

Popular music and Modern Band principles

Bryan Powell and Scott Burstein

Introduction

The inclusion of popular music in United States (US) public school music education classrooms has become increasingly common in the 21st century. Recent literature has outlined the variety of popular music programs in the US in an attempt to position current efforts to include popular music education in the US among the history of this movement (Krikun, chapter 4, this volume; Powell et al., 2015). An increasing body of academic work promotes the need for inclusion of popular music pedagogies in the curriculum of universities training future music educators (Jones, 2008; Mantie, 2013; Wang & Humphreys, 2009; Williams & Randles, chapter 5, this volume). The National Core Arts Standards – a conceptual framework for arts learning, adopted by the National Association for Music Education in the US for K–12 schools (mandatory public education) (NCAS, 2014) – recommend music education based on creativity and improvisation, as well as a focus on iconic notation alongside standard notation. The College Music Society’s Task Force on the Undergraduate Music Major (2014; a cadre of CMS members assembled to rethink music teacher education in higher education) also pointed to the need for an expansion of traditional music departments from classical and jazz performance-based ensembles to include classes that give students options in modern music career development, pointing often to the inclusion of popular music performance, composition, improvisation and cultural understanding (i.e. popular music studies; see Hooper, chapter 13, this volume) (CMS, 2014).

Despite the increased presence of popular music education at primary and secondary levels, American ‘pre-service’ music teacher education programmes face many roadblocks to establishing classes courses in popular music, in large part because those teaching future teachers were trained in school by educators inexperienced in popular music styles and pedagogy (Green, 2008; Price, 2006; Purves, 2002). Much of the mention of popular music classes in public schools refers to

isolated case studies of standout programs around the country, many of which are not scalable or replicable due to instrument limitations and teacher expertise (Clements, 2010). There seems to be a tendency for much of the existing discourse about popular music education to lean heavily on the informal learning model (Jaffurs, 2004; Karlsen & Väkevä, 2012), which while rich in theory is difficult to utilize in the US model of music classrooms that contain large student numbers with an attendant logistical inability to have small groups each rehearsing in the same music room. Most of the current popular music education approaches in music teacher education lean heavily on teaching the important and necessary key concepts that distinguish facilitation of the learning of popular music from teaching traditionally included musics, instead of using a blended approach that can be utilized in a wide range of settings (Heuser, 2014). These concepts include learning music through recordings instead of staff notation, performing on traditional rock instruments, working with repertoire that students have a role in choosing and introducing technology through, for example, iPad ensembles (Davis & Blair, 2011; Williams, 2014). While these are great strides towards a fuller popular music strand of education, they do not address how to teach a large class of students to play popular music on modern instruments in order to create and improvise utilizing the styles of music that they enjoy and experience day-to-day in their own musical, cultural world(s).

Teachers in a typical music class face many barriers to teaching beyond just their own knowledge of the subject material. According to Green (personal communication, February 4, 2011) ideally teachers teaching popular music in the classroom would have access to small rooms comprising rock band set-ups as well as technology workstations complete with current recording, engineering and music-making software. These teachers would act not as instructors but as facilitators and advisors, wandering freely from room to room, checking in on the students learning informally in small groups and creating new music, free from fear of capricious administrators who may see this instruction as unstructured or unsupervised (D'Amore & Smith, 2016). These issues help illuminate the practicality of ensembles such as concert band, orchestra, marching band, choir and jazz band in the contemporary teaching environment; these classes are improved with an increased number of student participants and high student-to-teacher ratios in a system that constantly promotes larger class sizes. The larger class sizes, however, are not ideal for conventional popular music ensembles. It is for this reason that many of the larger school districts in the United States (including New York City and Los Angeles) now offer courses in Modern Band. This chapter outlines some of the core values of Modern Band as defined by Little Kids Rock (LKR). In so doing, the authors hope to explain the rationale behind LKR's approach to training teachers to incorporate Modern Band in their classrooms.

Modern Band

So what precisely is Modern Band? Modern Band is a stream of music education that has two simple guiding attributes: repertoire and instrumentation. The repertoire is what might typically thought of as 'popular music' (the term *popular* being used

to mean ‘of the people’ – in this case, ‘of the students’). The term ‘popular music’ has been problematized in research literature (Gammond, 1991; Smith, 2014), and since popular music is always changing, we use the term to encompass a broad scope of music characterized by Bowman (2004) as having at least some of the following characteristics: “(a) breadth of intended appeal; (b) mass mediation and commodity character; (c) amateur engagement; (d) continuity with everyday concerns; (e) informality; (f) here and-now pragmatic use and utility; (g) appeal to embodied experience; and (h) emphasis upon process” (pp. 36–37). Modern Band encompasses broad genres of music (such as electric dance music) and more narrow genres such as djent, reggaeton, banda and shoegaze. Including these musics in the popular music category perhaps implies a level of commercial success that may not apply to all of the genres mentioned. Recent scholarship (Frith, 1998; Smith, 2014) debates whether ‘popular music’ presupposes or even has to include commercial viability or success. Therefore, the repertoire consideration of Modern Band is student-centred first and foremost, reflecting the music that students listen to on their own and with others.

Music classrooms incorporating Modern Band help to “bridge the gap” (Rodriguez, 2004) between the music that children experience in schools and the music they experience in their communities. Through focusing on music that is familiar to students, Modern Band allows students “to see themselves reflected in the curriculum. By validating and leveraging their cultural capital, (music educators) can forge stronger bonds between traditionally marginalized students and the schools that serve them” (Modern Band, 2014).

The second consideration in Modern Band is instrumentation. Just as orchestras and jazz bands have a typical instrumentation, so do Modern Bands: guitar, bass, keyboards, drums, vocals and technology. Much like orchestras allow for the addition and subtraction of certain instruments (e.g. adding an English horn or a harp), Modern Band allows for adding and subtracting instruments such as ukulele or traditional jazz or concert band instruments. Modern Band is thus arguably a unique ensemble concept that incorporates (indeed, presupposes) popular music and popular music instrumentation, but is not strictly defined by them.

Music as a second language and Modern Band

US music educators teaching Modern Band have become more prevalent in the last decade, particularly in larger urban school districts such as New York City and Los Angeles. The non-profit organization Little Kids Rock has trained over 1400 public school teachers in 29 cities in the US, providing curriculum, pedagogy and instruments to schools in order to offer Modern Band courses. Little Kids Rock provides teacher training and a gift of popular music instruments (guitar, bass, drums, keyboards and technology) to be used in the classroom for those teachers who participate in the training.

The core pedagogical principle employed by LKR is “Music as a Second Language” (MSL). Developed by LKR founder Dave Wish, a former first-grade ESL (English as a Second Language) teacher, MSL focuses on learning music in the way second languages are sometimes learned. MSL is based on the principles of

Stephen Krashen's *Second Language Acquisition* (1982), and likens the development of music knowledge to that of the development of speech. While LKR uses the title "Music as a Second Language" when describing its approach to teaching music, this moniker is less about music as a communicative tool (language) and more about music learning. As such, Music Learning as Second Language *Learning* (MLSLL) could arguably be a more accurate description.

The MSL approach holds that to best explore how students should first be exposed to music, educators should look to how children first learn to speak. Between the ages of eight months and two years of age, children begin trying to imitate the sounds of the language that they hear all around them. Parents delight as their babies start to babble and to use 'baby talk'. This babbling is an approximation of true speech. What sounds like 'nonsensical' syllables are actually sounds derived from the language that the baby is trying to speak. As babies babble, adults babble back, completing the approximation of a conversation.

Music, like language, is best learned in conversation with others who have already achieved some level of fluency and in such a way as allows for uncorrected musicking. While some approaches to musical learning, like Suzuki, for instance, start with music-making, often (school) music education takes an opposite course. When students arrive at school, they usually have not had the opportunity to play with musical instruments. Instead of first teaching children to produce music on instruments through imitation and approximation, the concept of 'musicianship' in US music curricula is often closely tied to competency with notation and its implicit underlying analysis (Swanwick, 1994; Williams & Randles, chapter 5, this volume). This comparison has implications for how music can be taught. Insofar as it is possible, LKR advocates that music instruction should emulate language instruction. Speech is not best learned as a series of discrete skills mastered out of context, nor is it learned by mastering the alphabet and decoding words. Rather, it is acquired in a meaningful, context-rich environment and with the invaluable assistance of other 'speakers'. A key principle of LKR's approach to music pedagogy, song before sight (or playing music before reading it) is also championed by organizations such as Musical Futures and supported by observations from research into how popular musicians learn (Green, 2002).

Core values of Modern Band

The basic values of LKR's approach to Modern Band are: Comfort Zone, Approximation, Scaffolding, Composition and Improvisation (Modern Band, 2014). These core values are focused on developing musical skills through learning to play familiar music in a way where pupils can be immediately successful. The following sections explore these core values.

'Comfort zone' and the 'affective filter'

Music performance anxiety (MPA) is a widely acknowledged condition for music performers of all ages. It has been studied from physiological (Salmon, 1990), social

psychological (Scanlan & Lewthwaite, 1984), developmental psychological (Richard, 1992) and gendered response perspectives (Kenny, 2013; Ryan, 2000, 2004), to name a few. While the phenomenon of MPA has been widely researched, it is rarely discussed in teacher education or the music classroom, leading to a situation in which “teachers observe their students experiencing MPA related to performances, examinations or auditions, but few have the prerequisite skills to manage the condition” (Patston, 2014, p. 85).

Recent studies have found MPA to be an issue for developing musicians as early as third grade (Boucher & Ryan, 2011). Since MPA often starts when a student is young and stays with individuals into their adult life, it is reasonable to conclude that music educators have a critical role in the developmental trajectory of musical anxiety in students. Indeed, Hendricks et al. (2014) demonstrated that teachers can foster emotionally safe learning environments and instil music students with a positive sense of self-belief, creative freedom and purpose. With this in mind, LKR has focused on training teachers to create ‘comfort zones’ in their music classrooms, which are safe spaces for students to learn, perform and express themselves. LKR’s approach to developing safe spaces for learning is greatly influenced by Krashen’s (1982) work, in which he develops the affective filter hypothesis postulated by Dulay and Burt (1977), which states that affective factors relate to the second language acquisition process. Krashen claims that learners with high motivation, self-confidence, a good self-image and a low level of anxiety are better equipped for success in second language acquisition. A student’s debilitating anxiety, low motivation and low self-esteem can and often do combine to form a ‘mental block’ – the “affective filter” (Krashen, 1982, p. 13) – that prevents successful second language acquisition.

Applying the affective filter hypothesis to learning music, it is easy to see that music-learning practices that include competitive structures, critical, demeaning or fear-based attempts at motivation and elitist notions of what it means to be a musician can stymie the creation of a safe space for music learning (Hendricks, 2014). There are three basic ways in which to lower a student’s affective filter and create a comfort zone: engaging their interests, providing a low-anxiety environment and bolstering their self-esteem. Utilizing student-centred music can not only engage students’ interests but also show them that their own musical choices and values have merit. One of the best ways to create a low-anxiety environment is by performing in large groups – an easy task in the typically large class sizes found in US music classes. Students often feel more confident learning when surrounded by others, where mistakes can be masked or absorbed and worked on until mastery. Another factor is using ‘input plus one’, or taking what the student feels comfortable with and introducing only one new element to work on at a time (Krashen, 1982, p. 24). With popular music, this can be done easily, as many songs use very few harmonies and simple ‘riffs’, making it relatively straightforward for teachers and students to break down the learning of a song into small, comprehensible steps. Finally, a teacher can bolster students’ self-esteem by noting the students’ individual successes in a non-competitive environment. All of these factors are within reach when the concept of approximation is taken into account.

Approximation

Approximation theory is used in mathematics to understand how functions can best be approximated with simpler functions (De Boor, 1986). In behavioural theory, successive approximation is described as a process whereby a behavioural demonstration most similar to the behaviour to be learned is reinforced and the criteria for reinforcement are gradually increased in complexity to the point that only the desired or goal behaviour is reinforced (Greer & Lundquist, 1976). As it pertains to music education and LKR's pedagogical approach to teaching Modern Band, approximation is best understood as the process by which students create and replicate versions of songs that, while not without flaws, are close enough to the original piece to be both fulfilling and educational for the student. While students' cover versions of songs may not be note-for-note reproductions of the originals, the music educator as part of the learning process embraces the approximation because it allows for the learning of musical concepts, ensemble participation and student enjoyment.

Embracing approximation is closely linked to the previously mentioned practice of creating a safe space for music students. According to Bartel (2004), the observation and study of how children learn language shows that focusing on the positive attempt at speech and continually modelling the desired target is a particularly productive way of encouraging language learners, whereas pointing out incorrect attempts and scolding are not productive. Through the encouragement of approximation, the teacher creates an environment where musical amateurism is embraced. Bowman (2004) pointed out that the root of amateur means 'to love'; i.e. amateurs are individuals who do what they do for the love of it. Promoting a love of music for all children is a central component of teaching music, and creating an environment where approximation is embraced can help lead to a classroom full of musical amateurs (students who engage with music for the love of it). Regelski (2007) stated that "the stigma attached to amateurs, and the cultural pedigree behind [this stigma] are increasingly major problems for the health and well-being of music and music education in society today" (p. 26). However, a growing area of research (Mantie & Smith, 2016) supports the notion that amateurism in the sense intended by Modern Band is a wholly positive notion and practice.

Christopher Small (1998) offered the term *musicking* to encompass the active process that extends to all kinds of musical involvements, interests and actions in society, including and beyond performing music. Similarly, Regelski (2007) utilizes *amateuring*, based on the work of Booth (1999), who defined this as an active, committed, disciplined, enlivening and loving pursuit that is vigorous, demanding and compelling. LKR promotes *amateuring* through embracing approximation. This approach encourages enthusiasm on the part of all students. As Regelski stated, "Study without such enthusiasm – or studies in which such enthusiasm is thwarted by parental pressure or fear of teacher censure – will rarely if ever lead to dedicated amateuring" (2007, p. 30).

Whereas most concert-goers of classical music would be uninterested in attending a concert where the orchestra merely approximated Beethoven or Brahms, the

basis of much popular music is re-working and approximating different versions of the same song in a variety of styles. It is for this reason that using approximation to lower the affective filter is so effective in Modern Band classrooms. Once songs are looked at as simple harmonic progressions, students can perform thousands of them after learning a few simple chords. Modifications can be made to simplify chart-toppers for a variety of levels and instrumental combinations, leading to the concept of scaffolding in order to guide students toward a path of progressive steps for a level of participation that is rewarding and educative for students.

Scaffolding – conversations with fluent speakers

Scaffolding is a form of socially mediated learning in which teacher and student constantly adapt their behaviour to one another's behaviour in order to reach a goal (Küpers et al., 2014). From a language acquisition standpoint, scaffolding is how new speakers learn through being surrounded by and conversing with fluent speakers. Language scaffolding is modelled by an infant beginning to learn their first language by hearing the phrases around them and starting to decode their meaning through conversation. This is apparent not only with the very young but also in the way fluent speakers change their vocabulary and tone based on audience; one would speak, for instance, to a group of peers differently than at a job interview or in an academic setting.

Through the lens of MSL, scaffolding is a way to create and/or modify lesson plans to be accessible at a variety of levels of experience, and for students at these levels all to interact at the same time. Therefore, it is not unusual to see a class at a variety of levels performing at once: guitarists who may be playing barre chords sitting next to others strumming open chords, pianists split two to a keyboard with one covering a simpler bass line while another plays inversions of chords, multiple percussionists playing everything from basic back-beats to more complex syncopated patterns. It is due to the approximation factor that scaffolding becomes applicable and desirable, giving beginning students models to aspire to while affording space for more advanced students to maintain their interest. This is something that once again can work fluidly in a Modern Band classroom but may not be advisable in the traditional US music classroom, where many ensembles are geared toward either beginners or advanced students, but clearly not to both.

Composition

Traditional approaches to music education in the US (concert band, marching band, jazz band, choir and orchestra) contain very little composition (Beckstead, 2001). Although composition is listed in the United States National Arts Standards, when students are taught solely to read notes off of a method book page the focus becomes reading and interpreting the compositions of others, not composing music of their own (Williams & Randles, chapter 5, this volume). Beckstead has argued that “historically, composition’s most conspicuous attribute in music education is its absence, especially in the public school setting” (2001, p. 44).

Composition in public school music education is often stymied by the teacher's perception that students must first learn Western musical notation as well as have great facility in one or more instruments before they are able to communicate their ideas in a composition (Cerana, 1995).

With these barriers to composition in mind, the MSL approach instead focuses on encouraging students to compose from an early age, initially with the use of one or two chords. This approach stands in stark contrast to many traditional music programs, which teach that reading and writing music are prerequisites for composing music. LKR believes that a well-run Modern Band program teaches children to write their own music: "Modern Band integrates composition and improvisation at the beginning of children's education as a means of ensuring that they experience the confidence-building and self-esteem-raising benefits that come with authorship" (Modern Band, 2014).

In order better to understand composition in the classroom, it may be helpful to look at the question of how people who cannot read music can write it through an MSL approach. People acquire their first language before they can read or write it. Linguists who study second language learning have argued that this same sequence should be employed as people acquire a second language (Bartel, 2004; Krashen, 1982). When children begin speaking they use verbs, nouns, pronouns, adverbs, conjunctions, prepositional phrases and many more parts of speech long before they can name and explain them. Children can also learn to 'speak' music long before they can explain it in academic terms. LKR encourages teachers to facilitate a nurturing environment through which students' tastes and personalities illuminate abilities that make their lives more beautiful (Modern Band, 2014). This focus on composition encourages all students to be musical storytellers, and not simply the readers of others' musical stories. LKR advocates for the integration of improvisation as a means of ensuring that students experience the confidence-building and self-esteem-raising benefits that come with authorship through composition. Authorship is an area that is curiously absent in many music education programs in the United States, often only found in high-level jazz courses where students learn through rigorous study of music theory.

Improvisation

The importance of improvisation in a student's musical education is well documented (Aaron, 1980; Burnard, 2000). Despite its inclusion in the National Core Arts Standards (2014), and research demonstrating the benefits of the inclusion of improvisation in the music classroom (Allsup, 1997; Hargreaves, 1999), the majority of music education classes in the US include very little improvisation outside of some jazz music. This holds true even into higher education music classes (Song, 2013).

LKR (and it is not alone in this belief) holds that in a safe and supportive environment – one that fosters the idea that 'there are no wrong notes' – improvisation can come from the outset. In an effort to demystify the process of improvisation for students, LKR encourages teachers to have students solo initially using just

two notes. This process opens up improvisation for all students, leading to success. Throughout the process, students are encouraged to bring their own musical ideas to the table as two-note solos progress into four-note solos, pentatonic solos and so on. In a Modern Band classroom, precise rhythms are unnecessary as students can experiment with different composing patterns (chords used to support solo or melodic lines) in order to create a rhythmic, musical tableau that works in conjunction with their peers. The successful inclusion of student improvisation includes composition, approximation, scaffolding and the creation of a safe space for student expression.

Conclusion

Outlined in this chapter is an explanation of the components of Modern Band as defined by Little Kids Rock. The authors have briefly outlined LKR's approach to Modern Band through the framework of Music as a Second Language. As mentioned in the introduction, it is not necessary to adopt the core values of LKR's pedagogy in order to identify a program as a Modern Band; however, the pedagogical foundations presented above (comfort zone, affective filter, composition, improvisation, approximation and scaffolding) provide context for how thousands of teachers in the US have been, and continue to be, trained to teach popular music in the classroom. It is also worth noting that multiple higher education institutions (including California State University, Long Beach; Eastern Washington University; University of South Florida and Montclair State University) have incorporated Modern Band and MSL into their music teacher education curriculum. This pedagogical foundation can help teachers who are hoping to reach more of their students but are unprepared in how to teach styles that are meaningful and relevant to their students (Abril, 2014).

This chapter has outlined an approach for implementing Modern Band in the music classroom. The authors are careful to point out that this is *an* approach, and not *the* approach, to teaching and learning Modern Band. As Modern Band's presence in the music classroom grows, it is imperative to recognize the diversity of experiences encompassed by the approach. Although there are many arguments for the inclusion of popular music in the US music classroom in order to reach the large percentage of students who are uninterested in traditional ensembles (Bowman, 2004; Fesmire, 2006; Tobias, 2010), just performing popular songs on traditional instruments or using the strict formal learning techniques often found in band and orchestra can fail to match the content with appropriate tools for learning (Green, 2002, 2008.) Utilizing a framework of Music as a Second Language in the Modern Band classroom is one solution to this inherent problem.

References

- Aaron, T. (1980). Music improvisation and related arts. *Music Educators Journal*, 66(5), 78–83.
- Abril, C.R. (2014). Invoking an innovative spirit in music teacher education. In M. Kaschub & J. Smith (Eds.), *Promising practices in 21st century music teacher education* (pp. 175–188). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Allsup, R.E. (1997). Activating self-transformation through improvisation in instrumental music teaching. *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, 5(2), 80–85.
- Bartel, L. (2004). What is the music education paradigm? In L. Bartel (Ed.), *Questioning the music education paradigm*. Volume II of the Series “Research to Practice: A Biennial Series” (pp. xii–xvi). Toronto: Canadian Music Educators Association.
- Beckstead, D. (2001). Will technology transform music education? *Music Educators Journal*, 87(6), 44–49.
- Booth, W.C. (1999). *For the love of it: Amateuring and its rivals*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Boucher, H., & Ryan, C.A. (2011). Performance stress and the very young musician. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 58(4), 329–345.
- Bowman, W.D. (2004). “Pop” goes . . . ? Taking popular music seriously. In C.X. Rodriguez (Ed.), *Bridging the gap: Popular music and music education* (pp. 29–49). Reston, VA: MENC.
- Burnard, P. (2000). How children ascribe meaning to improvisation and composition: Rethinking pedagogy in music education. *Music Education Research*, 2(1), 7–23.
- Cerana, C. (1995). Touched by machine? Composition and performance in the digital age. *Computer Music Journal*, 19(3), 13–17.
- Clements, A.C. (2010). *Alternative approaches in music education*. Lanham, MD: MENC.
- CMS. (2014). Transforming music study from its foundations: A manifesto for progressive change in the undergraduate preparation of music majors. Report of the task force on the undergraduate music major. Retrieved from: http://www.music.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1859 [Accessed 1 December 2014].
- D’Amore, A., & Smith, G.D. (2016). Aspiring to Music Making as Leisure through the musical futures classroom. In R. Mantie & G.D. Smith (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of music making and leisure* (pp. 61–80). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Davis, S.G. & Blair, D.V. (2011). Popular music in American teacher education: A glimpse into a secondary methods course. *International Journal of Music Education*, 29(2), 124–140.
- De Boor, C. (1986). *Approximation theory*. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society.
- Dulay, H. & Burt, M. (1977). *Viewpoints on English as a second language*. New York, NY: Regents.
- Fesmire, A. (2006). A survey of middle and senior high school guitar programs in Colorado: Understanding curricular design (Doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado). Retrieved from: ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. 3231306).
- Frith, S. (1998). *Performing rites: On the value of popular music*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gammond, P. (1991). *The Oxford companion to popular music*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Green, L. (2002). *How popular musicians learn: A way ahead for music education*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Green, L. (2008). *Music, informal learning and the school: A new classroom pedagogy*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Greer, D.R. & Lundquist, R. (1976). The discrimination of musical form through “conceptual” and “non-conceptual” successive approximation strategies. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 47, 8–15.
- Hargreaves, D.J. (1999). Developing musical creativity in a social world. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 142, 22–34.
- Hendricks, K.S., Smith, T.D., & Stanuch, J. (2014). Creating safe spaces for music learning. *Music Educators Journal*, 101(1), 35–40.

- Heuser, F. (2014). Juxtapositional pedagogy as an organizing principle in university music education programs. In M. Kaschub & J. Smith (Eds.), *Promising practices in 21st century music teacher education* (pp. 107–124). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jaffurs, S.E. (2004). The impact of informal music learning practices in the classroom, or how I learned how to teach from a garage band. *International Journal of Music Education*, 22(3), 189–200.
- Jones, P. (2008). Preparing music teachers for change: Broadening instrument class offerings to foster lifewide and lifelong musicing. *Visions of Research in Music Education*, 12, 1–15.
- Karlsen, S. & Väkevä, L. (2012). Future prospects for music education: Corroborating informal learning pedagogy. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.
- Kenny, D. (2013). Music performance anxiety: Origins, phenomenology, assessment and treatment. Retrieved from: <https://corpoemusica.files.wordpress.com/2013/03/1-music-performance-anxiety-origins-phenomenology-assess.pdf> [Accessed 3 January 2015].
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Retrieved from: http://www.sdkrashen.com/content/books/principles_and_practice.pdf [Accessed 4 January 2015].
- Küpers, E., van Dijk, M., & van Geert, P. (2014). “Look closely at what I’m doing!” scaffolding in individual string lessons: Two case studies. *International Journal of Music Education*, 32(3), 375–391.
- Mantie, R. (2013). A comparison of “popular music pedagogy” discourses. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 61(3), 334–352.
- Mantie, R. & Smith, G.D. (2016). Introduction: Grappling with the jellyfish of music making and leisure. In R. Mantie & G.D. Smith (Eds.) *The Oxford handbook of music making and leisure* (pp. 3–12). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Modern Band. (2014). Little Kids Rock website. Retrieved from: <http://www.littlekidsrock.org/thehang/teacher-resources/> [Accessed 1 March 2015].
- National Core Arts Standards. (2014). Retrieved from: <http://www.nationalartsstandards.org> [Accessed 1 March 2015].
- Patston, T. (2014). Teaching stage fright? Implications for music educators. *British Journal of Music Education*, 31(1), 85–98.
- Powell, B., Krikun, A., & Pignato, J. (2015). Something’s happening here: Popular music education in the United States. *IASPM@Journal*, 5(1). ISSN 2079-3871 | DOI 10.5429/2079-3871(2015)v5i1.2en
- Price, D. (2006). *Personalising music learning*. London: Paul Hamlyn Foundation.
- Purves, R. (2002). Effective teaching in secondary school music: Developing identities in teachers and pupils. Retrieved from: www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00002229.pdf [Accessed 1 December 2012].
- Regelski, T. (2007). Amateuring in music and its rivals. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 6(3), 22–50.
- Richard, J.J., Jr. (1992). The effects of Ericksonian resource retrieval on musical performance anxiety. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences & Engineering*, 55(2-B), 604.
- Rodriguez, C.X. (2004). Popular music in music education: Toward a new conception of musicality. In C.X. Rodriguez (Ed.), *Bridging the gap: Popular music and music education* (pp. 13–28). Reston, VA: MENC – The National Association for Music Education.
- Ryan, C. (2000). *A study of the differential responses of male and female children to musical performance anxiety*. Unpublished doctoral Dissertation, McGill University.
- Ryan, C. (2004). Gender differences in children’s experience of musical performance anxiety. *Psychology of Music*, 32(1), 89–103.

- Salmon, P. (1990). A psychological perspective on musical performance anxiety: A review of the literature. *Medical Problems of Performing Artists*, 5, 2–11.
- Scanlan, T.K., & Lewthwaite, R. (1984). Social psychological aspects of competition for male youth sport participants: I. Predictors of competitive stress. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 6, 208–226.
- Small, C. (1998). *Musicking: The meanings of performing and listening*. Hanover: University of Press New England.
- Smith, G.D. 2014. Popular music in higher education. In G.F. Welch & I. Papageorgi (Eds.), *Advanced music performance: Investigations in higher education learning* (pp. 33–48). Farnham: Ashgate.
- Song, A. (2013). Music improvisation in higher education. *Components: The Journal of the College Music Society*, 53. Retrieved from: http://symposium.music.org/index.php?option=com_k2&view=item&id=10308:music-improvisation-in-higher-education&Itemid=124
- Swanwick, K. (1994). *Musical knowledge: Intuition, analysis and music education*. London: Routledge.
- Task Force on the Undergraduate Music Maker (2014). Retrieved from: http://www.music.org/index.php?option=com_newsfeeds&view=newsfeed&id=2:events&catid=46&Itemid=203 [Accessed 2 March 2015].
- Tobias, E. (2010). Crossfading and plugging in: Secondary students' engagement and learning in a songwriting and technology class. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University. Retrieved from: ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI 3402496)
- Wang, J.C. & Humphreys, J.T. (2009). Multicultural and popular music content in an American music teacher education program. *International Journal of Music Education*, 27(1), 19–36.
- Williams, D.A. (2014). Another perspective: The iPad is a real musical instrument. *Music Educators Journal*, 101(3), 93–98.