

CHAPTER 14

The Discursive Terms of Music/Teacher Education at Four Higher Educational Institutions

Elin Angelo

Norwegian University of Science and Technology

Jens Knigge

Nord University

Morten Sæther

Queen Maud University College of Early Childhood Education

Wenche Waagen

Norwegian University of Science and Technology

Abstract: In this chapter, we examine how music/teacher education is represented on the websites of four Norwegian institutions that offer diverse kinds of music/teacher education at the BA, MA, and PhD levels and that offer qualifications for all types of music teaching professions in Norway. These four cases serve as examples of the main traditions of music/teacher educations in the Nordic area, with distinctive differences in their notions of music, pedagogy, professional orientation, and research. The analysis is theoretically grounded in Foucault's concepts of power/knowledge and governmentality. The findings suggest, on the one hand, considerable variations among the institutions and, on the other hand, similarities in how the representations operate in a range of steering techniques in the ways that these education programs, orientations, groups, and individuals are portrayed. The concluding discussion questions the power/knowledge constructions that provide authority to the dominating discourses, critically pointing to some effects that diverse representations might have for positions, ambitions, and individuals. Getting the diverse communities of music/teacher

Citation of this chapter: Angelo, E., Knigge, J., Sæther, M. & Waagen, W. (2021). The Discursive Terms of Music/Teacher Education at Four Higher Educational Institutions. In E. Angelo, J. Knigge, M. Sæther & W. Waagen (Eds.), *Higher Education as Context for Music Pedagogy Research* (pp. 351–385). Cappelen Damm Akademisk. <https://doi.org/10.23865/noasp.119.ch14>

License: CC BY-NC-ND 4.0.

educations to communicate seems imperative to evolve more reflexive, conscious, and participative music/teacher education programs in the 21st century.

Keywords: music teacher education, higher music education, website analyses, governmentality, power/knowledge

Music/teacher education in Norway is located in both higher music education (e.g., music academies) and in teacher education (at universities and colleges) institutions. These institutions are built on numerous traditions, foregrounding variations of music and modes of music education, teacher education and pedagogy, or the traditions combining these. The relation between music/teacher education and diverse music teacher professions in Nordic countries was previously identified to follow specific paths: universities educated teachers for upper secondary school, music conservatories educated teachers for music schools, and teacher education programs educated teachers for compulsory school (Nielsen, 2001). Because of extensive merging and collaboration in vocational fields and in the field of higher education, these paths are no longer as distinct (Aglen & Karlsen, 2017; Eidsvaag & Angelo, 2021; Holgersen & Holst, 2020; Nielsen, 2010). Today, musicians, teachers, and music teachers might combine a range of vocational tasks at the intersection of performing and teaching, correspondingly music teacher qualifications can be earned through many routes. A considerable body of discourse-oriented research has examined these fields, focusing on music teachers' practices and negotiations of professional identity and expertise (Ericsson & Lindgren, 2011; Jordhus-Lier, 2018; Krüger, 2000; Nerland, 2003; Mills, 2004). Internationally, there is a growing interest in evolving music teacher education programs to responsibly and inclusively embrace cultural, contextual, and local diversity (Benedict & Schmidt, 2014; Bowman, 2007; Kaschub & Smith, 2014). While the diverse music education practices in schools and society merge in the vocational field, this merging has not necessarily influenced the different music teacher programs. For example, although generalist music teacher education seems to train teachers to be competent in classroom management and group activities as singing and dancing, specialist music teacher education leads to practices of nurturing

individual skills in instruments, composing, and listening (Sætre, 2014, 2018). Music teaching seems to a great extent to be personally conducted, dependent on the individual teacher and his/her competence, confidence, and background (Dobrowen, 2020; Georgii-Hemming & Westwall, 2010; Kaschub & Smith, 2014). Music is also observed to be a threatened subject and area of practical and specialized knowledge area in teacher education, suppressed by less economically demanding arts subjects (Lindgren & Ericsson, 2011; Nielsen, 2010). So far, little research has been conducted on the institution's websites and their role in gearing knowledge development in the specific directions in this field. This chapter is a contribution in that regard.

Websites are a main way of recruiting new students and of reflecting and constructing institutional visions, values, achievements, and learning opportunities for the public and for the internal audience. Studies of the websites of educational institutions have been conducted within several fields (Callahan, 2005; Campbell-Price, 2017; Leathwood & Read, 2009; Zhang & O'Halloran, 2013). Studies of university prospectuses suggest an increased shift from how universities earlier communicated their identity as academic communities of scholars and learners toward increased marketization and the use of corporate branding language (Askehave, 2007; Fairclough, 1993; Hoang & Rojas-Lizana, 2015; Lažetić, 2019; Saichaie, 2011). Differences in university websites have also been identified as the consequences of national and institutional cultures (Callahan, 2005). Our approach to the examination of music/teacher education websites focuses on the negotiations of power/knowledge relations and the steering techniques that these include. Following Foucault's thinking on "authorship", we consider the authors of the websites as discursive entities who are "speaking" on behalf of the dominating discourses in each institution (Bayne, 2006; Foucault, 1977).

The background for this chapter is the research network MiU (*Musikkpedagogikk i utvikling*/Music Pedagogy in Development), established in 2018 through a collaboration among the four institutions that this chapter focuses on. Today, the MiU network consists of four institutions, five departments, and around 60 researchers employed at institutions that (intentionally or unintentionally) educate music teachers for schools, kindergartens,

societies, communities, and higher education (Angelo, 2020, F1). These institutions and departments are built on different and even contradictory traditions but have in common that they qualify music teachers/musicians that also teach many of the same music teacher positions in the merged fields of practice. Discussions among researchers at the various seminars and workshops offered by the MiU network from 2018 to 2020 have led to several questions about what courses the different institutions offered, the titles of those courses and education programs, employees' titles, and the main aims for each education program. Institutionalized habits and norms were identified and questioned. For example, discussions arose about the variety of terms used for subjects, disciplines, professional titles, and practices – even though the content was more or less the same; also, the titles of professional positions and subjects were similar but reflected dissimilar content and practices. Those discussions and observations led us to the idea of thematizing the institutionalized differences and addressing the following research question: How is music/teacher education represented and conducted through the websites of four different institutions? The slash sign in “music/teacher education” is employed to mark that not all of these institutions have music teacher education as their primary target. For example, two of the institutions are first and foremost *teacher* educations, with explicit mandates to educate teachers for kindergartens or school, in diverse kinds of subjects and knowledge areas. Another institution in the study is primarily oriented toward educating musicians and musicologists, with pedagogical education as only one of several choices for the students. Still, all these institutions educate teachers, and who are qualified to teach music, or educate musicians/musicologists, and who are also qualified to teach – in schools, kindergartens and a merged practice field. An intention of the current study is not to identify any “right” or “wrong” music teacher education but to scrutinize the diverse representations of music pedagogical qualification that are expressed on the four chosen institutions' websites. We mirror them in each other and suggest correctives and discussions that might provide reflexive and conscious approaches toward qualifying music/teachers in the twenty-first century. Before we present the research design and the four cases and discuss our findings, we first outline our theoretical premises.

Theoretical Premises

Theoretically, this chapter uses a discourse-oriented approach, where the term “discourse” is drawn from social sciences and cultural studies. Learning first and foremost on Foucault’s theories, discourse is employed as a concept connected with power and conducting for institutionalized ways of reasoning and acting. More specifically, the theoretical premises for this chapter are built on Foucault’s (1998/1980) thoughts on power/knowledge and forms of steering and steering technologies, developed in his later writings and progressing from his earlier works on unfolding how historic-specific processes led to certain perceptions, articulations, and procedures in specific fields of knowledge (e.g., Foucault, 1966/1989, 1988, 1995/1975, 2003/1963). In particular, the chapter builds on the term “governmentality”, which concerns the nature of power and the steering techniques that power operates in modern society (Dean, 2006; Foucault, 1991; Rose, 1996). Even though the term “power” rarely appears in study plans and strategy documents, this approach enables us to consider how power operates in the official representations of these education programs. Foucault sees power as productive rather than repressive and as mediated through all participants in a community rather than as a force directed from the top of the hierarchy. In fields of power/knowledge, for example, in the field of music pedagogy, certain perceptions, articulations, and terms are at stake. Related to this chapter, for example, are the ways to posit music as a subject, how music teacher qualifications are earned, and what they consist of, as well as ways to consider individuals as students, educators, and student applicants in relation to the education programs. In an analysis of governmentality, one main aim is to unfold how knowledge and power connect in specific ways and to determine which steering rationalities are included (Dean, 2006, p. 15). Through, for example, disciplinary power, pastoral power or biopolitical power, or through steering rationality as liberalism and risk conduct, individuals and groups can be seen to incorporate self-conduct and self-monitoring to integrate well into a given power/knowledge community, or to “identitate” (Schei, 2007) specific self-understandings. “Discipline”, in Foucauldian terms, is a mechanism of power that regulates the behaviors of individuals in a social society, while “pastoral” power encompasses these mechanisms toward some kind of “salvation” (Christianity), and

“biopolitical” power also concerns an individual’s biological and social body, including illness, health, life, and death. Thus, the institutions that serve as Cases 1–4 in the current study can be seen to fuel power through their website portrayals of individuals, learning activities, and knowledge development and to posit certain visions, ideals, and expertise as normal and rewarding.

According to Foucault, education is one of the strongest mechanisms in society because of its “claims for truth”. Given that, not only is knowledge power but the paths toward knowledge are also paved with power. With governmentality as our theoretical lens, we aim to examine how power displays in subtle mechanisms that merge outer, direct, and visible steering with inner steering, such as self-discipline, ownership, and autonomy (Dean, 2006). The individual’s participation in any power/knowledge community is authorized through incorporating specific perceptions, aims, and ways of using language; then, power operates to facilitate and stimulate certain actions and ways of thinking. In Rose’s (1996) theories about governmentality and advanced liberal conduct, power operates with reference to the individuals as “free subjects” with the capability, responsibility, and agency to make wise choices on their own. Molding and regulating individuals and groups through representations of music/teacher education can thus be viewed as ways of orchestrating the communities toward specific positionings and actions.

Methodology

In this methodological part of the chapter, we describe our data material, our analytical approach and ethical considerations, and the four music/teacher education institutions which this study concerns (Cases 1–4).

The data material consists of screenshots (June 2020) of the official websites, including hyperlinks to course descriptions and descriptions of mission and vision, and subgroups and employees at the institutions investigated: (Case 1) Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Department of Music; (Case 2) Queen Maud University College (DMMH); (Case 3) Nord University; and (Case 4) NTNU, Department of Teacher Education. All of these web pages are stored as PDFs using the

Fireshot software and can be found in the OSF repository.¹ The web pages are arranged by institution and number and will be referred to in the text as, for example, “C1, F1”—meaning: Case 1, Fireshot 1. Some websites exist only in Norwegian, so the translation to English used in the analysis section is done by the authors. Geographically, these four institutions are close (< 80 km; all located in the mid-Norwegian county Trøndelag), but the traditions and profiles of these institutions are different. Together, they qualify music teachers for kindergartens, schools, music and art schools, and universities. They all offer music/teacher education at the BA, MA, and PhD levels (alone or in collaboration with others) through the study programs of music performance, music technology, and musicology (along with one-year practical pedagogical education), vocational music teacher education, early childhood teacher education, general music teacher education for compulsory school, and specialized music teacher education.

The analytical work with this material follows a path framed by Jackson and Mazzei (2012) as a theory-driven approach to qualitative research. From this, the analytical process is more focused on identifications of steering techniques and knowledge/power relations based on a Foucauldian reading and less focused on following specific analytical steps. This theoretical approach also follows a considerable path of discourse theoretical studies within Nordic research in music education from 2000 onwards (Angelo et al., 2019; Jordhus-Lier, 2018; Krüger 2000; Lindgren & Ericsson, 2011; Nerland, 2003; Nielsen & Karlsen, 2020; Rolle et al., 2017). In this chapter, the term “discourse” is drawn from the field of social sciences and cultural studies and labels the whole set of terms, issues, and formulations embedded in a given cultural field. Steaming from Foucault’s theories and development of the term discourse (from 1960), we employ discourse as a social theoretical term connected to power and reflecting on how power in society materializes in institutionalized ways of reasoning and acting. From this approach, researchers might identify certain discourses as, for example, *dominating* (commonly accepted ways to view and speak about certain matters), *hegemonic* (supreme,

¹ <https://osf.io/zdp7u/>. Choose + on the option “data”, and the PDFs turn up.

interconnected with an ideology that justifies a society's acceptance of truths and normality), or *antagonistic* (opposing the given truths and normality, struggling among themselves to gain hegemonic positions). In the huge variations of how discourse-oriented research is connected, Angermüller (2015) suggests distinguishing between discourse-*analytical* paths, which follow exact methodological procedures, and discourse *theoretical* paths, which read the data from theoretical views without following particular steps and procedures. The current study follows the discourse theoretical path.

The ethical considerations in the present study concern the ways that we present our institutions and colleagues and how we engage in the analytical process concerning “our own” institutions’ websites. Website/document studies have advantages regarding openness, availability, stability (in PDF), lack of obtrusiveness, and reactivity (Bowen, 2009). Still, the analysis and interpretations of these websites can lead to different connections, patterns, and conclusions. Even though an insider perspective can be beneficial to pinpoint and more deeply explain the historical development and effects of identified steering mechanisms, we have thoroughly engaged in reading each other’s websites and questioned and rechecked in-progress analyses. The analysis has been conducted as a “bottom-up” approach, beginning with the body of website information. Ongoing discussions in our institutions – that are not represented on these websites – on the potential effects and causes have not been included in the analysis. With a social constructive approach, our aim is still not to present any one and only “truth”, but to provide transparent and respectful interpretations and discussions with transient references to specific websites (as PDF files in the OSF repository) and previous research. The study is conducted in line with the Norwegian Guidelines for Research Ethics in the Social Sciences, Humanities, Law and Theology (NESH, 2016) and the guidelines and requirements from the Norwegian Data Protection Services (NSD). Internet research is thematized in both these guidelines, but still, there exist several gray zones. Direct consultation with the NSD gave us clear directions in storing and treating the websites from research ethical perspectives. One main consequence of these consultations is that all individual names and photographs on the websites are blurred in the OSF repository.

The specific questions that frame our analyses are the following: (1) What dominating discourses mark the representation of music/teacher education on the institutions' websites? (2) How are teachers and students positioned within the area of music education on these websites? (3) Which steering techniques can be identified to conduct educators and students through these representations? Before we discuss the findings, we briefly present our four institutions.

The Four Cases

Case I. NTNU, Department of Music (IMU)

The Department of Music (IMU) has 450 students and 100 employees. IMU has developed over the past 40 years from a teacher training college (later: NTNU, Department of Musicology) and an independent conservatory, being firmly anchored in a teaching program, to a professional education program integrated with NTNU that also meets the academic conceptions of knowledge, practices, and qualifications. Upon integration, the department's only pedagogical position disappeared because ILU (Case 4) took over responsibility for pedagogy.

IMU offers studies within four programs: music performance studies (including practical pedagogical education), musicology, music technology, and dance studies (C1, F1). These programs all define their social mission by giving descriptions of job opportunities after study completion (C1, F5). The term "music pedagogue" does not appear among these social missions although the contents have significant pedagogical elements related to the job market and aim to qualify students for music teacher positions in compulsory schools and music schools. Music pedagogy is not mentioned in the titles of courses, with the exception of Instrumental Didactics,² which is an add-on course that performance students can choose. IMU has no MA program in music education, but several of the

2 The term "didactic" as used in Scandinavian education context relies to the German term "Didaktik", which has a very different meaning than the English term "didactics" and can be explained as the science of teaching. Please see the introduction chapter in this book for a more thorough elaboration.

MA theses in musicology (C1, F11) and a few of the MA theses in music performance (artistic/scientific interpretation) are characterized by their pedagogical focus.

Even if the department staff participate in artistic and creative activities in national and international contexts, their titles only reflect their level in the academic hierarchy, such as professor, senior researcher, or assistant professor (C1, F2). There is one exception: there is an associate professor of music didactics (C1, F8) (author 4).

Case II. Queen Maud University College (DMMH)

Queen Maud University College (DMMH) is a private college with the social mandate to educate early childhood education teachers; there are approximately 1,400 students and 150 employees. In 2013, “Preschool Teacher” was renamed “Early Childhood Teacher Education”. This marked a shift in the view of children as “becomings” to children as “beings”. Today’s framework of Norwegian kindergarten (Kunnskapsdepartementet, 2018, pp. 11–21) emphasizes the kindergarten as a cultural arena and one for children’s participation and democracy, including children’s play, wonder, and exploring. However, at the same time, several significant alterations appeared in early childhood teacher education. One was that the aspects of art and children’s culture were diminished in the field of education, replaced with more focus on learning (Kunnskapsdepartementet, 2012). In all course plans pursued by the new framework, clear requirements are set for measurable learning outcomes. Another significant change was that education became centered around interdisciplinary subjects instead of specific disciplines and subjects, and general pedagogy was included among the interdisciplinary subjects.³ The reason for this was expressed in the curriculum framework: to target the education toward the teaching profession (Kunnskapsdepartementet, 2018, 2012). This led to that development that even though the title of the educational program and the profession turned away from the term “school”, schooling, learning, and pedagogy were emphasized more.

3 Course plans, DMMH: <https://studier.dmmh.no/nb/studieplaner>

DMMH offers a BA (180 credit points [cp]) through four different programs with their own profiles and also four MA programs (120 cp) in the following areas: (1) a general program of early childhood teacher education; (2) a program focusing on music, drama, and the visual arts; (3) a program focusing on nature and the outdoor environment; and (4) a program focusing on multiculturalism in early childhood teacher education (ECTE) (C2, F1). One of the master's programs includes the module Children's Culture and Art Pedagogy. Music is not a separate subject in the general model for ECTE but is included as one of several subjects in the module Art, Culture, and Creativity (ACC), which positions arts subjects and artistic activity as one of several paths in ECTE. This module is mandatory for all four BA programs but is differently emphasized depending on the BA program. All education programs target early childhood teachers as independent of the educator's subject-specific background.

The music department at DMMH holds six academic positions (C2, F2). Five of these (one associate professor and four assistant professors) all have "music" included in their professional work title. The one top-level position in this department, the professor (docent) (author 3), gained the professional title of music pedagogy by applying advancement. All employees in the music department have their master's degree from NTNU, Institute of Music (Case 1) (C1, F11). All employees therefore applied for their jobs at DMMH expecting to adapt the music content for the ECTE students and, through them, for the kindergartens (Jobbnorge, 2014, 2018).

Case III. Nord University, Faculty of Education and Arts, Campus Levanger⁴ (NORD)

Within Nord University, all artistic subjects are located within the Faculty of Education and Arts (C3, F1). The faculty has approximately 3,500 students and includes a division for Arts and Culture that offers studies in music, drama and in arts and crafts. The division's music department

4 Until recently, Levanger was an independent university (HiNT) and was merged with other universities to form Nord University in 2016. However, the structure of music teacher education continued, so even today, there is still an independent music teacher education, which can be examined as an individual case in the present study. (Within Nord University, however, the subject of music is also part of other teacher education programs on the Nesna and Bodo campuses.)

at Campus Levanger has seven full and five associate professors and nine lecturers and assistant professors (C3, F3a,b). The music department has no individual website, and the university's website only provides a sub-page for the research group Music-Related Learning Processes, which comprises 10 members of the music department (C3, F2). The music department offers three study programs: (1) music teacher training (BA, 180 cp); (2) music teacher in music schools (*kulturskole*) (BA, 180 cp); and (3) an MA in music and ensemble direction (120 cp). Furthermore, there is the possibility of undertaking a doctorate in the field of music education (PhD program, Study of Professional Praxis).

None of Nord's course titles mentions *musikkpedagogikk* (music pedagogy) or similar terms (e.g., *musikkdidaktikk*/music didactics). However, *musikkpedagogikk* (music pedagogy) is part of the content of several bachelor's courses. First and foremost, it is an explicit and main element of the "teaching profession" modules (45 cp in total; these modules combine various educational contents and subjects). Outside these modules, when *musikkpedagogikk* (music pedagogy) is mentioned, there is often a strong focus on methodological aspects (e.g., warm-up techniques for choir singers) or a more implicit understanding (e.g., through mentioning a target group, like primary school children, for whom a piece of music should be composed) (C3, F7). In line with these observations, the term "pedagogy" is mostly used without the prefix "music," mainly when general pedagogical content is addressed (*allmenpedagogikk*/general educational science). When the term "music" is combined with educational content, the term "didactics" is mostly used (i.e., *musikkdidaktikk*). Within the curriculum of the MA program, the term *musikkpedagogikk* (music pedagogy or similar terms) is not used at all. However, there is the possibility of realizing projects and artistic work in pedagogical contexts (kindergarten, primary school, etc.). Also, an MA thesis can have a pedagogical focus (C3, F8).

At Nord University, the employee register shows only the positions (professors, lecturers, etc.) at the register's top level (C3, F3a,b). Music as a subject is not explicitly mentioned as part of the descriptions but is assigned to a person within a subcategory ("employee's skills", i.e., the content indicated by "music" is attributed as a "skill" to any person

working with music in any way). Scientific/artistic disciplines/domains (e.g., music education, musicology, violin, conducting, etc.) are not mentioned. Within the Department of Music, there are two employees with a PhD in (music) education (and four doctoral students working on a PhD in music education). The other employees (i.e., the vast majority) have an artistic professional background and subsequently teach mainly artistic courses (C₃, F_{3a,b}).⁵

Case IV. NTNU, Department of Teacher Education (ILU)

The Department of Teacher Education (ILU) at NTNU is presented on the website as Norway's largest academic environment within teacher education and educational research, with around 360 employees and 4,000 students (C₄, F₄). The overall focus is to educate general and subject-specific teachers in all school subjects for grades 1–13, as well as to educate school leaders. All course descriptions at ILU are clearly targeted at the profession of teaching. ILU offers education at the BA, MA, and PhD levels and a one-year add-on teacher program. The artistic and pedagogical development work and research at ILU is also geared toward schools, classrooms, and workplaces. This focus on the teaching profession strongly influences all sections at ILU, including the Arts, Physical Education, and Sports section, which comprises 38 professional positions, out of which 13 are within the subsection Music, Dance, and Drama, and seven positions are in music or music education (C₄, F₃).

The music department does not have its own website: it is part of the interwoven Arts, Physical Education, and Sports section and focuses on bodily, sensory, and aesthetic approaches to teaching and learning (C₄, F₂). Within the 10 bullet points presenting “research in, about or through the arts and artistic development”, the word “music” is displayed in one, while the other nine more generally describe research on teaching pedagogies, arts education, aesthetic learning, art in public spaces, and so on.

5 Timeedit, which is open to search for the individual staff's teaching tasks: <https://cloud.timeedit.net/nord/web/open/r1161XQQ7woZuoQv56o5YgZ6ynY.html>

Several of the course descriptions within music reflect that music is part of the interdisciplinary subject of “arts education” (e.g., the two-year MA program in arts education). Following this, subject-specific words such as “music”, “musician”, and “musical” are replaced with more general and, hence, not discipline-specific terms such as “the arts”, “artist”, and “artistic”. The lexical term “music pedagogy” exists in one study plan at ILU as a research and development (R&D) subject in the five-year teacher education for the compulsory school (MGLU) with MA in music.

The employee register at ILU shows both position and subject (C4, F3). The music group has one “professor in music education”, one “assistant professor in music didactics”, four “assistant professors in music”, and four “associate professors in music”. Two of these associate professors have a PhD in music education (C4, F3). The whole context of ILU’s website (C4, F1) reflects that all employees are, first and foremost, teacher educators, even though that is not specified in the employees’ professional titles. By clicking those employed in music and on their publication lists, it can be seen that two of the associate professors have music performance as a central R&D area, while the other five have either scholarly music education research or a mix of music performance/music education research as their core R&D work.

Dominating Discourses that Form the Representation

Across the presented institutions, we identified four discourses that operate power/knowledge relations in the representations of music/teacher education through embedded steering techniques. The first three include an antagonistic division between two confronting chains of equivalence, which both through present and absent elements demand hegemony: (i) two antagonistic profession discourses, (ii) two antagonistic discourses on the subject of music (iii) two antagonistic discourses on R&D, and (iv) a discourse of marketization. The following text elaborates on the identification of these discourses, examines how they seem constructed and how power operates through them in positioning individuals, groups, aims and articulations of knowledge. In the conclusionary remarks, we scrutinize the

authorities through which these discourses are mediated and critically outline some effects that these might have on future music/teacher educations.

Profession Discourses: Music or Pedagogy?

The profession discourse is marked by two antagonistic discourses: one foregrounding music and musicians/artists and the other foregrounding pedagogy and pedagogues/teachers. Cases 1–4 position quite differently on an axis between these representations, with Case 1 (IMU) being the most marked on the first (music); Cases 2 (DMMH) and (partly) 4 (ILU) the most marked on the latter (pedagogy, teacher education); and Case 3 (Nord) somewhere in the middle.

Music-Oriented Representation

On their opening web page and in the descriptions of the institution, courses, groups, and individuals, IMU (Case 1) claims to educate excellent and groundbreaking musicians. For example, a video portrayal of one of IMU's performance educators presents herself as a person who has "always played music" and posits music as being "about performing and communication" (C1, F3). Governance can be seen as operating power by "recognizing individuals' capacities for freedom and agency and directing this energy in specific ways" (Rose, 1996). IMU's portrayals can be seen as a means to identify the external and internal aims and background of individuals and gear their efforts toward integrating themselves well into IMU's community and the institution's discursive terms. This means, for example, spending much time practicing an instrument, aiming for personal expressions, and describing their knowledge development with words from the music performing world. Authority is then claimed for perceptions of music education directed at music performance. To operate self-understandings as musicians and performers displays as a prevailing condition in this education program, conducting self-discipline and effort to certain actions.

Music teacher education and music pedagogy are never mentioned in any of IMU's 165 course titles (except in the 30 cp course *Instrumental-didaktikk*). Neither is it apparent that all employees here spend 40–60%

of their time teaching. The words *musikkpedagogikk* and “music teacher education” are absent from all course descriptions. Still, IMU’s website calls attention to how at least 80% of the students will become employed as music teachers (C1, F4), and that educating music teachers is a crucial part of this institutions social mandate. For example, the vision and mission page about the music performance program states that “music performance education at NTNU Department of Music shall educate highly qualified performing musicians and music teachers” (C1, F6), and the musicology program is described as follows: “Educating adjuncts and lecturers for the educational system was and is the most clearly defined social mission for the educational program of musicology” (C1, F7). Several of the courses at IMU are directed at leading others in musical activities (ensemble leadership, accompaniment, cantor practice, laptop instruction, performance) (C1, F1). Through transient omission of the employees’ teaching practice and words of pedagogy/didactic/teaching and learning in course titles, the websites might be seen to route the IMU environment towards emphasizing musical artistry, creative and performing courses, and research. Viewed in totality, there is a discrepancy between the formalized social message about job opportunities, on the one hand, and the factual contents of course plans and teacher status, on the other hand. The responsibility for pedagogical education and introduction into educational research seems clearly ascribed to ILU (C1, F1).

IMU’s discursive praxis suggests that music education itself qualifies music teachers, without referring to either pedagogy or teacher education. This claims the authority to view and articulate musical knowledge as implicitly also referring to teaching expertise. In a governmentality analysis, power does not originate from a centrum but is a productive force that circulates among individuals and groups in all parts of a hierarchy. Through the websites, course plans, and presentations, power is exercised through directing individuals and groups to follow a music performance path and considering this to implicitly contain music teaching expertise.

Teacher/Pedagogy-Oriented Representation

The two institutions clearly positioned on the teacher/pedagogy part of the music pedagogy axis are DMMH (Case 2) and ILU (Case 4).

The websites of both institutions posit music as one of several subjects that play a subordinate role in qualifying teachers. For example, the following statement appears on ILU's website: "We educate teachers within a wide range of school and vocational subjects for grades 1 through 13. ... Our practice- and profession-oriented programs provide a solid foundation for future careers and life-long learning" (C4, F5). Music is just one of several subjects and is subordinated to the professional subject of pedagogy for earning a teaching qualification. Arts subjects on DMMH's website are positioned more as decorations in the form of photos of students doing music and art than as autonomous areas of knowledge and expertise. The primary subject at DMMH seems to be early childhood pedagogy. The term "music" is expressed and communicated as an expert field only in announcements of new positions (e.g., Jobbnorge, 2014, 2018). It is taken for granted that early childhood pedagogy is a lens for teaching and understanding the qualities of music in education when explaining the child's holistic development and cultural expression. Additionally, all music lecturers at DMMH have received their MA in music education from IMU (C1, F11), the institution that most clearly downplays pedagogy and teacher education. Following this, music lecturers at DMMH meet institutional expectations to "use" music as a tool for learning outcomes, such as social competence, language and communication development, cultural education, and aesthetic experience, without any educational background represented to cover such topics.

In both institutions (Cases 2 and 4), power is encompassed to view the subject of music as one of several subordinated fields of knowledge that future teachers gain from. In the same way as in the music-oriented representation of music pedagogy, these representations incorporate a claim for knowledge with embedded power relations, but the other way around. Here, pedagogy and teacher orientation mark the territory and work toward self-technologies that lead toward becoming a teacher and—through this—mean something for the child, the school, and society. These self-technologies are operated into the positioning of students and educators.

A common position that unites the communities at ILU and DMMH is their way of representing future teachers as responsible and autonomous

individuals with ambitions to be saviors. For example, ILU's website states, "As a teacher at a primary school, you are more than a person with a responsibility for the subject content. You are a key person in the child's life" (C4, F5). This quote positions the student and future teacher as an important person with a responsibility for understanding and taking care of the new generation. "A key person" in a child's life bears a main responsibility and authority to govern society and humans in the future. ILU's website can be seen as operating a pastoral form of power through portraying teachers as someone who can both lead children toward important knowledge and care for children's growth as members of a society. This power is even more clearly observed on DMMH's website, which opens with the following: "Are you adult enough to work with children? Choose early childhood teacher education at DMMH. Then you will obtain the skills that you need for the new jobs that exist. Do what's best for children" (C2, F3). On DMMH's website, we identified an embedded encouragement to "save" the children and an included presupposition that this role needs to be qualified. In positing that children's welfare is at stake, this representation operates both pastoral and biopolitical forms of power, including both the bodies and minds of the new generation. These self-steering mechanisms are further emphasized through a range of testimonials from teachers and students on DMMH's website, which all forefront DMMH as a provider of education where both students and teachers make a difference. Through DMMH's education program, the students gain professional identity and pride – to become child caretakers, or maybe even "child saviors" and thereby "societal saviors", even though what the children need to be saved from is never articulated.

So far, we have identified representations of music/teacher education as, more or less, without music and, more or less, without pedagogy. Nord University's position is somewhere in between, with an equal emphasis on music and pedagogy, operating power mechanisms and presenting claims for knowledge that include both positions. On Nord University's website, pedagogy is often the context referred to without determining precisely the relationship of a course's content to this context, what exactly pedagogical thinking means, or what the content means for the pedagogical thinking. A musicology course description

illustrates this: “The student can apply knowledge of music history in his didactical practice” (C₃, F₄).

When turning to the professional titles of the employees at the four institutions, only ILU and DMMH label their employees according to both title and subject, for example, as “associate professor of music”. IMU and Nord, on the other hand, only offer the employees an academic title (professor, associate professor, etc.) without any reference to the subject. This posits the academic hierarchy as the dominating subject and operates power that claims climbing the academic career ladder as superior to subject-specific expertise. The academization discourse will be elaborated on later in this chapter, but this labeling of the professional community also concerns targeting professions. Through a praxis that molds academic aspirations as crucial, the academic positioning of music teacher educators operates power contributing to a public presentation of music pedagogy. Both students and educators are provided with tools and opportunities through their education to act on this, which entails effort to influence individuals and groups to follow desired directions.

In sum, we find two antagonistic discourses that operate power through recognizing and targeting the capacities and agencies of individuals and groups to posit music/teacher education as falling primarily within either music or pedagogy. Music teachers (students and educators at these institutions) are offered roles as “child saviors”, “music experts”, “performers”, and “community-builders” and are provided with the language, tools, and choices needed to fuel their professional development toward this. These two discourses exclude each other and make it challenging to involve understandings that merge them. A main topic in the field of music education research is which ideals govern; those of music or those of the individual and the society (Bowman, 2007; Ericsson & Lindgren, 2011; Georgii-Hemming & Westwall, 2010; Sætre, 2018). While general teacher educations emphasize social skills and personal growth, fronting music as a means toward this, specialized music educations emphasize individual music skills and artistic expression, being less concerned with classroom management and music activities for unequal groups (Sætre, 2018). Critical concerns here include observations that legitimacy for

arts education in teacher education is constructed through positioning students, teachers, and future pupils as in need of therapy. A *lack* of specialized knowledge and expertise in music is even seen as a quality mark for teacher competence and a pedagogical tool, in positioning the students and the teachers with equal, unskilled premises (Lindgren & Ericsson, 2011). Also, specialized music teachers rarely include collective music activities such as singing and dance in their music teaching in the compulsory school, instead focusing on individual skills, listening and composing (Sætre, 2018). Because of a continuously merging practice field and hybrid tasks for music teachers – future music teacher education programs seem to need grounding in several approaches that can provide for a multitude of identity formations, role understandings, and epistemological standpoints. A challenge for future music teacher educations then seems to be to critically reflect on the diverse perspectives and steering techniques that these include and to provide a meeting place to articulate and critically reflect on the differences where students and educators develop tools to identify, discuss, and even change the hegemony and antagonistic representations of music teacher professionalism as either concerning music or concerning humans.

Interdisciplinarity: Music and “the Arts” – Two Sides of the Same Coin?

The websites represent the subject of music in two different ways: (i.) as its own autonomous field of expertise (IMU and Nord) and (ii.) as part of an interdisciplinary field of “arts education” (DMMH and ILU). Within the more or less “pure” music-specific representations, the area, groups, and individuals are posited as individuals (IMU) or participants in a community, together with the educators, co-students, and related communities (Nord). Within its interdisciplinary representation, music is presented as an area with desires for “aesthetical approaches to learning” and as an area where subjects such as music, visual arts and drama, and theater and dance are considered several sides of the same coin. The tendency to merge music with other arts subjects is also observed in Danish and Swedish music/teacher educational programs (Holgersen &

Holst, 2020; Lindgren & Ericsson, 2011; Nielsen, 2010). As a result of that music has disappeared as a compulsory subject in general teacher educations in several countries (2003 in Norway, in the 1980s in Denmark; Holgersen & Holst, 2020, p. 9), general teachers in schools have not necessarily received any music teaching since they left compulsory school as teenagers, the number of music educators within general teacher educations is falling, and (the cost-demanding) subject of music is generally marginalized both in teacher educations and in schools. Although there are similarities between music and arts subjects such as dance, drama, and arts and crafts, there are also considerable differences. For example, regarding the emphasis on handicraft and overarching intention. Lindgren and Ericson (2011) find that although drama in Swedish teacher education aims to improve the students' general sense of security as a teacher, music aims for teacher security specific related to situations involving singing and playing based on concrete technical skills in music.

The techniques of conduct are embedded in several ways in the interdisciplinary representations of music at the four institutions' websites. For example, the music group at ILU is part of an interdisciplinary section: "The *Arts, Physical Education, and Sports* section focuses on bodily, sensory and aesthetic approaches to teaching and learning. The section works with both practice-led and theory-driven research and artistic development, and inclusive and critical perspectives on teaching pedagogies" (C4, F2). In this quote, both students and teachers in music education are targeted to self-monitor and self-regulate their behavior and interest in bodily, sensory, and aesthetic approaches. Other possible approaches, such as subject-specific knowledge, technical skills, and familiarity with repertoire and performance, are left out. Further, this quote from ILU is followed by another phrase: "A goal is to promote ethically conscious relations, dialogues and collaborations across disciplines and boundaries, within the context of the teaching profession" (C4, F2). This can even be seen to suggest that other approaches might lead to *unethical* relations, dialogues, and collaboration. This is a powerful statement (operating disciplinary, pastoral, and biopolitical power), where the words "across disciplines and boundaries" clearly state the

interdisciplinary aim. Subject-specific knowledge development could, from this perspective, be judged as contrasting with and contradicting the aim of ethical consciousness. The language and terms here work as an apparatus that conducts the notions of music in more or less the same way as, for example, dance, drama, and visual arts, suggesting that music can be unproblematically merged with or even replaced by one of the other subjects within “arts education”.

Another example can be found with DMMH, where music is not a separate subject in the general model for ECTE but is included as one of several subjects in the module Art, Culture and Creativity (ACC): “The knowledge area [ACC] emphasizes aesthetic experiences, reflection, communication and expression through various sensory media ... the development of students’ aesthetic awareness, practical skills and creative abilities, as well as insight into the art possibilities and intrinsic value and their role as mediating tools in other areas of knowledge” (C2, F4). Arts education is positioned in a utilitarian manner as “tools” for learning diverse subjects and ways.

These representations of the subject of music display how terms, procedures, and knowledge are at stake. The different representations of music function as a steering technique that operates through the whole institutions’ thoughts of capacity, lives, and rewarding actions. Interdisciplinary and overdisciplinarily are seen as beneficial to counteract subject-specific introversion and narrow-mindedness and to elucidate and utilize music in broader educational contexts but at the same time can be a menace to concentrated absorption in music as its own specific art area with distinctive challenges for subject-specific know-how and insights (Nielsen, 2010, p. 15). Without these skills and crafts, the concept of quality in music and other arts subjects’ faces being relativized in teacher education because a lack of skills might become regarded as a superior teacher competence to align the positions between the teacher and the students (Lindgren & Ericsson, 2011). A challenge arising from the analyses is how music teacher education programs might qualify to reflect these perspectives up against each other, discuss what is gained and what is lost, and consider this in relation to the diverse contexts that future teaching musicians/music-oriented teachers might meet.

Academization: Scientific Research or Artistic Development?

Due to extensive merging in Norwegian higher education in the last 25 years, many conservatories and music/teacher education programs have changed their institutional status from colleges or college universities to full universities. With this academization process comes increased expectations for research, publications, academic career routing, and level-standardized education programs (Angelo et al., 2019). All cases in the current study employ the academic routes for BA, MA, and PhD degrees, and students are supposed to either write a BA or MA thesis or perform and be graded on their BA examination concert. While processes of academization are seen to possibly strengthen the legitimization of music education and music teacher education and increase critical reflections among students and teachers, they threaten time and courses for developing handicraft knowledge and technical skills in music education (Borg, 2007; Georgii-Hemming et al., 2013; Lindgren & Ericsson, 2011; Varkøy et al., 2020).

In our study, this process of academization is displayed, among other things, through banners on the various websites promoting research (DMMH, Nord, ILU), or either just research or research combined with artistic development (IMU) (C1, F9; C2, F1; C3, F1; C4, F1). Under these banners, there are hyperlinks to a wide variation of research groups and projects. This will route internal as well as external readers toward a notion of R&D as something one is expected to do and is rewarded for. IMU states, “The Department of Music has approximately 80 researchers and performing artists, including tenured staff, emeriti and temporary or guest researchers”. None of the research groups and research projects under this banner include any phrasing regarding music teacher education or music pedagogy/didactics. The subwebsite Artistic Research and Development is presented with the following introduction: “The department’s professional staff contributes extensively to the artistic R&D through its involvement in diverse activities such as musicians performing at concerts, recordings and media contributions locally, nationally and internationally—both as soloists, in a chamber music context, and as leaders of various types of ensembles and orchestras. Several of the

department's employees are also active composers" (C₁, F₁₀). This phrasing follows up on the professional targeting discussed before, which positions individuals and groups first and foremost as music artists, performers, and creators.

In Case 3, ILU's subsite for research states, "Our skilled teacher educators conduct R&D work targeting schools, classrooms and workshops", steering the efforts of R&D toward schools and the general teaching profession (C₄, F₆). Case 2 (DMMH) routes energies in R&D toward children, childhood, and kindergarten: "DMMH aims to produce relevant research and provide new knowledge of early childhood education and care to the society in general, as well as to our students and collaborating institutions at home and abroad" (C₄, F₄). Under the banners for research on both the ILU and DMMH websites, music teacher educational research is represented with a hyperlink to the earlier mentioned research group MiU. At Nord University, one research group articulates music teacher education as a main aim, operating power that directs groups and individuals to act on music pedagogical themes in their research and artistic development work. Some interesting additional information here is a concern at Nord University, ILU, and DMMH that artistic developmental work does not "count" for standard publication points in the same way that peer-reviewed publishing in academic journals does. At Nord, this has the consequence that employees who do not publish (enough) are "punished" with more time spent teaching; part of their research time is reduced, which is then "converted" into teaching time (C₃, F₉). In this way, power works in the community to steer individuals toward publishing rather than toward music performance efforts. This is the case even though most of the educators here are recruited from and employed with a background in music performance (C₃, F₃).

The representations of R&D work on these four institutions' websites display a tension between (1) a scientific path and (2) artistic path. Interest, enthusiasm, and effort in research activity is expected from both educators and students and can result in (1) scientific publications as journal articles, academic books, or BA, MA, or PhD theses or in (2) concerts or other performative presentations at senior and BA, MA, or PhD levels. The Norwegian system for financing research in higher education rewards

the scientific path, with funding from the state given to the researchers' home institution for each published article, book, theses, and so forth. A similar system for artistic presentations has been requested for decades but is still lacking. Music education research calls for clearer articulation and critical reflection but warns of transforming music into a pure "academic" subject and neglecting the development of specific knowledge and skills that pertain to music as an art form (e.g., Bowman, 2007; Georgii-Hemming et al., 2013; Kaschub & Smith, 2014; Nielsen, 2010). Although scientific and artistic paths could benefit from informing and challenging each other, a main issue rising from the analyses above is that these discourses seem to disqualify and exclude one another. Considering the identified steering mechanisms regulating the individual and collective conduct toward R&D, it seems unlikely that these expertise communities can communicate from a common ground. For example, methodology, verbal reflection, and positioning within previous research seem less emphasized in artistic paths for development and research, and dimensions of art seem less emphasized in pure scientific paths in music educational R&D. Without communication and exchanging ways to work with R&D, these paths might continue scientific and artistic approaches as oppositions, leading to narrow-mindedness and exclusion, instead of embracing diversity and inclusion.

Marketization: Toward a Corporate Branding of Music/Teacher Education

University promotions in the twenty-first century are found to have a growing tendency toward marketization, advertising, and student competition (Fairclough, 1993; Lažetić, 2019; Mautner, 2012). In our analysis, a market-oriented rationality for education is displayed on the websites of all four institutions. All websites are designed in a "streamlined" way, with more or less the same information under generally the same banners. This relieves student applicants of having to search for information and eases the administrative work for these studies, but it also works to suppress the possible characteristic features of each institution. A market-oriented rationality is also displayed through the advertising style of the

presentations of all four institutions, with language adopted from the corporate world (e.g., excellence, strategy, input, output), not least in the personal and direct ways that students are addressed. For example, a student testimonial on DMMH's web page claims that DMMH's education programs "will change your life and make you see things differently" (C2, F1). Here, power operates with reference to the individual freedoms and capacities and (seemingly) leaves it to the individuals and groups to choose the suggested paths, take up the offered subject positions, and then self-monitor and self-conduct toward the given opinions, identities, and desirable knowledge. Each individual is expected to "perform a regulated form of freedom" (Rose, 1996) and to follow given paths.

The corporate style of addressing students and student applicants as responsible and active customers is a considerable pattern on Nord University's website: "As a music student in Levanger, you become part of a vibrant and active music community consisting of around 140 students. You will also have good access to the practice rooms and technical equipment. In addition, there is a separate, student-run club scene on campus: Røstad Scene. This is a good arena for students who want to practice music or who want to learn more about the technical aspects, such as sound and light" (C3, F5). This posits students as responsible, operative, and self-sufficient customers, with their own capacities to direct their education. The educators at Nord are positioned as conventional partners, facilitators, and coaches, even as co-students—who are available resources for each student to utilize. The hierarchy between students and teachers is minimized at Nord, for example, in a course description: "Emphasis is placed on student active learning through, for example, presentations, teaching, self-reflection, work in groups, role-play and multimodal learning forms. Participation and active collaboration between students is necessary" (C3, F6). Here, advanced liberal governing (Rose, 1996) can be identified, allowing the students to "learn from experience" and freely choose to participate in the music environment offered to them. Such freedom is a presupposition for power to be performed, according to Foucault (1991) and Rose (1996), in market-driven higher education governance structures.

On IMU's website, the same liberal form of governing is observed, but in another direction: "At the Department of Music, we educate the

future professional musicians and music educators in jazz, classical music and church music. The bachelor's program in music performance gives you the opportunity to develop musical skills to a professional level, through targeted work on your main instrument, in the meetings with established musicians and through the development of a personal artistic expression and good communicative ability" (C1, F3). This quote exemplifies how students and student applicants at IMU are directly addressed through the pronouns "you" and "your". The terms "a professional level", "established musicians", and "personal artistic expression" positions the students as novices in an expert community. The teachers at IMU are profiled through photos, videos, and text as recognized musicians, while the phrasing "NTNU has trained some country's most famous performers in all genres" (C1, F3) distributes these positions as possible for novices to gain. In contrast to Nord's website, the teachers at IMU are positioned as experts, with exclusive capabilities that novices can also achieve—and when they follow a foot-worn path and integrate themselves well into the disciplinary systems of an expert, performing music community. Incorporated in this is the expertise needed to teach music well.

Although music in compulsory school in Norway (in 2020) is one of 10 subjects in a common education with tasks to form wise and participating citizens of society, music is a massive sector in society with many informal educational routes free for the individual to choose. Educated music/teachers meet a work market where many of these routes are merged and influence each other. The analysis above displays how the marketization of the higher education institutions positions the institutions as resources, free for the individual student to choose, as customers in a shopping mall. This marginalizes the institutions' mandate and responsibility to enhance the students and the field of music education with aspects that cannot be ordered and delivered based on individual requests (e.g., responsibility toward democracy, inclusion and diversity). Previous research has identified how music education is made a personal matter both in compulsory school (Georgii-Hemming & Westwall, 2010), leaving the content and the aims for the subject up to the individual teacher and his/her day form, and in extra-curricular music and art school (Holmberg, 2010), leaving it up to the individual student to "order" what music education

concerns. Through the present study, the higher educations in music and teaching might have abandoned any overarching ambitions beyond the student's individual choices. This raises the question about the music/teacher educational programs' collective responsibility and reflections on any common content and target groups. Research concerning music education and music teachers calls for manifold, inclusion and attendance to both differences and quality (e.g. Bowman, 2007; Georgii-Hemming & Westwall, 2010; Kaschub & Smith, 2014), emphasizing higher education as a transforming place to take care of all this (Johansen, 2006; Kaschub & Smith, 2014). From this, it seems crucial for the diversity of music/teacher educations to attend to the differences and articulate their mandates and visions beyond individual preferences and customized proposals. Faith in the individual is good, but higher education toward the hybrid work marked for music/teachers should perhaps have something common to add. The latter seems in that case essential to be articulated.

Concluding Remarks

Through the analyses, we have identified informal steering techniques that regulate the individual's and collective's prospects, self-understandings, values, and languaging of music/teacher's work and competence. These techniques operate disciplinary, pastoral, and biopolitical power in close persuading individuals, groups, and institutional communities. Our intention with these analyses has not been to detect "the best" music/teacher education program, nor to rate the four institutions in any way. Instead, our intention has been to examine the representations and conduct of music/teacher educations on these websites, mirror them in each other, and articulate possible correctives and discussions to evolve future music/teacher education programs. In this last section of the chapter we first sum up our discussions and identified discourses (i.–iv.), and then pose some disturbing prospects that ignoration of these informal steering mechanisms might bring for future music/teacher education programs.

(i.) We have identified two antagonistic discourses on professionalism: the first perceived and articulated from the basis of music (Cases 1 and 4) and the latter with a basis in pedagogy and the teaching profession (Cases 2, 3,

and 4). These findings coincide with previous music educational research, pointing to how music teacher education is targeted either toward music or toward humans as individuals and groups (e.g., Bowman, 2007; Ericsson & Lindgren, 2011; Georgii-Hemming & Westwall, 2010; Sætre, 2018, 2014). Our contribution is the identification of these antagonistic perspectives on public websites that pursue both the established communities and recruiting students. (ii.) Two opposite positions were identified regarding music as a subject. One involved music as its own, autonomous area of expertise and terms (Cases 1 and 4), and the other encircled music as one of several subjects within “the arts”, with aesthetical learning and sensory and bodily experience as a common area of knowledge and terms (Cases 2 and 3). Music as a subject has been found to either reflect objects or activities (music/musicking, e.g., Elliot, 1995; Small, 1988) and in teacher educations to reflect an overdisciplinary area of knowledge, including subjects such as drama, theater, dance, and arts and craft (Lindgren & Ericsson, 2011; Holgersen & Holst, 2020; Nielsen, 2010). Worries have been expressed both about adopting narrow-minded and restrictive views on music and about depriving music-specific knowledge and skills through positioning music as part of mere broad and overdisciplinary knowledge areas. (iii.) R&D is emphasized as main activities and interest on all four websites. An underlying tension in this discourse is that although scientific research is displayed as self-evident and unproblematically provides funding, many employees are recruited from performance and musical backgrounds and teach first and foremost in practical music disciplines. Artistic research and artistic developmental projects are registered on the websites, but scientific research has proved most gainful in higher education systems. (iv.) All the examined websites operate a liberal form of conduct and position students and educators as free individuals with the capability and responsibility to form their own lives and agencies. The educations are presented in advertising and competing ways, realizing music/teacher-roles and competence as personal choices and obligations.

These analyses have led to the following question: Who – from what knowledge community, background, and agency – should lead the development of music teacher education programs in the future? Should this,

for example, be people from “music”, “pedagogy”, “the arts”, “research” or perhaps from an advertising agency? The discussions above suggest that fundamentally different values, terms, knowledge, and mandates might be staged in future music/teacher education programs, depending on whose and what communities’ “naturalness” is mediated. We could, for example, see a future in which professors of “arts education” replace today’s professors of “music education” and in where subjects in “music” are replaced with subjects in “the arts”. We can also foresee a future in which teaching and pedagogical expertise is no longer part of higher music education programs. Higher music education can also be envisioned without any academic schooling, where writing and reflecting are replaced with performing and creating – or the opposite: in which academic research and top-level publishing becomes the most central activity in music education at all levels. Further, we can imagine how the increasing marketization of music teacher education allows anyone, without any specific music educational background, to perform as capable and responsible managers of future reforming and recreation, or to phrase it in advertising terms, “renewing” of music teacher education programs.

Here, it seems necessary to advance awareness within music/teacher educations about how informal regulations and mechanisms authorize specific power/knowledge connections, for example, how self-discipline, prospects, and efforts are routed toward individual practicing, social, or therapeutic endeavors, intervening with other subjects or writing articles, or how articulations and framings in advertisements for new positions, funding, and projects gear recruitment and knowledge development. This concerns what and whose knowledge, views on music, humans, societies, learning and teaching, and values and visions are governed in music/teacher education programs and whose and what that are left out. Such awareness is challenging, if not impossible, to gain from “inside” this various field because antagonistic mechanisms cultivate exclusion and hinder meta-questions. Also, discussing identified regulations is a challenging endeavor because the terms and names in this field are loaded and infiltrated parts of the mechanisms. It is undoubtedly difficult to speak without words, and it might be so that the various fields

of music education lack words. A more nuanced terminology might be required to refine and deepen the reflections about music, learning, and teaching in accordance with the diverse approaches that all might be valid to meet different contexts, people, and music(s). Teaching musician/music-oriented teachers is one such attempt (Bowman, 2007; Kaschub & Smith, 2014), and music/musicking is another (Small, 1989); in this chapter, music/teacher educations are a third. This path of slash terms can illustrate an area of terms and approaches to be developed and a common meta-level where aspects of agency and steering mentality are identified, thematized, and critically discussed. To do this, the communities need to communicate, and exactly this seems to be a needed part of the agenda.

References

- Aglen, G. S., & Karlsen, S. (2017). Jeg vil bli kulturskolelærer når jeg blir stor – hva innebærer det? En undersøkelse av kvalifiseringsveier innenfor musikkfeltet [How do I become a teacher in the music and art school? An examination of the qualification routes within the field of music education]. In E. Angelo, A. Rønningen, & R. J. Rønning (Eds.), *Forskning og utvikling i kulturskolefeltet. Den doble regnbuen: IRISforsk [Research and development in the field of kulturskole. The double rainbow: IRISforsk]* (pp. 157–184). Cappelen Damm Akademisk.
- Angermüller, J. (2015). Discourse studies. In J. D. Wright (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of the social & behavioral sciences* (2nd ed., pp. 510–515). Elsevier.
- Angelo, E. (2020). Musikkpedagogisk forskning – en møteplass? [Music pedagogical research—a meeting place?] In Ø. J. Eiksund, E. Angelo, & J. Knigge (Eds.), *Music technology in education—Channeling and challenging and perspectives* (pp. 7–14). Cappelen Damm Akademisk.
- Angelo, E., Varkøy, Ø., & Georgii-Hemming, E. (2019). Notions of mandate, knowledge and research in Norwegian classical music performance studies. *Journal for Research in Arts and Sports Education, Special Issue Community Arts / Arts Education*, 3(1), 78–100. <https://jased.net/index.php/jased/article/view/1284>
- Askehave, I. (2007). The impact of marketization on higher education genres – the international student prospectus as a case in point. *Discourse Studies*, 9(6), 723–742.
- Bayne, S. (2006). Temptation, trash and trust: The authorship and authority of digital texts. *E-Learning and Digital Media*, 3(1), 16–26. <https://doi.org/10.2304/elea.2006.3.1.16>

- Benedict, C., & Schmidt, P. (2014). Educating teachers for the 21st-century challenges: The music educator as a cultural citizen. In M. Kaschub & J. Smith (Eds.), *Promising practices in 21st century music teacher education* (pp. 79–99). Oxford University Press.
- Borg, K. (2007). Akademisering. En väg till ökad professionalism i läraryrket? [Academisation. Increasing professionalism in the teacher vocation?]. *Pedagogisk forskning i Sverige [Educational research in Sweden]*, 12(3), 211–225.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40.
- Bowman, W. (2007). Who is the “we”? Rethinking professionalism in music education. *Action, Criticism and Theory for Music Education*, 6(4), 109–131.
- Callahan, E. (2005). Cultural similarities and differences in the design of university web sites. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 11(1), 239–273.
- Campbell-Price, M. (2017). It depends on the priorities: the presence and profile of outdoor education on school websites. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, 18(3), 189–200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14729679.2017.1409642>
- Dean, M. (2006). *Governmentality: Power and rule in modern society*. Sage.
- Dobrowen, L. (2020). *Musikk på barnetrinnet. En studie av læreres forståelser av profesjonalitet i musikkundervisning [Music in the primary school. A study about teachers understandings of professionalism in music education]*. [Doctoral dissertation, The Norwegian Academy of Music]. <https://nmh.brage.unit.no/nmh-xmlui/handle/11250/2672795?locale-attribute=en>
- Eidsvaag, F. F., & Angelo, E. (2021). The craftsmanship that disappeared? About the music teacher’s handicraft education on a principal instrument. In E. Angelo, J. Knigge, M. Sæther, & W. Waagen (Eds.), *Higher education as context for music pedagogy research*. (pp. 65–94). Cappelen Damm Akademisk.
- Elliot, D. (1995). *Music matters: A new philosophy of music education*. Oxford University Press
- Ericsson, C., & Lindgren, M. (2011). The conditions for establishment of an ideological dilemma: Antagonistic discourses and over-determined identity in school music teaching. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 32(5), 713–728. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2011.620754>
- Fairclough, N. (1993). Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse: The universities. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), 133–168.
- Foucault, M. (1966/1989). *The order of things*. Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1977) What is an author? In D. F. Bouchard (Ed.), *Language, counter-memory, practice: Selected essays and interviews by Michel Foucault* (pp. 113–138). Cornell.
- Foucault, M. (1988). Technologies of the self. In L. H. Martin, H. Gutman, & P. Hutton (Eds.), *Technologies of the self: A seminar with Michel Foucault* (pp. 61–49). Tavistock.

- Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect. Studies in governmentality* (pp. 85–103). University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, M. (1995/1975). *Discipline and punish. The birth of the prison*. Second Vintage Books Edition.
- Foucault, M. (1998/1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings: 1972–1977*. Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (2003/1963). *The birth of the clinic: An archaeology of medical perception*. Taylor & Francis e-library.
- Georgii-Hemming, E., & Westvall, M. (2010). Music education – a personal matter? Examining the current discourses of music education in Sweden. *British Journal of Music Education*, 27(1), 21–33. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0265051709990179>
- Georgii-Hemming, E., Burnard, P., & Holgersen, S. (2013). *Professional knowledge in music teacher education*. Ashgate.
- Hoang, T. V. Y., & Rojas-Lizana, I. (2015). Promotional discourse in the websites of two Australian universities: A discourse analytic approach. *Cogent Education*, 2(1), 1011488.
- Holgersen, S.-E., & Holst, F. (Eds.) (2020). Musikfaget i undervisning og uddannelse. Status og perspektiv 2020 [Music in teaching and education. Status and perspectives 2020]. *Musikpædagogiske Studier – DPU* [Music Educational Studies – DPU]. https://edu.au.dk/fileadmin/edu/Udgivelser/Rapporter/Rapport_-_Musikfaget_i_undervisning_og_uddannelse_2020.pdf
- Holmberg, K. (2010). *Musik- och kulturskolan i senmoderniteten: reservat eller marknad?* [The community school of music and art in late modernity: Reservation or market?] [Doctoral dissertation, Malmö Academy of Music]. <https://www.lu.se/lup/publication/59e988cb-3252-45bd-a936-08fie8b6b0c9>
- Jackson, A. Y., & Mazzei, L. A. (2012). *Thinking with theory in qualitative research. Viewing data across multiple perspectives*. Routledge.
- Johansen, G. (2006). Fagdidaktikk som basis- og undervisningsfag. Bidrag til et teoretisk grunnlag for studier av utdanningskvalitet [Subject didactic as basic- and teaching subject. Contributions to a theoretical foundation for examining educational quality]. *Nordic Research in Music Education, Yearbook 8*, 115–136.
- Jobb Norge (2012). Utlysningstekst. Høgskolelektor i musikk [Announcement for vacant positions, assistant professor in music]. Dronning Mauds Minne Høgskole, 22. January.
- Jobb Norge (2014). Utlysningstekst. Førsteamanuensis/førstelektor i musikk [Announcement for vacant positions, associate professor in music]. Dronning Mauds Minne Høgskole, 25. February.
- Jordhus-Lier, A. (2018). *Institutionalising versatility, accommodating specialists. A discourse analysis of music teachers' professional identities within the Norwegian*

- municipal school of music and arts* [Doctoral dissertation, The Norwegian Academy of Music]. <https://nmh.brage.unit.no/nmh-xmlui/handle/11250/2480686>
- Kaschub, M., & Smith, J. (Eds.). (2014). *Promising practices in 21st century music teacher education*. Oxford University Press.
- Krüger, T. (2000). *Teacher practice, pedagogical discourses and the construction of knowledge: Two case studies of teachers at work* [Doctoral dissertation]. Bergen University College.
- Kunnskapsdepartementet [Ministry of Education and Research]. (2012). *Forskrift om rammeplan for barnehagelærerutdanning* [Regulation on the framework plan for early childhood teacher education]. <https://lovdata.no/dokument/SF/forskrift/2012-06-04-475>
- Kunnskapsdepartementet [Ministry of Education and Research]. (2018). *Nasjonale retningslinjer for barnehagelærerutdanningen* [Guidelines for early childhood teacher education]. https://www.uhr.no/_f/p1/i8dd41933-bffi-433c-a82c-2110165de29d/blu-nasjonale-retningslinjer-ferdig-godkjent.pdf
- Lažetić, P. (2019). Students and university websites – consumers of corporate brands or novices in the academic community? *Higher Education*, 77, 995–1013. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-018-0315-5>
- Leathwood, C., & Read, B. (2009). *A feminised future? Gender and the changing face of higher education*. SRHE & Open University Press.
- Lindgren, M., & Ericsson, C. (2011). Arts education in Swedish teacher training – what’s at stake? *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(8), 18–31.
- Mautner, G. (2012). The entrepreneurial university: A discursive profile of a higher education buzzword. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 2(2), 95–120. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405900500283540>
- Mills, J. (2004). Working in music: Becoming a performer-teacher. *Music Education Research*, 6(3), 245–261.
- 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 instrumental teaching in higher music education]. [Doctoral dissertation]. University of Oslo.
- NESH (2016). *Forskningsetiske retningslinjer for samfunnsvitenskap, humaniora, juss og teologi* [Guidelines for research ethics in the social sciences, humanities, law and theology]. Den nasjonale forskningsetiske komité for samfunnsfag og humaniora [The National Committee for Research Ethics in the Social Sciences and the Humanities] (NESH). <https://www.etikkom.no/forskningsetiske-retningslinjer/Samfunnsvitenskap-jus-og-humaniora/>
- Nielsen, S. G., & Karlsen, S. (2020). The case of Norway: A microcosm of global issues in music teacher professional development. *Arts Education Policy Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10632913.2020.1746714>

- Nielsen, F. V. (2001). Musiklæreruddannelse i et integrativt relationsfelt: Indhold, struktur og opgaver [Music teacher education in an integrating field of relations: Content, structure and tasks]. *Nordic Research in Music Education, Yearbook 5*, 159–176.
- Nielsen, F. V. (Ed.) (2010). Musikfaget i undervisning og uddannelse. Status og perspektiv 2010 [Music in teaching and education. Status and perspectives 2010]. *Musikpædagogiske Studier – DPU*. [Music Educational Studies – DPU]. https://pure.au.dk/ws/files/32963127/Statusrapport_Musikfaget_2010.pdf
- Rolle, C., Angelo, E., & Georgii-Hemming, E. (2017). Mapping the methodological field of ‘discourse analysis’ in music education research. A review study part 1. In A. Cvetko & C. Rolle (Eds.), *Musikpädagogische Forschung* (pp. 153–164). Waxmann.
- Rose, N. (1996). Governing ‘advanced’ liberal democracies. In A. Barry, T. Osborne, & N. Rose (Eds.), *Foucault and political reason: Liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationality of government*. UCL Press.
- Saichaie, K. (2011). *Representation on college and university websites: An approach using critical discourse analysis* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa]. <https://ir.uiowa.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2456&context=etd>
- Schei, T. B. (2007). *Vokal identitet: en diskursteoretisk analyse av profesjonelle sangers identitetsdannelse* [Vocal identity: a discourse theoretical analysis of professional singers identity formation] [Doctoral dissertation, University of Bergen]. <http://hdl.handle.net/1956/2549>
- Sætre, J. H. (2014). *Preparing generalist student teachers to teach music: A mixed-methods study of teacher educators and educational content in generalist teacher education music courses* [Doctoral dissertation, The Norwegian Academy of Music]. <https://nmh.brage.unit.no/nmh-xmlui/handle/11250/226772>
- Sætre, J. H. (2018) Why school music teachers teach the way they do: A search for statistical Regularities. *Music Education Research*, 20(5), 546–559. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14613808.2018.1433149>
- Varkøy, Ø., Angelo, E., & Rolle, C. (2020). Artist or crafts(wo)man? *European Journal of Philosophy in Arts Education*, 5(1), 7–32. <http://www.ejpae.com/index.php/EJPAE/article/view/41>
- Zhang, Y., & O’Halloran, K. L. (2013). Toward a global knowledge enterprise: University websites as portals to the ongoing marketization of higher education. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 10(4), 468–485. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2013.813777>