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Context for the study
PISA and similar studies have repeatedly shown how inequalities in Germany’s educational system are transmitted through generations. Since the ratification of the UN “Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities” (CRPD), the social awareness for such inequalities is increasing, and schools and music schools in Germany have defined “inclusion” as a goal (Verband deutscher Musikschulen, 2014; KMK, 2011). But as recent studies show, several social groups such as migrants, disabled and male students are not yet equally represented in music schools, and even less so in higher music education or among music teachers (Weishaupt, 2012).

To become a music teacher in a school or music school in Germany, generally one of several degree programs has to be completed. These programs differ for instance in their admission examination, their study contents, their aimed working field and in the institution they are studied at. For instance at “University of Music”,

- BA-students in “Music with Artistic-Pedagogical Profile” (IP) will be able to become instrumental or vocal teachers in music schools
- BA-students in “Elementary Music Pedagogy” (EMP) will be able to become music pedagogues in different settings (groups with babies, children, people with disabilities, elderly people, etc.)
- students in “school music” (ScM) will be allowed to teach music in grammar schools.

Music students at “University of Education” will be able to work as teachers
- in primary schools (Prim),
- in secondary schools (Sek) or
- in schools for children with special educational needs (SEN) or in so called “inclusive schools”

Aim for the study and research questions
According to Nerland (2007), higher music education can be understood as a social field. Bourdieu’s (2017) field theory helps in analyzing how the structure of a field plays an important role for understanding the emergence and reproduction of social injustice inside it (Söderman, Burnard, & Hofvander-Trulsson, 2015).

The aim of the presented research project is to find out more about the implicit field rules (Bourdieu uses the term “illusio”) which produce processes of inclusion and exclusion. It is presumed that these field rules reflect in the habitus of students in higher music education.

Are there differences concerning the implicit field rules among the above cited different degree programs and/or institutions? How is the field of higher music education structured? Which processes of inclusion and exclusion and of hierarchization result out of these rules? And how do they reflect in the students’ habitus? Which role does the prominent discussion about the music teacher’s position between the artist and the pedagogue play?
Description of the study
For the research, group discussions (Bohnsack, 2010) have been conducted with students in the above cited six different degree programs. The transcribed discussions are now being analyzed according to the documentary method (Bohnsack, 2010). This method of the Praxeological Sociology of Knowledge aims at the reconstruction of the habitus, analyzing the “how” of a group discourse.

Preliminary results
So far I have analyzed the discussions of IP-, EMP-, and Prim-students. Preliminary results show a clear difference in habitus between these three degree programs. Main orientations in the EMP- and Prim-groups seem to be more collective, whereas in the IP-groups they seem to be more individual. This difference has an impact on the aimed teaching designs and the envisioned aim of musical learning.
The admission examination seems to function as an “initiation rite” (Bourdieu, 1982) reflecting field rules such as the importance of practicing the instrument versus the importance of group atmosphere or the level of musical theory and practice demanded. Reproduced distinctions indicate a hierarchy that ranks artistic degree programs higher than educational ones.

Open questions
Discussions at the round table could be about the following questions:
- How is it possible to take into account the complexity of the habitus (socialization e.g. in the family, in peer groups, during higher music education)? Is this necessary?
- Which sociological and Bourdieuian questions could help to approach the empirical data?
- What about the normativity of Bourdieu’s theory? Is it too one-sided to analyze with his critical tools?

All other questions resulting out of the reading of my study description above or out of the round table discussion are welcome.
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