The conservatoire and the society[1]

Geir Johansen

Introduction

Conservatoires operate within societies undergoing rapid and continuous social and cultural change. As institutions of higher education, what challenges emerge with respect to their institutional self-image and notions of agency in this situation?

The seminal sociologist Emile Durkheim (1956/2007, p. 23) held that "[e]ducational transformations are always the result and the symptom of the social transformation in terms of which they are to be explained". Based on such insights, scholars of the sociology of education (e.g. Adams, 2013; Apple, 2013, 2007, 2006; Naidoo, 2005; Sadovnik, 2007) have long attended to the relationship between education and society, with higher education as one of their focus areas (e.g. Barnett, 2005; Margolis, 2001). It seems commonly agreed among those scholars that higher education reflects as well as contributes in shaping the society. Hence, by the virtue of being institutions of higher education, conservatoires inevitably play a role in the development of the society, which is why questions can be raised if they should explicitly reflect on this role and take an active part in the public conversation about society.

Traditionally, conservatoires serve to conserve cultural heritages. The etymological roots of 'conservatoire' underline this. From Latin, it entailed a place for preserving or carefully keeping anything, and from the start of the 1800s it was applied to schools of music for performing arts (ETYMONLINE, 2019). During the latest decades, however, conservatoires have also addressed the society in other ways than conserving a musical canon. Having increased their attention towards what has been called their societal or social assignment as well as strengthening their focus on justification purposes and developments on the labour market, projects of social outreach have increased in numbers, including music dissemination and activities in more untraditional areas and arenas such as prisons, hospitals and retirement homes.

---

[1] This chapter addresses issues from my Keynote speech at *The Protean Musician* conference at the Norwegian Academy of Music, November 2017 (Johansen, 2017).

However, voices have also been raised suggesting to widen the perspective beyond the social outreach idea. At the conclusion of the 2012 *The Reflective Conservatoire* conference at the Guildhall School of Music & Drama in London, Guildhall professor John Sloboda asked:

> Do conservatoires have any contribution to make to addressing the increasing polarization of modern society, increasing environmental and economic threats … not simply … the sickness and brokenness of the prison cell or the hospital ward, but also the shortcomings of the corporate boardroom or of the political system? (Tregear et al., 2016, p. 2)

In this chapter, I want to elaborate on Sloboda's widening of the social perspective of conservatoires to include the larger society and its challenges. This can be seen as re-actualising Durkheim's (1956/2007) reciprocal relationship between education and society followed by an emerging question about the possible responsibility of higher education institutions to engage in disseminating their experiences with the present political system, in order to take part in the public conversation and debate on society at large. Entailed, a perspective emerges which highlights the relationship between conservatoires and the priorities of business life and general politics, including principles of democracy.

I will approach this complex area by bringing the world into music education in the shape of perspectives from sociology (Baumann, 2012; Beck, 1994; Featherstone, Lash & Robertson, 1995; Giddens, 1990, 1991; Laclau & Mouffe, 2014) as well as the sociology of education (Adams, 2013; Apple, 2013, 2007, 2006; Dewey, 1897; Naidoo, 2005, Sadovnik, 2007) and a side-glance to the history of economics (Slobodian, 2018). Within this scope, I will discuss the relationship between the conservatoire and the society by differentiating between the intentional and functional sides of the former, and between conservatoires' societal assignment, contribution and responsibility.

Conservatoires and the society

The relationship between conservatoires and the society is many-sided, having its formal as well as informal sides. Formally, conservatoires address this relationship by their statements of goals, aims and intentions within policy documents and websites (Jørgensen, 2017) as well as communications with the authorities through official channels. Informally, the implementation of the priorities included in those statements, traceable within policy trajectories (Horsley & Johansen, 2016), can at least follow three paths. The first entails whom they give access, and the second the ways they design and revise their courses educating those who got that access, or in other words, their students. Thereby, via their graduates and post-graduates they take on the responsibility of influencing social arenas such as public school music education and schools of music and performing arts as well as music in upper secondary education. Thirdly, conservatoires address their social relationship by the ways and extent to which they take part in the public debate about society. Some of these informal sides overlap with their hidden curricula (Bradley, 2015; Johansen, 2021; Pitts, 2003), including the ways and extent to which they reproduce class advantages, musical hierarchies, gender issues, and foster other unintended learning outcomes in their students.

In a societal macro perspective, the relationship between the conservatoire and the society can be connected with the contemporary social and cultural condition which Antony Giddens (1990, 1991) calls late modernity. Sociology overflows with descriptions of the liquidness of our late modern condition. Zygmunt Baumann (2012, p. vii-viii) describes it as "a temporary and transient – as well as unfinished, incomplete and inconsistent – interim settlement" wherein "change is the only permanence, and uncertainty the only certainty". Giddens (1990, p. 53) on his side, describes it as modernity in its extreme, wherein "social life is rolled away from the fixities of tradition" and Ulrich Beck (1994, p. 7) points to that people "are being expected to live with a broad variety of different, mutually contradictory, global and personal risks". He thereby also draws the attention towards globalization (Featherstone, Lash & Robertson, 1995; Kertz-Welzel, 2018; Smith, 2003), a central trait of late modernity (Smith, 2003; Johansen, 2019). Alexandra Kertz-Welzel (2018) suggests that institutions such as conservatoires need to discuss globalisation in connection with the increasing weight on internationalisation in higher education politics, and how such institutions see themselves as parts of a globalized, yet culturally sensitive music education community.

When looking at conservatoires through lenses such as late modernity and globalization, , we should bear in mind that the late modern condition, with its variety of values, religious preferences, moral norms, and lifestyles to choose from, is not a condition of peaceful coexistence of non-hierarchical, parallel priorities. On the contrary, it is a condition wherein the discourses of different philosophies, ideologies, politics and policies constantly struggle about hegemony (Laclau & Mouffe, 2014). For example, during the recent history of education in western societies, we have seen such hegemonic struggles between positivist and positivism-critical discourses and philosophies (Karlsen & Johansen, 2019).

Clearly, these struggles have been won by discourses promoting marketization philosophies tightly connected with a neopositivist[2], numerical way of viewing education and educational research. The latter includes a notion that only empirical research is educationally relevant, prioritising research studies with preference for deduction over induction and emphasis on statistical analysis and methods following those of the natural sciences such as demonstrated by, for example, John Hattie's (2009) *Visible learning*. Studies equating the values of students' learning outcomes with future income rates (Inset, 2018) constitute another example. This way of looking at education dominates the discursive frames within which conservatoires have to navigate at the beginning of the new Millennium, for example with respect to the rhetoric of justification or when asserting artistic-educational priorities. These discursive frames are characterised by a one-dimensional belief in goal-driven curricula combined with a managerialist (Apple, 2007, see below) enthusiasm for measurement, together with the Neoliberal ideal of competition as the primary principle of increasing quality[3] and the genuflection for international university rankings, even if those rankings never reflect the whole of a university.

The discourses that have obtained hegemony connect with the priorities of educational sociologist Michael W. Apple's (2007, p. 178) "Conservative modernization", entailing a broad based alliance on the political Right side gathering different social tendencies and commitments in issues dealing with social welfare, culture, economy and, in our case, education. This alliance contains four major elements, Apple (2007) holds, Neoliberalism, Neoconservativism, Authoritarian populism, and New managerialism (p. 178). Here I want to direct the attention towards the joint consequences of Neoconservativism, Neoliberalism and New managerialism with respect to the present prevailing, and more or less available ways of acting, talking and thinking about education. According to Apple (2007), Neoconservative priorities entail higher standards, more rigorous testing, and a vision of a common culture with emphasis on a Western tradition. The educational priorities of Neoliberalism include freedom of choice and keeping public expenses and bureaucracy at a minimum along with education for employment and fears of losing international competitions in all fields, from university rankings to commercial trade markets. New managerialism points to the "Professional and Managerial New Middle Class" (Apple, 2007, p. 188) providing some of the support for the policies and politics of conservative modernization. It gains its own mobility within the state and the economy based on the use of technical expertise, with backgrounds in management and efficiency techniques, providing the technical and "professional" support (p. 188) for accountability, measurement, "product control" and assessment as required by the proponents of marketization and, paradoxical to the Neoliberal ideal of freedom, tighter central control in education.

---

[2] See https://www.qualityresearchinternational.com/socialresearch/neopositivism.htm

[3] Notwithstanding its anti-democratic underpinnings based on a notion of democracy as "always threatening to push the functioning market economy off its tracks" (Slobodian, 2018, p. 17).

In higher education, these traits were described already at the beginning of the 21st Century by educational sociologists such as Rajani Naidoo (2005, p. 27) who pointed to that "[g]overnments world-wide have begun to implement funding and governance frameworks based on market principles in an attempt to shift the terms on which fundamental activities such as teaching, learning, and research take place in higher education".

We also meet such descriptions in what educational sociologist David Geoffrey Smith (2003, p. 38) called "a host of actions designated to change both the nature and delivery of educational work", among which some important features are

- treating education as a business with … attempts to commercialize the school environment as well as make it responsible to outcomes or product-based measures,

- adopting a human capital resource model for education, whereby curriculum and instruction work should be directed at producing workers for the new globalizing market system,

- invoking the language of life-long learning to abate the concerns about the end of career labour (expect to lose your job frequently, and reskill, as companies need to perpetually restructure to remain globally competitive).

Navigating within the discursive frames of these political forces, the ways in which micro level experiences of conservatoire students relate to societal macro-level priorities constitutes a central issue, together with the other sides of conservatoires' many-sided, formal as well as informal relationship with society. Conservatoire graduates and postgraduates do not only influence their workplaces and students, they also belong to social groups such as labour union members, schoolchildren parents, voters, and some of them even politicians. In all those roles and social functions, they execute social agency as responsible, critical citizens by drawing on a holistic body of experiences and attitudes, partly affected by the formal as well as informal sides of their conservatoire education. In other words, what goes on inside, say, the main instrument lessons in a conservatoire studio, or the training program of instrumental teachers as well as within a curriculum development group or the conservatoire entrance exam committee meetings, will have consequences in the society outside that conservatoire. Thereby, a picture emerges of conservatoires clearly influencing the democratic development of society.

In order to discuss and decide how to take care of this democratic role by installing a combination of critical citizenship and expert musical competence in their students, conservatoires might profit from systematically inspecting their relationship *with* the society. Is this relationship characterized by the conservatoires as service institutions, 'delivering' labour to the labour market for music workers, thereby contributing to maintaining the social order, or is it characterized by a potential of contributing to societal change and further democratic development? In order to balance these two sides of the relationship, it may be useful to look closer to what the first may conceal, such as hidden curricula (Bradley, 2015; Johansen, 2021; Pitts, 2003), as well as the potential of the second. Hence, in the following, I will look closer into

- Conservatoires and the shaping of society.
- Conservatoires' self-understanding and "delivering" what is "ordered".
- Conservatoires' intentions and functions.
- Conservatoires' social assignment, contributions and responsibility.

Conservatoires and the shaping of society

The notion that education contributes in shaping the future society, and thereby to social change, presupposes a notion of what social change actually entails. Attending to the processes and dynamics of social change, the political theorists Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe (2014) highlight the dynamics wherein differing opinions, races, classes, genders, and worldviews as well as dissent and antagonisms are brought to the fore and made explicit (Johansen, 2014, p. 73). Sociologist Ulrich Beck (1994, pp. 3–4), on his side, points to factors of a more implicit, latent character, observing social change as "a broad-scale, loose-knit and structure changing modernization" occurring "on cats' paws", since the apparent "insignificance, familiarity, and often the desirability of the changes conceal their society changing scope". Within such a perspective, seeing conservatoires as bodies influencing social change is unavoidable.

The notion that education contributes in social shaping and change is neither new nor controversial. In addition to Durkheim (1956/2007), we find similar points of view among scholars of the sociology and philosophy of education such as John Dewey (1897, p. 80) who, already in the 19th century wrote that "I believe that education is the fundamental method of social progress and reform". Michael W. Apple (2007, p. 177), on his side, holds that

> Education is a site of struggle and compromise. It serves as a proxy as well as for larger battles over what our institutions should do, whom they should serve, and who should make these decisions. And, yet, by itself it is one of the major arenas in which resources, power, and ideology specific to policy, finance, curriculum, pedagogy, and evaluation in education are worked through. Thus, education is both cause and effect, determining and determined.

Consequently, the question is not if conservatoires actually contribute in shaping the society. In Baumann's words (2008, p. 39), "we cannot *not* make a difference whatever we do". The question is rather if conservatoires recognise their contribution and direct their curiosity and research interests towards how it takes place and what it entails. This presupposes, as a basic assumption, that conservatoires realize the full consequences of conceiving 'education' as a concept that includes higher education, and hence themselves as *educational* institutions.

The conservatoire as an educational institution

From time to time, an impression emerges that conservatories see themselves as primarily cultural or art institutions, and not to the same extent institutions of education. This self-image may stem from their connections with, say, orchestras, other professional music institutions, and the freelance labour market, established by conservatoire teachers who combine teaching with vocations such as musicians, composers, and conductors. What is unnoticed from time to time is that when entering the conservatoire, the experience conservatoire teachers collect from direct contact with the outside music life is transformed into a part of their knowledge base for *teaching*. Even if their experience constitutes a highly valuable and much needed competence ground for a well-functioning conservatoire, when that competence transformation is not attended to, a risk arises of blurring the fact that a main channel of conservatoires in influencing the future music life and thereby the society is an indirect one, namely through the students conservatoires educate. Moreover, it is also a perspective in which the dynamics of that contribution might be analysed.

The dialogue with the authorities and the public conversation about society

As educational institutions, conservatoires are governed by political priorities. Within the prevailing discursive frames, they are expected to attend to structures and requirements of higher education quality agencies, as well as political priorities such as changes restructuring higher education in general and directions for how to phrase or formulate educational aims and goals. The way conservatoires respond and manoeuvre within these frames and their dialogue with the authorities in these matters, represent a second channel with a potential for taking part in the shaping of the future society. It also constitutes a second perspective for analysing the dynamics of their social contributions. A third, potential channel of influencing social change is constituted by the general, public conversation about society, going on in the media. Proactively taking part in this public conversation on the basis of looking at society through the lens of the conservatoire, conservatoires can contribute with viewpoints that other participants of that conversation cannot see equally clear, for example making a case for values connected with slow processes and the non-measurable. Perhaps this is where their greatest non-utilized social potential lies, in what they are able to see, and then contribute with by the virtue of just *being* conservatoires. I will come back to this in more detail below.

Conservatoires' self-understanding

It is possible to hold that conservatoires *do* pay attention to the needs of society. Within the present, social condition, this includes responding to those philosophies, ideologies, politics and policies that presently stand out as the winners of the discursive struggles about hierarchy. Describing themselves with expressions such as 'delivering' what is 'ordered' demonstrate how conservatoires have ascribed hegemony to that discourse. This is utterly clarified by describing what they do in terms of behavioural objectives and by drawing on concepts such as 'accountability', 'employability', 'generic competences', 'relevance', and 'quality'. What is not so well communicated in conservatoires' self-identity narratives, along with how they keep those narratives going (Giddens, 1991), is their institutional *agency* (Giddens, 1991; Barnes, 2000). Here, agency concerns two dimensions: One connects with the autonomous position of music and the arts in society, as pointed out by philosophers such as Herbert Marcuse (1978). Other dimensions of agency concern the institutional autonomy of universities (Fumasoli, Gornitzka & Maassen, 2014) and the autonomy of professions (Molander & Terum, 2008). Insofar as conservatoires, together with universities, constitute institutions of higher education, and by the virtue of educating for musical professions, they carry all those three dimensions. Hence, they should see themselves as ethically responsible to inspect and execute their institutional agency accordingly, at least as a basis for critical reflection in adapting to, not simply adopting such priorities as market liberal notions of educational quality imposed on them by the authorities. Conservatoires may have a potential of paying significantly more attention than hitherto to the challenge of working for change in parallel with doing their best in order to succeed within the existing frames.

Conservatoires' intentions and functions

Analytically, separating between intentions and functions makes it possible to observe a possible misunderstanding that conservatoires actually function the way their leadership, teachers, or administrative bodies believe or intend. As regards intentions, even if they may be the best, conservatoires do not always make them explicit. Jørgensen (2017) studied purpose statements available in English or German on the websites of European conservatoires. Out of 60 institutions, 20 mentioned contributions to society while 40 did not. This lack of social priorities in "the organization's highest sense of purpose …" (p. 19) may point to a need among conservatoires for discussing the relevance of insights from the sociology and philosophy of education such as described above. It is highly problematic if conservatoires are unable to draw on such insights as part of a basic understanding of themselves.

Making conservatoires' social intentions explicit enables systematic studies of the discrepancies between intentions and functions. Highlighting such discrepancies might be a great help in constituting a basis for conservatoires' further, institutional development. In order to come to grips with their social functions, systematic studies attending to the surrounding society in general as well as conservatoires' target groups and alumni, informed by knowledge of the sociology of education are needed as a corrective to self-referential, internal discussions.

Conservatoires' social assignment, contributions and responsibility

In order to achieve a fuller, more comprehensive understanding of their relationship with society than is reachable when solely focusing on 'delivering' their 'products' according to what the authorities 'order', it may be fruitful to discuss a possible distinction between conservatoires' social assignment, contributions and responsibility. 'Assignment', then, would be partly defined by the authorities, and partly by the ways in which conservatoires analyse those authority-defined assignments, including the requests of the labour market.

Contrary to this notion of assignment, conservatoires' social *contributions* may reach wider, possibly identified more clearly when dismissing the 'ordering-delivering' lens. This is because the values and social impact of music making are not always congruent with prevailing, political notions of a well-functioning educational system or definitions of educational quality rooted in the philosophies of Conservative modernisation (Apple, 2007).

Conservatoires' contributions to society are more in line with the commitments of universities, as described by president Drew Faust (2007) of Harvard University in her inauguration speech:

> Universities make commitments to the timeless, and these investments have yields we cannot predict and often cannot measure. … We are uncomfortable with efforts to justify these endeavors by defining them as instrumental, as measurably useful to particular contemporary needs. Instead, we pursue them in part "for their own sake," because they define what has over centuries made us human, not because they can enhance our global competitiveness.
>
> A university is not about results in the next quarter; it is not even about who a student has become by graduation. It is about learning that molds a lifetime, learning that transmits the heritage of millennia; learning that shapes the future.
>
> A university looks both backwards and forwards in ways that must – that even ought to – conflict with a public's immediate concerns or demands.

Faust's speech also encourages a discussion of conservatoires' social responsibility, which needs to, at least analytically, be separated from their assignments and contributions. Conservatoires' social responsibility entails a moral obligation to critically inspect the surrounding society, locally as well as globally, and actively contribute to the discussion of its change and development. As such, it presupposes a recognition of institutional agency as a central part of their self-identity. There is a risk that compliance with the hegemonic discourse may hamper critical analyses of those responsibilities and initiatives and blur values that conservatoires, by virtue of *being* just conservatoires and working with music, can address more clearly than many other institutions can do. In other words, there is a not yet realised potential of conservatoires contributing in reshaping the higher education sector of society. For example, this might include promoting the values of depth and slow processes, the non-measurable; and creativity.

Depth, slow processes and the non-measurable

Conservatoires have a potential to contribute to the discussion of educational efficiency and quality. Seeing and utilising that potential might be regarded as part of their societal responsibility. This discussion needs to take place on a broad societal basis, since the ideal of efficiency is widespread across most sectors of society, most often connected with time, prioritizing the speed of problem solving over the depth of the insights derived thereby.

The global spread of this ideal as well as the efficiency concept itself, come together with a lack of discussion or attempts of closer definition. When only a little amount of time is allotted to reflect on what one is doing before one moves on, there is a danger that a one-sided notion and focus on efficiency causes a decrease in educational quality, another concept in great need of being discussed thoroughly. Working with arts education affords seeing particularly clear that increased efficiency, in its traditional, narrow sense, runs the risk of causing less artistic depth as well as creativity. Who could exemplify, better than voices within the arts and arts education, Jeff Adams' (2013, p. 243) suggestion that Neoliberal pedagogical processes operate "by reducing creative practices to passively reproductive activities"? Closely interrelated with the need for deconstructing 'efficiency', is a thorough discussion of the ever-raising belief in measurability permeating more or less all sectors of society. Arts and arts education have preconditions, which make them particularly equipped to seeing the shortcomings of this ideal. Within particular educational branches such as teaching methods, assessment and evaluation, conservatoires may have an obligation to, more strongly than hitherto, systematically disseminating their knowledge and experience in competence areas that have attracted increased focus by the raising quest for educational quality in the rest of academia. This includes areas such as self-regulated learning strategies, deliberate practice, assessment for student learning and qualitative assessment. For example, Ferm Almqvist et al. (2017, p. 11) suggest that "it is the ethical duty of arts educators (music educators included) to remind the authorities that qualitative evaluation is a reasonable and necessary way to judge learning".

Concepts of the assignment discourse

Looking back to conservatoires' social *assignment* as connected with 'delivering' what is 'ordered' actualises concepts of the hegemonic discourse such as 'accountability', 'employability', 'generic competences', 'relevance', and 'quality'. By virtue of being just institutions of arts education, conservatoires have a potential of recontextualising those concepts and take part in the struggle about filling them with meaning. This way they might question the definition power of the discourse and contribute to altering those concepts from fixed definitions to become floating signifiers (Laclau & Mouffe, 2014). Here, I will shortly discuss this in connection with employability and generic competences.

Employability

Yorke (2004, p. 8) defines employability as "a set of achievements … that make graduates more likely to gain employment and be successful in their chosen occupations … beyond the subject discipline … and of a wider range than those of 'core' and 'key' skills".

Recontextualising 'employability' to concern professional education in music would entail a discussion of what is located within versus beyond the subject discipline. For example, portfolio musicians draw heavily on internet and social media skills in navigating on the labour market. If such skills are not "generally considered to be important …" (p. 2) by traditional employers, then internet and social media skills are easily deemed irrelevant by conservatoires. This would happen if conservatoires solely comprehend employability as connected with the assignment perspective, and disregard the possible function-, contribution- and social responsibility sides of employability. A discussion is needed about if being employable has to do with existing as well as future labour market expectations and potential functions of music making, in the global as well as local society. Being employable may include competences such as those required to maintaining and improving the status of music in society, which, in turn, connect to larger traits of social development. Hence, the ability to reflect on the relationship between those two layers can be seen as a dimension of employability.

Generic competences

Generic competences (Young & Chapman, 2010) designate some of Yorke's (2004, p. 8) competences "beyond the subject discipline", "required to succeed across different workplace contexts" (Young & Chapman, 2010, p. 1). Young and Chapman provide a list of generic competences emerging across several research studies[4]. From a critical reader's point of view, perspectives such as critical thinking and integrity lack in several such frameworks. This lack indirectly supports views on generic competences as attributes making conservatoire graduates able to carry out what other people have prepared for them. Thereby the scope of 'musician' is reduced from entailing a reflective professional with strong agency, to an executive technician who is able to maintain the existing system, instead of contributing constructively to criticizing and thereby changing and improving it. The chances are few that a labour market hallmarked by the principles of conservative modernization (Apple, 2007) would demand generic competences such as constructive criticism and agency over competences constituting the executive technician.

---

[4] Main categories are (examples in brackets) basic skills (such as literacy and numeracy), conceptual skills (problem solving and pursuit of lifelong learning), personal skills (self-management and self-confidence), people skills (communication and teamwork), business skills (enterprise and financial planning), and other (motor skills).

Concluding remarks

If education in large, and higher education as one of its branches, contribute in shaping the society of tomorrow, there is no exception for conservatoires. On the contrary, conservatoires need to recognise that their educational endeavours inevitably constitute a part of Beck's (1994, p. 3) social change "on cat's paws". By systematically inspecting these processes as well as their institutional agency, they need to define what might be their particular contribution in reshaping higher education (Barnett, 2005) as well as the larger society. One way of addressing this challenge is differentiating between conservatoires' social assignment, contributions and responsibilities, as seen in the perspective of their intentions and functions.

Taking such systematic studies as a point of departure, four ways of action may be considered. One concerns the social perspectives conservatoires install in the students they graduate, another by communicating conservatoires' points of view within the educational system. Thirdly, the society issue might be addressed in research studies carried out by the conservatoires' academic staff, taking part in a global, culturally sensitive scholarly community (Kertz-Welzel, 2018) of higher music education. Finally, conservatoires might take part in the general, public conversation and debate about society and democracy. In the contemporary condition of late modernity, this goes on between powers promoting the democracy scepticism based priorities of Neoliberal philosophy (Slobodian, 2018), the Liberal democracy's ideal of building consensus[5] and the ideas of Radical democracy (Laclau & Mouffe 2014), which not only accepts differences, dissent, and antagonisms, but, not unlike a conservatoire, is depending on them for its further development.

References

Adams, J. (2013). The artful dodger: Creative resistance to neoliberalism in education. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies, 35*(4), 242–255.

Apple, M. (2013). *Can education change society?* New York, NY: Routledge.

Apple, M. (2007). Whose markets, whose knowledge? In A. Sadovnik (Ed.), *Sociology of Education. A Critical Reader* (p. 177–93). New York, NY: Routledge.

Apple, M. (2006). *Educating the "Right" way: Markets, standards, God and inequality*. New York, NY: Routledge.

---

[5] Which, according to Lacalu & Mouffe (2014) suppresses differing opinions, races, classes, genders, and worldviews.

Bauman, Z. (2012). *Liquid modernity* (Ed.). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bauman, Z. (2008). *The art of life*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Barnes, B. (2000). *Understanding agency: Social theory and responsible action*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Barnett, R. (Ed.). (2005). *Reshaping the university: New relationships between research, scholarship and teaching*. Berkshire: The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.

Beck, U. (1994). The reinvention of politics. Towards a theory of reflexive modernization. In U. Beck, A. Giddens & S. Lash, *Reflexive modernization: Politics, tradition and aesthetics in the modern social order* (p. 1–55). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bradley, D. (2015). Hidden in plain sight: Race and racism in music education. In C. Benedict, P. Schmidt, G. Spruce & P. Woodford (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of social justice in music education* (p. 190–203). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Dewey, J. (1897). My pedagogic creed. *School Journal*, *54*(January), 77–80.

Durkheim, E. (1956/2007). On education and society. In A. Sadovnik (Ed.), *Sociology of education: A critical reader* (p. 23–35). New York, NY: Routledge.

ETYMONLINE (n.d.). Conservatoire. *Online etymology dictionary*. Retrieved from https://www.etymonline.com/word/conservatory

Faust, D. (2007). *Inauguration address*. President Drew Faust, Harvard University, October 12, 2007. Retrieved from https://www.harvard.edu/president/speech/2007/installation-address-unleashing-our-most-ambitious-imaginings

Featherstone, M., Lash, S. & Robertson, R. (Eds.). (1995). *Global modernities.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Ferm Almqvist, C., Vinge, J., Väkevä, L. & Zandén, O. (2017). Assessment *as* learning in music education: The risk of "criteria compliance" replacing "learning" in the Scandinavian countries. *Music Education Research*, *39*(1), 3–18.

Fumasoli, T., Gornitzka, Å. & Maassen, P. (2014). *University autonomy and organizational change dynamics.* Oslo: ARENA Centre for European Studies, University of Oslo.

Giddens, A. (1990). *The consequences of modernity*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Horsley, S. & Johansen, G. (2016). Tracking policy trajectories in music education. In H.-P. Chen & P. Schmidt (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 18th international seminar of the ISME commission on music policy: Culture, education, and mass media*, 20–22 July 2016 (p. 190–213). Birmingham: ISME Commission on Policy: Culture, Education, and Media.

Inset, O. (2018, 23. April). Problemlæreren [The problem teacher]. *Klassekampen* [Oslo].

Johansen, G. (2021). The hidden curriculum in higher music education. In R. Wright, G. Johansen, P. Kanellopoulos & P. Schmidt (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook to sociology of music education* (pp. 300–311). New York, NY: Routledge.

Johansen, G. (2019). Alexandra Kertz-Welzel: Globalizing music education, a framework [Book review of *Globalizing music education, a framework,* by A. Kertz-Welzel]. *Philosophy of Music Education Review, 27*(1), 97–103.

Johansen, G. (2017). The conservatoire and the society. Keynote presentation at *The protean musician conference*. Norwegian Academy of Music, Oslo, November 1.–3.

Johansen, G. (2014). Sociology, music education, and social change: The prospect of addressing their relations by attending to some central, expanded concepts. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education, 13*(1), 70–98.

Jørgensen, H. (2017). European conservatoires' purpose or mission: A study of statements on the Institutions' websites. *Finnish Journal of Music Education, 1*(20), 8–20.

Karlsen, S. & Johansen, G. (2019). Assessment and the dilemmas of a multi-ideological curriculum: The case of Norway. In D. J. Elliott, M. Silverman & G. McPherson (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of philosophical and qualitative perspectives on assessment in music education* (p. 447–463). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Kertz-Welzel, A. (2018). *Globalizing music education: A framework*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Laclau, E. & Mouffe, C. (2014). *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics* (2nd ed.). London: Verso.

Margolis, E. (Ed.). (2001). *The hidden curriculum in higher education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Marcuse, H. (1978). *The aesthetic dimension*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Molander, A. & Terum, L. I. (2008). Profesjonsstudier – en introduksjon [Studying professions and professionalism – an introduction]. In A. Molander & L. I. Terum (Eds.), *Profesjonsstudier* (p. 13–27). Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Naidoo, R. (2005). Universities in the marketplace: The distortion of teaching and research. In R. Barnett (Ed.), *Reshaping the university: New relationships between research, scholarship and teaching* (p. 27–36). Berkshire: The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.

Pitts, S. (2003). What do students learn when we teach music? An investigation of the 'hidden' curriculum in a university department. *Arts & Humanities in Higher Education, 2*(3), 281–292.

Sadovnik, A. R. (Ed.). (2007). *Sociology of education: A critical reader.* New York: Routledge.

Slobodian, Q. (2018). *The end of empire and the birth of neoliberalism.* Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.

Smith, D. G. (2003). Curriculum and teaching face globalization. In W. F. Pinar (Ed.), *International handbook of curriculum research* (p. 35–52). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Tregear, P., Johansen, G., Jørgensen, H., Sloboda, J., Tulve, H. & Wistreich, R. (2016). Conservatoires in society: Institutional challenges and possibilities for change. *Arts & Humanities in Higher Education, 15*(3-4), 276–292.

Yorke, M. (2004). Employability in higher education: what it is - what it is not. Higher Education Academy/ESECT. Retrieved from https://s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/assets.creode.advancehe-document-manager/documents/hea/private/id116_employability_in_higher_education_336_1568036711.pdf

Young, J. & Chapman, E. (2010). Generic competency frameworks: A brief historical overview. *Education Research and Perspectives, 37*(1), 1–24.

Geir Johansen
Professor emeritus
Norges musikkhøgskole
geir.johansen@nmh.no