

One of the defining features of the majority of articles in *Dancecult* is the strong presence of participant-observation research and ethnographic writing, and an overwhelming emphasis on the *experience* of the live performance of EDM, at festivals, clubs, raves, bedrooms, or other spaces... By all appearances, *Dancecult* is what popular music studies journals might be if anthropology were part of the interdisciplinary compass, and if the primary objects of analysis were the social formations constituted at events. However, continuing a problem that generally affects anthropological approaches to music, within the journal very little attention has been paid to musical sound or structure.

—Bates, p.23

- Why do you think Dancecult's participant-observation research is unusual in popular music studies?
- Is there a reason few authors manage to consider both musical sound and the social aspect of music?

In the period since the foundation of IASPM, a fixation on mass media has indeed produced some arguments that 'exclude' significant musical practices...I argue that the centralizing of mediations as a sine qua non of 'popular music' fulfils the same political function as Samuel Johnson's decision to confine his English lexicon exclusively to words that had appeared in print (Johnson and Cloonan 2009: 43 44). Both maneuvers exclude from their field all practices that are not sanctioned by some form of technological dissemination...It banishes the intense quotidian, the oral 'coal face' of communication, where the links between music and identity are germinated, and where a decisive cultural history is created.

—Johnson, p.98

- Do you agree that not all popular music is mass-mediated?
- If so, how should we define popular music?
- What do you think of Johnson's term 'vernacular music'?