The Music Industries: Theory, Practice and Vocations – a Polemical Intervention

Martin Cloonan and John Williamson

> '... with thousands and thousands of young people still journeying to New York and Hollywood for music careers which simply do not exist.... too many young people are being prepared for a social and professional future that is but a misty, impossible dream' (Cahn 1948)

Introduction

The (almost) seventy year old quote above is striking for its contemporary relevance. The impossible dreams remain and thousands of young people still seek careers in music. So, *plus ça change*. However, one thing which *has* changed is the relationship between higher education and the music industries. If in 1948 the perceived route to a career in music was via towns such as New York (and its UK equivalent, London), then today in the UK it is often via universities and their Music Departments. In addition, whereas in 1948 UK higher education was the domain of the elites and music part of a limited provision (see John Butt's contribution in this volume), today the system annually produces thousands of students who wish to work in music and its allied professions. Such a scenario raises hard questions for both educators and students alike which this chapter seeks to address.

We think that Music students in Higher Education need to be asked some very important questions such as: What are you doing here? Why are you studying music? What do you want to do with that study? What benefit do you think you will gain via the *academic* study of music? Do you want to be educated (as in asked to explore a range of ideas and possibilities) or trained (as in shown how to do something, or how to do it better)? Are you happy to learn more about the music itself and how to play it (better) or do you think that such study needs to be located in the material conditions under which it takes place? What do you expect to be taught? How do you think that your degree content

will affect your career prospects? Put bluntly: Do you expect higher education to prepare you for working in the music industries without the degrees themselves containing at least one compulsory course on those industries? While our focus here is on undergraduate degrees, our arguments have implications for all those seeking to use a higher education programme to progress a career in music.

As will be apparent, our answer to the last question is implicit in the way it was posed and we will explain our views as the chapter progresses. Here we build on our joint and individual endeavours over a number of years. This includes our recent work in theorizing the music industries (plural, rather than singular - Williamson and Cloonan 2007, 2012), our experience in teaching Popular Music Studies (PMS) in UK Higher Education for over twenty five years and our individual work within the music industries.[i] We write from within the broad field of Popular Music Studies (PMS, Cloonan 2005) which we see as still being differentiated from a mainstream teaching of music in higher education which remains dominated by the western classical music canon. We also locate ourselves within the broadly leftist tradition with which PMS has been associated (Griffiths 1999). We see our arguments here as applicable to all seeking to work in and around music, from what might be characterized as the 'music profession' centred on the western tradition and modern 'art music', through those working in the 'popular' musical forms – pop, rock, hip hop etc. – to those seeking to work in the business of music and in music education. We regard all such people as working within the music industries[ii] and, as such, believe that in order to empower themselves they should seek to understand the nature of those industries.

Readers will have already noticed that we intend to be polemical. We want to raise the fundamental question: What are Music degrees *for*? We do not ask this in abstraction but in a context where higher education has become increasingly marketized (the introduction of annual fees of £9,000 per annum for undergraduate students in England provides one particularly stark example of this) and

where discourses of employability are widespread (Yorke 2004). More broadly we ask this question in a context where the dominant economic model is that of neo-liberalism, an ideology which stresses individual attainment (Harvey 2005) and which has seen models develop which view higher education as valuable only insofar as it enhances an individual's economic advancement. The idea of learning for its own sake or in order to cultivate responsible citizens has been overtaken by the idea of learning simply for economic gain.

We stress the need to understand the nature of the music industries not as an abstract idea but as a concrete (if fluid) reality which has implications for *all* musical careers whether that be as a classical or pop musician, a teacher, music industries employee or entrepreneur. We are interested in what it means to be a 'musician' in the current climate and what attributes are necessary to earn a living from this activity. We retain traditional Marxist ambivalence towards free market capitalism (it produces fantastic goods while simultaneously exploiting the majority of humanity) and believe that notions of employability *per se* have limited relevance in those industries – such as Music – which are dominated by self-employment. However, we also believe that it is incumbent upon us as Music educators to provide dispassionate, research-informed, critical accounts of the music industries for our students. In fact, we want to go further and argue that any Higher Education Institution which claims to be teaching Music, but does not provide dedicated courses on the music industries are doing a dis-service to students.

We do not expect this argument to win us many friends and have ourselves been accused of being government/business lackeys for making the sorts of arguments we make here. However, our intent is not to encourage students to fit themselves to existing economic models, but to critique them and develop alternative ways of thinking. We simply believe that in a context where many of our students wish to pursue careers in music and where the music industries are characterized by an over-supply of labour, insecure employment and low pay (DHA 2012) we question whether it is

acceptable for students to graduate in Music without having any critical insight in to the industries in which they seek to work. We are, of course, aware that students enter Music degrees for myriad reasons and not all of them will be seeking a career in music. But we assume that the vast majority will wish to be involved in music – as performers, teachers and fans – and argue that such roles will be enriched by a critical understanding of the music industries.

We also suggest that even those students whose concerns focus on the musical text – whether that be via analysis, performance or composition – will have their education radically impoverished without consideration of the *con*text of such activities. As Martin (2015) notes, musicology has moved beyond the study of texts to look at areas such as social meaning. He suggests that this 'analytical reorientation necessarily leads musicologists to engage with issues that are also of fundamental concern to sociologists' (ibid: 98). This includes a concern with the music industries, the study of which has been a key concern of Popular Music Studies scholars from a broadly sociological background from Adorno on and which we regard as essential to any well-educated music student.

The rest of this chapter falls in to three parts. We begin by outlining some recent developments in UK Higher Education and the place of Music within them, secondly we examine the nature of the music industries before moving on to questions of musical labour. Our premise is that - as Francis Bacon reportedly said - knowledge is power. We suggest that without knowledge of the music industries, Music students will be disempowered. We seek their empowerment.

Part One: Higher Education in Contemporary Britain

It is important to note that here the teaching of Music within higher education obviously does not take place in a vacuum. Rather it occurs within material conditions which are shaped by the prevailing socio-economic climate and its concomitant political ideology. As Marx (1970, 64)

explained in *The German Ideology*: 'The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas', and Harvey (2005) has illustrated how the dominant political ideology of recent years has been that of neoliberalism, serving the interests of a reconfigured ruling class. Space prevents a detailed analysis of neoliberalism here, but it is succinctly described by Harvey as

> … a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets and free trade (ibid, 2).

One manifestation of the dominance of neoliberal thinking has been the widespread erosion of free (as in fully state-funded) higher education and its replacement with a fee-based system. Students as consumers has become the norm. Within the UK the Browne report of 2010 on the funding of higher education (Browne *et al.* 2010) – and, in particular the role that student fees should play – has often been seen as the apex of this sort of thinking. As leading educational commentator Stefan Collini has noted:

> Essentially Browne is contending that we should no longer think of higher education as the provision of a public good, articulated through educational judgement and largely financed by public funds… Instead, we should think of it as a lightly regulated market in which consumer demand, in the form of student choices, is sovereign in determining what is offered by service providers (i.e. the universities) (2012, 178-9).

Collini concedes that the present system in England is not a completely free market as the state is still heavily involved in providing student loans and other means of support for teaching. However, it is necessary to note that the current (2015) UK government sees the arts almost only in market

terms[iii] and as the arts are not prized in the job market then support for them should be sacrificed in favour of the so-called STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Maths) subjects. For example, UK Education Secretary, Nicky Morgan, expressed concern that school students choosing arts subjects were making decisions would 'hold them back for the rest of their lives' (Vaughan 2014). Prior to this, the Browne Report had recommended that public support for teaching in higher education be targeted towards the STEM subjects (2010, 47) with the result that government support for the teaching of these subjects was to be ring-fenced, while the arts, humanities and social sciences was to be left to universities themselves. In effect the latter subjects were to be more marketized.[iv] Students on Music programmes may wish to consider why their degrees do not attract the same level of public support as their STEM-subject peers.

We remain opposed to such developments and to moves which treat our students as consumers rather than co-investigators. We note that Scotland, where we are based, has not followed England's lead in introducing undergraduate fees and provision for Scottish domiciled students remains free at the point of delivery. This at least suggests that another way of doing things is possible in England, something which is confirmed by the German experience where an experiment with undergraduate fees has effectively been abandoned (Hotson 2014). We do, of course, support moves to restore funding to arts and humanities courses. However, we also want to empower students in ways which go beyond turning them into consumers.

We also write as non-musicians who have worked in and around Music departments for a number of years. Our observation is that such departments are frequently populated by people who would rather be somewhere else. Amongst the academic staff, few consider themselves *primarily* as academics – being happier with their status as performer/musician/composer. Their students often share this orientation. Most would rather be out playing and composing and view the academic study of music as, at best, a means to end. While such observations constitute precisely the sort of

generalizations which we discourage our students from making, we hope that readers will bear with us here for the sake of argument. We empathize with the aspirations of our colleagues and students (the two are not mutually exclusive) who wish to concentrate on making and performing. We suggest that the results of the widespread nature of such aspirations are not so much an indifference to the business of music, so much as a general feeling that its study is not a matter of urgency and perhaps best left to others.

In order to test our belief that the business of music is largely disregarded within Music departments in the UK, we searched the University and Colleges Admission Service (UCAS) website in autumn 2015 for undergraduate Music degrees, restricting our analysis to *only* those programmes which were called Music – and *not*, for example, Music and Creativity, Music Performance, Music Technology, Popular Music etc. The survey was also limited to those offering full degrees (rather than other qualifications such as foundation degrees or a higher certificate or diploma). This resulted in the initial identification of 54 providers offering the sort of Music degree which matched our criteria.

Further details of what the degree Music programmes consisted of were then obtained. This was not always easy as websites often hid as much as they revealed. Our aim was to identify courses within Music degrees which could be classified as coming under "Music Business", "Professional Development/Practice" and "Placement". One of us has already noted problems of course and degree nomenclature with regard to Popular Music Studies degrees and courses (Cloonan and Hulstedt 2012, 6) and similar problems arose here. Nevertheless it is possible to make some generalizations.

The examination of the UCAS site showed that ten institutions running Music degrees had courses which under the broad ambit of "Music Business", eight had "Professional Development/Practice"

courses and eight provided placements. A further two referred to Personal Development Plans.[v] Thus overall around 19% of programmes can be said to have a dedicated Music Industries element, while around 15% had placement and/or Professional Development/Practice options. It should also be noted that some programmes made some play of the professional practice elements. These included Coventry University which tells students that they 'will be treated as a professional musician at the start your career from the moment that you arrive on the course' (www.coventry.ac.uk/course-structure/arts-and-humanities/undergraduate-degree/2016-17/music-ba-hons/) and the Royal College of Music which stresses the availability of 'Career development support and advice from the renowned Creative Careers Centre' (www.rcm.ac.uk/life/beyondthercm/creativecareers/). While such provision does not necessarily meet our desire that music industries courses are taught, it does suggest that students need to be aware of a world beyond musical texts.

However, more generally it is salutary to compare the results previously found in UK-based Popular Music Studies degrees (Cloonan and Hulstedt 2012) with those found with Music degrees. The results here suggest that at a somewhat crude level it can be said that the teaching of courses on the music industries is far more prevalent within PMS degrees than it is in more traditional Music degrees. As noted above, around 19% of Music degrees included a Music Industries courses, something which is standard n PMS degrees. In addition while only eight of the 54 Music degrees identified here offered placements, over 50% (17 out of 32) of PMS degrees were reported as offering these (Cloonan and Hulstedt 2012, 18). While it should be noted that eight of the institutions offering Music degrees had courses around professional development, it appears that within UK HE popular music is still conceived of as being commercial music (despite the fact that most of its practitioners are not commercially successful), while the majority of traditional Music degrees do not invite students to consider their relationship to the market. This imbalance strikes us as perverse, as *all* musical practices take place in market situations. In essence the economics of

staging an orchestral performance and a rock band are not that different – costs have to be covered in various ways and thus the 'success' of each is not purely aesthetic. Moreover, we suggest that asking students to compare the staging of such events are potentially immensely empowering.

We note that in terms of gaining 'real word experience' the placement option is something which is obviously important. Examples from the survey, such as Kent and Huddersfield, offer students the opportunity of a year on placement, illustrating the provision of music industries experience as a substantial element of institutional thinking. However, it is necessary to add a note of caution here, as in order to maximize their effectiveness, placements need to take place within the context of programmes which also include a course on the nature of the Music Industries or face the risk of working in abstraction. A true understanding requires knowing the context in which new skills are being learned.

The analysis of the UCAS data suggests that music departments as a whole have emerged relatively unscathed from the employability agenda – or, put another way, are failing to engage with it. Our own view of employability is that it has limited cachet within those professions, such as music, wherein the dominant contractual arrangement is that of self-employment (DHA 2012). Once again, we suggest that institutions which do not contain courses were such issues are discussed and critically analyzed are doing their students a disservice. For us the fact that students who aspire to work in the music industries may be spending three years of their lives and £27,000 in fees for Music programmes which may leave them no wiser about the machinations of the music industries than when started, this is a matter of some concern. We are aware that in some institutions music industries' issues such as copyright and management may be addressed within modules whose prime focus lies elsewhere – for example in performance. However, while we welcome this, we do not believe that it goes far enough. If the tables were turned and aspects such as analysis, composition and performance were addressed only as aspects of courses on the music industries we

doubt whether this would satisfy the justifiable concerns of our colleagues. If nothing else, dedicated courses on topics illustrate institutional recognition of their importance, while treating issues as aspects of broader courses illustrates a concomitant lowering of the importance attached to them.

Finally it should be noted here that another contextualizing factor is that higher education academics are increasingly being encouraged to collaborate with industry via activities which fall under the general ambit of knowledge exchange. In brief, the idea here is that academics share their expertise with industry and vice versa to mutual benefit. One welcome aspect of this is the chance for student interaction with key industry figures, something which we would encourage. However, there is a need for academics to retain independence and we have warned previously of the dangers of academics being drawn into becoming advocates when their role should be one of dispassionate observers and critics (Williamson *et al* 2011). We advocate not simply the teaching of courses on the music industries, but courses based on critical thinking, on questioning music industries norms, rather than simply passing them on. This raises the question of what sorts of industries are being observed.

Part Two: The Music Industries from Adorno to Adele

The figure of Theodor Adorno still looms large within PMS. As the first major critic of 'the culture industry', his analysis that this industry was based on standardization and ultimately catered for false, rather than genuine, needs is still one which lays down a challenge to all theorists of what are now colloquially known as the creative industries. While many PMS theorists have challenged key Adornian concepts such as the passive audience and the extent of standardization, he remains important as someone who insists on presenting the *reality* of industrial practices and their effects and our work seeks to follow this example. While much of the development of PMS can be seen in terms of trying to counter Adorno with some optimism of the will (Frith 1983) his challenge remains.

Adorno's main concentration was on the recording industry, a characteristic shared by a number of subsequent PMS theorists. Whilst such an orientation might be understandable (popular music was often been understood in terms of the 'hits' of the day which were delivered by record companies), it has not always been helpful in that it occluded other parts of those industries working in and around music. In previous research we have come to develop the concept of plural music industries, rather than a singular music industry. The origins of this can be dated to our survey of 'the music industry' in Scotland in 2002 (Williamson *et al* 2003) which was produced in a context where previous academic (and other) accounts of that industry had conflated it with the recording industry and in particular the machinations of the major record companies. Our research in Scotland revealed a great deal of musical activity, but no major label presence. This experience led us to develop the concept of the music industries (plural) rather than music industry (singular) which had dominated previous accounts (Williamson and Cloonan 2007; 2012). Our aim here was to illustrate both diversity – in terms of the range of artistic and economic activity which occurs beyond the major record companies – and complexity, in terms of the dynamic interactions and interrelationships between the various strands of the music industries wherein the relative strengths of constituent parts are in constant evolution.

As part of our research into the music industries, we have also looked at the lives of musicians over a 120 year period through the prism of the UK's Musicians' Union (Williamson and Cloonan 2016). The results resonate with our practical experience of working in the music industries and confirm that, for the most part, the supply of labour exceeds demand, leading to low earnings and insecure employment. Degree programmes which are aimed at musicians and hide this reality from their students are doing them no favours. The reality should be portrayed. Many university Music departments are clear that they are not attempting simply to produce musicians for the music industries. However, it seems likely that a majority of Music graduates will continue to interact with

the music industries – in their broadest sense – post graduation. Here we are also keenly aware that students need to be able not simply to *understand* the nature of the music industries, but to *critique* them – i.e. to apply critical thinking to that understanding.

One recent example can be used to illustrate this. In November 2013 the UK implemented the European Union Directive 2011/77/EU which extended the period for which sound recordings remain in copyright from 50 to 70 years. The move followed fierce lobbying from a range of high profile organizations within the music industries and fierce resistance from a range of academics (see Williamson *et al* 2011). The debate here centred on what a desirable period of copyright should be in a context where assignation of copyright by writers and performers is a primary mechanism through which money is made within the music industries. The longer compositions and recordings remain in copyright, the longer they can potentially make money for their copyright holders. However, the vast majority of compositions and recordings make little money and there is some public interest in allowing works of art to enter the public domain after a reasonable period. But what might that be?

Proponents of the new regulations argued that the moves would benefit aging musicians whose recordings from the 1960s were about to fall out of copyright (meaning that they could be commercially exploited without the performers being compensated). Opponents argued that comparatively few musicians would benefit and that the public good would be better served by limiting the copyright term and allowing public access to these old recordings. It was also noted that the moves towards term extension were happening at exactly the time when recordings made in the 'golden age' of British popular music – especially those of the Beatles – were about to fall out of copyright (Harkins 2012), which would have meant that record companies, to whom performers generally assign their copyright and which controlled the copyright in those recordings, would no longer be able to claim exclusive rights to be able to market them.

The rights and wrongs need not detain us further. What is important here is that fundamental questions were being raised about the proper remuneration of performing musicians. What value society places on musical composition and performance was being debated, disputed and decided. The decisions not only affected musicians' remuneration for playing on recordings, but the ability of composers to use such performances in their works (as, for example, in sampling). We suggest that students graduating from Music programmes should, at the very least be able to have an informed view of whether that extension was a good thing or not. If the answer to that (admittedly rhetorical) question is 'Yes', it seems that a number of things follow: the history of copyright should be taught, its development analyzed, its underpinning rationale questioned and its outcomes debated. As an abstract idea copyright might not mean much to the student obsessed with Bach or Miles Davis or developing their performance or compositional prowess, but as a concrete reality it underpins the workings of the music industries and it is thus of vital importance to practitioners. We suggest that musicians should not only know about the musical texts which they produce, but also the industrial *contexts* into which their work is flowing. Students who are spending £27,000 in tuition fees as part of a process which they hope will facilitate employment in the music industries should surely not find themselves at the end of three years as ignorant of the workings of the music industries (within which we include the traditional 'music profession') as they were when they began their degrees.

We observe that the music industries exist in 'a constant state of flux'. This makes both understanding trends and seeking employment hazardous. For example, the recording sector can be seen as dominant for around forty five years (circa 1963-2009), but has subsequently declined in the internet age where the fortunes of live music and music publishing have become increasingly important. Those seeking to work in the music industries *need* to understand these things and to think critically about their implications. If music theory a key to the understanding of music, then theory also has much to teach about the music industries – not merely in abstraction but as *lived*

experience. Here Adorno remains a key starting point not necessarily because he is right, but because he shows that it *matters*. It is not necessary to share his views of the culture industry to share his commitment to musical life and to trying to understand – and critique – the forces which underpin it. But we would also add key works by authors such as Becker (1982), Frith (1983), Peacock and Weir (1973) and, perhaps above all, Ehrlich (1985). What each of them contributes to is an understanding of the lives of musicians *as workers* (Williamson and Cloonan 2016), that is a people trying to make a living from their musical ability. It is surely incumbent upon higher education working in music to get students to reflect on how they intend to work.

Musicians need to be able to reflect on the factors which affect their chances of employment and their remuneration. Neither of us is a musician and we are aware that notions of what constitutes a musician remain contested. However, both our experience and the existing literature suggest that musical prowess is not enough (O'Neill 2003, 79). Of course musical skills need to be developed and this is not an attack on performance-based courses or programmes *per se*. But musical skills alone are not, it seems, enough. If this is the case (and we have no doubt that it is), then it has implications which we spell out in the next section.

Part Three: Discussion: What is to Be Done?

It should now be clear that we regard degree programmes which are aimed at developing musicians in order to facilitate their working in the music industries, but which do not contain courses on those industries as doing a disservice to their students. Some of the few fortunate ones who find themselves working as full-time musicians may end up with managers who will take care of the business side of things, but the majority will need to attend to their own business. Doing so will be all the harder if they have not been taught how to critically evaluate the workings of the music industries.

This need not entail the making of detailed business plans (although it might), more the exploration of the relationship between the art and commerce and the factors which have mediated this relationship over the years. We cannot (or would rather not) imagine students who have no interest in exploring the factors which have shaped musical practice over the years and which will shape their own. The teaching of the music industries should not be the passing on of information, but the critical investigation of practices of music making and the exploitation (in all senses of the word) of musical compositions and performances.

We have no doubt that such courses should be compulsory. Part of neoliberalism has been the elevation of consumer (for which in higher education read 'student') choice to the status of the sacrosanct. However, choice is not necessarily a good thing, especially if there is too much choice (Scheibehenne *et al* 2009) or if that choice is not an informed one. In addition, there are subjects in which to leave the curriculum to student/consumer choice would be to tempt disaster (Medicine springs to mind). We suggest that for those wishing to enter the music industries, being able to choose not to be educated about those industries risks similar disasters. What is needed is less choice and more expertise. This may not engender more success in popularity contests such as the ridiculous National Student Survey, but it will engender more critical and empowered workers.

Some Concluding Thoughts for Students

We are aware that the intended audience for this book might find some of our arguments a little abstract. However, we suggest that they are in fact fundamental. It is not necessary to buy into the rhetoric of students as customers (although we recognize that in some cases it might help) in order to believe that Music students *must* be taught about the music industries. This should not involve indoctrination, it should involve empowerment. Education has long involved processes of indoctrination as well as liberation. But the text is meaningless without the *con*text.

Previous research has illustrated that a concern about the pernicious impact of vocationalism and teaching of music industries courses is not just restricted to those working within the classical music world. In fact there is evidence that many popular music students simply wish to make music and have little interest in courses about the business of music (Cloonan and Hulstedt 2012). Furthermore the employability agenda which occupies much time within UK HE now, creates problems for those working within sectors where *self*-employment is the norm. We suggest that Music students need to think not so much about getting a job within music, as being able to develop the sorts of skills (personal as well as professional) which will allow them to cope in a business where self-employment is the norm. For us, being a musician necessitates being music business-savvy, at least in the sense of understanding how it works and one's location within it. Such knowledge is power.

As we end this chapter we are aware that it may jar with much of the rest of this book. However, we feel this supports, rather than undermines, our arguments. Nowhere else in the book is the thorny issue of the reality of working in the music industries raised. Moreover, as PMS specialists we note that while several chapters here mention popular music in passing, only this one comes from within PMS – i.e. from those academics concerned with the form of music which the majority of people listen to (whether by choice or not) day in day out. We are aware of many music departments which have a single popular music expert, but none in which popular music dominates and classical music is restricted to just one expert. The fact that the latter scenario is almost impossible to imagine intrigues us. Meanwhile traditional music departments remain dominated by the western canon, with PMS largely the domain of the non-traditional, often less prestigious, universities (Cloonan and Hulstedt 2012).

Our aim was to ask what graduates of Music undergraduate degree programmes should be able to do at the end of their programmes. We suggest that they should be able to make important

decisions about their careers in critically informed ways and that this requires critical engagement with the music industries during the course of their studies. It is incumbent upon all Music degree programmes to provide critical information on the state of the music industries that many students aspire to work in. This does not mean blind adherence to current ways of working and distributing profits, but subjecting such practices to scrutiny and challenging the rhetoric coming from both government and music industries' organizations. It means helping students to think through the implications of the business decisions they will make during their careers and to consider alternative ways of establishing musical careers. It does not mean avoiding criticism of the reality of the music industries, but it certainly *does* mean imparting knowledge of what that reality is. We fear that some would rather that this remained opaque, something which happens elsewhere, rather in the lived reality of musicians.

So, we suggest that undergraduate music students should demand Bach, Beethoven and Boulanger, as well as the Beatles, PJ Harvey and Nina Simone. They should by all means take the opportunity to improve their performance and/or compositional skills and given encouragement to understand as many different musical forms as possible and to be able to put them in a wider socio-historical context. But, those who are seeking a *career* in music then should also *demand* that their tutors help them to understand the workings and realities of the music industries. Only then will such tutors have truly assisted in empowering their students. Only then will a Music degree have shown its worth. Like it or not, music *is* a business, so music students should make it their business to understand it as such. Only by doing so will they ever be able to do what Public Enemy (and we) would have them do – Fight the Power.

Bibliography

Adorno, Theodor W. 2001. *The Culture Industry*: *Selected Essays on Mass Culture* (ed. J. Bernstein). Routledge.

Becker, Harold. 1982. *Artworlds*. University of California Press.

Browne, John *et al*. 2010. *Securing a Sustainable Future for Higher Education: An Independent Review of Higher Education and Student Finance*. Department for Business, Innovation and Skills. http://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-browne-report-higher-education-funding-and-student-finance. Accessed 26 February 2016.

Cahn, Meyer M. 1948. 'There is no Music Business'. *Music Educators' Journal* 34/5: 38-40.

Cloonan, Martin. 2005. 'What is Popular Music Studies? Some Observations'. *British Journal of Music Education* 22/1: 77-93.

——. 2007. *Popular Music and The State in the UK*. Ashgate.

——. 2015. 'Managing The Zoeys: Some Reminiscences'. In *Organising Music: Theory, Practice, Performance*, edited by Nic Beech and Charlotte Gilmore, 226-35. Cambridge University Press.

—— and Lauren Hulstedt. 2012. *Taking Notes: A Mapping of HE Popular Music and an Investigation into the Teaching of Theory and Analysis*. Higher Education Academy.

Collini, Stefan. 2012. *What are Universities For*? Penguin.

Department of Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS). 2009. *Higher Ambitions: The Future of Universities in a Knowledge Economy*. HMSO.

DHA Communications. 2012. *The Working Musician Report 2012*. Musicians' Union.

Ehrlich, Cyril. 1985. *The Music Profession in Britain since the Eighteenth Century*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Frith, Simon. 1983. *Sound Effects*. Constable. Oxford University Press.

Griffiths, Dai. 1999. 'The High Analysis of Low Culture'. *Music Analysis* 18/3: 389-434.

Harkins, Paul. 2012. 'Extending the Term: The Gowers Review and the Campaign to Increase the Length of Copyright in Sound Recordings'. *Popular Music and Society* 35/5: 629-49.

Harvey, David. 2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press.

Harvie, Jen. 2013. *Fair Play: Art, Performance and Neoliberalism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hotson, Howard. 2104. 'Germany's Great Tuition Fees U-turn', *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 13 February 2014. http://www.timeshighereducation.com/features/germanys-great-tuition-fees-u-turn/2011168.article. Accessed 26 February 2016.

Martin, Peter. 2015. 'Music and the Sociological Gaze'. In *The Routledge Reader on the Sociology of Music*, edited by John Shepherd and Kyle Devine, 97-104. Routledge.

Marx, Karl. 1970. *The German Ideology*. Lawrence and Wishart.

Negus, Keith. 1992. *Producing Pop*. Edward Arnold.

—— 1996. *Music Genres and Corporate Cultures*. Routledge.

O'Neill, Susan A. 2003. 'The Self-identity of Young Musicians" in *Musical Identities*, edited by Raymond MacDonald, David Hargreaves and Dorothy Miell, 79-96. Oxford University Press.

Peacock, Alan and Ronald Weir. 1975. *The Composer in the Marketplace*. Faber and Faber.

Scheibehenne, Benjamin, Rainer Greifeneder and Peter M. Todd, P. 2009. 'What Moderates the Too-much-choice Effect?'. *Psychology and Marketing* 26/3: 229-53.

Vaughan, Richard. 2014. 'Nicky Morgan Tells Pupils: Study STEM Subjects to Keep your Options Open', *Times Educational Supplement,* 10 November 2014. <http://www.tes.com/news/school-news/breaking-news/nicky-morgan-tells-pupils-study-stem-subjects-keep-your-options-open>. Accessed 26 February 2016.

Williamson, John and Martin Cloonan. 2007. 'Rethinking the Music Industry'. *Popular Music* 26/2: 305-22.

——. 2012. 'Contextualising the Contemporary Recording Industry'. In *The International Recording Industries*, edited by Lee Marshall, 11-29. Routledge.

——. 2016. *Players' Work Time: A History of the British Musicians' Union*. Manchester University Press.

Williamson, John, Martin Cloonan and Simon Frith. 2011. 'Having an Impact? Academics, the Music Industries and the Problem of Knowledge. *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 17/5: 459-74.

Yorke, Mantz. 2004. *Employability in Higher Education*: *What it is and What it is not*. Higher Education Academy.

---

[i] John Williamson managed the Scottish band Belle and Sebastian, Martin Cloonan managed Glasgow act Zoey Van Goey (see Cloonan 2015).

[ii] The main representative body for musicians in the UK, the Musicians' Union, follows this approach and organizes different sections for Teachers, Orchestras, Writers, Live Performance etc. See http://www.musiciansunion.org.uk/Home/About-Us/How-the-Union-Works/MU-Sections, accessed 26 February 2016.

[iii] One example of this is that the current Secretary of State for Culture Media and Sport (effectively the UK's Minister for Culture), Sajid Javid, has described ticket touts as "classic entrepreneurs", seemingly endorsing a view that tickets for concerts should go simply to those with the deepest pockets.

[iv] See http://www.andyworthington.co.uk/2010/11/22/did-you-miss-this-100-percent-funding-cuts-to-arts-humanities-and-social-sciences-courses-at-uk-universities/.

[v] It should be noted that some institutions provided more than one of a selection of a Music Business courses, placements and Personal Develop Plan. For example City has an optional Music Business course and provides placements, while Kent offers a year in industry as well as a Professional Practice module.