

University of Denver

Digital Commons @ DU

Musicology and Ethnomusicology: Student
Scholarship

Musicology and Ethnomusicology

11-2019

Censorship in Popular Music Today and Its Influence and Effects on Adolescent Norms and Values

Sarah Wagner

University of Denver, Sarah.Wagner@du.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.du.edu/musicology_student



Part of the [Musicology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Wagner, Sarah, "Censorship in Popular Music Today and Its Influence and Effects on Adolescent Norms and Values" (2019). *Musicology and Ethnomusicology: Student Scholarship*. 45.

https://digitalcommons.du.edu/musicology_student/45



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License](#).

This Bibliography is brought to you for free and open access by the Musicology and Ethnomusicology at Digital Commons @ DU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Musicology and Ethnomusicology: Student Scholarship by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ DU. For more information, please contact jennifer.cox@du.edu, dig-commons@du.edu.

Censorship in Popular Music Today and Its Influence and Effects on Adolescent Norms and Values

Censorship in Popular Music Today and its Influence and Effects on Adolescent
Norms and Values
Annotated Bibliography

Anthony, Kathleen S. "Censorship of Popular Music: An Analysis of Lyrical Content."

Masters research paper, Kent State University, 1995. ERIC Institute of
Education Sciences.

This particular study analyzes and compares the lyrics of popular music from 1986 through 1995, specifically music produced and created in the United States. The study's purpose is to compare reasons of censorship within different genres of popular music such as punk, heavy metal and gangsta rap. This paper also contains information regarding the background of music censorship, the effects of labeling certain recordings, and the involvement of music censorship on librarianship. In the study, Anthony goes into detail concerning a "series of (lawful) hearings on gangsta rap lyrics and their effect on American youth", specifically related to the topic of "Censorship in Popular Music Today and its Influence and Effects on Adolescent Norms and Values".

Bullock, Jon E. "Sing Unto the Lord a New Song – Just Not *That* One! A Case Study of Music Censorship in Free Will Baptist Colleges." Master's thesis paper, Liberty University, 2015. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Bullock summarizes his case study with the following sentence "... church authorities long ago determined that if music is to remain a legitimate part of sacred worship and expression, it must be controlled (2)". Bullock uses his proclamation of outside

entities, specifically the Christian Church, to provide evidence that students studying religious musics create an “unhealthy fascination” towards music censorship. This particular study relates to the topic of censorship within popular music because it draws ties to the overarching theme of music in general. It showcases that popular music is not the only form of music being censored and relates to the topic of “Censorship in Popular Music Today and its Influence and Effects on Adolescent Norms and Values” directly through Bullock’s studies of students.

Busey, Sean D. “Parental Advisory – Explicit Content: The Parents Music Resource Center, Conservative Music Censorship, and the Protection of Children.” Master’s thesis paper, University of Nevada, Reno, 2018. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

This thesis observes and expands on the Parents Music Resource Center (PMRC) that was heavily present in the 1980s specifically targeting the music genre, heavy metal. Busey presents evidence that the PMRC was a very dominant sociopolitical activist group that represented the overall political shift in the United States during the 1980s. Busey provides background on the PMRC founders, as well as expands and presents other historian’s objective and non-objective accounts of the PMRC. “Why... should one group be allowed to decide the public’s access to popular media of any kind on the grounds of inappropriateness, a subjective characteristic if ever there was one?” It is through Busey’s attention towards the topic of the PMRC that this particular thesis relates to the topic “Censorship in Popular Music Today and its Influence and Effects on Adolescent Norms and Values” specifically regarding the

P(arents) in the PMRC and their relationship in shaping adolescent norms and values.

Carpenter, Alexander. "'Die Young': On Pop Music, Social Violence, Self-Censorship, and Apology Rituals." *Popular Music and Society* 40, no. 3, 261-273.

<https://doi-org.du.idm.oclc.org/10.1080/03007766.2017.1307644>.

This particular article highlights the normativity of social violence and shows connections to social violence and apologetic rituals to music censorship. Carpenter uses this article to focus on self-censorship and apology rituals through two specific examples of artists Ke\$ha and Foster the People. Carpenter also goes into detail about how their songs were pulled from regular appearances on the radio in the wake of mass school shooting, Sandy Hook. Carpenter also ties in other examples of mainstream media being self-censored, namely Stephen King on his novella, *Rage*, which King himself pulled from being printed in 1999. This article is relevant to the topic "Censorship in Popular Music Today and its Influence and Effects on Adolescent Norms and Values" because it highlights a non-law induced form of music censorship that is relatively new to the United States. It also focuses on popular music examples that were largely mainstream in recent years (2010-2012) and geared towards an adolescent aged audience.

Chen, Alan K. "Instrumental Music and the First Amendment." *Hastings Law Journal* 66, Issue 1 (December, 2014): 381-442. HeinOnline Law Journal Library.

This particular article examines the implications of the First Amendment and whether or not instrumental music falls within the First Amendment's jurisdiction,

specifically the free speech theory. Chen expresses that instrumental music can fall under the First Amendment through two claims; instrumental music as speech and instrumental music as a communicative function. This article examines both judicial and scholarly treatments of music as speech and then lists historical and modern instances of instrumental music censorship by governments in the United States and other nations. This article, published in 2014, would have an interesting dialogue paired with Carpenter's "Die Young" article focusing on the specific historical time frame of 2012-2017 as well as speech based censorship vs. non-speech based censorship and the implications drawn between the two topics.

Deflem, Mathieu. "Popular Culture and Social Control: The Moral Panic on Music Labeling." *American Journal of Criminal Justice* (July 2019): 1-23.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-019-09495-3>.

This paper focuses on the overarching moral panic that was created in the 1980s by the creation of the Parents Music Resource Center. Deflem showcases the overall social control of music and how through cultural criminology ties are drawn between the social control of music and cultural struggles. This paper examines the overall history of the music labeling debate that took place in the 1980s and examines the changes that have taken place since in the music industry. This paper examines changes that have influenced the music industry, specifically through the Internet and the spread of digital technologies. The author analyzes the criminological context of music labeling through the medium of the "moral panic" perspective. This paper would tie into Carpenter's "Die Young" article, examining

how the development of social media platforms via the Internet has shaped both the social vs. social media reactions of music censorship.

Freshwater, Helen. "Towards a Redefinition of Censorship" in *Censorship & Cultural Regulation in the Modern Age* edited by Beate Müller, 225 - 246. Amsterdam: Brill Academic Publishers, 2004.

This essay is critical to the topic "Censorship in Popular Music Today and its Influence and Effects on Adolescent Norms and Values" as it not only analyzes why censorship began, but analyzes the attempts to create an alternative solution or predict where a new or redefined rule of censorship can go. This article in particular discusses what censorship is and puts contemporary debates into conversation with one another. This discussion examines what the broad definition of censorship encompasses and the dangers behind using such an encompassing definition. Freshwater proposes an "inclusive definition" that responds to the vast differences in the field of censorship, showcasing her acknowledgement of a diverse field that is encompassed in censorship.

Huff, Mac. *Forget You*. Exton, PA: Mars Force Music, 2011.

This particular score was selected based off of its explicit censorship of popular song *Fuck You* by Ceelo Green. The phrase "fuck you" is sang a total of twelve times in the original recording, and there are a total of thirty-one instances of blatant censorship – so much so that the name of the song was censored and replaced with "Forget You". The original song peaked with a number two ranking on the United States Billboard

Hot 100 in March 2011 and the same week it reached the second highest-ranking position it became the best-selling song in the USA. This explicit song is an example of successfully censored popular music – nominated for Record of the Year AND Song of the Year in 2011, winning Best Urban/Alternative Performance and named the number one song of 2010 by Time Magazine. There are 379 arrangements of *Forget You* listed exclusively in jwpepper.com.

Kallio, Alexis A. "Drawing a line in water: Constructing the school censorship frame in popular music education." *International Journal of Music Education* 33, Issue 2 (January 2014): 195-209. <https://doi-org.du.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/0255761413515814>.

This article examines music censorship within the classroom in a case study focusing on five Finnish schools. The author, Kallio, gives insight into Finland taking on an extremely democratic role when it comes to education. This article in particular examines the Finnish approach towards popular music education and compares it to formal music education. The author interviews five different Finnish teachers and examines each of their repertoire selection processes as well as how they balance different ideological conflicts as well as tensions that exist between the formal vs. popular approach to music education. It is understood that the given framework by which the music educators use decide what to teach is heavily influenced by mass media. The author alludes to the 'rules' of music censorship are easily compared to the idea of drawing a line in water.

Smith, Jeremy director. *Freedom of Expression: Resistance & Repression in the Age of Intellectual Property*. Media Education Foundation, 2007. 1 hr., 4 min.

This particular form of research is a documentary focusing on the phrase “freedom of expression”. The producers, McLeod and Smith, examine multiple facets and forms of censorship in regards to intellectual property law and the restrictive nature towards creativity and expression. It is based off of McLeod’s book *Freedom of Expression: Resistance and Repression in the Age of Intellectual Property* and focuses on examining censorship and repression through the various mediums of expression such as music, art, film, Internet, phrases, literature, dance, movement and fashion. This article can be placed into conversation with Chen’s article examining the censorship of instrumental music in regards to intellectual property and expression as well as Busey’s thesis in regards to the idea of one group selectively determining what the public can and cannot listen to or conclusively view, examine, observe, or experience.

Wagner, Geraldine. “Point: Music Censorship is Necessary to Protect Children” in *Points of View: Music Censorship*, 2-2. Ipswich, MA: Great Neck Publishing, 2016.

The overall thesis behind this article is “freedom of speech should continue to be protected, but in the case of music censorship, protecting children from the harmful effects of violent and lewd music should take precedence”. Wagner believes that children under a certain age (not defined) should not be exposed to music that is offensive (containing lyrics that are violent, racist, sexist or homophobic are listed

examples of offense) and compares protecting children from offensive music to protecting children with a bicycle helmet or a car seat, saying that we protect them from one but not the other and that we should add regulation when it comes to offensive music. This directly correlates to the topic, "Censorship in Popular Music Today and its Influence and Effects on Adolescent Norms and Values" through the focus on the seemingly criminal effects of non-censored music on adolescents.

Wallenstein, Andrew. "Why Does the Music Industry Hate My Kid?" *Variety* 320, Issue 17 (August, 2013): 23. ProQuest Central.

This particular article highlights a parent's frustration towards the lack of music censorship standardization as well as a lack of consistency towards song rights. Wallenstein's title question of "why does the music industry hate my kid?" offers perspective from a parent that wants to educate their child with songs that are popular using digital media. Wallenstein does offer up one solution to his qualm, and that is to have the streaming or digital media industry embrace the flexibility of digital media that can be tailor made to suit individual needs depending on what kinds of censorship the individual is looking for. For example, Wallenstein inquires about having recording industries always offer a clean version that can be purchased as a 'single' rather than purchasing an entire album. Wallenstein also suggests that YouTube and other streaming sources crack down on their consistency of media rights with questions of who can upload a song to YouTube, what kinds of permissions must exist for YouTube to function adequately, etc.