gives a more general picture of the quantity of popular music literature performed. Nominated teachers selected 16.2% and 17.2 % for beginning and advanced students, respectively. Not-nominated teachers' percentages were higher at 24.6% for beginning and 25.9% for advanced students.

Teachers believe that students should sing a higher percentage of classical music than folk or popular music. They indicated that finding quality popular music was difficult and that many of these compositions were not conducive to building proper

musicianship or vocal technique.  Directors were asked: "Choirs that perform a high percentage of popular music are sometimes criticized because the quality of much of the music performed is deemed by some to be substandard.  What are your beliefs on this topic?"  Of the teachers classified as nominated, 85% agreed with the statement while only 42% of the not-nominated teachers agreed.  However, most teachers indicated that popular music should be part of the total repertoire assuming directors select quality arrangements and compositions.

Participants were asked how frequently they used a list of sources for repertoire. Though not specifically concerning popular music, the top sources for overall repertoire were: (a) workshops and clinics, (b) live performances, (c) choral reading sessions, (d) recommendations from other directors, (e) recordings, and (f) music publisher sample scores.  Directors in the not-nominated group used publisher-supplied sample scores and catalogues ($\rho = .017$) more frequently than did directors in the nominated group.

Participants were asked to indicate how influential each listed criterion was in their selection of a piece of popular music literature for their program.  The most influential criteria for the selection of popular music literature were: (a) the student appeal of the work, (b) programming issues, (c) the public appeal of the work, (d) planned variety, (e) vocal maturity of the singers, (f) the potential of the work to provide for an aesthetic experience, and (g) director appeal of the composition.  Entertainment value was of more importance for popular music than for classical compositions, which indicated that selection criteria are not universally applied to all styles of music.

In the interview portion of the study, directors were asked how they select music for their most advanced choirs. Six criteria were identified as most important and were in the form of questions that most directors asked themselves: (a) Do I like it? (b) Can my choir perform it? (c) Does it meet the needs of the ensemble? (d) Will it work as part of the program that I have planned? (e) Is it a high-quality composition? and (f) Will the students like it?

Forbes did not define the term 'quality' in his study, but used the interview portion to determine what characteristics of the music directors examined to determine the quality of the song. Directors identified four major categories: (a) independent musical elements, (b) musical elements related to the characteristics, abilities, and needs of the ensemble, (c) director appeal of the composition, and (d) nonmusical elements.

The following section of related literature addresses the three broad categories that encompass the reasons teachers give for excluding popular music from the high school choral curriculum: (1) the music and materials available, (2) the teachers and their pedagogy, and (3) student concerns and social issues. Within each of these categories, subheadings are included to group related ideas. Much of this section references scholarly writing in the form of journal articles and research studies that are not directly related to popular music in the choral classroom, but have implications that are important to the topic.

**Reasons for Excluding Popular Music from the Curriculum**

**Music and Materials**

Teachers often cite issues with the music as a main reason that they do not include it in their curriculum.  Popular music is sometimes viewed as inherently inappropriate due to anything that is deemed objectionable including the poetry and the implications of the text (Chastagner, 1999; Hebert & Campbell, 2000; Jorgensen, 2002; Landeck, 1968; Monk, 1959), the lifestyle of the musicians and the impact the music is viewed to have on youth (Hebert & Campbell, 2000), and the perceived lack of value of popular music (S. Davis & Blair, 2011; Graham, 2009; Hebert & Campbell, 2000; J. Johnson, 2002; MacCluskey, 1979; Monk, 1959).

**Popular music's simplicity.**  There is a common belief among some teachers that popular music is 'simple music.'  The music has been described as being formulaic and filled with boring harmonies and rhythmic patterns (Dunbar-Hall & Wemyss, 2000; Middleton & Manuel, 2014; Monk, 1959), the form is predictable and unrefined, and that it "requires little intellectual effort to understand it" (S. Davis & Blair, 2011, p. 126). This generalization leads to the exclusion of popular music in the classroom in favor of music that is perceived as more complex.

**Quality and quantity.**  Teachers cite a shortage of materials, in both quantity and quality, as a reason they exclude popular music from their choral programs (Hebert & Campbell, 2000; Jorgensen, 2003; Mantie, 2013; Melnick, 2001; Monk, 1959; Pembrook, 1991; Woody, 2007).  Popular music is noticeably missing from well-respected music education resources, for example, the popular series *Teaching Music Through*

*Performance,* the Virginia Choral Directors Association's graded literature manual that provides the music selections available for the state choral assessment events, and many choral music education textbooks.

Popular music curricula continue to be relatively scarce in the USA (Hebert & Campbell, 2000). Websites offer current and detailed information on most popular music artists and arrangements of popular music for choral performing ensembles are available from music retailers like J. W. Pepper & Sons and publishing companies. Even though there are materials available, little information is provided on how to effectively incorporate these materials into an actual classroom or performance ensemble.

Many of these resources are closely related to their original source, oftentimes being a solo or small group of singers accompanied by instruments other than solo piano. Classroom ensembles do not operate under these ideal circumstances and frequently have other resources that are limited including time, funding, and personnel. Popular music arrangements often depend on expert vocal and instrumental skills that are not present in typical school programs (Monk, 1959). Arrangements for traditional school ensembles, including choirs, often do not do the music justice. Arrangements for choir are usually piano and vocal reductions of many instruments of varying styles (Woody, 2007). The lack of authenticity of the music performance may make the performance unsuccessful.

Staying up-to-date is a concern for teachers using popular music. The very nature of popular music means that it changes based on what is popular with the masses at the time and is closely linked with music marketing. Students' likes and dislikes change quickly, often every few weeks (Green, 2006). Even teachers who use popular music in

their classrooms cannot change their curriculum to correspond with students' changing preferences (Green, 2006). What is popular today may be considered over played and old very quickly. Another concern is that students often "conceal their 'real' musical tastes when at school in favor of appearing to be a part of the mass-mediated music of the Top 40" (Green, 2006, p. 105).

**Value.** Value judgments by the teacher on certain types of music dictate what types of music will be used in the classroom. There are music educators who do not believe that popular music has the same value as western art music, either educationally or aesthetically (S. Davis & Blair, 2011; Graham, 2009; J. Johnson, 2002; MacCluskey, 1979).

Rock music is an example of a genre that is specifically addressed in relation to its perceived aesthetic inferiority.

> The assumption of rock's aesthetic inferiority may often be attributed to (a) elitist attitudes regarding the putative achievements of bourgeoisie 'high art' versus that of 'the masses,' (b) naiveté regarding the values of rock musicianship, and (c) a lack of historical consciousness, particularly with regard to the natural process by which most inadequate creations are eventually discarded, failing the 'test of time.' (Hebert & Campbell, 2000, p. 17)

**Teacher and Pedagogy**

Including popular music in the choral classroom raises many pedagogical questions. How should popular music be included? How can the teaching, learning, and performance of popular music in the classroom be achieved in authentic ways? Which instructional strategies should be used to teach popular music? How should popular music learning and performances be assessed? How should teachers approach vocal

technique in the singing of popular music?  These questions point to many reasons why teachers choose to exclude popular music from their curriculum.

**Teacher education.**  The classical Western art tradition is still the primary focus of college and university music and music teacher education degree programs (Asmus, 2001; Emmons, 2004; Humphreys, 2002, 2006; Klocko, 1989; Nettle, 1995; Norman, 1999; Reimer, 2002; Rideout, 1990; Volk, 1998; Wang & Humphreys, 2009; Wicks, 1998).  Teachers have stated that they feel unprepared to teach popular music because their education and formal musical background did not include popular music (S. Davis & Blair, 2011; Hebert & Campbell, 2000; Isbell, 2007; MacCluskey, 1979).  Many colleges have "bypassed popular music, addressed it peripherally, or perhaps even strongly condemned it" (Pembrook, 1991, p. 30).  Teachers are of paramount importance in the traditional music education classroom due to their impact on curriculum choices. Their education, training, and preparation to become a teacher influence the way they think, feel, and ultimately act in regards to how they run their classroom.

There has been much attention drawn to music teacher education programs and the increased demands for public teaching licensure, accreditation requirements, and university policies (Jorgensen, 2003).  Popular music's integration into the collegiate curriculum has not been a common goal of teacher education programs in the United States (Hebert & Campbell, 2000).

College/university music education programs have been highly resistant to change according to a study published in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* by Sammie Ann Wicks.  Wicks (1998) found that almost 98% of current courses focused on the elite

western traditional music from the medieval era to the early 20th century. Only 1.4% of the courses at these colleges dealt directly with American musical traditions. Wicks also analyzed the topics in the journal *Ethnomusicology* and found that there were only five articles on American popular music over a fifty year time period.

Wang and Humphreys (2009) analyzed the content of American music teacher programs to estimate the amount and percentage of time music education majors spent on 13 styles of music, including popular music, in history, theory, and performance courses during a four-year program, both in and out of class. The findings indicated that an overwhelming majority of time was spent on western art music (92.83%) while only .54% was devoted to popular music. This small percentage of curriculum time has an estimated mean of 19.45 clock hours over a four-year period. This study also revealed that what little time students are exposed to popular music styles in college can be attributed to elective courses and the marching band, not core curriculum courses. The researchers conclude that it is unlikely for students who went through this curriculum to be prepared to teach popular music and that this lack of teacher preparation will continue to support a gap between K-12 music education and what students experience outside the classroom.

Many college faculty members are resistant to change, while some individuals are introducing progressive ideas, methods and courses (R. Johnson, 1997). Two national surveys (Dupree, 1990; Fonder & Eckrich, 1999) have shown that popular music was being added to music history and music theory syllabi in some colleges and universities. Wang & Humphreys (2009) also found that popular music was included, although

minimally, in a large university music school in the southwestern United States. Though scholarship in popular music and cultural studies is becoming stronger, much of it does not come from music faculty (R. Johnson, 1997).

Though students are beginning to demand more contemporary educational programs (Hannan, 2006; R. Johnson, 1997; Warner, 1997), ultimately teacher educators and music faculty are responsible for updating their syllabi to stay current (Hebert & Campbell, 2000). R. Johnson (1997) encourages educational programs to be "rooted in present practice and still be flexible enough to continue to adapt to the inevitability of change. We must learn from, and even savor, the past, but not become locked into it" (p. 4).

**Methods.** The majority of teacher education programs train teachers to use instructional strategies that are geared toward traditional choral music of the western classical style. It is rare to find programs and techniques that have been adapted to include popular music in ways that give it integrity (Isbell, 2007). When popular music is included in the curriculum, it is likely to be taught in the same manner as Western classical music where the teacher controls the entire process beginning with the choice of literature and ending with the assessment of the performance (Lebler, 2008). Although this is typical in the United States, Australia has made strides to include popular music in stylistically appropriate ways through both performance and pedagogy.

Dunbar-Hall and Wemyss (2000) propose that the introduction of popular music into the curriculum in Australia in the 1970s caused music educators methodological problems and ultimately led to the development of alternate methods, which reshaped the

field of music education in Australia. It was determined that the methods used before 1970 were not suitable for teaching popular music and so pedagogical changes took place. Changes included the development of new teaching methodologies, the inclusion of aspects of multiculturalism, and the use of new technologies that aligned the music education pedagogy in a way that is more closely aligned with the process of popular music production outside of the school setting.

The changes that have taken place in Australia are not universal and have not made large impacts on American music education systems. Western classical instructional methods are not true to the way popular music is learned and performed.

*No notation*. Teaching music reading skills is a common goal among choral educators. In the United States, large ensembles that emphasize notation reading are the norm (Mark, 1986), and therefore the reading of standard notation has become the focus of much teaching and learning in the music classroom (Dunbar-Hall & Wemyss, 2000). Because of this focus, popular music has not been included in choral classrooms as regularly as in other countries (Abril & Gault, 2008). Many teachers believe that music reading is a key element of lifelong learning in music. Although some teachers believe that rote learning is a key stage in the music learning process, other teachers work towards the goal of music reading in ways that do not include any rote work. Therefore, teaching music by rote has garnered a negative connotation for some teachers and teaching popular music in an authentic way, by use of oral/aural traditions, is seen as counter to the goals of music literacy.

*Authenticity.*  Authenticity, in western classical music, refers to performances that use period instruments and seek to recreate performance practices of the period (Sherman, 1998).  Authenticity in popular music performance follows this same premise. The use of appropriate instruments and performance practices (including vocal timbre and technique) are needed to have authentic popular music performances.

Teachers show concern about authenticity in the classroom, too (Green, 2006). Most teachers now understand the importance of authentic music examples, arrangements, instruments, teaching methods, and even context when including music of another culture.  Though popular music is often closely related to or considered a part of the teenage student's culture, it may or may not be identified as a part of the adult teacher's culture.  Popular music can be thought of as subculture of American music and so teachers should strive to give it the same consideration as they would when performing the music of another culture (Woody, 2007).  When these principles are applied to popular music, it can be overwhelming to teachers (Green, 2006).  Even teachers with the best of intentions may have difficulties recreating popular music performances with their students.

Teachers have two basic options when performing popular music: to use traditional ensembles, or to create nontraditional ensembles.  Using traditional large choral ensembles is likely the easiest on the teacher, but the results are often inauthentic because the popular music is not being performed in its original arrangement.  Creating nontraditional ensembles (i.e. small groups or a soloist with a rock band) is often more

difficult for teachers within a typical large ensemble, but is a more effective way of presenting popular music in an authentic way (Pembrook, 1991).

When students in Green's (2006) study were asked to recreate music that they chose, teachers were worried about the lack of authentic instruments and the technical difficulty of replicating professionally produced music. They were especially concerned because it was the students' own culture of popular music. Though teachers indicated they were very concerned, the students did not express concern about the authenticity of their musical products (Green, 2006). Green suggests that it may be advantageous for teachers to shift their authenticity concerns to the process and pedagogy of teaching popular music rather than the authenticity of the actual musical product.

*Context within classroom*. Placing popular music in the classroom, and more specifically a traditional performing ensemble, changes the context of the music drastically. For consumers of popular music, especially teenage students, popular music is something they listen to, enjoy, and even sing along to, but is not considered a topic of study. Green (2006) observed that popular music's "very presence [in the classroom] often means that it ceases to be considered 'popular music' by the pupils" (p. 105). Students may react negatively to the use of 'their' music in a way that they are not used to or do not want (Green, 2002). By incorporating popular music as a topic of study, the teacher is requiring a change of context for the student. The educational value may be present, but if popular music is approached in a formal manner, it may turn students away from music they love and identify with (Green, 2006).

This harm may exceed the educational value.  If students no longer want to listen to, perform, or otherwise engage with 'their' music, and placing it in the context of formal music education is to blame, then the student may be discouraged from continuing with formal music education.  Decreasing student enrollment is clearly not a goal of most teachers and causing students to dislike music, in any form, is also counterproductive.

**Performance problems.**  The performance of popular music brings a unique set of problems to the classroom.  The choral ensemble is not the norm for popular music performance.  Popular music is typically written for solo or small groups. Creating nontraditional ensembles (solos or small groups) involves more work for the teacher and may necessitate involving school administrators to change the master class schedule. However, nontraditional ensembles are the more effective way of presenting popular music authentically (Pembrook, 1991).

If the teacher chooses to create nontraditional ensembles, issues of access to musicians, instruments, appropriate vocal ensemble members, and introducing sound technologies make performing popular music a challenge.  The typical choral classroom uses piano as accompaniment, but to have authentic performances of most popular music, a variety of instruments are necessary.  The majority of popular music songs are accompanied by a combination of guitar (electric or acoustic), bass guitar, drums, and keyboard (Pembrook, 1991).  It can be very difficult for choral teachers to find local musicians who are capable and willing to play for such performances, and can be a large financial burden to pay qualified musicians.

With the addition of authentic instrumentation comes the need for sound technology that is often not required of traditional choral music. The sheer difficulty of reproducing professionally produced music is intimidating. The logistics of presenting a concert that incorporates a rock band requires an advanced knowledge of sound engineering and equipment that many teachers and programs do not have. Finding and paying for the services of people with these skills can also be difficult and costly.

*Vocal technique*. Vocal technique and vocal health are of great concern for choral teachers when choosing music literature (Forbes, 2001; Hebert & Campbell, 2000; Ponick, 2000). This is especially true of teachers of adolescents whose voices have not fully developed. Because one goal of teaching voice is to develop a student's use of head tone, it is often easier to use classical or folks songs (Ponick, 2000).

Teachers are worried that the performance of popular music can potentially damage young voices. When performing popular music, students "wish to imitate stylistic features, including voice production, that they hear in familiar popular songs and styles" (Ponick, 2000, p. 28). Smith-Vaughn's (2007) study indicated that students had significantly more vocal tension when performing gospel ($p = .002$) and musical theater ($p = .001$) than when performing in the classical style. The classical style was found to have a more relaxed musculature.

*Limits time for other genres*. Teachers believe that the use of popular music in the classroom limits the time available for the student to learn other worthwhile styles or genres of music (Forbes, 2001; Hebert & Campbell, 2000; Monk, 1959). Others believe that students already have exposure to popular music; so to use class time to cover it

would be wasteful. These teachers believe that class time should only be spent on music

that they would not experience outside of the classroom (Hebert & Campbell, 2000;

Monk, 1959).

Many teachers see carrying on the traditions of Western classical music as an

important mission of music education because they see it disappearing from the public's

view. Jorgensen (2003) spoke to this and referenced the belief that popular music plays a

role in the decline:

> Western classical music is marginalized in general education and the civic spaces
> of public life. Where once it held a privileged place, it seems now to have
> acquired (in some quarters at least) a negative connotation as a bastion of elitism
> and privilege. Instead, popular musics (with a nod to musics of other cultures)
> have pride of place in much elementary and secondary music education and in
> many university and college offerings designed for students whose principal fields
> of study lie outside music. An all-too-common musical illiteracy or, at best,
> elementary level of musical literacy and aurality renders western classical music
> inaccessible to the general public just as the pervasiveness of popular music
> renders it inaudible and invisible. (p. 130)

Those who view popular music as a threat to western classical music may also view its

introduction into the choir classroom as a contributing factor to the problem of

maintaining proper perspectives (Monk, 1959). Students may lose interest in classical

and other genres in favor of solely learning music with which they are familiar.

*Assessment.* Assessment procedures for popular music are a concern for some

music educators and are a reason given to exclude popular music from performance.

Warner's (1997) article, "'I'll Give It Five': The Assessment of Popular Music

Performance," addresses many topics of concern in the assessment of popular music.

Warner identifies the root of the problem as trying to apply traditional musicology,

analysis, theory and composition to popular music because popular music does not adhere to classical patterns. Traditional assessment of music performance focuses solely on musical aspects, but popular music performance depends on many elements. Warner states that popular music performance "is a complex artistic phenomenon involving several distinct elements, including music, movement, drama, visual stimuli and linguistic expression" (p. 38).

The incorporation of modern technology also adds difficulty to assessment. Popular music often uses MIDI sequencing, pre-recorded material, and other electronic elements that challenge the traditional skill based assessment. This can be taken as far as to question the value of technique as a pre-requisite for successful performances. The fact that popular music performances are usually the work of a team further complicates assessment. Some team members may have no music-making actions, but are a part of the overall performance. These team members may include dancers, lighting or sound technicians. Other team members may have a musical job, but also be expected to contribute by way of movement. Missing any of these components makes the overall performance weaker. Limiting assessment to purely musical elements does not work for popular music.

Choral teachers may also be concerned about the performance of popular music at large ensemble festivals. If popular music is not included on the list of approved literature for these events, ensembles cannot use it as part of their adjudication literature. This value judgment, whether viewed as explicit or implicit, may impact the overall use

of the genre.  If the reward system does not value certain styles of music, then it is hard to expect teachers to include popular music.

If popular music were to be included at large ensemble festivals, typical adjudication forms may need to be adapted or organizations may need to adopt a new form all together.  The Virginia Music Educators Association/Virginia Choral Directors Association Performance Assessment is judged using an adjudication form (Appendix C) that rates performers in six categories.

1. Tone- Healthy tone, focus, breath management, age appropriate
2. Intonation- Note accuracy, chords, intervals, unisons, tonal awareness
3. Diction- Vowels, consonants, languages, syllabic stress
4. Musical effect- Phrasing, dynamics, style, rhythmic precision, tempo
5. Balance/blend- Within/across: vocal sections, ensemble, dynamic spectrum
6. Stage presence- Posture, focus, professionalism, facial expression (VCDA, n.d.)

Although the performance of traditional, large-ensemble choral music certainly shares some similar features, the style of performance of popular music does not fit neatly into these categories.  Some would argue that it does not fit any of the categories, while others would say that the categories are similar, but the clarifying concepts must have different expectations.

Defining an appropriate assessment strategy for popular music requires considerable work and change on the part of the educator.  Many do not desire to change from traditional assessment norms and often do not (Warner, 1997).

**Student Concerns and Social Issues**

Popular music and the possibility of its negative impact on students has been the topic of much debate, especially between generations, in relation to lyrics and the lifestyles of popular musicians. Concerns about lyrics range from the text being trite (Jorgensen, 2002; Monk, 1959) to lyrics being offensive in language or subject matter (D. Baker, 1992; Hebert & Campbell, 2000; Monk, 1959). In the choral classroom, there are also concerns about the lyrics. If teachers choose to include popular music, it may be used as a 'bait-and-switch' tactic in an effort to draw students into the program and then only include it occasionally (Cuttietta, 1991; Gaitandjiev, 1997; Green, 2006).

**Classroom environment.** The 'bait-and-switch tactic' previously referenced is when teachers only use popular music occasionally, or as a recruiting tool, to draw students into the program so they will learn about classical music as a result (Cuttietta, 1991; Gaitandjiev, 1997; Green, 2006). Popular music in school does not mean just singing or listening to music students prefer just so they will have fun (Gaitandjiev, 1997). This approach is misleading to students and implies that popular music is not valued as a legitimate genre in and of itself (Green, 1988, 2006; Vulliamy, 1977a, 1977b). While this may be an effective recruiting strategy at least initially, students' exposure to and learning of popular music is merely superficial and lacks a solid educational purpose. The classroom environment may also suffer when students expect one thing and experience another based on information they are presented with that is not completely accurate.

**Social concerns.**

*Lyrics/text*.  Lyrics are an important part of vocal music.  Popular music often uses language that is unacceptable for a school setting.  Besides the obvious use of vulgar language, popular music also addresses topics that are taboo in the school environment including numerous songs that contain sexually suggestive lyrics or lyrics pertaining to drug use or gang violence (D. Baker, 1992; Hebert & Campbell, 2000; Monk, 1959).  The concern about secular lyrics has been an ongoing issue throughout the history of music and date back to the Medieval era when Goliards, itinerant poet-musicians, wrote lyrics that were profane and dealt with drunkenness, debauchery, and lechery (Goliard, 2015).  In 1985, the Parent's Music Resource Center lobbied for and achieved their goal of having warning labels placed on all recordings that were determined to be inappropriate for youth (Chastagner, 1999).

Music educators have tried different strategies to introduce popular music into the classroom while maintaining appropriate content and lyrics.  Beatrice Landeck applied a rock beat to folk songs to allow for the stylistic aspects of rock to be present and attract young people, but simultaneously avoid the controversial topics addressed in the lyrics (Landeck, 1968).  Hebert and Campbell (2000), however, suggest, "a policy of avoiding these topics may only serve to reify existing social problems and popular music might, to the contrary, be utilized as the ideal forum for initiating meaningful discussions of such issues" (p. 17).

Quality of lyrics or poetry is a concern even if the subject matter is appropriate. Many teachers feel that popular music lyrics are banal, cliché, or uninspired (Jorgensen,

2002; Monk, 1959).  Jorgensen (2002) identified several aims of music education, one of which was that music education was intended to move the population from the crude towards the sophisticated.  In this way, using popular music would cater to the interest of the masses and maintain the high arts as inaccessible to the majority of the population.

*Role model effect.*  Popular musicians are often thought of as role models for youth whether they intend to be or not.  The lifestyles of these musicians are called into question frequently in response to the ever-present media coverage of their personal lives.  Issues of immorality, violence, substance abuse, and other socially unhealthy and unacceptable behaviors are of concern when these musicians are viewed by youth as people to emulate.  We know that fandom plays a role in musical behaviors such as listening, going to concerts, and writing fan mail (deVries, 2004), but it can also manifest in negative behavior choices as was the case with Mark David Chapman who killed John Lennon (Jensen, 1992).  Therefore,

> it is a social responsibility to acknowledge the connection between art and reality, to determine when music and poetry reflect and portray socially unacceptable realities, and to assess the influence of such popular performers on the thoughts and behaviors of young listeners. (Hebert & Campbell, 2000, p. 18)

It is important to note that classical musicians are not held to the same standards as popular musicians (Hebert & Campbell, 2000).  Richard Wagner's anti-Semitism (Poliakov, 2003), Ludwig von Beethoven's angry outbursts (Mai, 2008), or Robert Schumann's trouble with alcohol (Peters, 2011), does not hinder teachers from using their music for study.

The following section of related literature addresses the three broad categories that encompass the reasons teachers give for including popular music in the high school choral curriculum: (a) the music and materials available, (b) the teachers and their pedagogy, and (c) student concerns and social issues. Within each of these categories, subheadings are included to group related ideas. Much of this section references scholarly writing in the form of journal articles and research studies that are not directly related to popular music in the choral classroom, but have implications that are important to the topic.

## Reasons for Including Popular Music in the Curriculum

Popular music's inclusion in secondary education has increased in recent decades (Lebler, 2008). While there are still concerns attached to the use of popular music, many teachers see the advantages or positive aspects of including popular music. Even though popular music is generally accepted as part of a 'varied repertoire of music,' researchers in the United States still feel the need to justify the choice to include popular music in the curriculum (Evans, 1983; Farmer, 1976; Fowler, 1970; Housewright et al., 1970; Kern, 1977; MacCluskey, 1969a, 1969b, 1979; Roem, 1968; Willis, 1970), unlike countries such as Australia and the United Kingdom that have national curricula that specifically include popular music. The following section includes arguments in favor of including popular music as a part of a "multilayered, multigenre, and multistyle practice" (Gaitandjiev, 1997, p. 67). Arguments for the inclusion of popular music are divided into three categories: (1) the music and materials available, (2) the teachers and their pedagogy, and (3) student concerns and social issues.

**Music and Materials**

Those who include popular music in their curricula have at their disposal a wealth of musical choices.  Popular music can be included to teach musical concepts and for performance.

**Popular music's simplicity.**  Many people view popular music as simple, or at least less complex than other music (S. Davis & Blair, 2011; Pembrook, 1991).  Those who include popular music do not see this as negative.  The simplicity of some popular music allows the teacher to introduce concepts that may not be accessible in larger, more complicated works (Grashel, 1979).  The Manhattanville Music Curriculum Project introduced the spiral curriculum, a sequence of concepts that are introduced at increasing levels of difficulty, to music education in the 1960s (Thomas, 1970).  When applying the spiral curriculum to music, the teacher presents concepts like form, rhythm, and melody at a level that is equivalent to the experience level of the student.  Popular music can be used in significant ways at the lower end of the spiral because it is at the student's experience level.  There is also the possibility of including popular music at other levels of the spiral (Pembrook, 1991).  Popular music is the music preferred by most teenagers (Benner, 1972; Grashel, 1979), and so the difficulty level of certain skills may be irrelevant at times because the students have informally gained the skills necessary to perform the music.

**Quality and quantity.**  The quality of music chosen to include in the curriculum should be a concern for teachers.  For teachers who include popular music as

performance literature, this is also true.  Selecting quality arrangements and compositions should still be a goal (Forbes, 2001).

Teachers who include popular music to teach concepts through listening need only an Internet connection to access recordings of millions of popular music songs. Those who include popular music as performance literature for large ensembles have a smaller number of songs from which to select.  However, a simple search of JW Pepper's website (www.jwpepper.com) reveals 632 choral arrangements of popular music in various voicings and ranging in difficulty from "easy" to "collegiate repertoire."  For those teachers who include solo popular music performance literature, the JW Pepper search results in 33,771 options, many of which are songbooks that include multiple songs.

**Value.**  Popular music, like all music, is valuable.  Lucy Green's (2006) theory states that there are two types of musical meaning: inherent and delineated.  Inherent meaning is "the ways in which the materials that are inherent in music—sounds and silences—are patterned in relation to each other" (p. 102).  Sometimes teachers use popular music in ways that do not show that they value the music.  Teachers may hope that including popular music will lead students to classical music.  This bait-and-switch approach devalues popular music (Green, 1988; Green, 2006; Vulliamy, 1977a, 1977b). While popular music may have value in leading students to an appreciation of other music, it can also be valued for its inherent meaning—sounds, silences, and the way they work together (Green, 2006).

Popular music is also valuable because of its delineated meaning. Delineated meaning refers to the connotations of social, cultural, religious, or political associations that music carries. These associations may be shared among a group or may be personal in nature, but all music must have some delineated meaning (Green, 2006).

**Teacher and Pedagogy**

Pedagogy, or the method of teaching, is rooted in historical practice and is often geared towards a repertoire of western classical tradition. Including popular music is a pedagogical choice that can have benefits for students, but has resulted in methodological problems for teachers (Dunbar-Hall & Wemyss, 2000). Although popular music is being increasingly incorporated into secondary and post-secondary schools, it is likely to be approached pedagogically the same way as western classical music, where the teacher is in control of which music is performed, how it is learned, and the assessment of the performance (Green, 2005; Lebler, 2008). This pedagogical approach changes popular music's inherent meanings (Green, 2006). Popular music in the classroom has necessitated a rethinking and reworking of the teaching and learning processes (Dunbar-Hall & Wemyss, 2000). An authentic pedagogical approach that incorporates popular music's informal learning practices includes self-teaching and peer directed learning (Green, 2005) and provides for student autonomy, individualized learning, expression, groups support, and offers many social benefits (Woody, 2007). The following sections speak to pedagogical advantages for including popular music into the curriculum and how popular music can be incorporated effectively.

**Teacher education.**

*Cultural studies.* Music education is sometimes defined as cultural studies, or as "a subject concerned with uncovering the differences and power relationships among groups of people and their cultures" (Dunbar-Hall, 2005, p. 33). By studying music in this way, the music curriculum is relevant to students and can address issues of poverty, ownership, and social justice. It allows students to analyze the relationships between cultures, in particular ones where one culture has power over another (Dunbar-Hall, 2005).

A growing number of choral music educators are exploring a multicultural approach to the choral singing experience by investigating a variety of culturally-based vocal aesthetics. Mary Goetze describes this approach as 'social justice through music.' The general idea is that all musics and the cultures that beget them are valued. Goetze, in particular, uses an intense method to learn about the cultural and musical aspects of pieces she introduces to her choirs. She spends time in the culture that she is studying. She participates, gathers information and tools, observes, and is a part of the daily life of the people who make the music. Goetze is careful to be respectful of the people, their cultural values, and the music (Indiana University, 2016).

While Goetze's focus is largely on music from cultures other than the culture of the students she teaches, the same principles can be applied to the inclusion of music from the student's culture: popular music. "From punk rock, to reggae, to dance music, lifestyle choices and subcultural membership can be aligned to different types of popular music, and in this way the network of popular music styles can be read as a system of

multiculturalism" (Dunbar-Hall & Wemyss, 2000, p. 26). This association of popular

music with a co-cultural membership (a culture functioning alongside a larger culture)

and identity leads to the conclusion that popular music is, in fact, multicultural music.

Multiculturalism in music deals with both teaching music to diverse populations

of students and the teaching of music from diverse cultures (Hebert & Campbell, 2000).

Goals of multicultural music education today include acknowledging diverse populations

and gaining an understanding of society and the world through music. Music education

often focuses on a piece of music as an example of how musical concepts are used in the

composition. This approach limits, and possibly eliminates, cultural elements of the

music including how different cultures influence the way musical concepts are used. By

taking a concept only approach, students are forced to analyze music from a Eurocentric

or 'westernized' view. Without acknowledging the cultural implications of the music and

also including culturally appropriate methods to teach the music, students receive an

incomplete and shallow implementation of multiculturalism (Dunbar-Hall, 2005).

The inclusion of popular music lends itself to the ideas and goals of

multiculturalism. Popular music is multicultural music. Students come from various

backgrounds, cultures, and subgroups. Drawing from this diversity, teachers can

incorporate popular music as a way of not only presenting a wide variety of music, but

also as a way of reaching diverse populations of students.

Clayton Parr (2006), in his article *Eight Simple Rules for Singing Multicultural*

*Music*, encouraged teachers to step out of their comfort zone so they and their students

can benefit from the vast array of musics and cultures of the world. Parr defines

multiculturalism as having many beliefs. Some of these beliefs may be similar to or very different from what we hold as our own beliefs. In the musical context this may include our beliefs about vocal technique, who sings the music, when and where something is performed, what a 'good' arrangement is, performance practices, language, or religious beliefs. In studying and performing multicultural music, sometimes we must set aside those beliefs so we can experience the music in the ways that the original culture did.

For choral singers this idea of setting aside beliefs is especially important. Because singers use their body to make the sounds, Parr suggests that singers must internalize the beliefs of the culture. While this suggestion may be controversial, the idea that authentic performances rely on an understanding of the context of the music and so, vocal technique, emotional aspects, and the meaning of the text inform how the music should be performed. If the music is not treated with the respect it deserves, including trying to make it as authentic as possible, what results is merely a caricature of the original. Parr suggests that when dealing with multicultural music, choral directors and singers should always strive for accuracy, honesty, integrity, and passion. In trying to present choral music in this manner, Parr gave eight rules for interacting with and performing multicultural choral music: (a) connect with culture, (b) focus on one style at a time, (c) listen widely, (d) provide the context, (e) seek authentic sources, (f) learn the language, (g) teach authentically, and (h) leave your comfort zone. These rules should be used as a guide and a starting point. As directors feel more comfortable, they can go farther.

Parr's ideas are about how to approach multicultural music, but only briefly

address how to choose multicultural music arrangements.  By selecting quality music and

arrangements, you set your students up for a deeper understanding of the music and

cultures and successful performances.  In Circling the Globe: Multicultural Resources

published in the *Music Educator's Journal* (1992), Judith Cook Tucker presents a

checklist of criteria for selecting published multicultural music.  She also provides a list

of published songs for different levels of choir that meet these criteria.

1. Musician/scholar from within the culture involved in the preparation?
2. Cultural context included for each piece or section: contributor, occasion, specific location and cultural group, common ages of participants, clothing, instruments normally used, etc.?
3. Typical arrangement and accompaniment suggested or included; minimal or no adaption?
4. Game/dance songs include adequate instructions?
5. Historical/geographical background included; maps, photographs, and illustrations?
6. Lyrics in original language (identified by name/transliteration/pronunciation)?
7. Translations: literal, interpreted with any deeper significance explained, possible singable version?
8. Listening/performance tape: Is there a tape; who performs on it; when, where, and how recorded; annotated? (Tucker, 1992, p. 38)

**Methods.**

*Standards*.  Choral teachers are expected to meet standards of learning set by

local, state, and national organizations.  The National Association for Music Educators

(NAfME) developed national music standards for performing ensembles to address the

artistic processes of creating, performing, and responding:

Creating
1. Imagine: generate musical ideas for various purposes and contexts.
2. Plan and Make: Select and develop musical ideas for defined purposes and contexts.
3. Evaluate and Refine: Evaluate and refine selected musical ideas to create musical work that meets appropriate criteria.
4. Present: Share creative musical work that conveys intent, demonstrates craftsmanship, and exhibits originality.

Performing
5. Select: Select varied musical works to present based on interest, knowledge, technical skill, and context.
6. Analyze: Analyze the structure and context of varied musical works and their implications for performance.
7. Interpret: Develop personal interpretations that consider creators' intent.
8. Rehearse, Evaluate, and Refine: Evaluate and refine personal and ensemble performances, individually or in collaboration with others.
9. Present: Perform expressively, with appropriate interpretation and technical accuracy, and in a manner appropriate to the audience and context.

Responding
10. Select: Choose music appropriate for specific purposes and contexts.
11. Analyze: Analyze how the structure and context of varied musical works inform the response.
12. Interpret: Support and interpretation of a musical work that reflects the creators'/performers' expressive intent.
13. Evaluate: Support personal evaluation of musical works and performance(s) based on analysis, interpretation, and established criteria.

Connecting
14. Synthesize and relate knowledge and personal experiences to make music.
15. Relate musical ideas and works with varied context to deepen understanding.  (NAfME, 2015)

These national standards are not mandatory for states and local education agencies (LEA) and therefore, different sets of standards are followed depending on where the school is located.  However, many states and LEAs used the national standards to guide their standard development.

Popular music can be used to effectively teach music standards (Isbell, 2007; Ponick, 2000). For example, let us consider the following scenario and how each standard is addressed. A student is performing a popular music solo with keyboard, guitar, bass, and drum accompaniment for a spring pops concert. The student first selects a song to sing by listening to multiple songs and deciding which one she likes best, fits her voice, and she feels comfortable performing (Standards 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6). The student then practices with the recording and sheet music to learn the words, rhythms, and pitches (Standards 7 and 8). The student then meets with the band members to practice (Standard 7), but hears that the drums are not playing the correct rhythm in the refrain (Standard 7). The student asks the drummer to play the rhythm she sings as a model for him (Standard 9). Next the student meets with her background dancers and shows them the dance she wants performed during the song. They also discuss the concert attire that they will wear to match the image of the song (Standard 14), which is influenced by Latin American rhythms and dances (Standard 15). The student performs the song for her spring pops concert (Standard 9). Following the performance, the student reflects on the performance through guided questions from the teacher (Standard 11, 12, and 13).

This scenario provides a brief, but illustrative example of how popular music can provide an accessible venue for advanced skill development that may be harder to provide with the traditional choral curriculum. Ponick (2000) cautions educators not to make popular music the sole genre used to teach the standards, but that it should be part of a well-rounded program of study.

*Concept teaching.* Paul Lehman states that "all music is made up of the same elements, including melody, rhythm, harmony, form, timbre, and dynamics. Different kinds of music use those elements in different ways, but, with few exceptions, any music can be used to teach any elements" and that "good teachers use a variety of types of music to bring about student learning" (as cited in Ponick, 2000, p. 24). Popular music can be used to teach musical concepts such as (a) timbre, (b) rhythm, (c) pitch and melody, (d) intensity, (e) texture, and (f) form, as well as others (Forbes, 2001; Grashel, 1979; Isbell, 2007; McCluskey, 1979; O'Brien, 1982).

Pembrook (1991) believes that "the decision as to whether popular music will be included in the classroom curricula or concerts should be based on the same criteria used for any other genre of music" (p. 31). The criteria Pembrook referenced are (a) sound, (b) harmony, (c) melody, (d) rhythm, and (e) growth. The following is a brief discussion of how popular music addresses each concept.

The sound of a song is determined by its texture, timbre, dynamic inflection, and instrumentation. Typical instrumentation for popular music is keyboard, electric guitar, bass guitar, and drums (Pembrook, 1991). Simply playing two popular music selections at the beginning of class and asking students to note similarities and differences is a way to start a discussion about the sounds associated with popular music (McCluskey, 1979). Some students when listening to popular music fixate on one aspect of the song (often the lyrics) and do not notice what else is occurring in the music. Determining when instruments are added is a rudimentary skill associated with describing texture and

timbre.  A more advanced skill is then to describe how the addition/subtraction of an instrument changes the sound and feel of the music.

Harmony includes the concepts of tonal center, modulations, types and functions of chords, and cadence types and locations (Pembrook, 1991).  Popular music is well suited to teach these concepts because it is thought of as simple.  The chordal harmonies are often based on the primary chords of tonic, subdominant, and dominant.  Pembrook (1991) analyzed the number one song from *Billboard* in the popular category from 1965–1990 and found that 70% of the harmonies used were I, IV, or V chords.  Modulations do not occur frequently, but if they do occur it is temporary or happens near the end of a piece changing up a half-step or a whole step to increase tension (Pembrook, 1991).  Current popular music uses a wider variety of compositional techniques and chord progressions like I-V-vi-IV or I-vi-III-VII.  If students are familiar with a popular music selection they will be able to focus more intently on the new concepts being learned and how it relates to the sounds they already know.

The concept of melody encompasses the range, type of motion, chromaticism, mode, and melismatic versus syllabic text settings (Pembrook, 1991).  Popular music often has modal influences that can be a way to expose students to something other than major/minor tonalities.  Melody lines in popular music also frequently have an emphasis on a repeated tone that may show that the melody is of lesser concern to composers than lyrics (Pembrook, 1991).  Students' familiarity with the melody line, especially in vocal music, can only benefit student learning.  Guiding students to a deeper understanding of

how the melody is composed, including how the text influences those choices, will lead to more content knowledge and better performances.

Rhythm concepts include meter, tempo, and rhythmic ostinatos (Pembrook, 1991). The majority of popular music is quadruple/simple meter (Pembrook, 1991; Schroedl, 2001). The meter is often easily identifiable because the strong beats are reinforced by the bass drum. Popular music is sometimes generalized as having the same tempo no matter the song, but popular music tempos range from very slow to a frenetic pace (Pembrook, 1991). The variation in tempo lends itself to various dance styles that often accompany popular music performances.

Ostinatos, in particular rhythmic ostinatos, are found throughout popular music (Dunbar-Hall & Wemyss, 2000; MacCluskey, 1979) in drum kit rhythms, bass guitar patterns, lead guitar riffs, and chord progressions. These ostinatos provide a useful way to introduce students to instrumental playing if equipment is available, or as sound material to relate to written notation (Dunbar-Hall & Wemyss, 2000). Because ostinatos are pattern-based, they are consistent with the accepted music education methodologies of Orff, Kodaly, and Music Learning Theory.

Pembrook (1991) defines music's formal structure and symmetrical versus nonsymmetrical phrase structure as growth. Though the term growth is not widely used, the concept is. Because most popular music songs are similar in length, the formal structure is often similar, too. The formal structure of popular music commonly follows this pattern: instrumental introduction, verse, chorus, verse, chorus, instrumental interlude, chorus, and fadeout ending (Pembrook, 1991). Form is a concept that students

often struggle with because educators try to teach it within the context of classical forms. Young musicians are not accustomed to hearing long pieces of music and therefore have a hard time determining the form of a movement of a symphony. Students are more likely to be able to comprehend the form if given a popular song. Making connections for students from what they know to what they do not understand will make classical forms and learning seem easier (deVries, 2004).

Grashel's (1979) study of three introductory programs in music form used popular music as introductory material in combination with band literature. Participants ($N =$ 168) were in four middle school band classes. Three classes were given one of the three treatments: in-class instruction, programmed instruction, and a combination of in-class and programmed instruction. The fourth class served as the control group. The researcher developed *Form* test was administered to determine whether the experimental treatments were effective in developing knowledge of form. All treatments were effective [($F = 221.676$), ($\rho = .001$)]. This study indicates that intermediate instrumentalists can learn the concept of musical form from strategies that use popular music as introductory material and can transfer that knowledge to unfamiliar band literature.

***Informal learning.*** Informal learning in music is an undervalued aspect of a student's growth and progression. Musicians are likely to encounter two different approaches to their musical learning. One approach is formal and often occurs in music classrooms or private lessons. The other approach is informal, or vernacular, music experiences students have outside of school (O'Flynn, 2006; Small, 1987).

Formal music practice involves a teacher or someone with superior skills imparting knowledge and skills in a linear fashion. This teacher is in charge of the learning and evaluation. In formal music education there is often a feeling that students do not learn, or at least do not learn as well, if they are not taught properly. The goals of formal music education are to be technically proficient and expressive on an instrument or the voice (Jaffurs, 2004). Some musicians trained in conservatories or universities may feel that once they have graduated they have gathered all of the knowledge and skills that they need (Jaffurs, 2004).

Many young musicians continue to learn music informally through participation in peer-organized garage bands playing music of their own choosing, often popular music of their generation (Campbell, 1995; Jaffurs, 2004; Woody & Lehmann, 2010). Informal learning is often characterized by autonomous, self-directed, self-assessed, and intrinsically motivated learning (Green, 2001, 2006; Jaffurs, 2004; Westerlund, 2006).

Formal and informal music learning share some common goals: composing, arranging, improvisation, and learning to sing and play instruments (Jaffurs, 2004). Though many of the goals are the same, the approach to achieving those goals is quite different. Jaffurs (2004), based on Green's work, identifies the informal music learning standards as:

1. Listening—able to glean information for copying the music. Learning through listening and remembering what is heard. There are three types of listening: 1) purposive listening; listening for use later, to remember and compare so you can put it to use or describe it later, 2) attentive listening; listening with same concentration as purposive but without trying to remember for later, 3) distracted listening: listening to music intermittently with no intention for later use but for reasons of enjoyment.

2. Evaluating—ability to judge correctness, modify and evaluating continually.
3. Chord progressions—ability to play standard chord progressions as in a 12 bar blues. This ability advances over time. Eventually players hear changes that are more complex and unfamiliar, they copy and use what is heard.
4. Timbre qualities—ability to detect timbral qualities in the music they want to copy. These styles might be country, heavy metal, and rock and roll.
5. Style sensitivity—familiar with many styles and sensitive to individual styles. Adaptable to the idiosyncrasies of the style and able to change quickly even if unfamiliar with a selection.
6. Technical proficiency—can play in any key and easily maneuver around the instrument or voice.
7. Repertoire—has a repertoire of between fifty to several hundred songs.
8. Reproduction—can reproduce exact imitations of songs they hear; able to copy the key structure, harmonic structure, timbre, textual and rhythmic qualities.
9. Improvisation/Creativity—can "make it up as they go along," embellish, arrange and contribute creative ideas to the music.
10. Reading—ability to read is not required but those who can read use it as a "memory jogger," accurate sight reading is not required.
11. Continually improving and growing seeks ways to widen knowledge and skills. Listens to all genres of music for new ideas.
12. Inter-personal skills—ability to communicate with others in peer-directed group verbally and non-verbally, can read each other. Able to get along with and cooperate with members of the group, team effort with no one person in charge. Respect of each other and good character are also requisites. (pp. 10–11)

Students involved in typical formal music education today are learning music in a completely different way than their ancestors learned music and the way that young people learn music in cultures around the world (Campbell, 1991; Hargreaves & North, 2001; Woody & Lehmann, 2010).

Lucy Green's (2005) study involved thirteen and fourteen year olds in London, England. The first phase of the study asked students to bring in CDs of their own choice of music. Students were then asked for form friendship groups and recreate a song without any guidance from teachers. The second phase of this study asked students to

take given recorded riffs, learn to play them, and then combine them to create their own

music composition.  In each phase, students were successful at recreating or composing

under the given guidelines.  Green and cooperating music educators observed

enthusiasm, concentration, skill development, and product driven practice in the student

musicians.  Green's (2006) research on informal music learning has revealed five main

characteristics of music learning practices and how they are different from formal music

education:

> First, informal learners choose the music themselves, music that is already
> familiar to them, that they enjoy and strongly identify with.  By contrast, in
> formal education, teachers usually select music with the intent to introduce
> learners to areas with which they are not already familiar.  Second, the main
> informal learning practice involves copying recordings by ear, as distinct from
> responding to notated or other written or verbal instructions and exercises.  Third,
> not only is the informal learner self-taught, but crucially, learning takes place in
> groups.  This occurs through conscious and unconscious peer-learning involving
> discussion, watching, listening to and imitating each other.  This is quite distinct
> from the formal realm, which involves adult supervision and guidance from an
> expert with superior skills and knowledge.  Fourth, informal learning involves the
> assimilation of skills and knowledge in personal, often haphazard ways according
> to musical preferences, starting with whole 'realworld' pieces of music.  In the
> formal realm, pupils follow a progression from simple to complex, which often
> involves a curriculum, syllabus, graded exam, specially composed piece or
> exercises.  Finally, throughout the informal learning process, there is an
> integration of listening, performing, improvising and composing, with an
> emphasis on creativity.  Within the formal realm, there is more of a separation of
> skills and an emphasis on reproduction. (p. 106)

*Skill development.*  Informal learning is vital in skill development (Cope, 2002; S.

Davis, 2005; S. Davis & Blair, 2011; Garrison, 1985; Green, 2002; Jaffurs, 2004;

Lillestram, 1996).  Skill acquisition is often haphazard, need based, or because of the

students' musical preference (Green, 2005; Jaffurs, 2004).  Students learn a skill when it

is needed in a song, not necessarily in a logical progression from simple to more complex (Green, 2005). This does not mean that the rudiments of music such as scales and arpeggios are not important, it just means that they are learned to the extent that they are needed in the style of music they are trying to learn (Woody, 2007). Often skill acquisition and development occurs in a group setting, but the motivation is the result of fulfilling the individual need for the skill. Educators call this process peer tutoring or cooperative learning, but many musicians refer to it as jamming (Woody, 2007).

Informal learning of popular music, which is the traditional and most authentic method, can lead to the acquisition and development of musical skills and knowledge. To turn a lead sheet into a performance, musicians must have an "understanding of the roles, limitations and performance practices of a range of instruments and voices; to exercise artistic decision making; to convert chord symbols into viable parts for a range of instruments, by showing abilities with voicings, voice leading, chord types, inversions, and the musical thinking behind bass lines and inner parts" (p. 25). Even those who do not consider themselves to be musicians or who are not involved in formal or intentional informal music education acquire vocal skills by singing with recordings and imitating recording artists of varying genres (Woody & Lehmann, 2010).

*Aural skills.* Informal, or vernacular, musicians spend a large amount of time listening to the style of music they perform. Listening is an important part of the process of making music and many times precedes the performers first attempt at playing the music. When trying to imitate or recreate songs, active and engaged listening occurs especially in difficult passages of music (Woody, 2007). In fact, recorded music is a

vernacular musician's primary source of acquiring skills, even above written or verbal instructions (Green, 2005). While formal musicians also work to develop aural skills, vernacular musicians place an emphasis on those skills being functional (Woody, 2007)

Green (2006) investigated how informal music practices in the classroom could positively affect students' musical experiences. In this study, students were asked to bring in recordings that they liked, form groups, and recreate the music. Students noticed differences in the way they listened to music, including identifying rhythms and instrumentation. Teachers also identified listening as the main skill developed in this study (Green, 2006).

Woody and Lehmann (2010) investigated the differences in ear-playing ability between formal musicians and those with vernacular music experience. Participants ($N$ = 24) heard melodies and played or sang them back. The number of trials for an accurate performance was recorded. Results from this study showed that singing required fewer trials than playing on an instrument [$F(1,22) = 55.13, \rho < .001$] and that vernacular musicians required fewer trials than formal musicians ($r = 1.98$). Through interviews after the trials, participants reported their thoughts. Woody and Lehmann concluded that "vernacular musicians applied a more sophisticated knowledge base to generate accurate expectations; formal musicians used less efficient strategies" (p. 101).

Both studies suggest that informal music skills, specifically aural skills, are an important part of musicianship. Playing or singing by ear is a foundational music skill that contributes to a student's ability to sight-read, improvise, play from memory, and perform rehearsed music (McPherson & Gabrielson, 2002; Woody, 2007; Woody &

Lehmann, 2010). Teachers often place the aural skills of ear playing in opposition with read music notation, but these studies serve as evidence that they are related (Woody & Lehmann, 2010).

Musicians having an ear-based fluency on their instruments allow them to understand the symbols of music notation like the reading of written verbal language (Mills & McPherson, 2006; Woody & Lehmann, 2010). Ear-playing experience prior to learning to read notation is still very uncommon in the music classroom (Gordon, 2003; Mainwaring, 1951; Suzuki, 1986; Woody & Lehmann, 2010). Woody and Lehmann (2010) and Green (2006) note that more consideration should be given by music educators to develop and incorporate ear playing in school music, especially in relation to popular music in the curriculum.

*Practice.* Practicing music is something for which both formal and informal music educators advocate. However, the treatment and attitudes of the musicians often differ. Informal musicians describe their practicing as voluntary and enjoyable likely because they are gaining individual skills. Much of that can enjoyment can be attributed to practicing with friends (Green, 2005) while gaining individual skills and that practice sessions are in the context of real musical experiences, including songs with which they are familiar (Woody, 2007).

Green's (2006) study showed that students in an informal music learning setting had a tendency to continue playing even when mistakes were made and avoided making corrections. Practice sessions during this study were student lead and had no teacher

intervention.  It was noted that the students' final performances were above the teacher and researcher expectations.

*Improvisation.*  Improvisation is a goal of both formal and informal music learning, though formal music education has historically offered few opportunities to develop necessary skills (Woody, 2007).  Even in Jazz music, which is now widely accepted in formal music education, students are taught Jazz improvisation through classical methods based on theory.  An authentic approach to Jazz improvisation places focus on listening, ear-playing, trial and error, and most importantly, self-expression (Woody, 2007).  These characteristics are also present in the performance of popular music.

Vernacular musicians' process of recreating popular music songs requires an integration of listening, performing, improvising, and composing throughout the process. Each of these skills is incorporated into the process instead of thought of as a separate act (Green, 2005).  The process of recreating a popular music song is similar to that of creating original compositions by ear (S. Davis, 2005; Green, 2001; Isbell, 2007; McGillen & McMillan, 2005, Newsom, 1998).  The study of popular music in schools provides opportunities for students to actively engage in improvisation and composition (Abramo, 2011; Allsup, 2003; MENC, 1994; Woody, 2007).

*Lifelong learning.*  For many teachers, one goal is for students to become lifelong learners and have a lifelong relationship with music.  The National Association for Music Education (NAfME) states their mission is "to advance music education by promoting the understanding and making of music by all" (NAfME, 2015).  The inclusion of popular

music into the curriculum, along with a pedagogy that honors the musical tradition, gives students the skills to be musically active throughout their lives.  The skills of vernacular, or informal, musicians like playing by ear and improvising, enable participation in music making as part of their leisure time, family gathers, social events and religious activities (Woody, 2007).  These skills can offer the student autonomy from the teacher/master that would increase their capacity to continue learning independently for the rest of their lives (Green, 2006; Woody, 2007; Woody & Lehmann, 2010).

*Cooperative learning.*  The pedagogy of the teacher lecturing and the student listening is the stereotypical model of education and while this model is still used by many, there is research to support the benefits of cooperative, or group, learning.  Lebler (2008) calls for a pedagogical change to accommodate the learning preferences and cultural characteristics of Generation Y (also labeled as the net generation, the gamer generation or the yuk/wow generation).  This generation of learners prefers to work in teams and to learn through discovery (Oblinger & Oblinger, 2005) and trial and error (Lebler, 2008).  Students often reject the process of learning that includes the transmission of knowledge from an adult expert (Beck & Wade, 2006).  In this way, students must take responsibility for their learning including decision making about what and how they learn.  Lebler (2008) suggests that this pedagogy does not replace or displace the teacher.  The teacher plays a critical role of mentor and supporter.  The teacher acts as a guide to the students' learning, but the onus is on the student to produce a learning product.

General education classrooms have modeled this pedagogy through the use of stations, small group learning with assigned tasks, and project based learning. Music Education tends to focus on whole group outcomes, namely performance. The inclusion of popular music in the classroom has the potential for addressing the pedagogical preferences of the current generation of students. Popular music making frequently uses peer learning through a mutual learning community (Allsup, 2003). Students learn concepts and skills on their own and then share them with the rest of the group. For example, a student listens to a song she likes on the radio and decides to learn to play the song on the guitar and sing it. The student then goes to a website that provides the lyrics and chords to the song. The student plays the chords she knows and then asks a friend how to play the ones she has not learned yet. In this scenario, the student has control over the process the entire time and directs her own learning. She self-monitors and makes decisions about how she wants to learn and how she wants the musical product to sound (Lebler, 2008). She seeks out the knowledge she needs to solve her problems. She is constantly assessing herself and receiving feedback from her peers to improve her product (Lebler, 2008).

**Performance.**

*Technology*. The use and manipulation of technology is a twenty first century goal of many school systems. It is a goal created out of necessity as the use of technology permeates all areas of society. The goal in relation to music is easily addressed through the inclusion of popular music. The development of popular music has followed and used the current technologies associated with the time of its creation

(Dunbar-Hall & Wemyss, 2000). Popular music's dependence on technology for composition, performance, and dissemination require its introduction into the music classroom (Dunbar-Hall & Wemyss, 2000).

The role of technology in music is important to study in both popular music and music in general (Berz & Bowman, 1994; Brown, 1999). Composition is no longer notation dependent, but there is now much reliance on technology (Dunbar-Hall & Wemyss, 2000). Programs such as ProTools, GarageBand, Audacity, Finale and a myriad of free software available from the Internet allow professionals and amateurs alike to record, mix, and publish their musical works. Thus, "'writing' music is becoming a euphemism" (R. Johnson, 1997, p. 5).

Access to these and other technologies and the study of popular music mean that merely teaching students proper choral singing technique is no longer adequate. Music students need to be introduced to audio recording, digital media, sound systems, and other musical technologies depending on the interests of the students (R. Johnson, 1997). With the addition of this technology to the classroom, the teacher must be aware of how students learn and that boys and girls approach music technologies differently (Abramo, 2011). The use of this technology in the classroom may, in fact, favor the learning preferences of boys (Armstrong, 2001; Caputo, 1994) and could provide an opportunity to recruit and enroll males into the choral program. The use of these technologies in the classroom, and in turn, outside of the classroom, necessitates discussions with students about economic, legal and other professional concerns associated with theirs and others' music (R. Johnson, 1997).

***Improve performance of other genres.*** Transfer of learning is defined as occurring "when learning in one context enhances (positive transfer) or undermines (negative transfer) a related performance in another context" (Perkins & Salomon, 1992). Grashel's (1979) study used popular music to teach form to intermediate instrumentalists. The study showed that the students were then able to transfer these concepts to unfamiliar band literature. Transfer of learning also may occur in performance skills. The performance and study of popular music may also improve aspects of classical performance. Popular music performance allows for freedom on the stage because the singing is not score-bound. Many popular music selections have an ease in phrasing and articulation that can be applied to traditional choral music. Maybe the most important aspect of popular music is its outstanding commitment to the expression of emotion in a song (Mann, 1995). By including popular music that students can relate to, the likelihood that they will learn to perform with expression increases. Students, then, have the opportunity to transfer those skills to other genres.

***Assessment.*** The assessment of popular music is a concern for some teachers, as mentioned in the portion of the exclusion section (page 45). It is important that both students and staff recognize the difficulties that are associated with assessing the performance of popular music (Warner, 1997). Recognizing that the traditional methods of teacher-centered assessment are not the most appropriate, and often inappropriate, for the performance of popular music, is essential.

Assuming that all music, including popular music, abides by the same standards and rules of classical music ignores the essence of the characteristics of popular music.

Therefore, assessing popular music in traditional ways (theory, musicology, analysis) without considering the context also dismisses its unique performance characteristics including the use of technology, its reliance on group support of solo performance, visual elements of lighting and movement, and expression (Warner, 1997). It is a difficult task to determine assessment criteria that sufficiently address the many aspects of popular music performance. For this reason, determining and implementing appropriate assessments of popular music is frequently neglected (Warner, 1997). However, many teachers have adopted alternate assessment strategies that are more appropriate for popular music while still benefiting the music program and the students.

Good learners are aware of their strengths and weaknesses, able to assess their own learning, and are able to manage their learning (Claxton, 1999). Lebler (2008) identifies three broad types of assessment that good learners do consistently. The first, 'Assessment OF Learning,' deals with measuring a student's understanding of curriculum content. This is the traditional role of assessment. 'Assessment FOR Learning' is when assessments are used to determine areas in which students need improvement. That is, to identify weaknesses or deficiencies in learning in order to address those in the future. 'Assessment AS learning' includes students in the process of assessment in hopes that actively assessing themselves and others will produce learning in itself. This type of assessment has been a topic of learning research and has been identified as important.

Music learning and the study of popular music can be valuable to the development of these types of assessment skills. The ability to self-assess and the habit of doing so allows students to develop skills they will use inside and outside of the music

classroom, and even beyond graduation (Boud, Cohen, & Sampson, 1999; Claxton, 1999; Sadler, 2005).

**Student Benefits and Social Benefits**

The inclusion of popular music in the choral classroom can have positive student and social benefits. The classroom environment can be enriched with the inclusion of new and different types of students, creating a safe place to learn, and making the classroom experience relevant to students' lives. Students can benefit socially by gaining a deeper understanding of emotions and having the opportunity to express those emotions through music. Popular music may also provide some intrinsic motivation that will help students gain skills necessary to become lifelong learners.

**Environment.**

*Enrollment.* In the current educational climate, there has been a documented decrease in instructional time in the arts and less student involvement in music (Council for Basic Education, 2004; Music for All Foundation, 2004). These declining numbers have been attributed to more time being devoted to tested subjects or to make up for budget deficits (Abril & Gault, 2008). To this end, music teachers spend much time recruiting to keep enrollment numbers large enough to help justify their position. Studies suggest that including popular music can attract more students to music programs and can also help to retain them once they are enrolled (Isbell, 2007). Currently, public school music programs enroll a fairly homogenous student population (Stewart, 1991), often those who have been identified as having high musical ability (Jaffurs, 2004). However, there are many talented and interested students who are not enrolled in school music

programs who may be overlooked because they are not formally trained, lack music

reading skills, or are interested in styles other than the traditional choral music (Jaffurs,

2004; R. Johnson, 1997).  Curricular choices or policies that exclude popular music may

alienate these students (Isbell, 2007).

   ***Classroom environment.***  One of the most important things for any classroom is

creating a safe environment.  Besides the obvious need for physical safety, students need

a place where it is safe to try new things, be creative, be expressive, and be themselves.

In the music classroom it is especially important to provide a safe environment for

students to present their music (S. Davis & Blair, 2011).  The inclusion of popular music

in the choral classroom offers a welcoming way into learning concepts while still

allowing students to be comfortable with the song selection.  By starting with something

the students already know, they become comfortable with their new environment.

   Formal schooling has been described as coming from the industrialization of

society and that it is out of context, in a specialized setting, removed from the routines of

daily life (Strauss, 1984).  If the music classroom is so far removed from students'

informal musical experiences, it may be hard to provide an environment that students

want to be in.  Analyzing the environment that students create when they make music that

is meaningful to them and applying those ideas to the classroom may help teachers create

the type of environment that is conducive to higher achievement for their students

(Sloboda, Davidson, & Howe, 1994).

   ***Preference.***  Popular music is the style choice of young people (Hargreaves &

North, 1997; LeBlanc, 1979; May, 1985; Mills, 2000; Stewart, 1984), regardless of what

kind or how much musical experience they have had (Benner, 1972). This is evidenced by teenage consumption of popular music, which is a multibillion-dollar industry (Geter & Streisand, 1995). Since music appears at every stage of growth and is common to all cultures, it is important to determine the significance of music and music education to all students, whether enrolled in music programs or not (Campbell, Connell, & Beegle, 2007). This understanding can help teachers provide students with a variety of musical experiences that stem from music they are interested in and will help them develop an 'at-homeness' in the music classroom. "The more students can feel that music is a part of, rather than apart from their lives, the more meaningful it will become to them" (Monk, 1959, p. 102).

Mueller (2002) and Zillmann and Gan (1997) provide reviews of literature on popular music tastes of adolescents. Teachers have found that being aware of students' musical preferences and being familiar with their music is advantageous (S. Davis & Blair, 2011). Pre-service teachers reported making connections with elementary students by starting with musical activities using popular music, which the children prefer. By appealing to their fandom, teachers have been able to demonstrate similarities between the students' music and other music (deVries, 2004).

***Identity.*** Identity formation is complex and a result of many interacting factors. Popular music may be one of the most powerful means by which students construct personal identity and interpret social experience by offering them strategies for knowing themselves and connecting with others (Arnett, 1995; Campbell, Connell, & Beegle, 2007; Hebert & Campbell, 2000; Larson, 1995; Tarrant, North, & Hargreaves, 2002).

The strength of popular music to address identity and other issues related to self, society, and culture have led music educators to advocate for the incorporation of popular music into the other subject area curricula in secondary schools (Allsup, 2004; Boespflug, 2004; Campbell, 1995; Durrant, 2001; Frith, 1996; Green, 2004; Hebert & Campbell, 2000).

Campbell et al. (2007) investigated the significance of music and music education to middle and high school students. Participants ($N = 1,155$) included those enrolled and not enrolled in school music programs. Participants were ages 13–18 years. Content analyses were performed on essays, statements, and reflections that were submitted for a national essay contest entitled "Ban the Elimination of Music Education in Schools." Identity formation in and through music was the most frequent theme teenagers wrote about in their essays and included individual (instrumental, vocal, listener) and group identities (band, choir, orchestra; Campbell et al., 2007).

*Relevance.* The choral class is an elective at the secondary level. Students often have many choices and are being pulled in different directions. Some of the reasons stated by students for not participating in school music programs are: (a) lack of interest, (b) poor literature selections by directors, (c) insufficient connection with local ethnicities and cultures, and (d) a lack of relevance of the music curriculum (Hope, 2004). By making musical experiences within the choral classroom relevant to students, the reasons students gave for not participating in school music may be addressed. Including popular music in the curriculum is one way to increase relevance, especially if the teacher takes into account the students they teach.

The disconnect between the music that students prefer outside of school and the music offered in the public school classroom seems to increase as students progress through school (Greer, Dorow, & Randall, 1974; Hargreaves, Comber, & Colley, 1995). Students are seeking relevance and connection between their lives in school and out of school. "Although there are important reasons to preserve long standing traditions of school music, one wonders why the content of our music curricula doesn't better reflect the musical world in which we live" (Woody, 2007, p. 32). Including popular music in the choral classroom can provide opportunities for students to learn musical skills, content, and techniques that are not easily learned from the traditional curriculum (Isbell, 2007). The use of vernacular music means that it is accessible to all people, including performing it (Woody, 2007).

*Student respect and rapport.* Teacher training for music educators generally prepares teachers to operate within the typical system of teaching rather than to challenge it (Drummond, 2010). The inclusion of popular music at the collegiate level is minimal, if it is present at all (Wang & Humphreys, 2009). However, if teachers take an interest in the music that their students listen to, the teacher may understand what it is like for students to be asked to sing unfamiliar music because for students, "it's not about what will help them learn music, it's about what music is; it is their culture, every day, it is what is cool and what their brothers and sisters listen to. They love and enjoy music" (Jaffurs, 2004, p. 199). Even a small amount of staying up to date with popular music garners a level of respect from students (Goodwin, 1997), because respecting their music is a form of respecting the student (Woody, 2007).

Popular music in the classroom is a unique way of showing that the teacher acknowledges the role that music plays in the students' lives and provides a musically diverse environment in which students can learn about many aspects of music (S. Davis & Blair, 2011). We are all naturally prejudiced towards certain musics, which makes it difficult to view all music objectively. "A prejudice in favor of 'my music(s)' may have a corollary in a prejudice against 'others music(s)'" (Drummond, 2010, p. 118). Conversations about the differences in musical preference and the importance of respecting these differences can help students learn to appreciate different styles of music (S. Davis & Blair, 2011). If students learn that all musics are related and have links between styles and genres, they may become more flexible in their appreciation and enjoy a wider range of musical styles while still being able to make decisions about what they believe is good and bad music (Gaitandjiev, 1997).

Even the language used can impact students' perceptions of music. Music teachers often label 'world music' as 'other musics'; however, Drummond (2010) encourages a new perspective on labeling music that takes into account the roots and social context of the music.

> Classical music is no longer out there on its own, treated as something separate from the other musics of the world. It has no automatic privileges. It is simply (but by no means insignificantly) a court music that emerged in the area of North-west Asia, also known as Europe. (Drummond, 2010, p. 122).

This new perspective may bring to light prejudices that are found in traditional music educator training (Drummond, 2010). Teachers must understand that the values and attitudes that they project affect their students' attitudes (Lamont, 2002).

Bourdieu realized that all social groups have different cultural practices and that the dominant class in society has the ability to place value on its cultural practices making it the legitimate practices of its society.  So, if a student is a part of the legitimate class, they are prepared to succeed, but if they are not a part of the legitimate class, they will likely have difficulty succeeding because of their lack of knowledge of the cultural practices (DiMaggio, 1982).

Teachers need to be open to a wide variety of musics and be sensitive to the culture and musical experiences of their students while balancing longstanding musical traditions with new global approaches in school music instruction (Campbell, 2004). This shift should ensure that no one, no group, or no musical tradition is superior or made to feel apologetic (Drummond, 2010).

If popular music is approached by exclusively relating it to the universal values that are normally associated with classical music, popular music appears as the inferior genre (Green, 2003).  Graham (2009) studied the relationship between 'cultural omnivorousness' and music education in the United States.  Cultural omnivorousness is "a general disposition towards the consumption of culture in which the person possessing such an attitude is open to consuming a broad range of cultural products from elite high culture to popular mass culture" (Alderson, Junisbai, & Heacock, 2007; Bryson, 1996; Graham, 2009; Han, 2003; Kammen, 2000; Peterson & Kern, 1996; Van Eijck, 2001). The musical taste of the United States population as a whole had increased in breadth between 1982 and 1992 (Peterson & Kern, 1996).  According to Graham's study, music education has a significant impact on music consumption.  A person who took a music

class between the ages of 12 and 17 listened to, on average, 1.8 more music genres than someone who did not take a music education class (Graham, 2009).

> Cultural openness is seen as a positive value to possess, and this research suggests that music education is effective in socializing students to these values. In another sense, if these are systematic differences in access and quality of instruction, then these socialization effects may be unevenly distributed. (Graham, 2009, p. 298)

Evidence suggests that there are, in fact, differences in the quality of music education in the United States (Hinckley, 2000; Richmond, 1997; Undercofler, 1997). Due to the nature of music programs, economically advantaged schools will more easily be able to support quality music programs and therefore, most of the benefits of music education, including cultural omnivorousness will accrue to the economically advantaged (Graham, 2009).

*Student expertise.* Students come to music classes with a great deal of prior knowledge about music. In particular, they are experts in relation to popular music (Goodwin, 1997; Isbell, 2007; Vulliamy & Lee, 1976). Teachers should recognize this expertise in their students and acknowledge that the teacher is no longer the only voice of authority in the room (Goodwin, 1997). Because students have prior experiences and expertise in regards to popular music, students can take a more active role in their learning (Isbell, 2007). Students can make informed musical decisions for themselves if the teacher provides them with the opportunity to do so (Woody, 2007).

If teachers think of themselves as facilitators or guides to their students' music making experiences, the students have the chance to become the masters and be

responsible for their own learning (S. Davis & Blair, 2011; Woody, 2007). The teacher must be aware of each student's abilities. Just because students may have an expertise in popular music, it does not mean that they are prepared to be responsible for their own learning, especially if they are used to learning from a teacher who has complete control of everything (Hanrahan & Isaacs, 2001; Lebler, 2007). However, if the goal is to develop self-directed learning, the teacher must get out of the way and let the student handle what had previously been the teacher's responsibility (Goodwin, 1997; Lebler, 2007).

**Social benefits.**

*Expression.* Popular music is often used as an expressive tool for students. Students use music to express who they are as individuals. Music is a way students convey messages about what they believe, want, and value (Jorgensen, 2002). This can be seen in the lyrics, music, and the groups of people generally associated with a genre. For example, Hebert and Campbell (2000) describe rock as "driving, energetic, and expressive of contemporary people, their ideas, and their life circumstances" (p. 21).

Students use music to express their emotions. Making music gives students the opportunity to be themselves. The inclusion of music in the classroom gives students the chance to be comfortable and relaxed in school (Campbell, Connell, &Beagle, 2007). Teachers trained in a traditional, formal music education program may not realize that students of every time have wanted to create, perform, and listen to their own music (Jaffurs, 2004). Including music that students identify as their own validates the students' self-perception and expressions (Elliott, 1995; Seifried, 2006).

Popular music lyrics often express critically important topics and the inclusion of this music can be an impetus for the discussion of themes often overlooked in the classroom such as fear, friendship, rejection, self-respect, and loss (Hebert & Campbell, 2000). Many students describe their music teachers as "encouraging, motivating, and acting as both role models and friends who can be trusted for listening and giving advice" (Campbell, Connell, & Beegle, 2007, p. 232). Hebert and Campbell (2000) suggest that the music classroom may be an ideal forum for discussions of these topics. A deeper understanding of these topics and the emotions associated with them can have a positive impact on their expression in performance and may also help students deal with real life experiences related to the topics.

*Intrinsic motivation.* Intrinsic motivation occurs when you do something because the activity brings you pleasure (Raiber & Teachout, 2014). Students who engage in informal music learning seem to have more intrinsic motivation than students involved in formal music education that is technique-intensive and notation-based (Green, 2006; Woody, 2007). Informal musicians have a passion for music. They are musicians because they want to be and devote their time to honing their skills without a reliance on a master teacher (Jaffurs, 2004). Popular music in the choral classroom may contribute to students being intrinsically motivated and become lifelong music learners. If the literature chosen brings them pleasure, they are more likely to want to work to improve their skills.

**Gender**

Researchers have consistently found differences between genders. In music, differences have also been found in regards to gender. Stereotypes, or associations, are often made in relation to music performance (Abramo, 2011; Bayton, 1997; Crowther & Durkin, 1982; Delzill & Leppla, 1992; O'Neill & Boulton, 1996). Popular music consumption differs by gender through the association of subgenres with a particular gender (DeNora, 2000; McRobbie, 2000). Gender is also a contributing factor to differences in learning styles and is evident in music education (Abramo, 2011).

Both children and adults associate certain instruments with corresponding genders (Crowther & Durkin, 1982; Delzill & Leppla, 1992; O'Neill & Boulton, 1996). In popular music, some argue that even types of playing are gendered (Abramo, 2011). Virtuosic playing of electric guitar is frequently linked with male players, while females are often associated with strumming acoustic guitars to accompany singing (Bayton, 1997; Whiteley, 2000).

These differences are not limited to performance, but may also be seen in popular music consumption. Studies have shown that mainstream subgenres of popular music, like pop, have been associated with girls (DeNora, 2000), while alternative music including punk and heavy metal are often considered masculine and associated with boys (McRobbie, 2000).

Abramo (2011) investigated how gender affected participation in a secondary popular music class that focused on writing and performing original music. In this study, the boys group practiced their music as has been described before in research (Allsup,

2003; Campbell, 1995; S. Davis, 2005; Green, 2001; Jaffurs, 2004).  Most notably, gestures were the main form of communication ahead of even the spoken word.  The lyrics were added last and reluctantly.  The boys assigned the task to two members to complete (Abramo, 2011).

The girls' group practiced by having a dialogue about the music and then rehearsing through trial and error.  In contrast to the boys group, the girls separated the verbal aspects of their practice from the music making.  The lyrics of the song were more prominent in the practicing and execution of the song for the girls than they were for the boys (Abramo, 2011).

The study also included a mixed gender group comprised of two boys and two girls.  Data from this group suggest that the different characteristics of the way boys and girls prefer to practice made it difficult to rehearse.  This tension affected how participants interacted and contributed to the group practice sessions (Abramo, 2011).

While the main difference between the boys and girls groups tended to deal with communication styles, the study did find similarities among the groups in how they notated their compositions.  The groups rarely used notation and when they did it was as an aid in memorization.  Chord symbols were used to help memorize progressions.  The largest use of notation was simply writing down the lyrics of the song (Abramo, 2011).

Popular music, in general, calls for a non-traditional approach by the classroom music teacher.  If the classic popular music rehearsal style is adopted, are all students benefiting?  Abramo's study raises the questions of gender sensitivity and suggests that because popular music practices are thought to be more male-centered, according to

popular musicologists and ethnomusicologists, girls may not be motivated to participate (Dibben, 2002; Green, 2008). This orientation toward males has discouraged women from pursuing and being successful in the field of popular music (McClary, 1991; Moisala & Diamond, 2000).

Studies have also found that boys and girls approach music technology differently and that typical approaches to music technology may favor boys' learning styles (Armstrong, 2001; Caputo, 1994). Abramo suggests that the role of the teacher is that of facilitator and mediator. Teachers should help students navigate musical differences and differences in communication or practice styles. By allowing students the autonomy to choose their own process, teachers need to oversee the implementation of these processes (Abramo, 2011).

As illustrated throughout this chapter, a relatively small number of research studies were found concerning popular music in the classroom, and even fewer that were directly related to choral classrooms. Several studies related to performance literature selection included information regarding popular music, but did not describe why popular music was included or excluded, the frequency of use, and the instructional practices and purpose of popular music in the high school choral classroom. No descriptive studies were found attempting to provide a clear picture of classroom practices of choral teachers concerning the inclusion of popular music in their curriculum. These topics became the research questions for the current study and the basis for the *Popular Music Survey.*

# CHAPTER III

# METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to provide a descriptive analysis of high school choral teachers' inclusion of popular music in current teaching practices by (a) determining the frequency of inclusion, (b) developing a profile of teachers, schools, and choral programs that include popular music in the curriculum, (c) determining which demographic characteristics affected the amount of popular music included, and (d) developing a profile of popular music implementation details.  The researcher-designed *Popular Music Survey* was administered to high school choral teachers in the Commonwealth of Virginia and the responses were analyzed to answer the following research questions:

1. Are high school choral teachers including popular music as performance literature and/or instructional materials?

2. What characteristics of the teacher, school, choral program, and/or ensemble best describe those who include popular music?

3. To what extent is popular music being included in the high school choral curriculum?

4. How is popular music being implemented in the high school choral classroom?

**Participants**

Participants for this study were high school choral directors ($N$ =273) in the Commonwealth of Virginia for the 2013–2014 school year. The choral teachers in the Commonwealth of Virginia were chosen because of the researcher's familiarity with the state and the ease of access of resources. A directory of all public schools in Virginia was obtained from the Virginia Department of Education website (http://www.doe.virginia.gov). Schools were then sorted to include schools that served any students in grades nine, ten, eleven, or twelve. All listings for jails and correctional centers were removed. Detention Home Education Programs are not required to provide music education, and if music is taught at the facility, it would be provided by an outside contract teacher (Virginia Department of Education, 2002).

Choral teacher contact information was obtained in one of three ways. The researcher first contacted the district representatives of the Virginia Music Educators Association (VMEA) to request contact information. Three districts responded with school names, teacher names, and teacher email addresses. A research assistant then used the directory from the Department of Education and collected contact information through the use of school websites. Finally, the research assistant used the directory from the Department of Education and called schools to request the choral teacher's name and email address. This process resulted in 290 usable contacts.

**Data Collection**

**Survey**

The researcher-designed survey (see Appendix A) was developed to gather information from current high school choral teachers concerning the inclusion of popular music in their classroom.  The survey format options of paper, phone or in-person interview, and online were considered.  The researcher determined that the online format would best serve to reach the largest number of potential participants, be time efficient for both the researcher and the participants, and minimize research costs.

It was determined that participants needed to be separated into two groups: those who did include popular music and those who did not include popular music in their classroom.  The online format allowed for a gateway question, or question that divides the participant answers into two or more groups.  For this study, the gateway question was "Do you include popular music in any of your high school choir classrooms?"  Based on the answer to this question, participants were directed to another set of questions.  By distinguishing these two groups, more detailed information could be obtained on the choral teachers' rationale for including or not including popular music.

 Participants selecting 'yes' were directed to questions concerning the frequency of use and the instructional practices and purpose of popular music in the high school choral classroom.  Participants selecting 'no' were directed to another section of the survey and asked to identify reasons why they did not include popular music.  More detail on the design of the survey collection information on the inclusion of popular music and its specific uses follows.

The instrument was created as an online survey using Qualtrics®. The Qualtrics® survey software was chosen due to its availability through the researcher's university. It was chosen over free programs available online because of the reputation of the company and the software's ability to handle the survey design including a gateway question and the inclusion of charts that would gather information about each choir class efficiently.

The resulting survey contained a demographics section and either 19 or 21 questions depending on whether respondents' answer to the gateway question was 'yes' or 'no,' respectively. Three experts in the field of music education and two practicing music teachers reviewed those items. Based on the feedback, items were revised by rewording the questions for clarity. The revised survey was piloted to ensure that it was easily understood and to determine the reliability and validity of the instrument. More information about the pilot survey is found in the "Pilot Study of Survey" section on page 107.

The survey was divided into two sections: demographics and Popular Music Inclusion information (see Appendix A for complete survey).

**Demographics.** The demographic section of the survey was designed to collect demographic information in three categories: teacher's personal demographics, school demographics, and choral program demographics. The demographics chosen for this study were based on the demographic data collection used in previous research investigating music teaching practices (Demorest, 2004; Forbes, 2001; Kuehne, 2007; Reames, 2001; Strand, 2006). Though the demographic data are similar to previous studies, the current study sought to approach the data from a different perspective to

determine which, if any, demographic categories impact various popular music inclusion choices.  The purpose of this section of the survey was to gather information about each participant to be used in analyses to determine if any teacher, school, or choir program characteristics had a significant impact on whether popular music was included, the frequency of use, and the instructional practices and purpose of popular music in the high school choral classroom.

*Teacher's personal demographics.*  The personal demographics section asked teachers to provide general information about themselves and their education history. The purpose of this section of the survey was to gather information to be used in the analysis to determine if any teacher characteristics had a significant impact on whether popular music was included, the frequency of use, and the instructional practices and purpose of popular music in the high school choral classroom.  Questions were used to collect demographic information including the teacher's gender, age, teaching certification, years of teaching experience, and years of experience at their current school. The teacher's education history was collected through questions that asked teachers to provide more specific information regarding their college degrees, majors, and which college or university they attended.  The same information was collected if teachers had completed a master's, Ph.D., or Ed.D. program.  Questions were also included to determine whether the teacher was certified by the National Board for Professional Teacher Standards or held other certifications.

*School demographics.*  The school demographics section collected information about the school.  The purpose of this section of the survey was to determine if any

school characteristics had a significant impact on whether popular music was included, the frequency of use, and the instructional practices and purpose of popular music in the high school choral classroom. Questions about the school included location, school population, and percentage of students receiving free or reduced lunch.

*Choral program demographics.* The choral program demographics section collected information about the choral program as a whole and specifics about each choral class. The purpose of this section of the survey was to gather information to be used to analyze if any choral program characteristics had a significant impact on whether popular music was included, the frequency of use, and the instructional practices and purpose of popular music in the high school choral classroom. Questions were included to determine the total choral population and a description of the program. Specifically, the survey asked for the number of choral classes taught, types of classes and enrollment numbers in each class, whether the class participated in the Virginia Music Educators Association/Virginia Choral Directors Association Performance Assessment for choirs and what rating they received.

**Popular music inclusion.** The second section of the survey, the Popular Music Inclusion section, began by presenting the definition of popular music for the purpose of the survey: "'Popular music' is an umbrella term used to cover a wide range of musical genres that are well known by a large number of people. Genres include, but are not limited to, alternative, country, dance, Disney, electronic, Hip-hop, rap, Indie, Inspirational (Contemporary Christian and Gospel), pop, rock, R&B, and soul. Popular music does not include art music, jazz, spirituals, or folk songs. Popular music is likely

to be transmitted through the electronic means of radio, television, or the Internet." The definition was followed by the gateway 'yes' or 'no' question "Do you include popular music in any of your high school choir classrooms?" Participants selecting 'yes' were directed to questions concerning the frequency of use and the instructional practices and purpose of popular music in the high school choral classroom. Participants selecting 'no' were directed to another section of the survey and asked to identify reasons why they did not include popular music.

*Yes*. If participants selected 'yes' to indicate that they included popular music in their curriculum, they were directed to a chart that collected data on which choral classes included popular music in the curriculum. For each class that included popular music, participants were asked to indicate the purpose of its inclusion. Related research shows that teachers include popular music for the utilitarian aspects of teaching musical concepts or skills (Forbes, 2001; Grashel, 1979; MacCluskey, 1979; Pembrook, 1991), as performance literature for concerts (Isbell, 2007; Lebler, 2007; Pembrook, 1991; Warner, 1997), or as both an avenue for teaching concepts and as performance literature.

Participants were then asked to identify reasons why they included popular music. Participants could "select all that apply" from a given list of answers derived from the literature review and an "other" option with free response. See Appendix B for the list of answer choices with supporting literature references.

The related literature (deVries, 2004; Dunbar-Hall & Wemyss, 2000; Forbes, 2001; Grashel, 1979; Isbell, 2007; McCluskey, 1979; O'Brien, 1982; Pembrook, 1991; Ponic, 2000) showed that popular music could be used as an instructional tool to teach

musical concepts (i.e., melody, harmony, timbre, etc.) in the same way that teachers have been using traditional choral music to accomplish this learning objective.  Based on this literature, musical concepts were listed and participants were asked to select which, if any, musical concepts they taught through popular music.  Participants could "select all that apply" from the given list of answers and an "other" option with free response.  This question was used to gather more data on the purpose and instructional practices of teachers including popular music in their classrooms.

Previous studies (Forbes, 2001; Reames, 2001) have gathered data regarding literature selection for high school choral teachers.  Forbes' (2001) study included the percentage of popular music out of the total performance literature selected.  In an effort to compare and expand upon the previous study, the current study contained questions to gather data about the performance of popular music.  Participants were asked whether they performed popular music with their choral ensembles and if so, what genres were used during the 2013-2014 school year.  These questions were presented in an effort to describe, in a more specific manner, which genres or types of popular music were being included in the classroom.  Participants could "select all that apply" from a given list of answers derived from the literature review (Pembrook, 1991) and an "other" option with free response.

The related literature (Forbes, 2001; Green, 2006; Hebert & Cambell, 2000; Monk, 1959) suggested that one concern with including popular music was that it would limit or eliminate time for the teaching of other genres or styles.  To give a general view of repertoire used by each teacher and how popular music fit into a varied repertoire, the

participants were asked for the percentage of popular music performed and which genres other than popular music were included this year for performance. Participants could "select all that apply" from a given list of answers derived from the literature review (Forbes, 2001; Reames, 2001).

Related literature indicated that teachers had concerns about the availability and quality of popular music literature (S. Davis & Blair; 2011; Hebert & Cambell, 2000; Melnick, 2001; Pembrook, 1991; Woody, 2007). In a previous study about high school choral literature selection, Forbes (2001) concluded that selection criteria may not be universally applied to different genres. In the current study, two survey questions were designed to gather data and speak specifically to selection criteria for popular music and how teachers choose popular music songs. Participants could "select all that apply" from a given list of answers derived from the literature review (Forbes, 2001; Reames, 2001) and an "other" option with free response. A third question was included to determine where teachers obtained the popular music materials they include in their classroom. Participants could "select all that apply" from a given list of answers derived from the literature review (Hebert & Campbell, 2000; NAfME, 1994) and an "other" option with free response.

Wang and Humphreys (2009) concluded that the study of popular music is not present in many students' college experience, and if it is present, it is often in extracurricular opportunities or classes that are not required for their degree. Two questions were designed based on Wang and Humphrey's (2009) study to compare these findings to the current study about the presence of popular music in the college/university

setting.  The questions were used to determine whether having or not having specific

college/university training influenced the inclusion of popular music.  Data were

collected to determine whether and how participants received instruction during their

college experiences on how to teach popular music.  If participants said that they had

instruction in teaching popular music, they were asked which types of instruction they

received.  Participants could "select all that apply" from a given list of answers derived

from the literature review (Wang & Humphreys, 2009) and an "other" option with free

response.

Popular music learning often happens in an informal setting (Campbell, 1995;

Campbell et al., 2007; S. Davis & Blair, 2011; Green, 2005, 2006; Jaffurs, 2004; Lebler,

2007, 2008; Mantie, 2013; Woody, 2007; Woody & Lehmann, 2010) Based on this

literature, it was determined that another question was needed to gather data on learning

experiences concerning popular music that teachers have had outside of the

college/university setting.  Participants were asked whether they had received any

instruction in teaching popular music from somewhere other than college (i.e., high

school, garage bands, professional development sessions, etc.).  If participants selected

'yes,' they were asked to indicate where they had received instruction in the free response

option.

No previous studies had tried to determine how choral teachers were

implementing popular music as performance literature.  Popular music performance

implementation and logistics details were acquired through the final set of four questions.

The purpose of these questions was to determine when during the year popular music was

performed and to provide a description of performance practices related to popular music. Participants were asked when they typically performed popular music during the year. Participants could "select all that apply" from a given list of answers derived from the literature review (Cutietta, 1991; Forbes, 2001) and an "other" option with free response. Two questions were designed to determine what type(s) of accompaniment were used for choir and solo performances of popular music. Participants could "select all that apply" from a given list of answers derived from the literature review (Cutietta, 1991; Evelein, 2006; Isbell, 2007) and an "other" option with free response.

One question about student preference was included because previous research implied that students no longer liked the popular music once it was put into the classroom context because taking popular music from an informal setting to a formal setting changed the students' perceptions of the music (Green, 2002, 2006) and that the songs were not current popular music by the time they were performed because students' interests in popular music change quickly (Green, 2006). Other research indicates that teachers include popular music as a recruiting tool and as a way to retain students from year to year (Isbell, 2007; Pembrook, 1991). If students do not like popular music once it is placed into the context of the classroom, then that would not be an effective recruiting tool. The current study asked the teachers how they thought their students felt about performing popular music (love it, like it mostly, indifferent, dislike it, hate it). Answer choices were given in a Likert-type scale in an effort to determine whether, in general, students were in favor of popular music in the classroom.

Once participants had finished the Popular Music Inclusion section, a message thanking them for completing the survey appeared. Participants were instructed to exit the program and close the browser.

Information concerning the survey for participants selecting 'no' to the gateway question "Do you include popular music in any of your high school choir classrooms?" is presented in the following section.

*No.* Participants selecting 'no' to the gateway question "Do you include popular music in any of your high school choir classrooms?" were asked to identify reasons why they did not include popular music. Participants could "select all that apply" from a given list of answers derived from the literature review (Cutietta, 1991; Evelein, 2006; Isbell, 2007) and an "other" option with free response. Appendix B shows each response and references the previous research from which the answers were drawn.

For each reason the participant selected as to why popular music was not included, another question was presented that asked for more specific information about that reason. For example, if the participant selected "Popular music is often not appropriate," a follow-up question would provide more specific choices: (a) The text uses language that is not acceptable in school settings, (b) The text is about inappropriate subject matter (i.e., sex, drugs, violence), (c) The music is too easy for my students, and (d) The style is better suited for small group and solo performers rather than a large ensemble. Participants could "select all that apply" from the given list of answers derived from the literature review and an "other" option with free response.

Wang and Humphreys (2009) concluded that the study of popular music is not present in many students' college experience, and if it is present, it is often in extracurricular opportunities or classes that are not required for their degree. Two questions were designed based on Wang and Humphrey's (2009) study to compare these findings to the current study about the presence of popular music in the college/university setting. The questions were used to determine whether having or not having specific college/university training influenced the inclusion of popular music. Data were collected to determine whether and how participants received instruction during their college experiences on how to teach popular music. If the participant said that they had instruction in teaching popular music, they were asked which types of instruction they received. Participants could "select all that apply" from a given list of answers derived from the literature review (Wang & Humphreys, 2009) and an "other" option with free response.

Popular music learning often happens in an informal setting (Campbell, 1995; Campbell et al., 2007; S. Davis & Blair, 2011; Green, 2005, 2006; Jaffurs, 2004; Lebler, 2007, 2008; Mantie, 2013; Woody, 2007; Woody & Lehmann, 2010) Based on this literature, it was determined that another question was needed to gather data on learning experiences concerning popular music that teachers have had outside of the college/university setting. Participants were asked whether they had received any instruction in teaching popular music from somewhere other than college (i.e., high school, garage bands, professional development sessions, etc.). If participants selected

'yes,' they were asked to indicate where they had received instruction in the free response option.

To determine whether participants would ever consider including popular music, participants were then asked what would have to change for them to include popular music in their curriculum. Choices were given based on frequently given reasons in the related literature (Cutietta, 1991; S. Davis & Blair, 2011; Gaitandjiev, 1997; Green, 2006; Hebert & Campbell, 2000; R. Johnson, 1997; MacCluskey, 1979; Melnick, 2001; Monk, 1959; Pembrook, 1991; Seifried, 2006; Wang & Humphreys, 2009; Woody, 2007) that teachers gave for not including popular music. There was also an option for teachers to choose that they did not plan to use popular music in the future. A follow up question asked whether teachers would be willing to attend a professional development session on performing popular music to determine their interest level in learning more about popular music instruction.

Questions about repertoire selection followed and asked directors to indicate which genres they used for performance and how they decided which pieces to use. These questions were designed to give a clear picture of what literature teachers who were excluding popular music were using and how they made these decisions. Participants could "select all that apply" from a given list of answers derived from the literature review (Forbes, 2001; Reames, 2001).

Once participants had finished the Popular Music Inclusion section, a message thanking them for completing the survey appeared. Participants were instructed to exit the program and close the browser.

The survey was piloted to ensure that it was easily understood and to determine the validity and reliability of the instrument. Results of this pilot are presented in the next section.

**Pilot study of survey.**

*Participants and procedures.* Participants for the pilot study were selected from one of two groups: teachers in a neighboring state currently employed as high school choir directors ($n = 24$) and current/former graduate students at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro ($n = 6$) who have taught choral music at the high school level for a total of 30 potential participants. These potential participants were selected due to their location near the Commonwealth of Virginia and because the schools varied by location in urban, suburban, and rural areas. The current/former graduate students were included because of their education level and their ability to provide useful feedback about the survey construction. The researcher emailed the recruitment cover email (Appendix A) and a link for the online survey to the pilot study group. After three days, a reminder email was sent (Appendix A) requesting that the survey be completed. The survey was open for a period of 5 days on Qualtrics®.

*Results.* After five days, it was determined that a sufficient number of surveys were returned and the survey was closed. In total, 15 useable surveys were completed. Feedback about the survey was collected through an open-ended question that allowed participants to provide feedback about survey construction and content. The question also asked participants to provide their name and phone number if they agreed to be contacted after taking the survey. Five participants were interviewed to discuss the

survey format, design, and content. Adjustments were made to four survey questions that did not allow participants to "select all that apply." For the final survey form, the researcher adjusted the instructions to be specific to the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Validity and reliability were confirmed for the survey as in previous research studies (Abril & Gault, 2008; Kuehne, 2003; Reames, 2001). Face validity was confirmed by determining that all questions asked dealt with the topic of popular music inclusion in the choral classroom. Content validity was determined by a set of experts having subject knowledge who determined that the questions were asked clearly and were directly related to the answer choices that were available.

**Procedures**

Participants were contacted by email and notified of the current study. A cover email containing the URL link to the survey was included (Appendix A). This initial email was sent on July 29, 2014 to 290 potential participants. The cover email informed participants that the URL link would be active for two weeks. Three emails failed (address not properly formatted) and 18 emails bounced (rejected by the recipient's server, possibly due to typographical errors) for a total of 21 unsuccessful emails. The researcher reviewed these emails and found 12 email addresses contained typographical errors. These were revised and resent in a separate mailing for a total of 281 emails delivered. During the active time window, there were 40 complete survey responses.

On August 15, 2014, another email was sent reminding potential participants of the study and providing the link to the survey. The second mailing on August 15, 2014, included 290 emails sent. Three emails failed and 22 emails bounced for a total of 25

unsuccessful emails.  The same list of 12 revised email addresses was also sent.  A total

of 277 emails were delivered.  The difference in emails that failed and bounced from the

first mailing to the second mailing are likely due to teachers changing jobs and email

accounts being closed after the start of the school year.  Fifteen additional surveys were

completed giving a total survey response (first and second mailings) of 55.

It was determined that the survey response rate was too low to be considered a

representative sample of the population.  A third email was sent on January 15, 2015

containing the URL link to the survey.  On January 19, 2015, an email was sent to all

district representatives asking them to encourage the teachers in their district to complete

the survey.  The third mailing on January 15, 2015, included 290 emails sent.  Three

emails failed and 26 emails bounced for a total of 29 unsuccessful emails.  The same list

of 12 revised email addresses was also sent.  A total of 273 emails were delivered.

During this window, 59 surveys were completed.

A total of 114 surveys were completed.  Ten surveys were removed because they

were identified as duplicates.  Usable, completed surveys numbered 104.  The survey

response rate was calculated using the third mailing statistics.  After reviewing the failed

and bounced emails, the researcher concluded that these were the result of teachers who

changed jobs and no longer had access to the school email.  Therefore, 104 surveys were

completed out of a possible 273, yielding a 38.1% response rate.

## Data Analysis Procedures

The first research question was, "Are high school choral teachers including

popular music as performance literature and/or instructional materials?"  The research

question was answered by participants responding to the survey question "Do you include popular music in any of your high school choir classrooms?" The percentage of 'yes' and 'no' answers were determined as an answer to this research question.

The second research question was "What characteristics of the teacher, school, choral program, and/or ensemble best describe those who include popular music?" Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the demographic information gathered in the survey concerning the high school choral teachers. Frequency counts and percentages were calculated for years of being a music teacher, years of teaching high school choir, years teaching at the present school, participant age, certification status, gender, race, education levels, music education degrees, certification by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, and other certifications. Descriptive statistics were used to present a generalized description of high school choir teachers in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

The school demographic information gathered was analyzed using descriptive statistics to determine whether the sample represented different school areas, populations, and affluence. Frequency counts and percentages were calculated for school area, school population, and students receiving free or reduced lunch. Descriptive statistics were also used to analyze choral program and ensemble demographics reported by teachers. Frequency counts and percentages were computed for total choral population, types of choirs, and choral assessment attendance. These statistics give an overall picture of the state of high school choral programs in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

The sample data for teacher race, school location, and school size were compared to the data for the Commonwealth of Virginia provided by the Common Core of Data using chi-square Goodness of Fit analyses to determine whether a representative sample was collected.

The third research question was, "To what extent is popular music being included in the high school choral curriculum?" Data were analyzed to determine which, if any, teacher, school, choral program, ensemble demographics, or experience with popular music are significant indicators of popular music inclusion in the classroom. Each question from the demographic section was analyzed using either a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) or Pearson chi-square, depending on whether the variable was continuous or categorical, to determine whether there were statistically significant ($p <$ .05) differences between the participants' percentage group of popular music included in total performance literature due to characteristics of the teacher, school, choir program, and ensemble.

The final research question was "How is popular music being implemented in the high school choral classroom?" Responses from participants who answered 'yes' to the gateway question were used to answer this question. Frequency counts and percentages were computed based on responses regarding teachers' reasons for including popular music in their classrooms, concept teaching, performance of popular music literature, other performance literature included, popular music genres included, finding/selecting/obtaining popular music, when popular music is performed,

accompaniment type(s) for choir and solo performances of popular music, and student

feelings about popular music.

The next chapter presents the results of the statistical analyses used to address

each research question.

**CHAPTER IV**

**RESULTS**

The purpose of this study is to provide a descriptive analysis of high school choral teachers' inclusion of popular music in current teaching practices by (a) determining the frequency of inclusion, (b) developing a profile of teachers, schools, and choral programs that include popular music in the curriculum, (c) determining which demographic characteristics affected the amount of popular music included, and (d) developing a profile of popular music implementation details. The researcher-designed *Popular Music Survey* was administered to high school choral teachers in the Commonwealth of Virginia and the responses were analyzed to answer the following research questions:

1. Are high school choral teachers including popular music as performance literature and/or instructional materials?

2. What characteristics of the teacher, school, choral program, and/or ensemble best describe those who include popular music?

3. To what extent is popular music being included in the high school choral curriculum?

4. How is popular music being implemented in the high school choral classroom?

This chapter is organized by research question. The results of the statistical analyses for research questions one through four are presented.

**Research Question One**

Research question one was, "Are high school choral teachers including popular music as performance literature and/or instructional materials?"

This question was answered through the use of a gateway question, or question that divides the participants answers into two or more groups. For this study, the gateway question was "Do you include popular music in any of your high school choir classrooms?" Participants could either answer 'yes' or 'no.' Based on the answer to this question, participants were directed to another set of questions. By distinguishing these two groups, more detailed information could be obtained on the choral teachers' rationale for including or not including popular music. One hundred percent of participants (104/104) answered 'yes' to the gateway question "Do you include popular music in any of your high school choir classrooms?" All participants were then directed to the Popular Music Inclusion section of the survey for the answer 'yes.'

**Research Question Two**

Research question two was, "What characteristics of the teacher, school, choral program, and/or ensemble best describe those who include popular music?"

Participants for this study were high school choral directors (N=273) in the Commonwealth of Virginia for the 2013-2014 school year. Participants were contacted by email and notified of the current study. Three mailings produced 104 complete surveys out of a possible 273, yielding a 38.1% response rate.

The demographics chosen for this study are based on the demographic data collection used in previous research investigating music teaching practices (Demorest,

2004; Forbes, 2001; Kuehne, 2007; Reames, 2001; Strand, 2006).  Though the demographic data are similar to previous studies, the current study seeks to approach the data from a different perspective to determine which, if any, demographic categories impact various popular music inclusion choices.  The following sections present the descriptive analysis of each demographic area: (1) teacher, (2) school, (3) choir program, and (4) ensemble.

**Personal Demographics**

**Years as a music teacher.**  Participants were asked, "How many years have you been a music teacher (through the 2013–2014 school year)?"  A drop down menu provided answer choices 1-30 and an option for "31+ years."  Participation by years of music teaching experience was especially diverse.  Each year, from one year of experience to 31+ years of experience, was represented by at least one participant except for years 21 and 27.  Though in the one-way analysis of variance (page 141) this variable was treated as continuous, years of music teaching experience were grouped in sets of 10 years to illustrate that the distribution is positively skewed.  To show greater detail in the 1–10 years of experience group, the group with the largest frequency, that grouping was divided into five-year groupings.  To retire with full benefits in the Commonwealth of Virginia, teachers must have completed 30 years of teaching.  Participants who have exceeded 30 years of teaching and therefore would be eligible for retirement were grouped separately and labeled as "31+ years."  The distribution of participants by music teaching experience is presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Survey Response by Music Teaching Experience

| Music Teaching Experience | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| 1–5 years | 18 | 17.5 |
| 6–10 years | 27 | 26.2 |
| 11–20 years | 29 | 28.1 |
| 20–30 years | 19 | 18.5 |
| 31+ years | 10 | 9.7 |
| Total | 104 | 100.0 |

**Years as a high school choral teacher.** Participants were asked, "How many

years have you been teaching high school choir (through the 2013–2014 school year)?"

A drop down menu provided answer choices 1–30 and an option for "31+ years."

Participation by years of high school choral teaching experience was diverse. Each year,

from one year of experience to 31+ years of experience, was represented by at least one

participant except for years 19, 23, 28, and 29. Though in the one-way analysis of

variance (page 141) this variable was treated as continuous, years of high school choral

teaching experience were grouped in sets of 10 years to illustrate that the distribution is

positively skewed. To show greater detail in the 1-10 years of experience group, the

group with the largest frequency, that grouping was divided into five-year groupings. To

retire with full benefits in the Commonwealth of Virginia, teachers must have completed

30 years of teaching. Participants who have exceeded 30 years of teaching and therefore

are eligible for retirement were grouped separately and labeled as "31+ years." The

distribution of participants by high school choral teaching experience is presented in

Table 2.

Table 2

Survey Response by High School Choral Teaching Experience

| High School Choral Teaching Experience | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| 1–5 years | 34 | 32.8 |
| 6–10 years | 24 | 23.1 |
| 11–20 years | 25 | 24.0 |
| 20–30 years | 12 | 11.7 |
| 31+ years | 5 | 4.8 |
| Missing | 4 | 3.8 |
| Total | 104 | 100.2 |

**Years at present school.**  Participants were asked, "How many years have you

taught in your present school (through the 2013-2014 school year)?"  A drop down menu

provided answer choices 1-30 and an option for "31+ years."  Participation by years of

high school choral experience at present school was diverse.  Each year, from one year of

experience to 31+ years of experience, was represented by at least one participant except

for years 16, 20, 21, 24, 27, 28, 29, and 30.  Though in the one-way analysis of variance

(page 141) this variable was treated as continuous, years of high school choral experience

at their present school were grouped in sets of 10 years to illustrate that the distribution is

positively skewed.  To show greater detail in the 1–10 years of experience group, the

group with the largest frequency, that grouping was divided into five-year groupings.

Teachers in the Commonwealth of Virginia are required to have 30 years of experience to

retire with full benefits if retiring before the age of 65 (Virginia Retirement System, 2016) Participants who exceeded the 30 years were grouped separately and labeled as "31+ years." The distribution of participants by high school choral teaching experience is presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Survey Response by Years of High School Choral Experience at Present School

| Years at Present School | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| 1–5 years | 43 | 41.3 |
| 6–10 years | 24 | 23.1 |
| 11–20 years | 27 | 26.0 |
| 20–30 years | 6 | 5.8 |
| 31+ years | 2 | 1.9 |
| Missing | 2 | 1.9 |
| Total | 104 | 100.0 |

**Certified to teach music in Virginia.**  Participants were asked, "Are you currently certified to teach music in the Commonwealth of Virginia?"  Answer choices of 'yes' and 'no' were provided.  Certified music teachers accounted for 98.1% of participants.  Only two participants (1.9%) reported not being certified to teach music in the Commonwealth of Virginia.  The distribution of participants by certification is presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Survey Response by Teachers Certified to Teach Music

| Certified | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 102 | 98.1 |
| No | 2 | 1.9 |
| Total | 104 | 100.0 |

**Gender.** Participants were asked, "What is your gender?" Answer choices of 'male' and 'female' were provided. Thirty participants identified their gender as male (29.1 %) and 73 participants identified as female (70.9%). One participant did not respond to the question. Participation by gender is presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Survey Response by Gender

| Gender | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Male | 30 | 28.8 |
| Female | 73 | 70.2 |
| Missing | 1 | 1.0 |
| Total | 104 | 100.0 |

**Age.** Participants were asked, "What is your age?" A drop down menu provided answer choices 20–55 and an option for "56+ years." Participation by age of participant was especially diverse. Each year, from 23 year of age to 56+ years of age, was represented by at least one participant except for years 45 and 47. Though in the one-way analysis of variance (page 142) this variable was treated as continuous, years of

music teaching experience were grouped in sets of 10 years to illustrate that each decade

of the typical career of a teacher was found to have approximately equal frequency of

participation.  Teachers in the Commonwealth of Virginia are eligible for unreduced

retirement benefits as early as age 50 and reduced retirement benefits as early as age 55

(Virginia Retirement System, 2016).  Participants who have exceeded the approximate

retirement age were grouped separately and labeled as "56+ years old."  Participation by

age is presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Survey Response by Age

| Age | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| 23–30 years old | 21 | 20.2 |
| 31–40 years old | 27 | 26.0 |
| 41–50 years old | 17 | 16.3 |
| 51–55 years old | 18 | 17.3 |
| 56+ years old | 21 | 20.2 |
| Total | 104 | 100.0 |

**Race/ethnicity.**  Participants were asked, "What is your race/ethnicity?" Answer

choices were provided based on the United States Census Bureau's report about Virginia

demographics.  Answer choices given were (a) White, (b) Hispanic/Latino, (c) Black or

African American, (d) Native American, (e) Asian/Pacific Islander, and (f) Other with a

free response option.  Most participants identified their race/ethnicity as White (85.6%)

with fewer participants identifying as Black/African American (9.6%).  Hispanic/Latino

and Asian/Pacific Islander represented one percent each.  Three participants (2.9%)

identified their race as "Other," with two participants entering "Jewish" into the text field. There is a marked lack of diversity in the race/ethnicity of participants of this survey. Participation by race/ethnicity is presented in Table 7.

Table 7

Survey Response by Race/Ethnicity

| Race/Ethnicity | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| White | 89 | 85.6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 1 | 1.0 |
| Black or African American | 10 | 9.6 |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 1 | 1.0 |
| Native American | 0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 3 | 2.9 |
| Total | 104 | 100.0 |

Based on data from the Common Core of Data, a program of the United States Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics that collects data about public schools, public school districts, and state education agencies in the United States, Boser (2014) identified teacher race demographics by state. This data included only the categories of white, black, Hispanic, other, and "two or more races." The 'other' category included Asian/Pacific Islander, and Native American. These were combined because the data did not meet the Institute of Education Sciences reporting standards.

By collapsing the data from the current study, the sample can be compared to the population through a chi-square Goodness of Fit analysis. The result was not statistically

significant ($p = .842$) indicating that the sample was representative of the population.

The results of the analysis are presented in Table 8.

Table 8

Frequencies of Teacher Race

|  | White | Hispanic | Black | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Observed Freq. | 89 | 1 | 10 | 4 |
| Expected Freq. (prop.) | 86.7 (.85) | 2.0 (.02) | 10.2 (.10) | 5.1 (.05) |

*Note.* $\chi^2 = 0.833$, df =5, $p = .842$. Numbers in parentheses, (), are expected proportions. Freq. = frequency and prop. = proportion.

**Bachelors major.** Participants were asked to indicate their Bachelors major and were given the choices of 'Music Education' or 'Other' with a free response option. Music education was listed as the undergraduate major of 80.8% of the high school choral teachers. However, of those that chose "other" as their major, 17 of 20 majored in some form of music (performance, commerce, church music). Participants represent 62 colleges from 17 states and the District of Columbia. The majority of participants were graduates of Virginia institutions (56.7%), with James Madison University (10.6%), Virginia Commonwealth University (5.8%), and Radford University (5.8%) having the largest representation. The distribution of participants by bachelor's major is presented in Table 9.

Table 9

Survey Response by Bachelor's Major

| Major | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Music Education | 84 | 80.8 |
| Other | 20 | 19.2 |
| Total | 104 | 100.0 |

**Master's.** Participants were asked, "Do you have a master's degree?" Answer choices of 'yes' and 'no' were provided. The majority of participants had a master's degree (61.5%). Participants by master's degree are presented in Table 10. Participants were then asked to indicate the college/university they attended for their master's degree through free response. Participants represented 32 colleges from 16 states and the District of Columbia. The majority of participants were graduates of Virginia institutions (59.4%), with Shenandoah University (12.5%) having the largest representation, followed by George Mason University, James Madison University, Lynchburg College, Virginia Commonwealth University, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University with 6.3% each. The distribution of participants by master's degree is presented in Table 10.

Participants were asked to indicate their master's major and were given the choices of 'Music Education' or 'Other' with a free response option. A Master's in Music Education was listed as the major for 34.4% of participants with a master's degree. Almost twice as many participants (65.6%) had master's degrees in something other than music education. However, of those who chose "other" as their major, 29 of 40 (72.5%) majored in some form of music (performance, conducting, or church music). See

Appendix D for complete list of "other" master's majors. Participation by master's major

is presented in Table 11.

Table 10

Survey Response by Master's Degree

| Master's Degree | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 64 | 61.5 |
| No | 40 | 38.5 |
| Total | 104 | 100.0 |

Table 11

Survey Response by Master's Major

| Master's Major | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Music Education | 22 | 34.4 |
| Other | 42 | 65.6 |
| Total | 64 | 100.0 |

**PhD/EdD.** Participants were asked, "Do you have a PhD or EdD degree?"

Answer choices of 'yes' and 'no' were provided. Six participants (5.8%) reported having

a PhD or EdD. Participants were then asked to indicate the college/university they

attended for their PhD or EdD degree through free response. Participants represented

four colleges from three states. Half of the participants were graduates of Shenandoah

University, a Virginia institution. Participants were asked to indicate their PhD or EdD

major and were given the choices of 'Music Education' or 'Other' with a free response

option. Of the six participants with a doctoral degree, five reported having a terminal

degree in music, with four of those five in music education and one as a DMA in Choral

Conducting.  The distribution of participants by doctoral degree is presented in Table 12.

Table 12

Survey Responses by Doctoral Degree

| Doctoral Degree | Frequency | Percentage |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | 6 | 5.8 |
| No | 98 | 94.2 |
| Total | 104 | 100.0 |

### National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification.

Participants were asked, "Are you a National Board Certified Teacher?"  Answer choices

of 'yes' and 'no' were provided.  Seven participants (6.7%) reported having been

certified by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.  Participation by

National Board Certification is presented in Table 13.

Table 13

Survey Response by National Board Certification

| National Board Certified | Frequency | Percentage |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | 7 | 6.7 |
| No | 93 | 89.4 |
| Missing | 4 | 3.8 |
| Total | 104 | 100.0 |

**Other certifications.**  Participants were asked to list other certifications they had

obtained through free response.  Participants obtained 34 certifications.  Of the 34

certifications obtained, 27 (79.4%) were music-related certifications. Among those

certifications, Orff (23.5%) and Kodaly (17.6%) certifications were the most frequently

obtained. See Appendix D for a complete list of participants' certifications.

**Teacher education in popular music pedagogy.** Participants were asked, "Did

you receive any instruction in teaching popular music in your college experience?"

Answer choices of 'yes' and 'no' were provided. The majority of participants (78.8%)

indicated that they did not receive any instruction in teaching popular music. If

participants selected 'yes,' they were asked, "If you had instruction in teaching popular

music in your college experience, what types of instruction did you receive? (select all

that apply)." Answer choices were: (a) Popular Music was covered in a methods class,

(b) Popular Music was performed in a traditional ensemble, (c) Popular Music was

performed in non-traditional ensemble (d) Popular Music was covered in a separate class

devoted to the genre, and (e) Other with a free response option. Of the 22 participants

who did receive collegiate instruction in teaching popular music, zero participants

performed popular music in a traditional ensemble. The nontraditional performance

ensemble was the most frequent way instruction was provided (17.3%). Eight

participants (7.7%) indicated that popular music was covered in a methods class. Two

participants (1.9%) indicated that there was a separate class devoted to the genre of

popular music, and one additional participant selected "other" and said the university

offered an unrequired class about popular music but scheduling conflicts made it

impossible to register. The second participant that selected "other" indicated that popular

music was covered in a "show choir methods." The distributions of participants by

instruction in teaching popular music in college and type of popular music instruction

received are presented in Table 14 and Table 15, respectively.

Table 14

Survey Response by Instruction in Teaching Popular Music in College

| Received Instruction | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 22 | 21.2 |
| No | 82 | 78.8 |
| Total | 104 | 100.0 |

Table 15

Survey Response by Type of Popular Music Instruction Received

| Type of Instruction | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Popular music was covered in a methods class | 8 | 7.7 |
| Popular music was performed in traditional ensembles | 0 | 0.0 |
| Popular music was performed in non-traditional ensembles | 18 | 17.3 |
| Popular music was covered in a separate class devoted to the genre | 2 | 1.9 |
| Other | 2 | 1.9 |

Because popular music is often learned informally and apart from formal

schooling, participants were also asked, "Did you receive any instruction in teaching

popular music from somewhere other than college (i.e., high school, garage bands,

professional development sessions)? If so, where?" Answer choices were 'yes' with a

free response option and 'no.' Those who indicated that they had other instruction

(32.7%) identified conferences/workshops, student teaching/other teachers, high school

experiences, performances, and self-directed study as other instruction they had received

concerning popular music. The distribution of participants by instruction received in

teaching popular music other than college is presented in Table 16.

Table 16

Survey Response by Instruction in Teaching Popular Music—Other

| Other Instruction | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 34 | 32.7 |
| No | 68 | 65.4 |
| Missing | 2 | 1.9 |
| Total | 104 | 100.0 |

**School Demographics**

**School area.** Participants were asked, "Which of the following best describes the

area in which your school is located?" Answer choices of (a) Urban, (b) Suburban, and

(c) Rural were provided. Participation by school location was equally distributed

between suburban (41.3%) and rural (41.3%), followed by urban (17.3%). The

distribution of participants by school location is presented in Table 17.

The Common Core of Data identifies school area by (a) City, (b) Suburb, (c)

Town, and (d) Rural. Although the categories do not match exactly, the general trend is

similar in that the number of schools in suburban and rural areas is approximately equal

and approximately twice as large as the number of schools in urban areas. The

distribution of schools in the Commonwealth of Virginia by school location is presented

in Table 18.

Table 17

Survey Response by School Location

| School Location | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Urban | 18 | 17.3 |
| Suburban | 43 | 41.3 |
| Rural | 43 | 41.3 |
| Total | 104 | 100.0 |

Table 18

School Location—Commonwealth of Virginia

| School Location | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| City | 51 | 18.7 |
| Suburb | 93 | 34.0 |
| Town | 31 | 11.3 |
| Rural | 98 | 35.9 |
| Total | 273 | 100.0 |

**School size.**  Participants were asked, "What is the total population of your

school?"  Answer choices were provided in increments of 500 up to 3500 students.  The

upper limit was determined based on school enrollment information provided on the

Virginia Department of Education website.  Participation by school size was

approximately evenly distributed among schools in the 501–1000 students (24.0%),

1001–1500 students (29.8%), and 1501–2000 students (21.2%) range.  The extremes of

large (2000+ students) and small schools (1–500 students) were also approximately

evenly distributed at 12.5%. The distribution of participants by school size is presented

in Table 19.

Table 19

Survey Response by School Size

| School Size | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| 1–500 Students | 13 | 12.5 |
| 501–1000 Students | 25 | 24.0 |
| 1001–1500 Students | 31 | 29.8 |
| 1501–2000 Students | 22 | 21.2 |
| 2001–2500 Students | 9 | 8.7 |
| 2501–3000 Students | 2 | 1.9 |
| 3001–3500 Students | 2 | 1.9 |
| Total | 104 | 100.0 |

The sample data for school size was compared to the data for the Commonwealth

of Virginia provided by the Common Core of Data using a chi-square Goodness of Fit

analysis. The result was not statistically significant ($p = .802$) indicating that the sample

is representative of the population. The results are presented in Table 20.

Table 20

Frequencies of School Size

|  | 1–500 | 501–1000 | 1001–1500 | 1501–2000 | 2001–2500 | 2501–3000 | 3001–3500 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Observed Freq. | 13 | 25 | 31 | 22 | 9 | 2 | 2 |
| Expected Freq. (prop.) | 12.17 (.117) | 26.31 (.253) | 26.31 (.253) | 22.88 (.220) | 11.44 (.110) | 3.85 (.037) | 1.14 (.011) |

*Note.* $\chi^2 = 3.053$, df =6, $p = .802$. Numbers in parentheses, (), are expected proportions. Freq. = frequency and prop. = proportion.

**Free/reduced lunch population**. Participants were asked, "What percentage of your school population is on the free/reduced lunch program?" Participants were directed to a link to a PDF file that provided the total free/reduced lunch percentage for each school. Answer choices were provided in 10% increments. Participation by the percentage of students on the free/reduced lunch program in the school ranged from schools 13 schools in the 1–10% range (12.5%) to 81–90% range (2.9%). Seventy-four percent of schools had 50% or less of their students on free/reduced lunch. The distribution of participants by free/reduced lunch population is presented in Table 21.

The sample data for free/reduced lunch percentages were compared to the data for the Commonwealth of Virginia provided by the Common Core of Data using a chi-square Goodness of Fit analysis. The result was statistically significant ($p = .013$) indicating that the sample is not representative of the population. The results are presented in Table 22.

Table 21

Survey Response by Free/Reduced Lunch Population

| Free/Reduced Lunch | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| 1–10% | 13 | 12.5 |
| 11–20% | 12 | 11.5 |
| 21–30% | 17 | 16.3 |
| 31–40% | 19 | 18.3 |
| 41–50% | 16 | 15.4 |
| 51–60% | 12 | 11.5 |
| 61–70% | 5 | 4.8 |
| 71–80% | 7 | 6.7 |
| 81–90% | 3 | 2.9 |
| 91–100% | 0 | 0.0 |
| Total | 104 | 100.0 |

Table 22

Frequencies of Free/Reduced Lunch

| | 1–10 | 11–20 | 21–30 | 31–40 | 41–50 | 51–60 | 61–70 | 71–80 | 81–90 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Observed Freq. | 13 | 12 | 17 | 19 | 16 | 12 | 5 | 7 | 3 |
| Expected Freq. (prop.) | 6.8 (.062) | 13.7 (.125) | 20.5 (.187) | 18.4 (.168) | 18.1 (.165) | 14.9 (.136) | 7.7 (.070) | 3.2 (.029) | 0.80 (.007) |

*Note.* $\chi^2 = 19.302^*$, $df = 8$, $p = .013$. Numbers in parentheses, (), are expected proportions. Freq. = frequency and prop. = proportion.
$^*p < .05$

## Choir Demographics

**Choir population.** Participants were asked, "What is the total population of your high school choir program?" Answer choices were provided in increments of 50 up to

300 students and an option for "301+" for all programs larger than 300 students. Each

participant reported the number of total students in their high school choral program.

Program sizes with 150 students or less were the most frequently reported (89.4%). Ten

schools had choral programs with 151–300 students. Only one program reported having

more than 300 students. The distribution of participants by choral program size is

presented in Table 23.

Table 23

Survey Response by Choral Program Size

| Choral Size | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| 1–50 Students | 30 | 28.8 |
| 51–100 Students | 38 | 36.5 |
| 101–150 Students | 25 | 24.0 |
| 151–200 Students | 5 | 4.8 |
| 201–250 Students | 4 | 3.8 |
| 251–300 Students | 1 | 1.0 |
| 301+ Students | 1 | 1.0 |
| Total | 104 | 100.0 |

Choir populations were compared to school population to determine whether the

enrollment size of the choir program was dependent on the enrollment size of the school.

The result of the chi-square analysis was found to be statistically significant ($p = .000$).

Participants who taught in schools with larger overall school populations were more

likely to have a larger choir program population. Results of the chi-square calculation are

shown in Table 24.

Table 24

Results of Chi-square Test and Descriptive Statistics for School and Choir Population

| Choir Program Population | School Population | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1–500 | 501–1000 | 1001–1500 | 1501–2000 | 2001–2500 | 2501–3000 | 3000–3500 |
| 1–50 | 9 (69.2%) | 14 (56.0%) | 4 (12.9%) | 2 (9.1%) | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 1 (50.0%) |
| 51–100 | 4 (30.8%) | 10 (40.0%) | 13 (41.9%) | 8 (36.4%) | 2 (22.2%) | 1 (50.0%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| 101–150 | 0 (0.0%) | 1 (4.0%) | 12 (38.7%) | 6 (27.3%) | 4 (44.4%) | 1 (50.0%) | 1 (50.0%) |
| 151–200 | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 1 (3.2%) | 4 (18.2%) | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| 201–250 | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 2 (9.1%) | 2 (22.2%) | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| 251–300 | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 1 (11.1%) | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| 301+ | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 1 (3.2%) | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) |

*Note.* $\chi^2 = 73.559^*$, df = 36, $p = .000$.  Numbers in parentheses indicate column percentages.
$^*p < .05$

**Number of high school choral classes.**  Each participant reported how many choral classes they taught each year.  Answers provided were one class through eight classes.  A class is defined as a unique group of students (i.e., a year-long class on block scheduling with the same students would count as one class).  Answers ranged from 1 class to 7 classes per year.  The most frequent response was 4 classes.  One participant did not answer the question, but responses on the following questions indicated that this

participant had one class. The distribution of participants by number of high school choral classes is presented in Table 25.

Table 25

Survey Response by Number of High School Choral Classes

| Choral Classes | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| 1 Class | 11 | 10.6 |
| 2 Classes | 19 | 18.3 |
| 3 Classes | 17 | 16.3 |
| 4 Classes | 27 | 26.0 |
| 5 Classes | 13 | 12.5 |
| 6 Classes | 15 | 14.4 |
| 7 Classes | 1 | 1.0 |
| Missing | 1 | 1.0 |
| Total | 104 | 100.0 |

**Ensemble Demographics**

**Choir descriptions.** Participants were asked to identify which description best fit each of their choral classes. Answer choices given were (a) Beginning Choir, (b) Intermediate Choir, (c) Advanced Choir, (d) Auditioned Choir, (e) Madrigal Singers, (f) Show Choir, and (g) Other with a free response option. A total of 371 classes were reported from 104 participants. "Beginning Choir" (26.7%) and "Intermediate Choir" (26.4%) were the most frequently identified class descriptions. There were 28 classes labeled as "Show Choir" (7.5%). Twenty-seven participants also selected the open-ended "Other" response. These responses indicated that there are high school choir classes being taught for Men's Choir (3), Women's Choir (7), Vocal Jazz (6), and classes of a

combination of beginning, intermediate and advanced students (2), and an adaptive choir

for special education students (1). Participants also indicated that they taught piano (3),

music appreciation (1), musical theater (1), and classes noted as other but not identified

(3). The distribution of description of high school choral classes is presented in Table 26.

Table 26

Survey Response by Description of High School Choral Classes

| Class Description | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Beginning Choir | 99 | 26.7 |
| Intermediate Choir | 98 | 26.4 |
| Advanced Choir | 41 | 11.1 |
| Auditioned Ensemble | 62 | 16.7 |
| Madrigal Singers | 15 | 4.0 |
| Show Choir | 29 | 7.8 |
| Other | 27 | 7.2 |
| Total | 371 | 100.0 |

**Choral assessment.** For each choral class identified previously, participants were

asked to indicate whether that class attended the Virginia Music Educators

Association/Virginia Choral Directors Association Performance Assessment, which is an

adjudicated choral ensemble festival. Seventy-two participants (69.2%) indicated that

they took at least one of their choir classes to the Virginia Music Educators

Association/Virginia Choral Directors Association Performance Assessment. Thirty

participants (28.9%) indicated that they did not take at least one of their choir classes to

Choral Assessment. Of the 371 total choir classes, 180 classes (48.5%) attended Choral

Assessment.  The distribution of participants by Choral Assessment attendance is

presented in Table 27.

Table 27

Survey Response by Choral Assessment

| Choral Assessment | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 72 | 69.2 |
| No | 30 | 28.9 |
| Missing | 2 | 1.9 |
| Total | 104 | 100.0 |

Ensemble data were analyzed to determine if the inclusion of popular music as

performance literature or to teach concepts was dependent on whether or not an ensemble

attended the Virginia Music Educators Association/Virginia Choral Directors Association

Performance Assessment.  Participants indicated that they taught 371 classes.  For each

class, participants were asked whether they went to Choral Assessment.  Of the 371

classes, seven classes labeled "other" were determined to be classes that were not choral

classes (piano, music appreciation, musical theater, classes not labeled).  Of the 364

remaining classes, 27 participants did not respond to the assessment questions.  Data

were collected for 337 choral classes on whether the teacher included popular music in

each class as performance literature or to teach musical concepts.  Of the 337 classes,

98% of classes included popular music instruction.  A Chi-square test was used to

determine whether class attendance at Choral Assessment had a significant impact on the

teacher's inclusion of popular music instruction.  The results were not significant ($p$ =

.057).  Results of the chi-square calculations are shown in Table 28.

Table 28

Results of Chi-square Test and Descriptive Statistics for Class Choral Assessment

| | Popular Music Inclusion | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Choral Assessment | No | Yes | Total |
| Yes | 7 (33.3%) | 173 (54.8%) | 180 (53.4%) |
| No | 14 (66.6%) | 143 (45.2%) | 157 (46.6%) |
| Total | 21 (100%) | 316 (100%) | 337 (100%) |

*Note.* $\chi^2$ = 3.629, df = 1, $p$ = .057.  Numbers in parentheses indicate column percentages.

**Research Question Three**

Research question three was, "To what extent is popular music being included in

the high school choral curriculum?"

Demographic data about the teacher, school, and choir program were collected

and analyzed to determine whether these characteristics contributed to differences in the

percent of popular music included as performance literature.  Participants indicated the

percentage of popular music they include as performance literature by choosing the

appropriate percentage range.  The percentage ranges were in increments of ten from zero

to one hundred.  The results of this question are presented in Table 29.

Table 29

Survey Response by Percentage of Popular Music Performed

| Percentage of Popular Music | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| 1–10% | 38 | 36.5 |
| 11–20% | 36 | 34.6 |
| 21–30% | 17 | 16.3 |
| 31–40% | 6 | 5.8 |
| 41–50% | 3 | 2.9 |
| 51–60% | 1 | 1.0 |
| 61–70% | 0 | 0.0 |
| 71–80% | 0 | 0.0 |
| 81–90% | 2 | 1.9 |
| 91–100% | 1 | 1.0 |
| Total | 104 | 100.0 |

For the purpose of the following analyses, the responses were combined to make three groups. The majority of participants indicated that they included popular music as "1–10%" or "11–20%" of their total performance literature. The final group was created by combining any response above 21% and was labeled at "21+%." Having three groups allows the statistical analyses to run correctly based on sample size and eliminating cells with small or zero frequencies. These groups are presented in Table 30.

Each question from the demographic sections on teacher, school, and choir program was analyzed using either a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) or Pearson chi-square test, depending on whether the variable was continuous or categorical, to determine whether there were statistically significant differences among the participants' percentage group of popular music included in total performance literature due to

characteristics of the teacher, school, and choir program.  The following sections present the statistical analysis of each demographic area: (1) teacher, (2) school, and (3) choir program, and (4) ensemble.

Table 30

Survey Response by Groups Percentage of Popular Music Performed

| Percentage of Popular Music | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| 1–10% | 38 | 36.5 |
| 11–20% | 36 | 34.6 |
| 21+% | 30 | 28.9 |
| Total | 104 | 100.0 |

**Teacher**

Demographic data about the teacher was collected and analyzed to determine whether there were statistically significant differences among the participants' percentage group of popular music included in total performance literature due to these characteristics.  There were no significant differences between the percentage group of popular music included in total performance literature based on the teachers' years of experience as a music teacher ($p = .823$), teachers' years of experience teaching high school choir ($p = .266$), teachers' years at their current position ($p = .332$), the teachers' age ($p = .885$), teachers' certification status ($p = .165$), teachers' gender ($p = .526$), teachers' race/ethnicity ($p = .121$), bachelor's major ($p = .373$), presence of a PhD ($p = .158$), or National Board Certified Teacher status ($p = .197$).  Results of the one-way ANOVAs and chi-square calculations are shown in Tables 31–40.

Table 31

One-way ANOVA: Teachers' Years of Music Teaching Experience

| Source | SS | df | MS | F | Sig. |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Years | 36.080 | 2 | 18.040 | .195 | .823 NS |
| Error | 9248.017 | 100 | 92.480 | | |

Table 32

One-way ANOVA: Teachers' Years of High School Choir Experience

| Source | SS | df | MS | F | Sig. |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Years | 194.894 | 2 | 97.447 | 1.344 | .266 NS |
| Error | 7034.746 | 97 | 72.523 | | |

Table 33

One-way ANOVA: Teachers' Years at Current Position

| Source | SS | df | MS | F | Sig. |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Years | 105.485 | 2 | 52.742 | 1.114 | .332 NS |
| Error | 4684.006 | 99 | 47.333 | | |

Table 34

One-way ANOVA: Teachers' Age

| Source | SS | df | MS | F | Sig. |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Years | 30.216 | 2 | 15.108 | .122 | .885 NS |
| Error | 12528.775 | 101 | 124.047 | | |

Table 35

Results of Chi-square Test and Descriptive Statistics for Teachers' Certification

|  | Popular Music Inclusion Group | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Certification | 1–10% | 11–20% | 21+% |
| Yes | 37 (97.4%) | 35 (97.2%) | 30 (100.0%) |
| No | 1 (2.6%) | 1 (2.8%) | 0 (0.0%) |

*Note.* $\chi^2 = 6.491$, $df = 4$, $p = .165$.  Numbers in parentheses indicate column percentages.

Table 36

Results of Chi-square Test and Descriptive Statistics for Teachers' Gender

|  | Popular Music Inclusion Group | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Certification | 1–10% | 11–20% | 21+% |
| Male | 12 (32.4%) | 8 (22.2%) | 10 (33.3%) |
| Female | 25 (67.6%) | 28 (77.8%) | 20 (66.7%) |

*Note.* $\chi^2 = 1.284$, $df = 2$, $p = .526$.  Numbers in parentheses indicate column percentages.

Table 37

Results of Chi-square Test and Descriptive Statistics for Teachers' Race/Ethnicity

|  | Popular Music Inclusion Group | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Race/Ethnicity | 1–10% | 11–20% | 21+% |
| White | 33 (86.8%) | 32 (88.9%) | 24 (80.0%) |
| Hispanic/Latino | 0 (0.0%) | 1 (2.8%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Black/African American | 5 (13.2%) | 3 (8.3%) | 2 (6.7%) |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 1 (3.3%) |
| Other | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 3 (10.0%) |

*Note.* $\chi^2 = 12.747$, $df = 8$, $p = .121$.  Numbers in parentheses indicate column percentages.

Table 38

Results of Chi-square Test and Descriptive Statistics for Bachelor's Major

| | Popular Music Inclusion Group | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bachelor's Major | 1–10% | 11–20% | 21+% |
| Music Education | 33 (86.8%) | 29 (80.6%) | 22 (73.3%) |
| Other | 5 (13.2%) | 7 (19.4%) | 8 (26.7%) |

*Note.* $\chi^2 = 1.971$, $df = 2$, $p = .373$.  Numbers in parentheses indicate column percentages.

Table 39

Results of Chi-square Test and Descriptive Statistics for PhD/EdD

| | Popular Music Inclusion Group | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| PhD/EdD | 1–10% | 11–20% | 21+% |
| Yes | 3 (17.6%) | 3 (11.5%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| No | 14 (82.4%) | 23 (88.5%) | 21 (100.0%) |

*Note.* $\chi^2 = 3.685$, $df = 2$, $p = .158$.  Numbers in parentheses indicate column percentages.

Table 40

Results of Chi-square Test and Descriptive Statistics for National Board Certification

| | Popular Music Inclusion Group | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| National Boards | 1–10% | 11–20% | 21+% |
| Yes | 4 (11.1%) | 3 (8.6%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| No | 32 (88.9%) | 32 (91.4%) | 29 (100.0%) |

*Note.* $\chi^2 = 3.250$, $df = 2$, $p = .197$.  Numbers in parentheses indicate column percentages.

The result of the chi-square analysis for presence of a master's degree was found to be statistically significant ($p = .028$).  Those participants who had achieved a master's degree were more likely to include more popular music in their high school choral

curriculum. However, the chi-square calculation for master's major was not significant

($p = .845$). Results of the chi-square calculations are shown in Tables 41 and 42,

respectively.

Table 41

Results of Chi-square Test and Descriptive Statistics for Master's Degree

| | Popular Music Inclusion Group | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Master's Degree | 1–10% | 11–20% | 21+% |
| Yes | 17 (44.7%) | 26 (72.2%) | 21 (70.0%) |
| No | 21 (55.3%) | 10 (27.8%) | 9 (30.0%) |

*Note.* $\chi^2 = 7.176^*$, $df = 2$, $p = .028$. Numbers in parentheses indicate column percentages.
$^*p < .05$

Table 42

Results of Chi-square Test and Descriptive Statistics for Master's Degree

| | Popular Music Inclusion Group | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Master's Major | 1–10% | 11–20% | 21+% |
| Music Education | 5 (29.4%) | 9 (34.6%) | 8 (38.1%) |
| Other | 12 (70.6%) | 17 (65.4%) | 13 (61.9%) |

*Note.* $\chi^2 = .315$, $df = 2$, $p = .854$. Numbers in parentheses indicate column percentages.

**School**

Demographic data about the school was collected and analyzed to determine

whether there were statistically significant differences among the participants' percentage

groups of popular music included in total performance literature due to these

characteristics. There were no significant differences between the percentage groups of

popular music included in total performance literature based on the total school

population ($p$ = .435), the percentage of the school's population on free/reduced lunch ($p$

= .308), or the location of the school ($p$ = .165). Results of the one-way ANOVAs and

chi-square calculations are shown in Tables 43–45.

Table 43

One-way ANOVA: School Population

| Source | SS | df | MS | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Population | 755777.665 | 2 | 377888.833 | .839 | .435 NS |
| Error | 45472587.719 | 101 | 450223.641 | | |

Table 44

One-way ANOVA: School's Population on Free/Reduced Lunch

| Source | SS | df | MS | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lunch | 1093.257 | 2 | 546.628 | 1.190 | .308 NS |
| Error | 46395.205 | 101 | 459.258 | | |

Table 45

Results of Chi-square Test and Descriptive Statistics for School Location

| | Popular Music Inclusion Group | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| School Location | 1–10% | 11–20% | 21+% |
| Urban | 11 (28.9%) | 5 (13.9%) | 2 (6.7%) |
| Suburban | 14 (36.8%) | 16 (44.4%) | 13 (43.3%) |
| Rural | 13 (34.2%) | 15 (41.7%) | 15 (50.0%) |

*Note.* $\chi^2$ = 6.491, $df$ = 4, $p$ = .165. Numbers in parentheses indicate column percentages.

**Choir Program**

Demographic data about the choir program was collected and analyzed to determine whether there were statistically significant differences between the participants' percentage group of popular music included in total performance literature due to these characteristics. There were no significant differences among the percentage groups of popular music included in total performance literature based on the total population of the choir program ($p = .706$) or the number of classes present in the choir program ($p = .494$). Results of the one-way ANOVAs are shown in Tables 46–47.

Table 46

One-way ANOVA: Choir Program Population

| Source | SS | df | MS | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Population | 2424.678 | 2 | 1212.339 | .349 | .706 NS |
| Error | 350495.784 | 101 | 3470.255 | | |

Table 47

One-way ANOVA: Number of Classes in Choral Program

| Source | SS | df | MS | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Classes | 3.597 | 2 | 1.798 | .710 | .494 NS |
| Error | 253.277 | 100 | 2.533 | | |

Seventy-two participants (69.2%) indicated that they took at least one of their choir classes to Choral Assessment. Thirty participants (28.9%) indicated that they did not take at least one of their choir classes to Choral Assessment. A Chi-square test was

used to determine whether taking at least one class to Choral Assessment had a

significant impact on the teacher's percentage of popular music included.  The results

were not significant ($p$ = .656).  Results of the chi-square calculations are shown in Table

48.

Table 48

Results of Chi-square Test and Descriptive Statistics for Teacher Choral Assessment

| | Popular Music Inclusion Group | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Choral Assessment | 1–10% | 11–20% | 21+% |
| Yes | 28 (75.7%) | 25 (69.4%) | 19 (65.5 %) |
| No | 9 (24.3%) | 11 (30.6%) | 10 (34.5%) |

*Note.*  $\chi^2$ = .843, $df$ = 2, $p$ = .656.  Numbers in parentheses indicate column percentages.

**Research Question Four**

Research question four was, "How is popular music being implemented in the

high school choral classroom?"

Teachers were asked to indicate the reasons they choose to include popular music

in their classroom from a given list of answers derived from the literature review and an

"other" option with free response.  Answer choices are listed in the Table 49.  The most

frequent reasons were "Popular music adds variety to the choir program" (86.5%), "I can

teach musical concepts through popular music" (82.7%), and "My students like popular

music" (75.0%).  The reasons with the lowest frequency count are "Because I am

required to by my district" (1.0%), "It allows my students to be the expert" (18.3%), and

"I believe in starting with what the students already know" (19.2%).  "Other" responses

can be found in Appendix D.  The distribution of reasons teachers gave for including

popular music is presented in Table 49.

Table 49

Reasons for Including Popular Music

| Reasons | *n* (%) |
| --- | --- |
| I believe in starting with what the students already know. | 20 (19.2) |
| It makes the concepts I teach relevant to my students' lives. | 66 (63.5) |
| It shows that I value/respect my students' music. | 61 (58.7) |
| I can teach musical concepts through popular music. | 86 (82.7) |
| I like popular music. | 42 (40.4) |
| My students like popular music. | 78 (75.0) |
| Popular music has inherent value. | 36 (34.6) |
| Popular music attracts more/varied students. | 67 (64.4) |
| It allows my students to be the expert. | 19 (18.3) |
| It meets local/state/national standards. | 21 (20.2) |
| It develops students' aural and expressive skills. | 45 (43.3) |
| Popular music adds variety to the choir program. | 90 (86.5) |
| I include popular music to please my audience. | 51 (49.0) |
| Because I am required to by my district. | 1 (1.0) |
| Other | 9 (8.7) |

**Concepts and/or Performance**

**Musical concepts taught through popular music.**  Sixty-seven participants

(64.4%) indicated that they taught musical concepts through popular music in at least one

of their choral classes.  Thirty-four participants (32.7%) indicated that they did not teach

musical concepts through popular music.  The distribution of participants by teaching

concepts through popular music is presented in Table 50.

Table 50

Survey Response by Concept Teaching Through Popular Music

| Concept Teaching | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 67 | 64.4 |
| No | 34 | 32.7 |
| Missing | 3 | 2.9 |
| Total | 104 | 100.0 |

Participants were asked, "Do you use popular music to teach any of the following

musical concepts? (select all that apply)."  Answer choices were given and included an

"other" answer with a free response option.  The complete list of answer choices is

presented in Table 50.  For each of the musical concepts listed, at least 50% of

participants incorporated popular music to help teach the concept.  Popular music was

most frequently used to teach the concepts of melody and harmony, 83.7% and 87.5%

respectively.  Ten participants also selected the open-ended "Other" response.  These

responses indicated that the musical concepts of reading rhythms, sight-reading,

arranging, vocal styles, and choreography were also taught through popular music

literature.  Although 34 participants (32.7%) answered that they did not teach musical

concepts through popular music in the previous question, some participants answered this

question signifying that they did use popular music to teach musical concepts.  The

distribution of participants by concepts taught through popular music is presented in

Table 51.

Table 51

Survey Response by Concepts Taught Through Popular Music

| Concept | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------|-----------|------------|
| Steady Beat | 73 | 70.2 |
| Meter | 63 | 60.6 |
| Melody | 87 | 83.7 |
| Harmony | 91 | 87.5 |
| Tonality | 55 | 52.9 |
| Texture | 52 | 50.0 |
| Tempo | 59 | 56.7 |
| Expressive Elements | 79 | 76.0 |
| Timbre | 54 | 51.9 |
| Form | 66 | 63.5 |
| Other | 10 | 9.6 |

**Performance of popular music.** Participants were asked whether they included

popular music as performance literature in any of their high school choral classes. Of

104 participants, 99 (95.2%) responded that they included popular music as performance

literature. The distribution of participants by performance of popular music is presented

in Table 52.

Table 52

Survey Response by Performance of Popular Music

| Perform Popular Music | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 99 | 95.2 |
| No | 5 | 4.8 |
| Total | 104 | 100.0 |

**Other performance literature.** Participants were asked to select which other styles of music they included as performance repertoire. Answer choices were given and included (a) Renaissance, (b) Baroque, (c) Classical, (d) Romantic, (e) 20th Century, (f) Folk song arrangements, (g) Jazz, and (h) Non-Western. The performance literature categories with the highest frequency of responses were Classical (75.0%), 20th Century (75.0%) and folk song arrangements (86.5%). The distribution of participants by percentage of other performance literature is presented in Table 53.

Table 53

Survey Response by Other Performance Literature

| Literature | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Renaissance | 67 | 64.4 |
| Baroque | 59 | 56.7 |
| Classical | 78 | 75.0 |
| Romantic | 47 | 45.2 |
| 20th Century | 78 | 75.0 |
| Folk song arrangements | 90 | 86.5 |
| Jazz | 69 | 66.3 |
| Non-Western | 54 | 51.9 |

**Popular music genres performed.**  Based on the definition of popular music for this survey, participants were asked to identify which genres of popular music they included as performance repertoire.  Answer choices include (a) Alternative, (b) Country, (c) Dance, (d) Disney, (e) Electronic, (f) Hip-Hop/Rap, (g) Indie, (h) Inspirational-Contemporary Christian and Gospel, (i) Pop, (j) R&B/Soul, (k) Rock, and (l) Other with a free response option.

Pop was the most commonly selected genre (87.5%).  R&B/Soul (47.1%), Rock (42.3), and Disney (43.3%) were also used frequently.  Nineteen participants used the open-ended response "Other."  Of these responses, 9/19 indicated that they included musical selections from Broadway.  World music, folk, jazz were also given as open-ended responses despite the working definition specifically stating that they were not being considered popular music for the purposes of the study.  Specific examples of music were also given such as "50's Doo Wop/60's girl group, Motown, oldies, and "The Lion Sleeps Tonight."  The distribution of participants by popular music genres performed is presented in Table 54.

Table 54

Survey Response by Popular Music Genres Performed

| Genre | Frequency | Percentage |
|-------|-----------|------------|
| Alternative | 14 | 13.5 |
| Country | 34 | 32.7 |
| Dance | 10 | 9.6 |
| Disney | 45 | 43.3 |
| Electronic | 4 | 3.8 |
| Hip-Hop/Rap | 8 | 7.7 |
| Indie | 10 | 9.6 |
| Inspirational | 32 | 30.8 |
| Pop | 91 | 87.5 |
| R&B/Soul | 49 | 47.1 |
| Rock | 44 | 42.3 |
| Other | 19 | 18.3 |

**Selecting/Finding/Obtaining Popular Music Materials**

   **Selection criteria for popular music.**  Participants were asked which criteria

they used to select popular music from a list of choices derived from previous research

(Forbes, 2001).  Answer choices are presented in Table 55.  "Quality" (93.3%) and "If it

fits my ensemble's needs" (84.6%) were the most frequently selected criteria.  "Concepts

to be covered" had the lowest frequency of responses (38.5%).  Fifteen participants also

selected the open-ended "Other" response.  These responses indicated that audience

appeal, concert theme/programming needs, and appropriateness of the literature were also

important selection criteria for popular music.  Responses for other are presented in

Appendix D.  The distribution of participants by selection criteria for popular music is

presented in Table 55.

Table 55

Survey Response by Selection Criteria for Popular Music

| Selection Criteria | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Quality | 97 | 93.3 |
| Concepts to be covered | 40 | 38.5 |
| If it fits my ensemble's needs | 88 | 84.6 |
| If sheet music is available | 60 | 57.7 |
| If my students will like it | 58 | 55.8 |
| If I like it | 68 | 65.4 |
| Other | 15 | 14.4 |

**Finding popular music literature.** Participants were asked how they find

popular music to be included in their curriculum. Answer choices were given based on

previous research (Forbes, 2001; Reames, 2001) and can be found in Table 56. The

response "What is available through the provider (J. W. Pepper, Musical Source,

catalogues)" was the most frequent response (87.5%). "Student input/suggestions" was

the second most frequent response (74.0%). Participants also identified "Publisher

materials" as a frequent way of finding/selecting literature (66.3%). "Listening to radio,

online, or iTunes" (44.2%), "Colleagues" (36.5%), and "Workshops" (41.3%) were used

to a lesser extent. Ten participants also selected the open-ended "Other" response. These

responses indicated that online music sources (i.e., printable scores and recordings

through YouTube), listening to other "quality" choral groups perform, and what is

already in their music library also play a role in finding popular music. The distribution

of participants by popular music literature selection is presented in Table 56.

Table 56

Survey Response by Finding Popular Music

| Finding Popular Music | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Publisher materials | 69 | 66.3 |
| Student input/suggestions | 77 | 74.0 |
| Listening to radio, online, or iTunes | 46 | 44.2 |
| What is available through the provider (JW Pepper, Musical Source, catalogues) | 91 | 87.5 |
| Colleagues | 38 | 36.5 |
| Workshops | 43 | 41.3 |
| Other | 10 | 9.6 |

**Obtaining popular music materials.** Participants were asked to indicate where they obtained the popular music materials they used. No previous research studies have investigated where teachers obtain popular music materials. Answer choices were given based on related literature were (a) Online websites (pay), (b) Music providers, (c) Free online sources, (d) Student arrangements, and (e) other with an option for free response. Music providers such as J. W. Pepper, Musical Source, and other catalogues were used by 98.1% of participants. Online sources, both paid (37.5%) and free (25.0%), were also used. Arrangements were also composed by students (22.1%), directors (11.5%), and commissioned composers (1.9%). The distribution of participants by where popular music materials are obtained is presented in Table 57.

Table 57

Survey Response by Where Popular Music Materials are Obtained

| Where Materials are Obtained | Frequency | Percentage |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Online websites (Pay) | 39 | 37.5 |
| Music Providers (JW Pepper, Musical Source, catalogues) | 102 | 98.1 |
| Free online sources | 26 | 25.0 |
| Student arrangements | 23 | 22.1 |
| Other | 16 | 15.4 |

## Popular Music Performance Details

**Concerts including popular music**. Participants were asked on which concert performances they programmed popular music. Answer choices provided were common concert types: (a) Fall Concert, (b) Christmas/Winter Concert, (c) Spring Concert, (d) Pops Concert, (e) Graduation, and (f) other with an option for free response. The spring concert was the most frequent response (86.5%). Twenty-eight participants (26.9%) indicated that they gave a Pops Concert. Eight participants also selected the open-ended "Other" response. These responses indicated that popular music was performed at school and community events as well as in Show Choir specific settings such as competitions and concerts. The distribution of participants by concerts including popular music is presented in Table 58.

Table 58

Survey Response by Concerts Including Popular Music

| Concerts Including Popular Music | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Fall Concert | 13 | 12.5 |
| Christmas/Winter Concert | 33 | 31.7 |
| Spring Concert | 90 | 86.5 |
| Pops Concert | 28 | 26.9 |
| Graduation | 27 | 26.0 |
| Other | 8 | 7.7 |

**Accompaniment for choral performances of popular music.** Participants were asked to indicate which types of accompaniment they used for choral performances of popular music. Answer choices were given based on common accompaniment styles for popular music: (a) Piano only, (b) Band, (c) Accompaniment Track, (d) A cappella, and (e) other with an option for free response. Piano only (83.7%) and a cappella (78.8%) were most frequently used. A band comprised of keyboard, guitar, bass, and drums was used by 49% of participants. Accompaniment tracks were also used by 47.1% of participants. Four participants also selected the open-ended "Other" response. These responses indicated that popular music was accompanied by other combinations of instruments including guitar only, jazz band, and accordion. The distribution of participants by accompaniment type for choir performances of popular music is presented in Table 59.

Table 59

Accompaniment Type for Choir Performances of Popular Music

| Accompaniment Type | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Piano Only | 87 | 83.7 |
| Band (Keyboard, Guitar, Bass, Drums) | 51 | 49.0 |
| Accompaniment Track | 49 | 47.1 |
| A cappella | 82 | 78.8 |
| Other | 4 | 3.8 |

**Accompaniment for solo performances of popular music.** Participants were asked to indicate which types of accompaniment they used for solo performances of popular music. Because there is a large focus on group singing in choral classes, the option "I do not include solo popular music performances" was given. The remaining answer choices were given based on common accompaniment styles for solo popular music:(a) Piano only, (b) Band, (c) Accompaniment Track, and (d) other with an option for free response. Forty-one participants (39.4%) indicated that they did not include solo popular music. Of the remaining 63 participants, Piano only was the most frequent response (52/63, 82.5%). A band comprised of keyboard, guitar, bass, and drums was used by 36.5% of participants who include solo popular music. Accompaniment tracks were used by 55.6% of participants who include solo popular music. Six participants selected the open-ended "Other" response. These responses indicated that popular music was accompanied by solo instrument (often guitar) or string orchestra/full ensemble. The distribution of participants by accompaniment type for solo performances of popular music is presented in Table 60.

Table 60

Accompaniment Type for Solo Performances of Popular Music

| Accompaniment Type | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| I do not include solo popular music performances | 41 | 39.4 |
| Piano Only | 52 | 50.0 |
| Band (Keyboard, Guitar, Bass, Drums) | 23 | 22.1 |
| Accompaniment Track | 35 | 33.7 |
| Other | 6 | 5.8 |

**Student feelings about performing popular music.** Participants were asked what kind of student responses they observe while performing popular music. Answer choices were given in a Likert-type scale: (a) They love it, (b) they like it mostly, (c) They are indifferent, (d) They dislike it, and (e) They hate it. Positive responses of "They love it" or "They like it mostly" accounted for 94.2% of participants. Five participants (4.8%) responded with "They are indifferent." No participants chose the responses of "They dislike it" or "They hate it." The distribution of participants by student response to performing popular music is presented in Table 61.

Table 61

Student Feelings about Performing Popular Music

| Student Response | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| They love it | 47 | 45.2 |
| They like it mostly | 51 | 49.0 |
| They are indifferent | 5 | 4.8 |
| They dislike it | 0 | 0.0 |
| They hate it | 0 | 0.0 |
| Missing | 1 | 1.0 |
| Total | 104 | 100.0 |

The following chapter is a discussion of the results of the study.  The analyses from this chapter will be discussed along with their implications for the music education profession and for practicing teachers.  Finally, suggestions for future research will be presented in relation to the current study.

# CHAPTER V

# CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study is to provide a descriptive analysis of high school choral teachers' inclusion of popular music in current teaching practices by (a) determining the frequency of inclusion, (b) developing a profile of teachers, schools, and choral programs that include popular music in the curriculum, (c) determining which demographic characteristics affected the amount of popular music included, and (d) developing a profile of popular music implementation details. The researcher-designed *Popular Music Survey* was administered to high school choral teachers in the Commonwealth of Virginia and the responses were analyzed to answer the following research questions:

1. Are high school choral teachers including popular music as performance literature and/or instructional materials?

2. What characteristics of the teacher, school, choral program, and/or ensemble best describe those who include popular music?

3. To what extent is popular music being included in the high school choral curriculum?

4. How is popular music being implemented in the high school choral classroom?

## Discussion

**Research Question One**

Research question one was, "Are high school choral teachers including popular music as performance literature and/or instructional materials?" All participants ($n = 104$) in the current study indicated that they included popular music in their choral curriculum.

Considering the sizable amount of research that indicates teachers have problems with the inclusion of popular music (D. Baker, 1992; Chastagner, 1999; S. Davis & Blair, 2011; Cuttietta, 1991; Dunbar-Hall & Wemyss, 2000; Forbes, 2001; Gaitandjiev, 1997; Graham, 2009; Green, 2006; Hebert & Campbell, 2000; Isbell, 2007; J. Johnson, 2002; Jorgensen, 2002; Landeck, 1968; MacCluskey, 1979; Mantie, 2013; Melnick, 2001; Middleton & Manuel, 2014; Monk, 1959; Pembrook, 1991; Ponick, 2000; Warner, 1997; Woody, 2007), and previous research that concluded teachers were excluding popular music from performance (Forbes, 2001), the finding that all participants included popular music indicates that despite their concerns, teachers are finding ways to include popular music.

Teachers are finding and including popular music materials in ways that they find valuable in their classroom. Popular music is being included to teach musical concepts and as performance literature. Although teachers indicated that they had issues finding quality popular music literature and there were problems with arrangements especially in relation to rhythm, it is clear they are overcoming these issues and successfully including popular music.

**Research Question Two**

Research question two was, "What characteristics of the teacher, school, choral program, and/or ensemble best describe those who include popular music?"

Demographic data concerning the race/ethnicity of the teacher, school size, and percentage of students on free/reduced lunch were analyzed to determine whether the sample data were representative of the population of choral teachers in the Commonwealth of Virginia. This information is presented and discussed first and followed by a more general discussion of the findings concerning characteristics of the teacher, school, choral program, and ensemble. Finally, a teacher and school profile is presented based on the most frequent demographic responses of those who include popular music in the classroom.

Demographic data from the sample were compared to the demographic data for the Commonwealth of Virginia provided by the Common Core of Data for race/ethnicity of the teacher, school size, and percentage of the school population on free/reduced lunch using chi-square Goodness of Fit analyses. These analyses can be used to determine whether the sample data were representative of the population of choral teachers in the Commonwealth of Virginia. By concluding that the sample was representative of the population, it is acceptable to generalize conclusions about the sample to the population.

Results of the analyses were not statistically significant for the race/ethnicity of the teacher ($p = .842$) and school size ($p = .802$) indicating that the sample is representative of the population with regards to these characteristics. Although the data for school location cannot be compared directly because categories are not the same, the

general trend is similar in that the number of schools in suburban areas is approximately equal to that of rural areas and approximately twice as large as the number of schools in urban areas.   These findings indicate that the sample is representative of the population and findings can be generalized to the population.

The sample data for free/reduced lunch percentages were statistically significant ($p = .013$) indicating that the sample is not representative of the population in relation to the percentage of the school's population receiving free/reduced lunch.  The observed frequencies from the sample data in the "1-10%," "70-80%," and "80-90%" responses were larger than the expected frequencies indicating that the sample data were over-represented by schools with small and large percentages of students on free/reduced lunch.  This finding indicates that the findings, especially those directly related to free/reduced lunch percentages, were not generalizable to the population.

Demographic data concerning the teachers' years of teaching experience, years of high school choral teaching experience, and years at their present school were diverse and each ranged from one to 31+ years.   Although the range was the same for each, as you move from teaching experience to high school choral teaching experience to years at their present school, the data becomes weighted more heavily towards fewer years.  This indicates that some participants in the Commonwealth of Virginia have taught at levels other than high school and many have changed teaching positions between schools.  It is generally accepted to include popular music in elementary general music, but there is still much debate about the inclusion of popular music at the secondary level (Dunbar-Hall & Wemyss, 2000).  The finding that teachers in the Commonwealth of Virginia have music

teaching experience other than as a high school choral teacher may influence their decisions to include popular music. If teachers have successfully included popular music at the elementary level and experienced the benefits, they may be more likely to include it in the high school choral curriculum even though there is debate among other educators about its inclusion.

The data indicate that the sample was representative of the population of teachers in the Commonwealth of Virginia in regard to race/ethnicity. However, it is important to note that most participants (85.6%) were white and the proportions of race/ethnicity of teachers are not the same as the student population (Virginia Department of Education, 2016) or the overall population in the Commonwealth of Virginia (U.S Census Bureau, 2016). This finding is important for two reasons. It is difficult to find meaningful information about how and whether the race/ethnicity of a teacher impacts the inclusion of popular music if there are very few participants that represent race/ethnicities that are not White. Because the sample is representative of the population of teachers in the Commonwealth of Virginia, it is not likely that a higher response rate would yield different results. To determine whether the teachers' race/ethnicity has an impact on the inclusion of popular music, future research would have to include a larger population, possibly at a regional or national level. Popular music styles are often associated with a particular race and based on their cultural and life experiences. It is possible that the genres included for performance may be impacted by these cultural attributes, but because of the small number of participants, the statistical analyses could not detect the differences.

Participants ranged in age from 23 to 56+ years old. Participants older than forty accounted for 53.8% of the sample. Popular music is preferred by young people (Benner, 1972; Geter & Streisand, 1995; Hargreaves & North, 1997; LeBlanc, 1979; May, 1985; Mills, 2000; Stewart, 1984) and so it may be tempting to think that younger teachers would include popular music and possibly include it more extensively. However, Davis and Blair (2011) found that despite their youth and preference for popular music, pre-service teachers questioned the use of popular music in school contexts. Popular music is also seen as a way to separate teenagers from adults (Ponick, 2000) and so it may also be tempting to think that older teachers would not include popular music. This study shows that all participants, regardless of age, included popular music in the choral classroom. This finding may indicate that even though popular music is shown to be the style of music teenagers prefer, it does not mean that it cannot also be liked by those in older age brackets. While some music may still serve to separate generations, it may be true to a lesser extent or even an outdated way of thinking.

A Bachelor of Music Education was the undergraduate degree earned by 80.8% of participants. The majority of participants (78.8%) indicated that they did not receive any instruction in teaching popular music in their college experience. This finding is consistent with conclusions that the many college curricula do not included popular music (MacCluskey, 1979; Pembrook, 1991). In practical terms, this finding shows that 82 participants are teaching materials in which they had no formal training in their collegiate experience.

Eight participants (7.7%) indicated that popular music was covered in a methods class and eighteen participants (17.3%) indicated that popular music was performed in a non-traditional ensemble.  This finding is consistent with Wang & Humphrey's (2009) study that showed that much of the limited amount of time devoted to popular music in the university setting could be attributed to participation in elective courses rather than required curricular courses.  Though the current study did not seek to determine the amount of time devoted to popular music in the university setting, it is important to note that there are universities that are including popular music instruction in required methods classes.  Methods classes in music education programs are courses that are directly addressing instructional methods and practices.  They often give students a chance to put into practice what they have learned about music in other classes in the context of teaching others.  Having an expert teacher present to observe and guide these pre-service teachers in the inclusion of popular music could not only encourage them to include it, but could also elevate their ability to include popular music successfully and in a meaningful way for their students.  When a professor, who is in a position of authority, includes popular music in their curriculum, it signifies that it is a legitimate type of music for study.

Two participants (1.9%) indicated that there was a separate class devoted to the genre of popular music, and one additional participant that said the university offered an unrequired class about popular music but scheduling conflicts made it impossible to register. These types of classes at the collegiate level show that the study of popular music is being taken more seriously, at least by some.  Johnson (1997) suggested that

these types of changes had begun and attributed it to individuals who were introducing progressive ideas, methods, and courses.

While it is clearly not widespread among university curricula, these findings show a progression towards the inclusion of popular music.  The changes may be attributed to recent research in the United States that seeks to justify the inclusion of popular music or international research that focuses on popular music pedagogy and implementation (Mantie, 2013).  The addition of popular music to the collegiate curriculum may be due to an increased demand from students who are open to more contemporary ideas and who are capable and willing to incorporate the technology associated with these changes (Johnson, 1997).  Including popular music may have once been the exception, but according to the current study's findings those teachers not including popular music are now the exceptions.  If this is true of other states and regions, the inclusion of popular music at the university level is necessary and important topic in which teachers should have meaningful exposure.

The majority of participants (61.5%) also had a master's degree.  Mantie (2013) found that discourse on popular music in music education in the United States often focused on quality teaching of quality music literature by highly qualified teachers. Forbes (2001) found that teachers not nominated as outstanding teachers programmed more popular music than those nominated as outstanding teachers.  This finding essentially equated the inclusion of popular music with poor teaching (Mantie, 2013). While the presence of a master's degree does not equate to quality teaching, it is an

accepted and financially rewarded indicator of a highly-qualified teacher by the Commonwealth of Virginia.

The large number of participants with master's degrees may be a result of the participants' commitment to the music education profession. By choosing to pursue an advanced degree in a related field, teachers are furthering their knowledge and skill set needed to become better teachers and make more informed decisions about their teaching. For others, it may be a means to increase their salary because the Commonwealth of Virginia provides pay increases for teachers who have earned a master's degree.

Reames (2001) study, also conducted in the Commonwealth of Virginia, found that 32% of responding schools offered only one choral class. The current study found that 10.6% of responding schools offered only one choral class. More class offerings at schools represent a growth in choral opportunities for students. A greater percentage of participants indicated that they taught classes that were differentiated by experience and ability, which is an indicator of a "quality" music program as defined by NAfME's *Opportunity to Learn Standards for Music Instruction* (2015).

More class offerings do not necessarily represent a growth in the enrollment of the choral program. If the same number of students is divided into more classes, each class will be smaller in size. This may have an impact on music selection for each class. Because enrollment numbers are often tied to how schools make decisions on their teaching allotments, it is reasonable to think that program enrollment numbers have also increased and required the addition of more classes. Though Reames (2001) did not

present enrollment numbers for classes or choral programs, these data are presented in the current study and can be used in future research to determine growth in class offerings and choral enrollment in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Popular music is not included in the Virginia Music Educators Association *Literature Manual* (2014) for approved music for performance at the Virginia Music Educators Association/Virginia Choral Directors Association Performance Assessment. This means that for every ensemble that attends this event, the teacher has a specific reason not to choose popular music. Ensemble attendance at the Virginia Music Educators Association/Virginia Choral Directors Association Performance Assessment did not have a significant impact ($p = .057$) on whether popular music was included as performance literature and/or as instructional materials. In fact, only 21 (2%) of the 337 classes did not include some form of popular music instruction. This finding is important because it contrasts prior research that indicated that a concern about the inclusion of popular music is that it limits time for other styles of music (Monk, 1959). Teachers whose ensembles are performing at the Virginia Music Educators Association/Virginia Choral Directors Association Performance Assessment are likely to still include popular music.

By taking the demographic data gathered in the current study, a profile can be developed of the typical high school choral teacher in the Commonwealth of Virginia that includes popular music in the classroom. A profile of the school, choral program and ensembles in which the teachers work can also be developed. The following section presents these profiles.

The typical high school choral teacher in the Commonwealth of Virginia that includes popular music in the classroom is likely to be white female over the age of forty. She has been a high school choral teacher for less than 20 years because she also has music teaching experience other than as a high school choral teacher. She has likely changed teaching positions between schools because she has been at her current school for less than 10 years. Her education includes a Bachelor's Degree in Music Education and a master's degree in either music education or a music related area. Despite her degrees in music, she received no formal instruction in popular music teaching.

This typical high school choral teacher likely works in a suburban or rural school that has a population of 1001-1500 students. The school serves a student population where less than 50% of students receive free/reduced lunch. The choral program that the teacher is responsible for is likely to have less than 150 students who participate in at least one of the four choral classes offered based on ability and experience level of the student. The teacher is likely to take at least one of these ensembles to the Virginia Music Educators Association/Virginia Choral Directors Association Performance Assessment.

While this profile is a generalization based on the data gathered in the current survey, and one can easily recognize that there are teachers who deviate from this description, the profile provides a portrait of teachers including popular music that may differ from previous expectations.

**Research Question Three**

Research question three was, "To what extent is popular music being included in the high school choral curriculum?"

Of the selected characteristics that were investigated for this study, the achievement of a master's degree was the only characteristic that had a statistically significant impact ($p = .028$) on the extent to which teachers were including popular music in the high school choral curriculum. This shows that participants who had achieved a master's degree were more likely to include more popular music in their high school choral curriculum than those participants who do not have a master's degree. As discussed in research question two, Forbes (2001) found that teachers not nominated as outstanding teachers programmed more popular music than those nominated as outstanding teachers. This finding essentially equated the inclusion of popular music with poor teaching (Mantie, 2013). While the presence of a master's degree does not equate to quality teaching, it is an accepted and financially rewarded indicator of a highly qualified teacher by the Commonwealth of Virginia.

This is an important finding because it is contrary to Forbes' (2001) results. If you consider the presence of a master's degree an indicator of a quality teacher, it could be concluded that quality teachers include popular music and at a higher percentage. In either case, to say that including or not including a style of music impacts whether the teacher is considered "quality" is over simplifying a very complex issue and not taking into account characteristics of the situation. However, at least the idea of including popular music being associated with poor teaching can be refuted because it is

unreasonable to conclude that this many teachers who have advanced degrees and use popular music could all be poor teachers making poor music decisions.

The presence of a master's degree does not necessarily mean that master's programs are including information on popular music pedagogy or encouraging students to include popular music as performance literature. There are several reasons that may factor into this finding. In this study, all participants except one had a master's degree that was related to music, music education or education in general. Obtaining an advanced degree in these areas indicate that teachers are showing a personal commitment to the profession. This commitment is evident through the amount of money paid to obtain the degree, the amount of time spent in classes, and the amount of effort it takes to learn the material and complete the requirements for the degree. This is a particularly good indicator of commitment to the profession in the Commonwealth of Virginia where it is not required that teachers obtain a master's degree.

Participation in a master's degree program in music may influence the participant to include a wider variety of music. Teachers who focus on conducting in their master's program are likely to conduct various styles of music under the supervision of professors. This opportunity allows the teacher to have a broader experience with teaching various styles of music in which they may not be familiar. Through this process, teachers may develop the skills needed to teach styles of music in which they have no formal training.

Masters programs may have a graduate course that focuses on multicultural music and its inclusion in the classroom may have direct ties to a teacher's inclusion of popular music. Multicultural music classes may teach the process of learning to identify an

unfamiliar style, finding information and resources on teaching using an authentic

pedagogy with the purpose of an authentic performance experience, and developing an

understanding of the context of the music. Because popular music is multicultural music,

these concepts directly relate even if they are not specifically mentioned in relation to

popular music.

Advanced music education methods courses are also present in master's

programs. A deeper understanding of methods and instructional strategies may lead

teachers to be more confident in strategies that are outside of the norm in a traditional

choral classroom. Knowing why these strategies are incorporated may be more important

than the topic of how that is the focus of the undergraduate curriculum.

Master's degrees are often focused on the ability to read, understand, interpret,

and perform research. This may be accomplished through participation in formal studies

and research papers or informally by learning to ask and answer your own questions. In

general, teaching music is a constant exercise in identifying problems and finding

solutions. Master's students are expected to have and are evaluated on these skills.

Forbes (2001) found significant demographic differences between those who were

nominated as outstanding teachers and those who were not nominated. Because those

who were nominated as outstanding teachers included less popular music, the group

differences in demographics are relevant to the current study. Significant demographic

differences were found between those who were nominated as outstanding teachers and

those who were not nominated in regard to: (a) school enrollment ($p = .030$), (b) choral

enrollment ($p = .001$), (c) the number of classes available ($p = .001$), and teacher

experience ($p$ = .000).  In general, Forbes concluded that "directors identified as outstanding were generally found to teach in larger schools, have larger choral programs, and have substantially more music teaching experience" (p. 107).  The current study found no statistically significant differences in the amount of popular music included as performance literature in regard to: (a) school size ($p$ = .435), (b) choral program size ($p$ = .706), (c) number of classes available ($p$ = .494), or (d) music teaching experience ($p$ = .823).  The current study found that these demographic characteristics did not impact the amount of popular music included.

Sampling techniques between the two studies were markedly different so one could expect the findings to be different.  The current study investigated the population of high school choral teachers in the Commonwealth of Virginia, while Forbes' study included participants from Florida, George, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia. Due to the sampling and research design differences, both studies have interesting findings, but a comparison cannot be made between them.

Forbes (2001) also found significant negative correlations between the number of pop/rock compositions selected and school enrollment (r = -.243) regardless of the designation of nominated as outstanding or not.  This finding indicates that as the school enrollment increases, the number of pop/rock compositions decreased.  This finding was not confirmed by the current study and shows that the amount of popular music did not differ depending on the size of the school.

One may have the expectation that less affluent schools would include more popular music and less traditional choral literature or conversely that more affluent

schools would include more traditional choral music and less popular music based on prior research (Forbes, 2001) that found significant negative correlations between the number of pop/rock compositions selected and the socioeconomic composition of the school's student body (r = -.287). These findings indicate that the more affluent a school is the less pop/rock selections will be included. The current study analyzed the percent of students who received free/reduced lunch in relation to percent of popular music performed and found that the amount of popular music performed did not differ depending on the percent of students who receive free/reduced lunch ($p = .308$).

**Research Question Four**

Research question four was, "How is popular music being implemented in the high school choral classroom?" The following is a discussion of the results by topic area: (a) Reasons for Inclusion, (b) Concepts and/or Performance, (c) Selecting/Finding/Obtaining Popular Music Materials, and (d) Popular Music Performance Implementation Details.

**Reasons for Inclusion.** The most frequent reasons for the inclusion of popular music were "Popular music adds variety to the choir program" (86.5%), "I can teach musical concepts through popular music" (82.7%), and "My students like popular music" (75.0%). These reasons may not be surprising considering they have been used as justification for the inclusion of popular music for decades. Teachers are encouraged to select a wide variety of music that not only provides differing learning opportunities for students, but also helps create a diverse and interesting concert program that will entertain an audience. The fact that students like popular music is well documented and

it makes logical sense that teachers would want to include music that students like. This statement does not mean that all music has be music that students like, but including popular music can show that the teacher respects the students' music.

"It meets local/state/national standards" (20.2%), "I believe in starting with what the students already know" (19.2%), "It allows my students to be the expert" (18.3%), and "Because I am required to by my district" (1.0%) had the lowest frequency counts. These reasons fall into the category of teachers and pedagogy and can be viewed as two pairs. Meeting standards and district requirements are external reasons or motivators. These reasons may be a way teachers justify the inclusion of popular music for teaching evaluations and administrators that look for standards based instruction based on a rubric. These reasons for inclusion may not have high frequencies, regardless of whether they are true, because they are not as important to teachers as other reasons.

The other pair with the lowest frequencies are internal or personal reasons related to pedagogy. Starting with what the student already knows and building based on that knowledge is a common educational tool, but may not be part of the music teacher's traditional teaching strategies. The students' expertise in popular music may actually make teachers uncomfortable. Teachers are used to being the expert who imparts knowledge to their students. It can be quite unsettling for the teacher to know less about a subject area than the students. Teachers must be confident in themselves and their abilities to admit when there are gaps in their knowledge. This reason may also have a lower frequency because teachers do not realize or acknowledge their students as experts. Students may have an incredible depth of understand and breadth of experience with

popular music, but may not have the basic skills needed to perform, make musical decisions, or analyze the music in ways that are expected in the classroom.

**Concepts and/or performance.** Sixty-seven participants (64.4%) indicated that they taught musical concepts through popular music in at least one of their choral classes. Thirty-four participants (32.7%) indicated that they did not teach musical concepts through popular music. Although 34 participants answered that they did not teach musical concepts through popular music, 31 of these participants answered the question "Do you use popular music to teach any of the following musical concepts?" signifying that they did use popular music to teach musical concepts.

This discrepancy may be due to several factors. If the intent of the teacher is to include popular music to provide variety in the literature performed for a concert, they may not consider the possibilities that the piece of music has to offer as musical concept instruction. If the music is treated as a novelty rather than a legitimate musical composition, then the standards may not be the central focus and could possibly be ignored completely. Conversely, it may be that the teachers had not previously considered that they were covering these musical concepts as they taught popular music materials.

Another possibility is that the teacher's pedagogy may not be concept oriented. If the choral curriculum were focused mainly on performance, it would be easy to ignore many valuable musical concepts. Classrooms where teachers teach solely by rote and students learn to mimic what they hear have little need for a clear understanding of musical concepts.

Regardless of whether teachers specifically intended to teach musical concepts through the inclusion of popular music or not, it is clear that they are. For each of the musical concepts listed, at least 50% of participants incorporated popular music to help teach the concept. Popular music was most frequently used to teach the concepts of melody and harmony, 83.7% and 87.5% respectively. Popular music is comprised of the same elements and musical concepts as music traditionally studied in music classrooms (Forbes, 2001; Grashel, 1979; Pembrook, 1991). Grashel (1979) concluded that popular music was an effective way to teach musical concepts and that students were able to transfer knowledge learned through popular music to unfamiliar music literature. This study shows that high school choral teachers are using popular music for the utilitarian function of teaching musical concepts even though there is evidence that some teachers may not have realized they were doing so.

For those teachers who may not have realized they were teaching concepts through popular music, they are likely missing out on a valuable way to lead students to a deeper understanding of other styles of music. If students know and understand concepts related to popular music, then the strategy of making an explicit connection to the same concept in unfamiliar music is a useful tool that may save instructional time and lead to the students understanding the concept regardless of the style of music being studied. This study did not investigate whether teachers made connections between information taught about and through popular music with other styles of traditional choral music. Future research along with the findings from the current study may help justify and

legitimize the study of popular music in the choral classroom because it is being utilized in ways that are similar to traditionally-accepted styles of choral literature.

Five participants (4.8%) indicated that they did not use popular music as performance literature, but still included it in their curriculum. This stands in contrast to Forbes' (2001) study that showed that 28.9% (13 participants) of teachers nominated as 'outstanding teachers' and 15.1% (9 participants) of not-nominated teachers used zero pieces of popular music as performance literature. Although Forbes divided his sample into two groups, the overall number of participants was the same as the current study ($N$ = 104). Forbes found that 21.2% of participants did not include popular music as performance literature while the current study found that only 4.8% did not include popular music as performance literature. This finding suggests a growth in the percentage of teachers who are including popular music as performance literature.

This growth may be due to several factors. Teachers' have access to more popular music materials than in the past. The growth of Internet resources and technology in general have made materials more readily available to teachers regardless of the teachers' physical location. These materials may still lack desired quality and quantity, but they are available and accessible.

Teachers may be more willing to include popular music because of an overall growth in the acceptance of its merits. National organizations like NAfME and the state affiliates provide workshops and clinics at annual conferences. Fifteen participants indicated that they received training in popular music instruction through conferences and workshops. Several participants also indicated that their colleges/universities included

popular music instruction in methods classes, non-traditional ensembles, and stand-alone classes. Though this college/university training accounted for a small number of participants in this study, its presence in the collegiate curriculum may account for a growth in the number of teachers including popular music.

This growth may also be attributed to the use of popular music as a recruiting tool. Participants (64.4%) indicated that one reason they included popular music was because "Popular music attracts more/varied students." There is a need to keep enrollment numbers high to justify teaching positions, especially in difficult economic times. Teachers may be including popular music as a way to get students involved in the choir program. Though many researchers have cautioned teachers against bait-and-switch tactics, teachers may still be employing them. The current study did not investigate whether teachers were providing a realistic view of the inclusion of popular music during recruitment.

Participants were asked what percentage of their total performance repertoire was popular music. The largest number of participants (36.5%) answered 1-10% (which included the 5 participants that responded they did not include popular music as performance repertoire). The majority of participants responded that the percentage of popular music performed was 30% or less (87.4%). A prior study (Turley, 1989) suggested that high school directors are placing a great deal of emphasis on popular music literature to the exclusion of music of other styles and from other historical periods.

To determine whether other styles were being excluded, or at least not included, participants were asked which other types of music they included as performance repertoire. The styles with the highest frequency of responses were Classical (75.0%), 20th Century (75.0%) and folk song arrangements (86.5%). Reames (2001) found that 20$^{th}$ century literature was ranked number one of the historical periods and so the high frequency from the current study would support that finding. This finding may be because of the large choral music publishing industry. Composers make money based on the number of publications and copies sold. These new compositions are marketed to music teachers through advertisements in publisher materials, recordings, and at choral music reading sessions.

Though 75% of respondents indicated that they included music from the Classical period, it may be that these respondents included music in the classical style rather than just music from the historical period considered classical. There is no way to determine what music participants included in this response. It is possible that participants did include at least one piece of music from the classical period as performance literature. This finding would also make sense considering responses to Renaissance, Baroque, and Romantic had lower frequencies.

The category of performance literature with the highest frequency of respondents was "folk song arrangements." This finding may be attributed to Virginia's location and history of folk music related to coalmines, the Appalachian Mountains, and the various cultures of settlers of the United States. Folk music may be a style of music that remains relevant to the lives of many people in Virginia.

The styles with the lowest frequency of responses were Romantic (45.2%), Non-Western (51.9%) and Baroque (56.7%). While it may not be surprising that Romantic and Baroque music were only included by approximately half of participants, the lack of inclusion of Non-Western music by 48.1% of participants is interesting considering one way to justify the inclusion of popular music is through the research in relation to multicultural music. It may be that the label of "Non-Western" was not associated with multicultural music.

There are no categories that have a frequency of 100%, and therefore it is clear that choral teachers are not including some styles of music in their curriculum. The survey question asked about music from the previous year. It may be that teachers are approaching their music literature choices long term rather than trying to include every style every year. For example, teachers may try to provide the opportunity for each student to perform various styles during their high school career because it is not feasible to include all styles every year. From these data, one cannot conclude that the lack of inclusion of some literature is a result of the inclusion of popular music. Longitudinal studies may help determine valuable information about literature selections throughout the course of a student's high school choral experience.

Participants were asked to identify which genres of popular music they included as performance repertoire. Pop was the most commonly selected genre (87.5%). R&B/Soul (47.1%), Rock (42.3), and Disney (43.3%) were also used frequently. The genres with the lowest frequencies were Alternative (13.5%), Hip-Hop/Rap (7.7%), and Electronic (3.8%). These findings may be indicative of what is available through music

providers and the findings from the current study that music providers are the most frequently used source for obtaining popular music. The J. W. Pepper website does not distinguish between genres of popular music. Everything is labeled as "Pop Choral Arrangements." This may also have lead to the "Pop" genre being the most commonly selected genre.

The differences in these frequencies may be attributed to the characteristics of the genre and how closely they are related to traditional choral styles. For example, including the Electronic genre may be difficult because of the technology resources available to teachers. Hip-Hop/Rap may be more difficult because the lyrics and subject matter are often not appropriate for public performances at a school event. Teachers have expressed concern over vocal health and technique that may also contribute to which genres of popular music are included. Rap and Alternative music often employ vocal techniques that are not taught in traditional choral classrooms. If teachers believe these techniques to be damaging to students' voices, then it makes sense that they would not be included for study.

Nineteen participants used the open-ended response "Other." Of these responses, 9/19 indicated that they included musical selections from "Broadway." "World music," "folk," and "jazz" were also given as open-ended responses despite the working definition specifically stating that they were not being considered popular music for the purposes of the study. These findings are an indication of the difficulty in defining the term 'popular music.' Even though it was explicitly defined for the purposes of the study, participants still had their own perception of what the term meant. Arguments can

be made for 'folk' and 'jazz' music to be considered popular music. The current study did not include folk or jazz as popular music because they have not been considered popular music in previous research (Bowman, 2004; Forbes, 2001; Frith, 1987; Johnson, 1997; Lebler, 2008; Tagg, 2000; Taynbee, 2000; Woody, 2007; Woody & Lehmann, 2010) and because they are often performed in western art style concert arrangements in school settings (Wang & Humphreys, 2009). If the teacher defines popular music as one thing and chooses music accordingly, and the students define popular music in another way, the students and the teacher could miss out on the benefits available when including music that is popular music according to the students. Many of the benefits of including popular music stem from the music being familiar and liked by the students. Choosing music that is not defined as popular by the students reduces these benefits, regardless of whether there are other advantages to including the music.

Alternately, strictly defining popular music may have eliminated some relevant information. Because popular music is situated in the cultural context of the people participating, all types and styles of music could be considered popular music. If music is popular with the students in the choral ensemble and the teacher is including it as popular music, it *is* popular music and can carry the same advantages and disadvantages of any other type of popular music. Teachers should strive to know what types of music students consider popular and in what types of music students are engaged outside of the school setting. Teachers must remember that many students are involved in music in ways other than the choral classroom such as religious choirs, garage bands, informal

playing and singing, instrumental study, and as listeners and consumers of commercial music.

**Selecting/finding/obtaining popular music materials.** Participants were asked which criteria they used to select popular music. "Quality" (93.3%) was the most frequently selected criterion. The current study did not identify the same criteria for participants to choose as Forbes' (2001) study. However, the findings from the current study show that quality is the most frequently used criteria to select popular music. These findings do not confirm Forbes' findings where the "quality of the composition" did not fall into the top seven criteria chosen. This indicates a change in the teachers' expectations of the music and arrangements. Teachers are now using quality as a criterion for popular music selection. Teachers are looking for quality and have expressed that finding quality arrangements is a problem (Appendix D, page 252). The current study also found evidence of this in how teachers obtained popular music materials because teachers indicated that they used student and director arrangements and also commissioned arrangements of popular music. Music providers and arrangers need to be aware that these concerns exist and that what is currently available is not being well-received by teachers. Open conversations between arrangers, publishers, teachers, and students about what constitutes a quality arrangement of popular music may be beneficial for everyone involved.

An interesting finding about selection criteria is found when comparing the choices "If my students will like it" and "If I [the teacher] like it." More participants were concerned with liking the music themselves (65.4%) than they were if the students

would like it (55.8%).  This finding may suggest that teachers believe that their opinions hold more weight than students' opinions about music.  While this may be an acceptable idea concerning music with which the students are unfamiliar, it seems contrary to many of the reasons why a teacher would include popular music.

Participants were asked how they find/select popular music to be included in their curriculum.  The response "What is available through the provider (J. W. Pepper, Musical Source, catalogues)" was the most frequent response (87.5%).  "Student input/suggestions" was the second most frequent response (74.0%).  Participants also identified "Publisher materials" as a frequent way of finding/selecting literature (66.3%).  "Listening to radio, online, or iTunes" (44.2%), "Colleagues" (36.5%), and "Workshops" (41.3%) were used to a lesser extent.  Ten participants also selected the open-ended "Other" response.  These responses indicated that online music sources (i.e. printable scores and recordings through YouTube), listening to other "quality" choral groups perform, and what is already in their music library also play a role in finding/selecting popular music.

These findings differ from previous research (Forbes, 2001; Reames, 2001) that found the most frequently used resources for literature selection were workshops and live performances.  The difference in the findings are likely attributable to the current study asking specifically about sources for selecting popular music.  Most notable is the teachers' attention to student input/suggestions.  Taking suggestions for popular music selections gives students ownership in the music-making process.  It is a way to better ensure that students will like and want to perform the pieces.  However, if teachers are

unwilling to consider pieces that are not readily available through music providers and online sources, someone other than the students are actually guiding the selection process. Students may have input, but only to the extent to which materials are available.

Participants were asked to indicate where they obtained the popular music materials they used. Music providers such as J. W. Pepper, Musical Source, and other catalogues were used by 98.1% of participants. Online sources, both paid (37.5%) and free (25.0%), were also used. Arrangements were also composed by students (22.1%), directors (11.5%), and commissioned composers (1.9%). Music providers and online sources are not surprising sources for obtaining music. The frequency of arrangements by students, directors, and commissioned composers is notable and may be attributed to a lack of quality arrangements (Hebert & Cambell, 2000; Melnick, 2001; Davis and Blair; 2011; Pembrook, 1991; Woody, 2007) or the availability of desired compositions.

**Popular music performance implementation details.** Participants were asked on which concert performances they programmed popular music. The spring concert was the most frequent response (86.5%), but all other concerts had participants indicate that they included popular music. The prevalence of popular music at the spring concert may be because it is typically the last concert of the year. Teachers may seek to include multiple styles of music to illustrate the variety that students have studied throughout the class. Teachers may also use popular music as a treat or reward at the end of the year. The spring concert also would fall after ensembles perform at the Virginia Music Educators Association/Virginia Choral Directors Association Performance Assessment

and performing popular music may be a pleasing contrast after focusing on other styles for long periods of time.

Eight participants also selected the open-ended "Other" response. These responses indicated that popular music was performed at school and community events. This finding, along with responses that popular music was included at graduation, point towards a conclusion that popular music is included when the choir is singing in service of an event where the focus is not the choir. This may have to do with considering who the audience is and the purpose of the music. The audience at these events are not attending a choral concert and so performing music that is above their understanding or too formal for the event would not make sense. Music at these events may be used more for entertainment value, than to create an intellectual or aesthetic experience.

Twenty-eight participants (26.9%) indicated that they gave a Pops Concert. By having a concert specifically devoted to popular music, participants are indicating that it is not being treated as a novelty number to add variety to an otherwise traditional concert program. It also indicates a level of importance and value being given to popular music that has been questioned in previous research (Davis & Blair, 2011; Graham, 2009; Hebert & Campbell, 2000; Johnson, 2002; MacCluskey, 1979; Monk, 1959). A Pops Concert may also be used as a recruiting or fundraising tool for choir programs. Because these types of programs are entertaining, it is possible that a larger number of people would attend.

Teachers may also see instructional and learning advantages to a Pops Concert. If approached from the perspective that the teacher is a facilitator and guide and students

are the experts who make musical and performance decisions, students and teachers will have experiences that are not typical in a traditional choral setting. Students are forced to be responsible for their own learning, musical decisions, and performance choices. Students have a chance to put what they have learned in the choral class into action with an assurance that the teacher is there to support them in the process. This approach, though not typical in the United States, is employed at the collegiate level in Australia (Lebler, 2007, 2008).

Participants were asked to indicate which types of accompaniment they used for choral performances of popular music. Piano only (83.7%) and a cappella (78.8%) were most frequently used. A band comprised of keyboard, guitar, bass, and drums was used by 49% of participants. Accompaniment tracks were also used by 47.1% of participants. Four participants also selected the open-ended "Other" response. These responses indicated that other combinations of instruments including guitar only, jazz band, and accordion accompanied popular music.

This finding shows that teachers are including various types of accompaniment for choral performances of popular music. The prevalence of a live band and single instrument (piano or guitar) accompaniment implies that teachers may be incorporating accompaniment styles that are stylistically accurate depending on the piece of music being performed. Accompaniment tracks may not present an authentic live performance, but may be used as a substitute when incorporating live instruments is not feasible or because it is a more simple solution to providing an authentic sound.

Popular music sung a cappella was also included frequently. A cappella group-singing competitions at the high school and collegiate levels are available and highly competitive. The recent television show Glee, the Pitch Perfect movies, and televised competitions like The Sing Off may be influencing the amount of a cappella music in the choral setting. Arrangements from these shows are available through music providers and are recognized by students.

Participants were asked to indicate which types of accompaniment they used for solo performances of popular music. Forty-one participants (39.4%) indicated that they did not include solo popular music. Of the remaining 63 participants, Piano only was the most frequent response (52/63, 82.5%). A band comprised of keyboard, guitar, bass, and drums was used by 36.5% of participants who include solo popular music. Accompaniment tracks were used by 55.6% of participants who include solo popular music. Six participants selected the open-ended "Other" response. These responses indicated that popular music was accompanied by solo instrument (often guitar) or string orchestra/full ensemble.

These findings show that even though a large portion of popular music literature is originally recorded by solo singers, 39.4% of participants only used choral arrangements. While large ensembles are the normal construct in the United States (Mark, 1986), individual goals are part of the NAfME National Standards for Music Education. Teachers may be missing out on a valuable way to include these standards with popular music.

The findings for teachers who are including solo performances of popular music suggest that various types of accompaniment for solo performances of popular music are being included. These findings are similar to the findings for choral performances of popular music. The major difference between choral and solo accompaniments was that solo music is not often performed a cappella. This is not particularly interesting considering the relatively small amount of recorded popular music that is unaccompanied. The prevalence of a live band and single instrument (piano or guitar) accompaniment implies that teachers may be incorporating accompaniment styles that are stylistically accurate depending on the piece of music being performed. Accompaniment tracks may not present an authentic live performance, but may be used as a substitute when incorporating live instruments is not feasible or because it is a more simple solution to providing an authentic sound.

Participants were asked what kind of student responses they observe while performing popular music. Positive responses of "They love it" or "They like it mostly" accounted for 94.2% of participants. Five participants (4.8%) responded with "They are indifferent." No participants chose the responses of "They dislike it" or "They hate it." These findings show that, in general, students like performing popular music. The findings are consistent with research indicating that popular music is preferred by teenagers (Benner, 1972; Geter & Streisand, 1995; Hargreaves & North, 1997; LeBlanc, 1979; May, 1985; Mills, 2000; Stewart, 1984) and that students did not show concern about perfectly authentic performances of popular music (Green, 2006). These findings do not support research indicating that including popular music in the classroom takes it

out of context for the students and may make them dislike it (Cutietta, 1991; Green, 2002, 2006).  This may still be true for some students.   Music, though often performed in a group, is still a personal experience.  Students may express something outwardly that does not match how they feel inwardly.  The current findings are based on teacher perception of student responses to popular music and may not give an accurate picture of how the students actually feel.  Though the survey indicated that teachers are using student input as a selection criterion for popular music, teachers may also benefit from hearing how students feel about performing popular music.  This type of feedback from students could have positive influences on learning and the learning environment, especially if the teacher is able to make adjustments based on the feedback.

Based on the findings from research question four, a profile of how teachers are implementing popular music in the classroom can be developed.  The typical high school choral teacher described in research question two is likely to be implementing popular music in the classroom through both performance and concept teaching.  Popular music for performance is selected based on the criteria of quality and the ability of the piece to meet ensemble needs.  Teachers will choose particular musical pieces based on what is available from music suppliers based on input/suggestions from students.  Materials will then be purchased from the music supplier.  Performances of popular music will most frequently be in a choral setting at the spring concert and be accompanied by piano.

### Summary of Findings

The findings of the current study provide a profile of typical high school choral teachers in the Commonwealth of Virginia who include popular music in the classroom

as well as a profile of their school, choral program and ensembles. A description of the teachers' popular music implementation details is also provided. The following section presents a summary of these findings.

The typical high school choral teacher in the Commonwealth of Virginia who includes popular music in the classroom is likely to be a white female over the age of forty. She has been a high school choral teacher for less than 20 years because she also has music teaching experience other than as a high school choral teacher. She has likely changed teaching positions between schools because she has been at her current school for less than 10 years. Her education includes a Bachelor's Degree in Music Education and a master's degree in either music education or a music related area. Despite her degrees in music, she received no formal instruction in popular music teaching. Because she has achieved a master's degree she is more likely to include a larger amount of popular music as performance literature.

This typical high school choral teacher likely works in a suburban or rural school that has a population of 1001-1500 students. The school serves a student population where less than 50% of students receive free/reduced lunch. The choral program that the teacher is responsible for is likely to have less than 150 students who participate in at least one of the four choral classes offered based on ability and experience level of the student. The teacher is likely to take at least one of these ensembles to the Virginia Music Educators Association/Virginia Choral Directors Association Performance Assessment.

The typical high school choral teacher is likely to be implementing popular music in the classroom through both performance and concept teaching. Popular music for performance is selected based on the criteria of quality and the ability of the piece to meet ensemble needs. Teachers will choose particular musical pieces based on what is available from music suppliers based on input/suggestions from students. Materials will then be purchased from the music supplier. Performances of popular music will most frequently be in a choral setting at the spring concert and be accompanied by piano.

While this profile is a generalization based on the data gathered in the current survey, the profile provides a portrait that may differ from previous expectations. The stereotypical idea that young, African American men who teach in large urban schools with high poverty use popular music to engage students in the music program is not consistent with the current findings. The current findings are also not consistent with older research on reasons teachers exclude popular music or in regard to music selection. Therefore, the implications for music education based on these findings should be considered.

## Implications for Music Education

The findings of the current study indicate that popular music is being included by high school choral teachers with minimal or no training in the inclusion of popular music. This means that teachers are deciding how to teach popular music, how to select popular music literature, and how to implement popular music performances on their own and based on the training they received in other types of music. The implications for music

education are both philosophical and pragmatic and should lead to an authentic and effective inclusion of popular music in the high choral classroom.

**Develop Philosophical Position**

There is widespread inclusion of popular music in the high school choral classroom. NAfME and other professional music educator organizations have advocated for its inclusion, but there is still a need for the profession to agree on a philosophical position regarding the value and efficacy of including popular music. A solid philosophical foundation would assist in the decision making process for practicing teachers and researchers studying the inclusion of popular music.

**Develop Pedagogy**

The music education profession should take steps to develop a pedagogy of popular music instruction. This pedagogy should seek to honor the music, the informal learning styles of its practitioners, and the context of popular music. The pedagogy should take into account what the students already know, as some will be experts in popular music when they enter the choral classroom, and what can be gained from the study of popular music. In the development process, varying levels of inclusion should be addressed since there is not a standard requirement for popular music inclusion. Issues of vocal health for both the student and teacher should be addressed. Once this pedagogy is developed, it should then be disseminated in such a way that practicing educators can implement it quickly and with confidence. The pedagogy should also be disseminated in teacher education programs to inform future generations of choral teachers.

**Teacher Education**

Teacher education programs need to reevaluate what materials need to be covered to provide teachers with the skills needed to function in high school choral classrooms. The current findings indicate that very few teachers had instruction at the collegiate level in teaching popular music and those that did have some instruction were often in a nontraditional performance ensemble. This information is of particular importance for music education methods courses. In the current study, 78.8% of participants ($n = 82$) are teaching using a genre that was not covered in their collegiate experience.

It is important that teacher education programs begin to include popular music as a topic for students to explore. Simply identifying similarities and differences between popular music and traditional choral music teaching can draw the pre-service teachers' attention to concepts to consider. There is a need for specific instruction on including popular music as a tool for teaching musical concepts that address standards-based instruction. Including popular music for its educational value provides another way to justify its inclusion to those who have negative associations with the genre. There is also a need for specific instruction on performing popular music with traditional ensembles. The normal class for choral teachers is in the format of a large ensemble. Teachers need experience in pedagogy appropriate for popular music, sound technologies, and experience in leading instrumentalists accompanying popular music. Many skills gained through traditional teacher education programs will apply, but knowing which skills and how to transfer that knowledge could make teaching and performing popular music in the traditional choral ensemble more effective.

**Popular Music Choral Literature Needed**

It is clear from the present study that high school choral teachers are including popular music as performance literature (95.2%). While there are materials available, the quantity and quality of popular music arranged for the choral ensemble are lacking. When asked what types of problems they had associated with teaching popular music, teachers overwhelmingly identified issues related to written arrangements. Music teachers and the music education profession need to make it known that there is a deficiency in what is available. Teachers should make informed decisions about the popular music arrangements they purchase and avoid publications that are not quality arrangements.

**Assessment of Popular Music Performance**

The assessment of popular music needs to be addressed by the music education profession to determine what criteria are appropriate to determine the quality of a performance. Choral assessments (music performance adjudication, festival, contest) typically do not include popular music as a performance option. Based on the assessment rubrics, this is likely the correct decision regarding popular music. However, excluding popular music from any type of objective assessment implies that it is not valuable. The reward system is not in place for students, teachers, and districts to perform popular music at a high level. This likely contributes to the sometimes negative view of performing popular music with choral ensembles.

**Recruitment**

Popular music is a powerful tool to recruit students into the choral classroom due to the students' musical preferences. Choral teachers need to capitalize on this, while being honest about the inclusion of popular music in the program. Teachers must stop using the 'bait-and-switch' tactic to recruit students. It is unfair to have students expect one thing and experience another based on information they are presented with that is not 100% accurate.

## Future Research

**Descriptive Studies**

The present study is the first that seeks to describe the current teaching practices of high school choral teachers' inclusion of popular music in their curriculum. Future research is needed to expand upon the current findings. The researcher suggests replicating the current study with a goal of a larger response rate to get a clearer description of practices in the Commonwealth of Virginia and allow for more complex statistical analyses. A larger response rate would also address the concern that potential participants chose whether to take the survey or not based on their interest in the topic of popular music.

Replication studies or similar descriptive studies should also be undertaken to gain insight in to areas outside of the Commonwealth of Virginia. Research should be done at the state, regional, and national levels. These studies can be used to compare findings across areas and to determine other future areas related to the inclusion or exclusion of popular music in the choral classroom.

Replication studies or similar descriptive studies should also be undertaken in the related music performance areas of middle school choral, middle and high school band, middle and high school orchestra, and general music. Comparisons can then be made between performance area and age of students.

Descriptive studies should also investigate popular music literature selection to expand on the current findings. Determining more specific characteristics of the music that choral teachers are selecting for performance may give a clearer picture of what teachers consider popular music and whether characteristics of the teacher impact the specific popular music chosen.

**Selection of Popular Music Literature**

Future research should be conducted on the selection of popular music literature for performance, especially in relation to high school choral literature. Selection criteria should be analyzed for both popular music and other genres to determine similarities and differences, as well as to provide general literature selection guidelines for popular music. This research should consider multiple layers of the choral arrangement and specifically include accompaniment, vocal ranges, rhythmic and tonal written notation, and authenticity. Other selection criteria to consider are student preference, audience preference, and educational value.

**Musical Concept Transfer Studies**

Future research should be conducted to determine the effectiveness of using popular music to teach musical concepts in the high school choral classroom and the students' ability to transfer that knowledge to other genres of music. Similar studies, or

studies that include other performance areas, should also be undertaken in the related music performance areas of middle school choral, middle and high school band, middle and high school orchestra, and general music. Comparisons can then be made between performance area and age of students.

**Pedagogy**

Future research is needed to develop pedagogy to teach popular music in the choral classroom. Developing and implementing a pedagogy that is effective and authentic to popular music's traditions should be the goal. Researchers should reference studies conducted in Australia and the United Kingdom to design studies specifically geared towards secondary education in the United States. Lebler's (2007, 2008) work analyzing a scaffolded, self-directed learning environment in the Bachelor of Popular Music program at an Australia conservatorium is a starting point for this research. Although most public schools would not have the facilities or equipment to implement this style of program in the manner it was originally introduced, adaptations of the original program may prove useful at the secondary level. Research on pedagogical techniques for teaching and performing popular music also need to address issues of vocal technique as related to vocal health.

<div align="center">

**Conclusion**

</div>

The current study provided a descriptive analysis of high school choral teachers' inclusion of popular music in current teaching practices by (a) determining the frequency of inclusion, (b) developing a profile of teachers, schools, and choral programs that include popular music in the curriculum, (c) determining which demographic

characteristics affected the amount of popular music included, and (d) developing a profile of popular music implementation details.  This information is useful and provides a basis for future research on the inclusion of popular music in music education.  The findings of this study provide several key takeaway points.

Popular music is being included in the high school choral curriculum.  The music education profession and popular music researchers need to move beyond simply seeking to justify popular music's inclusion in the curriculum.  One step that should be taken is to change the discourse from 'using' popular music to 'including' popular music.  This change in the language used to discuss popular music indicates that the value of popular music does not simply exist because of its usefulness.

Because popular music is being included, the profession needs to work to develop a pedagogy based on authentic processes and performance practices based on existing research and through investigating best practices of those currently teaching popular music successfully.  This pedagogy needs to be disseminated through teacher education programs to prepare future teachers to successfully include popular music in their curriculum. The pedagogy also should be disseminated to practicing music educators in ways that provide them with concise information about applying the pedagogy to their curriculum such as workshops, clinics, choral music reading sessions, and articles in professional journals geared towards practicing music educators.

Popular music is culturally relevant and is music students prefer.  Including popular music allows students to be the expert and to access prior knowledge and build upon what they already know.   Including music that is relevant to students' lives is one

way for teachers to show they respect and value their students. The inclusion of popular music benefits students and *that* should be the ultimate goal.

## Coda

I became interested in popular music in the choral classroom through my middle and high school choral experiences (1994-2001). My teacher included a Pops Concert each spring. Choirs performed several popular music selections that were accompanied by piano and advanced students were given the opportunity to perform a solo with a traditional rock band accompaniment. Even as a student I realized how different this experience was in comparison to the other concerts we performed.

Once I became a teacher (2005), I followed the Pops Concert model that I had experienced in high school. My teacher had warned me that this type of concert was an incredible amount of extra work, and she was correct. I quickly realized that the amount of time and effort to organize and execute this type of performance was more than what I spent on a traditional choral concert. Preparing my first Pops Concert was jarring. I was trained to teach and perform traditional choral music with my choirs, but I had no training in how to lead a rock band that did not read music notation or operate under the same rehearsal guidelines that I had set for my classroom. I was no longer in charge. I could not be in charge. I did not have the skills necessary to effectively communicate what needed to happen next and so I sat back and let three high school boys who played guitar, bass, and drums take the lead. They listened to recordings and recreated the songs my students were performing.

I became the facilitator. I provided supervision and the space for the students to work. I organized the practice times to ensure that all soloists had ample time to practice with the band. I became the keyboard player (something I never thought my very meager piano skills would allow) by filling in parts played by other instruments and notated in the score I had as reference material. I took direction from the band because they had more skills in this area than I did and because they encouraged me to play even when I made mistakes.

My pedagogical approach was to stay out of the way as much as possible, participate in the music making when appropriate, facilitate rehearsals logistically, and to offer my advice when necessary. My students have flourished under these circumstances. The learning experiences are student directed from selecting the music to the final performance details. Students prepare the music, interact with the band, design costumes and lighting, and have control over their performance.

I am, in general, a process oriented teacher. However, the Pops Concerts are the products of which I am most proud. After several years of experience, my role in the Pops Concert is to greet the audience, possibly conduct a beginning choir piece, and at the end of the concert thank the audience for coming. The students are responsible for everything and I am there as a safety in case something goes wrong.

I see the benefits of this approach daily. My students assess themselves, make musical decisions, read music, listen to music, analyze music, think about music, and are constantly seeking to learn more. They can identify what they know and they ask questions about what they do not know.

Several projects and papers throughout my graduate studies were related to the inclusion of popular music and the topic became increasingly interesting to me as my teaching career progressed. When I entered the Ph. D. program my goal was to improve my teaching. It was important to me that I could directly apply my research to my teaching. I was fortunate to have professors that supported that goal and encouraged my study of popular music inclusion.

**REFERENCES**

Abeles, H., Hoffer, C., & Klotman, R. (1995). *Foundations of Music Education.* New York, NY: Schirmer Books.

Abramo, J. (2011). Gender differences of popular music production in secondary schools. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 59*(1), 21–43.

Abril, C., & Gault, B. (2008). The state of music in secondary schools: The principal's perspective. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 56*(1), 68–81.

Alderson, A. S., Junisbai, A., & Heacock, I. (2007). Social status and cultural consumption in the United States. *Poetics, 35*(2-3), 191–212.

Allsup, R. (2003). Mutual learning and democratic action in instrumental music education. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 51*, 24–37.

Allsup, R. (2004). Of concert bands and garage bands: Creating democracy through popular music. In C. X. E. Rodriguez (Ed.), *Bridging the gap: Popular music and music education* (pp. 204-223). Reston, VA: MENC.

Armstrong, V. (2001). Theorizing gender and musical composition in the computerized classroom. *Women: A Cultural Review, 12*, 35–43.

Arnett, J. (1995). Adolescents' uses of media for self-socialization. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 24* (5), 519–533.

Asmus, E. (2001). Commentary: How many courses? What content? *Journal of Music Teacher Education, 10*(2), 5–6.

Baker, D. (1992). The danger of popular music. *Miami New Times.* Retrieved from

http://www.miaminewtimes.com/music/the-dangers-of-pop-music-6364873

Baker, P. J. (1982). The development of a music teacher checklist for use by

administrators, music supervisors, and teachers in evaluating music teach-ing.

*Dissertation Abstracts International, 42*-08A, 3489.

Barry, N., & Walls, K. (1999). Pre-service teachers' reactions to aural examples of

various styles and genres. *Research Studies in Music Education, 13,* 13–27.

Bartle, J. A. (1993). *Lifeline for children's choir directors* (rev. ed.). Toronto: Grodon V.

Thompson.

Bayton, M. (1997). Women and the electric guitar. In S. Whitley (Ed.), *Sexing the groove*

(pp. 37-49). London, England:Routledge.

Beck, J. C., & Wade, M. (2006). *The kids are alright: How the gamer generation is

changing the workplace*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Benner, C. H. (1972). Teaching performing groups. *Research to the Music Classroom.

No. 2.* Washington, DC: Music Educators National Conference.

Berz, W., & Bowman, J. (1994). *Applications of research in music technology.* Reston,

VA: Music Educators National Conference.

Blosch, C. S. (1985). A comparative study of ratings of music and vocal competencies for

high school choral students (Doctoral dissertation, Florida Atlantic University,

1985). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 46*-05A, 1134.

Boespflug, G. (2004). The pop music ensemble in music education. In C. X. Rodriguez (Ed.), *Bridging the gap: Popular music and music education* (pp. 190–204). Reston, VA: MENC—The National Association for Music Education.

Boud, D., Cohen, R., & Sampson, J. (1999). Peer learning and assessment. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 24*(4), 413–426.

Bowman, W. D. (1998). *Philosophical perspectives on music*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bowman, W. D. (2004). 'Pop' goes: Taking popular music seriously. In C. X. Rodriguez (Ed.), *Bridging the gap: Popular music and music education.* Reston, VA: MENC—The National Association for Music Education, 29–49.

Brown, A. (1999). Music, media and making: Humanising digital media in music education. *International Journal of Music Education, 33,* 10–17.

Bryson, B. (1996). ''Anything but heavy metal'': Symbolic exclusion and musical dislikes. *American Journal of Sociology, 61*(5), 884–899.

Byrne, C., & Sheridan, M. (2000). The long and winding road: The story of rock music in Scottish schools. *International Journal of Music Education, 36,* 46–57.

Campbell, P. S. (1991). *Lessons from the world: A cross-cultural guide to music teaching and learning.* New York, NY: Schirmer.

Campbell, P. S. (1995). Of garage bands and song-getting: The musical development of young rock musicians. *Research Studies in Music Education, 4*, 12–20.

Campbell, P., Connell, C., & Beegle, A. (2007). Adolescents' expressed meanings of

music in and out of school. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 55*(3), 220–

236.

Caputo, V. (1994). Add technology and stir: Music, gender, and technology in today's

music classrooms. *Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning, 4–5,* 85–

90.

Chastagner, C. (1999). The Parent's Music Resource Center: From information to

censorship. *Popular Music, 18,* 179–192.

Choate, R. (Ed.) (1968). *Documentary report of the Tanglewood Symposium.*

Washington, DC: MENC.

Claxton, G. (1999). *Wise up: The challenge of lifelong learning.* London: Bloomsbury.

Contemporary Music Project: Comprehensive Music Education. (1968). *Music Educators

Journal, 54*(7), 42.-69.

Cooper, B. L. (1998). Teaching with popular music resources: A bibliography of

interdisciplinary instructional approaches. *Popular Music and Society, 22*(2), 85–

114.

Cope, P. (2002). Informal learning of musical instruments: The importance of social

context. *Music Education Research, 4*(1), 93–104.

Council for Basic Education. (2004). *Academic atrophy: The condition of the liberal arts

in America's public schools.* Retrieved from http://music-for-all.org

Crowther, R., & Durkin, K. (1982). Sex- and age-related differences in the musical behaviour, interests and attitudes towards music of 232 secondary school students. *Educational Studies, 20,* 13–18.

Cutietta, R. (1991). Popular music: An ongoing challenge. *Music Educators Journal, 77*(8), 26–29.

Davis, A. P. (1994). Performance ratings and analysis of teaching during choral rehearsal (Doctoral dissertation, The Florida State University, 1993). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 54*-07A, 2500.

Davis, S. (2005). "That Thing You Do!" Compositional processes of a rock band. *International Journal of Education and the Arts, 6*(16), 19.

Davis, S., & Blair, D. (2011). Popular music in American teacher education: A glimpse into a secondary methods course. *International Journal of Music Education, 29*(2), 124–140.

Decker, H. A., & Kirk, C. J. (1988). *Choral conducting: Focus on communication.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Decker, H. A., & Kirk, C. J. (1995). *Choral conducting: A focus on communication*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Delzell, J. K., & Leppla, D. A. (1992). Gender associations of musical instruments and preferences of fourth grade students for selected instruments. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 40*, 93–103.

Demorest, S. (2004). Choral sight-singing practices: Revisiting a web-based survey. *International Journal of Research in Choral Singing, 2*(1), 3–10.

DeNora, T. (2000). *Music in everyday life.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

deVries, P. (2004). Listen to the fans. *Music Educators Journal, 91*(2), 25–28.

Dibben, N. (2002). Gender identity and music. In R. MacDonald, D. Hargreaves, & D. Miell (Eds.), *Musical identities* (pp. 117–133). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

DiMaggio, P. (1982). Cultural capital and school success: The impact of status culture participation on the grades of U.S. high school students. *American Sociological Review, 47(2),* 189–201.

Drummond, J. (2010). Re-thinking western art music: A perspective shift for music educators. *International Journal of Music Education, 28*(2), 117–126.

Dunbar-Hall, P. (1993). *Teaching popular music.* Sydney: Science Press.

Dunbar-Hall, P. (1996). 'Designing a teaching model for popular music' in G. Spruce (Ed.) Teaching Music. London: Open University Press, 216-226.

Dunbar-Hall, P. (1999). Analysis of popular music: A challenge for music education. *Research Studies in Music Education, 13,* 40–55.

Dunbar-Hall, P. (2005). Colliding Perspectives? Music curriculum as cultural studies. *Music Educators Journal, 91*(4), 33–37.

Dunbar-Hall, P., & Wemyss, K. (2000). The effects of the study of popular music on music education. *International Journal of Music Education, 36,* 23–34.

Dupree, M. (1990). Beyond music in Western civilization: Issues in undergraduate music history literacy. *College Music Symposium, 30*(2), 100–105.

Durrant, C. (2001). The genesis of musical behavior: Implications for adolescent music education. *International Journal of Education & the Arts, 2*(5).

Elliott, D. J. (1995). *Music matters: A new philosophy of music education.* New York, NY: Oxford University.

Emmons, S. E. (2004). Preparing teachers for popular music processes and practices. In C. X. Rodriguez (Ed.), *Bridging the gap: Popular music and music education* (pp. 159–174). Reston, VA: MENC—The National Association for Music Education.

Evans, L. (1983). Popular music in music education. *The Piano Quarterly, 122*, 54–55.

Evelein, F. (2006). Pop and world music in Dutch music education: Two cases of authentic learning in music teacher education and secondary music education. *International Journal of Music Education, 24*(2), 178–187.

Farmer, P. (1976). Pop music in the secondary school: A justification. *Music in Education, 40(*5), 217–219.

Fonder, M., & Eckrich, D. W. (1999). A survey on the impact of the voluntary national standards on American college and university music teacher education curricula. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 140,* 28–37.

Forbes, G. (2001). The repertoire selection practices of high school choral directors. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 49*(2), 102–121.

Fowler, C. B. (1970). The case against rock: A reply. *Music Educators Journal, 5*7(1), 38–42.

Frith, S. (1987). Towards an aesthetic of popular music. In R. Leppert & S.

McClary (Eds.), *Music and society: The politics of composition, performance and reception* (pp. 133–150). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Gaitandjiev, G. (1997). Popular music in school: A point of view from Bulgaria. *Journal of Popular Music Studies, 9*(1), 65–69.

Gammond, P. (1991). *The Oxford companion to popular music*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Garrison, V. H. (1985). *Traditional and non-traditional teaching and learning practices in folk music: An ethnographic field study of Cape Breton fiddling (Transmission, Violin, Canadian Education, Instrumental, Nova Scotia)*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA.

Gass, G. (1992). Why don't we do it in the classroom? In A. De Curtis (Ed.), *Present tense: Rock and rock and culture.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Geter, T., & Streisand, B. (1995). Recording sound sales: The music industry rocks and rolls to the newest financial rhythms. *U.S. News and World Report*, 25(September), 67–68, 70, 72.

Goliard. (2015). In *Encyclopedia Britannica.* Retrieved from http://www.britannica.com/art/goliard

Goodwin, A. (1997). On being a professor of pop. *Popular Music and Society, 21*(1), 43–52.

Gordon, E. E. (2003). *Learning sequences in music.* Chicago, IL: GIA.

Graham, R. (2009). The function of music education in the growth of cultural openness in the USA. *Music Education Research, 11*(3), 283–302.

Grashel, J. (1979). Strategies for using popular music to teach form to intermediate instrumentalists. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 27,* 185–191.

Green, L. (1988). *Music on deaf ears: Musical meaning, ideology and education.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Green, L. (2001). *How popular musicians learn: A way ahead for music education.* Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

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

Green, L. (2005). The music curriculum as lived experience: Children's "natural" music-learning process. *Music Educators Journal, 91*(4), 27–32.

Green, L. (2006). Popular music education in and for itself, and for 'other' music: current research in the classroom. *International Journal of Music Education, 24*(2), 101–118.

Green, L. (2008). *Music, informal learning and the school: A new classroom pedagogy.* Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Greer, R. D., Dorow, L. G., & Randall, A. (1974). Music listening preferences of elementary school children. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 22*(4), 284–291.

Han, S. (2003). Unraveling the brow: What and how of choice in musical preference. *Sociological Perspectives, 46*(4), 435–459.

Hannan, M. (2006). Contemporary music student expectations of musicianship training needs. *International Journal of Music Education, 24*(2)*,* 148–158.

Hanrahan, S. J., & Isaacs, G. (2001). Assessing self- and peer-assessment: The students' views. *Higher Education Research & Development, 20*(1), 53–70.

Hargreaves, D. J., Comber, C., & Colley, A. (1995). Effects of age, gender, and training on musical preferences of British secondary school students. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 43*(3), 242–250.

Hargreaves, D. J., & North, A. C. (Eds.) (1997). *The social psychology of music*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hargreaves, D. J., & North, A. C. (2001). *Musical development and learning: The international perspective.* London, England: Continuum.

Hebert, D., & Campbell, P. (2000). Rock music in American schools: Positions and practices since the 1960s. *International Journal of Music Education, 36,* 14–22.

Herman, S. (1988). *Building a pyramid of musicianship*. San Diego, CA: Curtis Music.

Hinckley, J.M. 2000. Pivotal issues in music education in the twentieth century. *Arts Education Policy Review, 101*(3), 31_33.

Hoffer, C. R. (2001). *Teaching music in the secondary schools* (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Hope, S. (2004, November). *Creating a positive future for P–12 music education*. Paper presented at the National Association of Schools of Music Annual Meeting, San Diego, CA.

Housewright, W., Longfield, R., & Willens, M. (1970). Where does rock music belong in the schools? *Today's Education, 59*(5), 34–36.

Humphreys, J. T. (2002). Some notions, stories, and tales about music and education in society: The coin's other side. *Journal of Historical Research in Music Education, 24*, 137–157.

Humphreys, J. T. (2004). Popular music in American schools: What history tells us about the present and the future. In C. X. Rodriguez (Ed.), *Bridging the gap: Popular music and music education* (pp. 91–106). Reston, VA: MENC—The National Association for Music Education.

Humphreys, J. T. (2006). 2006 Senior Researcher Award acceptance address: Observations about music education research in MENC's first and second centuries. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 54*, 183–202.

Indiana University. (2016). Mary Goetze biography. Retrieved from https://honorsandawards.iu.edu/searchawards/honoree.shtml?honoreeID=3522

Isbell, D. (2007). Popular music and the public school music curriculum. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education, 26*(1), 53–63.

Jaffurs, S. (2004). The impact of informal music learning practices in the classroom, or how I learned to teach from a garage band. *International Journal of Music Education, 22*(3), 189–200.

Jansen, G. E. (1995, February). *Feel the quality: Finding criteria for selecting excel-lent choral music.* Paper presented at a Florida State University Post-Graduate Research Seminar in Choral Music Education, Tallahassee, FL.

Jensen, J. (1992). Fandom as pathology: The consequences of characterization. In L. A. Lewis (Ed.), *The adoring audience: Fan culture and popular media* (pp. 9–29). New York, NY: Routledge.

Johnson, J. (2002). *Who needs classical music? Cultural choice and musical value.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Johnson, R. (1997). Better late than never: Thoughts on the music curriculum in the late 20th century. *Journal of Popular Music Studies, 9*(1), 1–6.

Jorgensen, E. R. (1996). The artist and the pedagogy of hope. *International Journal of Music Education, 27*, 36–50.

Jorgensen, E. R. (1997). *In search of music education*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Jorgensen, E. (2002). The aims of music education: A preliminary excursion. *Journal of Aesthetic Education, 36*(1), 31–49.

Jorgensen, E. (2003). Western classical music and general education. *Philosophy of Music Education Review, 11*(2), 130–140.

Kammen, M. (2000). *American culture, American tastes: Social change and the 20th century*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.

Kern, R. (1977). Using informal music in teaching. *Clavier, 16*(8), 32–35.

Kirschner, T. (1998). Studying rock: Towards a materialist ethnography. In T. Swiss, J. Sloop, & A. Herman (Eds.), *Mapping the beat: Popular music and contemporary theory* (pp. 247–268). Oxford: Blackwell.

Klocko, D. G. (1989). Multicultural music in the college curriculum. *Music Educators Journal, 75*(5), 38–41.

Kuehne, J. (2007). A survey of sight-singing instructional practices in Florida middle school choral programs. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 55*(2), 115–128.

Lamb, G. H. (1988). *Choral techniques* (3rd ed.). Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown.

Lamont, A. (2002). Musical identities and the school environment. In R. MacDonald, D. Hargreaves, & D. Miell (Eds.), *Musical identities* (pp. 41–59). Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.

Landeck, B. (1968). A Happy alternative to embracing rock. *Music Educators Journal, 55*(4), 35.

Larson, R. (1995). Secrets in the bedroom: Adolescents' private use of media. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 24*(5), 535-550.

LeBlanc, A. (1979). Generic style music preferences of fifth-grade students. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 27*(4), 255–270.

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

Lebler, D. (2008). Popular music pedagogy: Peer learning in practice. *Music Education Research, 10*(2), 193–213.

Lee, E., & Vulliamy, G. (Eds.). (1982). *Pop, rock and ethnic music in school.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Levi, R. M. (1985). The relationship of selected variables to successful choral programs (Doctoral Dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1985). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 47-05A*, 1643.

Lowe, G. (1997). *The Rock Book.* Sydney: McGraw-Hill.

Lilliestam, L (1996). On playing by ear. *Popular Music, 15*(2), 195–216.

MacCluskey, T. (1969a). Rock in its elements. *Music Educators Journal, 56*(3), 49–51.

MacCluskey, T. (1969b). Roll over, Beethoven. *Music Educators Journal, 56*(3), 65–67.

MacCluskey, T. (1979). Peaceful coexistence between pop and the classics. *Music Educators Journal, 65*(8), 54–57.

Mai, F. (2008). Emotion in Beethoven and his music-psychiatry in music. *The British Journal of Psychiatry, 193*(3), 209.

Mainwaring, J. (1951). *Teaching music in schools.* London, England: Paxton.

Mark, M. (1986). *Contemporary music education.* New York, NY: Shirmer.

Mann, L. (1995). Chasm or continuum? The applicability of classical vocal techniques to popular vocalism. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park, 1995). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 57*(03), 03A.

Mantie, R. (2013). A comparison of "Popular music pedagogy" discourses. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 61*(3), 334–352.

May, W. (1985). Musical style preferences and aural discrimination skills of primary grade school children. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 33*(1), 7–22.

McClary, S. (1991). *Feminine endings.* Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press.

McGillen, C., & McMillan, R. (2005). Engaging with adolescent musicians: Lessons in
song writing, cooperation and the power of original music. *Research Studies in
Music Education, 25*, 36–54.

McPherson, G. E., & Gabrielsson, A. (2002). From sound to sign. In R. Parncutt & G. E.
McPherson (Eds.), *The science and psychology of music performance: Creative
strategies for teaching and learning* (pp. 99–115). New York, NY: Oxford
University Press.

McRobbie, A. (2000). *Feminism and youth culture* (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Melnick, J. (2001). Using music. *Journal of Popular Music Studies, 13,* 125–127.

Middleton, R. (1990). *Studying popular music.* Ballmoor (UK): Open University Press.

Middleton, R., & Manuel, P. (2014). Popular music. *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music
Online.* Oxford University Press.

Miller, K. E. (1988). *Vocal music education: Teaching in the secondary school.*
Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Mills, S. (2000). Recognizing middle school students' taste for popular music. *General
Music Today, 13*(3), 3–6.

Mills, J., & McPherson, G. E. (2006). Musical literacy. In G. E. McPherson (Ed.), *The
child as musician: A handbook of musical development* (pp. 155–171). New York,
NY: Oxford University Press.

Moisala, P., & Diamond, B. (Eds.). (2000). *Music and gender*. Chicago: University of
Illinois Press.

Monk, P. (1959). Popular music in the classroom. *Music Journal, 17*(1), 102–103.

Morgan, R. G. (1992). A study of a director's behaviors and his students' perceptions in a high school choral ensemble (Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1992). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 53*-06A, 1836.

Mueller, R. (2002). Perspectives from the sociology of music. In R. Colwell & C. Richardson (Eds.), *The new handbook of research on music teaching and learning* (pp. 584–603). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Music Educators National Conference. (1966). *Experiments in musical creativity: CMP 3.* Washington, D. C.: Music Educators National Conference.

Music Educators National Conference. (1994). *Opportunity to learn standards for music instruction: Grades PreK-12.* Reston, VA: Author.

Music for All Foundation. (2004). *The sound of silence—The unprecedented decline of music education in California public schools.* Retrieved from http://music-for-all.org

The National Association for Music Education. (2015). *NAfME Strategic Plan.* Retrieved from http://www.nafme.org/wpcontent/files/2014/06/2011stratplanfinal2.pdf

The Neilson Company. (2015). *Music sales measurement.* Retrieved from Neilsen at http://www.nielsen.com/us/en/solutions/measurement/music-sales-measurement.html

Nettle, B. (1995). *Heartland excursions.* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Newsom, D. (1998). Rock's quarrel with tradition: Popular music's carnival comes to the classroom. *Popular Music and Society, 22*(3), 1-20.

Norman, K. (1999). Music faculty perceptions of multicultural music education. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 139*, 37–49.

Oblinger, D. G., & Oblinger, J. L. (2005). Is it age or IT: First steps towards understanding the net generation. In D. G. Oblinger & J. L. Oblinger (Eds.), *Educating the net generation* (Eds.), 2.1-2.20. Washington, DC: An Educause e-book. Retrieved from www.educause.edu/educatingthenetgen

O'Brien, J. (1982). A plea for pop. *Music Educators Journal, 68*(7), 44, 51–54.

O'Flynn, J. (2006). Vernacular music-making and education. *International Journal of Music Education, 24,* 140–147.

O'Neill, S. A., & Boulton, M. J. (1996). Boys' and girls' preferences for musical instruments: A function of gender? *Psychology of Music, 24,* 171–183.

Palisca, C. (1964). *Music in our schools: A Search for improvement.* Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Parr, C. (2006). Eight simple rules for singing multicultural music. *Music Educators Journal, 93*(1), 34-37.

Pembrook, R. (1986). Popular music in research and in the classroom. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education, 4*(1), 6–10.

Pembrook, R. (1991). Exploring the musical side of pop. *Music Educators Journal, 77*(8), 30–34.

Peters, U. H. (2011). Composer Robert Schumann not a bipolar.  *European Psychiatry, 26*(1), 243.

Peterson, R. A., & Kern, R. M. (1996). Changing highbrow taste: From snob to omnivore. *American Sociological Review, 61*(5), 900–907.

Poliakov, L. (2003). *The History of anti-Semitism, volume 3: From Voltaire to Wagner.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Ponick, F. S. (2000). Bach and rock in the music classroom. *Teaching Music,* 8(3), 22–29.

Qualification and Curriculum Development Agency. (2007). *Music: Programme of study for key stage 3 and attainment target.* Retrieved from http://curriculum.qcda.govuk/key-stages-3-and-4/subjects/key-stage-3/music/programme-of-study/index.aspx?tab=4

Raiber, M. & Teachout, D. (2014). *The Journey from Music Student to Teacher: A Professional Approach.* New York: Routledge.

Reames, R. (2001). High school choral directors' description of appropriate literature for beginning high school choirs. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 49*(2), 122–135.

Regelski, T. A. (1998). The Aristotelian bases of praxis for music and music education as praxis. *Philosophy of Music Education Review 6*(1), 22–59.

Reimer, B. (2002). The need to face the issues. In B. Reimer (Ed.), *World musics and music education: Facing the issues* (pp. 3–11). Reston, VA: MENC—The National Association for Music Education.

Reimer, B. (2003). *A philosophy of music education: Advancing the vision* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Richmond, J.W. (1997). Universal access for the universal language. *Arts Education Policy Review, 99*(11), 22-29.

Rideout, R. (1990). The German model in music curricula. *College Music Symposium, 30*(2), 106–111.

Roem, N. (1968). The music of the Beatles. *Music Educators Journal, 55*(4), 33–34, 77–83.

Rogers, J. (1990). Using popular music to teach global education. *Magazine of History, 4*(4), 43–45.

Sadler, D. R. (2005). Interpretations of criteria-based assessment and grading in higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 30*(2), 175–194.

Schroedl, S. (2001). *Play Drums Today!,* Milwaukee, WI: Hal Leonard.

Seeger, A. (2002). Catching up with the rest of the world: Music education and musical experience. In B. Reimer (Ed.), *World musics and music education: Facing the issues* (pp. 7–10). Reston, VA: MENC—The National Association for Music Education.

Seifried, S. (2006). Exploring the outcomes of rock and popular music instruction in high school guitar class: A case study. *International Journal of Music Education, 24*(2), 168–177.

Sherman, B. (1998). Authenticity in musical performance. *The encyclopedia of aesthetics.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Sloboda, J., Davidson, J., & Howe, M. (1994). Is everyone musical? *The Psychologist, 7*(8), 349–354.

Small, C. (1987). *Music of the common tongue: Survival and celebration in Afro-American music.* London: Calder.

Smith-Vaughn, B. (2007). The Impact of singing styles on tension in the adolescent voice. (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 2007).

Stewart, C. (1991). Who takes music? Investigating access to high school music as a function of social and school factors. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1991). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 52*(10), 3554A.

Stewart, R. (1984). A comparison of music preferences of students in three educational systems: Seventh-day Adventist, public, and private independent schools. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Miami, 1984). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 45*(04), 1066A.

Strand, K. (2006). Survey of Indiana music teachers on using composition in the classroom. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 54*(2), 154–167.

Strauss, C. (1984). Beyond 'formal' versus 'informal' education: Uses of psychological theory in anthropological research. *Ethos, 12*(5), 195–222.

Suzuki, S. (1986). *Nurtured by love: The classic approach to talent education* (2nd ed.). Miami, FL: Suzuki Method International.

Szabo, C. E. (1993). A profile of ten high school choral directors and their activities during one week (Doctoral dissertation, Kent State University, 1992). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 53*-08A, 2730.

Tagg, P. (2000). *Kojak: 50 seconds of television music: Towards the analysis of affect in popular music.* New York, NY: The Mass Media Music Scholars' Press.

Tarrant, M., North, A., & Hargreaves, D. J. (2002). Youth identity and music. In R. MacDonald, D. J. Hargreaves, & D. Miell (Eds.), *Musical identities* (pp. 134–150). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Thomas, R. (1970). *Manhattanville music curriculum program. Final report.* Washington, D. C.: United States Office of Education.

Toynbee, J. (2000). *Making popular music: Musicians, creativity and institutions*. London: Arnold.

Tucker, J. C. (1992). Circling the globe: Multicultural resources. *Music Educators Journal, 78*(9), 37-40.

Turley, P. W. (1989). Activities and philosophical principles employed in selected Indiana high school choral departments (Doctoral Dissertation, Ball State University, 1988). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 49, 2577A.

Undercofler, J.F. (1997). Music in America's schools: A plan for action. *Arts Education Policy Review, 98*(7), 15-19.

University Libraries—University of Maryland. (2016). *Contemporary Music Project.* Retrieved from http://www.lib.umd.edu/scpa/nafme/cmp/home

Väkevä, L. (2006). Teaching popular music in Finland: What's up, what's ahead? *International Journal of Music Education, 24*, 126–131.

Van Eijck, K. (2001). Social differentiation in musical taste patterns. *Social Forces, 79*(3), 1163–85.

Virginia Choral Directors Association. (n. d.). Assessment Form. Retrieved from http://www.vcda.net/index.php/assessments.html

Virginia Department of Education. (2002). *Administrative manual for teachers in regional and local detention homes.* Retrieved from http://doe.virginia.gov/support/state_operated/administrative_manual_detention.pdf

Virginia Department of Education. (2013). *Music standards of learning for Virginia public schools.* Retrieved from http://www.doe.virginia.gov/testing/sol/standards_docs/fine_arts/2013/music/std_finearts_music.pdf

Virginia Retirement System. *Virginia Retirement System plan 1: Handbook for members.* Retrieved from http://www.varetire.org/pdf/publications/handbook-plan-1.pdf

Volk, T. (1998). *Music, education, and multiculturalism: Foundations and principles.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Vulliamy, G. (1977a). Music and the mass culture debate. In J. Shepherd, P. Virden, T. Wishart, & G. Vulliamy (Eds.), *Whose music: A sociology of musical languages* (pp. 179–200). London: Latimer New Dimensions.

Vulliamy, G. (1977). Music as a case study in the 'new sociology of education.' In J. Shepherd, P. Virden, T. Wishart, & G. Vulliamy (Eds.), *Whose music: A sociology of musical languages.* London: Latimer New Dimensions.

Vulliamy, G. & Lee, E. (Eds.) (1982). *Rock, Pop and Ethnic Music in Schools.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wang, J., & Humphreys, J. (2009). Multicultural and popular music content in an American music teacher education program. *International Journal of Music Education, 27*(1), 19–36.

Warner, T. (1997). "I'll give it five": The assessment of popular music performance. *Journal of Popular Music Studies,* 9(1), 37–42.

Wemyss, K. (1999). Ethical issues surrounding the inclusion of the music of Maganiu Malu Kes (the Torres Strait Islands) in curricula. In K. Leanneret & K. Marsh (Eds.), *Proceedings of the ASME XII National Conference* (pp. 230–236). Sydney: Australian Society for Music Education.

Wemyss, K. (2004). Reciprocity and exchange: Popular music in Australian secondary schools. In C. X. Rodriguez (Ed.), *Bridging the gap: Popular music and music education* (pp. 141–157). Reston, VA: MENC.

Westerlund, H. (2006). Garage rock bands: A future model for developing musical expertise? *International Journal of Music Education, 24,* 119–125.

Whiteley, S. (2000). *Women and popular music: Sexuality, identity and subjectivity.* London, England: Routledge.

Whitlock, R. H. S. (1991). Choral curriculum as it affects performance at the secondary level. *Choral Journal, 32*(3), 39–45.

Wicks, S. (1998). The Monocultural perspective of music education. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 44*(18), A72.

Willis, T. (1970). Youth music on their terms. *Music Educators Journal, 56*(9), 56–59.

Woody, R. H. (2007). Popular music in school: Remixing the issues. *Music Educators Journal,* 93(4), 32–37.

Woody, R., & Lehmann, A.  (2010). Student musicians' ear-playing ability as a function of vernacular music experiences. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 58*(2), 101–115.

Zillman, D., & Gan, S-L. (1997). Musical taste in adolescence. In D. J. Hargreaves & A. C. North (Eds.), *The social psychology of music* (pp. 161–187). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

# APPENDIX A

## POPULAR MUSIC SURVEY

From:         Elaine K. Smith, UNCG PhD Candidate

Subject:       Popular Music Survey

Hello Choir Directors,

      My name is Elaine Smith.  I am the choir director at Bassett High School in Bassett, Virginia.  I am currently in the process of completing my PhD in music education at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.  I am conducting a study on the inclusion of popular music in high school choirs in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

      You are receiving this email because you have been identified as a high school choir director in Virginia.  I am requesting that you complete a 10-minute-long, anonymous survey about your current teaching practices regarding popular music.  The information you provide will help me complete my study and will help to provide a clearer picture of popular music's inclusion or exclusion from the classroom.

      The survey is completely anonymous, meaning that your identity cannot be connected in any way by your answers, and it is voluntary, so you can opt out at any time.

      The survey will be available from April X to April X.  To access the survey, please click here.  If the survey does not open automatically, please copy and past the link to your Internet browser's address bar:

http://www.XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

      Questions about this survey?  Email: eksmith3@uncg.edu

Thank you for your time!

Elaine Smith
UNCG PhD Candidate

If you do not wish to receive future emails regarding this study, please reply to eksmith3@uncg.edu with the subject "opt out."

From:        Elaine K. Smith, UNCG PhD Candidate
Subject:      REMINDER: Popular Music Survey


Greetings and happy Friday!

**Take 10-minutes to complete the Popular Music Survey, please! If you have already completed the survey, thank you!**

My name is Elaine Smith. I am the choir director at Bassett High School in Bassett, Virginia. I am currently in the process of completing my PhD in music education at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. I am conducting a study on the inclusion of popular music in high school choirs in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

You are receiving this email because you have been identified as a high school choir director in Virginia. I am requesting that you complete a 10-minute-long, anonymous survey about your current teaching practices regarding popular music. The information you provide will help me complete my study and will help to provide a clearer picture of popular music's inclusion or exclusion from the classroom.

The survey is completely anonymous, meaning that your identity cannot be connected in any way by your answers, and it is voluntary, so you can opt out at any time.

The survey will be available from April X to April X. To access the survey, please click here. If the survey does not open automatically, please copy and past the link to your Internet browser's address bar:

http://www.XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Questions about this survey? Email: eksmith3@uncg.edu

Thank you for your time!

Elaine Smith
UNCG PhD Candidate



If you do not wish to receive future emails regarding this study, please reply to eksmith3@uncg.edu with the subject "opt out."

From:          Elaine K. Smith, UNCG PhD Candidate
Subject:       REMINDER: Popular Music Survey


Hello Colleagues!

At the beginning of this school year, I emailed you a link to a short survey. **If you have already completed the survey, thank you!** If you have not completed the survey, **please help me with my dissertation research by completing a 10-minute survey!**

My name is Elaine Smith. I am the choir director at North Iredell High School in Olin, North Carolina. I am currently in the process of completing my PhD in music education at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. I am conducting a study on the inclusion of popular music in high school choirs in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

You are receiving this email because you have been identified as a high school choir director in Virginia. I am requesting that you complete a 10-minute-long, anonymous survey about your current teaching practices regarding popular music. The information you provide will help me complete my study and will help to provide a clearer picture of popular music's inclusion or exclusion from the classroom.

The survey is completely anonymous, meaning that your identity cannot be connected in any way by your answers, and it is voluntary, so you can opt out at any time.

The survey will be available from April X to April X. To access the survey, please click here. If the survey does not open automatically, please copy and past the link to your Internet browser's address bar: http://www.XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Questions about this survey? Email: eksmith3@uncg.edu

Thank you for your time!

Elaine Smith
UNCG PhD Candidate



If you do not wish to receive future emails regarding this study, please reply to eksmith3@uncg.edu with the subject "opt out."

If after reading the consent form you do not want to participate, please check the NO button and exit the program.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO
CONSENT TO ACT AS A HUMAN PARTICIPANT: LONG FORM

Project Title:  A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF THE CURRENT TEACHING PRACTICES
OF HIGH SCHOOL CHOIR TEACHERS' INCLUSION OF POPULAR MUSIC
Project Director: Ms. Elaine K. Smith, Dr. Brett Nolker (advisor)

What is the study about?
This is a research project.  Your participation is voluntary.  This study was designed to investigate the current practices of high school choir teachers in regards to their inclusion of popular music in the classroom.

Why are you asking me?
We are looking for high school choir teachers in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

What will you ask me to do if I agree to be in the study?
We will ask you to complete a 10-15 minute online survey.

What are the risks to me?
The Institutional Review Board at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro has determined that participation in this study poses minimal risk to participants.  Participants may skip questions they do not wish to answer.  The researcher will not be able to identify answers by participant through the online survey.

If you have questions, want more information or have suggestions, please contact Elaine K. Smith or Brett Nolker, who may be reached at (336) 334-3642 or eksmith3@uncg.edu.

If you have any concerns about your rights, how you are being treated, concerns or complaints about this project or benefits or risks associated with being in this study please contact the Office of Research Integrity at UNCG toll-free at (855)-251-2351.

Are there any benefits to society as a result of me taking part in this research?
The benefits to society may include a deeper understanding of how popular music is or is not being included in high school choir classrooms.

Are there any benefits to me for taking part in this research study?
There are no direct benefits to participants in this study.

Will I get paid for being in the study?  Will it cost me anything?
There are no costs to you or payments made for participating in this study.

How will you keep my information confidential?
The online survey separates data from participants. Responses are anonymous. Data will be stored on a password-protected computer. Printed copies of data will be stored in a locked filing cabinet off campus. All information obtained in this study is strictly confidential unless disclosure is required by law. Absolute confidentiality of data provided through the Internet cannot be guaranteed due to the limited protections of Internet access. Please be sure to close your browser when finished so no one will be able to see what you have been doing.

What if I want to leave the study?
You have the right to refuse to participate or to withdraw at any time, without penalty. If you do withdraw, it will not affect you in any way. If you choose to not to complete the survey in full, your data will not be used.

What about new information/changes in the study?
If significant new information relating to the study becomes available which may relate to your willingness to continue to participate, this information will be provided to you.

Voluntary Consent by Participant:
By checking 'Yes' below and completing this survey, you are agreeing that you read, or it has been read to you, and you fully understand the contents of this document and are openly willing consent to take part in this study. All of your questions concerning this study have been answered. By continuing with the survey, you are agreeing that you are 18 years of age or older and are agreeing to participate in this study.


Yes, I have read the consent form and I agree to participate in the study.

No, I do not agree to participate in the study.

**POPULAR MUSIC SURVEY**

**PERSONAL DEMOGRAPHICS**
Please answer based on the **2013–2014** school year.

How many years have you been a music teacher (including this year)?
      Years:  Drop down menu

Are you currently teaching high school choir? (High School choir is defined as a performance ensemble that includes only students in grades 9–12.)
      1.     Yes
      2.     No

How many years have you been a teaching high school choir (through 2013–2014 school year)?
      Years:  Drop down menu

How many years have you taught in your present school (through 2013–2014 school year)?
      Years:  Drop down menu

Are you currently certified to teach music in the Commonwealth of Virginia?
      1.     Yes
      2.     No

What is your gender?
      1.     Male
      2.     Female

What is your age?
      Years:  Drop down

What is your race/ethnicity?
1.     White
2.     Hispanic/Latino
3.     Black or African American
4.     Native American
5.     Asian/Pacific Islander
6.     Other: _____


**YOUR EDUCATION**
Please provide information regarding your education.


       Bachelors
          1. College/university attended
          2. Major
               1.     Music education
               2.     Other: _____
          3. Minor: _____

Do you have a Master's degree?
1.     Yes
2.     No


       Master's
          1. College/university attended
          2. Major
               1.     Music education
               2.     Other: _____

Do you have a PhD or EdD degree?
1.     Yes
2.     No


       PhD/EdD
          1. College/university attended
          2. Major
               1.     Music education
               2.     Other: _____

Are you a National Board Certified Teacher?
1.    Yes
2.    No

Please list any other certifications you have obtained.
1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

**SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS**
Please answer based on the **2013–2014** school year.

Which of the following best describes the area in which your school is located?
1.    Urban
2.    Suburban
3.    Rural

What is the total population of your school?
1.    1-500 students
2.    501-1000 students
3.    1001-1500 students
4.    1501-2000 students
5.    2001-2500 students
6.    2501-3000 students
7.    3001-3500 students

What percentage of your school population is on the free/reduced lunch program?
Accuracy is important to the nature of this study.  Please find your school percentage at
the following link:  Free/Reduced Lunch Percentages by School
1.    0-10%
2.    11-20%
3.    21-30%
4.    31-40%
5.    41-50%
6.    51-60%
7.    61-70%
8.    71-80%
9.    81-90%
10.   90-100%

**CHOIR PROGRAM DEMOGRAPHICS**
Please answer based on the **2013-2014** school year.


What is the total population of your high school choir program?
1. 1-50 students
2. 51-100 students
3. 101-150 students
4. 151-200 students
5. 201-250 students
6. 251-300 students
7. 301+ students


How many high school choir classes do you teach per year? (A class is defined as a unique group of students.  For example, a year-long class on block scheduling with the same students would only count as one class.)
1. 1 class
2. 2 classes
3. 3 classes
4. 4 classes
5. 5 classes
6. 6 classes
7. 7 classes
8. 8 classes


In the following questions, you will be asked to select a brief description of each high school choir class that you teach per year, the size of the choir, whether that choir participated in choral assessment, and what rating they received this year.  The order in which you report them does not matter.


Which description best fits your first choir?
1. Beginning Choir
2. Intermediate Choir
3. Advanced Choir
4. Auditioned Ensemble
5. Madrigal Singers
6. Show Choir
7. Other: _____

Which description best fits your second choir?
1. Beginning Choir
2. Intermediate Choir
3. Advanced Choir
4. Auditioned Ensemble
5. Madrigal Singers
6. Show Choir
7. Other: _____

Which description best fits your third choir?
1. Beginning Choir
2. Intermediate Choir
3. Advanced Choir
4. Auditioned Ensemble
5. Madrigal Singers
6. Show Choir
7. Other: _____

Which description best fits your fourth choir?
1. Beginning Choir
2. Intermediate Choir
3. Advanced Choir
4. Auditioned Ensemble
5. Madrigal Singers
6. Show Choir
7. Other: _____

Which description best fits your fifth choir?
1. Beginning Choir
2. Intermediate Choir
3. Advanced Choir
4. Auditioned Ensemble
5. Madrigal Singers
6. Show Choir
7. Other: _____

Which description best fits your sixth choir?
1. Beginning Choir
2. Intermediate Choir
3. Advanced Choir
4. Auditioned Ensemble
5. Madrigal Singers
6. Show Choir
7. Other: _____


Which description best fits your seventh choir?
1. Beginning Choir
2. Intermediate Choir
3. Advanced Choir
4. Auditioned Ensemble
5. Madrigal Singers
6. Show Choir
7. Other: _____


Which description best fits your eighth choir?
1. Beginning Choir
2. Intermediate Choir
3. Advanced Choir
4. Auditioned Ensemble
5. Madrigal Singers
6. Show Choir
7. Other: _____

For each class, select whether you took them to choral assessment this school year (2013–2014) and what rating they received.

| | Choir Size | Choral Assessment | | Assessment Ratings | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Yes | No | Comments | Superior I | Excellent II | Good III | Fair IV | Poor V |
| 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | | | | |

**Popular Music**
For the purpose of this survey, popular music is defined as…

"Popular music" is an umbrella term used to cover a wide range of musical genres that are well known by a large number of people. Genres include, but are not limited to, alternative, country, dance, Disney, electronic, Hip-hop, rap, Indie, Inspirational (Contemporary Christian and Gospel), pop, rock, R&B, and soul. Popular music does not include art music, jazz, spirituals, or folk songs. Popular music is likely to be transmitted through the electronic means of radio, television, or the Internet.

Do you include popular music in any of your high school choir classrooms?
1. Yes
2. No

**YES**

For each class, select whether you include popular music in the curriculum.  If yes, select whether you use popular music to teach concepts or as performance literature.

|   | Include Popular Music? | | How Popular Music is Included | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|   | Yes | No | Concepts | Performance |
| 1 | | | | |
| 2 | | | | |
| 3 | | | | |
| 4 | | | | |
| 5 | | | | |
| 6 | | | | |
| 7 | | | | |
| 8 | | | | |

If you **do** use popular music in your classroom, what are the reasons?  (please select all that apply)

1.      I believe in starting with what the students already know.
2.      It makes the concepts I teach relevant to my students' lives.
3.      It shows that I value/respect my students' music.
4.      I can teach musical concepts through popular music.
5.      I like popular music.
6.      My students like popular music.
7.      Popular music has inherent value.
8.      Popular music attracts more students.
9.      It allows my students to be the expert.
10.     It meets local/state/national standards.
11.     It develops students' aural and expressive skills.
12.     Popular music adds variety to the choir program.
13.     I include popular music to please my audience.
14.     Because I am required to by my district.
15.     Other: _____

Do you use popular music to teach any of the following musical concepts? (please select all that apply)

1. Steady beat
2. Meter
3. Melody
4. Harmony
5. Tonality
6. Texture
7. Tempo
8. Expressive Elements
9. Timbre
10. Form
11. Other: _____


Do you perform popular music literature with your high school choir(s)?

1. Yes
2. No


What, if any, problems do you experience when performing popular music?

_____


How do you find/select your popular music literature? (select all that apply)

1. Publisher materials
2. Student input/suggestions
3. Listening to the radio, online, or iTunes
4. What is available through the provider (JW Pepper, Musical Source, catalogues)
5. Colleagues
6. Workshops
7. Other: _____


Where do you obtain your materials/literature?

1. Online websites (pay)
2. Music providers (JW Pepper, Musical Source, catalogues)
3. Free online sources
4. Student arrangements
5. Other: _____

Which criteria do you use to select popular music literature for performance? (select all that apply)

     1.     Quality
     2.     Concepts to be covered
     3.     If it fits my ensemble's needs
     4.     If sheet music is available.
     5.     If my students will like it.
     6.     If I like it.
     7.     Other: _____

Does student feedback and/or input influence which music is performed?

     1.     Yes
     2.     No

Which popular music genres did you include this year for performance?  (select all that apply)

     1.     Alternative
     2.     Country
     3.     Dance
     4.     Disney
     5.     Electronic
     6.     Hip-Hop/Rap
     7.     Indie
     8.     Inspirational—Christian & Gospel
     9.     Pop
     10.     R&B/Soul
     11.     Rock
     12.     Other: _____

Did you receive any instruction in teaching popular music in your college experience?

     1.     Yes
     2.     No

If you had instruction in teaching popular music in your college experience, what types of instruction did you receive? (select all that apply)

     1.     Popular music was covered in a methods class.
     2.     Popular music was performed in traditional ensembles.
     3.     Popular music was performed in non-traditional ensembles.
     4.     Popular music was covered in a special class devoted to the genre.
     5.     Other: _____

Did you receive instruction/training in teaching popular music somewhere other than college? (i.e., high school, garage bands, professional development sessions)? If so, where?

    1.    Yes _____
    2.    No


When during the year do you typically perform popular music? (select all that apply)

    1.    Fall Concert
    2.    Christmas/Winter Concert
    3.    Spring Concert
    4.    Pops Concert
    5.    Graduation
    6.    Other: _____


Which type of accompaniment do you use for choir performances of popular music? (select all that apply)

    1.    Piano only
    2.    Band (Keyboard, Guitar, Bass, Drums)
    3.    Accompaniment CD
    4.    A cappella
    5.    Other: _____


Which type of accompaniment do you use for popular music solo performances? (select all that apply)

    1.    I do not include solo popular music selections.
    2.    Piano only
    3.    Band (Keyboard, Guitar, Bass, Drums)
    4.    Accompaniment Track
    5.    Other: _____


How do your students feel about performing popular music?

    1.    They love it.
    2.    They like it mostly.
    3.    They are indifferent.
    4.    They dislike it.
    5.    They hate it.

What percentage of your total performance literature was popular music?
1.   1-10%
2.   11-20%
3.   21-30%
4.   31-40%
5.   41-50%
6.   51-60%
7.   61-70%
8.   71-80%
9.   81-90%
10.  91-100%

Which other genres did you perform this year? (select all that apply)
1.   Renaissance
2.   Baroque
3.   Classical
4.   Romantic
5.   20th century
6.   Folk song arrangements
7.   Jazz
8.   Non-Western

**NO**

If you do **not** use popular music in your classroom, what are the reasons?  (select all that apply)

1.   Popular music is often not appropriate
2.   I'm not comfortable teaching popular music to my students
3.   I do not believe that it is a useful learning tool
4.   I do not like popular music
5.   There is a shortage of quality popular music arrangements
6.   Popular music is too easy for my students.
7.   Popular music creates a lack of interest in other genres of music.
8.   I do not have time to include popular music.
9.   I have no training in how to teach popular music effectively.
10.  There are no accepted models or pedagogy for teaching popular music.
11.  I am concerned that my students will learn to sing by rote instead of through written notation.
12.  Popular music is not approved for formal choral assessment events.
13.  Other: _____

Based on your answers from the previous question, please provide more specific information.  Select all that apply.

Popular music is often not appropriate
1.      The text uses language that is not acceptable in school settings.
2.      The text is about inappropriate subject matter (i.e., sex, drugs, violence)
3.      The music is too easy for my students
4.      The style is better suited for small group and solo performers rather than a large ensemble.
5.      Other: _____

I'm not comfortable teaching popular music to my students
1.      I have no training in how to teach popular music effectively.
2.      I am not an expert in popular music/my students know more than me.
3.      I do not know how to perform popular music authentically.
4.      I do not see value in popular music.
5.      Other: _____

I do not believe that it is a useful learning tool
1.      My students already know popular music.  I should teach them music they would not experience otherwise.
2.      The music is too easy for my students.
3.      I can accomplish the learning objectives without using popular music.
4.      Other: _____

I do not like popular music
1.      My musical preferences do not include popular music.  My groups perform songs I like.
2.      I do not like to hear popular music performed by choirs.
3.      I want students to learn to like the music that I introduce in class.
4.      Other: _____

There is a shortage of quality popular music arrangements
1.      Choral arrangements of popular music do not produce authentic sounds.
2.      My students do not like the changes arrangers make to their music.
3.      Arrangements are not available for current/past popular songs that I would like to use.
4.      Other: _____

I do not have the resources to perform popular music in an authentic way.

1. My students do not use vocal technique that lends itself to popular music.
2. Arrangements of popular music are not authentic.
3. I do not have access to musicians who play the guitar, bass, and drums.
4. I do not have the funds to pay for musicians who play the guitar, bass, and drums.
5. Other: _____


Popular music is too easy for my students.

1. The harmonies are too simple.
2. The melody line is simple.
3. The rhythms are simple.
4. The emotions expressed are simple.
5. The students do not have to read notation because they already know the song.
6. Other: _____


Popular music creates a lack of interest in other genres of music.

1. My students will not want to sing harder music after singing popular music.
2. My students already like popular music.  If we perform it, it will be harder on me to teach other genres.
3. My students will want to learn all genres by ear/rote.
4. Other: _____


I do not have time to include popular music.

1. There are too many standards to meet.
2. I have too many other concerts to prepare already.
3. Popular music takes more time for me (the teacher) to prepare.
4. Popular music takes more time outside of class to prepare.
5. Choral assessment takes up a lot of time.
6. Other: _____


I have no training in how to teach popular music effectively.

1. I have not been involved in popular music performance.
2. I had no instruction in college on teaching popular music.
3. I do not know where to get training/help in learning to teaching popular music.
4. Other: _____

There are no accepted models or pedagogy for teaching popular music.
1.     I have never seen someone else teach popular music.
2.     I had no teaching models who used popular music in high school or college.
3.     There are not enough resources/materials on how to teach popular music.
4.     Other: _____

I am concerned that my students will learn to sing by rote instead of through written notation.
1.     I do not teach music by rote.
2.     My students think it's easier to learn by rote and do not want to learn to read notation.
3.     If we learn by rote, my students will miss out on using their reading skills.
4.     Other: _____

Popular music is not approved for formal choral assessment events.
1.     I cannot use popular music during assessment season.
2.     I only use music deemed as worthy of the assessment list.
3.     I (or my choir) am not rewarded for performing popular music.
4.     Other: _____

What would have to change for you to consider using popular music in the future?
1.     Increased Instruction
2.     Better arrangements (quality/difficulty)
3.     Access to instrumentalists
4.     Greater Funding
5.     I do not plan to use popular music
6.     Other: _____

Do you receive any pressure from the school or community to perform popular music? If so, how?
1.     Yes
               _____
2.     No

Do you receive any instruction in teaching popular music in your college experience?
1.     Yes
2.     No

Did you receive any instruction in teaching popular music in from somewhere other than college (i.e., high school, garage bands, professional development sessions)?  If so, where?
      1.     Yes _____
      2.     No


Would you be willing to attend a professional development session on performing popular music?
      1.     Yes
      2.     No


Which genres did you include this year for performance?
      1.     Renaissance
      2.     Baroque
      3.     Classical
      4.     Romantic
      5.     20th Century
      6.     Folk song arrangements
      7.     Jazz
      8.     Non-Western
      9.     Other: _____


What criteria do you use to select literature for performance?
      1.  Quality
      2.  Concepts to be covered
      3.  If my students will like it.
      4.  If I like it.
      5.  Its inclusion on the state assessment
      6.  Other: _____


Does student feedback and/or input influence which music is performed?
      1.     Yes
      2.     No


Thank you for completing the Popular Music Survey! Please exit the program and close your browser.

## APPENDIX B

## SURVEY SOURCE LIST

If you **do** use popular music in your classroom, what are the reasons? (please select all that apply)

1. I believe in starting with what the students already know. (Davis and Blair, 2011; deVries, 2004; Forbes, 2001; Goodwin, 1997; Green, 2006; Isbell, 2007; Pembrook, 1991; Vulliamy & Lee, 1976)

2. It makes the concepts I teach relevant to my students' lives. (Campbell, Connell, & Beegle, 2007; Evelein, 2006; Green, 2006; Hope, 2004; Isbell, 2007)

3. It shows that I value/respect my students' music. (Goodwin, 1997; Davis & Blair, 2011; Woody, 2007)

4. I can teach musical concepts through popular music. (Forbes, 2001; Grashel, 1979; Pembrook, 1991)

5. I like popular music. (Davis & Blair, 2011)

6. My students like popular music. (Benner, 1972; Geter & Streisand, 1995; Hargreaves & North, 1997; LeBlanc, 1979; May, 1985; Mills, 2000; Stewart, 1984)

7. Popular music has inherent value. (Campbell, Connell, & Beegle, 2007; Davis & Blair, 2011; Green, 1988, 2006; Vulliamy 1977a, 1977b)

8. Popular music attracts more students. (Isbell, 2007; Pembrook, 1991)

9. It allows my students to be the expert. (Goodwin, 1997; Isbell 2007; Vulliamy & Lee, 1976)

10. It meets local/state/national standards. (Ponick, 2000; Wang & Humphreys, 2009)

11. It develops students' aural and expressive skills. (Campbell, Connell, & Beegle, 2007; Dunbar-Hall & Wemyss, 2000; Green, 2005; Mann, 1995; Woody, 2007)

12. Popular music adds variety to the choir program. (Bowman, 2004; Choate, 1968; Elliott, 1995; Forbes, 2001; Green, 2001; Humphreys, 2004; Jorgensen, 1996, 1997; Ponic, 2000; Regelski, 1998; Reimer, 2003; Rogers, 1990)

If you do **not** use popular music in your classroom, what are the reasons?  (select all that apply)

1. Popular music is often not appropriate (Chatagner, 1999; Hebert & Cambell, 2000; Monk, 1959)

2. I'm not comfortable teaching popular music to my students (Davis & Blair, 2011; Hebert & Campbell, 2000; Wang & Humphreys, 2009)

3. I do not believe that it is a useful learning tool (Davis & Blair, 2011; Forbes, 2001)

4. I do not like popular music (Davis & Blair, 2011; Drummond, 2010; Forbes, 2001; Graham, 2009; Hebert & Campbell, 2000; MacCluskey, 1979)

5. There is a shortage of quality popular music arrangements (Hebert & Cambell, 2000; Melnick, 2001; Davis and Blair; 2011; Pembrook, 1991; Woody, 2007)

6. I do not have the resources to perform popular music in an authentic way. (Cutietta, 1991; Green, 2006; Monk, 1959; Seifried, 2006)

7. Popular music is too easy for my students.  (Davis and Blair, 2011)

8. Popular music creates a lack of interest in other genres of music. (Jorgensen, 2002; Monk, 1959)

9. I do not have time to include popular music. (Green, 2006; Hebert & Cambell, 2000; Forbes, 2001; Monk, 1959)

10. I have no training in how to teach popular music effectively.  (Gaitandjiev, 1997; Hebert & Cambell, 2000; Johnson, 1997; MacCluskey, 1979; Davis &Blair, 2011; Pembrook, 1991 Wang & Humphreys, 2009)

11. I am concerned that my students will learn to sing by rote instead of through written notation. (Dunbar-Hall & Wemyss, 2000; Mark, 1986; Woody & Lehmann, 2010)

12. Popular music is not approved for formal choral assessment events. (VCDA, n. d.; Warner, 1997)

13. Other: _____

# APPENDIX C

# VMEA/VCDA CHORAL ASSESSMENT ADJUDICATION FORM

SCHOOL: _____  CHOIR: _____

DIRECTOR: _____  ENSEMBLE SIZE: _____

SELECTION 1 TITLE & COMP/ARR: _____  GRADE: ____  SOURCE: ____

SELECTION 2 TITLE & COMP/ARR: _____  GRADE: ____  SOURCE: ____

| | I - SUPERIOR | II - EXCELLENT | III - GOOD | IV - FAIR | V - POOR | SCORE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Tone** | 15  14  13 | 12  11  10 | 9  8  7 | 6  5  4 | 3  2  1 | Tone |
| Healthy tone, Focus, Breath management, Age appropriate | Proper tone production in all ranges and dynamic levels | Proper tone production in most ranges and dynamic levels | Tone production is inconsistent across ranges and dynamic levels | Elements of proper tone production are seldom present | Proper tone production is not evident | |
| **Intonation** | 15  14  13 | 12  11  10 | 9  8  7 | 6  5  4 | 3  2  1 | Intonation |
| Note accuracy, Chords, Intervals, Unisons, Tonal awareness | Pitches are correct / well centered, adjustments are made quickly | Pitches are correct but not always centered | Inconsistent note accuracy and intonation | Numerous inaccuracies in notes and intonation | Undeveloped intonation and incorrect pitches | |
| **Diction** | 15  14  13 | 12  11  10 | 9  8  7 | 6  5  4 | 3  2  1 | Diction |
| Vowels, Consonants, Languages, Syllabic stress | Expressive use of the elements of diction with unified vowel placement | Consistent use of the elements of diction; Minor problems in vowel placement | Inconsistent application of the elements of diction & vowel placement | Minimal application of the elements of diction & unified vowel placement | Undeveloped diction & lack of unified vowels | |
| **Musical Effect** | 15  14  13 | 12  11  10 | 9  8  7 | 6  5  4 | 3  2  1 | Musical Effect |
| Phrasing, Dynamics, Style, Rhythmic precision, Tempo | Outstanding / artistic phrasing & dynamics Outstanding rhythmic precision, tempo, style | Consistent use of appropriate style, tempo dynamics, phrasing, rhythmic precision | Inconsistencies in rhythmic precision. tempo, and in use of expressive elements | Numerous rhythm / tempo / dynamic / phrasing / stylistic inaccuracies | Undeveloped rhythm and expressive elements | |
| **Balance / Blend** | 10  9 | 8  7 | 6  5 | 4  3 | 2  1 | Balance/Blend |
| Within/across: Vocal sections, Ensemble, Dynamic spectrum | Appropriate melodic / harmonic / dynamic balance / blend within & across ensemble | Minor problems in melodic / harmonic / dynamic balance & blend within / across ensemble | Inconsistent ensemble balance / blend | Frequent balance / blend problems | Ineffective balance / blend | |
| **Stage Presence** | 10  9 | 8  7 | 6  5 | 4  3 | 2  1 | Stage Presence |
| Posture, Focus, Professionalism, Facial expression | Outstanding posture, stage presence, majority of ensemble uses facial expression | Excellent posture, stage presence, some of ensemble uses facial expression | Inconsistent focus & professionalism, minimal use/ absence of facial expression | Stage presence frequently distracted from the performance | Ineffective stage presence | |

Adjudicator's Signature: _____

| RATINGS & SCORES | FINAL RATING | TOTAL SCORE |
|---|---|---|
| I   Superior 68-80 | | |
| II   Excellent 52-67 | | |
| III   Good 36-51 | | |
| IV   Fair 20-35 | | |
| V   Poor 6-19 | | |

# APPENDIX D

# SURVEY RESPONSES FOR "OTHER"

What is your race/ethnicity?

- (2)    Jewish
- (1)    Not identified

Bachelors Major

        Art
        Secondary Education, Choral Emphasis
- (2)    Vocal Performance
        Bachelor of Arts
        Organ and Church Music
        Bachelor of Science in Music
- (2)    Church Music
        Commerce and Music
        Double Major in Music and Anthropology
        Double with Music Performance
        Mathematics
        Music Education Voice
        Piano Performance/Music Education
        Music Performance
        Music Technology
        Music with Vocal Concentration
        Piano Performance
        Speech Pathology/Audiology

Master's Major

        Administration
- (8)    Choral Conducting
- (4)    Conducting
        Counseling
- (2)    Curriculum and Instruction
- (3)    Education
        Education and Curriculum & Instruction
        Flute Performance
        Library Science

  (2)  Trombone Performance
      Master of Arts in Teaching- Choral Music Education
      Church Music/Choral Conducting
  (2)  Music
      Music Education and Choral Conducting
  (3)  Music Performance
      Musicology
      Reading Specialist
      Religious Education and Church Music
      Special Education
      Theology
      Vocal Pedagogy and Performance
  (2)  Vocal Performance

Please list any other certifications you have obtained.

    "Art"
    "Certification for K-12 General & Choral"
    "College Board; AP Music Theory"
    "CPR/First Aid/AED"
    "Desktop Music Production"
    "Education Administration"
    "Elementary Education"
    "k-12 Music Education"
    "Kodaly"
    "Kodàly Certification"
    "Kodaly Level 1"
    "Kodaly Level I"
    "Level 3 Orff Schulwerk"
    "Middle School Mathematics"
    "Music K-12 Vocal"
    "NAfME"
    "Orff level 1"
    "Orff Level 1"
    "Orff Level II"
    "Orff/Kodaly Level 1"
    "Special Education - Severe/Profound"
    "St. Norbert College - Music Education Certification Only Program"
    "Vocal music K-12"
    "ACDA"
    "Kodaly level I"
    "Music K-12 Instrumental"
    "NVCC; Audio Engineering"

"Opticianry"
"Orff"
"Orff/Kodaly Level 2"
"Piano"
"Gordon Learning Theory"
"Dalcroze in progress"
"Guitar"

Class Descriptions

    (3)    Piano
    (6)    Vocal Jazz Choir
           Music Appreciation
           Musical Theater
           "Adaptive choir for special education students"
    (2)    Beg/Int/Adv Choir
    (7)    Women's Choir
    (3)    Men's Choir
    (3)    Not Identified

If you do use popular music in your classroom, what are the reasons?

"Singers can apply good techniques to popular music as well as classical
    literature "
"Popular music in after school a cappella groups"
"Should study a variety of styles and learn musical concepts through
    them"
"Wide variety of musical styles"
"Reasons vary"
"Each choir is traditional and show- Popular Music in show part"
"Recruitment tool/builds excitement"
"Students continue with the music program"
"Teaches complex rhythms that might not be available otherwise"

If you had instruction in teaching popular music in your college experience, what types of
    instruction did you receive?

"Show Choir Methods"
"Popular music class was offered but not required- participant did not take
    due to scheduling conflicts"

Do you receive any instruction in teaching popular music from somewhere other than college (i.e., high school, garage bands, professional development sessions)?

(15)    Conferences/Workshops
(2)     Performances
(5)     Student Teaching/Other Teachers
(4)     High School
(2)     Personal Performances
        Family
(2)     Self-study
        Working as a Studio engineer


Do you use popular music to teach any of the following musical concepts?

        "Choreography"
        "Arranging"
        "Entertain the audience"
(2)     "Rhythm"
        "Sight reading"
        "Syncopation"
        "Stylistic vocal techniques"
        "Movement"
        "Whatever the given piece has to offer"


Which popular music genres did you include this year for performance?

        "50's Doo Wop/60's girl group"
(9)     "Broadway"
        "Contemporary A cappella"
        "Folk/singer-songwriter"
        "Motown"
        "Oldies"
        "Swing/jazz/blues"
        "The Lion Sleeps Tonight"
        "Varies among classes"
        "World music"


Which criteria do you use to select popular music literature for performance?

        "All apply"
(3)     Audience appeal

"Content and appropriateness"
(2)    Fits the need of the performance
"For specific concerts like Black History Month"
"I use themes for our Spring concert (Motown, Quartets)"
"It can be combined with other pieces to create a coherent 30 minute
      program"
"It fits the theme of our concert"
"If the lyrics/subject matter are school appropriate"
"It has to have good harmony and not be trite"
"Present to them pieces they should know past and present"
"Quality of the arrangement and if it suits the standards of the program"

How do you find/select your popular music literature?

"Free arrangements online (music score)"
"I base it on the theme of the concert and what I know and thing works for
      the students"
"Judging choral festivals"
"Listening to what other "quality" choral groups perform to see what
      possibilities are out there"
"Seniors vote on end of year theme"
"Student suggestion box"
"What is already in my music library"
(2)    "Write my own arrangements"
"Youtube"

Where do you obtain your materials?

(2)    Commission arrangements
(12)    Director arrangements

When during the year do you typically perform popular music?

"'Night on broadway' concert"
"Black History Month"
"Community Performances"
"End of the Year Pops Concert"
"Show choir competition"
"Show choir concert"
"Singing valentines"
"Variety show"

Which type of accompaniment do you use for choir performances of popular music?

> "Combination of piano, a cappella, youtube karoke, and students playing guitar or upright bass. I even played accordion on one song."

Drums
Guitar
Jazz Band

Which type of accompaniment do you use for popular music solo performances?

> Combination
> (2) Guitar
> Keyboard
> Single instrument
> String orchestra/full orchestra

What, if any, problems do you experience when performing popular music?

- "Students that know a particular song well, will sometimes revert to singing the way the recording artist sings it, rather than the way it is written in the music. This could be rhythmic/pitch variation as well as other elements."
- ""Not like the radio!" / They sometimes want to do more of this genre than others which we need to study as well."
- "1. Finding contemporary music that is language and content appropriate. 2. Students using unhealthy vocal techniques. 3. Students attempting techniques that are too difficult for them. 4. Students selecting music based solely on what they "like" instead o musical merit, cultural relevancy, intrinsic quality, or message."
- "Accompanent with piano rather than sound track (auditorium not conducive to soundtracks). Students try to sing with pop "nasal" sound."
- "Bad vocal techniques that they copy from their favorite "popular" singers"
- "Beginning students, especially sopranos, have tendency to want to sing what they have heard, and usually it's different from what is printed on the music. Older students that can sight read, loose the tendency to make things up that aren't written."
- "Bridging the gap between what they know from listening to the radio and what they get with a choral arrangement of that song in class."
- "Difficult rhythms, application of some proper techniques"
- "Difficulty learning harmony parts when students are used to singing the melody along with the radio."
- "Encouraging students to follow the music and not add what they think the artists does on original recordings."

- "Finding a balance between staying true to the original song and making it interesting to sing. This is especially true when the original song doesn't change much between verses, or relies heavily on instruments I'm not able to use in the choral arrangemen."
- "Finding choral arrangements of songs students would like to perform  Finding quality choral arrangements of popular music  Worrying about rights to performing popular music in order to create own arrangements (by director or students)"
- "Finding good arrangements"
- "Getting students to understand that the choral sound of a popular song is not going to be like the recording by the pop artist."
- "Getting the rhythms to feel right"
- "Getting the students away from what they have heard on a recording/radio and actually singing what is written on the page."
- "I am including Broadway in the popular genre, it is popular with my kids.  The major problem in classroom is the representation of melody using standardized notation.  It just doesn't always fit.  Everyone has an idea of how it is 'supposed' to sound, and th notation does not represent any of those ideas!"
- "I have to arrange/transcribe the music (2 and 3 part) and use a karoke version as accompaniment"
- "If I am not careful with the pacing of my teaching, students can get bored of the popular music they rehearse due to its repetitive nature."
- "If the notation in the music is different from what they've heard then it becomes an issue teaching the correct notation."
- "inadequacy of only piano accompaniment, appropriateness of concert attire, difficulty in finding arrangements worth learning"
- "Inadequate/awkward piano accompaniment"
- "It can't be current popular music.  I don't particularly like doing that."
- "It is always difficult to teach harmony to songs that the students already know.  Also, convincing them that this is not the same arrangement, or that it can still sound awesome in a choral arrangement is sometimes tricky."
- "It may be difficult with pronunciations.  Students will mimic what they may have already heard so I have to reteach correct singing."
- "It's well accepted here.  It is much more challenging to do quality music here.  It took several years of "setting the stage" to get the students and community to accept something in another language."
- "Like I mentioned before, it is mainly with the after school a'capella groups.  We've experienced no problems...."
- "Making sure that I stay within copyright laws."
- "Most arrangements are watered down and sound cheesy.  Students can perform difficult syncopated rhythms easily but arrangers don't write them out like the original.  I have to re-arrange a lot."
- "My students mimic the poor vocal tone that they hear on the radio."

- "None.  The students understand that it is the exception, not the rule to have the opportunity to perform a pop piece."
- "None-5"
- "Often times the rhythm on the page is not what the students are used to hearing. I err on the side of doing what is correct from the printed music, not what the song sounds like."
- "performing the rhythms as written and not as they are heard"
- "Popular music is often used to compare and contrast musical elements.  Most of my students find the classics most interesting because they already know the pop music."
- "Pushing/straining; singing flat, generally poor vocal technique"
- "Quality of sheet music available for ensemble ability levels."
- "Ranges/tessituras tend to sit too low for the female, adolescent voice.  Students are sometimes frustrated that the choral version of a piece does not sound like the piece they listen to by the artist."
- "Rhythmic integrity."
- "Rhythmically Awkward"
- "Singing with good vocal technique unlike some popular artists."
- "Sometimes if you select one or two pieces of popular music, invariable, someone(s) in the choir doesn't like it.  It is not their favorite type of music."
- "Sometimes the song is no longer popular by the time we perform it"
- "Sometimes the students are less excited about classical literature, because they know we could be working on a piece of popular music that they are more excited about"
- "sometimes the text is difficult."
- "Students are frustrated when the choral arrangement is not exactly like the original performance of the song.  This leads to discussion about choral music vs. solo music, and then they are fine."
- "Students have trouble learning harmony parts since everyone knows the melody. Appeasing everyone is difficult when choosing pop music.  Less emotional/musical "payoff" with these songs."
- "Students like to sing familiar music the way they want, not necessarily the way it's written or supposed to be performed."
- "Students sometimes want to perform it only in the way that they have heard it."
- "Students struggle with the difference between the "radio version" and the arrangement of the song.  Many popular songs have complex rhythms or melismatic figures that are difficult to replicate in a large group, so arrangements are written to make them sinable, but differ from what the student wants to hear/sing."
- "Students tend to not raise the soft palate for a pure, mature tone.  They are tempted to sing like artists they hear on the radio and add scooping.  They also often do not sing what is written on the page; they sing what they have heard on the radio."

- "Students tend to sing popular music the way they hear it performed, rather than the way it is written (per the arrangement)."
- "Students try to replicate what they hear on the radio"
- "Students want to sing songs as they know them and not how they are arranged. Pop rhythms can be challenging. Hard to teach harmony."
- "Students want to sing the music the way the radio performer sings, not using good vocal technique that they learn in choir class."
- "Students wanting it to sound like recordings, singing like they have heard rather than reading what is on the page"
- "The arraignments are often difficult because they are slightly off from what the students hear on the radio."
- "The arranger not making a genuine attempt to stay true to the original performer."
- "The biggest challenge and changing the tone from a classical choral sound to a more popular sound without sacrificing quality of sound"
- "The biggest problem is that "everybody knows that song" and they want to sing it the way they think they hear it rather than using good singing techniques and how it is written. I say to them "The good news is everybody knows this song" and the bad news i "Everybody knows this song.""
- "The biggest problem is the students resort to poor vocal technique trying to sound like what the song sounds like in their head or how they hear it on the radio. They also perform incorrect rhythms, striving to sing more like a soloist than a choir at firt."
- "The most common problem is that the choral arrangement, by nature differs from the original, and students are surprised and sometimes disappointed by this."
- "The notation often differs from what the recorded popular song"
- "The students expect t to sound like the original performer."
- "The students want the song to sound just like they hear it on their cds, MP3 players, or radio."
- "There are way too many poorly done arrangements...a lot of "schlock" put out simply to sell copies."
- "They initially want to sing it as they hear it on the radio. It is a struggle for them to harmonize or sing it differently."
- "They sing it like they hear it on the radio"
- "They want to sing it like the heard the artist perform it."
- "Trying to sound like the original artist (who is one person) when many (the choir) are singing. Avoiding poor vocal habits (typically displayed by the artist, although I avoid selecting music where this is a big issue)"
- "Unifying style, adjusting rhythms from what they're used to hearing, fighting over solos!"
- "Unlearning bad habits from their listening to original recordings; unwillingness to sing harmony by more immature singers."

- "Vocal style and health may become problematic"
- "We don't do a lot of popular music.  We have a Broadway show and our spring concert has historically been a semi-pops concert and includes a handful of popular songs but most of the popular music as you define is student-selected for events such as pep ralies and graduation."