

Woman and Full Professor in Music Education – Work Experiences in the Field of Academia

Carina Borgström Källén

University of Gothenburg

Abstract: This chapter explores work experiences of female full professors in music education. By targeting this group, positions for music education as a discipline in the field of academia in conjunction with gender are being highlighted and discussed. The objective is to problematize constructions of expertise and excellence in relation to gender equality and consecrated positions within the departments where the professors in focus are working. As a theoretical framework Pierre Bourdieu's field theory combined with Raewyn Connell's gender theory is applied. The empirical data that underpin the study in focus consist of three focus group interviews conducted in 2018 with eight full professors in the Nordic countries. The study is inspired by narrative as a method for re-telling, and thematized collective and compiled stories from the participants' utterances constructed for the presentation of the data. In order to handle ethical demands a meta-method-meeting was developed for the study in focus, i.e. all participants were invited to collaborate on the design of the study, keeping transparency, ethics and anonymity in focus. The findings suggest that the professors' agency for claiming a core position at their departments, respectively, is dependent on what local gatekeepers consecrate as symbolic capital for the acknowledgement of expertise and excellence.

Keywords: academia, consecration, gender, music education, professor

Music education in relation to gender equality raises questions that address teaching and learning in all kinds of school contexts, from pre-school settings to higher music education. It also raises questions about the relations between music education, gender, power and positions in academia as a field (Bourdieu, 1988). In this chapter three focus group discussions that explore work experiences and career paths of eight female full professors in music education are being analyzed. The professors in question hold positions in higher music education at universities in the Nordic countries. By targeting this particular group, i.e. women that are research leaders and bearers of expertise, positions for music education as a discipline in academia in conjunction with gender constructions are being highlighted and discussed. The objective of the chapter is to problematize results from the study in focus that have implications for music education as a discipline. More precisely, the chapter aims at problematizing construction of expertise and excellence within the discipline, in relation to gender equality and consecrated positions. The following questions are formulated: What is at stake for female professors' careers in music education within the field of academia? What positions and symbolic capitals are consecrated in the departments where the professors are working?

Women in the Field of Academia

No study has been identified that explicitly investigates the working situation for female, full professors in music education. Related research from a wider scope is therefore presented. Gender studies of women in the field of academia in general comprise a large body, and research from the last two decades, focusing Western universities, show gender inequality among the staff (Acker, 2010, 2012, 2014; Acker & Webber, 2009; Kalm, 2019). These studies point at a complexity, and at a paradox, when gender representation is used as a measure of equality. The number of women on all academic levels is increasing in the Western countries, and the majority of undergraduate students are women. The paradox is that inequality remains, but more subtle than before. It is for

example noticed that men are still holding prestige positions, a fact that cannot only be explained by age, discipline and generation (Bondestam & Grip, 2015).

It is also shown that women in academe do a lot more so-called glue-work (Acker & Webber, 2009), or housekeeping (Kalm, 2019) than men do, work-tasks that do not merit you as a researcher, but still have to be done to keep things running at a department. According to Kalm (2019) women carry out a disproportionate share of academic housekeeping tasks, affecting a complex set of factors, such as the publish or perish-related competitive academic culture, researcher ideals and gender norms. She stresses that “unbalanced academic housekeeping allocation may partially account for women’s difficulties in advancing within academia” (Kalm, 2019; p. 5). Gender representation in academia is also described as a pyramid, where the base, the bachelor level, has a majority of women, while the top, the full professor level, is represented by approximately 75% men, depending on the discipline and the country (Bondestam & Grip, 2015; Kalm, 2019).

Research exploring the structures of drafting committees for research funding show a pattern of underrepresentation connected to gender and race in the boards (Husu & de Cheveigné, 2010). Studies stress the importance of gender equity when nominating to these positions, since they offer valuable experience and useful knowledge when writing research funding applications (Bondestam & Grip, 2015; Husu & de Cheveigné 2010).

Women in Music Education

The body of research in music education and gender shows that music teaching and learning in a variety of aspects is an arena for stereotyped gender performances. This is displayed as gendered constructions regarding for example choice of instrument and genre (Abeles, 2009; Borgström Källén, 2014; Green, 1997; Pellegrinelli, 2008; Wych, 2012), the possibility to claim space (Björck, 2011; Ferm Almqvist, 2019), power relations (Abramo, 2009; Armstrong, 2011; Borgström Källén, 2014; Green, 1997) and subordination from a LGBTQ perspective (Bergonzi, 2015;

Gould, 2012). Research also emphasizes the impact of context and discourse for how gender is constructed in the music classroom (Borgström Källén & Lindgren, 2017, 2018). An inertness over time regarding changing stereotyped gender performances is also highlighted (Abeles, 2009).

Research on gender equality and higher music education has focused mainly on the student perspective (de Boise, 2018). de Boise's (2018) study on gender equality in higher music education in Sweden and in the UK, shows less institutional discrimination against women in Sweden than in the UK, but at the same time that the gendered subject choices are transnational. He argues that a critique of neoliberalism together with an intersectional take is essential to tackling gender inequalities in higher music education.

Only a handful of studies related to women and academic careers within music education are identified (Blix et al., 2019; Dyndahl et al., 2017; Wieland Howe, 2009). The findings of these studies correspond with research from academia in general, suggesting that gender inequality still remains but is more subtle than previously shown. Blix et al. (2019) show a gender impact when applications for promotion to associate and full professor are evaluated within the Arts in Norway. According to Blix et al. gender inequality is shown both in experts' reports and when the applicants themselves are grading their value of quality in their specific subject. The study implies that subject specialists are operationalizing their own understanding of quality when assessing applications for promotion, using markers like scene, type of audience, creativity and relations for cooperation as starting points. According to Blix et al. insufficient criteria for quality along with a hegemonic elite discourse in Arts education lead to the fact that the power to define quality remains in the hands of those who already hold the definitions. The conclusion of the study is an urgent need for explicit criteria of quality in the performing arts at the level of associate and full professor.

Dyndahl et al. (2017) show a gender effect on supervising master and PhD theses in popular music in Norway. They conclude that there is a gendered division of labor regarding what kind of subjects, taking all music subjects into account, men and women are supervising respectively. Male professors are supervising over 80% of the theses on popular

music. The study suggests that “when women introduce popular music to the music academic field in Norway in the role of supervisors, it happens through its implicit (and rather tacit) inclusion in music education and music therapy practices” (Dyndahl et al., 2017, p. 448). Thus, their findings suggest that when women supervise theses in popular music it is more often than not embedded in education or music therapy.

Wieland Howe (2009) views women in music education careers from a historical perspective. Not so surprisingly, there has been great improvements regarding female representation and impact in the discipline if looking back a hundred years, but nevertheless she concludes that there is much more to be done before music education offers equal opportunities for men and women. In the second half of the twentieth century there have been many opportunities for women in music education to edit journals and serve on editorial boards. However, according to Wieland Howe there is still, in 2009, a hierarchical division of labor within the discipline. She shows that women have always had numerous opportunities in the fields of music and education because parts of those fields can be regarded as extensions of activities performed in the home. Wieland Howe points out, that if looking at female music educators today it may seem as if there are no “musical ceilings” (Wieland Howe, 2009, p. 177) and no gender bias. However, she concludes, women are concentrated in certain areas, such as early childhood and general music. Following Wieland Howe there is no problem when talking representation in the discipline of music education as a whole, but when going into detail the same patterns as in the field of academia in general is shown, i.e. women are more likely to be positioned in areas not considered as high status, while men are more likely to be positioned in areas with high status.

Field and Gender

For analyzing the data parts of Pierre Bourdieu’s field theory (1986, 2000), specifically focusing academia as a field (1988), is applied, together with Raewyn Connell’s gender theory (2009), emphasizing power and division of labor. According to Bourdieu, a field is defined as a place for games, i.e. a place for competition between individuals and institutions battling

for the same object. This requires specialists, value hierarchies and real or symbolic institutions. Examples of fields, according to Bourdieu, are the Academic field, the Cultural field, the field of music and the field of the arts (Bourdieu, 1986, 1993, 2000). Characteristics of a field are that it is regarded as autonomous, with specific rules and values and with contesting poles that are constructed by the actors within the field (Bourdieu, 2000).

The actors, or the players within the field, are hierarchically positioned, and they are competing for coveted positions on the basis of how the field evaluates their capital. The value of a specific capital is not static, instead it is related to what is privileged in each field. According to Bourdieu (1986) *social capital* refers to the network of people one has that enables oneself to maintain one's position in a social hierarchical system. In a gender perspective, social capital has been applied as an explanation to why women have difficulty reaching top positions in many professions (Griffin, 2017). The argument is that men support each other by gaining social capital in homosocial networks. *Cultural capital* is according to Bourdieu referring to assets that are not economic, but still enable social mobility.

Symbolic capital refers to the amount of prestige a player has, equaled with a reputation of competence and an image of respectability, i.e. the symbolic capital legitimizes the other forms of capital a player possesses. Social and cultural capital only reinforce social status if recognized in the form of symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1986, 2000), and it is obtained when the player is *consecrated* by others in the field. A field also needs established hallmarks, or *consecration instances*, (artefacts like artists and classical canons) to obtain commitment and dedication for the game. Thus, the concept *consecration* describes how actors in a field are embraced and celebrated by other actors, acting as stakeholders or gatekeepers (Bourdieu, 2000). To consecrate someone is to create and maintain an aura of admiration and mysticism that surrounds an individual or a group of individuals within a specific field. Consecration can therefore be constructed with different kinds of symbolic capital depending on what is regarded as valuable. Bourdieu (1993) emphasizes the role of relevant gatekeepers as agents of consecration, since authority to produce symbolic capital is needed.

Cattani et al. (2014) stress the importance of taking the allocation between peripheral players and core players in a field into account, whether in science or in art. The peripheral players are challenging the core players when moving from the periphery of the field to the core. This struggle has been conceptualized by Bourdieu in various ways (1993, p. 83), as dichotomies between incumbents and dissidents, insiders and outsiders, orthodox and heretics, and core and peripheral players. Cattani et al. (2014) argue that core players are more likely to defend orthodoxy because their symbolic capital is already embedded in the field, while peripheral players are more likely to depart from the field's canons and expectations.

According to Connell (2009), gender has a unique position among social constructions, since it is addressed to our bodies and plays on the reproductive differences through *the reproductive arena* (Connell, 2009, pp. 66–71). The body thus becomes simultaneously both agent and object in a social practice. This practice is called *social embodiment* (Connell, 2009, p. 66). Connell (2009) divides gender relations into four interlocking dimensions – *power relations*, *production relations*, *emotional relations* and *symbolic relations* (2009, pp. 75–85). In this chapter power relations will be applied to analyze gendered hierarchical positions in the academic field. Production relations are used to interpret gendered divisions of labour. In order to link Bourdieu to gender theory Adkins and Skeggs (2004), is applied, since Bourdieu had, despite his work *Masculine domination* (2001), little to say about gender and women (Adkins & Skeggs, 2004). Adkins stresses that Bourdieu's theoretical apparatus can contribute to developing analysis of gender equality (Adkins & Skeggs, 2004). She compares with how feminist researchers, such as Butler (1993) and Frazer (1997), have deployed and developed theorists as Habermas and Foucault in directions towards feminist perspectives, even though they, like Bourdieu, had substantively little to say about feminism and gender. Adkins concludes that Bourdieu's lack of attention to gender and feminist theory must be located as typical of his contemporaries (Adkins & Skeggs, 2004, pp. 4–6), and she argues that his theory is fruitful for contemporary feminist theory. Three of her arguments are particularly relevant for this study. Firstly, because Bourdieu claims that social action

is always embodied, secondly since power is subtly inculcated through the body and thirdly because Bourdieu emphasizes the politics of cultural recognition and social position taking. During the last decades a body of gender related research has been accumulated with Bourdieu as a theoretical framework (Adkins & Skeggs, 2004) and his framework is also applied by a number of researchers in music education and musicology for analyzing musical fields (Burnard et al., 2015; Dyndahl, 2002; Nerland, 2003; Nylander, 2014).

Methodology - Ethical Quandaries as Guidance for Design

This study has been conducted in close collaboration with the participants, since anonymity and ethical considerations are demanding a great deal of attention. Mainly because full professors in music education in the Nordic countries constitute a small number, and strategies on how to avoid identification had to be discussed thoroughly. The empirical material consists of three focus group discussions (Dahlin-Ivanoff, 2018, pp. 81–92) with eight full professors, holding positions in music education in the Nordic countries. The interviews generated in total seven hours of recorded data.

A *meta-method-meeting* (MMM) was applied in order to handle ethical demands within the study. The concept *meta-method-meeting* was developed and elaborated by me as a tool for ethical considerations connected to the study. In a meta-method-meeting all participants are invited to collaborate in the design of a study, keeping *transparency*, *ethics* and *anonymity* in focus. When asking informants for consent the ethical demands were described and a meta-method-meeting was suggested. The meeting took place with six of the eight participants. The professors that did not participate in this meeting agreed beforehand to approve of the decisions made at the meeting. It was also decided that the meeting should be described as a crucial part of the study's methodology. At the meeting a meta-method-plan was constructed, concerning primarily two issues: (1) how to address the participants, their colleagues and their workplaces to avoid identification (2) agreements how to make it possible

for the participants to edit and approve their own transcribed excerpts to further avoid identification.

To address the ethical dilemma posed by the second issue a strategy was agreed upon; each informant would read an anonymized version of the transcripts, from their own focus group, where identification markers such as names, departments, faculties, specific titles and places were already removed. The participants would be able to delete, rephrase or disguise their utterances in their own excerpts if they find them problematic when it comes to anonymity and ethics.

According to Esaiasson et al. (2012, pp. 318–326) focus groups are especially suitable for studies investigating delicate subjects, such as individuals' personal experiences at a workplace where they still are working, since the group members could gain strength from each other. But Esaiasson et al. also point out the risk of members in the focus group disseminating what was said during the interview since they, as opposed to the researcher, are not obliged to keep silent about what members in the group were saying. With this in mind all participants signed a contract of non-disclosure, designed by me and approved by the meta-group, in which they promised to keep silent of what was said.

In the letter of consent, the participants were informed of the plans to construct the transcripts into collective, compiled narratives (De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2015) of three fictitious full professors, using the narratives as a form for presentation of the result. The participants all agreed upon that it was a fruitful way of handling the dilemmas with anonymization.

At the meta-method-meeting key-questions, prepared in a protocol for study (Dahlin-Ivanoff, 2018) were discussed. By sharing the questions beforehand, the participants were given the opportunity to discuss the themes and propose changes within the frame of the overall objective of the study. The group decided on deleting one question and adding two new ones. The new questions were formulated at the meeting and added to the protocol of study. Hereby, the meta-method-meeting co-constructed not only the design and the ethical conditions of the study, but it also slightly affected the objective and hence the outcome. The themes agreed upon for the three focus groups were as follows: career, current work situation, responsibility and power, knowledge to hold in trust, limits and

constraints for music education as a discipline, possibilities and restrictions in relation to gender.

Finally, the dilemma concerning translation was discussed at the meta-method-meeting. A valid Swedish transcript out of utterances made on several languages is a challenge, risking translations that misinterpret the informants' intentions. I proposed, if unsure of the correct translation, that I should write what I *heard* in the original language *as I heard* it and then combine this incorrectly spelled utterance with a suggestion how to translate it into Swedish and English. Thereby the informants could see, when they read the transcripts, both what they actually said and my suggestions how to translate it. The meeting participants agreed and when the informants read the transcripts, I was in a dialogue with each one of them concerning the translation.

The analysis was conducted in three steps. Firstly, a categorization was made, using the questions from the protocol of study as a basis. In the second step the categories identified were thematized and three contrasting positions emerged in the material. As the third step the narratives were constructed, i.e. three different positions were composed into the narratives of fictitious professors Andersen, Johansen and Olsen. In the result excerpts from the three narratives are presented. Since I am using narratives to construct themes for analysis, using excerpts from those narratives to present the data, the study is not ontologically and epistemologically regarded as a narrative inquiry (Clandinin, 2007). Rather, it is inspired by narrative as a theory for re-telling (Barrett & Stauffer, 2009; De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2015) and from theories on neo-narrative methodology (Stewart, 2010). By using narratives, or excerpts of narratives, as the form for presentation it is possible to construct three fictitious professors, Andersen, Johansen and Olsen, and still be able to keep the participants anonymous.

The Narratives of Professors Andersen, Olsen and Johansen

Below the analysis of the narratives of the fictitious professors Andersen, Johansen and Olsen is presented, starting with a short description of the three.

Similarities are shown regarding the professors' background. All three are raised in a Nordic country and they have similar educational background, including preparatory music schools since early childhood, a music teacher education and a PhD in music education. They describe their early career into the PhD programme in a similar, but somewhat contradictory way. This first step into a career as a researcher in music education is on the one hand described as something coincidental, something not planned for, but on the other hand as something they were "drawn to" (professor Johansen). A desire to find spaces to learn more and to "try to reach the ceiling with new ways of thinking" (professor Andersen) and "get a language for all the questions" (professor Olsen). All three emphasize the huge importance of the Nordic Network for Research in Music Education (NNRME), which they refer to as their "home".

Talking with Bourdieu the similar educational background of the three professors can be interpreted as if they were actors in the field of music long before they entered the field of academia. They all describe the entrance into the academic field as ambiguous and insecure, speaking of a need for a social network of peers, the NNRME, to feel comfortable. The network functioned as a way to build up a social capital viable in the new field, and as a bridge of security between the field of music, where the rules of conduct were known and where they knew their positions, and the academic field, where they were trying to learn how to play the game.

Currently, professor Andersen and professor Olsen work at departments that train teachers in all kinds of subjects and for a variety of school forms, such as pre-school teachers and secondary school teachers; a part of the Academic field where pedagogical competence in general is emphasized. Professor Johansen works at a department where music education is embedded in an environment where professional musicians are being trained and where music as art is emphasized.

Gender Equality and the Professors Work Places

All three professors describe an extremely heavy workload. However, they interpret their experiences as a woman in the field of academia in

different ways. Professor Andersen talks about her heavy workload and the pressure from colleagues without explicitly connecting it to gender. She says that there is a majority of women at her department and that she feels respected for who she is. Though, she adds, the reason for her not having to think about gender is that women in the past paved the way.

Professor Andersen: In my department there's a majority of women and some of us are full professors. As a woman I always feel respected. I have never felt that gender is a hindrance in my career. Have always known that if you want something done you have to do it yourself. Some people are like a pain in the ass, regardless of their gender. But I can say that I am privileged, because I don't have to think about gender in my everyday life and I understand that this is because women in the past did the hard work, both in NNRME and at my department. Therefore, I feel that I am obliged to help the next generation. Because I did not receive any help until I was almost already merited as a professor. At that time, I got a coach, an elderly male professor with many years of experience. He was someone I could talk to.

In the excerpt above professor Andersen describes herself as a woman who does not experience gender oppression at her workplace. She admits that colleagues can be hard to cooperate with and that some of them behave badly, but argues that these behaviors are connected to individuals regardless of their gender. Her analysis is that she is privileged, since other women paved the way and that is why she can work without thinking of gender as a hindrance. In the narrative she emphasizes her own strength and persistency as means to get things done.

Professor Olsen speaks of two aspects of gender inequality. Firstly, as a problem from the past, something that occurred before her entrance to the academy. She emphasizes, like professor Andersen, that she is aware of the privilege of not having to speak about gender, and she refers to the women with a specific kind of strength in the previous generation who paved the way. Secondly however, Olsen recognizes more subtle expressions of gender inequality at her department, related to the division of labour and power. She has noticed that women in her department tend

to do more caring work and more so-called glue-work, or housekeeping than men, and that work tasks conducted by men receive a lot more praise.

Professor Olsen: I am convinced that I reached my position as full professor because of all the “strong women” in my department. They’ve involved me in lots of exciting projects, given me advice like “don’t let it bother you”. There have been men who’ve been rather arrogant, but with the strong women in the background I’ve had the strength to handle it. These are women who are very clear and forceful in their argumentation. They are thick-skinned and have been good role models. I’ve felt the pressure to quickly become a professor, but I can see now that I lacked female professor role models early on in my career. What if it’s deteriorating terms and status that make it possible for women to become professors? If terms were what they once were, maybe the position wouldn’t have been available to us. There’s also something about the caring tasks that women perform to a greater extent than men. I think you become more harshly judged as a woman if you say no and send the students down the hall. But it becomes a hindrance, because it takes time. And there’s something about the way men often boast about themselves. Men speak of their work in a way that gives them status. If you’re saying that an assignment is important, you’re also saying that you have to devote a lot of time to it. Not saying it out loud will backfire. Competent girl shoots herself in the foot. Are women so happy about their little shred of influence that we just go with the stream and do what’s expected?

Professor Olsen is praising other women at her department for leading the way for her career. She describes them as strong, thick-skinned, and as forceful in their argumentation and she is thanking them, and not herself, for her position in academia. But despite the strong women and their power, she has experienced gender inequality, constructed in subtle ways, and shown as gendered divisions of labour and power relations that elevate and celebrate ordinary work tasks if they are conducted by men.

Professor Johansen describes her work situation as if gender inequality is a struggle and an everyday problem. She compares her situation with

male professors in music education in the generation before her and concludes that they never would have accepted the terms she works under. She describes how gender inequality is shown in almost all her work tasks; a heavy workload, feelings of being diminished and disempowered, a feeling of guilt if not being helpful and being objectified as woman.

Professor Johansen: I'm getting positioned as a woman all the time. It's happening in situations where I'm the one who's most qualified. When I claim space I'm seen as troublesome, and that's when I realize that I'm a woman. The goal is that we shouldn't have to talk about gender. But there's been more focus from the ministry, because there are too few female professors at Music Academies in general. I'm grateful for having participated in a program enhancing the careers of female university graduates. But it's regarded as vip lane, as if you're admitted on quota. Then you have to prove yourself and be twice as good. When I was promoted there was no great cheering. I'd hoped that they'd say: "Finally, a female professor to improve the statistics." But no. I've been discriminated so many times I've lost count. I don't have the strength to fight anymore. A striking example is when a male colleague was asked to become the head of postgraduate studies as a full-time position. Later, when I got the question, the assignment had been reduced to 20%. Or when my meetings are ignored, and people don't respond to E-mails. I have had to work extremely hard with tasks that are not normally that of a professor. Teaching at all levels. Supervising bachelors. At the same time, I'm expected to do everything that's included in my function as a professor. I've been working every summer and basically every weekend. When I brought this up with my boss, she suggested I should contact a psychologist to have someone to talk to. And I've often been disparaged. At a staff meeting a boss said: "Imagine, our little girl has become a professor here." Becoming a professor actually reduced my power. I haven't been backed up by the strong women that the two of you speak of. The ones in corresponding positions with us are almost all men and great artists. On paper I'm a professor, but at my department I'm positioned as a woman working in pedagogy. They think research on young children is of no value, and you become positioned even more as a woman.

Professor Johansen describes her work situation as a constant struggle and as she is positioned as a peripheral player at her department. She feels objectified as a woman and she expresses that she lacks power to change her situation. Her title as a professor does not give her the symbolic capital she needs, since the consecration instances at her department are celebrated artefacts in the arts, such as compositions or concerts. Hallmarks that are out of reach for her.

When listening to professor Andersen and Olsen it is clear that they have authority as professors at their departments. They talk about their promotion as a condition for making their voice heard, a way of influencing their departments. They express how the title makes it possible to work for music education as a discipline within their departments, and how the title has moved them from a peripheral position to a position closer to the core.

Professor Olsen: I benefit somewhat from my title as a professor, and can use the time as it was originally intended. Exerting influence on subject fields. So the title of professor has really opened doors. Previously, when I spoke of the status of music pedagogy, it was like calling out into empty space. Nobody felt addressed by the criticism, but with the title of professor I can make a difference.

Professor Andersen: As a professor I have the power to improve education. Somehow it gives me support, and that came as a surprise to me. Suddenly the things I said carried more weight. And suddenly other doors opened. I was expected to take the lead in various situations. The department leadership turn to me when they need subject legitimacy.

The promotion to professor works as a symbolic capital for professor Andersen and professor Olsen, moving them close to the core players at their departments. For professor Johansen, however, the effects of the promotion are the opposite. She is disempowered by core players at her department and she is positioned rather as a woman working in pedagogy.

Double Subordination?

In this section, what I call a double subordination is focused, i.e. when gender and music education in conjunction work as deconsecrating instances that position the actors as peripheral and disempowered players in the field. In all three departments where the professors work music education is positioned as peripheral, and the subject is called into question by players from other disciplines. However, the actors that are constructed as having core positions vary. Andersen and Olsen describe how music education is seen as something strange, exotic, and something that the stakeholders are unsure of how to deal with. At their departments players compete with scientific merits for a position in the core, and the stakeholders ask for consecration instances such as scientific papers published in highly ranked journals, successful funding applications and international scientific networks. At professor Johansen's department the core players are the performing musicians and the creative artists, some of them promoted to professors in the Arts. And the consecrated instances are artefacts such as compositions and artistic performances that peers have the authority to turn into symbolic capital, i.e. it is the reputation as an artist rather than scientific merits that consecrate the core players in the department where professor Johansen works.

In the excerpt below professor Olsen is reflecting on her status as professor in music education in relation to her position in the field of academia, i.e. the educational context. She compares her own department, in teacher education, with departments of musicology and music performance, and argues that power and impact related to the title as full professor seem to be related to the context you are in.

Professor Olsen: It is of importance that we are a faculty for teacher education, and not an academy of music. Had it been musicology or at an academy of music, I think it would have been more difficult. In those contexts there are particular challenges. And it's not just the subject, something seems to happen when it's connected to gender. We have no artistically promoted professors.

In the excerpt above Olsen suggests that there can be particular challenges at a department of musicology or an academy of music if you are a woman and hold a position in music education. She analyses the situation as if the subject music education intersects with gender, suggesting that this conjunction constructs subordination. She is also implicitly claiming that the fact that her department lacks artistically promoted professors makes it easier for her to position herself as a core player.

The narrative of Andersen does not imply double subordination, instead it points at a pole in the academic field where the title full professor in music education works as a symbolic capital. However, her narrative shows that music education as a discipline is subordinated at her department, questioned and contested by competing disciplines.

Professor Andersen: I have felt that music pedagogy as a discipline is under attack from various quarters. On the one hand from a tradition that says that music education should be transformed into liberal arts, on the other hand from practicing musicians who claim that they know music education since they teach music. It has been provocative to some that music education can be its own subject field with its own traditions. We have to fence the subject in, with reference to the Nordic community. That will be our salvation. But it's trying that you need to have those kinds of discussions with colleagues.

The excerpts show how the definition of music education is contested by players in competing disciplines at Andersen's department, attacked by liberal arts and by music teachers who claim a preferential right of interpretation when it comes to music education. Andersen stresses a need to frame the discipline with the help of the research network in NNRME. Talking with Bourdieu, the position for Andersen could be interpreted as if gatekeepers and stakeholders at her department make it possible for her to claim a core position as a female professor, as long as she does not try to use music education as a symbolic capital for competing. If she is using her title as professor as a consecrated instance, working on a general level for her department, she can be consecrated by gatekeepers and stakeholders within the field.

Professor Johansen experiences music education as subordinated, or peripheral, at the department where she works. She also describes her position as a female professor as subordinated. In the following excerpt this double subordination is shown. Professor Johansen is focusing on experiences of being subordinated due to how stakeholders consecrate male artists with genius. A construction that subordinates the professor both as female and as representing the “wrong” discipline. She speaks about experiencing a difference between how she is being positioned inside and outside her department respectively, and of how she adapts to the gatekeepers’ rules at her department as a strategy for acceptance. As an example of the latter she describes how she is emphasizing her research on higher music education rather than that on young children. Finally, the line organization as a tool for double subordination is focused by professor Johansen.

Professor Johansen: The idea of the male genius being supremely elevated lives on. In addition, pedagogy is ranked at the bottom. I’m doubly subordinated, which is degrading. Around me there are a lot of male artistically promoted professors who take the liberty of defining my subject. All of the promoted professors are men, I think. There are three categories of men I have to relate to. Most highly ranked are men who are artistically promoted professors. Any bullshit thing they say turns into highly relevant information. Then there are male professors with a doctorate in the wider field of arts and culture. They have become some kind of know-it-alls who speak with great authority. Much cooler than female professors with a PhD in music education. The third category is male bosses who have been practicing musicians or music teachers. They see me as a threat. I have to be very aware of the chain of command, and not fancy myself just because I’m a professor with a doctorate. Yet they haven’t read any of my publications. I was the only woman in a steering group once. Either you kept quiet or else you were a nuisance. Strategy documents that I had written weren’t used at all. The preferential right of interpretation was given to someone who knows nothing about music education. In other parts of the university and in international networks, I have influence. But at my own department, where decisions about strategic funding are made, that power is very

limited. Usually it's non doctorates in artistic fields who set the agenda and define music education. So, I've realized that I have to speak louder about higher music education. It's all about who gets appointed to these head positions. If they know anything about pedagogy and research. Not even the head at our faculty has a doctorate, something that would never be found anywhere else at the university. The line organization is very powerful. I was shocked when I realized that the conditions had changed totally compared to my predecessor's. I think it's important to have research in music pedagogy at a university offering music education. But you shouldn't have to bend over backwards, change your vocabulary and pretend to be more of an artist than you are. You shouldn't have to navigate in that manner just to do your job. It's silly at a university, but these are powerful structures.

Professor Johansen expresses a significant double subordination, disempowered both as a female and as a professor in music education. This double subordination can be interpreted as a conjunction of an epistemological and social erasure. Professor Johansen is positioned as if she lacks relevant expertise and as if she is invisible to the core players at her department. But her narrative is contradictory since she also describes her position as if she is threatening the core actors, as they realize that her expertise, measured in scientific merits, is contesting the core players symbolic capital and thereby their position as consecrated artists and professors of the arts.

To sum up the findings, the experiences of subordination differ between the three professors. However, all three have experienced competing players from other disciplines, i.e. actors that have contested the professors' position as experts in music education, and they all describe a struggle voicing music education. Professor Andersen is struggling to get recognition and a position for music education as a discipline, but she is satisfied with her position as a female professor in general. Professor Olsen talks about music education as peripheral, but that her promotion has given her a position where she can act. She also points at her workplace as in some aspects affected by gender, when talking about housekeeping, or glue-work, in academia (Acker & Webber, 2009; Kalm, 2019), work tasks that consume time but do not merit you, but she does not talk about herself as being oppressed

or subordinated. For professor Johansen a significant double subordination is found and she expresses a frustration over her situation. She feels objectified as a woman and she also expresses a lack of respect at her department for her expertise as a professor.

Conclusions

This study shows that the amount of prestige the professors possess, respectively, to a large extent is a matter of where in the Academic field they are positioned. If they work at a department where teacher education and educational science are in focus, it is more likely that their title as professor functions as a consecration instance and thereby produce symbolic capital. If working at a department where music as an art form is in the forefront, the title professor of music education does not render any honour or praise. Symbolic capital is hard to access on scientific merits since the gatekeepers celebrate other kinds of consecration instances, such as being a highly ranked performing musician or a professor in composition.

Findings also suggest that the workplaces could be interpreted as two subfields, the music academy and the teacher education. This is, since they appear to be, at least to some extent, autonomous regarding the rules for playing the game successfully, i.e. the competition is based on hallmarks for expertise and excellence specific for each subfield. The consecration instances in the subfield music academy are, according to professor Johansen's experience closely connected to the field of the arts, while the field of teacher education, according to professors Andersen and Olsen, is tied to the field of education. Perhaps the structures of gendered power relations shown in research in the field of music (Citron, 1993; Ganetz, 2009; Green, 1997; Leonard, 2007; Lorentzen, 2009; McClary, 1991) are also viable for the double subordination of professor Johansen. The symbolic capital that consecrates artists in the public arena are in that case also measuring what is regarded as consecration instances at the Music academy where professor Johansen works. If so, is it possible to compete for a core position if not measured by standards from the field of the Arts?

Women as housekeepers, or glue-workers, in academia are highlighted in research in recent years. That is, research shows that women are doing

work that does not bring merit, but has to be done to keep a department running, such as administrative work and caring for the well-being of students and colleagues. When looking at the findings in this study the professors are reflecting over their heavy workload and especially professor Olsen and professor Johansen comments on being overwhelmed by housekeeping tasks that they feel obliged to do but that are affecting their everyday work since they are time-consuming.

Finally, implications for music education research need to be problematized in relation to the findings. The subordination of music education as a discipline, experienced by all three professors, and the gendered subordination shown mainly in professor Johansen's workplace, but also to some extent in professor Olsen's, is problematic for music education research in the long run. If women have less time allocated for research, since they conduct more housekeeping and glue-work (Acker & Webber, 2009; Kalm, 2019) or caring work that does not bring merit but is time-consuming, and if they are discriminated and socially ignored because of their gender, it will affect the outcome of music education research. As full professors in music education, Andersen, Olsen and Johansen function as role models, within and outside their departments, for assistant and associate professors as well as for PhD and master students. It is therefore relevant to argue that if the professors are being positioned as peripheral actors by their departments, it has an effect not only on their self-esteem as professionals, but also on music education as a research field. If female professors are deconsecrated and disempowered it is implicitly shown that their expertise and research are of less value. A conclusion from the findings might be that music education needs specific contexts for its persistence, and perhaps an increased focus on gender equality in departments where the liberal arts and the performing arts are positioned in the forefront.

References

- Abeles, H. (2009). Are musical instrument gender associations changing? *Journal of research in music education*, 57, 127–139. <http://jrm.sagepub.com/content/57/2/127>
- Abramo, J. M. (2009). *Popular music and gender in the classroom* [Doctoral dissertation]. Columbia University. ProQuest LLC.

- Acker, S., & Webber, M. (2009). Women working in academe: Approach with care. In C. Skelton, B. Francis, & L. Smulyan (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of gender and education* (pp. 483–496). Sage.
- Acker, S. (2010). Gendered games in academic leadership. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 20(2), 129–152. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09620214.2010.503062>
- Acker, S. (2012). Chairing and caring: Gendered dimensions of leadership in academe. *Gender and Education*, 24(4), 411–428. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2011.628927>
- Acker, S. (2014). A foot in the revolving door? Women academics in lower-middle management. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 33(1), 73–85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2013.864615>
- Adkins, L., & Skeggs, B. (2004). *Feminism after Bourdieu*. Blackwell.
- Armstrong, V. (2011). *Technology and the gendering of music education*. Ashgate.
- Barrett, M., & Stauffer, S. L. (2009). *Narrative inquiry in music education. Troubling certainty*. Springer.
- Bergonzi, L. S. (2015). Gender and sexual diversity challenges (for socially just) music education. In C. Benedict, P. Schmidt, G. Spruce, & P. Woodford (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of social justice in music education*. <https://global.oup.com/academic/product/the-oxford-handbook-of-social-justice-in-music-education-9780199356157?cc=se&lang=en&#>
- Björck, C. (2011). *Claiming space. Discourses on gender, popular music and social change* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Gothenburg]. <https://gupea.ub.gu.se/handle/2077/24290>
- Blix, H. S., Mittner, L., & Gjørnum, R. G. (2019). I kjønneste orden? Kvalitet og betydningen av kjønn i vurdering av professor- og dosentkompetanse i kunstfagene [Quality and the influence of gender when assessing professor competence within the arts]. *Nordic Journal of Art and Research*, 8(1), 1–18. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7577/information.v8i1.2853>
- Bondestam, F., & Grip, L. (2015). Fördelning eller förfördelning? Forskningsfinansiering, jämställdhet och genus – en forskningsöversikt. [Research funding, equality and gender – a research overview.] *Forskningens villkor 2015*(1). Nationella sekretariatet för genusforskning. University of Gothenburg.
- Borgström Källén, C. (2014). *När musik gör skillnad – genus och genrepraktiker i samspel* [When music makes a difference – gender and genre practice in interplay]. [Doctoral dissertation, University of Gothenburg]. <https://gupea.ub.gu.se/handle/2077/35723>
- Borgström Källén, C., & Lindgren, M. (2017). Performing gender when music is, or is not, at stake – a meta-analysis on students' adaption to discourse. *Nordic Network for Research in Music Education, Yearbook 18*, 97–116.

- Borgström Källén, C., & Lindgren, M. (2018). Doing gender beside or in music: Significance of context and discourse in close relationship in the Swedish music classroom. *British Journal of Music Education*, 35(3), 223–235. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0265051717000316>
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). *Kultursociologiska texter* [Writings on sociology of culture]. In D. Broady & M. Palme (Selection). Salamander.
- Bourdieu, P. (1988). *Homo academicus*. Oxford Polity.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993). *The field of cultural production*. Columbia University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2000). *Konstens regler. Det litterära fältets uppkomst och struktur* [The rules of art]. Symposium.
- Bourdieu, P. (2001). *The masculine domination*. Polity Press.
- Burnard, P., Hofvander Y., & Söderman, J. (2015). *Bourdieu and the sociology of music education*. Ashgate.
- Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter. On the discursive limits of 'sex'*. Routledge.
- Cattani, G., Ferriani, S., & Allison, P. D. (2014). Insiders, outsiders and the struggle for consecration in cultural fields: A core-periphery perspective. *American Sociological Review*, 79(2), 258–281.
- Citron, M. (1993). *Gender and the musical canon*. University of Illinois Press.
- Clandinin, D. J. (2007). *Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology*. Sage.
- Connell, R. (2009). *Gender in world perspective*. Polity Press.
- Dahlin-Ivanoff, S. (2018). Fokusgruppsdiskussioner [Focus group discussions]. In G. Ahrne & P. Svensson (Eds.), *Handbok i kvalitativa metoder* [Handbook in qualitative methods] (pp. 81–92). Liber AB.
- de Boise, S. (2018). Gender inequalities and higher education: comparing the UK and Sweden. *British Journal of Music Education*, 35(1), 23–41.
- De Fina, A., & Georgakopoulou, A. (2015). *The handbook of narrative analysis*. Wiley Blackwell.
- Dyndahl, P. (2002). *Musikk/teknologi/didaktikk. Om digitalisert musikkundervisning dens diskursivitet og (selv) ironi* [Music/technology/education. On digitilized music education, its discursivity and (self) irony]. Unipub AS.
- Dyndahl, P., Karlsen, S., Nielsen, S. G., & Skårberg, O. (2017). The academisation of popular music in higher music education: The case of Norway. *Music Education Research*, 19(4), 438–454. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14613808.2016.1204280>
- Esaiasson, P., Gilljam, M., Oscarsson, H., & Wängnerud, L. (2012). *Metodpraktikan. Konsten att studera samhälle, individ och marknad* [Practical methodology. The art of studying society, individual and market]. Nordstedts.
- Ferm Almqvist, C. (2019). Towards offering equal learning opportunities for female students in popular music ensemble education: Relate, respond, and re-do. *Music Education Research*, 21(4), 371–386. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14613808.2019.1633293>
- Frazer, M. (1997). *Justice interruptus: Critical reflections on the 'Postsocialist' condition*. Routledge.

- Ganetz, H. (2009). *Rundgång, genus och populärmusik* [Feedback loops, gender and popular music]. Makadam.
- Gould, E. (2012). Homosexual subject(ivity)s in music (education): Deconstructions of the disappeared. *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, 20(1), 45–62.
- Green, L. (1997). *Music, gender and education*. Cambridge University Press.
- Griffin, G. (2017). *A dictionary of gender studies*. Oxford University Press Online Version. <https://www-oxfordreference-com.ezproxy.ub.gu.se/view/10.1093/acref/9780191834837.001.0001/acref-9780191834837>
- Husu, L., & de Cheveigné, S. (2010). Gender and gatekeeping of excellence in research funding: European perspectives. In B. Aulenbacher, E. Kirsch-Auwärter, U. Müller, & B. Riegraf (Eds.), *Gender change in academia. Remapping the fields of work, knowledge, and politics from a gender perspective* (pp.43–59). Springer.
- Kalm, S. (2019). Om Akademiskt hushållsarbete och dess fördelning [On academic housekeeping and its allocation]. *Sociologisk forskning*, 56(1), 5–26.
- Leonard, M. (2007). *Gender in the music industry, rock, discourse and girl power*. Ashgate.
- Lorentzen, A. H. (2009). *Fra syngedame til produsent, Performativitet og musikalsk forfatterskap i det personlige projektstudioet* [From singbird to producer. Performativity and musical authorship in an individual studio project]. [Doctoral dissertation, University of Oslo]. <https://openarchive.usn.no/usn-xmlui/handle/11250/2437870>
- McClary, S. (1991). *Feminine endings: Music, gender and sexuality*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Nerland, M. (2003). *Instrumentalundervisning som kulturell praksis. En diskursorientert studie av hovedinstrumentundervisning i høyere musikkutdanning* [Instrumental teaching as cultural practice. A discourse-oriented study of teaching in higher music education]. [Doctoral dissertation]. University of Oslo.
- Nylander, E. (2014). *Skolning i jazz. Värde, selektion och studiekarriär vid folkhögskolornas musiklinjer* [Jazz schooling. Value, selection and music careers in folk high schools] [Doctoral dissertation]. Linköping University.
- Pellegrinelli, L. (2008) Separated at 'birth': Singing and the history of jazz. In N. Rustin & S. Tucker (Eds.), *Big ears: Listening for gender in jazz studies* (pp. 31–47). Duke University Press.
- Stewart, R. (2010). Creating new stories for praxis: navigations, narrations, neonarratives. In E. Barrett & B. Bolt (Eds.), *Practice as research approaches to creative arts enquiry* (pp. 123–134). Tauris & Co.
- Wieland Howe, S. (2009). A historical view of women in music education careers. *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, 17(2), 162–183.
- Wych, G. (2012). Gender and instrument associations, stereotypes and stratification, a literature review. *National Association for Music Education*, 30(2), 22–31.