MAYDAY GROUP

Action for Change in Music Education

Volume 15 Number 2
March 2016

Vincent C. Bates, *Editor*

Brent C. Talbot, *Associate Editor*

Music Educators' Expertise and Mandate:
Who Decides, Based on What?

Elin Angelo

Special Features: For optimal viewing and to access endnotes and citations by simply placing the cursor over the corresponding number and date, download and open this document in Adobe Reader.

Music educators' expertise and mandate: Who decides, based on what?

Elin Angelo

Who should define music educators' expertise and mandate, and on what basis? Is this for example individual music educators, diverse collectives, employment institutions or political frameworks? How can one discuss professional quality and codes of ethic in this field, where these questions inseparably adhere to personal qualities and quality of a life? Or where such questions are already banned to those both outside and inside specific expert communities? This article proposes MEPRUN — music educators' professional understanding — as a vital concept to facilitate such reflections, focusing on power, identity and knowledge on personal, collective, institutional and political level. This concept is employed in studies about a jazz pedagogue, a rural music teacher in a combined position, a French horn pedagogue, and a Balinese gamelan pedagogue (Angelo, 2015a, 2015b, 2013, 2012). The article contributes to more articulated knowledge on what forms music educators practices, and serves to qualify the discussions in and around this field.

Keywords: *professional understanding, music education, expertise, mandate, professional dilemmas.*

Musicians work in orchestras, military bands, and churches, as freelancers in projects, and on TV and radio shows. Some play, others compose, arrange, or conduct. Many also teach musicianship in one way or another, in general schools, music and art schools, community music and/or as private studio teachers. The lines between the professions of musicians and the profession of music teachers are blurred occupationally, educationally, epistemologically and ontologically. Music educators often combine a range of such tasks, and take part in several collectives with different expectations to their professional expertise, identity, and responsibility. These collectives can have instruments, genre or ensemble type in common, or also employment authorities, institutions and/or political frameworks; on *municipal* levels authorities of education, health care or culture, on *national* levels diverse ministries, such as the Ministry of Culture, the Church, education, or military defense. Also *personal*

convictions are strong and have quite free reign in this relatively unformalised landscape, where both individuals and collectives might *live* their work, more than they are expected to reflect upon it and question their practices.

Multiple positions, affiliations and tasks cause music educators to navigate a complexity of "truths" and develop a chameleonic way of being, in which the ability to "blend in" might become the most obvious expertise. This, though, is unlikely the expertise for which these professionals *wants* to be recognized. My question is *what*, then, *is* their defining expertise and mandate? Who defines this, how, and on what basis? How can one enable discussions on *quality* in this field, with awareness towards these mechanisms? This article suggests MEPRUN as an approach to such reflections, to question and challenge the established what's, how's, and why's.

The article has three parts. First I explain the term profession in relation to performing music education, and then follow a rather extensive part where I elaborate MEPRUN's three main aspects: power, identity and knowledge. This culminates in a conceptualisation of the contradictions as "professional dilemmas," something that marks the transition to the third part where I elaborate MEPRUN's four levels: personal, collective, institutional, and political. In the summary I add up the discussions and stress the need for music educators to give voice to their practices and what forms them, and also to take active part in public meaning making about music education. This is crucial to qualify the discussions about quality, not only inside but also around the field of music education.

Professions

Professions are expert-occupations, which require special knowledge and skill to perform important tasks in society. For example, doctors cure people, and lawyers take care of justice. It is essential for each profession to assure society of the need for its expertise and services, and to ensure that there is a clear distinction between the *profession's* body of knowledge and *general* knowledge in society. This process of jurisdiction is about the profession's control over a vocational area and is fundamental to the profession's existence (Abbot 1988). The line between professional expertise and ordinary knowledge and skill is harder to draw in some professions than others. For example, what is it that early childhood teachers know

or can do that parents/others do not or cannot? What is it that a professional saxophone teacher knows and can do, that a professional saxophone *musician*, an *amateur* saxophone player, or a teacher of *a different instrument* does not or cannot?

A typical issue in professional theory is the question of *who* should define and regulate the professional's expertise and tasks, the society that needs the services, or the professionals who hold the expertise (Abbot 1988; Evetts 2003)? Societal insight and oversight are certainly relevant to inform the body of regulations, or "ordering systems" necessary to ensure safety in health care, for example. However, there are also professions in which the professionals' responsibilities to society cannot be entirely prescribed or controlled — to do so would limit their potential and deny them the room they need to unfold — for example, the jazz pedagogue who aims for his students to play something *personal*, "something that has never been played before . . . otherwise, jazz education would become completely reactionary" (Angelo 2015b, 170). It would be both impossible and antagonistic to "order" this expression; instead, this expression can hopefully emerge through a dynamic process, uniquely calibrated to the specific person and situation. Not all essentials are "orderable," and professional responsibilities might also include taking care of the un-orderable needs in people's lives.

Arguments along these lines are often voiced by groups whose vocational choices imply a calling of some kind, such as teachers and artists. Sceptical voices in pedagogy and teacher education are concerned that turning education into a formal "profession" might strengthen governmental control to the extent that the individual teacher becomes a mere functionary, without any real authority and responsibility for ones' work. The fear is that such external regulation could turn teaching into an industry, and threaten education as a *democratic* project in which teachers bear personal responsibilities for a diversity of pupils, values and contexts (Englund 1996; Dale 2001). It is challenging to discuss and regulate *teachers'* mandates and expertise, but even more challenging is it perhaps to discuss what *artists* and musicians should do and know? Who should decide this, and control it? If it is society, then what happens to artists' possibilities to question the very grounds on which societies are built?

Professions are *heterotelic,* writes Norwegian profession theorist Harald Grimen (2008b), meaning that they have no value in themselves; their only value lies in serving something else. The point of a nurse giving an injection is not giving the injection in itself; it is to treat or cure a disease. Such reasoning also exists in discussions in and around the field of music education, where arguments about its utility in improving health, school grades, and productivity are extensive. Opposite arguments refuse to regard music playing or singing as services that benefit something else, insisting instead on the intrinsic value of music, music education, and musicking. From this perspective, one might ask about *the point* of a clarinettist who with his breath, tongue, and whole self, takes off to the initial glissandos of Gershwin's Rhapsody in Blue; or similarly, ask about the point of a kayaker, physically and mentally plunging down a huge waterfall. Both these activities can end very badly, but to ask for "the point" might be the wrong question. To discuss such activities and groups as "professional," one would need to find ways to discuss professions as *autotelic* — having their own value. However, art is neither about the artwork nor the artist, as Martin Heidegger explains, but instead about essential and ground-breaking *Truth*, put in to work, in artworks (Heidegger 2006, 2000). Being a musician or a music educator then, can be perceived as something deeply existential, that implies insights to reveal such truths — and put them to work, in music or musicking, which certainly emphasises playing and teaching music as an essentially meaningful praxis in itself.

In either case, whether you argue that music education is autotelic, heterotelic, or both, there is a need for music educators to take part in the discussion, and to engage in the sense-making that leads to decisions that in fundamental ways regulate what kinds of music education practices can — and cannot — take place. There is "no one true way" Bowman states, and advises to let plurality be plural, and to avoid hypostasis (Bowman 2009, 8). A plural way to approach this might be to let essential beliefs and constructional approaches exist alongside each other, and then perhaps provide possibilities to consider a profession as both autotelic and heterotelic.

There exist several kinds of regulation and regulatory bodies that aim to secure and control the knowledge and practices of professions. First are the special

programmes in institutions of higher education, such as medical or law degrees, that aim, through both practical and theoretical, research-based training, to qualify professionals, develop knowledge and standards, and internalize values in these fields. Other forms of regulation are the certification and licensing that allow professionals to use specific titles and perform specific tasks, and the authorities to follow up if anyone violates professional codes of conduct.

The field of music education is only to a limited degree regulated in these ways, even though it is common to refer to this vocational group as a profession. There is a diversity of formal and informal paths qualifying music educators, with different values in different contexts. Some places of work require formal music education, some require formal teacher education, some both, and some none of these. In some contexts it is regarded as best if the musician is an autodidact, or a "pure genius," believed to be "uninfected" by any education. Yet, even if no such thing as a classical saxophone authority *formally* exists, several *informal* mechanisms effectively regulates who is seen as a "real" saxophonist and who is not.

It is these kinds of controls that are discussed under the "power" aspect of the concept of MEPRUN in the following, closely intertwined with the other two aspects: identity and knowledge.

Power

In the context of MEPRUN, power exists on personal, collective, institutional, and political levels. It refers to the forces that regulate what can be done and thought, and what becomes taken for granted as truths. Power might be regarded as something omnipresent, necessary and productive, required for us to know anything about ourselves and the world (Foucault 1999). As Foucault explains it, power is needed to produce reality, or what we see as "truths." This production happens through multiple mechanisms that distinguish true from false statements through educational systems, media, scientific discourses, and diverse political and economic ideologies. Power produces knowledge, which in turn also legitimates the power relations that enable it, Foucault states, employing the term *power/knowledge* (Foucault [1975] 1995). In this way, not only *is* knowledge power, but the roads to knowledge are also paved with power.

From such a perspective, certain power relations need to be accepted to gain access to specific knowledge, skills, and values — for example, to become (a true) "pianist" or "singer." In an earlier study on horn education, I found the "wise hornists" to be a powerful and influential international community, defining norms, repertoire, and ways of work for pupils at all levels (Angelo 2012). In the practice of the jazz pedagogue, the jazz environment outside the institution is a main reference. This millieu is critical to the "institutionalising" of jazz in formal music education, and jazz pedagogues worry that this will "destroy jazz completely" (Angelo 2015b, 170). In the practice of the rural music teacher, important references are compulsory school, community music, and the community itself, and this local life deeply impacts her perceptions on what she should do, and what knowledge and skills then comprise her "expertise" (Angelo, 2015a). Foucault explains how discourses are regulated by mechanisms that restrict *what* can be said, thought, and done, *who* can speak, and with what authority. What is regarded as valid references and affiliations are part of this, and the examples above illustrate how key references are quite different in these contexts, and lead to dissimilar perceptions of crucial tasks and special knowledge, even though these practices from the outside might seem quite alike.

Pierre Bourdieu's thoughts also have aroused interest in the field of music education research (Burnard et al. 2015; Wright 2010; Dyndahl et al. 2014). While Foucault's thinking provides perspectives to consider "constructions" of professional understandings, Bourdieu's thoughts provide departures to discuss "structures" that define such perception. Bourdieu effectively demonstrates the social and economic fundaments of a hierarchized system of cultural preferences; a main concern in his writing is the relationship between power and culture. Sociological approaches in music education research emphasize social, cultural, and ethnic backgrounds as central aspects that inform musical preferences, and impact musical upbringing and education. Fruitful terms from Bourdieu's work are *field, habitus,* and *capital*. Monika Nerland (2003) combines Foucault's thoughts on knowledge and power with Bourdieu's thoughts on field in her research on instrumental music teaching. This is a curious approach that deeply inspired me when I started my PhD work, and I aimed to study instrumental music educators' work and positioning in one or several

fields. As the work developed, however, I experienced conflicts between how the research participants articulated their experiences, and what terms and language this constructive/structural approach gave me. These challenges led me to a more phenomenological and existential approach, which allowed me also to discuss "essences" in music and music education.

My philosophical dilemma emerged through the *analytical* part of the research work, when I experienced that I had to discuss the jazz pedagogue's aims of "becoming oneself" and to "hear what you hear" as mere "discourses about . . ." This challenged ethical parts of the research, as I aimed to conduct the research as "resonant work", and to write in a way that made sense and could be recognized in the contexts that I wrote about (Barrett and Stauffer 2009, 20–7). I needed a language that better reflected not only *what* was talked about — but also *how*, and by which metaphors, terms, and stories. I found it hard to explain my findings in a research language wherein the human being, meaning and essence had no place. I could have identified discourses anyway, and they might have provided interesting analyses regarding tradition, power relations and incorporating ways to think and act, but I chose not to.

In Scandinavian music education research there are several paths, following diverse theoretical and philosophical stances and research traditions. Two of these became important to me: first, a discourse-oriented, Foucault-inspired approach, informed by the work of Thorolf Krüger (2000), Monika Nerland (2003), Tiri Bergesen Schei (2007) and others; second, a being-phenomenological approach, inspired by Martin Heidegger's philosophy, and developed in music education philosophy by scholars such as Frederik Pio, Øivind Varkøy and Cecilia Ferm (Ferm 2006; Pio 2012; Pio and Varkøy 2015, 2012). Frede V. Nielsen's phenomenological consideration on music as a "many faceted universe of meaning" also has been a major inspiration (Nielsen 1998). My philosophical dilemma concerned what *kind* of power I should emphasise, what I should focus on — being and essences, or power/knowledge and constructions/structures — and perhaps most important, which *terms* I should use to even explain this dilemma? This philosophic reflection was elaborated in a conference paper (Angelo 2010) titled "Essence or Structure? (Heidegger or Foucault)," and later developed in to the article: "Power or Being:

About Experiences and Understandings of Instrumental Music Teaching" (Angelo and Varkøy 2011). To elaborate on these opposing philosophical positions and the language they offered for explanation was a crucial task for me in the work of inquiring into music educators' professional understanding.

The "ontological turn" concerns Heidegger's turn to considering the world as a question of our being in it (dasein). This question is emphasised in music education research, both in Nordic countries and internationally, and provides frames for discussing both art and arts education (and thus also music and music education, even though Heidegger never wrote specifically about that) as something *active* that *forces* humans into deep insights about themselves and their being in the world (Pio and Varkøy 2015; Lines 2005; Naughton 2009). "Objects too have agency," states Bruno Latour (1996, 63). Inspired by Nielsen's thoughts on music as a multifaceted phenomenon *and* on Heidegger's thoughts on art as truths powerfully put into work (Heidegger 2000, Nielsen 1998), one could change this to: "*Music* too has agency." And, *then* this change of philosophical standpoint is important, for the discussion on the jazz pedagogue's intentions of supporting students in "becoming themselves," and to consider music education as an autotelic profession, deeply calibrated to a specific music — and that music's possible agencies.

Callings

Power, in this article, is thus viewed both as something *inner* and something *outer*. While *outer* power is seen as social, cultural, political and discursive, *inner* power refers to personal convictions and persuasions, or even "callings." Music plays fundamental roles in people's lives, as important aspects in their life worlds, or their identities, in their relations and communications, and both to connect to and escape from the world (e.g. Gates 1991; Ray 2004; Barret and Stauffer 2009). Playing and teaching music can be experienced as a "duty," given from the divine, as the Balinese gamelan pedagogue explains it (Angelo 2013), or as the jazz pedagogue puts it (Angelo 2015b, 179), "I don't *act* a jazz pedagogue, this is my life!"

Personal convictions and callings are discussed in music education as well as in several other occupations or professions, and both the English and German words for occupation — *vocation* and *Beruf* — have the connotations of "calling." Robert V.

Bullough, Jr. and Kendra M. Hall-Kenyon explain "calling" in the teaching profession as responding to a call from a source that may be "inner or outer, and sometimes from God" (Bullough and Hall-Kenyon 2011, 128). Responding to this call is experienced as the realization of something true and right, in the way it was meant to be, and in a way that provides meaning, direction, and moral reason. When a person possessing a strong sense of calling describes herself as a teacher, she is saying more than that she does the work of teaching: "literally, she *is* a teacher — to teach is a way of coming at life, of finding oneself, which is experienced as deeply spiritual and life affirming — living a life that matters" (128). This coincides with the jazz pedagogue's explanation of becoming a jazz musician and how it actually is *his life*, that is realised in his teaching practice: the paths and efforts that have brought him a career and life both as a jazz musician and jazz pedagogue.

Dedication and personal commitment are beneficial for involvement and motivation, but such personal callings and self-modelling practices are also challenging — not least for discussing and judging quality, posing critical questions, and potentially *changing* practices. A calling is by definition not negotiable, and resists external control. Those who do not have the specific knowledge, or the special calling, have no *real* access to ask critical questions on these practises, and the worst thing about that is perhaps that neither do those *inside* these sealed traditions. They just perform them, with values and views on people, society, and music unquestioned. The many "callings" in the field of music education might also not be as altruistic as they first seem, Regelski (2012) points out. They might, for example, *not* be about the pupil or society, but instead about the music educator's *self*-interest and *self*-commitment. Either way, the challenge with such powerful motivation and commitment as a "calling" is that this makes the practices hard to question and challenge. Roger Mantie and Brent C Talbot (2015) ask: "How we can change our habits if we don't talk about them?" and actually pinpoint the motivation for this article and for the concept MEPRUN: namely to facilitate strong reflections, and enable criticism and change, or assist qualified approvals and wisely *un*changed practices.

Society's gatekeepers

In many professions, a main mode of regulation is certification and authorization in the form of licenses or educational degrees that give the professional the right to use a protected title and to practice as designated by that title — for example, as a lawyer or a doctor. Practitioners of music and also, to a large degree, of music education are not formally regulated in this way. Degrees, exams, and bravura diploma concerts do not lead automatically to positions or funding as a musician, or open doors to recognized music educator positions. Instead, musicians have to prove their knowledge, repeatedly, to demonstrate their quality convincingly in different contexts.

The classical term *profession* concerns professions as associations, and not as collections of individuals (Grimen 2008b). The focus is on individuals as members of an association doing more or less the same thing, in more or less similar ways. In the field of music education, though, the individuals are important. The tradition of master-apprenticeship is strong and implies that not only are techniques and knowledge learnt, but also values, views, and ways of being. Ways of being a singer, a conductor, or a piano teacher vary according to context, style, or personality, and students may be more likely to apply to study under particular persons than to study under instrument or genre teachers in general.

There are, of course, a number of associations, organizations, networks, and unions in this field, related to instruments, genres and ensemble types, some of which belong together and others which absolutely do not. Examples include flute associations, choral associations, school music unions or jazz societies. Each of these associations can be regarded as holding power that affects what their members or associates can and will do and say, who they relate to and distance themselves from, and which ones are listened to or not.

Grimen employs the term "morals of the profession" to talk about power that regulates professions (as associations) from the inside, and explains these morals as a form of inner self-justice that regulates the professional's behaviour and interests (Grimen 2008b). Such morals usually rest upon societal tasks and political legitimacy, but even if these aspects are hard to pinpoint in music education, one might regard the power in each of the music associations mentioned above as a kind

of "moral of the profession." Within the many groups in the music education field, one also finds sub-organizations related to specific masters or traditions, each with their own "sub-morals." Some examples in the song context are Lutheran choral associations, folk song societies or oratory music organizations, and in the context of saxophone traditions; classical saxophone or jazz saxophone societies.

Grimen refers to reflections *about* the norms and values that guide the professions inner self-justice, or their moral of the profession, as "ethics of the profession." Ethical questions do not only concern what is "right" to do (according to internalised values and norms between the professionals), but also what is "good" to do (Grimen 2008b, 144). One might imagine such discussions for example among military music educators, or also church music educators, regarding how "good" their interests, behaviours, and views are for new generations. This is a different discussion of quality than a discussion related to established norms among their colleagues, and a discussion where "proper" behaviour is not necessarily the same as "good" behaviour. The international society of music education research is thoroughly occupied with such questions, with discussions in numbers of networks, journals, conferences, and publications. These reflections, though, also needs to be voiced by music educators themselves, and to take place in the diverse fields of music education practices. That is a concern for higher music education as well as for music teacher education, and also for school leaders in the different contexts, which need to value and find arenas for such discussions.

Identity

What one *does*, as a music educator, often also denotes who one *is*, personally and professionally. "Real" pianists or piano teachers, for example, might *be* that, both on stage, in the teaching room and private, and affect their preferences and interests in many ways. Professional identity and identity formation is a recurring theme in music education research (Bouij 1998; McClellan 2014; Mills 2004; Pellegrino 2009; Roberts 2002; Talbot 2013). Interests in this research include, for example, the relationships between personal and professional perceptions of oneself, and how persons socialise into the fields of music and education. Mills (2004, 245) explains the question of identity to be more complex in the field of music than in many other

vocational areas where the professional identity is equal to a person's job title. In the field of music, individuals might call themselves something other than their job titles, or even something different from what their incomes are derived from; for example one might identify as a musician or composer though one works primarily as a teacher.

Education as a musician (singer, composer, etc.) often starts at a young age, unlike the starting age of 18–19 seen in many other special educations. This means that personal identity and professional identity can develop in parallel, and entwine from early years. Kåre Heggen (2008, 323) sees identity and identity problems fundamental to what actions and orientations become meaningful, in any profession, and suggest that identity should be an issue in special education across all professions. According to the research mentioned, the topic of professional identity and personal identity formation might be worth pursuing in both higher music education and in music teacher education. One could, for example, start by making a personal list of *people* who have impacted how one considers oneself as a professional, identify common characteristics among these, and continue with group reflections on the revelations. Such an approach is inspired by Brent Talbot's research about music and identity (Talbot 2013), but focuses on the person rather than the music. Both lists of influential persons and music could be relevant to inquire into music educators' professional understanding.

There are few formal guidelines in the field of music education, and personal judgement is given a pretty free reign to form the practices and assess quality. Traditions and recognized masters greatly impact the defined ways to work, but also the ways to *be* and *talk*, as well as preferences regarding clothes, food and which music one listens to. Self-understanding can at times seems *inherited* in this field, as when members of the new generation (of violin teacher John, for example), simply *carry out* what they have learnt, with great respect and humility, but without any opportunity to question what they live and do. Heggen (2008, 322–5) describes how a professional's identity can resemble the collective identity of the profession. He differentiates between the *profession identity*, which is collective, and *professional identity*, which is individual and might be more or less similar to the collectives'. This distinction provides possibilities to examine the professional

identity of violin teacher A and B, related to the profession identity of the violin teacher community (built on the image of violin teacher John).

Identity work is part of most special educations, although only in *informal* ways, according to Heggen (2008). He explains that the students needs to be exposed to a diversity of professional identities in their education, because this enriches their work on their own professional identities, and provides opportunities to discuss identity in relation to professional work. Heggen proposes that diverse persons, from different positions in the higher education institution as well as from the practice field, should be invited to model possible identities in the profession concerned. Higher music education and music teacher education formally and informally relate to a range of contexts with diverse *profession* identities, as well as individual, *professional* identities. This diversity could be seen as a basis for thematisation and discussion — of differences, characteristics and professional addresses. Such a task could serve as a foundation to educate *reflective* teachers who are able and willing to discuss and develop their own practices.

Knowledge

A special body of knowledge is the foundation for any profession, and the strength of the profession relies on the distance between that profession's special knowledge and general knowledge in society. It is important for professions to mark this distinction, and to develop and maintain their own knowledge through research and education. The body of knowledge of a profession is a complex phenomenon that often consists of theoretical insights from several areas, and practical skills as well as familiarity with concrete situations. The diverse types of knowledge are interconnected in professional practice, even though they may have nothing in common on theoretical levels. For example, a doctor has both medical knowledge and knowledge of communication. These bodies of knowledge have little relation as subjects in university studies or research, but are connected in the doctor's practice because they are both necessary for the doctor to make a correct diagnosis and treat the patient. Grimen (2008a) uses the term "practical syntheses" for such composite units of professional knowledge.

Several professional studies scholars turn to Aristotle's three forms of knowledge to explain and elaborate on knowledge in the professions (Flyvbjerg 1991; Georgii-Hemming 2013; Grimen 2008a; Regelski 2012). These are episteme, techné, and phronesis. The first one, *episteme*, or *theoria* as Regelski (2012) uses, relates to theoretical knowledge, which is not dependent on the context or person. The latter two involve different forms of practical wisdom. Phronesis is the wisdom to act well for good aims, and is argued to be crucial in music education contexts (Georgii-Hemming 2013; Regelski 2012). Ethical considerations are seen as decisive for music educators, to discuss their tasks in local, global, human, and societal perspectives (Bates 2014; Bowman 2009; Heimonen 2012; Regelski 2012). Techné is technical knowledge as well as artistic sensitivity, both of which are needed for artists to put truth into work in artworks (Heidegger 2000; Varkøy 2013). In music education practise, all these forms of knowledge are employed, entwined and adjusted to the unique situations. Aristotle (2011) distinguishes between activities that aim for specific goals (*poiesis*) and activity whose meaning is the activity itself (*praxis*). Music education practice can be performed and discussed as both, according to the earlier discussion on this as a heterotelic or autotelic profession. Practices might aim for something specific, such as learning a scale or preparing for a concert, or the aim might be toward good actions in themselves. Regelski (2012, 45) explains praxis in music education as led by phronesis; intellectual and ethical excellence in being prudent and wise. If music education is pursued as *praxis*: "ends and means fuse, and "right action" is at once "right results" for the "correct reasons" both for the self-ful teacher and needful students" (60). One might add to this that the specific music also could be "needful," and set criteria for what are prudent and well-informed actions in the teaching practices.

The concept MEPRUN emerged through studies of music pedagogues' practices, which I considered as *praxis;* namely, as actions that were morally and virtuously calibrated to carry out what they understood as their main responsibility. I considered French horn education, focusing scales and technique, as prudent and wise, according to the perspective of what it *means* to be a hornist in the world (Angelo 2012). Similarly, rural music education attuned to a specific local community's *sensus communis*; is also considered as *praxis*, with the aim to

contribute to the pupils' whole development (Bildung), calibrated to this specific environments values. To do so this music teacher sees it as her task to "be there," as part of her pupils' everyday life. She teaches various disciplines in school and society, and therefore meets the same pupils several times a week. Her expertise, as she herself explains as a "broad" knowledge, concerning many instruments and contexts, needs to be viewed as a "deep" knowledge, *in* these pupils and this community, crucial for her to be able to fulfil what she sees as her mandate (Angelo 2015a). In the practice of a Balinese gamelan pedagogue all actions were attuned to carry out music education prudent and wise, related to a duty toward the devout (Angelo 2013). A dimension identified across these examples is the difference between a local and a global focus. While the local values and relations clearly guide the rural music teacher, the French horn pedagogue seems more guided by national and international standards of horn education. Vincent Bates (2014) problematizes the relation local/global and power in his discussion about Cosmopolitanism in music education. He points to how world wide movements in music education (e.g. El Sistema or multiculturalism) provide some (and not all) with a vantage (and place-less) point from which to judge what is right and good — for others. Bates argues that judgements of what is good and wise hardly can be discussed on a general level, but that such concerns need to relate to specific music, people and context. In the examples mentioned above, there is no either/or, but rather they position differently on the axis local–global.

The body of knowledge in music performance and music education can be explained and conceptualized in different ways. For example in dichotomies such as broad/deep or practical/theoretical, as ontological assumptions of what "music," "musicking," or "music education" are (Cook and Everist 2001), or what music as a *basic subject* is, related to the diverse forms of *teaching subjects* in music. Frede V. Nielsen (1998,110) illustrates the basis subject as an axis on which *ars* (the aesthetic) and *scientia* (the scientific) mark the poles, and handicrafts/everyday culture is considered as in the middle. The music educator might emphasise these aspects differently in all kinds of music subjects, and then realize music education more or less artistically, scientifically, or craft/culture-oriented. Geir Johansen (2006, 119) identifies three types of *knowledge cultures* in music teacher education and argues

that what *becomes* basic knowledge in this education actually does so through negotiations between different positions and persons. The three identified knowledge-cultures are: *general educational*, *musicological* and *performing/creative music-pedagogue* culture, where the last category is also sub-divided into *musician*-pedagogue and musician-*pedagogue* orientations, emphasizing musician and pedagogue differently.

As previously stated, music educators meet many different expectations about their knowledge in multiple contexts, and the knowledge to "change" among several know-hows and knowledge foundations, might *also* be regarded as a "special" knowledge in this field. This competence to "blend in," switch and adjust can be compared to the chameleon expertise in changing colour to become an imperceptible part of diverse environments. Danish educational researcher John Krejsler (2008) employs the term "competency nomads" for teachers in our days, a term that points exactly to competencies that are continuously changing. Krejsler's "competency" is about both identity and knowledge, and connotes a whole being who is service attuned, and knows how to change to meet the demands of pupils, parents, and society. This is a good but perhaps somewhat depressing definition: is the music educator's expertise nothing other than continuously changing — the lifelong adaptation of a professional vocabulary to match changing needs? Nomadic work, though, can also be seen as good and beneficial in music education, as Lauren Richerme (2013) points out, and as crucial to enable important connections in local and global environments. Music educators certainly need to be flexible and to develop in relation to the constant new generations of students from ever-new milieu. Still, not at least for jurisdictional causes, music educators might *also* gain to express with greater clearity what their special expertise is — and how this is decisive for humans and society.

Professional dilemmas in music education

The background for the concept MEPRUN is the web of deep and oppositional expectations and norms, and the informal power mechanisms that regulate them. These contradictions can be conceptualized as a range of *professional dilemmas,* illustrated by a series of dichotomies, for example, generalist ↔ specialist, musician

↔ teacher, individual ↔ part of a profession, calling ↔ professional service, way of life ↔ job, artist ↔ craftsman, tutti musician ↔ soloist, trained expert ↔ natural talent, practitioner ↔ academic, locally oriented ↔ globally oriented. A "dilemma" is a situation in which one has to choose between two or more choices, which may be equally good or bad, but that lead in different directions. All of these dichotomies concern both identity and knowledge, entwined, and a regulating "authority." My aim is that music educators themselves could develop a greater competence to articulate and discuss the diverse alternatives, and not at least; what guides their choices.

The arrows in the dichotomies above could have been stretched, placed on top of each other and spread out as a spider chart, simultaneously pointing in many directions. One might visualize stretching a fabric over this, anchoring it in the arrows and make a "trampoline" out of the dynamical, changing grounds. Such a foundation keeps the music educators vital, never letting them "fall down" in mere habit, but instead demands reorientation by immediate reaction to even small changes in the power relations. Such a picture might be beneficial for the *practices*, and to imagine how power changes affect individuals, collectives, institutions and even political frames. MEPRUN is proposed as a concept to facilitate the *reflections* upon this, and to develop a professional language to discuss how perceptions are negotiated in this field, and what references that *should* be seen as valid to discuss quality in music education practice. Such discussions are necessary as part of the task to professionalize the field of music education (Angelo and Georgii-Hemming 2013), and to strengthen this fields capacity in taking care of it's own knowledge development, and become able to discuss their realised codes of ethics.

Professional understanding on four levels

The tensions described, the understanding of one's mandate and expertise, and the dilemmas occurring when these are pulled in different ways — can be considered on four levels: the personal level, collective level, institutional level, and political level. One can see these levels as circles within each other, and what then is considered as the most outer and the most inner can be viewed differently. For example, the

"personal level" might be the inner level but also the outer level, embracing all the others.

On the *personal level,* MEPRUN is about music educators' subjective notions of what they should and can be and do. Individual preferences and judgements have great impact on practices in this field, as the occupation of music education is rarely formally regulated. One's masters, personal convictions, experiences in early ages, and the life-long process of developing a professional identity lead to practices and values that are fundaments for what the students of music educators learn about themselves and music, but are difficult and challenging to articulate and discuss. This is because they literally might *be* their profession. In other words, their specific professional understandings and practices are unique to them as persons, so it is hard to compare their quality and ethics against a common scale or set of criteria. The worst thing about this is perhaps not that *others* cannot question them, but that they themselves have no clear view of the ground on which they stand.

On the *collective level,* MEPRUN is about collective understandings that are significant for the music educator. There exist plenty of collectives and groups of musicians and music educators, including groups that share in common certain instruments and genres (for example, *church* singers), various types of ensembles, composing, arranging, school music, music schools, and so on. These groups exist within, but also across institutions, work contexts, and countries. For example, classical saxophonists in Norway and in Canada know the same repertoire and work towards the same ideals. Some of the groups in the music education landscape belong together, others absolutely do not. Some require money for membership, while others offer funding for specific applications. Which collectives the music educator is or is not part of has consequences, affecting preferences on many levels, including professional language (whether one goes to *rehearsal* or *practice*, for example, or whether *ear training* or *gehör* is a subject in the education provided), their practices (how one behaves both on and around a stage, what warm up exercise one uses or what kind of vibrato a player develops), what is purchased (reeds, mouthpieces, instruments), and music played (arias, etudes, songs). Belonging to one or several such collectives provides certain spaces for what can be thought, said and done, even if these frames are not articulated. Such collectives exist both inside,

outside, and across institutions in the field, and although there might be a lack of formal guidelines for who is an authentic part of one or the other, the rules are obvious to those in the game, and work perfectly as gatekeepers — keeping out (and in) any possible critical remarks about underlying values and practices.

On the *institutional level,* MEPRUN is about the understandings that have an impact in the varied field of music education. Compulsory schools and music schools, as well as conservatories and teacher education institutes, are all examples of institutions that might hold quite contradictory notions about music educators' expertise and mandates. In Norway, community schools of music and performing arts (CSMA) are examples of institutions that can be very different. The CSMAs are obligated by the Norwegian Law (§ 13-6), but owned and enabled by diverse municipalities and therefore realized as a heterogeneous range of practices. Some have profiles as professional music schools that effectively train pupils in collaboration with symphonic orchestras or professional military music, others are realized as resource centres for communities, and relate to amateur choirs, bands, and compulsory school or kindergarten, or even for nursing homes. Nielsen (2001) has examined which paths music teachers in Scandinavian countries usually follow; those trained in conservatories teach in music schools, those trained in teacher education teach in compulsory schools, and those trained in universities teach in upper secondary schools. These three paths are increasingly merging, which means that contrasting institutional knowledge cultures — such as those that are more musicological performance-oriented and those that are more education-oriented in general — are confronting one another. In community music one also finds diverse cultures, in choirs, bands, school marching bands, and orchestras. Such groups might signal, through the language, terms, objectives or practices they apply, what cultures they are part of (and not), and how this informs knowledge and being.

On the *political level,* MEPRUN is about the influences of the diverse ministries or municipal sectors to which music educators relate as individuals, collectives, or institutions. This includes inter-institutional concerns as well as governmental control. Musicians and music educators may be employed by the church, the military, or government agencies in the education, culture, health, or other sectors. Political responsibilities and negotiations are different in each sector, as are their

priorities, which necessarily also affect debates in music education regarding curricula, syllabi, traditions, mandates, and expertise. If music education is positioned in the *health sector*, questions about it are framed by the societal responsibilities of hospitals, nursing homes, and diverse public health services. When it is positioned in the *military defence* sector, questions about music education are juxtaposed with questions of national security and national and international defence policy. When it is part of the *education sector*, discussions about music education are subsumed under broader discussions of general education, basic competencies and knowledge development, while in the *culture sector* it competes with education in different art subjects and film, as well as football and other sports. The question of funding is important on the political level, and impacts music educators in many ways — their positions, salaries, work time, equipment, facilities, etc. As a consequence of all of the above, the mandates and expertise associated with music educator positions differ in each context. These differences interfere with the ability of music educators (as individuals, collectives or institutions) to communicate with each other across different political affiliations. Such dialogues are necessary, however, and are part of professionalizing the profession of music education — from the inside.

Summary

Who decides music educators' mandate and expertise, and on what basis? "Who", in this article is explained as individuals, collectives and institutions, and "what" as traditions, habits and internalised norms. The mechanisms that perform these regulations, the "hows," one might say, is first and foremost *in*formal, forced by powers that are personal and cultural, inner and outer. The question missing is "Why." *Why* should music educators realise this or that practice, or perhaps even: why not?

MEPRUN is suggested as an approach to encourage such discussions, and to facilitate powerful reflections among music educators. Earl and Timperley (2008) distinguish between *strong reflections* and *weak reflections*, explaining the first as persuasive and developing, and the latter as mere conversations in a discourse wherein a discourse of consensus and approval. MEPRUN means to encourage the

Angelo, Elin. 2016. Music educators' expertise and mandate: Who decides, based on what? *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 15 (2): 178–203. act.maydaygroup.org/articles/ Angelo15_2.pdf

first, namely powerful discussions that *mean* something for the individuals, where also questioning and criticism are welcomed — but facilitated in an ethical way, with insight in the power mechanisms and the relations between identity and knowledge as discussed in this article. One aim is to grow a precise and nuanced language to discuss quality in music education practices. To do that music educators from all fields need to voice their arguments, in *their* words and with *their* references — to qualify these discussions. Another aim is to encourage and enable music educators to voice these discussions also outside music education context, and perhaps influence bigger questions in society, such as what "knowledge" is, and what kind of wisdom that should be nurtured in human lives and societies. Also for *that*, music educators need to reflect upon and put words on what kind of knowledge they take care of, and what value this have for people and the world. For both of these tasks, music educators must contribute to open up the many sealed discursive universes, invite to dialogues, and commit also to *reflect* upon their professional lives and work. Then one might find distinctive differences, decisive in the field of music education, as an even *better* ground for collaboration than illusions that all is the same.

Acknowledgments

References

Abbott, Andrew. 1988. *The system of professions. An essay on the division of expert labor.* Chicago/ London: University of Chicago press.

Angelo, Elin. 2015a. The music educator: Bridging performance, community and education. An instrumental teacher's professional understanding. *International Journal of Community Music* 8 (3): 279–96.

———. 2015b. Music education as a dialogue between the outer and the inner. A jazz pedagogue's philosophy of music education. In *Philosophy of music education challenged: Heideggerian inspirations,* edited by Frederik Pio and Øivind Varkøy, 169–84. Dordrecht: Springer.

———. 2013. The duty of Gamelan. A Gamelan pedagogue's philosophy of work. In *Nordic Research in Music Education. Yearbook. Vol. 14,* edited by Sven-Erik Holgersen, Eva Georgii-Hemming, Siw G. Nielsen and Lauri Väkevä, 195–216. Oslo: NMH-publikasjoner.

———. 2012. *Profesjonsforståelser i instrumentalpedagogisk praksis.* PhD thesis. Trondheim: Norwegian University of Science and Technology.

———. 2010. Essence or structure? (Heidegger or Foucault?). Paper presentation, PhD in Progress. *Nordic Network for Research in Music Education, 15th Conference.* Malmö Academy of Music, Lund, Sweeden. 21-23 April 2010

Angelo, Elin, and Eva Georgii-Hemming. 2014. Profesjonsforståelse. En innfallsvinkel til å profesjonalisere det musikkpedagogiske yrkesfeltet. In *Nordic Research in Music Education. Yearbook.* Vol. *15,* edited by Sven-Erik Holgersen, Eva Georgii-Hemming, Siw G. Nielsen and Lauri Väkevä, 25–47. Oslo: NMH-publikasjoner.

Angelo, Elin, and Øivind Varkøy. 2011. Væren og makt. Om *opplevelser* og *forståelser* av instrumentalpedagogiske praksiser. In *Nordic Research in Music Education. Yearbook.* Vol 13, edited by Sven-Erik Holgersen, Siw G. Nielsen and Lauri Väkevä, 93–114. Oslo: NMH-publikasjoner.

Aristotle. 2011. *Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Barrett, Margaret S., and Sandra L. Stauffer. 2009. *Narrative inquiry in music education: Troubling certainty.* New York: Springer.

Bates, Vincent C. 2014. Rethinking cosmopolitanism in music education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 13 (1): 310–27.

Bouij, Christer. 1998. *Musik – mitt liv och kommande levebröd: en studie i musiklärares yrkessocialisation.* PhD thesis. Göteborg: Göteborgs universitet, Musikhögskolan.

Bowman, Wayne. 2009. No one true way: Music education without redemptive truth. In *Music education for changing times. Guiding visions for practice,* edited by Tomas A. Regelski and J. Terry Gates, 3–15. New York: Springer

Bullough, Robert V., Jr., and Kendra M. Hall-Kenyon. 2011. The call to teach and teacher hopefulness. *Teacher Development* 15 (2): 127–40.

Burnard, Pamela, Ylva Hofvander Trulsson and Johan Söderman, eds. 2015. *Bourdieu and the sociology of music education.* London/New York: Ashgate.

Cook, Nick and Mark Everist, eds. 2001. *Rethinking music.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dale, Erling Lars. 2001. Pedagogikkutdanning og erkjennelsesinteresser. In *Pedagogikk og lærerprofesjonalitet,* edited by Tone Kvernbekk, 67–82. Oslo: Gyldendal akademisk.

Dyndahl, Petter, Sidsel Karlsen, and Ruth Wright, R, guest eds. 2014. Sociology of music education special issue. *Action, Criticism and Theory for Music Education* 13 (1).

Earl, Lorna M., and Helen Timperley. 2008. *Professional learning conversations. Challenging in using evidence for improvement.* United Kingdom: Springer Academic Publisher.

Englund, Tomas. 1996. Are professional teachers a good thing? In *Teachers` professional lives*, edited by Ivor Goodson & Andy Hargreaves, 75–87. London/ New York: Routledge Falmer.

Evetts, Julia. 2003. The sociological analysis of professionalism: occupational change in the modern world. *International Sociology* 18 (2): 395–415.

Ferm, Cecilia. 2006. Phenomenological ontology and epistemology in relation to music educational settings. In *Nordic Research in Music Education. Yearbook.* Vol. 8, edited by Frede V. Nielsen and Siw G. Nielsen, 91–102. Oslo: NMH-publikasjoner.

Flyvbjerg, Bent. 1991. *Rationalitet og magt. Det konkretes videnskab.* København: Akademisk forlag.

Foucault, Michel. 1999. *Diskursens orden: Tiltredelsesforelesning holdt ved College de France 2. desember 1970.* Oslo: Spartacus.

———. (1975) 1995**.** *Discipline & punish: The birth of the prison.* New York: Random House, Inc.

Gates, J. Terry. 1991. Music participation: Theory, research, and policy. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education* 109: 1–35.

Georgii-Hemming, Eva. 2013. Music as knowledge in an educational context. In *Professional knowledge in music teacher education,* edited by Eva Georgii-Hemming, Pamela Burnard and Sven-Erik Holgersen, 19–38. Farnham: Ashgate.

Grimen, Harald. 2008a. Profesjon og kunnskap. In *Profesjonsstudier*, edited by Anders Molander and Lars Inge Terum, 71–86. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

———. 2008b. Profesjon og profesjonsmoral. In *Profesjonsstudier*, edited by Anders Molander and Lars Inge Terum, 144–60. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Heggen, Kåre. 2008. Profesjon og identitet. In *Profesjonsstudier*, edited by Anders Molander and Lars Inge Terum, 321–32. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Heidegger, Martin. 2006. *The origin of the work of the art.* Translated by R. Berkowitz and P. Nonet. academia.edu/2083177/Bard College

———. 2000. *Kunstverkets opprinnelse.* Oslo: Pax forlag

Heimonen, Marja. 2012. Music education and global ethics: Educating citizens for the world. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 11 (1): 62–80.

Johansen, Geir. 2006. Fagdidaktikk som basis- og undervisningsfag. Bidrag til et teoretisk grunnlag for studier av utdannigskvalitet. In *Nordic Research in Music Education. Yearbook. Vol. 8,* edited by Frede V. Nielsen and Siw G. Nielsen, 115–36. Oslo: NMH-publikasjoner.

Krejsler, John B. 2008. Från professionell lärare till kompetansnomad? In *Läraren i blickpunkten – olika perspektiv på lärarens liv och arbete*, edited by Carola Aili, Ulf Blossing and Ulrika Tornberg, 251–68. Stockholm: Lärarforbundets förlag.

Krüger, Thorolf. 2000. *Teacher practice, pedagogical discourses and the construction of knowledge: Two case studies of teachers at work.* PhD thesis. Bergen: Bergen University College Press.

Latour, Bruno. 1996. *Vi har aldri vært moderne: Essay i symmetrisk antropologi.* Oslo: Spartacus.

Lines, David. 2005. "Working with" music: A Heideggerian perspective of music education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 37 (1): 65–76.

Mantie, Roger, and Brent C. Talbot. 2015. How can we change our habits if we don't talk about them? *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 14 (1): 28–53.

McClellan, Edward. 2014. Undergraduate music education major identity formation in the university music department. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 13 (1): 279–309.

Mills, Janet. 2004. Working in music: Becoming a performer-teacher. *Music Education Research* 6 (3): 245–61.

Naughton, Christopher. 2009. *The thrill of making a racket. Nietzsche, Heidegger and community samba in schools.* Auckland: University of Auckland.

Nerland, Monika. 2003. *Instrumentalundervisning som kulturell praksis: En diskursorientert studie av hovedinstrumentundervisning i høyere musikkutdanning.* PhD thesis. Oslo: Unipub forlag.

Nielsen, Frede V. 2001. Musiklæreruddannelse i et integrativt relationsfelt: Indhold, struktur og opgaver. In *Nordic Research in Music Education. Yearbook. Vol .5,* edited by Frede.V. Nielsen and Harald Jørgensen, 159–76. Oslo: NMHs skriftserie.

———. 1998. *Almen musikdidaktik.* København: Christian Ejler.

Pellegrino, Kristen. 2009. Connections between performer and teacher identities in music teachers: Setting an agenda for research. *Journal of Music Teacher Education* 19 (1): 39–55.

Pio, Frederik. 2012. *Introduktion af Heidegger til de pædagogiske fag. Om ontologi og nihilisme i uddannelse og undervisning.* Aarhus: Aarhus Universitet, DPU

Pio, Frederik, and Øivind Varkøy, eds. 2015. *Philosophy of music education challenged: Heideggerian inspirations.* Dordrecht: Springer

Pio, Frederik, and Øivind Varkøy. 2012. A reflection on musical experience as existential experience: An ontological turn. *Philosophy of Music Education Review* 20 (2): 99–116.

Ray, Johanna. 2004. *Musikaliska möten man minns : om musikundervisningen i årskurserna sju till nio som en arena för starka musikupplevelser.* PhD thesis, Åbo: Åbo Akademi University Press

Regelski, Thomas A. 2012. The good life of teaching or the life of good teaching? *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 11 (2): 42–78.

Richerme, Lauren Kapalka. 2013. Nomads with maps: Musical connections in a glocalized world. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 12 (2): 41–59.

Roberts, Brian A. 2002. Gatekeepers and the reproduction of institutional realities: The case of music education in Canadian universities. *Musical Performance* 2 (3): 63–80

Schei, Tiri Bergersen. 2007. *Vokal identitet: en diskursteoretisk analyse av profesjonelle sangeres identitetsdannelse.* PhD thesis, Bergen: Universitetet i Bergen.

Talbot, Brent C. 2013. The music identity project. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 12 (2): 60–74

Varkøy, Øivind. 2013. Techné, technological rationality and music. In *Professional knowledge in music teacher education,* edited by Eva Georgii-Hemming, Pamela Burnard and Sven-Erik Holgersen, 39 –50. F arnham: Ashgate.

Wright, Ruth. 2010. Sociology and music education. In *Sociology and music education*, edited by Ruth Wright, 1–20. Farnham: Ashgate.

About the Author

Elin Angelo (Ph.D) has education and experience as a professional musician and as a music educator, and has been employed in higher education since 2002. Her background includes experience from military bands, symphonic orchestra and diverse freelance projects, and music teaching in kindergartens, schools, community music, music and art schools, higher music education and teacher education. She defended her thesis *Instrumental music educators' professional understanding* in 2012, and publishes nationally and internationally on music education, community music and music teacher education.