

## KAPITTEL 7

# Educating music teachers at the Norwegian Academy of Music: How did we arrive here?

Geir Johansen Norwegian Academy of Music

**Abstract:** The history of the Bachelor of Music in Music Education Programme at the Norwegian Academy of Music goes back to the establishment of the Academy in 1973. This article focuses on the fundament upon which it was built in terms of subject traditions and philosophical bases and aims to describe the lines along which it developed from there into its current shape in the 2020s. Of particular interest are the issues, debates and decisions about structural as well as curricular changes along the way, together with patterns occurring and reoccurring across these changes over the decades. These are seen in the light of how they have influenced the students' education, as reflected in notions of identity and knowledge. During the period that the article addresses, a gradual clarification of implicit priorities emerged together with a constant differentiation of the programme curricula and widening of its scope. The latter unfolded from initially concentrating on classical music together with a one-dimensional notion of music teacher identity, to including jazz, pop, rock and traditional folk music and a multifaceted music teacher identity, wherein an emerging interest in community music could also be identified. Nevertheless, hierarchies emerged between propositional, tacit and bodily knowledge, and the included music cultures, as well as in the positioning of the programme within the total programme portfolio of the institution. A need for further systematic information about the programme was identified, along with the importance of acknowledging a continuing debate.

**Keywords:** Music teacher education, identity, knowledge, programme structure, curriculum

Citation: Johansen, G. (2023). Educating music teachers at the Norwegian Academy of Music: How did we arrive here? In Ø. Varkøy, E. M. Stabell & B. Utne-Reitan (Eds.), *Høyere musikkutdanning: Historiske perspektiver* (Kap. 7, pp. 145–172). Cappelen Damm Akademisk. <https://doi.org/10.23865/noasp.199.ch7>  
License: CC-BY 4.0

## Introduction

At the Norwegian Academy of Music (NMH), a programme of music teacher education has been a part of the portfolio since 1973, when the Academy was established and included in the public system of higher education in Norway.<sup>1</sup> In the 2020s, the programme is organised as a four-year Bachelor of Music in Music Education (Norges musikkhøgskole [NMH], 2022), preparing the students for teaching music in primary, lower and upper secondary school, as well as the municipal culture schools. It qualifies them for instrumental and vocal (hereafter referred to simply as instrumental) teaching, along with professional roles such as conductors of wind bands, choirs and string orchestras, instructors in jazz, rock and pop music and community music leaders.

The comprehensiveness of this scope, including an emphasis on the students' performance level on their principal instrument, puts different notions of identity and knowledge at play. Establishing a programme of music teacher education is conceivable as an act of identity work itself, making a particular programme identity emerge as integrated with the general institutional identity of the Academy. Moreover, it offers an identity as a music teacher student to its applicants, together with a future identity as a professional music teacher. However, it is not self-evident that all the enrolled students adapt their self-images to such institutional identity expectations, regardless of their identity work outside and before they entered the institution. On the contrary, international studies of the formation of music teacher identity (Chua & Welch, 2021; Bouij, 2006; Johansen, 2010) indicate that there is a discursive identity (Gee, 2001) dynamic going on, in which students interpret the institutional expectations in harder or softer confrontations with their own identity formation. This can be seen in the light of the self as a reflexive project (Giddens, 1991, p. 75). It takes place in negotiations with oneself as well as with one's peers, subordinated to the more inclusive and fundamental aim of building and rebuilding a coherent and rewarding sense of a [professional] self along a trajectory from the past to the anticipated future (p. 75). As such, it presumes a narrative (p. 76) that must be worked at continuously. In discursive terms (Gee, 2001), this may include an interplay between identities discursively ascribed to a person by others, such as 'music educator', and a person's active attempts to achieve

---

1 After a decision adopted by the *Storting* (Norwegian parliament) in 1992, see <https://www.nb.no/items/0d0e8bb65cbdb5cf276e766a5288be69?page=387>.

an identity, such as ‘musician’, a well-known binary that has been repeatedly described internationally in studies of music teachers’ and student music teachers’ identity (Bernard, 2004; Bouij, 2006; Chua & Welch, 2021; Johansen, 2010; Jordhus-Lier, 2021; Roberts, 2004).

Similar to the dynamics of identity formation, throughout the history of the programme neither the students nor their teachers have subscribed to equal notions and hierarchies of knowledge across the different courses and visions of the future labour market. Keeping identity narratives going within a context where different notions of knowledge meet has actualised negotiations of meaning and meaningfulness, as well as of knowledge value hierarchies. From an Aristotelian perspective (Aristotle, 2011), the experience-based knowledge that dominates the conservatoire tradition’s instrumental teaching practice, as well as the craft dimensions of school music teaching (Johansen, 2021b), connect with the handcraft and artistic sides of *techne* as well as the practical wisdom of *phronesis*. Meeting the knowledge worlds of musicology and the theory of education with elements of *episteme* in terms of what we might call scientific knowledge has actualised these negotiations further. Partly overlapping with the Aristotelian categories, the different forms of knowledge that have met and become actualised within the identity-knowledge dynamics of the programme include Gilbert Ryle’s (1949) ‘knowing that’ and ‘knowing how’, together with Maurice Merleau-Ponty’s (1979) bodily knowledge and Michael Polanyi’s (1966) tacit dimensions of knowledge. For the students, these dynamics have included reciprocal processes by which music teacher competence has been constantly shaped and reshaped throughout the course of study.

Historically, perspectives of identity and knowledge also emerged as connected with the justification arguments and philosophical bases of music and music education that were put forward repeatedly throughout the 1800s, during several attempts to obtain government funding for a Norwegian music institute. Still recognisable in the late 1960s, they contributed significantly to the foundation of the programmes of school music and instrumental pedagogy when the new institution was established in 1973.

The subsequent development of the programme took place by linear as well as non-linear movements, the latter entailing debates and compromises between representatives of different subject traditions who took different stands about issues such as the new institution’s societal responsibility. Intertwined with issues of identity and knowledge, these debates included different views of the labour market and issues such as professions

and professionalism, all of them recurring throughout the subsequent decades in different shapes and forms.

## Purpose and main questions

The purpose of this article is to shed light on how the programme developed from the start in 1973 and throughout the subsequent period up to the 2020s. The main questions addressed include:

- What philosophies and subject traditions were present within the basis upon which the programme was established, and in what ways were they traceable in the further development of the programme?
- What were the main changes to the programme during its development from the 1970s to the 2020s, and what emerged as the prominent issues and debates in those connections?
- What notions of identity and knowledge were at play within the development processes of the programme as intertwined with these traditions, issues, and debates?

## Methodology

To illuminate the purpose and main questions, a case study design (Stake, 2008) was chosen wherein the methodological approaches included document studies, personal communications and narrative construction of my own experiences within the programme. Document studies (Bowen, 2009) included formal curricula and programme information texts.<sup>2</sup> Personal communications were carried out via conversations and email exchanges with a sample of participants who were selected using a purposeful typical instance sample strategy (Treacy, 2020, p. 84). A total of 13 participants were recruited, including former students, teachers and programme leaders, as well as academy principals and heads of academic affairs representing all the periods in focus from the 1970s to the 2020s. They agreed to participate on the condition that they would not be quoted or referred to in ways that might identify them. The document study assisted in establishing a framework for constructing a narrative account of my own experiences, which was carried out in accordance with the ideal of researchers

---

<sup>2</sup> *Studieorienteringer*

‘enrich[ing] the[ir] research by mobilizing their pre-understanding more actively and systematically’ (Alvesson & Sandberg, 2022, p. 396). This systematically mobilised pre-understanding included my various roles as former student, curriculum group participant, remote practicum supervisor and programme teacher, as well as textbook author and researcher. The analysis proceeded by critically reflecting on the documents, the researcher’s own experiences and the statements from the 13 participants together. Thereafter, the material arrived at was coded according to the priorities of the research questions and a historical timeline. Finally, critical points were double checked by re-contacting relevant participants.

## Tracing the roots

There were several traditions that emerged at the end of the 1960s as the basics or pillars upon which the new music pedagogy programmes of instrumental and school music teaching were built. By being included within a music conservatoire, the programmes were positioned within the European conservatoire tradition in terms of the legacy of the 1800s conservatoire model, such as that manifested in Leipzig and Paris, which in turn originated in Italy in the preceding decade (Sadie, 1980; Weber et al., 2001). The 1800s conservatoires primarily educated composers, performers and church organists, and full programmes for music teacher education were not a typical feature. In the Nordic countries, however, a particular branch of the tradition may be identified wherein programmes in music pedagogy were included in the Swedish conservatoires from the late 1800s<sup>3</sup> and in the other Nordic countries<sup>4</sup> from the first part of the following century. In Norway, a music teacher seminary was established at the Oslo Conservatoire of Music in 1911 (Lindemann & Solbu, 1976, p. 37), whereafter comprehensive courses qualifying students as music teachers were offered from 1935 (p. 65). After organising exams in church organ teaching, instrumental teaching, school music teaching, wind band instruction and musical kindergarten teaching in the period of 1959–69, a new curriculum draft was presented in 1969 that was formally adopted in 1970 (Musikkonservatoriet i Oslo, 1970). This included a three-year school music

---

3 The first music teacher graduation at the Royal Swedish Academy of Music took place as early as 1814 (Ahlbeck, 2020).

4 See, for example, Jørgensen (2022).

teacher programme and a one-year post graduate programme in instrumental teaching. After some debate, this curriculum structure was adopted as a part of the new institution when the conservatoire was converted into the NMH in 1973.

Educationally, these programmes were indebted to the traditions and discourses of instrumental pedagogy, as well as those of school music. The instrumental pedagogy tradition had long been maintained by organisations such as the Norwegian and Oslo Music Teachers' Associations.<sup>5</sup> These associations constituted sources of influence as well as channels of international impulses to the new programmes at the NMH because members of these associations were employed as teachers in the new institution. The Oslo Music Teachers' Association<sup>6</sup> had been active since 1905 and was mainly concentrated on instrumental (primarily piano) teaching, with exams that soon made it an informal approval body of professionalism in instrumental pedagogy. Moreover, in 1950, the Norwegian Music Teachers' Association established an exam in high-level piano teaching in close cooperation with the Oslo Conservatoire of Music. Consequently, a variety of principles and practices that were anchored in European traditions of instrumental teaching came to constitute significant parts of the basis of the new instrumental pedagogy programme. These included traditions such as, but not restricted to, those of the flute after Johan Joachim Quantz (1752/2001), piano after Carl Phillip Emanuel Bach (1787/1948), brass instruments after Jean-Baptiste Arban (1859) and vocal teaching in the tradition of Italian *Bel Canto* (Ricci, 1915). In the 1900s, influences from outside Europe were also brought into piano teaching and its debate in terms of principles, such as those of James Mursell in the USA (Løchen, 1992).

School music pedagogy had been practiced in primary schools in terms of song since the very first attempts at establishing a public school in Norway in the 1700s (Jørgensen, 1982). Here, international influences included Sarah Anna Glover and John Curwen in England (Rainbow, 1980) and Emile Jaques-Dalcroze in Switzerland in the 1800s, along with the influences of the systems of the Austrian Carl Orff and Hungarian Zoltan Kodaly in the 1900s (Choksy et al., 2001). In the late 1960s and beginning

<sup>5</sup> *Norsk musikk lærerforening* and *Oslo musikk lærerforening*

<sup>6</sup> *Oslo musikk lærerforening*, now *Musikkpedagogene Oslo* [the Oslo Music Teachers' Organization], <https://omlf.no/>

of the 1970s, influences from the creative music education movement in England (Paynter & Ashton, 1970) and Canada (Schafer, 1976) were added to this picture.

Other historical influences, affecting the institution as a whole and with consequences for the new music pedagogy programmes, originated in the widening of the scope and structure of the church music programmes by drawing on impulses from musicology, establishing the conservatoire 'model' of principal instrument, second instrument, harmony, music history and aural training. This model is still very much alive in the 2020s, as evident in the 2022 programme curriculum (NMH, 2022).

Together with the school music tradition, a fifth pillar of the programmes was the general education and classroom tradition conveying principles and issues such as those of the central European *Bildungsdidaktik* (Klafki, 2000), highlighting the reciprocal relationship between the subject matter, teacher and learner in a larger educational perspective. Together with this, the action-oriented, problem-solving and critical principles of the progressive education movement in the USA (Dewey, 1938) and the child-centred pedagogy of the Swede Ellen Key (1900), and her forerunners Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1762) and Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi (1951) played significant roles, in addition to Friedrich Schiller's (1795) works on the aesthetic upbringing of human beings.

A sixth pillar of the programmes emerged from the struggles for public funding of music institutions in Norway in the 1800s. Here the argumentation included the need to educate a qualified audience and improve the level of singing in church congregations, as well as to make the human benefits of music available to all human beings across the different social classes, clearly inspired by the ideal of education for all, 'even the poorest', as expressed by the *Bildung* philosopher Alexander von Humboldt (Klafki, 2000, p. 88). Also included was the power of music to have a formative effect on the human mind (Herresthal, 2005), not least in terms of religious and moral upbringing, and the importance of 'giving children and young people their first appreciative music experiences and joy of singing', as expressed by the Norwegian music educator Lars Roverud (1815, p. 16), who was inspired by Pestalozzi and the thesis by the Dane Børge Poscholan Kofod (1804), *The Influence of Music on Human Beings*. From the 1970s on, these principles were gradually brought to the fore in discussions about the identity of the music pedagogy programmes in terms of musical versus non-musical justification of music and music education. In addition, they

came to constitute tacit parts of the course curricula that were gradually made explicit throughout the following decades.

## The seventies

The programme structure that had been adopted from the Oslo Conservatoire in 1973 was kept when a new curriculum was introduced in 1975 (Musikkhøgskolen, 1975). Herein the most prominent new move was the clarification and description of the aims of the programmes. Most detailed for school music, these aims included educating music teachers who understood how music teaching connects with the larger contexts of school and society, as well as their students' preconditions and reactions, being able to adapt their teaching accordingly as well as in accordance with changing external priorities. Such external priorities were promoted by the 1974 general curriculum of primary and secondary education in Norway (Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet, 1974). Guiding all school subjects including music, priorities emerging from the roots of the programme, such as religious and moral upbringing, were given priority. Moreover, the ideal of attending to students' preconditions and reactions was mainly connected with progressive and child-centred pedagogy. In the programme, these priorities were traceable to a various degree between courses but were not made explicit in curricular terms.

Some of the procedures involved in implementing the 1975 curriculum (Musikkhøgskolen, 1975) almost went on without further ado, whilst others raised debates between stakeholders representing different subject traditions and philosophical standpoints on what a good school music or instrumental teacher should be. Discussions included what responsibility each of the different courses and their teachers should take for the holistic profile and identity of the programme. For example, should principal instrument teachers differentiate their teaching between music teacher students versus performance students, or should the teachers' fidelity to the subject tradition of their instrument have priority over these different programme profiles? In other words, it was a conflict between the teachers' professional identity narratives and their perceptions of the programmes' institutional identity, with extensions to the differences between 'knowing how' (Ryle, 1949) dimensions of playing an instrument versus 'knowing that' dimensions of seeing music teaching in a societal perspective.



The envisaged professional role of the graduates in the 1975 curriculum was one-dimensional, featuring one single track towards this role for all school music students, respectively those who studied instrumental pedagogy. This view required very few electives that might enable students to further specialise during the course of study. In addition, the idea prevailed that all students, including those enrolled in the music pedagogy programmes, needed to study the same literature and follow the same courses in, for example, music history, harmony and aural training. To a varying degree, this caused frustration among students who found some of the mandatory courses less relevant from the perspective of their envisaged identity as future music teachers (participant 1, 7, 8). In the pedagogy courses, a similar critique of curricular issues was raised against what, by some, was seen as an overweight of pedagogy for small children and beginners (participant 1, 5, 12). Later on, Bouij (2006) identified similar issues in his longitudinal study of Swedish music teacher students' role identity from 1988 onwards.

Issues of identity and knowledge also emerged in the wake of the piano pedagogue Eva Sandvik Stugu (Løchen, 1992, p. 21). After completing studies at Teachers College, Columbia University in New York, in the 1950s and 60s she had introduced the perspectives of James Mursell (Løchen, 1992; Mursell, 1946), propagating wholeness and meaningfulness as the basic principles of teaching piano. Together with this, she also spoke up for a balance between playing by ear and sheet music playing from the very start for the child beginner. This still met resistance in the 1970s from representatives of the more traditionally oriented theory and sheet music based piano pedagogy tradition.

In school music, the issue of holistic versus atomistic knowledge acquisition emerged through a discussion wherein 'from parts to the whole' approaches were opposed by priorities of holistic musical 'formula'. The latter was inspired by the Jaques-Dalcroze, Orff and Kodaly pedagogy traditions (Choksy et al., 2001), and introduced to the programme by the legendary Joar Rørmark,<sup>7</sup> who brought in the works of the Swede Daniel Helldén (Helldén et al., 1962) and the Dane Erling Bisgaard (1969), as well as the holistic approaches of the project-method-oriented composition

---

7 Head of the school music programme, as well as the later bachelor programme, until his retirement in 2000.

movement in England (Paynter & Ashton, 1970) and Canada (Schafer, 1976).

Two approaches to student learning emerge as implicit priorities in the 1970s programmes of music pedagogy, both traceable throughout the following decades and still valid in the 2020s, even if they were never manifest in curricular terms. One was the idea of teaching music as a reflective practice, an ideal in concert with Westbury's (2000, p. 17) distinction between a teacher with professional autonomy developing 'his or her own approaches to teaching' versus a teacher that was 'expected to implement a system's accounting procedures [...]'. This resonates with Philpott and Spruce's (2021, p. 295) ideal of music teacher agency and the 'agentic music teacher', entailing teachers who critically position themselves and their practices within a structure-agency dialectic between the discourses of education, music education and musicology (p. 288). Such priorities are traceable through the pedagogy courses' propagation of a critical, reflective position with emphasis on analysing and approaching each educational context and situation by drawing on a wide repertoire of teaching strategies and musical content. The 'hiddenness' (Margolis, 2001; Martin, 1994) of these priorities caused frustration among students who expected the teachers to pay more attention to normative, formal public-school music curricula, or single instrumental 'schools' such as the Suzuki (1968) model. Some students did not understand this critical reflective approach or its significance before they were close to graduation (participant 2, 3, 4, 9).

The other implicit approach to student learning entailed the notion of the student as a traveller on a learning trajectory between the various courses in the programme in terms of communities of practice (Wenger, 2006; Ferm Thorgersen & Johansen, 2012). These communities represented various perceptions and hierarchies of knowledge, from the tacit, bodily craft dimensions of music teaching (Johansen, 2021b) with traits of the Aristotelian *phronesis* and *techne* to the *episteme*-dominated courses of the theory of education, as well as music history and harmony. Moving along these trajectories, the student was made responsible for seeing how the various courses filled in each other in fostering a holistic music educator competence. This raised challenges for some of the students' identity work and knowledge acquisition. When literally moving from a pedagogy class to a principal instrument lesson, they had to choose between whether or not to adapt to an envisaged music teacher identity in the first context and,

respectively, a performer identity in the second in order to enhance their learning (Ferm Thorgersen & Johansen, 2012).

## The eighties

The new curriculum of 1982 was published in a separate volume for each programme, known as ‘the yellow books’ (Solbu, 1983, p. 67). This change of curriculum design enabled the complementary subjects<sup>8</sup> (NMH, 1982, p. 92) of harmony, music history and aural training to be more clearly adapted to the identity and educational profile of the programme than before, even if this priority had been sketched out already in the 1975 curriculum. This cross-subject, holistic view on the relationship between the complementary subjects and the programme was further enhanced by increased teacher collaboration and assessment meetings.

The 1982 curriculum also introduced a major, structural change by gathering together the school music and instrumental pedagogy programmes within a new, four-year ‘Candidate Programme in Music Education, (NMH, 1982, p. 8). This was organised in a 2+2-year structure, allotting two years to each study area. Within this new co-existence of school music and instrumental pedagogy, both traditions were maintained though not always without discussions about which had benefited most from their merging.

Whilst the courses in school music pedagogy were formally justified by the fact that music is a mandatory school subject, the courses in instrumental pedagogy had no such justification to fall back on. Still, they strongly influenced the students’ discursive (Gee, 2001) identity work and narratives (Giddens, 1991), not least with respect to their envisaged identities (Johansen, 2008) as future professionals.

The decision to include courses and traditions of instrumental pedagogy within a unified programme of music education, despite not having any formal justification, can be seen as a consequence of NMH’s self-definition of its responsibility (Johansen, 2021c) for the large labour market existing outside primary and secondary school teaching. This included the municipal culture schools, private instrumental tuition and a broad variety of amateur ensembles. Recognising and taking educational responsibility for this comprehensive field emerged as an almost obstinate (Biesta, 2019) institutional strategy in a situation where, for the authorities, apparently a

---

8 *Stottefag*

teacher was a schoolteacher and school music teaching the only conceivable music teacher vocation. Education needs to be obstinate, not for the sake of being difficult but to make sure that it can contribute to emancipation and democratisation, Biesta (2013) suggests, distinguishing between responsive and responsible ways of addressing the societal context of an educational institution. Whilst the school music courses represented the institution's responsive response, 'adapt[ing] itself to the demands of the [...] society' (p. 733), in contrast maintaining and nurturing the instrumental pedagogy courses appeared to be a responsible response, highlighting education's duty to resist (Biesta, 2013). This resistance lasted through the following decades until, together with the actions of other forces such as the 'targeted efforts towards politicians and the education bureaucracy' (Norsk kulturskoleråd, 2016) by the then Norwegian Council for Schools of Music, it resulted in the inclusion of municipal music schools in the Norwegian Education Act.

Another fundamental change with vast consequences for differentiation within the programme, as well for the whole NMH on a somewhat longer term, was the decision of opening up for applicants who played jazz, rock and pop. This decision was made in 1984<sup>9</sup> and manifested as part of the subsequent curriculum revision of 1993. The teachers who were engaged were primarily jazz musicians, a move that allowed jazz to take a dominant position within this expansion of the music-cultural scope. Still, as Weisethaunet (2021, p. 39) suggests, it may appear that jazz became a kind of catalyst contributing to increased equality between different genres in general. Hence, a first sign of development emerged towards what was to become a later, multicultural profile for the programme.

This widening of the music-cultural scope did not occur without debate. One issue revolved around whether it was necessary for NMH to take this responsibility at all or if it should be left to other institutions (Tønsberg, 2013). Other issues were easily recognisable throughout the other Norwegian conservatoires as well, when they, in the years that followed, expanded their scope and programme portfolio likewise. These concerns included a fear of downsizing the classical programmes, the dubious consequences of breaking with the conservatoire tradition, pedagogical

---

9 Initially described in *studieorienteringen* (the programme information) for 1984-85 and limited to applicants with saxophone, guitar, bass, song, piano, trumpet, trombone or percussion as their principal instrument.

challenges in connection with the question of whether jazz, rock and pop music were suited to systematic, academic treatment at all, and doubts about recruiting qualified teachers (p. 69).

This opening for a more comprehensive variety of principal instruments also required new pedagogy courses, such as jazz-saxophone pedagogy and el-guitar pedagogy. This raised an identity and knowledge-related debate about the possible basic aspects of instrumental technique across, for example, classical versus jazz vocal training. In school music pedagogy, however, being not equally strongly connected with the students' principal instruments, a move towards adding jazz, rock and pop (Swanwick, 1968; Ruud, 1981) to the existing priorities and repertoires emerged gradually and with less friction. Within the complementary courses, adjustments were made to aural training and harmony, however, not explicitly to music history. Here, a first sign of expansion beyond classical music did not emerge until 1997 (NMH, 1997).<sup>10</sup>

As cultural newcomers, the jazz, rock and pop students faced challenging identity work, wherein their ascribed as well as achieved identities (Gee, 2001) were put into play as parts of keeping their identity narratives going (Giddens, 1991). In addition, their position within the discursively regulated, 'hidden' (Johansen, 2021a) hierarchy of the programme was put into play. In Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger's (1991) words, they were legitimate peripheral participants but had a long way to go before being accepted as full members.

Being the first programme within the NMH to include jazz, rock and pop, it also constituted the only trajectory at that time through higher music education for jazz, rock and pop students who did not see themselves as future music educators but aimed at careers as performers. This increased complexity of envisaged, professional identities caused challenges of relevance and motivation that were not resolved until the performance programmes widened their music-cultural scope correspondingly, which happened gradually throughout the 1990s. Similar to the findings on music teacher students' identity mobility in Sweden (Bouij, 2006), some of the students who had initially aimed at performance chose to remain in the pedagogy programme when given the opportunity to transfer to the performance programme later on.

---

10 See Gjertrud Pedersen's article (Chapter 4) in this volume.

In addition to expanding the music-cultural scope of the programme, another move towards further differentiation included an increase in the number and range of electives in the 1982 curriculum. However, despite this increased variation, the envisaged labour market was still the traditional one, with the public and culture schools as the main categories along with traditional ensembles such as choirs, wind bands and string orchestras.

## The nineties

The 1993 curriculum clarified the consequences of including jazz, rock and pop within the programme by establishing new courses in jazz-rock-pop ensemble and instrumental pedagogy, as well as aural training and harmony in parallel with the existing equivalents in classical music.

However, the main change of the 1990s was the merging of NMH with the East Norwegian District Conservatoire of Music (ØMK) in 1996. This brought the instrumental pedagogy versus school music issue back into the debate with a new strength. ØMK had educated instrumental and school music teachers in two separate undergraduate programmes. An initial suggestion to simply integrate these two programmes within the combined 2 + 2-year NMH programme was not well-received among the ØMK instrumental pedagogy teachers. They believed they had been promised a continuation of the separate instrumental pedagogy programme in the new expanded institution. Included in their opposition was concern about putting at stake the visibility of the professional instrumental teacher role and identity together with the unique kinds of knowledge attached to the professional competence of instrumental pedagogy. Moreover, they feared that merging the programmes into one would reduce the quality of the teaching of instrumental pedagogy as well as the educational outcomes for the students, including the professional identity with which the latter would enter the labour market. The debate resulted in retaining a separate programme of instrumental pedagogy manifested in a specific, formal curriculum (NMH, 1997) parallel to the candidate programme in music education. This separation lasted until both programmes were finally integrated within the framework of the 2 + 2 structure in 2002. The last students graduated from the separate instrumental pedagogy programme in 2005.

The conflicts and discussions concerning the ØMK and NMH programmes also fuelled a debate about the practicum. Different opinions were asserted about whether the students' practical vocational training

would be best taken care of by a 'practice school'<sup>11</sup> within the institution or within municipal music schools that constituted the 'real' labour market. This issue was further actualised when municipal music and culture schools obtained formal status in 1997 by an amendment to the Norwegian Education Act,<sup>12</sup> which stated that every municipality, alone or in collaboration with another, was to provide a municipal, extra-curricular music and culture school for children and adolescents. ØMK had developed a well-functioning practice school, where children and adolescents came to the conservatoire and were taught by students who were supervised by conservatoire teachers. From the NMH side, the problematic aspects of this arrangement were raised, including that it did not introduce students to real labour market contexts and that it might constitute competition with the local municipal music and culture school. Countering this point of view, ØMK representatives held that one could not expect the same level of supervision competence from teachers at the music and culture schools as the academy's instrumental pedagogy teachers unless resources were allocated to time-consuming supervisor training of the former. Another argument in favour of a practice school within the Academy was the possibility of selecting practice students at different levels who the academy students could work with on a weekly basis over a long period. The debate was accompanied by simultaneous attempts to combine different outside and inside practicum models throughout the 1990s before a final, expanded remote model was adopted at the beginning of the 2000s.

In the 1993 curriculum, a shift of rhetoric exchanged the terms 'teaching methods' and 'methodology' with *Didaktik*. This represented a widening of educational perspectives and more conscious attention than in the 1970s to the ideal of teaching as a reflective practice and the music teacher's professional autonomy, as embedded in the Central European *Didaktik* and *Lehrplan* theory (Jank & Meyer, 2003; Westbury et al., 2000). Within music pedagogy courses, this change of conceptualisation led to increased attention towards the reciprocal relationship between the method category and the categories of aims, repertoire content, frame factors, student pre-conditions and assessment, along with the role of this reciprocity as a basis for systematic planning strategies.

---

11 *Øvingsskole*

12 Section 13-6 of *Opplæringsloven* [the Norwegian Education Act].

Supporting this autonomous and agentic (Philpott & Spruce, 2021) music teacher role, the 1993 curriculum introduced a new course in the general philosophy of music education.<sup>13</sup> Here, the notion of the benefits of music for human beings that had emerged already in the 1800s and was maintained throughout the 1970s and 80s as an ‘embraceable’ hidden curriculum (Martin, 1994), was explicitly addressed. This enabled deliberate discussions about the basics and entailments of arguments propagating those benefits, including a critical view of their sometimes romantic overtones. Thereby, new dimensions were added to the ideal of the graduates as music educators rather than mere teachers. This was supported by the first in a series of textbooks for the undergraduate level written by one of the programme’s teachers, Øivind Varkøy’s (1993) *Why Music?* This was followed later in the 1990s by Ingrid Maria Hanken’s and Geir Johansen’s (1998) book *The Didaktik of Music Teaching*.<sup>14</sup> These volumes brought the students into contact with basic aesthetic theory as well as contemporary debates on the international scene. Among these were the debate between Bennett Reimer (1970) and David Elliott (1998) about an aesthetic versus praxialist notion of music education, as well as music as practice as part of Christopher Small’s (1998) concept *musicking*. From the Norwegian scene, Jon-Roar Bjørkvold’s *The Muse Within*<sup>15</sup> (1992) was introduced, which criticised school music for disregarding children’s own music culture and natural musicianship, as well as for supporting an ideal of perfectionism, an issue that was further fuelled by the new national curriculum of school music in 1997, which stated that ‘togetherness and interaction is as important as quality and mastery’ (Kirke-, utdannings- og forskningsdepartementet, 1997, p. 236).<sup>16</sup>

The notion and ideal of music teaching as a reflective practice were also supported by publications and textbooks on the instrumental pedagogy side, such as Synnøve Løchen’s (1992) *Music Teaching, an Art in Itself*, enabling a more well-informed, reflective discussion than before in piano pedagogy classes about the principles of meaningful, holistic teaching. In addition, Olaug Fostås (2002) concluded her work throughout the 1990s by presenting a comprehensive, analytical approach to instrumental pedagogy in general in her book *Instrumental Teaching*. The first empirical study

13 *Musikkpedagogisk grunnlagstenkning*

14 *Musikkundervisningens didaktikk*

15 Original edition in Norwegian: *Det musiske menneske* (1989), published by Freidig forlag.

16 «[...] samvær og samhandling er like viktige som kvalitet og meistring».



of piano pedagogy at the NMH was carried out by Bjørg J. Bjøntegaard (1999, p. 113), which exposed discrepancies between the teachers' reported weight on different focus areas and the students' experiences of the same among nine teachers of piano pedagogy and 474 students who participated in their classes throughout the 1990s. The largest discrepancies included the attention given to motivation, creativity, group teaching and teaching repertoire for middle and higher-grade students. Similar information about the pedagogy courses for other instruments is still lacking in the 2020s.

## The new millennium

The new millennium presented itself with the increasing social and cultural differentiation that had been described by several scholars towards the end of the preceding decade (Bauman, 2000; Beck et al., 1994; Luhmann, 1984). In the programme, a corresponding differentiation took place through an increased number and variation of courses. Thereby more individualised student trajectories towards a broader scope of envisaged professional identities were enabled.

Paradoxically, the increased social-cultural differentiation took place together with a political narrowing of educational perspectives in which NMH had to navigate. After the implementation of the Bologna system<sup>17</sup> and the Quality Reform (St.meld. nr. 27 (2000–2001)), this manifested itself in evidence-based and target-means priorities. Within the sociology of higher education, the included processes were described in terms of the marketisation of universities (Naidoo, 2005),<sup>18</sup> leading to the 'commodification' of academic practices (p. 28) and changing the shape and form of academic programmes (p. 33). The consequences for higher music education were discussed by voices addressing issues such as the rhetoric of standardisation (Schmidt, 2011), conceptualisations of educational quality (Johansen, 2012) and the neoliberal sides of the emerging entrepreneurship courses (Sadler, 2021).

Within the programme, the contradictory traits of social-cultural differentiation and increased authority control met in the re-structuring of the curriculum and the shift in rhetoric according to standardised templates

---

<sup>17</sup> <http://www.ehea.info/>

<sup>18</sup> Others connected it with educational neoliberalism, new conservatism, and managerialism, as well as the challenges of educational globalisation (Apple, 2007; Smith, 2003).

on one side and, on the other, leaders and teachers of the programme that carried out their agency (Philpott & Spruce, 2021) by deciding what innovations the programme needed to be relevant in the future on the basis of defining their space for action. In 2002, improvisation was included in the performance syllabuses together with ‘interpretation and accompaniment’,<sup>19</sup> as well as ‘complementary instruments.’<sup>20</sup> In 2008, a course in ‘genre knowledge’<sup>21</sup> was added and, in 2013, a structural differentiation was made between classical, jazz-rock-pop and traditional folk music principal instruments. In 2016, ‘stage awareness’<sup>22</sup> and ‘work physiology’<sup>23</sup> were added, and in 2022 these topics were gathered in a new course called ‘musicians’ health, motivation and practise.’<sup>24</sup>

Within the rhetoric domain, ‘music education’ partly replaced ‘music teaching’ in 2010, an adjustment that foreshadowed a rhetorical shift in 2018 when the heading ‘pedagogical courses’ was changed to ‘music education courses’ (NMH, 2018). Together with clarifying music education as an overarching category, the change from ‘teaching’ to ‘education’ underlined the wider perspectives of the programme as reaching beyond mere questions of teaching and learning.

Among the complementary courses, a course in ‘music aesthetics and philosophy’ was added in 2002, together with one in ‘music technology’. Courses in ‘minority cultures and ethnic music understanding’,<sup>25</sup> ‘dance and drama’, and ‘music facilitation’<sup>26</sup> were also added, and in 2010 a course in ‘applied harmony’<sup>27</sup> was included, complementing the existing harmony course. In 2022, the collection of complementary courses was further adjusted, expanded and renewed by including ‘digital competence for musicians’, ‘digital competence for music educators’, ‘extended musician competence’,<sup>28</sup> ‘musical knowledge’,<sup>29</sup> and ‘industry, profession and identity’.

The new course in ‘industry, profession, and identity’ attracted particular critical attention. In line with international tendencies (Bartleet et al., 2019), it was included to prepare students for a more complex labour

---

19 *Innstudering og akkompagnement*

20 *Støtteinstrumenter*

21 *Sjangerkunnskap*

22 *Scenisk bevissthet*

23 *Arbeidsfysiologi*

24 *Musikerhelse, motivasjon og øving*

25 *Minoritetskulturer/etnisk musikkorientering*

26 *Musikkformidling*

27 *Anvendt satslære*

28 *Utvidet musikerkompetanse*

29 *Musikkforståelse*

market than earlier. The emphasis was on being one's own employer, partly propagating entrepreneurial ideals. In relation to these priorities, critical questions were raised, such as whether business-like priorities might confront the artistic aspects of a professional musician or music educator identity. On the societal level, Sadler (2021, p. 137) asked if '[e]ntrepreneurship develops a programme of reproduction of neoliberal ideals in the arts while also reproducing the systemic inequalities of neoliberal capitalism'.

Structural changes also included the introduction of a general, compulsory curriculum for all teacher education in Norway. In the music education programme, the pedagogical part was made an appendix<sup>30</sup> to the curriculum in 2022. After having left the idea of integrating the pedagogical subjects and courses within the entire four-year course of study in 2008, this move finally outmanoeuvred the idea that the students would profit from the mutual maturation of musical and pedagogical insights that had been prominent since 1973.

Teachers and leaders of the programme held various opinions about these arrangements. Some suggested that ideals such as those of the versatile, professional performing music educator were fully attainable regardless of the new, mandatory frameworks and structures. Others maintained that in sum, these changes represented a turn away from a holistic way of thinking about education towards a philosophy favouring a more atomistic curriculum design, which they opposed.

Across these opinions, adapting to the authority guidelines represented a break with the Nordic and Central European *Didaktik* and *Lehrplan* tradition that accompanied the change of rhetoric from 'method' to '*Didaktik*' in the 1993 curriculum, to the benefit of a more fragmented, Anglo-Saxon curriculum tradition (Westbury et al., 2000, p. 7). The rationale for these changes included the Bologna system's ideal of a cross-national qualifications framework that might enhance student mobility.

On the differentiation side of this structure and agency situation, from the beginning of the 2000s we saw a further music-cultural differentiation in the programme in terms of an expansion from the 1990s inclusion of jazz-rock-pop principal instruments to the inclusion of traditional Norwegian folk music that was manifested in the 2013 curriculum. In addition, a complementary course in 'minority cultures and ethnic music knowledge' was added in 2010 (NMH, 2010). This move towards a multicultural profile went

---

30 Vedlegg om musikkpedagogiske emner i Kandidatstudiet i musikkpedagogikk

hand-in-hand with widening the notion of the labour market, by adding a community music perspective (Brøske, 2017). Together, these developments concurred with an increasing, international orientation as well as new arrangements for the practicum.

These new arrangements for the practicum included some project-based parts where students and supervisors travelled together to a location outside the NMH where they stayed for a period, carrying out educational as well as performance tasks. Thereby the students were afforded embodied experiences of the reciprocal relationship between the performance and pedagogy sides of their future profession. Locations included local communities in Norway as well as abroad, a geographical and cultural variety that added new dimensions to the practicum.

Among the international project-based practicum projects, the largest took place in the Palestine refugee camp Rashidieh in the city of Tyr in southern Lebanon (Storsve & Brøske, 2020). Here, the first student group took part in 2005, whereafter the project has been offered on a regular, annual basis as far as the political situation in the Middle East has allowed. However, the decision about making the project a part of the practicum was not made without a debate about political connotations, questioning if it was possible at all to carry it out without influencing the students to take a stand in favour of one of the sides of the Israel-Palestine conflict. The conclusion was to continue and for the students, the connections between music education and its societal consequences were clarified to a new extent. Subsequently, practicum projects abroad have come to include locations in Georgia in 2017 and India in 2018-2021, as well as South-Africa from 2022 on.

## Final considerations

The development of the Bachelor of Music in Music Education Programme has been characterised by a reciprocal interplay between some basic philosophies and subject traditions, as well as the impact of issues emerging in the surrounding contemporary culture and society. Intertwined with notions of identity and knowledge, this interplay of tradition and innovation has affected changes in the curricular as well as the structural dimensions of the programme.

Among the basics, or pillars, of the programme, the philosophical notions of the human benefits of music that emerged in the debate in

Norway in the 1800s were maintained in terms of a positive, 'embraceable' (Martin, 1994) hidden curriculum throughout its first decades, whereafter they were explicitly manifested as a curricular priority in 1993. In addition, together with the Nordic branch of the conservatoire tradition as a second pillar, the other pillars that included the subject traditions of instrumental pedagogy and school music pedagogy were traceable in various shapes over the years through structural moves between separate and integrated programme designs.

The main changes to the programme and the issues causing as well as caused by them included the move from a solely classical music-cultural orientation to including jazz, rock, pop and traditional folk music, and further towards a multicultural scope. Furthermore, changes in the practicum took place by way of a debate about organising it inside or outside the academy and later debate about the political implications of practicum projects abroad. A shift of rhetoric from 'teaching methods' and 'methodology' to '*Didaktik*', and expanding 'music teaching' to 'music education', widened the educational scope of the programme and prompted discussions about the later turn away from an ideal of a holistic to an atomistic programme structure.

Intertwined in these development processes, dimensions of identity and knowledge were at play. They included the institutional self-identity and identity narrative of the NMH and the programme, together with the identity expectations they raised towards the students. This created challenges in the identity narrative work of the students, including their discursively achieved and ascribed identities as music and music teacher students, as well as their envisaged identities as future music educators. Identity processes also affected the students' learning within and between the various courses of the programme. Thereby continuous processes of maintaining and revising knowledge hierarchies across the Aristotelian *episteme-technephronesis* spectrum were actualised by these identity narrative dynamics.

When looking closer at how these traditions, debates and changes emerged throughout the development of the programme from the 1970s to the 2020s, two ideals of student learning emerged. The first entailed the conception of the student as a traveller on a learning trajectory between the various courses. The other included the ideal of teaching music as a reflective practice in terms of a competence achieved by the travelling, as extended to the notion of music teacher agency and an 'agentic music teacher' (Philpott & Spruce, 2021).

In addition, several hidden hierarchies emerged, all in flux rather than fixed. They included a value hierarchy between different kinds of knowledge, with the Aristotelian *episteme* and Ryle's (1949) 'knowing that' on top and *techne*, *phronesis* and 'knowing how' at lower levels, together with tacit and bodily knowledge. Moreover, music-cultural status hierarchies emerged with classical music at the top and jazz, rock, pop and traditional folk music at lower levels, with connections to a hierarchy between the students due to their corresponding principal instruments. Similar to the findings of Dyndahl et al. (2017), indications of value hierarchy processes taking place between the various musics of the jazz-rock-pop field also emerged. Finally, a hierarchy could be described between the different programmes of the institution, where the programme in music education was positioned close to the bottom. A tendency, however, was that the borders between the hierarchical levels became less sharp and the distance from top to bottom of each hierarchy decreased throughout the period that was studied.

Moreover, some traits of differentiation and adaptation emerged within the development processes. Music-cultural differentiation took place from the initial concentration on classical music via the inclusion of jazz-rock-pop and traditional folk music towards a comprehensive, multicultural scope. Woven together with this was the structural differentiation from an initial unified track towards graduation to a multitude of options for individual competence specialisations, assisted by a gradually increasing number and selection of mandatory as well as elective courses. A tendency towards increased adaptation emerged through the gradual move away from the academic freedom of programme shaping and curriculum construction in the first decades of the programme towards complying with mandatory adjustments and changes in accordance with authority-defined structures and rhetoric after the turn of the century.

In its shape in the 2020s, the programme is characterised by a balance between contemporary priorities and issues that have continued throughout its whole history, both at play within continuous negotiations of identity and knowledge. The reciprocity of these factors suggests that the further development of the programme will be dependent on the continuous consideration of their interplay in order to fuel the dynamics, as well as creating the momentum needed to keep the programme relevant in the decades to come. Still, judging from the debates that became central as parts of the programme's development, the need for a debate culture can be

identified in which the necessity of debate is recognised and the opponent is welcomed as '[...] not an enemy to be destroyed but an adversary whose existence is legitimate' (Mouffe, n.d; Varkøy & Dyndahl, 2022).

In the further development of the programme, paying attention to other balances may also be helpful. One applies to the individual student and the balance between a clearer priority of her or his need for an individualised trajectory throughout the course of study and, on the other side, an awareness of the relationship between music, music education, society and culture as connected with the professional identity and collective responsibility of the music educator profession within the society of tomorrow. Another balance concerns the programme, on the one side striving to fulfil its part of the authority-given societal assignment of the NMH and, on the other side, needing to systematically inspect its actual social function and thereby arrive at a self-defined notion of its societal responsibility (Johansen, 2021c). Understanding and acting upon this responsibility presupposes that the programme defines its agency and space for action when seeking to educate not only music teachers and pedagogues but rather music educators with a many-sided professional identity, an ideal gathered within the scope of 'civic professionalism' (Laes et al., 2021). This designates music educators who are striving 'towards reconnecting high-quality music [teaching] practices with the support and strengthening of the democratization of society' (p. 16). Realising that this can be done without neglecting responsibility for their subject, it includes perceiving the inherent value of the music experience (Varkøy, 2015) and the non-musical outcomes (Mark, 2002) of their work as two sides of the same coin, and the competence to make those two sides mutually strengthen each other.

Attempting to describe the historical development of the programme reveals a need for knowing more about it, including the students' educational processes and outcomes. Systematic alumni studies might be helpful in this respect. In addition, an overview of the existing knowledge about the programme<sup>31</sup> might inform the identification of areas in need of further scholarly attention.

---

31 Such as Bjøntegaard (1999), Bröske Danielsen & Johansen (2012), Ferm & Johansen (2008), Ferm Thorgersen & Johansen (2012), Ferm Thorgersen et al. (2015), and Gravem Johansen (2017).

## References

- Ahlbeck, B. (2000). *Musikutbildning och examination vid Kungl. Musikaliska akademien under "Pehr Frigel-epoken" 1796–1842* [Music education and examination at the Royal Swedish academy of music during the 'Pehr Frigel-era' 1796–1842]. Kungl. Musikaliska akademien.
- Alvesson, M., & Sandberg, J. (2022). Pre-understanding: An interpretation-enhancer and horizon-expander in research. *Organization Studies*, 43(3), 395–412.
- Apple, M. (2007). Whose markets, whose knowledge? In A. Sadovnik (Ed.), *Sociology of education: A critical reader* (pp. 177–193). Routledge.
- Arban, J.-B. (1859). *La grande méthode complète de cornet à piston et de saxhorn* [Complete method for cornet and saxhorn]. Léon Escudier.
- Aristotle. (2011). *The Nicomachean ethics*. University of Chicago Press.
- Bach, C. P. E. (1948). *Essay on the true art of playing keyboard instruments*. Norton. (Original work published 1787).
- Bartleet, B. L., Ballico, C., Bennett, D., Bridgstock, R., Draper, P., Tomlinson, V., & Harrison, S. (2019). Building sustainable portfolio careers in music: Insights and implications for higher education. *Music Education Research*, 21(3), 282–294.
- Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid modernity*. Polity Press.
- Beck, U., Giddens, A., & Lash, S. (1994). *Reflexive modernization: Politics, tradition and aesthetics in the modern social order*. Polity Press.
- Bernard, R. (2004). *Striking a chord: Elementary general music teachers' expressions of their identities as musician-teachers* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Harvard Graduate School of Education.
- Biesta, J. J. G. (2013). Responsive or responsible? Democratic education for the global networked society. *Policy Futures in Education*, 11(6), 733–744.
- Biesta, J. J. G. (2019). *Obstinate education: Reconnecting school and society*. Brill.
- Bisgaard, E. (1969). *Musikbogen I: Nye og gamle danske børnesange i lette spillesatser med metodiske anvisninger* [Musikbogen I: New and old Danish children's songs in easy-to-play arrangements with methodical instructions]. Wilhelm Hansen.
- Bjøntegaard, B. J. (1999). *Klaverutdanning og klaverundervisning: Fra utdanning til jobb i den kommunale musikkskolen* [Piano education and piano teaching. From graduating to working in the municipal culture school]. Norges musikkhøgskole.
- Bjørkvold, J.-R. (1992). *The muse within: Creativity and communication, song and play from childhood through maturity*. HarperCollins Publishers.
- Bouij, C. (2006). Music teacher identity meets working life: Results from a longitudinal project about Swedish music teachers. In B. Stålhammar (Ed.), *Music and human beings – Music and identity* (pp. 109–122). University of Örebro.
- Bowen, G. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40.
- Brøske, B. Å. (2017). The Norwegian Academy of Music and the Lebanon Project: The challenges of establishing a community music project when working with Palestinian refugees in South Lebanon. *International Journal of Community Music*, 10(1), 71–83.
- Brøske Danielsen, B. Å., & Johansen, G. (Eds.) (2012). *Educating music teachers in the new millennium: Multiculturalism, professionalism and music teacher education in the contemporary society: A report from a research and development project*. Norges musikkhøgskole.
- Choksy, L., Abrahamson, R., Gillespie, A. E., Woods, D., & York, F. (2001). *Teaching music in the twenty-first century* (2nd ed.). Prentice Hall.
- Chua, S. L., & Welch, G. (2021). A lifelong perspective for growing music teacher identity. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 43(3), 329–346.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. Delta Pi.



- Dyndahl, P., Karlsen, S., Graabræk Nielsen, S., & Skårberg, O. (2017). The academisation of popular music in higher music education: The case of Norway. *Music Education Research*, 19(4), 438–454.
- Elliott, D. (1998). *Music matters: A new philosophy of music education*. Oxford University Press.
- Ferm, C., & Johansen, G. (2008). Professors' and trainees' perceptions of educational quality as related to preconditions of deep learning in *Musikdidaktik*. *British Journal of Music Education*, 25(2), 177–191.
- Ferm Thorgersen, C., & Johansen, G. (2012). Student music teachers' learning trajectories – A relational perspective. In B. Å. Bröske Danielsen & G. Johansen (Eds.), *Educating music teachers in the new millennium: Multiculturalism, professionalism, and music teacher education in the contemporary society: A report from a research and development project* (pp. 187–206). Norges musikkhøgskole.
- Ferm Thorgersen, C., Johansen, G., & Juntunen M. L. (2015). Music teacher educators' visions of music teacher preparation in Finland, Norway and Sweden. *International Journal of Music Education*, 34(1), 49–63.
- Fostås, O. (2002). *Instrumentalundervisning* [Instrumental teaching]. Scandinavian University Press.
- Gee, J. P. (2001). Identity as an analytic lens for research in education. *Review of Research in Education*, 25, 99–125.
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity*. Stanford University Press.
- Gravem Johansen, G. (2017). Genres, values, and music pedagogy students' identity formation as music teachers *in spe*. In S. G. Nielsen & Ø. Varkøy (Eds.), *Educational research in music – Perspectives from Didaktik, sociology and philosophy: Festschrift to Geir Johansen* (pp. 127–139). Norges musikkhøgskole.
- Hanken, I. M. & Johansen, G. (1998). *Musikkundervisningens didaktikk* [The Didaktik of music teaching]. Cappelen Akademisk.
- Helldén, D., Fredborg, K., & Asmussen, H. (1962). *Musikkmetodikk for barneskolen* [Music method for the primary school]. Musikkhuset.
- Herresthal, H. (2005). Glimt fra musikkutdanningen i 1800-tallets Christiania [Glimpses of the music education in Christiania in the 1800s]. In A. Braaten, R. Frorud, H. Glattre, N. Grinde, A. Haavardsholm & R. Vatn (Eds.), "Jeg kunne det da jeg gikk hjemmefra": Oslo Musikk lærerforening gjennom hundre år 1905–2005 (p. 14–45). Norsk Musikforlag.
- Jank, W., & Meyer, G. (2003). *Didaktische Modelle* [Didaktik models]. Cornelsen Scriptor.
- Johansen, G. (2008). Relations between educational quality in music teacher education and students' perceptions of identity. In F. V. Nielsen, S. G. Nielsen & S. E. Holgersen (Eds.), *Nordic Research in Music Education: Yearbook 10* (pp. 53–72). Norges musikkhøgskole.
- Johansen, G. (2010). Student music teachers' deep and surface learning and its relations to identity – Between the academy and the pre-service music teacher training field. In S. E. Holgersen & F. V. Nielsen (Eds.), *RAIME – Research Alliance of Institutes for Music Education, Proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium* (pp. 149–156). DPU.
- Johansen, G. (2012). Why should music teacher educators pay attention to the global crises of economy and climate? In B. Å. Bröske Danielsen & G. Johansen (Eds.), *Educating music teachers in the new millennium: Multiculturalism, professionalism and music teacher education in the contemporary society: A report from a research and development project* (pp. 219–232). Norges musikkhøgskole.
- Johansen, G. (2021a). The hidden curriculum of higher music education. In R. Wright, G. Johansen, P. Kanellopoulos & P. Schmidt (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook to sociology of music education* (pp. 300–311). Routledge.
- Johansen, G. (2021b). The craft of music teaching in a changing society. In K. Holdhus, R. Murphy & M. Espeland (Eds.), *Music education as craft* (pp. 27–38). Springer.
- Johansen, G. (2021c). The conservatoire and the society. In S. Karlsen & S. G. Nielsen (Eds.), *Verden inn i musikkutdanningene: Utfordringer, ansvar og muligheter* [Higher music

- education and the surrounding world. Challenges, responsibilities and possibilities] (pp. 139–154). Norges musikkhøgskole.
- Jordhus-Lier, A. (2021). Using discourse analysis to understand professional music teacher identity. *Nordic Research in Music Education*, 2(1), 187–192.
- Jørgensen, C. (2022). *AM-uddannelsens fødsel – og hvad der gik forud* [The birth of music pedagogy education and its prehistory]. Det Jydske Musikkonservatorium – Royal Academy of Music.
- Jørgensen, H. (1982). *Sang og musikk: Et fags utvikling i grunnskolen fra 1945 til 1980* [Song and music: The development of a school subject from 1945 to 1980]. Aschehoug.
- Key, E. (1900). *Barnets århundre* [The century of the child]. Bonnier.
- Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet. (1974). *Mønsterplan for grunnskolen 1974* [National curriculum of primary and lower secondary school 1974].
- Kirke-, utdannings- og forskningsdepartementet. (1997). *Læreplanverket for den 10-årige grunnskolen 1997* [Curriculum of the 10-year primary and secondary education 1997].
- Klafki, W. (2000). The significance of classical theories of *Bildung* for a contemporary concept of *Allgemeinbildung*. In I. Westbury, S. Hopmann & K. Riquarts (Eds.), *Teaching as a reflective practice: The German Didaktik tradition* (pp. 197–205). Erlbaum.
- Kofod, B. P. (1804). *Musikens Indflydelse på Menneket: Bidrag til et filosofisk-historisk Forsøg* [The influence of music on human beings: A contribution to a philosophical-historical experiment]. Gyldendalske Boghandlings Forlag.
- Laes, T., Westerlund, H., Saether, E., & Kamensky, H. (2021). Practicing civic professionalism through inter-professional collaboration: Reconnecting quality with equality in the Nordic music school system. In H. Westerlund & H. Gaunt (Eds.), *Expanding professionalism in music and higher music education – A changing game* (pp. 16–29). Routledge.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lindeman, T., & Solbu, E. (1976). *Musik-Konservatoriet i Oslo 1883–1973* [The Oslo Conservatoire of Music 1883–1973]. Tanum-Norli.
- Luhmann, N. (1984). *Soziale Systeme* [Social systems]. Suhrkamp.
- Løchen, S. (1992). *Musikkundervisning – en kunst i seg selv: Instrumentalmetodikk med vekt på klaver* [Music teaching – An art in itself: Instrumental method with emphasis on the piano]. Arabesk.
- Margolis, E. (Ed.). (2001). *The hidden curriculum in higher education*. Routledge.
- Mark, M. L. (2002). Nonmusical outcomes of music education: Historical considerations. In R. Cowell & C. Richardson (Eds.), *The new handbook of research on music teaching and learning* (pp. 1045–1052). Oxford University Press.
- Martin, J. R. (1994). What should we do with a hidden curriculum when we find one? In J. R. Martin, *Changing the educational landscape: Philosophy, women, and curriculum* (pp. 154–169). Routledge.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1979). *Phenomenology of perception*. Routledge.
- Mouffe, C. (n.d.). Agonistic democracy and radical politics. *Pavilion: Journal for Politics and Culture*. <https://www.pavilionmagazine.org/chantal-mouffe-agonistic-democracy-and-radical-politics/>
- Mursell, J. L. (1946). *Successful teaching*. McGraw Hill.
- Musikkhøgskolen. (1975). *Studieplan* [Curriculum].
- Musikkonservatoriet i Oslo. (1970). *Studieplan* [Curriculum].
- Naidoo, R. (2005). Universities in the marketplace: The distortion of teaching and research. In R. Barnett (Ed.), *Reshaping the university: New relationships between research, scholarship and teaching* (pp. 27–36). Open University Press and McGraw Hill.
- Norges musikkhøgskole. (1982). *Studieplan for musikkpedagogikk* [Curriculum of music education].

- Norges musikkhøgskole. (1997). *Studieplan for instrumental-/ vokalpedagogikk* [Curriculum of instrumental/vocal education].
- Norges musikkhøgskole. (2010). *Studieplan for kandidatstudiet i musikkpedagogikk* [Curriculum of Bachelor in Music Education].
- Norges musikkhøgskole. (2018). *Studieplan for kandidatstudiet i musikkpedagogikk* [Curriculum of Bachelor in Music Education].
- Norges musikkhøgskole. (2022). *Studieplan for Bachelorstudiet i musikkpedagogikk* [Curriculum of Bachelor of Music in Music Education]. <https://nmh.no/studiehandboker/startkull-2022/studier/bachelorstudiet-i-musikkpedagogikk>
- Norsk kulturskoleråd. (2016). *Our organisation's history in English*. <https://www.kulturskoleradet.no/om-oss/historien#historyinenglish>
- Paynter, J., & Ashton, P. (1970). *Sound and silence: Classroom projects in creative music*. Cambridge University Press.
- Pestalozzi, J. H. (1951). *The education of man*. Philosophical Library.
- Philpott, C., & Spruce, G. (2021). Structure and agency in music education. In R. Wright, G. Johansen, P. Kanellopoulos & P. Schmidt (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook to sociology of music education* (pp. 288–299). Routledge.
- Polanyi, M. (1966). *The tacit dimension*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Quantz, J. J. (2001). *On playing the flute: The classic of Baroque music instruction*. Faber. (Original work published 1752).
- Rainbow, B. (1980). Glover, Sarah Anna. In S. Sadie (Ed.), *The Grove dictionary of music and musicians* (Vol. 7, p. 454). Macmillan.
- Reimer, B. (1970). *A philosophy of music education*. Pearson Education.
- Ricci, L. (1915). *La crisi del bel canto* [The crisis of *Bel Canto*]. Galletti.
- Roberts, B. A. (2004). Who's in the mirror? Issues surrounding the identity construction of music educators. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 3(2), 1–42.
- Rousseau, J.-J. (1762). *Emile ou de l'éducation* [Emile, or On Education]. Jean Néaulme.
- Roverud, L. (1815). *Et Blik på Musikens Tilstand i Norge* [A glance at the condition of music in Norway]. Grøndahl.
- Ruud, E. (1981). *Rock og pop i klasserommet* [Rock and pop in the classroom]. Norsk Musikforlag.
- Ryle, G. (1949). *The concept of mind*. Hutchinson.
- Sadie, S. (1980). Conservatories. In Sadie, S. (Ed.), *The Grove dictionary of music and musicians* (Vol. 6, pp. 18–21). Macmillan.
- Sadler, K. M. (2021). A critical assessment of entrepreneurship in music higher education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 20(3), 132–155.
- Schafer, R. M. (1976). *Creative music education*. Macmillan.
- Schiller, F. (1795). *Briefe über die ästhetische Erziehung des Menschen von Friedrich Schiller* [Letters on the aesthetic education of man by Friedrich Schiller]. Die Horen.
- Schmidt, P. (2011). Living by a simple logic: Standards and critical leadership. In P. G. Woodford (Ed.), *Re-thinking standards of the twenty-first century: New realities, new challenges, new propositions* (pp. 69–90). University of Western Ontario.
- Small, C. (1998). *Musicking: The meanings of performing and listening*. Wesleyan University Press.
- Smith, D. G. (2003). Curriculum and teaching face globalization. In W. F. Pinar (Ed.), *International handbook of curriculum research* (pp. 35–51). Erlbaum.
- Solbu, E. (1983). Norges musikkhøgskoles oppgaver – noen glimt fra den faglige utviklingen [The Norwegian Academy of Music's responsibilities – Some glimpses of the professional development]. In H. Jørgensen & E. Solbu (Eds.), *Norges musikkhøgskole 10 år: Program for jubileumskonsertene og jubileumsartikler* (pp. 65–73). Norges musikkhøgskole.
- Stake, R. E. (2008). Qualitative case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strategies of qualitative inquiry* (pp. 119–149). Sage.
- Storsve, V. R., & Bröske, B. Å. (Eds.). (2020). *Look beyond – Make a difference: Experiences from a music project in Lebanon*. Norges musikkhøgskole.

- St.meld. nr. 27 (2000–2001). *Gjør din plikt – krev din rett: Kvalitetsreform av høyere utdanning* [The quality reform in higher education]. Kirke- utdannings- og forskningsdepartementet. <https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/eebf61fb4a204feb84e33355f30ad1a1/no/pdf/stm200020010027000dddpdfa.pdf>
- Suzuki, S. (1968). *Nurtured by love: A new approach to talent education*. Warner Brothers Publications.
- Swanwick, K. (1968). *Popular music and the teacher*. Pergamon Press.
- Treacy, S. J. (2020). *Qualitative research methods*. Wiley Blackwell.
- Tønsberg, K. (2013). *Akademiseringen av jazz, pop og rock – en dannelsesreise* [The academisation of jazz, pop and rock – An educational journey]. Akademika.
- Varkøy, Ø. (1993). *Hvorfor musikk? En musikkpedagogisk idéhistorie*. [Why music? A history of ideas on music education]. Ad Notam Gyldendal.
- Varkøy, Ø. (2015). The intrinsic value of musical experience: A rethinking: Why and how? In F. Pio & Ø. Varkøy (Eds.), *Philosophy of music education challenged: Heideggerian inspirations* (pp. 45–60). Springer.
- Varkøy, Ø. & Dyndahl, P. (2022). Do we all have to be 'leftists'? A dialogue about antagonism and agonism in music education research. *Nordic Research in Music Education*, 3, 1–20.
- Weber, W., Arnold, D., Gesselle, C. M, Cahn, P., Oldani R. W., & Ritterman, J. (2001). Conservatories. *Grove Music Online*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.article.41225>
- Weisethaunet, H. (2021). Jazz som konservatoriefag i Norge – en (u)mulig historie? [Jazz as a conservatoire subject in Norway – An (im)possible history?] *Studia Musicologica Norvegica, Norwegian Journal of Musicology*, 1, 27–44.
- Wenger, E. (2006). *Learning for a small planet: A research agenda*. <https://docslib.org/learning-for-a-small-planet>
- Westbury, I., Hopmann, S., & Riquarts, K. (Eds.). (2000). *Teaching as a reflective practice: The German Didaktik tradition*. Erlbaum.
- Westbury, I. (2000). Teaching as a reflective practice: What might *Didaktik* teach curriculum? In I. Westbury, S. Hopmann & K. Riquarts (Eds.), *Teaching as a reflective practice: The German Didaktik tradition* (pp. 15–39). Erlbaum.