Gender Lessons

Girls and boys negotiating learning community in Basics of Music

—

ANNA KUOPPAMÄKI

Gender Lessons

**Girls and boys negotiating
learning community in Basics of Music**

Anna Kuoppamäki

Gender Lessons

Girls and boys negotiating
learning community in Basics of Music

UNIVERSITY OF THE
ARTS HELSINKI
SIBELIUS
ACADEMY

Abstract

Kuoppamäki, Anna. 2015. Gender Lessons. Girls and boys negotiating learning community in Basics of Music. The Sibelius Academy of the University of the Arts Helsinki. Studia Musica 63. Doctoral Dissertation. 180 pages.

This study examines the complexity of children's gendered negotiations in a music classroom, particularly how the age-related social phenomenon of gendered border work, gendered learner identities and the construction of musical agency are intertwined in these negotiations when learning music in a group. This study views 9-year-old children participating in a classroom discourse of the Finnish Music School Basics of Music (BoM) course, and aims to identify and analyze practices in which agency is either supported or restricted. Hence, it discusses both the complications and even the inequalities that children's gendered interaction may cause in learning, as well as situations in which social boundaries are crossed and multi-voicedness promoted. This study adopts a socio-cultural view of learning, taking a standpoint on gender that is socially constructed, performative and fluid. Further, it understands discourse extensively, that is, including also the artefacts, experiences and practices shared by the local community of learners, and seeks to discuss identity, agency and gender as lived relations that all are negotiated in social interaction with others. While considering the music classroom as a social space, in which identities and agencies are negotiated in the classroom discourse, this study argues that gendered border work interferes with students' learning processes when they negotiate memberships in a community of learners, and construct ownership of meaning and agency in music-making.

This study is an ethnographic practitioner inquiry that experiments with different pedagogical solutions, and was therefore carried out in two types of settings: a co-ed setting and single-gender settings. The same children participated in both settings. This two-prong approach was important in order to understand how gendered border work is intertwined with the processes in which identities and agencies are negotiated collectively as well as individually. The data, collected during one semester (16 weeks) consists of: videotaped lessons; children's stimulated recall-interviews conducted in groups, individually and in pairs; and a teacher's research diary. The analysis uses multi-methodological lenses, including both concept-driven and data-driven qualitative analysis. Furthermore, in order to attend to the voices of the children participating in BoM, and to give the reader a taste of the ambiances and feelings and what gendered border work may be about, a narrative approach was used by presenting characters of 'Emma' and 'Amos'.

These two narratives are representative constructions based on the experiences of several children who participated in the BoM classroom activities and, later, in the stimulated recall-interview sessions.

The findings of this study suggest that, in the music classroom, for this particular age-group, children's gendered negotiations may create boundary issues, and thus, obstacles for democratic and meaningful learning to take place. In order to promote equal opportunities and collaborative learning, social issues, such as gender, need to be identified and treated openly and sensitively in the classroom discourse. In the BoM classroom under study, gendered border work took place in three ways: in adopting gender based learner identities; in holding gendered beliefs and pre-conceptions; and in falling into polarized 'good student' and 'rebel student' identities, thus driving the processes of negotiating memberships and constructing ownership of meaning. The study points out how, in particular, the use of student voice operates as a legitimator, regulating access to participation and contributing to shared meaning making. However, the findings suggest that, in a co-ed setting, the practices that support reflexivity and the processes of negotiating individual meanings de-emphasize gendered groupings among the children. In the BoM classroom, these practices involve individual creative activities, such as the students inventing own rhythmic patterns or compositions, which allowed them to draw from their own personal worlds. In these situations, the students were able to cross the gender boundaries and engage in learning collaboratively.

Tiivistelmä

Kuoppamäki, Anna 2015. Tyttöjen ja poikien opit. Sukupuolineuvottelu oppimisyhteisöstä Musiikin perusteissa. Taideyliopiston Sibelius-Akatemia. Studia Musica 63. Väitöskirja. 180 sivua.

Tutkimuksessa tarkastellaan, kuinka lasten sukupuoleen sidottu rajatyön käsite (*gendered border work*), oppijaidentiteetit ja musiikillinen toimijuus kietoutuvat toisiinsa musiikin ryhmäoppimisessa. Tutkimuksessa analysoidaan yhdeksänvuotiaiden lasten osallistumista luokkahuonediskurssiin musiikkiopiston "Musiikin perusteiden" tunneilla. Tutkimus pohjautuu sosiokulttuuriseen oppimiskäsitykseen. Sukupuoli (*gender*) ymmärretään sosiaalisesti rakentuneena, performatiivisena ja prosessimaisena. Identiteettiä, toimijuutta ja sukupuolta tarkastellaan alati muuttuvina sosiaalisina suhteina, joista neuvotellaan vuorovaikutuksessa toisten kanssa. Musiikkiluokka nähdään siis sosiaalisena tilana, jossa identiteeteistä ja toimijuuksista neuvotellaan luokkahuonediskurssissa. Diskurssi ymmärretään laajassa merkityksessä sisältämään myös oppijoiden keskenään jakamat artefaktit, kokemukset ja käytännöt. Aineiston kautta tarkastellaan lasten sukupuolineuvottelusta mahdollisesti aiheutuvia oppimisen vaikeuksia tai jopa eriarvoisuutta aiheuttavia tekijöitä, mutta myös tilanteita joissa sosiaalisia raja-aitoja ylitetään ja moniäänisyyttä tuetaan. Tutkimuksen perusteella esitetään, että lasten sukupuolinen rajatyö vaikuttaa oppilaiden oppimisprosseihin erilaisissa musiikin tekemisen tilanteissa ryhmäjäsenyyksistä, merkityksistä, omistajuudesta ja toimijuudesta neuvoteltaessa.

Tutkimus on etnografinen *practitioner inquiry*, jossa tutkija toimii sekä opettajana että tutkijana kokeillen erilaisia oppimisyhteisön ideaalia tavoittelevia pedagogisia ratkaisuja. Tämän vuoksi tutkimus on toteutettu kahdessa vaiheessa: sekaryhmässä sekä tyttöjen ja poikien erillisissä ryhmissä. Tutkimuksessa samat lapset osallistuvat molempiin vaiheisiin. Kaksivaiheisuus mahdollistaa erityisesti sen tarkastelemisen, kuinka sukupuolinen rajatyö kietoutuu prosesseihin, joissa identiteeteistä ja toimijuuksista neuvotellaan sekä yhteisön että yksilön tasolla. Aineisto on kerätty yhden lukukauden (16 viikkoa) aikana, ja se koostuu videoiduista oppitunneista, ryhmä-, yksilö- ja parihaastatteluina toteutetuista lasten stimulated recall -haastatteluista sekä opettajan tutkimuspäiväkirjoista. Analyysissä on hyödynnetty sekä käsite- että aineistolähtöistä laadullista sisällönanalyysiä ja narratiivisia menetelmiä. Narratiivista lähestymistapaa on käytetty koostettaessa useamman lapsen kertomuksista hahmot "Emma" ja "Amos", jotka ovat representatiivisia konstruktioita (*representative construction*) luokkahuoneen aktiviteetteihin ja stimulated recall -haastatteluihin osallistuneiden lasten kokemuksista. Hahmojen tarkoituksena on nostaa

esiin tutkimukseen osallistuneiden lasten ääni ja valottaa lukijalle tutkimuksen kohteena olleen luokan tunnelmia ja tunteita sekä lasten sukupuolisen rajatyön mahdollisia piirteitä.

Tutkimuksessa osoitetaan, kuinka musiikkiluokassa ja tutkimuksen kohteena olevassa ikäryhmässä lasten sukupuolineuvotteluissa saattaa rakentua sosiaalisia raja-aitoja, jotka haittaavat demokraattisen ja mielekkään oppimisen toteutumista. Yhdenvertaisten mahdollisuuksien ja yhteistyössä tapahtuvan oppimisen tukeminen edellyttää sosiaalisten tekijöiden, kuten sukupuoleen liittyvien neuvottelujen tunnistamista ja sensitiivistä käsittelyä luokkahuonediskursseissa. Tutkimuksen kohteena olleessa musiikin perusteiden opetusryhmässä lasten sukupuolinen rajatyö ilmeni kolmella tavalla ohjaten prosesseja, joissa ryhmäjäsenyyksistä ja oppimisen merkityksistä neuvoteltiin lasten kesken: (1) sukupuoleen sidotun oppijaidentiteetin omaksumisena, (2) sukupuoleen sidottujen käsitysten ja ennakkoluulojen ylläpitämisenä ja (3) polarisoituneiden ns. "kiltin oppijan" ja "villin oppijan" identiteettien ylläpitämisenä. Erityisesti sukupuolittuneet erot oppilaiden puheessa vaikuttivat oppilaiden mahdollisuuksiin osallistua ja vaikuttaa yhteisistä merkityksistä neuvotteluun. Tutkimus osoittaa kuitenkin, että ns. sekaryhmässä käytännöt, jotka tukivat refleksiivistä oppimista ja yksilöllistä merkityksistä neuvottelua vähensivät sukupuolittuneita ryhmäjakoja lasten keskuudessa. Tällaisia olivat käytännöt, jotka sisälsivät myös yksilöllisiä ja omasta elämysmaailmasta ammentavia luovia prosesseja, kuten oppilaiden omien rytmisten ostinatojen keksimistä tai säveltämistä. Näissä luokkatilanteissa oppilaat saattoivat ylittää sukupuoleen sidottuja raja-aitoja ja osallistua oppimiseen yhteistyössä toisten kanssa.

Asiasanat: musiikkikasvatus, sukupuoli, sukupuolen rajatyö, oppijaidentiteetti, toimijuus, kollaboratiivinen oppiminen, oppimisyhteisö, musiikkiopisto, musiikin perusteet, practitioner inquiry.

Acknowledgements

In many ways this work is about community. Nurturing of both collaborative learning and a sense community among my students has been my inspiration and pedagogical guideline when practicing as a music educator. When engaging in the process of conducting this inquiry my research interest was particularly in the social issues that may hinder such an environment from developing. In my own life, I have been fortunate enough to be surrounded by many communities that I have been privileged to work and reflect my thoughts with.

The first community that I want to thank is my Mutri doctoral school of Sibelius Academy – my supervisors, professors and fellow doctoral students. First and foremost, I am grateful for my responsible supervisor Prof. Heidi Westerlund with whom I have had an enormous joy to share insights about music education, and who has supported me endlessly, every step of the way, while conducting this inquiry. Heidi, thank you for your vision and making this journey so memorable. I would like to thank my second supervisor Prof. Sidsel Karlsen for teaching me academic rigor and for always offering fresh and relevant perspectives on my research topic. Sidsel, it has been a great pleasure to study with you. I also thank Prof. Lauri Väkevä for inspiring conversations as well as good company when shoe shopping in various parts of the world. My gratitude also goes to Prof. emeritus of music education Marjut Laitinen who was my first supervisor when I began my doctoral studies. Further, I would like to thank Prof. Ritva Engeström for supervision during an earlier stage of my project, and again, recently, when reading the first version of my work. Ritva, your insightful comments helped me to find a new angle for my topic in the last stage of the inquiry. I would also like to thank Prof. Kai Lehikoinen for taking time to read my first full draft of the work and for giving relevant and helpful comments. And, I thank the reviewers of this study, Prof. Taru Leppänen and Prof. Cecilia Ferm Thorgersen, for their careful reading and insightful comments on the manuscript.

Throughout the research project, the community of doctoral students of Sibelius Academy's Faculty of Music Education, Jazz, and Folk Music has been a great support. Thank you particularly Inga Rikandi and Hanna Nikkanen, as well as Tuulikki Laes, Alexis Kallio, Heidi Partti, Aleksi Ojala, Sari Muhonen, Olli-Taavetti Kankkunen, Danielle Tracey and others for reading and commenting on my work at different stages.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

"We all teach gender, we all perform gender"

(Roberta Lamb 2007, 3)

Introduction

If I had to name one thing that I would hope for my students, it would be that they have opportunities to creatively and meaningfully explore music, both individually and collectively. This hope was also the initial inspiration for conducting this study. In my own Finnish Music School Basics of Music classroom, I have been committed to experimenting with practices that I have thought would promote processes of such musical exploration. My aim has been to facilitate learning environments that would invite students to take an *active stance* as learners, expressing their own opinions, while also being sensitive to the views of others. In other words, the students construct *personal* meanings, while gaining experiences of what it means to be a member of a particular *community*. In a Finnish music classroom, this typically means engaging in processes of music-making and shared meaning negotiations in relatively free dialogical settings that involve versatile musical interaction. This *active stance* approach applies to general music education as well as to specialized extra-curricular music schools; the latter is the context of this study. To be successful, this kind of musical participation calls for cooperation and social sensitivity from everyone involved.

However, the social life of a classroom may sometimes be messy, generating boundary issues and tensions that may compromise student participation and even cause inequalities among the students. In music education, such social interaction complications may cause consequences on two levels. First, on a collective level where music is a social experience, complications may affect the processes of *shared* meaning-making when people engage in musical activities with others. Secondly, on an *individual* level where people gain a sense of ownership of learning by having legitimacy to contribute, complications may affect the processes of gaining a *sense* of agency in negotiating personal meanings. Hence, in order to promote individual and shared musical agency (e.g. Karlsen 2011), that is, for people to recognize the range of possibilities to act and interact musically, it is necessary to take into account the social conditions that may interfere the learning processes (see Westerlund 2002). Further, as a result of my personal experiences as a practitioner observing the social interaction in my own music classroom, this study presumes that gender is one of the social dimensions that operates as a vehicle of inclusion and exclusion among the children. Among their peer groups in school-yards and other social spaces, children step in and out of stereotypical gendered behaviours, sometimes by emphasizing conventionalized gendered groupings and sometimes by ignoring them. In the social spaces of learning, such as the classroom, these manifestations of children's gendered negotiations, however, may create obstacles for democratic and meaningful learning to take place.

In the Nordic schooling discourse, it is a central goal to offer the same educational resources for all children regardless their age, class, gender, ethnicity or location. With minor exceptions, such as sports education, teaching usually takes place in co-educational settings. Nevertheless, the recent literature (Käyhkö 2011; Lahelma 2012) suggests that in Finnish schools, *gender equality* is rather understood as *gender neutrality* (Käyhkö 2011). This is evident, for example, in official school documents where references to gender have gradually decreased. However, some authors claim that this gender neutrality (and equality) is only apparent (ibid.). The administrative attempts to neutralize gender have not been able to decrease the significance of gender in everyday school life, where girls and boys remain juxtaposed with each other (ibid.). Thus, it seems that the normative expectations of our school system not to underpin stereotypical behaviour, easily results in taking the equal treatment *for granted*. Indeed, when conducting this study, I more than once ran into the question of gender issues 'being taken care of long ago'. The danger of falling into such 'gender-blindness', that is, considering the questions of gender as something that has been resolved and, as such, not worth of further studies, is a current issue in music education (Roulston & Misawa 2011). Namely, understanding gender as something that is constructed and reconstructed in everyday life, and particularly in interactions with other people, it has neither been 'taken care of', nor should it be taken for granted. As the Danish childhood researcher Jan Kampmann argues (see Bredesen 2003), every generation of children re-invents what gender means to them. Therefore, gendered negotiations are also inherently part of the social life of every music classroom.

Against this background, by viewing my own classroom, this practitioner inquiry or more specifically 'inquiry as stance' examines the complexity of children's gendered negotiations, and by asking *"How is gender performed in the negotiations of BoM classroom?"*, considers the music classroom as a social space in which identities and agencies are negotiated in the classroom discourse (e.g. Wenger 1998/2003). I understand discourse extensively – to also mean the artefacts, experiences and practices that are shared by a local community of learners (Wenger 1998/2003; Gutierrez et al. 1995). Accordingly, I adopt a post-structuralist standpoint that gender, as a constitutive source of identity, is also socially and discursively negotiated (e.g. Butler 1990; Connell 2002). These negotiations are simultaneously cultural and contextual, as well as individual and collective. In this *performative* view (Butler 1990/1999) gender is not something that is fixed and solid. In other words, it is not something that we are, but rather something that is fluid and situational – something that we *do* by reproducing certain actions, such as gestures, motions and physical marks (see e.g. Stone 2007; Berg 2010). For children, sustaining and contesting gendered conventions in the form of *gendered border work* (e.g. Thorne 1993) is a way to manifest their on-going negotiations of gender. This testing of the limits and potentials of gender – stepping in and out of gendered conventions – is

a natural part of the process of growing up. In the social life of a classroom, however, these manifestations sometimes complicate interactions and even create forms of student 'underlife' (Goffman 1961), either disruptive or restrained behaviours, that may direct the participation of everyone involved. By experimenting with pedagogical solutions in which the same children participate in co-ed and single-gender learning environments, this study seeks to explore and better understand the dynamics of the social phenomenon of gendered border work in a music classroom context. Hence, this study argues that gendered border work (e.g. Thorne 1993) interferes with learning processes when negotiating memberships in a community of learners, and constructing ownership of meaning and agency in music making (Wenger 1998/2003). Therefore, if the aim of teaching, among other things, is to foster equal access to learning and transformation, these consequences cannot be overlooked but need to be treated in the classroom discourse.

This practitioner inquiry views gender from a fresh angle by examining the interrelations of children's gendered border work (e.g. Thorne 1993), learner identities (e.g. Wenger 1998/2003) and the construction of musical agency (e.g. Karlsen 2011). By sharing parts of the social life of one particular music classroom, the study discusses the challenges and potentialities that arose when negotiating the classroom discursive practices with these particular children. My own role as a researcher and practitioner is twofold. On one hand, it could be claimed that I know this context in-and-out after many years of practicing as a teacher in classrooms similar to the one examined in this study. On the other hand, I realize that my dual role sets special kinds of challenges for the trustworthiness of this study. Knowing that it is impossible to entirely separate the two roles, I am trying to address the social issues in classroom interaction as openly as possible in order to give a rich picture of the happenings that took place and the phenomenon under study.

In the study, the children participated in reflecting on their own experiences when engaging in the classroom discursive practices. When conducting this study, giving voice to the children themselves when trying to understand how gendered border work might get intertwined with the processes of constructing memberships and contributing to the shared enterprises in the classroom discourse is held as one of the central starting points. Hence, this study seeks to discuss identity, agency and gender as lived relations (McNay 2004) that are all constructed in social interaction with others. This aim brings me back to the beginning.

I started this introduction by stating that my hope as a music educator was to be able to offer my students opportunities for musical explorations in different forms. In other words, to facilitate social learning environments and musical practices that would promote curiosity and an open-minded attitude towards music making and learning itself. Building up such conditions requires mutual respect, shared interests and cooperation from all the participants, as well as the capability for individual reflection and making of personal choices. In the social life of children, gender, as a constitutive source of identity, operates as an indicator when determining who is taken in to the shared activities, and who is left out. Therefore, the focus of this study concerns children's social interactions and the ways gender becomes intertwined with the processes of negotiating learner identities and agencies, thus, either promoting or complicating their efforts to take an active stance as learners. This study provides a greater understanding of the social dynamics of children's gendered negotiations in classroom-based learning, and means to onwards facilitate gender sensitivity in the music classroom.

1 Context of the study and theoretical lenses

This chapter introduces the context of the study and its theoretical lenses. The aim of this study is to explore children's social interaction when learning music in the Finnish Music School 'Basics of Music' (BoM) classroom, and particularly, to observe and understand how gender becomes intertwined with the processes of negotiating learner identities and agencies when participating in the classroom discourse. To this end, it introduces a socio-cultural perspective on learning that emphasizes participation and cultural settings as central to learning. Furthermore, it discusses gender as socially and discursively constructed and localized practice, particularly viewing it from angles that would open new understandings about children's gendered interactions when entering educational spaces. This chapter begins by locating this study in the research fields of gender and music education. Then, it briefly introduces the Finnish Basic Education in the Arts system, and moves on to the tradition of teaching music theory in Finland. Finally, it generally rationalizes the course Basics of Music (BoM) and describes the BoM in the context of this study.

1.1 Earlier research

Since the 1980s, the subject of gender in the school context has widely interested scholars. These studies have focused, for example, on identifying and treating structures within schooling that are seen to produce inequity between girls and boys regarding access to educational resources and learning outcomes (e.g. Bailey 2002; Weaver-Hightower 2003; see also Roulston & Misawa 2011). A large body of that literature draws from the second-wave feminist accounts, such as sex role socialisation theories (e.g. Davies 1984; Paley 1984; Lees 1986), followed by the third-wave feminism and the post-structuralist gender theories in late 1980s early 90s (e.g. Davies 1989; Walkerdine 1989, 1990; Butler 1990; Connell 2002) that discuss gender, above all, as a fluid and social structure.

In next section, I first introduce research conducted in the field of general education that views gender and equality issues, for example, in relation to school achievement; learner identities; power hierarchies; sexuality in school context; teacher attitudes; citizenship; or other identity variables such as class, ethnicity or nationality. I then briefly introduce some studies conducted in arts education, and move on to research that focuses on gender and music education. These studies discuss topics such as gender in relation to various aspects of musical performances; pedagogical issues and research practices; gendering of musical practices; interaction in music classroom; and music teachers' perceptions.

The debates on gender and achievement and reports suggesting that girls' and boys' experiences of schooling differ from one another (Skelton & Francis 2009) have turned scholars' interest, for instance, to whether girls and boys actually learn differently (Baron-Cohen 2004; Slavin 1994), or whether the learning styles of girls and boys differ from one another (Coffield et al. 2004; Younger et al. 2005). Despite the popularity of such beliefs, there is little evidence to support a so-called 'brain-sex'; or that learning styles could be clearly distinguished one from another; or that learning styles would be gender specific. The studies on gender-based classroom placement have shown evidence of girls benefiting from single-gender teaching, whereas boys do not seem to profit from it, though they may be more motivated to study arts and humanities in this setting (Warrington & Younger 2001; Younger et al. 2005; Younger and Warrington 2006; Jackson 2002; Sullivan 2010; Ivinson & Murphy 2007; Lembo 2011). However, Younger et al. (2005) found that practices that improved boys' learning outcomes in primary literacy implemented holistic teaching strategies (strategies that integrate reading, writing, speaking, and listening into a whole) and promoted social interaction and collaboration among the students, for instance, by using drama and encouraging paired and group talk that allowed the students to share and explore their ideas before starting to write. Hence, what appeared to be particularly valuable in these single-gender environments was that they specifically payed attention to the social conditions of the students. Such focus on the social interaction, holistic teaching strategies and collaborative learning when facilitating the learning environments – either co-ed or single-gender – resonates highly with the pre-understanding of this study that takes a standpoint to gender and learning that they both are primarily social conducts.

Studies on femininities (Renold 2001; Reay, 2001; Paechter 2006; Gordon 2006a, 2000b) and on masculinities (Connell 1995; Skelton 2001; Martino & Pallotta-Chiarolli 2003; Martino & Berrill 2003; Connolly 2004; Martino 2006) in the school environment have shown polarization between female and male students, for example, in adopting learner identities; this is, not least due to gendered cultural expectations set to the students when entering spaces of learning. The processes by which children and adolescents deconstruct and reproduce gender collectively are illuminated, for example, in studies on classroom-based literature discussion groups (Brendler 2012), pre-school aged children's play groups (DeLair 2000) and all-girls' after-school clubs (Happel 2011). For instance, Brendler's (2012) study group, who considered gender and power relations through the lens of conversational dynamics, suggested that students' varied communities of practice, such as a classroom community of practice, most likely influenced their gender beliefs. Also these studies further inform us about the significance of gender in children's and adolescents' social lives and about the importance of investing in the social conditions and equity issues in educational contexts in order to better promote equal opportunities among the students. Regarding the interrelations of gender and school achievement, the

work of Francis (2000), Skelton (2006) and Francis and Skelton (2005, 2009), for example, explain that other social identities, including ethnicity and social class, have a greater influence on school achievement than gender alone. Hence, gender as well as other identity variables should always be viewed as intersectional, and examined by considering the ways they interact with one another. In fact, studies on high-achieving students (Renold & Allan 2004; Swain 2002) suggest that there are more similarities than differences between male and female students. Furthermore, gender has been used as a lens in a large body of studies that examine students' classroom interaction and teacher attitudes in perceiving their students (Renold 2000, 2003, 2005, 2006b; Skelton and Francis 2003; Skelton 1989). These studies suggest that teachers persist in 'reading' the students according to their gender, that is, the boys are seen to achieve because of their 'natural talent', whereas girls' school successes are considered to be due to their diligent work. However, teacher attitude is just one factor that influences constructions of identity. Another important element is how students position themselves when engaging in classroom discursive practices which is one of the interests of this study.

In a large number of Finnish school ethnography studies, gender has been the focus (e.g. Gordon et al. 2000; Tolonen 2001; Lahelma & Gordon 2003). Another primary focus has been the differences and inequalities in schools, contextualized in the construction of student citizenship (Gordon, Holland & Lahelma 2000a and 2000b; Gordon 2006a, 2006b; Gordon, Holland, Lahelma & Thomson 2008). In his inquiry, Lehtonen (2003) examines how students construct sexuality and gender in school by sustaining and contesting the existing constructions and norms related to sexuality and gender. His findings suggest that, in formal and informal schools, heteronormativity is prevalent and supported in many ways, for example, in textbooks, teaching and everyday school practices. In school social life, students and teachers were found to both promote and contest these heteronormative accounts. The relations of gender and nationality in children's interactions are the focus of Lappalainen's (2006) research, while Honkasalo (2011) discusses the themes of multiculturalism and gender equality among girls with multicultural backgrounds. These studies show how questions of nationality, ethnicity and gender intersect in children's social lives, and how meanings of racism are often gendered and nationally-specific. Tainio (2005, 2007, 2008, 2009) examines the use of verbal communication in classroom conversations, and discovers that teachers frequently use gendered group designations, such as 'boys'; in that way, teachers highlight male and female students as uniform groups. This uniformity is particularly evident when teachers have issues with student discipline. In her study, Palmu (2003) looks at how gender identities are constructed through cultural texts used in schools, and reinforced by students in the context of Finnish language lessons. Palmu's findings suggest that the cultural texts used in schools, such as textbooks, literature readings and classroom discourses, reinforce images of gender,

in which emphasize manly agency and masculine linguistic expressions, leaving women and femininity in the background. Gendered group hierarchies in school-sports education are the focus of Berg's (2010) inquiry, which points out how, in the context of school-sports lessons, access to expert positions are dependent on students' socio-economical backgrounds; these backgrounds regulate access to material and social resources, and are therefore unevenly distributed. Thus, she demonstrates how mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion are intertwined with students' sporting skills and peer groups that have hierarchical structures that become visible, for example, in team selection situations.

In the field of arts education, Kankkunen (2004) examines the construction of gender in upper-school fine arts classrooms. Her study illuminates the ways that gender becomes significant in the classroom in the forms of: differences in styles of being and doing, aesthetic values, subject matters and in the crafting of student artworks. Issues of gender become particularly evident, for example, when teachers are setting tasks or giving instructions, or when the representations of men and women in the media are discussed in classroom conversations. Differences and gendered boundaries are constructed in classroom discourses, in actions, speech- and picture-making, interactions and conversations, but they were also contested and deconstructed. Lehikoinen (2006) locates his study on boys in dance education at the intersection of dance studies and the sociology of masculinity. He points out multiple prevailing and intertwining discourses that underpin stereotypical views about boys as a uniform entity with certain kinds of biological and cultural qualities, and fixed gendered interests, thus positioning dancing boys at the margins. Furthermore, Anttila (2003) addresses gender issues in her study on dialogue in dance education. She calls for critical awareness in education and teaching, and holds that education, specifically art education, neglects social relations, imagination, play and art.

In music education, a notable amount of studies of gender issues (e.g. Barry 1992; Cooper 1995; Delzell & Leppla 1992; Fortney, Boyle & DeCarbo 1993; Hargreaves, Comber & Colley 1995; Ho 2009; Schmidt 1995; Zervoudakes & Tanur 1994; North, Hargreaves & O'Neill 2000; Hall 2005) focus on the relations of gender and various aspects of musical performance, such as students' instrument choice and learning, singing accuracy, musical preferences and students' perceptions of teacher feedback (Rouston & Misawa 2011). Sexism and exclusionary practices are examined, for example, in studies on music education textbooks (Koza 1992, 1993, 1994) and on children's song materials (Morton 1994; Leppänen 2010). In her study, Leppänen (2010) examines children's music culture in Finland, asking what kinds of conceptions, for instance of gender or ethnicity, are available to children through children's music. She suggests that Finnish children's songs offer stereotypical views about gender identities, their qualities and relations; and, therefore, these songs guide children to a certain kind of understandings

of gender. Children's song images of activity and passivity, private and public, heroism and crossing the norms are often normative and gender-specific in a way that directs and limits the processes of children negotiating gender. Furthermore, studies view female experts practicing in music, such as McWilliam's (2003) study on the depiction of female wind-band conductors in *The Instrumentalist Magazine*. All and all, as Roulston and Misawa (2011) among others suggest, this kind of literature shows the disproportional representations of men and women in music, but also how these representations differ from one another.

A large body of studies have drawn on feminist or post-structuralist theories in order to critically discuss pedagogical and research practices in music education (Gould 1994, 2004; Lamb 1996, 1997; Green 1997, 2002; O'Toole 1994, 1997, 1998). These writings have discussed the feminist values of music education as rooted in socially-based and student-centred orientation, which emphasizes the process of becoming, and personal assimilation of culture rather than simply mastering a specific body of knowledge (Coeyman 1996; Lamb et al. 2002). Moreover, feminist compensatory research has been vital for the efforts in pursuing democracy and equal opportunities in music education by making girls and women in music practices visible, and by "representing gender as meaningful in situations where the facts were not known or the meaning not recognized" (Lamb et al. 2002, 655). For instance, Lamb (1995, 1996) has explored the contradiction between feminist pedagogy and the hegemonic structure of music and music education, arguing that the master-apprentice tradition in music education is the source of the silencing of women's musical voices (Lamb et al. 2002).

The gendering of music as an activity and the gendering of musical practices have been the focus of Gould's (1992a, 1994) and Dibben's (1999, 2000, 2002) writings on gender identity and music. Gould (1994) depicts the practice of music education as being gendered male and female simultaneously, thus causing contradictions; Gould suggests a transformation of the 'music educator' concept (Lamb et al. 2002). Although the musical canon in-large is seen as male, McGregor and Mills (2006) have suggested that music is considered to belong to the affective domain and is therefore related to the realm of femininity practice. According to Bennetts (2013), in the school context, this conception serves to construct music as a 'girls' subject'. Boys' absence in music programs has been a widely-acknowledged concern. Their participation in music and the strategies for encouraging boys' participation have been discussed, for example, in the writings of Adler and Harrison (2004) and Lamb, Dolloff, and Howe (2002). Moreover, the relations of middle-school boys' musical participation and the school context have been examined in Bennetts's (2013) inquiry: Bennetts's study highlights the significance of the school context in the promotion of musical participation in either reinforcing or interrupting

and challenging gendered stereotypes (ibid.). Green's (1997) study illuminates processes involved in negotiating gender identity through musical participation, beliefs and preferences. Her findings show a number of attitudes about gender-appropriateness in musical practices, for example, that girls are not seen to posses the necessary abilities for composition. Green suggests that the music education curriculum can offer vital tools in reconsidering gender politics by contesting gendered musical meanings, in terms of, for example, musical canons, role models and activities associated with the realms of feminine or masculine practices and cultural expectations.

Music teachers' perceptions and practices have been studied, for example, in McIntosh's (2000) inquiry on teacher-student interaction in the music classroom. This study shows that boys receive a disproportional amount of teacher-student interaction, and that students' behaviours and student-initiated interactions notably influence the teacher-student interaction, in that teachers often simultaneously respond to student behaviour in their interactions with students. So according to McIntosh, teachers should pay more attention not only to the equal treatment of male and female students, but to the ways they respond to student behaviour. Roulston and Misawa (2011) have looked at music teachers' experiences and constructions of their classroom practices in relation to their conceptualizations of gender. They argue that music educators should consider gender as a relevant concept in music education, and in doing so, examine their own presumptions about teaching and learning music, and the ways feminine and masculine practices are negotiated in the spaces of learning music. These practices are also one of the key interests of this study. Moreover, they point to the importance of teacher education in preparing future teachers to resist the dominant constructions of gender that amplify the stereotypical performances among the students and teachers. Another perspective is taken by Charles (2004) who examines how children construct gender by adopting and reproducing ideologies associated with female and male's musical practices in music education, and how these gendered ideologies may affect their expectations, specific practices and their musical compositions (see also Roulston & Misawa 2011). Charles' findings suggest that among these students the girls developed a 'female musical subculture' for their participation in the compositional world. Despite this, he demonstrates that the children, in their own musical practices, were not producing ideological assumptions about gendered musical practices; this is seemingly in a contradiction to how they operated discursively as their discourse was influenced by gendered musical ideologies. Furthermore, Charles' study explicates teachers to be strongly affected by gendered ideologies because they displayed stereotypical expectations about the music that girls and boys produce.

A number of recent studies discuss the current themes in music education, such as new technologies and digital learning spaces, and informal learning, for instance, in popular music practices. In her study considering how gender difference is constructed in a music technology classroom, Armstrong (2011) reveals that, with the familiarization of music technology, boys are more and more dominating musical practices in music classrooms, and girls are becoming more and more underprivileged (see also Seddon 2012). Armstrong (2011) suggests that male teachers and students "actively produce gendered technological cultures that position female pupils in a marginalized role that stands outside of the male produced culture" (p. 61). Moreover, her results demonstrate that boys are often awarded higher status due to teachers holding that boys are more creative than girls. Similarly, Abramo's (2011) inquiry on gender and popular music in the school classroom examines how students' perceptions of sexual identity affect their participation. His findings indicate that boys used popular music practices to project their sexual identity. This was evident, for example, in their refusal to participate in musical acts, such as singing in a high range or writing lyrics in a rock band context, even though these acts were not identified as problematic within traditional music ensembles and genres. In a different vein, Björck's (2011) study focuses on gender equality and girls' and women's access to participation in popular music practices. She holds that the enhancement of gender-equity in the popular music classroom calls for consideration of school-governance cultures; the composition of student groups; and the various ways that teachers and students perform gender in a classroom. For a reflexive practice of music education, Björck proposes that teachers should train pedagogical skills in order to critically observe how the social norms are constructed and sustained in and out school. In her work, Borgström Källén (2014) highlights and problematizes how gender, in interplay with genre practice, is expressed and constructed in musical action among Swedish upper secondary art programme students. The findings indicate that gender construction in musical action is salient in almost every situation where the participants made music together, but that they perform differently depending on the genre practice. Furthermore, the study points out that the participants put gender at stake when it comes to relations of production, power and symbols. Nevertheless, the students' choices, in terms of educational content in their musical learning, seem to be strictly gendered, in that way restricting their acting space. Despite a large body of studies viewing gender in school environments, the Finnish music classroom, however, still lacks research related to gender.

In this chapter, I have provided a selected overview of some of the research conducted in the field of gender and education. A large body of the studies that I introduce, express about the complexity of gender – just as any human interaction is complex – and the importance of considering gender issues in music education. In the next section, I introduce the Finnish Basic Education in the Arts-system and the study's context.

1.2 Introducing the context of the study

Basic Education in the Arts

This study has taken place in a context of an extra curricular music school guided by the policy of Basic Education in the Arts. Basic Education in the Arts is a voluntary activity, usually organized by public or private extracurricular art institutions. It is arranged according to the Act and Decree on Basic Education in the Arts (FNBE 1998) and follows the Framework Curriculum (FNBE 2002) given by the Finnish National Board of Education. According to the Basic Arts Education Act, Basic Education in the Arts is goal-oriented, advancing from one level to another, providing the students with facilities for self-expression as well as a basis for potential vocational studies in higher education. It is organized mainly for children and adolescents, however, in addition, may be organized for small children and adults (Koramo 2009; Korpela et al. 2010).

The Basic Arts Education Act designates the aims in education and legislates the conditions for organizers, collaboration, curriculum guidelines, student selection, evaluation, personnel, state subsidy and student fees. Based on the number of students and the confirmed number of lesson hours given, the education providers may receive statutory government transfers (Koramo 2009; Korpela et al. 2010). The fundamental principles of the Finnish educational system, like every child's right to the equal access to educational resources or a student-centered approach in teaching, are articulated in the act.

The Finnish Basic Education in the Arts is organized in various fields of the arts, including music, literary arts, dance, performing arts (circus and theatre) and visual arts (architecture, audiovisual arts, visual arts and crafts). In 2014, the government (the Ministry of Education and Culture) funded 88 music institutes and 41 schools offering other art forms. Of all the students participating in Basic Education in the Arts in 2007-2008, 49,8% received instruction in music (Koramo 2009; Korpela et al. 2010).

A network consisting of extra-curricular music schools and conservatoires encompasses most parts of the country, that are specialized either in teaching western art music, pop/jazz music, folk music or offer various styles of teaching. A majority of these institutions follow the Framework Curriculum established by the Finnish National Board of Education. In addition to educational aims, goals and a conception of learning, the Framework Curriculum includes guidelines for the content, extent and evaluation of music studies. It may encompass two kinds of syllabi, general (2005) and extended (2002). The general syllabus emphasizes the joy and freedom of independent study, as well as collaborative music-making. The teaching objectives are customized according

to the individual aims of the students. The extended syllabus additionally focuses on the special aptitudes needed for vocational and higher education; extended syllabus students are usually selected by entrance examinations. Music schools frame their own curricula, and can independently define the content and the subjects taught within the Framework Curriculum (FNBE 2002; 2005; Koramo 2009; Korpela et al. 2010). The difference of these two syllabi is substantial as the general syllabus reaches the whole generation of children and adolescents, whereas extended syllabus involves only a selected amount of students that receive tuition in various fields of extra curricular arts education.

According to the Framework Curriculum, the general objectives of music teaching in Basic Education of the Arts are to support the development of students' personalities, to help children and adolescents mature into mentally-balanced and aesthetically- and ethically-sensitive persons with strong self-confidence; to nurture students' lifelong love for, and interest in, music; to guide students towards focused and persistent way of working in and through music collectively or as individuals; and to open up possibilities for future vocational training and higher education in the arts (FNBE 2002, 6; Korpela et al. 2010). However, sometimes there are hindrances that interfere in the processes of learning. This study examines how social factors, such as gender, may complicate classroom interactions, thus preventing students from constructing memberships and acting collectively as a community of learners.

Largely, the focus of teaching in music schools, from primary school to more advanced levels, is on one-on-one musical lessons. Despite this shared focus, instruction style may vary from one to another, and it may also occur as small-group teaching or in larger groups, such as orchestras and choirs. Courses are offered on all classical, jazz, folk and rock band instruments. In addition, teaching is offered in various theoretical subjects, such as music theory, solfége lessons involving ear training, music reading and writing skills and music history classes (FNBE 2002, 9; Korpela et al. 2010).

The teaching of music theory in Finland

This inquiry was conducted in a Basics of Music classroom in which children learn, among other things, music theory and solfége. Unlike in many other countries, in Finland, music theory, including solfége (designated here as Basics of Music / *Musiikin perusteet,* and referred to later as BoM), is taught as a separate subject starting from the elementary level. This practice, originally initiated by musical instrumental teachers, goes back to the early 1970s. Before that time, theoretical subjects and sight-reading were taught in tandem with musical instrumental teaching. Furthermore, sight-reading was taught in

school as part of general music education. In 1978, a music theory course was added to the of the music-school curriculum nationwide as a mandatory component (Länsi-Helsingin musiikkiopisto 1995).

In the late 1980s and particularly in the '90s, the aims and subjects offered by music schools, which was closely regulated by Association of Finnish Music Schools (Suomen Musiikkioppilaitosten liitto), were under re-evaluation because it they were considered to be too narrow. A wider range of musical styles was required from classical to pop and jazz, in addition to lessons in improvisation and music technology. Moreover, the examination system and mandatory theory lessons were criticized as not meeting the needs of all students. (Heimonen 2002, 195) Until 1998 in music theory and solfége, learning outcomes were tracked by annual standard tests given by the Association of Finnish Music Schools.

The Framework curriculum (FNBE 2002) distributed in 2002 emphasized nurturing students' lifelong relationship with music, and the possibilities for self-expression in and through music. During the past decade, in order to better correspond to these overarching aims, the Association of Music Theory and Solfége Teachers (Mutes Ry) has actively participated in reforming the BoM course, emphasizing creative and hands-on approaches, integrated with creative music-making, such as composing. In 2013, a working committee appointed by the Association of Finnish Music Schools released new instructions concerning the objectives, contents and assessment for the BoM course.

BoM Rationale

In this inquiry, I examine the classroom discursive practices in my own BoM classroom, such as artefacts, experiences and practices shared by the students and myself, as the teacher. Throughout the study, I also discuss my pedagogical aims, choices and practices that were facilitated in the course of the data collection. Of all the instructional domains, pedagogical practices in music theory are probably the most unmapped (Schwartz 2012). The studies that do exist are in higher education, like Ilomäki's (2011) study on pianists' aural-skills, and Schwartz's inquiry on undergraduate music theory pedagogy (2012). Traditionally, music theory as a subject is mainly understood as consisting of formal musical knowledge, such as facts, concepts, descriptions and theories, in other words, textbook-types of information about music. For many of us, hearing the words 'music theory' brings up images of scales, key signatures and roman numerals, that is, abstract concepts, rather than actual tangible understanding of musical processes and events (Rogers 2004, 5). Consequently, the musical knowledge easily remains inert (Whitehead 1929) and disconnected from skills (Ilomäki & Holkkola 2013; Kuoppamäki 2010).

Although music-theory learning traditionally takes place inside a theory classroom and is understood as supporting students' musical instrumental studies and their development of musicianship skills, it traditionally excludes actual music-making. However, connecting the knowledge to its practical use is not always simple. A 9-year-old student of mine once asked: "Is this the same G major as the one in my instrumental lesson?" Her question illustrates how long a conceptual journey is, for example, from the BoM classroom to a musical instrumental lesson (Kuoppamäki 2010). Philosopher and educational reformist John Dewey considered this problem in a wider educational context over a hundred years ago when he introduced his Laboratory School. In 1966, he writes: "The divorce between learning and its use is the most serious defect of our existing education. Without the consciousness of application, learning has no motive to the child" (1966a, 73). Dewey claims that children's own instinctive and impulsive actions are the origin of all education. At the same line, researcher on psychology of music education Margaret Barrett (2005) suggests that identifying the significance of children's play in the learning processes helps us to understand the role of musical play in children's development (p. 261). Hence, learning by doing is inherent to constructing and testing knowledge.

However, the current BoM teaching aims, articulated for instance in the instructions given by the Association of the Finnish Music Schools (2013), challenges the long-lived practice of separating the theoretical content and its use, claiming it is out-dated. According to Ilomäki and Holkkola, the course of study in the BoM lessons is increasingly built upon actual music-making and communication in and through music (Ilomäki & Holkkola 2013); thus, the learning of concepts and notation is integrated with music-making situations (ibid.). Hence, the role of BoM can also be seen as constructing musical agency that enables one to use musical knowledge in *changing musical arenas*, formal and informal, and to construct musical communities (Karlsen 2011; Juntunen et al. 2014). Understanding BoM in this way gives it a whole new philosophical and social meaning. According to Westerlund (2002), one of the key competences in practicing musical agency is the ability to change one's own experience and social environment. Indeed, many researchers, such as Blair (2009), DeNora (2000) and Small (1998) emphasize precisely the social dimensions in constructing agency. Hence, philosophically thinking, BoM can be understood as an arena or a pedagogical space in which the students can share their musical interests reflexively, through joint musical activities (Ilomäki & Holkkola 2013).

In the spirit of these new understandings, the objectives of BoM at the elementary level, articulated in 2013 by the Association of Finnish Music Schools, emphasize students' capabilities to act and interact musically and to apply theoretical contents in musical situations, in other words, to build agency in music. BoM's overall objectives are that students: 1) gain skills in musicianship; 2) know a variety of repertoire and are familiar

with the main styles, phenomenon and instruments of the musical genre they are studying; 3) learn to perceive rhythm, melody and harmony; and 4) gain skills in composition and improvisation. (SMOL 2013).

The classroom environments in BoM vary depending on the teaching methods used by the teacher. The methods may involve, for example: singing; musical movement; dance; drama; visual arts; playing instruments; listening to music; going to concerts; working on computer exercises; and textbook or other written assignments. Hence, the classroom is designed suitably according to the activities offered in the course. The students usually participate in BoM lessons once a week. At the elementary level, the extent of studies varies from four to six years depending on the program offered by the music school.

BoM at the site of this study

In my classroom, BoM is taught by experimenting with creative and hands-on methods. The challenge of connecting theory and practice is taken into consideration, for example, when the students bring their own musical instruments to the BoM classroom. The more traditional methods of teaching BoM, such as a teacher explaining theoretical contents to the students or conducting exercises that focus on reading and writing skills of music, are integrated with workshop-type settings, in which learning musical knowledge may take place in varying musical situations, such as musical movement, improvising or composing in a group. This approach is also taken into account when arranging the physical environment suitable for the alternating classroom activities. Hence, the classroom setting involves both facilities for working with pen and paper at tables, but also free space, for instance, for playing instruments or doing bodily exercises, such as body percussion or dancing. In addition, course content involves, for example, drama, visual arts, architecture and dance. In this classroom, the students work with their own musical instruments in order to explore the theoretical contents of the course, including musical structures, scales, chord progressions, pitches, timbre and rhythmic patterns, by making music together. As an example, students might learn a musical arrangement as a group, playing in different keys, and actually inventing a musical situation rather than simply learning key signatures and how to transpose from one key to another; in this way, the students are giving the learned knowledge an audible and embodied form. Thus, the pedagogical aim is to promote understanding of the interrelationships that drive musical processes. From this angle, learning can be understood as an increasing ability to think musically.

In this BoM classroom, I understand creative music-making in a group as providing opportunities to explore and experiment with music, and to negotiate and make musical

choices. It may also provide potential for students to develop personal meanings and to create sensitivities to the views and needs of others. Indeed, music education philosopher Bennett Reimer (1995) describes the engagement in a musical activity as an intense "self-within-the-world human condition" (p. 1). Hence, musical activity can be seen as an endeavour of manifesting selfness (ibid). However, in classroom-based learning, this takes place in interactions with others. Joint music-making, in the form of performing, composing or improvising, includes both elements of critical self-reflection and shared decision-making. Thus, it is an interplay of *private* and *public* meaning-making. Without overlooking the importance of joint music-making in shaping *individual's* self-identity, music sociologist Christopher Small (1998) suggests that its significance may be even more profound on the *collective* level. Music-making can be used to collectively affirm and explore identity, and musical interaction may also be thought of as acts of exploring human relationships. As Karlsen (2011) writes, this provides an opportunity to attend and to expand "what it means to be on a collective level" (p. 10). Reimer (1995) agrees that such joint effort to create musical experience collectively adds another layer to the potential profundity of the musical experience (p. 15). From Small, Karlsen and Reimer's perspectives, the BoM classroom can also be viewed as a social intersection for the music school practices, in which students share their interests and experiences in and through music.

However, this kind of educational culture does not take place by itself, but calls for social awareness, sensibility and even persistence. The long process of rethinking and reconstructing the aims, contents and pedagogical practices in my own BoM classroom goes back to the late 1990s. In developing new approaches, I soon realized that it was not so much about myself as a practitioner or about the ways of facilitating learning environments, but rather about what we accomplished together with the students, about interaction and cooperation, about community (Kuoppamäki 2010). Hence, I started to experiment with methods that would invite the students to explore, lead conversations, ask questions and share opinions about music *as a group*, while leaving space for making musical judgements and choices, and developing *personal* appreciation, understanding and meaning. In other words, I wanted to nurture spaces of learning that would not just address topics and ask questions requiring clear-cut right or wrong answers, but would also encourage the students to deal with ambiguity, and learn that some questions can have a great many answers (ibid.).

Moving towards a workshop-type of setting, in which students were encouraged to actively experiment and share views, created new kinds of challenges in terms of social interaction. Despite my efforts to promote more student-led practices and bring elements of art, play and invention into the learning processes and the pedagogical culture of the

BoM classroom, the interactions often seemed to lack dialogue, cooperation and a sense of community. It was not easy to achieve the spirit of joint creative exploration. Obviously, the situation varied from class to class, let alone from week to week. Nevertheless, I was able to identify some behavioural modes that were more or less analogous to most of the groups and that, in my mind, called for a closer look in order to better understand the social dynamics in children's music classrooms.

Evidently, pursuing such collectivity in learning calls for promoting the social interactions and the communicative skills of the participants. By communicative skills, I include both verbal and non-verbal practices, such as gaze, gesture, posture and timing that are fundamental to on-going participation (see also Rogoff 2003). In this view, all human cognition and activities are socially and culturally constructed, and occur by and through communicative processes (Barrett 2005, 263). Hence, as Wenger (1998/2003) claims, meaning exists neither in us, nor in the world, but in the dynamic relation of living in the world together with others. Understanding learning from this perspective makes the practices that support dialogue and participation of particular value in classroom-based learning. As was the case with the BoM classroom at the site of this study, practice is always messy and improvised, and requires on-going judgement (Wenger 2009). However, facilitating experiences of shared negotiation processes and a sense of mutuality and accountability may turn conflicts into learning opportunities (ibid.); in this way, conflicts can strengthen the students' identity as legitimate members of the community, and guide their way towards becoming independent intellects and agents (Kuoppamäki 2007).

1.3 Socio-cultural approach in the BoM classroom

This study adopts a sociocultural perspective (e.g. Mead 1934/1956; Vygotsky 1978) that emphasizes social participation as central to learning. For educational philosopher and psychologist Jerome Bruner (1996), a culture denotes an environment, embodying '
"a set of values, skills and ways of life" (p. 3) in which we live. Hence, culture can be understood as the context – such as the BoM classroom of this study – in which individual members negotiate meanings of the happenings and phenomena. In Bruner's *cultural* view, education is understood as a process of negotiation between the individual and culture. These processes of negotiation keep culture in on-going change. Moreover, according to Bruner (ibid.), culture can also be seen as a 'toolkit' for sense-making and communicating, enhancing our contribution in action, perception and thought (p. 126). Language commonly used in a particular cultural setting, including knowledge, beliefs and values shared by the people of the culture, serves as a good example of such a toolkit (ibid.; see also Takaya 2008). Consequently, a sociocultural view of learning

abandons the traditional view of schooling with its emphasis on individual knowledge and performance, and it understands the human thought and as potentially action advancing action in particular social interactions and cultural settings (see e.g. Wenger 1998/2003; Barrett 2005; Wenger 2006). In this study's BoM classroom, learning is understood as depending on the access to shared classroom culture, including its values, practices and processes of negotiation. Educational theorist Etienne Wenger (1998/2003) describes participation as the social experience of living in the world in respect to membership in social communities, and active involvement in joint enterprises. In the classroom, in a community of learners, students can manifest their learning by participating actively in the classroom's social and intellectual practices (Yamakawa et al. 2009). This does not, however, mean that the participants inevitably share the same meanings with regard to these activities, but "they share the process of engagement and construction of their subjectively unique understandings of their participation based on the communicated messages across and within activities and participants' past experience of certain practices" (R. Engeström 2009, 262; see also R. Engeström 2005; Gutiérrez & Rogoff 2003; Valsiner 2001). The participation process combines modes of doing, talking, listening, feeling and belonging that involve our whole person, including our bodies, minds, emotions and social relations. In other words, it is a source of identity (ibid., 56). Learning changes who we are by changing our capability to participate, to belong, and to negotiate meaning (Wenger 1998/2003, 4, 225-226).

Viewing learning as a form of social participation sets communities and their localized practices at the centre of the learning and knowing process by directing the ways that memberships and ownerships of meaning are negotiated (Wenger 1998/2003; Barrett 2005; Paechter 2003). Consequently, in social contexts, learning depends on our ability to contribute to shared meaning-making, to engage in activities, claim identities and relate to artefacts (Wenger 1998, 55-56). In other words, "who gets to learn and what is learned is connected to the social relationships constructed in classrooms" (Gutierres et al. 1995, 445). Thus, classroom is a dynamic system of relationships and structures, mirroring larger societal structures and power relationships (Aronowitz & Giroux 1993; Freire & Macedo 1987; Giroux 1988). Rethinking 'learning' within a social theory framework has implications on three levels. First, for *individuals* it means that learning involves both engaging in and contributing to the shared practices of their *communities*. Secondly, for communities it means that learning is a matter of renewing their practices and ensuring new generations of members. Finally, for *organizations* it means that learning encompasses the sustainment of the interconnected communities of practice; it is through this community practice that an organization knows what it knows, thus becoming more effective and valuable as an organization (Wenger 1998/2003, 7-8; see also Rikandi 2010).

Communities of practice

In this inquiry, the concept of 'community of practice', first introduced by Lave and Wenger in 1987 (Lave & Wenger 1991 /2009; Wenger 2006) and further developed by Wenger (Wenger, 1998/2003; Wenger, McDermott and Snyder 2002; Wenger 2006), is used as a lens in articulating and conceptualizing the practices in the BoM classroom. According to Wenger, community of practice is not a synonym for 'group', 'team' or 'network'. Namely, a group of learners neither automatically forms a socially supportive context for learning to take place nor forms a community. Almost a century ago, Dewey (MWs) insightfully stated that building up a community requires shared commitment to the mutual work. According to Deweyan pragmatism, we all live in our own world that is meaningful for us in a way that it cannot be for anybody else; but when acting together in order to achieve common goals, we have to adjust our individual approaches, perspectives and actions so that others are able to respond (Biesta & Burbules 2003, 12). This process of *communication*, as Dewey describes it, transforms the individual worlds of everyone involved, creating a shared *intersubjective* world (ibid.). Such a notion of 'practical intersubjectivity' (Biesta 1994) with other people through action resonates with Lave and Wenger's (1991) ideas about what it takes to engage in collaborative learning. Similarly as Deweyan pragmatist philosophy, Lave and Wenger do not set the individual against the social and communal. Rather, the individual and social can be seen as mutually constitutive. Hence, to form such a profitable environment – a community of practice – requires mutual engagement, joint enterprise and shared repertoire (Wenger 1998/2003, 73-74). This means that social relations rest on mutual respect, a sense of belonging and cooperation and allow all participants' full membership and access to negotiation and learning (ibid.), enabling, for instance, learning from peers.

While acting and interacting within and across events, members of a classroom community construct normative patterns of life (Gutierrez et al. 1995). These scripts are defined by particular social, spatial and language patterns that community members use as resources in order to interpret others' engagement and guide their own participation (ibid.). According to Gutierrez (1993), a script then stands for an orientation that the participants come to expect after repeated interactions at a site that is constructed both in place and time. However, the BoM classroom under study was an entirely new community of learners. Hence, the norms and shared practices were only starting to be negotiated and to take shape. In that sense, the concept of a community of practice or a learning community (Wenger 1998/2003) at that stage represented rather an ideal, that is, something that the BoM classroom so far was only aiming to become. Consequently, building up a community for learning to take place was my ideal as a teacher; and also articulated in the Finnish National Core Curriculum; however it might not have been some of the students' ideal.

Having access to such processes, in which the meanings, practices, social rules and hierarchies are negotiated, is fundamental to the construction of agency (Wenger 2006; McNay 2004). In this study, agency is understood as socially constructed and a part of communities, cultural conceptions, social norms and relationships (McNay 2004). Hence, the theory of communities of practice brings together social theory and learning theory. The community and its practices represent a social structure; the memberships and engagements in practice – that either promote or compromise access – represent agency (Wenger 2006). In a community of practice, every member plays a significant part. They come to the community with different interests and ways of contributing to mutual goals; in that way, the community of practice is in constant change (Wenger 1998/2003; 2006). Engeström (1999) shares this view of a changing community of practice by holding multi-voicedness as one of the key components of a community as an activity system, which may be formed by diverse views, traditions and interests. This study particularly explores the ways that gender becomes intertwined with the processes of negotiating identities and musical agency in the BoM classroom.

Memberships and ownerships of meaning

The different modes of participation that shape our identities are related to the communities in with which we engage, and the ability to shape the meanings that define these communities (Wenger 1998/2003, 188). According to Wenger (ibid.), the shaping of identity formation is a dual process, first, a result of tensions between our investments in various forms of belonging, and secondly, a result of our capability to negotiate significant meanings. The processes that define our memberships (identification) and our ownership of meanings (negotiability) form in Wengerian terms: the social ecologies of identity.

By 'identification', Wenger (1998/2003) refers to a socially-organized process of identifying as something or someone, such as a category or role, while at the same time, identifying with something or someone (p. 191). In this sense, identity is the core of social nature, a locus of social selfhood, and also a social power; identity is the power to belong, to be a certain person and to claim a place with legitimacy of membership (Wenger 1998/2003, 207). Thus, we build a community of practice through a process of identification by working out our relations with each other, and by defining the forms of memberships (p. 192). The social relations that regulate membership formations can be driven, among other things, by gendered negotiations. These gendered manifestations are of key interest to this study. From the teacher perspective, understanding the dynamics that drive the social interaction in pedagogical situations is vital in order to support students' identity negotiations and facilitate collective learning experiences. According to

Wenger (ibid.), the experience of mutuality and accountability when engaging in shared enterprises is central to identification.

The ability to contribute, take responsibility for and shape the meanings that are important within a social structure, such as a BoM classroom, refers to the other aspect of identity: 'negotiability' (Wenger 1998/2003). According to Wenger (1998/2003), negotiability creates ownership of meaning (p. 197) and designates "the degree to which we have control over the meanings in which we are invested" (ibid., 188). In that sense, negotiability refers to our position in social spaces. Engaging in such negotiation processes calls for cultural literacy (Schirato & Yell 2000), "a familiarity with the rules and conventions of a culture; and a feel for negotiating those rules and conventions" (p. 17). Hence, as Wenger (1998/2003) claims, negotiability can operate both   as a source of participation but also as a vehicle of non-participation (p. 203).

According to feminist music education scholar Elizabeth Gould (2007), participation is specifically, if not exclusively, one of the main features of carrying out democracy. In music education, equality is typically seen as "equal opportunity or equal access to educational and musical resources", for instance, "equal access to power in student-teacher interactions through students making choices and decisions, or at least voting on issues" that affect them (p. 231). However, it is not only through the practices in which we engage we build our identities, but just as importantly, it is through the practices in which we *do not* engage (Wenger 1998/2003, 164). In other words, what we are not can play a significant role in how we come to define ourselves. Hence, a mix of participation and non-participation shapes fundamental aspects of our lives. This mix defines how we locate ourselves in a social landscape, what we care about, what we miss out on, what we try to know and relate to, what we choose to ignore, with whom we want to associate and whom we avoid, and how we engage and direct our energies (p. 167-168). Within a community of learners the modes of participation and non-participation are intertwined, among other things, with gendered negotiations and with the adoption of group identities; thus, the modes of participation operate as a source of social power.

To summarize, learning depends on our ability to engage in activities, identities and artefacts in social contexts. The artefacts or 'reifications' in Wengerian terms, such as abstractions, tools, symbols, stories, terms and concepts, are produced through mutual engagement (1998/2003, 59). Mutual engagement in the negotiation process involves both meaningful proposal production, and the adoption of these proposals. Taking part in such negotiations calls for mutuality and cooperation. More specifically, it requires legitimacy in order for participants to contribute and take responsibility for the shared enterprises within a social body (Wenger 1998/2003, 197). Ferm (2004) shares this view by suggesting

that intersubjective creation of meaning through shared responsibility is central to musical interactions in school (see also Olsson 2007). In this sense, 'economies of meaning' (ibid.), that is, our possibilities to participate in the processes of negotiation, reflect power relations, which regulate the building of ownership of meaning. A sense of ownership depends on one's own conceptions of the range of possibilities to use the constructed knowledge; in that way, ownership is central to meaning-making and the construction of agency. On the teacher's part, this requires a sensitivity to students' previous experiences and an awareness to promote new initiatives (Ferm 2004). However, ownership of meaning can also be compromised by social boundaries, which can inhibit access to participation and meaning negotiation. Causes of inhibitive social boundaries may include various, intersecting modes of difference, including ethnicity, class, gender, age, sexuality and place. This study specifically explores the ways that gendered negotiations are manifested in a children's music classroom, specifically, participating in a BoM course.

1.4 Learning and gender

In this section, I discuss the wide and complex issue of gender in the context of education. Instead of attempting to be comprehensive, I will view it particularly from a perspective that contributes to understanding children's gendered interactions while learning music in a group. Relevant to this study as a whole, I focus on the relations of: gendered learner identities (Paechter 2006; Gordon 2006a; Wenger 1998/2003); gendered border work (Thorne 1993; Bredesen 2004; Paechter 2006; Connell 2009; Berg 2010); and building musical agency (e.g. Karlsen 2011).

First, before getting started, the use of terminology requires some explanation. In this inquiry, I have chosen to use the terms 'girl' and 'boy' when referring to female and male students; I made this decision, first, for clarity, and secondly, in order to emphasize that my focus is on *children's* gendered negotiations. This does not, however, mean that I would not be aware of the fact that using such terms is potentially problematic. There are two main concerns regarding the use of these terms. First, although it is commonplace to think that there are only two biological sexes, and that this 'two-sex-model' is straightforward and solid (Mikkola 2011), researchers have shown that this perception is false, estimating that 1,7% of the population fall outside of the two-fold sex-categorization (Fausto-Sterling 1993, 2000a, 2000b). According to Mikkola (2011), intersex people illustrate that sexual attributes associated with females and males do not always align, and that some individuals may have a blends of both attributes (see also Fausto-Sterling 1993b, 2000a, 2000b; Stone 2007). Consequently, drawing on Fausto-Sterling, Stone (2007, 44) argues that 'sex' is a cluster concept, meaning that it is adequate to satisfy *enough* of the sex attributes that tend

to cluster together in order to qualify a person as being of a particular sex. For Stone, sex is a matter of *degree*. One can be more or less male/female, but making a strict distinction between the two is misleading (Stone 2007; Mikkola 2011). Furthermore, transsexuality is further evidence that biological sex is not to be something straightforward and definite.

My second concern regarding the use of the terms 'girl' and 'boy' relates to gender theorist Judith Butler's (1993) claim that making categorizations such as 'girl' or 'boy' involves evaluative and normative commitments. According to Butler (1990/1999), sexed bodies do not exist outside social meanings. Therefore, our understanding of gender shapes our conceptions of sex (ibid., 139; see also Mikkola 2011). From this perspective, sexed bodies are not empty substances on which gender is constructed, but we discursively construct gender, meaning that sexed bodies are what they are because of what we ascribe to them and how we classify their traits (Butler 1993; Mikkola 2011). Therefore, for Butler, sex assignment is always normative (1993, 1). She argues that calling a newborn a 'girl' or a 'boy' is not a descriptive but a normative claim, a 'speech act' (ibid., 7). In speech act theory, it is discursive practice that names, enacts and produces performative gender (ibid., 13).

The Conception of gender

No uniform agreement about gender is available, and the concept of 'gender' is as highly-contested as it is multiply-defined. For one, it can be seen as a role, as doing, as a style, as a habit or as an appearance (Ojala et al. 2009). In a simplified sense, 'sex' is a category that we associate more with biology, whereas 'gender' is a category that we associate more with psychological or social construction. Gender scholar Raewyn Connell (2009) argues that most gender discourses in our society emphasize precisely that dichotomy. In its most common usage, the term 'gender' is conceptualized as "the cultural difference of women from men, based on the biological division between male and female" (Connell 2002, 8). Simone de Beauvoir (1972) famously defined gender as becoming, so behavioural rather than biological; as culturally learned; and as something that develops in relation with one's social circumstances (see Mikkola 2011). Beauvoir's groundbreaking work has resulted in many interpretations by gender scholars. For example, gender is seen as a causally-constructed process of socialization that takes place through social learning by observing the world (e.g. Haslanger 1995). However, social learning theory has been criticized for being too simplistic to explain gender differences. In these understandings, gender is viewed, for instance, as feminine or masculine *personality* (Chodorow 1978; 1995); emphasizing parenting practices in the processes of constructing gender; or as feminine or masculine *sexuality* (MacKinnon 1989), that is, hierarchical and tied to sexualized

power relations (Mikkola 2011). In common with the positions outlined above, another gender perspective considers common conditions that make some individuals women and some men, so it understands women or men as a group, possessing and sharing some characteristic qualities, experiences, common conditions and criteria that define their gender. In this 'gender realistic' view, all women are assumed to differ from *all* men (ibid.)

Gender realism has been criticized by a number of scholars (Spelman 1988; Harris 1993; hooks 2000; Stone 2007) because it fails to view gender alongside other dimensions of social difference, such as race, class, ethnicity or nationality; thus, it assumes that all women would share, for example, the experience of a white, middle-class Western feminist (Mikkola 2011). Butler (1990/1999) criticizes such positions for being *normative* by making two claims. First, she argues that such unitary gender notions do not take into account the cultural, social and political intersections in which people construct identities. In this way, she is implying that there is some common understanding of what being a woman [or man] should apply (Butler 1990/1999). Secondly, as discussed above, her view of 'identity categories', including gender, "are never merely descriptive, but always normative, and as such, exclusionary" (Butler 1991, 160; see also Mikkola 2011).

Performative gender

This study adopts a poststructuralist approach, understanding gender as a fluid, socially-constructed and performative structure. In other words, gender is not treated as an outcome of genetic or biological differences. Instead, masculinities and femininities are seen as 'real fictions' that are produced through social agents' internalized power relations that are performed in their minds, bodies and behaviours (Foucault 1978; Butler 1990/1999; see also Archer 2006). In this view, gender is fundamentally understood as relationally constructed, meaning that notions of 'maleness/masculinity' are solely intelligible and negotiated in relation to the notions of 'femaleness/femininity', and vice versa (e.g. see Davies 1989, 2003; Francis and Skelton 2005; Archer 2006). By performative, I meant that gender is something one does, not something one is:

> ... gender is always a doing, though not a doing by a subject who might be said to pre-exist the deed.... There is no gender-identity behind the expression of gender; that identity is performatively constituted by the very 'expressions' that are said to be its results. (Butler, 1990/1999, 25)

Hence, gender is a sequence of acts. 'Doing' gender means reproducing certain gestures, motions and marks that are commonly related to certain physiological features (Berg 2010, 72). According to Mikkola (2011), repeated engaging in 'feminizing' and 'masculinizing' acts congeals gender, thus falsely giving people an impression of gender as something they naturally are. However, genders come into existence only to the extent that they are performed (Butler 1990/1999, 278-279). Stone (2007) shares this view by suggesting that, for example, "being feminine is just a matter of doing certain activities" (p. 64).

In order to find alternate conceptualizations of gender other than difference and dichotomy, Connell (2002, 2009) discusses gender as a structure of social relations that involves a specific relationship with bodies. For her, gender is "a structure of social relations that centres on the reproductive arena, and the set of practices that bring reproductive distinctions between bodies into social processes" (Connell 2002, 8; 2009, 11). Connell (2002, 2009) shares Butler's (1993) view that bodies cannot be understood as just simply as the physical objects of social processes, but rather, bodies ares active participants in social processes, taking part in social agency, and in generating and shaping social conduct (2009, 11, 57). According to Connell, gender, like other social constructions, is multi-dimensional, being about identity, sexuality and work, and all of these at once (ibid., 11).

In this view, gender is constructed and reconstructed through our social engagements in everyday life and thus, can be seen as a situational and on-going process. This resonates with McNay's account of gender as lived social relation (McNay 2004). For her, seeing gender from this perspective brings experience to the centre of social analysis (ibid.). Carrie Paechter (2003, 138) argues that the ways we end up performing certain masculinities or femininities in certain contexts can be understood as communities of localized practices. Consequently, being a man, a woman, a girl or a boy is something that has a different meaning in different times and places (Berg 2010, 49). These meanings are repeatedly negotiated within social configurations. Discourse, in this sense, involves the artefacts, experiences and practices shared by the members of a local community (Gutierrez et al. 1995). Gee (1990) describes discourse as:

> … a socially accepted association among ways of using language, of thinking, believing, valuing, and of acting that can be used to identify oneself as a member of a socially meaningful group. (Gee 1990, 143)

Hence, in this view of negotiation of identity and the social roles that participants adopt in communities are best understood in consideration of what people do in shared participation with one another (Gutierrez et al. 1995).

With her notion of heterosexual matrix, Butler (1990/1999), problematizes these negotiations by asking to what extent the prevailing gendered practices rule identity formation, and to what extent 'identity' is a normative ideal rather than a feature based on one's actual experience (2006, 68). She explains:

> I use the term heterosexual matrix ... to designate that grid of cultural intelligibility through which bodies, genders, and desires are naturalized ... a hegemonic discursive/epistemological model of gender intelligibility that assumes that for bodies to cohere and make sense there must be a stable sex expressed through a stable gender (masculine expresses male, feminine expresses female) that is oppositionally and hierarchically defined through the compulsory practice of heterosexuality. (Butler 1990, 151)

Consequently, a heterosexual matrix suggests that society privileges both masculinity and heterosexuality (Skelton & Francis 2009).

According to Renold (2006), Butler's conceptualization of how gender is routinely spoken through a hegemonic heterosexual matrix (Butler 1990, 1993), and her focus on the dynamic and citational nature of identity, in which gender is manifested through a series of repetitive performances that create the illusion of a 'proper', 'natural' or 'fixed' gender, is valuable in theorizing children's identity-work. As Renold (2006) notes, Butler's notion of gender as 'illusory' is also a helpful theoretical lens, resonating with children's repetitive gendered manifestations as they try to construct a coherent 'abiding gendered self' (Butler 1990, 140), as well as to gain sensible understanding of their confusion at the impossibility of this task (see Thorne 1993; Davies 1989, 1993). Indeed, in Renold's (2000, 2001, 2005) studies, children, on a large scale, articulate difficulties in trying to make sense of the range of conflicting discourses about "what and how 10-year old and 11-year old 'girls' and 'boys' should and should not do or be" (Renold 2006, 498-499). Hence, as Davies (1989) argues, acting in non-normative ways is not always a question of choice "but involves grappling with both subjective constraints and the constraints of accepted discursive practices" (p. 235). Consequently, when trying to make sense of how gendered negotiations drive children's interaction in the classroom, it is necessary to ask what identities are available, and on what conditions and with what consequences crossing boundaries has in given situations. Identifying these possibilities is necessary in order to claim an access to the groups and activities of the 'opposite gender' (Thorne 1993, 111). Ole Bredesen (2004) argues that generally speaking, crossing gendered categories seems to be more dangerous for boys than for girls, whether it is a question of wearing a skirt in public, playing with dolls, hugging or even focusing on school work, which is often considered as girl-like. Looking at boys in dance education, Kai Lehikoinen (2006) points out multiple prevailing and intertwining discourses that underpin stereotypical views about

boys as a uniform entity with certain kinds of biological and cultural qualities, and fixed gendered interests, thus positioning dancing boys to the margins. Furthermore, within dance education, boys are offered only very limited possibilities for them to individually negotiate masculinities (p. 275). Rather, they are "subjected to masculinism as a culturally dominant heteronormative discourse that is produced in boys' dancing through intertextual references from Western history writing, literature, popular culture, sports, the military discourse and nationalism" (p. 276). These findings tell, for one, about the complexity of this topic and how deeply cultural norms and conceptions are embedded in us. Even more importantly, they invite us to consider teacher's responsibilities in facilitating learning environments that would support individual processes of identification, processes of identifying oneself as or with someone or something (regarding identification, see Wenger 1998/2003).

Localized femininity and masculinity practices

In educational spaces and in their peer groups, children construct an ideal for what it means to be a 'girl' (group femininity) or a 'boy' (group masculinity) (Paechter 2006, 366). However at the same time, they build up an understanding of who they themselves are in relation to this ideal, thus building up their individual femininities and individual masculinities (ibid.). According to Paechter (2006), both the child's individual image and their ideal image are relational concepts, but in different ways. While neither of them is uniform, femininity and masculinity are more inclusive, allowing children to make generalizations, such as "girls are like this or boys are not like that". While doing generalizing in this way, children simultaneously build up their individual femininities and masculinities either in parallel with or in opposition to these perceptions. Both femininity and femininities, and masculinity and masculinities are built up in local communities of femininity and masculinity practices (ibid.). What counts here "is a shared understanding of what it is to be a member of that community" (Paechter 2006, 366; see also Wenger 1998/2003).

Recent studies suggest that girls negotiate femininity (and masculinity) and boys negotiate masculinity (and femininity) collectively in relation to a variety of outside influences, conceptions and representations. Within a discourse of defining gender, rather as something that you do than something that you are, these shifting and interrelated internal and external influences construct an ever-changing, localized and shared view about, what 'doing girl' or 'doing boy' implies to, using 'performative' terms. In these negotiations, when falling to gendered border work (Thorne 1993; Bredesen 2004; Connell 2009; Berg 2010), sustainment of stereotypical gendered behaviours and groupings, femininity is

defined directly in juxtaposition to masculinity (ibid., 366-367). According to Paechter (2006), central to this collective construction of femininity and masculinity is that gender boundaries serve "to draw what for children is a particularly salient boundary: that between girls and boys" (p. 367). Gaining knowledge about what is locally fundamental to being a girl or a boy is essential for children, because, for example, it allows a girl to understand and express to others that she is not a boy, and a boy to understand and express that he is not a girl (ibid.). However, at the same time, it is important to keep in mind and acknowledge that girls can certainly behave in what are commonly viewed as masculine ways, and boys in what are commonly viewed as feminine ways (Skelton & Francis 2002, 2009; Paechter 2006).

Gendered border work

In this study, I argue that participation and the capability to contribute to joint enterprises are challenged by gendered border work (Thorne 1993; Bredesen 2004; Paechter 2006; Connell 2009; Berg 2010). As a concept, gendered border work (Thorne 1993) refers to an age-related phase, roughly between the ages of eight and 12, when children themselves actively sustain stereotypical gendered behaviours and groupings (see also Davies, 1993). The 'joint enterprises' here refers to the processes of constructing for the participants a new learning culture that would promote creative musical exploration and student-led practices in the BoM classroom. This is seen as a mutual project shared by the students and the teacher, calling for active involvement from all participants. According to Gordon (2006a), gendered border work is particularly evident in adopting gendered learner identities, which are evident in the different uses of voice, time and space between the male and female students, and potentially complicate interactions and hinder participation. In her book *Gender Play* (1993), Thorne considers gender differences to be typically situational, that is, emphasized in some situations and ignored or overridden in others. Consequently, as Connell (2009) puts it, gender difference is not something that simply exists (p. 15), it is something that must be made to happen. In other words, children are not passively socialized into gendered categories, but create their own agency in learning gender by moving in and out of gender-based groupings (p. 16). This also means, however, that gender difference can also be unmade, revised and made more or less important (p. 15).

According to the Danish sociologist Jan Kampmann (in Bredesen 2003), every generation of children reinvents gender and use it as a tool and indicator of social inclusion and exclusion (p. 30). In the BoM classroom, girls and boys preferred sitting at tables in single-gender groups, they preferred doing group assignments in single-gender groups, and when asked to join in musical exercises, girls selected a place next to the other girls

and boys next to the other boys; inevitably, there was always a gap between these two 'camps'. With these gendered indicators, children experiment with their identity, testing and playing with gender potentials and limits. In her study when considering situations in which gender differences were emphasized or de-emphasized, Thorne (1993) notices that although teachers sometimes emphasize gender, for instance, by arranging a classroom learning game with the girls competing against the boys, most teacher-led activities de-emphasized gender. In such situations, the division was not between the 'groups of girls and boys', but rather between the teacher and the students (see also Connell 2009). Likewise, Ericsson and Lindgren (2010) notice that teacher presence seems to reduce such divisions. Alternatively, Olsson (2007) argues, in the absence of a teacher, when there is no-one to guide the space-claiming processes, the possibilities for social hierarchies to govern are opened.

Gendered agency

Feminist educational research has suggested that agency is gender-differentiated (e.g. Cohen 1996; Butler 1990/1999; Renolds 2006b; Francis 2000; Francis and Skelton 2005, 2009; Gordon 2006a, 2006b). The idea of a learner, a knower and an achiever identity is seen as more masculine than feminine (Cohen 1996). Thus, in this understanding, practicing agency is associated more with masculinities while femininities are associated more with self-control (Gordon 2006a). Further, recent literature (Skelton and Francis 2009; Renold 2001; Maynard 2002) suggests that this self-control and rational behaviour is expected from girls in educational contexts. In their school ethnographies, Gordon (et. al. 2000) and Tolonen (2001) discover that embodied activities and use of the girls' space of girls were more regulated and differently interpreted than embodied activities and use of the boys' space. According to Gordon (2006a, 6), the figure of an active, mobile boy is attached to the cultural image of that masculinity and activity as naturally connected. Hence, when entering educational spaces, boys often seem have more autonomy over their embodiment and their location in spatial relations (Gordon 2006b, 288). In addition, Gordon (2006a) claims that girls' use of student voice seems to be more strictly controlled than boys' use of student voice.

Consequently, the use of voice can be complicated for girls (Gordon 2006a). Drawing on hooks (1989), she suggests that in order to practice agency, girls must balance between 'suitable speech' and the craving to 'talk back' (hooks 1989). In other words, as Gordon (2006a) claims, girls more often face situations in which their voice is considered inappropriate. For example, in Renold's (2001) study, teachers described academically-able girls as 'overconfident' and 'bossy'. Thus, when entering a learning space in an overtly

'agentic' manner, girls may experience tension between their gender and their agency. With the term 'agentic', Gordon (2006b) refers to a sense of agency. From her perspective, agency can be understood as one's own conceptions about the range of possibilities to act and interact socially. In that way, agency is contextual and closely intertwined with processes of identification and negotiability (Wenger 1998/2003; Barrett 2005).

The question of gendered learner identities and gendered agency is complex. The significance of teacher attitudes in shaping students' learning experiences is widely acknowledged in the literature. However, a number of studies suggest that the differential perception of girls, as succeeding through hard work and boys as naturally clever, still continues (Skelton & Francis 2009; Francis 1998; Jones & Myhill 2004). This dichotomy implies that teachers continue 'reading' girls and boys according to gender constructions that "insist on locating talent and ability in the masculine", Skelton and Francis (2009, 96) argue. At the same time, recent studies on high-achieving students indicate more similarities than differences between girls and boys (Skelton 2007).

The conceptualization of the ways that gender intertwines with the construction of agency depends on how gender is understood in the first place. McNay (2004) argues that if gender is defined as a lived social relation, constructed and re-constructed through social engagements with others, then gendered agency may be understood through the concept of experience. Conceptualizing experience more as an outcome of social and cultural practices rather than an individual property makes it possible to see how our experiences, that is, our assembled knowledge about gender, drives our understanding of agency (McNay 2004). Experiences create a sense of continuation, and build up a sense of who we are as agents, what have we achieved, and in what we are about to engage (ibid.); our agency locates our interactions in our local communities and into the nexus of learning. Hence, as Gordon (2006a) states, agency always "takes places somewhere, in some place" (p. 5).

1.5 Social change in the classroom

Ideally, the classroom is a site for social change. The social processes of learning and teaching as well as the local settings in which they are situated are never stable (Olsson 2007) and require, as such, constant re-evaluation and readjustment. Understanding identity as performative clarifies how our behaviour changes depending on with whom we are interacting, and in what context these actions take place (ibid.). Hence, every community of learners is different from any other community.

The BoM classroom under study consisted of newcomers participating in their first year of the BoM course. Hence, the workshop-type classroom practices were new to the students and required their familiarization with creative musical exploration, which was situated in relatively free, dialogical settings and involving bodily interaction. In classroom interactions, such processes of negotiation can be messy at times. According to Goffman (1961), the challenging of both societal and classroom discursive practices develops within the social space of the classroom 'underlife' (see also Gutierrez, et al. 1995). 'Underlife' can be defined as the range of activities that are developed in order to distance oneself from the surrounding institution and may take either disruptive or restrained forms (Goffman 1961).

Gutierrez et al. (1995) argue, that although underlife develops in every classroom, it rarely is included in pedagogical practices. Therefore, despite the natural multi-voicedness of any classroom, student underlife commonly sustains traditional classroom power relations, in that way, it hinders transformation within the learning community (ibid.). However, according to Gutierrez et al. (1995), it is precisely this dynamic interrelation between the official and unofficial scripts, in a third space, which makes the change possible.

The classroom life, like the one in the BoM classroom, contains various social spaces with competing discourses that may create tensions and conflicts among the participants (Gutierrez et al. 1995). However, these sociocultural conflicts can, however, be turned into positive responses that negotiate shared dialogic meaning among the participants and bridge the multiple and varied social spaces in the classroom (ibid.). Consequently, conflicts can drive towards constructing new learning cultures and create opportunities for third space and social change; in that way, conflicts turn into learning opportunities (Gutierrez 1995; Wenger 2009). In Finland, The Framework Curriculum (FNBE 2002, 6; Korpela et al. 2010) given by the Finnish National Board of Education guides education providers to support the students' growth into ethically sensitive persons with strong self-confidence and capability for cooperation and engaging in learning both collectively and individually.

2 Methodological approach and research questions

This study's initial motive and rationale has been to better understand and respond to the pedagogical challenges caused by gendered border work (Thorne 1993; Bredesen 2004; Paechter 2006; Connell 2009; Berg 2010) in a BoM classroom that was in the process of negotiating new classroom discursive practices among the participants. In order to comprehend the ambivalence and complexity of gender in children's musical interactions, this study focuses on the relations of gendered learner identities (Gordon 2006a); gendered border work (e.g. Thorne 1993); and the construction of musical agency (e.g. Karlsen 2011) among 9-year-old music school students learning in a BoM course.

2.1 Research questions

Drawing on Wenger's (1998/2003) theories of communities of practice and his concept of the social ecology of identities, through which he discusses the ideal of a learning community from the perspectives of forming memberships (identification) and gaining ownership of meaning (negotiability), the main research question posed in this study is:

How is gender performed in the negotiations of the BoM classroom?

Further, the two subquestions are:

1. How does gendered border work drive the negotiation of the forming of memberships in the BoM classroom); and
2. How does gendered border work drive the negotiation of gaining ownership of meaning in the BoM classroom?

Although the classroom discourse is always negotiated by everybody involved, including the teacher and the students, this study focuses on children's gendered negotiations and interactions when engaging in BoM classroom activities. By experimenting with different pedagogical solutions in which the same children participate in classroom discourse in co-ed (Phase One) and in single-gender (Phase Two) settings, this study seeks to explore and understand the social phenomenon of gendered border work (e.g. Thorne) and how gendered border work impacts learning in the BoM classroom. This initial motive also guided this study's choice in selecting a suitable methodological approach.

Drawing on Deweyan pragmatist philosophy, suggesting that we only know the world through our own actions (see also Biesta & Burbules 2003), my research interests have evolved from my own observations in day-to-day life practice as the teacher in a BoM classroom. I wanted to grasp a social issue that, in my view, was causing tensions and even inequalities among the students. I wanted to explore it from different angles. Consequently, this study's overall aim during the data collection and experiments was to understand the issues rather than change them. As a teacher one always has visions and hopes for social change to take place. However, change cannot be designed but needs to be negotiated between everybody involved. What a teacher can do, is to respond to the problematic issues and experiment with different solutions. Therefore, understanding a research project as a fluid, dynamic and an on-going process that seeks to generate *knowledge from practice to practice* (Cochan-Smith & Lyttle 2009) methodologically grounds this research as a practitioner inquiry in the school ethnography fields.

2.2 Inquiry as stance

The general approach of this study is a practitioner inquiry as *stance*. The notion of inquiry as stance, defined by Marilyn Cochran-Smith and Susan Lytle (2009), is grounded in the problems and contexts of practice in the ways that practitioners theorize, study and act on the problems "in the best interests of the learning and life chances of students and their communities" (p. 123). Hence, in this study 'inquiry as stance' is seen as an attitude, a pragmatic attitude for living and acting together responsibly in an intersubjective world (Biesta & Burbules 2003, 108; see also Rikandi 2012; this study p. 26). Therefore, it is not just instrumental to find out how to get things done, but also social and political; further, it is necessary to discuss what to get done, *why* to get it done, on *whose terms* and in *whose interests*. This notion involves an on-going process of problematizing present arrangements and rethinking the ways that knowledge and practice are constructed, evaluated and used (ibid., 121). Hence, as stated above, this study focuses on: the dynamics of gendered border work in two types settings; and how gendered border work is intertwined with the processes in which learner identities and agencies are negotiated collectively as well as individually.

Although this study investigates a particular, localized context with particular participants, it seeks to understand children's gendered interactions when entering educational spaces in a way that contributes to the wider conversations of democracy in music education and learning in general. Epistemologically, this grounds the study to the notion of inquiry as stance as an organic and democratic theory of action that positions practitioners' knowledge, and practitioners and their interactions with students and other

participants at the centre of educational transformation (Cochran-Smith & Lytle 2009, 123-124).

Practitioner research

Practitioner research (Cochran-Smith & Lytle 2009) can be defined as a conceptual and linguistic umbrella for number of modes, versions and variations of educational inquiry. These varying genres have eight features in common: 1) having practitioners acting as researchers; 2) making assumptions about links of knowledge, knowers and knowing; 3) locating the inquiry in professional contexts; 4) blurring boundaries between inquiry and practice; 5) emphasizing communities, networks and other forms of collaboration; 6) holding new conceptions of validity and generalizability; 7) maintaining consistency in data collection and analysis; and 8) making efforts to maintain transparency with the inquiries, including and in being open to criticism about the inquiries (ibid. 38, 118).

In this inquiry, as is common to all forms of practitioner research, I simultaneously take the roles of practitioner and researcher (Cochran-Smith & Lytle 2009). This duality makes it possible for me to participate in the inquiry process from the inside, focusing on the problems and questions that arise from the practice in my own professional context, the BoM classroom (ibid.). After all, one cannot study the social world without being a part of it (Atkinson & Hammersley 1994, 249). Furthermore, this duality allows me to ask questions that emerge "from neither theory nor practice alone but from critical reflection on the intersection of the two" (ibid., 42; see also Biesta and Burbules 2003, 108). Hence, as in most versions of practitioner research, the role of the local community is central as the site where knowledge is constructed, used and initially made public. (ibid.).

The students and myself as their teacher raised discussions about the issues confronting equity and agency, inviting all the participants to reflect on the boundaries that complicate social interaction in the BoM classroom. Understanding the process of knowledge-creation in a new way requires new conceptions of validity and generalizability (Cochran-Smith & Lytle 2009). The new criteria address: democratic validity in respecting and taking into account all participants' perspectives and interests; outcome validity in resolving the problems addressed; process validity in using convenient and sufficient research methods; catalytic validity in deepening the understanding of all stakeholders; and lastly dialogic validity in monitoring analyses through critical reflection with peers (ibid., 44).

On-going changes in the power relations among the students required me to constantly rethink my own views, attitudes and actions as a practitioner. According to Cochran-

Smith and Lytle (2009), what makes practitioner inquiries recognizable is that, alongside documenting classroom practices and students' learning, they "systematically document from the inside perspective their own questions, interpretive frameworks, changes in views over time, dilemmas, and recurring themes" (p. 44).

Finally, the last trait characterizing practitioner research is the emphasis on making the enterprise public and open to the critique of a wider community. The focus here is, on one hand, on the role of peers and inside participants who evaluate the analyses, and on the other hand, on opening practitioner knowledge to the public outside that community (ibid., 45).

2.3 Ethnography

In general, ethnography can be understood as a form of research in which social settings and the perspectives and practices of the people in these settings are studied (Hammersley 2007; Wilson, 2013). In this ethnographic study, I participated in the research process and the day-to-day life of the BoM classroom, producing knowledge together with all the participants involved in the process. The aim was to analyse, as multifacetedly as possible, the cultural and social processes and meanings that agents give to the processes (Gordon et al. 2000). Moreover, my study explored and experimented with different pedagogical solutions as an on-going stance of inquiry. Therefore, unlike in ethnography conventionally, the inquiry is conducted in two different pedagogical settings. As explained above, this methodology was selected for pragmatic reasons, in order to gain as multifaceted knowledge as possible of how gendered border work is played out in children's classroom interaction.

Similar to an ethnographic study, the data production, interpretation and theorizing processes overlap with each other. In this inquiry, my acting in a dual role, both as a practitioner and as the researcher, made it possible to evaluate, reconsider and adjust my own choices and understandings while moving forward with the project. Generally in ethnography, knowledge and knowing are attached to a particular time, place and the observer; in this sense, the study is both contextual and material (Lappalainen 2007, 10-14). The data, descriptions and narratives are inherently filtered and selected by the researcher. Hence, the subjectivity of an observation-, inquiry-based study is well acknowledged among ethnographers (Berg 2010, 85).

This ethnographic inquiry observes and explores practices in which agency is limited or even excluded (Lappalainen 2007) in the BoM classroom. It newly discusses

the complications and even inequalities that children's gendered interactions may cause in learning. In that sense, the study is also takes an ethnographic feminist perspective. Although Beverly Skeggs (2001, 427) argues that there is nothing about ethnography itself that makes it feminist, she does identify ethnography viewed through feminist lenses as gender sensitive, reflexive and fragmented (p. 429). Further, Tolonen and Palmu (2007, 93) characterize ethnographic studies as rich and carefully reasoned analyses that leave space for interpretations.

Educational ethnography

This study is specifically an educational ethnography. Educational ethnography is rooted in the North American anthropological tradition (Lahelma & Gordon 2007); it can also be seen as a continuum to Chicago School sociology, which is particularly interested in people's everyday life in local contexts and urban spaces (Akinson 2001b; Deegan 2001). In Europe, educational ethnography was established primarily in the sociology of education. When comparing the British and North American practices, Delamont and Atkinson (1995) find that in the North American practice the focus mainly concerns ethnicity in classrooms, whereas British sociologists are more interested in social class differences. One of the important postmodern feminist insights is that differences, such as class, gender, ethnicity, age and place, should always be viewed in relation to one another as intersecting elements (Lahelma & Gordon 2007, 30). Consequently, this study examines, gender as being closely intertwined with age and place.

In Finland, educational ethnography has been influenced mainly by the British tradition. Today, there are four features common to Finnish educational ethnography: first, the interest in questions of difference and inequality; secondly the ways that an inquiry is contextualized within society and the development of schooling, seeking to make a critical societal analysis; thirdly, the trend of favouring comparative ethnography; and fourthly, the emphasis on methodological discussions and ethical considerations during the inquiry process. (Lahelma & Gordon 2007, 29).

Ethnography in BoM classroom

This study further represents classroom ethnographical research. 'Classroom ethnography' refers to the inquiry into behaviours, activities, interactions and discourses that takes place in formal or semi-formal educational spaces (Watson-Gegeo 1997), such as classrooms. Common to classroom ethnographies are that: the teaching and learning processes are

viewed from a sociocultural perspective; and it offers a holistic analysis that is "sensitive to levels of context in which interactions and classrooms are situated" (ibid., 135). In this study, the BoM classroom was observed intensively and in detail for one semester and documented by videotaping the lessons. A method videography (Knoblauch 2006/2009) has many benefits, for instance, it is enormously data intensive – allowing simultaneous use of multiple semiotic resources by participants such as sign phenomena in both stream of speech and the body – and therefore typically used when analysing structures and patterns of social interaction (ibid.; Goodwin 2009). Moreover, it allows the researcher to return to the significant events as many times as needed in order to gain nuanced understanding of the phenomenon under study; and importantly, it enables to share with others – colleagues, teachers, and the learners themselves – what one sees (Goldman 2007). Partially gleaned from the video-taped lessons, my observations were then supplemented by stimulated recall interviews (ibid.) with the participants. When planning this inquiry, I expressly wanted to give the children an opportunity to reflect on their own experiences when participating in BoM. According to Tochon (2007), viewing past actions using video feedback stimulation enables one to remember their thoughts with greater validity than recall done without video. The research report offers narratives of the classroom settings, statements of terms on which the classroom was socially constructed, and an account of social norms that directed participants' behaviours and shaped their interpretations of particular interaction (Watson-Gegeo 1997; Erickson 1985).

At times, examining interactions that I was part of, in my own professional context, was challenging. As a teacher, I inevitably had an active role negotiating a learning culture in the BoM classroom. According to Hammersley (2007), the researcher's familiarity with the site of inquiry must be treated as anthropologically strange when documenting the perspectives and practices of the observed. Hence, as Delamont and Atkinson (1995) claim, one of the challenges of educational ethnography is precisely fighting against this familiarity.

2.4 Research design and data collection

This study's research design aims at enabling the examining of the topic from different perspectives. Therefore, I chose to carry out the study in two settings: as working with all the students together; and as working with the students divided into two groups of girls and boys. The same children participated in both settings. As stated above, this two-prong approach allowed me to view how gendered border work was intertwined with the processes in which identities and agencies were negotiated collectively as well as individually.

Data collection

During the 2009 fall semester, I carried out the data collection in an extra curricular music school located in Helsinki, the capital city of Finland. I had previously tested the data collection in the 2009 spring semester in order to rehearse my chosen methods. Since the participants were to consist of beginner students, I contacted their parents by e-mail, asking them to discuss with their children the possibility of participating in the research project. My aim was to form a group of eight girls and eight boys, but by the time the fall semester started and the families finally managed to coordinate their timetables, the group consisted of six girl and nine boy participants. At this point, I again contacted the parents, and more carefully explained the idea of my study, acquiring written consent for their children's participation. (See Appendix 1)

The data was collected during one semester in two phases. In Phase One, everybody was working together for eight weeks; in Phase Two, the girls and boys were divided into separate groups, also for eight weeks. Research data from both Phases includes: 1) a teacher diary, and 2) video recordings of the lessons with stimulated recall interviews (Goldman et al. 2007), taken after the last lesson of each phase. It is methodologically important that the same children were observed and interviewed while participating in the BoM classroom, both in Phase One and in Phase Two. The first phase consisted of eight, 45-minute lessons in a mixed-gender environment, followed by stimulated recall interviews. In the interviews, the students were shown video clips taken from their lessons that were to be discussed in a relevant interview. The video clips were chosen by me. Likewise, the stimulated recall interviews were video recorded. The interviews were conducted in two different settings: 1) two group interviews, one with a group of boys and one with a group of girls (two group interviews total); and 2) two individual interviews carried out with boys and two individual interviews carried out with girls (four interviews total). Each interview lasted approximately 45 minutes, with a total recorded interview time of 270 minutes.

Hoping to get the richest reflections possible, I tried out various settings when conducting the stimulated recall interviews (Goldman et al. 2007). I wanted, for example, to find out if peer-reflection would bring up something that did not appear in one-on-one situations or in a group context. Moreover, I tried to choose the interviewees accordingly to the different ways they seemed to position themselves in teaching versus learning situations. Some students were more 'social' and some as more 'private'. I soon learned, however, that it was impossible to foresee what course the interview would take. The intensity of the interviews varied notably.

As Beverly Skeggs (1994) writes, researchers can only mediate the sides or parts of their students' lives that the students choose to show; from these parts, I, as a researcher, choose what to report here.

In addition to the video-recordings and interviews, I kept a teacher's diary in which I journalled after every lesson, including what had been done, what had gone as planned, what not, and what my own impressions and feelings were. Between lessons, I watched and draft-transcribed the video material for the previous week in order to supplement my notes with the happenings and reflections. (See Appendix 2)

The second phase of data collection consisted of eight, 45-minutes lessons in for the a divided group of girls, and of eight lessons for a divided group of boys. In total, combining both phases of the video recordings consisted of 24 lessons. The Phase Two video recordings were followed by the stimulated recall interviews, largely in the same manner as the first phase, in two different settings: first, two group interviews, one with a group of girls and one with a group of boys; and second, two individual interviews carried out with the boys. With the girls, I conducted one individual interview and one interview in pairs, as said above, in order to see if reflecting with a peer would bring something new to the situation. The interviews lasted approximately 45 minutes each, hence 270 minutes in total. (See Table 1)

Table 1: Data collection

Phase 1	Phase 2
Everybody working together (8 lessons)	Work divided into groups of 7 girls and 9 boys (16 lessons)
Video recordings of the lessons (8 lessons)	Video recordings of the lessons (16 lessons)
Recorded stimulated recall-interviews: 1 group interview with girls 1 group interview with boys 2 individual interviews with girls 2 individual interviews with boys	Recorded stimulated recall-interviews: 1 group interview with girls 1 group interview with boys 1 individual interview with girls 1 interview in pairs with girls 2 individual interviews with boys
Teacher diary	Teacher diary

In the beginning of the video recording, some children paid attention to the video cameras and made remarks about the fact that the lessons were recorded. After about two lessons, they seemed to become accustomed to the cameras. As a teacher, I noticed that it was sometimes difficult to ignore the presence of the video cameras, particularly when something went differently as I had planned, either better or worse. Hence, it is relevant to ask "how the medium of video affects and changes the the culture one is studying from the moment the camera is turned on" (Goldman 2007, 5).

2.5 Methods of analysis

In analysing the data, I turn to the theory of communities of practice introduced by Wenger (1998/2003) and use multi-methodological lenses. Central to my work is the concept of a learning community and the ways that one identifies oneself (identification) and one's capacity to negotiate meanings (negotiability) as a member of such a community. As discussed earlier, I aim to understand the dynamic social relations in which learner identities (e.g. Gordon), agencies (e.g. Wenger 2006; McNay 2004) and gender (e.g. Butler 1990/1999; Connell 2002, 2009) are negotiated when engaging in classroom discourse,

and to observe and explore the practices in which agency is either limited or excluded (Lappalainen 2007), or supported. Further, I discuss both the complications and even the inequalities that children's gendered interaction may cause in learning, as well as the situations in which the social boundaries were crossed and multi-voicedness promoted. Hence, my focus is in the ways that students construct identities and memberships, and participate in the mutual shaping of meanings in a BoM classroom. As is common in an ethnographic study, the phases of conducting my inquiry, including the data production, interpretation and theorizing, overlapped each other (Lappalainen 2007).

My analysis draws on Braun and Clarke's (2006) thematic analysis method (TA). TA is an empirically-driven approach that identifies and analyses the most fundamental patterns of meaning in a data set (Braun & Clarke 2006; Joffe 2011). Themes can involve both manifest content and latent, more tacit content. This method often views both types of content simultaneously, using the manifest themes as a path to understanding the more latent content. TA uses existing theoretical constructs to examine data but allows: "emerging themes to 'speak' by becoming the categories for analysis" (Joffe 2011, 209).

As explained earlier, when implementing my inquiry, I had three sources of data: observation data, stimulated recall interviews and a teacher diary. After transcribing the video recordings and familiarizing myself with my field notes and stimulated recall interviews, I first approached the data by looking for all possible, various aspects of learner identity. I was particularly interested in how gender, being a constitutive source of identity, operates as a vehicle of for inclusion and exclusion in the children's classroom interaction. (See Appendix 3 for example of transcription)

So the starting point for my analysis was to use the data in order to identify various modes of participation; events that could be decoded as promoting participation; and events that could be decoded as compromising participation (Wenger 1998/2003) in the student-student and student-teacher interaction. I first used open coding (Kvale & Brinkmann 2009, 202; Bold 2012, 130), coding very concrete and hands-on notions about the actions and interactions that took place during the lessons, such as "boys run around"; "girls/boys select place next to other girls/boys"; "boys sword fight with the dish brushes"; "girls wait silently in their seats"; "girls and boys play warm-up games together"; "girls and boys debate topic for group-work task" and so on. I then started to organize, group and conceptualize the codes by exploring the data and identifying what could be related to what.

In the next stage of analysis, I constructed categories of meanings (Kvale & Brinkmann 2009, 202; Gibbs 2007, 47-48) that related to the actions and events I had identified. In constructing the categories, I used both concept-driven and data-driven approaches (Kvale and Brinkmann 2009, 202). On one side, I placed modes of participation that in my mind were connected to the processes of negotiating identities and memberships (identification) in the BoM classroom. I identified these categories as "use of student voice"; "mobility and use of physical space"; and "emphasizing/de-emphasizing gendered groupings".

On the other side, I placed modes of participation that I thought were connected to the processes of negotiating and shaping shared meanings and creating ownership in learning (negotiability). For this side, I selected categories such as "having/not having ones ideas accepted"; "accepting/not accepting ideas of others"; and "contributing/not contributing to shared enterprises". Then I went back to my initial codes and organized them according to my categories; I noticed that many of the happenings both promoted and compromised participation depending on from whose perspective their were viewed. (See Table 2)

Table 2: Modes of participation

Forms of memberships (identification)   Ownership of meaning (negotiability)

Promoting participation	Compromising participation	Promoting participation	Compromising participation
Use of student voice • boys and girls discuss the happenings and the structure of the penguin story • girls discuss the topics of the focused lesson • boys protest about the noise caused by some of the boys	*Use of student voice* • boys talk out of turn • boys are being boisterous • boys chat while playing instruments in a group • girls do not openly express their resentment about interruptions	*Having one's ideas accepted* • Max introduces a warm-up game he knows • Filip inspires the others with his idea when composing his penguin story	*Not having one's ideas accepted* • girls try to 'sweet talk' boys into cooperating with them
Mobility and use of physical space • girls and boys play warm-up games together • girls and boys participate in doing musical movement together	*Mobility and use of physical space* • boys run around • boys lay on the floor • boys shove each other • girls wait silently on their seats for the boys to calm down • two girls get into a quarrel and kick each another	*Accepting ideas of others* • students try out different solutions when composing together	*Not accepting ideas of others* • girls/boys debate the topic in drama group work
De-emphasizing of gendered groupings • girls and boys solve a task with peers	*Emphasizing gendered groupings* • girls/boys select place next to other girls/boys when in circle • girls/boys sit in tables with other girls/boys	*Contributing to shared enterprises* • girls/boys teach their body percussions to each other • girls/boys cooperate in musical improvisation, imitating animals • girls/boys play the 'conductor game' together • boys cooperate in doing rhythmic dictation	*Not contributing to shared enterprise* • boys sword fight with dish brushes while doing a collaborative percussion piece • boys do not care about finishing the drama group task

When coding (Kvale & Brinkmann 2009; Bold 2012) and categorizing the data (Kvale & Brinkmann 2009; Gibbs 2007), I noticed that the student voice operated as a strong legitimator in the BoM classroom interactions (Arnot 2007), regulating access to participation. To get a closer look at the use of student voice, I went back to my observation data, and first, counted the number of times that the students engaging in conversation during the lessons. I was interested in who was talking and what was the conversation about. Hence, I wanted gain knowledge about both the amount and the quality of the conversations. These efforts provided me with an overview of the gendered nature of the use of student voice in the BoM classroom. (See Table 3 in 4.2.1)

In order to move ahead with the analysis, I selected episodes from the observation data that seemed significant for meaning condensation (Kvale & Brinkmann 2009, 205-207). The selected episodes, teacher diary and stimulated recall interviews were understood as accounts (Atkinson & Coffey 2002). I then used these accounts to organize, re-narrate and retrospectively construct the events of interaction, including choices that were made and activities in the BoM classroom; further I interpreted the meanings connected to the observed happenings (Josselson & Lieblich 2003). The narratives provided select sources for representations of experiences that offered insight "into characters, events and happenings central to those experiences" (Coffey & Atkinson 1996, 68).

I then aimed to build overarching themes within the data that would open up multifaceted insights to the research topic (Braun & Clarke, 2006). I was able to construct three umbrella themes, namely 1) modes of participation; 2) holding gendered beliefs and preconceptions; and 3) shifting between 'good student' and 'rebel student' identities.

I mentioned above that when conducting the analysis, I approached it by using multi-methodological lenses. In Chapter 5, I present the characters of 'Emma' and 'Amos'. These narratives are representative constructions (Bold 2012) based on the reflections of several children, participating in the activities in the BoM classroom and later in the stimulated recall interview sessions. The video documentation of the interviews allowed me to return to the interview ambiances including tones of voice, facial expressions and feelings. This turned out to be helpful particularly, when constructing the narratives, since sometimes the ways things are said express more than the actual words. Leavy (2009) suggests that using such constructions or fictions in analysis "allows the researcher to re-examine his or her findings in a new context", which can be beneficial in trying to elaborate the theoretical or other insights (p. 46). Taking such a standpoint, Frank (2000) identifies fiction as a problem-solving strategy (see also Leavy 2009, 44). According to Leavy (2009), in terms of practice, fiction can be used as a part of the methodology that is "consistent with feminist, postmodern, postcolonial, or other critical perspectives on social power" (p. 46). She holds

that the texture of human experience, in my inquiry informed by the classroom discourse, can be accessed and expressed by using the tools of fiction (ibid.). The aim of including the narratives in the results chapters was, for one, to attend to the voices of the children participating in BoM, and second, to give the reader a taste of the ambivalent nature of this research topic. Hence, the narratives can be viewed as an attempt to represent, through the characters of 'Emma' and 'Amos', a set of events, ambiances, feelings and a particular type of phenomenon (ibid.), and they can be understood as "a form of analysis and reporting of the research data" (ibid., 145). Bold (2012) suggests that using representative constructions is justified in situations "where the researcher seeks to make sense of diverse realistic data through analysing the parts and then synthesizing them into a realistic framework – a narrative that is readable and meaningful – in preparation for further analysis" (p. 146).

2.6 Ethical considerations

As a site of inquiry, classroom life is complex. As socially constructed, continuously negotiated and shaped by many factors, the understanding of the issues and processes that define it, requires the understanding of what is relevant in this particular context (Bresler 1996). The presence of subjectivity in ethnography should always be acknowledged, explored and negotiated. In the absence of causal explanations or predictions, the interpretations are constructed and relative. The same activities may be interpreted differently by different participants depending on their ways of relating to the phenomenon under inquiry (ibid.).

Hence, with no single or solid interpretation or view at hand, a researcher is faced with a question of whose view or voice to attend to: The researcher's view or the participant's? If it is the participant's view, then, which participant? The research design, data collection and finally the form and the voice of the research report are shaped by these decisions (Bresler 1996, 136).

Acting in a dual role as a practitioner-researcher with the idea in mind that "truth and certainty are unstable" (Bold 2012, 13), required from my part even more awareness of my own positions, motives, hopes and even fears. On one hand, it would not even be possible to entirely distance oneself from one role or the other. On the other hand, just because of the dual role, it could be claimed that I know the context from the inside out and already have a solid pre-understanding of the phenomenon under study. In that way, as Bresler (1996, 138) also writes, subjectivity can be seen both as an advantage and a challenge, and something that needs to be recognized, negotiated and re-negotiated.

Questions of power are always present when conducting an inquiry. Sensitivity and responsibility are self-evidently required from the researcher's part, but the situation is particularly delicate when the participants are children (Kvale & Brinkmann 2009). Although the students participating in the study were building knowledge along with me, by reflecting on their own learning in the stimulated recall interviews, I was fully aware that I held all the power. I was the one who designed the learning environments, selected the topics and facilitated the activities in the BoM course. Moreover, I was the one to ask the questions, interpret the findings and write the research report. As Tolonen and Palmu (2007) explain, these power relations and related ethical questions need to be critically considered all along the research process; such is the case with this inquiry. Acting in a dual role as the practitioner of the BoM classroom and a researcher examining that particular practice, I was required to constantly navigate and re-navigate my own responsibilities and ethical considerations.

3 The case of BoM

This chapter (3) and Chapters 4 and 5 explore the social engagements taking place in a nine-year old children's music-learning in a group context in a Finnish music-school classroom, following the 'Basics of Music' (BoM) course. This chapter outlines the 'Basic of Music' course and presents the classroom social interactions in a chronological order, beginning with phase one of the research project (everybody working together), followed by phase two (working in divided groups of girls and boys). The chapter articulates the interactions and the processes of negotiation from the teacher perspective and seeks to give the reader an overview of the classroom activities during the time of data collection. Moments during these interactions that were particularly illuminating are explored in more detail in Chapters four 4 and five 5, addressing both the challenges and the potentials for democratic learning when participating in BoM.

Table 3 serves as an opening for this chapter to illustrate the case of BoM, the contents and the classroom activities, during the time of data collection.

Table 3: Contents of the lessons and classroom activities

Time of a data collection	Lesson	Contents of the lessons	Classroom activities
Beginning of Phase 1: Working in co-ed setting	1	What is BoM? Getting to know each other. About communicating in and through music: listening, reacting and interacting. Working with a beat and rhythmic patterns. Introducing the rhythmic syllables of quarter note and eighth note. Identifying rhythmic patterns.	Introducing everybody in the class. Warm-up games to support interaction and collaboration among the students. Body percussion: working with a beat and rhythmic patterns simultaneously. Learning the rhythmic syllables of quarter note and eighth note and identifying some rhythmic patterns by listening. Writing some of them on a black board.

Time of a data collection	Lesson	Contents of the lessons	Classroom activities
	2	Continuing with the beat and rhythmic patterns. Introducing rhythmic notation. Rhythmic dictation.	Starting with a warm-up game introduced by a student. Body percussion: working with the beat and rhythmic patterns. Introducing rhythmic notation and writing down some of the patterns worked on earlier. Conducting a rhythmic dictation.
	3	Students' own rhythmic inventions and creating of a collaborative percussion piece. Reading and writing skills for rhythmic patterns.	Starting with a warm-up game. Inventing students' own rhythmic patterns by using body percussion. Working on a collaborative percussion piece based on students' own inventions using dish brushes and foam mats as instruments. Introducing how to notate students' own rhythmic patterns and exercising reading the patterns.
	4	G-clef, pitches, major scale and the basic rules of melodic notation.	Starting with a warm-up game. Singing a familiar song with body percussion and musical movement. Discussing the concepts of G-clef, pitches and major scale. Getting familiar with the basic rules of melodic notation. Notating the rhythm and the melody of the familiar song from the beginning of the lesson.
	5	The concepts of the major scale and the key system. Melodic improvisation using a pentatonic scale.	Working with the students' own instruments: familiarization with major scales and the key system by playing together. The students invent melodic ostinati by using pentatonic scale on a tonic-dominant bass line. The invented ostinati are sung and notated together.

Time of a data collection	Lesson	Contents of the lessons	Classroom activities
	6	Continuing the familiarization with the pitch names and introducing the octave ranges. Introducing students' own instruments and discussing their ranges. An introduction to an upcoming composing project:collaborative instrumental improvisation. Exercising the identifying and marking of the staff pitches in different octave ranges.	Getting familiar with the octave ranges: students explore the octave ranges with their own instruments and introduce their instruments to the others. The ranges of each instrument are explored and discussed. An introduction to an upcoming composing project: collaborative instrumental improvisation by imitating the characteristics of animals selected by the students. Exercises from the textbook: identifying and notating the staff pitches in different octave ranges.
	7	Melodic dictation. Starting with the collaborative composing project: a group drama assignment conducted with students in two small groups. Performing the completed composition assignments for the other group.	Writing a melodic dictation. Starting the collaborative composing project with a drama group assignment: creating a story based on a scene with an animal selected by the students and using mime. The stories of a penguin and a rabbit are performed and the happenings; characteristics; and the structure of each story are discussed together.
End of Phase 1	8	Understanding rhythmic notation: working on time values; bars; time signatures; and other rhythmic notation features. Composing project: an instrumental group improvisation of a penguin as a topic. Crafting alternative, instant compositions of the invented materials by playing a conductor-game.	Rhythmic reading exercises by clapping and using rhythmic syllables. Composing project: memorizing the story of the penguins from the previous week and discussing the characteristics of a penguin, and how these characteristics could be imitated musically. A collaborative instrumental group improvisation of a penguin. The material invented in a group improvisation operates as musical building blocks in crafting instant compositions. A conductor-game: one student at a time acts as a conductor, selecting or muting the ostinati in a way that creates a new, original version of the composition.

Time of a data collection	Lesson	Contents of the lessons	Classroom activities
Beginning of Phase 2: Working in single-gender settings	9	Chromatic symbols. Composing project: an instrumental improvisation with a rabbit as a topic.	Studying chromatic symbols first with own instruments and then by exercises from the textbook. Composing project: musically experimenting with a rabbit as a topic in the same manner as with the penguin in the previous week.
	10	Dotted time values in reading, writing and making music. Continuing with the composing project.	Studying dotted time values by doing body percussion, writing down ostinati; reading exercises and conducting a rhythmic dictation. Composing project: both groups select a penguin as their topic.
	11	The concepts of keys, major scales and tonal degrees. Continuing the composing project.	Studying keys, major scales and tonal degrees by singing, playing instruments and completing exercises in the textbook. Continuing with the composing project collaborating as an instrumental group.
	12	Musical intervals. Continuing the composing project.	Introducing musical intervals by singing, playing instruments and by doing exercises from the textbook. Continuing the composing project: penguins' wobbly walking, sliding on the ice and the jump to the water.
	13	Minor scales and related keys. Continuing the composing project. Rehearsing for the upcoming written summary test.	Studying minor scales and the related keys by singing and playing instruments. Continuing the composing project: working on the endings and rehearsing the performances for the pre-Christmas party. Rehearsing for the upcoming written summary test.
	14	A small written summary test about the contents of the BoM course studied in the all semester.	The lesson only involves a small written summary test about the contents discussed in the fall semester.

Time of a data collection	Lesson	Contents of the lessons	Classroom activities
		Pre-Christmas party with two other groups.	Pre-Christmas potluck party with some games and singing Christmas carols. Students perform the unfinished compositions for the other groups as they are at the moment. The students guess each other's topics and discuss the stories behind the compositions.
	15	Introducing triads and scale degrees. Major and minor chords. Going to concert: an animation with two live-pianos in the music school's concert hall.	Studying triads and scale degrees by singing and completing some exercises from the textbook. The lesson is shorter because of going to a concert: an animation with two live-pianos in the music school's concert hall.
End of the project	16	Introducing absolute chord symbols. The functions of tonic, subdominant and dominant. Playing an arrangement together in order to demonstrate chord progressions. Finishing the composing project.	Continuing with the concepts of triads and scale degrees and introducing absolute chord symbols. Discussing the functions of tonic, subdominant and dominant. The students participate in working on an arrangement of a song that was sung in the beginning of the lesson to demonstrate the use of chords. The arrangement is then played together. Finishing the composing project.

As explained in Chapter 1.1, this BoM classroom experimented with creative and hands-on approaches and a workshop-type of setting in order to support interactions and collaborative learning among the students. As the table above shows (and is also discussed Chapter 1.1), the classroom activities involved, among other things, singing, musical movement, body percussion, drama, playing instruments, improvisation and composing, thus, calling for active participation from everyone. Hence, the pedagogical aim was to encourage the students to explore, discuss and experiment with music, and to negotiate meanings collectively. This semi-formal, workshop-type of learning environment may have differed from a conventional school classroom environment in which the students as third-graders had already been socialized. Hence, participating in BoM also called for negotiations about new classroom practices.

3.1 Getting started

Wenger (1998/2003) has written that one cannot design learning itself, but rather the environment within which learning may take place. A sense of community is something that can grow over time, but it depends on everyone involved (ibid.). Therefore, setting up conditions in which every student can equally participate and practice agency is one of my core responsibilities as a teacher. Classroom terms are usually negotiated over and over again, but are particularly present when starting with a new group of students. This was the case for this particular group of students in this particular classroom.

The first phase of the project began with the first lesson of the BoM course. The class consisted of seven girls and seven boys, with two more boys joining the class from the second lesson onwards. First, we discussed the BoM course aims. I asked if the children had an idea about what would they be doing in the class. What was it going to deal with? And I explained why participating in the course would be useful when learning how to play an instrument or to make music. After that, everybody introduced himself or herself by telling their names, instruments they were playing, how long they had been playing and who their instrumental teachers were. Without going into any details, I told the children that, in the first-half of the semester, we would be working as a whole group and, in the second-half, divided into two groups.

In order to learn everybody's names, we first played a rhythmic name-game. I then introduced a warm-up game, which was about making contacts and about making and accepting proposals. After playing for a while we did one more clapping game, which was focusing on listening, reacting and performing musical gestures simultaneously. The games aimed at easing the excitement and building a joyful and safe atmosphere in

which everybody would feel comfortable to engage in the activities. During the games, we discussed some of the core features of communicating in and through music – namely listening, reacting and interacting. These features also represented the kind of learning culture that I was hoping to build with the BoM classroom students. In my opinion as a teacher, the students were working well together.

After finishing the warm-up games, the rest of the lesson was used to collectively work on a beat and with rhythmic patterns in different ways. At the end of the lesson, one of the boys suggested a rhythmic game that he knew and we decided to start the next lesson with it. Consequently, the whole first lesson focused on getting to know each other, and on supporting social interaction and collaboration among the children. After the lesson, I wrote to my teacher's reflection diary:

09-08-26
The first lesson this went quite well, though some of the boys could not concentrate
throughout the whole lesson. I tried to softly suggest slowing
down a bit to one of the boys after the lesson.

In the second lesson, two more boys joined into the group, so the group then consisted of seven girls and nine boys. At the beginning of the lesson, I asked the student, who in the first lesson suggested a game he knew, if he now could introduce it to the rest of the class. Everybody seemed to like the game and we played it for quite a long time.

During the second half of the lesson, we continued with the previous week's theme of the beat and rhythmic patterns by using body percussion and a familiar song. Although the atmosphere appeared to be nice, I repeatedly had to ask some of the boys to settle down and focus on the shared activities. After the lesson, I privately had a talk with these boys about the social rules in the classroom. We made a deal about maintaining a somewhat more peaceful tone of voice and behaviours from then on.

3.2 When the challenges begin

The next lesson was centred on children's own rhythmic inventions, aiming at collectively creating a rhythmic piece made by the students, and on reading and writing skills of rhythmic patterns. Everybody actively participated in a warm-up game, but soon after the boys from the previous week started to ignore my instructions and quite intensively disrupted the joint activities. Instead of joining the rest of the group, they repeatedly wandered around the classroom or were lying on the floor, and chatting with each other.

This of course complicated the participation of everyone and the rest of the group had to repeatedly wait when I had to calm down their behaviour.

In the middle of the lesson, however, there was an episode during which the students cooperated remarkably actively. They had been inventing their own rhythmic patterns by using body percussion and were now teaching them to the others. They evidently enjoyed demonstrating their own patterns and had come up with imaginative body-percussion ideas. The next step was to use those patterns to build a collaborative percussion piece by using dish brushes and foam mats for their instrumentation. The moment was gone, though; some of the boys got wrapped up in sword fighting with the dish brushes and did not participate in the group activity. I had to cut out the task and now openly have the same conversation as the week before about the appropriate social practices that I expected in the BoM classroom – practices that would allow everyone in the classroom to equally participate in and contribute to the shared enterprises. Like a week earlier, we again made a deal about calmer behaviour.

Equality in a music classroom can be understood as an equal opportunity or equal access to educational and musical resources; as Gould (2007) frames it, classroom equality is equal access to power in interactions. Teachers manifest power through their attitudes, the ways that they conduct lessons, and through assessments. Students' power manifestations can be seen in their behaviour and in their attitudes towards other students and teachers (see hooks 1994; Freire 2005). Although this probably was not their deliberate intention, the restless boys' behaviour caused an issue with power in the BoM classroom. After the lesson I wrote in my diary:

09-09-09
This did not work out. Some of the boys were just running around… The girls
and couple of the boys tried to participate as actively as they could. I am not happy about
cutting down the group task.

By ignoring the shared activities, these particular students made everybody else wait for the activities to continue. As a result, the group's participation was compromised and the equality of interaction was openly questioned. Consequently, the lesson showed, despite the promising events in each lesson so far, that negotiating a democratic learning environment would require sensibility and resilience in this particular BoM classroom.

The theme of the fourth lesson was to introduce pitches, major scales, G-clef and the basic rules of using melodic notation. All of the students had been playing an instrument for at least a year, some even three to four years, so this was not actually new for them. To

my surprise throughout the lesson, the negotiation about classroom social rules continued to be an issue with the same students. In particular, the transitions from one activity to the next took a really long time. Twice, I tried to solve the situation by rearranging the seats of the students who seemed to be having difficulties concentrating on the activities. Despite the on-going negotiations about creating collaborative practices and a supportive learning environment, these particular students persisted in their disruptive behaviours. I was puzzled with the situation. Was it about the structure of the lessons, about lack of social skills – from my or their part – or just about lack of interest? Regardless, I did not seem to be able to catch their attention and motivate them to collaborate with the rest of the group.

As discussed earlier in Chapter 1.2, according to Wenger, identities are produced through the practices in which we engage, but just as importantly, they are also produced through practices in which we do not (Wenger 1998/2003, 164). Hence, what we are *not* can also play a significant part in how we define ourselves. This notion may give new perspectives in viewing social interactions in the BoM classroom. When falling into gendered border work (Thorne 1993; Bredesen 2004; Paechter, 2007; Connell 2009; Berg 2010), the girls and the boys seemed to intentionally produce identities in juxtaposition to one another. In addition to the possible reasons considered above, there is room to suggest another angle to look at this lack of mutual engagement among some of the boys. Namely, since all the girls seemed to adopt a uniform student role by following the coursework and participating in classroom activities, when driven by gendered border work, some of the boys may have adopted a shared understanding of group masculinity that would allow them, for whatever reason, to stand out somehow differently.

For the next lesson, the students were asked to bring their own instruments with them. The aim of the lesson was to work on major scales, key system, reading and writing of music by using a staff, and on melodic invention. The lesson did not bring any notable change to the on-going negotiation of social practices in the classroom. As earlier, there were some moments of mutuality, but for the most part, the same students more or less continued to dominate the classroom interactions by seeking attention from the others and creating disorder in the joint activities.

Launching the basic rules of working as an instrumental group, such as not talking when playing and vice versa, listening to the others and following the instructions was a particular effort. Keeping the music making running was at times quite demanding but I absolutely did not want to cut off the playing as I had done two weeks earlier. I did, however, have to repeatedly remind some students of the basic rules.

A week later, the lesson focused, among other things, on becoming familiar with the concept of octave ranges. This was done by working with the students' own instruments. We also collectively figured out each instrument's range, and the students introduced their instruments to the rest of the group. The concept of octave ranges was then integrated with an instrumental improvisation of imitating three animals picked by the students. The group came up with the improvisations of a dinosaur, a cat and a bee. After making music, the rest of the lesson was used to work collaboratively with the textbooks, completing exercises in identifying and notating the staff pitches in different octave ranges. In my diary I wrote:

09-09-30
Today some of the students seemed to be really tired and the lesson was extremely restless. I really had to put a lot of effort in keeping up the discipline, and still, at times, the concentration of some students was extremely poor. I even had to ask one of the boys to step aside from playing for a while. He was really bothering the other students too much. Also, the transitions took a really long time again. I had to give two speeches about behavioural rules during the lessons. There were some nice moments as well, though. When imitating the animals, the children came up with some really nice ideas; good concentration from the whole group in soft, sneaking cat steps. The piano students came up with nice purring and the string players with great meowing. Finally, after the second reprimanding speech, the end of the lesson was actually quite peaceful when working with the textbooks. I felt sorry for those students who had to listen to my nagging, even though all they had been doing was just sitting and waiting quietly.... I think we are dealing with some power issues here.

Socially, the BoM classroom did not seem to make much progress. The span of concentration was surprisingly short, and the same students kept on dominating the classroom interactions, in a way that complicated the participation of others. Moreover, as a practitioner, I felt that this probably was the most challenging class with which I had worked, and felt both frustrated and responsible. My aim, as a teacher, had been to facilitate a democratic learning environment in which every student could explore and experiment with music collaboratively. However, the prevailing situation did not quite match with that. Group cooperation evidently suffered from lack of mutuality. While I was considering my own solutions, some of the students had also started to invent their own.

72

3.3 Looking for 'coping strategies'

In terms of social interaction, lesson seven started well. The students were focused and concentrated on checking the homework, which was followed by a small melodic dictation. After finishing the dictation, the class was divided in half, each group working in a different classroom. The assignment was, as a group, to pick an animal for a topic, explore its characteristic features and create a small story or performance by using mime. The performance should also have a clear structure: a beginning, middle and an end. The aim was to be able to use it later as a starting point for a collaborative composing project. Both groups struggled quite a lot with the team work. There seemed to be two 'fronts', girls' and boys', each with difficulties in accepting the other's ideas. Eventually, both groups needed a teacher's help to finish the task. For the final part of the lesson, the stories, one about the penguins and one about the rabbits, were performed for the other group, and the characteristics, events and structures were collectively discussed.

In these particular group work situations it seemed obvious that the individual preferences and choices of the students were overdriven by gendered border work (Thorne 1993; Bredesen 2004; Paechter 2006; Connell 2009; Berg 2010). Especially for the boys, maintaining the polarization seemed to be far more important than finishing the task. I only later found out that the girls had made a bet with the boys before the lesson started. The bet was about whether the boys were able to behave during the lesson or not. When working on the drama assignment, both groups created a 'coping strategy', attempting to talk the other group into cooperation by threatening that the other group would loose the bet.

The eighth and the final lesson of Phase 1 began with working on rhythmic notation, time values, bars and time signatures. This was done collectively by reading and clapping exercises, and doing written textbook exercises. The beginning of the lesson did not bring much that was new to the social dynamics of the BoM classroom interactions. All the girls and a couple of boys were trying to focus on the tasks while some of the boys showed only selected interests in the shared activities. The transitions from one activity to the next took a really long time.

The second half of the lesson was used to start the music composition assignment based on the students' invented stories from the previous week. The group chose to work with the penguin story and immediately had many ideas to elaborate on the topic: wobbly walking; being clumsy on the ground, yet skilful swimmers in the water; sliding sounds on the ice; and so on. The group came up with a colourful instrumental improvisation, in which each student brought something characteristic to the penguins. Then, each

student's invented material was used as a musical building block in order to craft alternative miniature compositions. One of the students always stood in the middle of the circle of players as a conductor, selecting or muting the material for her/his version of the composition. The students were clearly excited about the conductor-game, and it was carried on uninterrupted until the end of the lesson. I reflected in my diary:

> *09-10-21*
> *Quite demanding start for a lesson that luckily ended nicely. You never know what to expect. The students really seemed to enjoy the last part, working on their composition. Next week, we divide the students into two groups. Did we get anywhere here socially? It will be really interesting to see what is going to happen.*

The ninth lesson of the course signalled the beginning of the project's second phase, in which students were divided by gender into two groups: one group of girls and one group of boys. The lessons were conducted one after another. In the beginning part of the lesson, we focused on the chromatic symbols, which the students first explored and studied with own instruments; then, the students did exercises from the textbook. Throughout the lesson, the girls were remarkably focused in their work. In contrast, the boys' participation suffered from constant interruptions by certain group members. So, once again, I opened a conversation about social behaviour in the BoM classroom. In the class discussion, some of the boys spoke up, complaining that the constant disturbances made it difficult for them to concentrate during the lessons. We agreed that each and everyone should be responsible for maintaining a cosy learning environment in the class.

In the composition assignment, the students explored with their instruments the character of a rabbit in the same manner as the previous week with the penguin character. Although particularly the girls came up with many ideas for both characters, both of the groups decided to stick with the penguin as their topic for a group composition. In the boys' group, focusing on playing was difficult at times. After the lesson, I wrote in my diary:

> *09-10-28*
> *Amazing, what a huge difference between these two groups! It almost felt as if the girls would have been absorbing information…the atmosphere was really focused. Nothing new under the sun with some of the boys, though. Talking with them does not seem to help at all. We have the same conversation in every lesson. Today, though, the students called for a more peaceful atmosphere. Maybe this is the start of something new.*

3.4 Promising glimpses

Lesson ten started with activities that focused on rhythm. The new task was to learn to read, write and play dotted-time values. To this end, two third of the lesson was dedicated to doing body percussion, ostinati notation, reading exercises and rhythmic dictation. The last fifteen minutes was comprised of collectively continuing the composition assignment. In the both groups, the students tried to come up with various ways with their instruments of penguin wobbly walking and ice sliding.

Just like the previous week, the girls' group actively participated in all the shared activities and were focused. Having absolutely no interferences felt almost surreal. Looking from a teacher's perspective, the atmosphere was relaxed and cosy.

With the boys, I had decided in advance to maintain a calm atmosphere; early in the lesson, the boys made attempts to compromise the peace, but I reminded them about the deal we had already made a number of times. However, the attention span was really short and I had to repeatedly ask them to focus on the activities. Despite the reprimands, I paid attention to my own tone of voice, trying to deliver my message in a determined yet friendly manner. When sitting together doing some sight reading exercises, one of the boys, Matt, suddenly turned to me and asked: "Which do you like better, girls or boys?" I said that I liked both equally. "I want you to consider us as stupid", the second boy, Jack, continued. His comment was quite unexpected, and I asked him, why would he want that? He just answered "because". This led us to a conversation about their family members who, in their mind, did hold them as stupid. I said that I was sure that no one really believed this.

After nine weeks, of at times quite intense negotiation about what behaviours were or were not acceptable in the lessons, the conversations made me reconsider again the social dynamics in the BoM classroom. Again, what were the available identities? To me, the striking trait of adopting highly stereotypical gendered learner identities (Gordon 2006a) signalled possible links between localized understandings of group masculinity and group femininity in the BoM classroom (Paechter 2006) and gendered border work (Thorne 1993; Bredesen 2004; Paechter 2006; Connell 2009; Berg 2010).

Despite some social ups and downs during the lesson, positive things happened as well. Some time later, when conducting rhythmic dictation, the whole group was suddenly, extremely well focused on the task, and some of the boys cooperated actively, helping each other complete the assignment. I thought this was very promising. In the last part of the lesson, when working on the group composition, the students came up with some new ideas. In my diary I wrote:

The eleventh lesson plan introduced the concept of keys, major scales and tonal degrees. We studied them by listening, singing, playing instruments and doing textbook exercises. The boys' lesson was a roller coaster. At times, they participated quite actively, but their concentration only lasted for a short while. The good periods were followed by poor ones. What was new, though, was that they seemed to be more conscious about their own behaviour and even commented when things started to 'go under'. During the composition assignment, however, the positive intensity of the previous week was gone. The boys did not get any further with their group composition and suffered even to remember the beginning of it from their work the week before.

Instead, the girls moved to the next passage of in their story, in which the penguins are swimming and fishing in the sea. Although the girls were mostly working in a focused manner and achieved a lot during the lesson, something peculiar happened. Two girls sitting next to each other ran into a small conflict about the use of their physical space, and it took me a while to convince them to stop quarrelling. This was a totally new situation. In Phase 1 when everybody still was working together, the girls never showed any disruptive behaviours. It is worth mentioning, however, that I may not have noticed this going on with the girls before when the boys were keeping me so occupied. Consequently, I have to admit that as a teacher, the boys behaviour was so challenging, I could not share my time equally then between my students. In my diary I wrote:

In the beginning of lesson twelve, I asked the boys if they were now ready for composing. This time, the group worked really focused with the project. They came up with many ideas and tried different solutions. Although their concentration sometimes

slipped, they managed to finish the first section of their story and even moved on to the next passage: the penguins in the water. They even practiced for a long time, polishing a section that illustrated penguins' jumping into the water.

With the girls' group, we started the class by repeating the major scale from the previous week and then moved to introducing learning intervals. This was carried out by singing and playing on the instruments and then doing some textbook exercises, learning how to identify and build intervals. The last part of the lesson was used to work on the second passage of their composition. The girls' cooperation appeared to be easy again, and they had time to rehearse their piece from the beginning to the end of the second passage a couple of times.

Working the lessons in an the opposite reverse order from the girls, the boys finished the lesson by studying the intervals. At this point, focusing on learning was difficult for some of the boys; however, it was really nice to be able to give them positive feedback after a relatively good lesson.

Lesson thirteen was centred on the minor scales and the concept of related keys. Part of the lesson was also used to rehearse for the upcoming test the following week. In the boys' group, the lesson was dynamically like some of the previous ones, including some quite promising and some quite challenging moments. In the beginning of the lesson, the students actively participated, but then suddenly they lost focus. Some of the boys protested quite intensely against the noise in the classroom, saying that it really was frustrating to repeatedly wait for the situation to calm down and to get going with the shared activities. As reported earlier, this was not the first time that some of the boys called for more a peaceful classroom environment. For example, Emil had been reacting to the situation since the beginning of the course. Now, however, he had a group of allies.

Despite 'unpredictability' being the best word to describe the interaction among the boys so far, one of the greatest moments of cooperation was yet to come. The last part of the lesson was dedicated to the composing project. Working started disorderly, and I pointed this out to the students. Then suddenly, one of the students, Filip, got a great idea about the passage the students tried to find a creative realisation. His enthusiasm immediately caught on to the others, and suddenly, the group cooperated like never before. Filip seemed to be totally in charge and easily unified the others. At this moment, I only needed to step back and let them finish composing the section. I wrote to my diary:

The lesson with the girls was again quite harmonious. They were, however, worried about the up-coming test, so, in addition to learning the task of the week, we spent a lot of time rehearsing for the summary test. Time management never seemed to be a problem for the girls. So, as in previous lessons, they still had some time remaining, and this time, they planned the ending for their composition.

The next two weeks prior to Christmas break, were dedicated to the summary test and a pre-Christmas potluck party with some games and Christmas carol singing. The both groups performed their unfinished compositions, as they were at the moment. This allowed us to jointly discuss how the same story could be given many kinds of musical realisations.

Following Christmas break, the fifteenth lesson focused on harmony, introducing triads and scale degrees. The class became familiar with chords and the idea of using the degrees by singing, and also discussed whether the chords sounded like major or minor chords. The lesson was shorter than normal because the students were going to see a performance in the music school concert hall of an animation accompanied by two pianos. Both groups focused well throughout this lesson.

The sixteenth lesson signalled the end of Phase 2 of the research project. This lesson continued with the topic of the previous lesson. Further, the chords were named by using chord symbols. For the pianists and the guitarists, this notation was already somewhat familiar from their instrumental lessons. We also discussed the functions of tonic, subdominant and dominant. I demonstrated the functions by playing together with the students an arrangement of a song that had been learned earlier in the lesson. Socially, this lesson was also quite a success in both groups. The students were focused and the atmosphere was mostly quite cosy. I wrote in my diary:

10-01-20
This was the last lesson of the research project. For the first time a second good lessons in a row – unprecedented for the boys! Although, the "wild" boys were not around, hopefully this is a new beginning.

3.5 Looking back from a teacher's perspective

Looking back, the interaction in the BoM classroom makes it necessary to rethink my own understandings of the social situations and the choices I, as a practitioner, made during my data collection. As said above, my hope, as a teacher, was to facilitate a learning environment that would promote hands-on explorations with music in workshop-type settings. I also aimed to facilitate explorations that would also raise questions that do not necessary have clear-cut 'right or wrong' answers, but would encourage the students to embrace ambiguity and make their own musical choices, both individually and as a community. With this approach, my educational aim was to promote more student-led practices in the BoM classroom. As one who does not necessarily have all the answers but is willing to help the students to find them, I saw myself as the more experienced agent, engaging in mutual learning processes with the students.

Traditionally, teachers have been preferably perceived as neutral, distant and almost genderless professionals (Rekola & Vuorikoski 2006). Society has stereotyped teachers as authorities who keep their own emotions in the background, do not make mistakes, and do not reveal their ignorance. This stereotype has emphasized the teacher's role to be in mastering the subject contents. Constructing a reflective and democratic learning environment requires the reassessment of this out-dated teacher role. This reassessment calls for the teacher to come out from behind the role of a neutral expert (ibid., 24). This revised identity means being open to new solutions in changing situations, and the ability to take risks and to tolerate uncertainties (e.g. Dewey 1999/29; Westerlund & Juntunen 2013). As relevant to this study, this kind of reflexive thinking and inquiry originates from a need to gain new understandings in more or less problematic situations (Dewey 1997/1910; Westerlund & Juntunen 2013). Reflecting on the social phenomenon that was problematic in my own classroom led me to experiment with new kinds of solutions, and think of teaching not as something that is fixed or settled, but rather a life-long learning process (Westerlund & Juntunen 2013). This flexible, forward-thinking attitude can also be encouraged in students, and practiced in the course of shared activities; in that way, teachers can further promote autonomy and transformation in learning.

When trying to conceptualize what was going on socially in the BoM classroom, I have to take into account that my own personality; style as a teacher; and even my gender are not inconsequential, but play a part in the whole. Even though a large body of recent literature shows that matching gender does not positively impact boys' motivations or achievements (Skelton & Francis 2009, 119), understanding gender as performative and as constructed in lived social relations means that it is negotiated in everyday classroom interactions between the participants. Thus, it is also negotiated between the teacher and

the students. Even though I was trying to be aware of my own attitudes and the messages that I was sending to the students – for instance, by never calling them 'girls' or 'boys' – I cannot avoid recognizing the possibility that some of these messages – comments, attitudes or gestures – may have been gendered, and were perhaps even inevitably so.

In a participation metaphor, people must learn the norms, values and practices of each new community they enter (Yamakawa, Forman & Ansell 2005, 179). Since the BoM classroom may have differed from a regular school classroom in terms of dialogical settings and classroom practices typical for creative processes. Therefore, it is only natural that negotiating these new practices took some time, and was dependent on effective communication between all the participants. It cannot be overlooked, however, that in this study, I was the one who designed the BoM course, selected the practices and defined the social norms in this particular classroom. In other words, I held a notable amount of power. Hence, teaching is permeated by value statements (hooks 1994; Florence 1998). Regarding the values and aims of education, with power always comes ethical responsibility. In Freirean thinking, music education is not neutral and needs to recognize students' individual needs, and specific contextual features (Juntunen & Westerlund 2013). Such dialogue between the teacher and students rests on cooperation, which can only thrive in a democratic learning environment (Freire 1970). Therefore, paying attention to the social life of a classroom and its built-relations is vital. Just as one cannot design the actual learning and transformation, pursuing a democratic learning environment is a process, which has an outcome that depends on everybody involved.

Teaching is living in the moment. This makes it simultaneously so rewarding and also demanding. Conducting lessons means constantly making choices – choices about the contents, practices and social norms. As this study also shows, a teacher's best efforts do not always lead to the best outcomes. Ferm (2006) suggests that a teacher needs openness and awareness to be able to react to sudden changes and, for example, to the students' initiatives. Indeed, as teachers, we often tend to assume that creative practices always produce positive learning experiences among the students and promote reflexivity and transformation in learning. However, it is something that can neither be planned in advance nor taken for granted. In the next two chapters, I discuss in more detail episodes taken from the lessons during the data collection that present interactions, times of tension, conflicts, times of cooperation and sharing of learning in the BoM classroom.

4 Interaction in the BoM classroom

Chapter 3 outlined the 'Basics of Music' course and chronologically presented the social interactions that took place in the classroom during the data collection period. This chapter examines the interactions in more detail by focusing on the social events and happenings that were particularly illuminating when viewing the interrelationships of children's gendered negotiations and the construction of musical agency in classroom-based music learning. In order to answer the main research question: *How is gender performed in the negotiations of the BoM classroom?*, I explore students' social interactions through three constructed themes: 1) performing modes of participation; 2) holding gendered beliefs and preconceptions; and 3) shifting between 'good student' and 'rebel student' identities. I discuss these themes by observing the classroom discourse, and by comparing Phase One (co-ed setting) to Phase Two (single-gender settings). I use two sub-questions to support my analysis: 1) How does gendered border work drive the negotiation of the forming of memberships in the BoM classroom?; and 2) How does gendered border work drive the negotiation of the gaining of ownership of meaning in the BoM classroom?

4.1 Modes of participation

During the whole process of conducting this inquiry, the theme that repeatedly caught my attention was the presence of tensions arising from participation that seemed to regulate the construction of memberships among the students, and, thus, their access to learning and agency construction. This study understands 'agency' as socially constructed; and as part of communities, cultural conceptions, norms and relationships; it is determined expressly by the access to cultural, material and social resources (McNay 2004; see also Gould 2007) and by our own engagements in social situations. In the BoM classroom studied here, the social boundaries caused by gendered border work seemed to compromise or sometimes even restrict (Thorne 1993; Bredesen 2004; Paechter 2006; Connell 2009; Berg 2010) access to mutual negotiation processes and the shaping of meanings of shared enterprises (Wenger 1998/2003), creating inequalities among the students.

As the observation data, as well as children's own reflections later indicate, gendered border work in the BoM classroom can be traced at least in two ways, by: 1) adopting gender-based learner identities, and 2) sustaining gendered beliefs and preconceptions. The former is particularly evident in the differences of the use of student voice, time, mobility and physical space between the male and female students (Gordon 2006a).

All of these differences are critically important when students negotiate memberships and ownerships of meaning (Wenger 1998/2003); therefore, these differences operate as vehicles of inclusion and exclusion in pedagogical situations. It is clear that gender differences do not simply exist, but are made to happen, as Connell (2009, 15) writes. Consequently, children do not become passively socialized into gendered categories but indeed practice gendered agency.

In the next section, I discuss how the use of student voice, time, mobility and physical space created different modes of student participation.

4.1.1 The Use of student voice

In the BoM classroom, the use of student voice seemed to be particularly problematic and gender differentiated. Although I anticipated these findings, the girls and boys' different uses of voice still surprised me. Throughout the study, it became obvious to me that the use of voice can indeed operate as a powerful legitimator (Arnot 2006) in the classroom context.

The concept of voice is associated with identity work, such as individual and collective identities and identification (Arnot 2006, 410; Wenger 1998/2003). At the same time, the use of voice is connected to negotiability (Wenger 1998/2003). The capability to contribute to shared meaning-making and to create ownership of meaning depends on access to practical reflection in classroom discourse, for instance, as Bohman (1999, 140) suggests, "to give convincing reasons, to back up claims made in speech when challenged by other speakers".

In the following episode, students discuss a topic about instrumental improvisation. Access to this kind of practical reflection is difficult for part of the class because some of the students continue to dominate the interaction by talking over the others and by playing their instruments while the others try to lead a conversation. Therefore, it is challenging for the students who tried to ignore the interruptions and engage in the assigned task.

Ester	*A cat.*
Anna	*Okay, a cat. Hey, tell me what comes to your mind with 'a cat'?*
	[Talking in the background.] Hey Sweeties, please be quiet okay?
	Sweeties, quiet now… What comes to your mind? Ester?
Ester	*Well, at least cats don't stomp…*
Anna	*How do cats move then? Veronika?*

Veronika	They move quietly and softly…
Anna	Okay, hey… cats kind of tiptoe. They are soft, yeah? What else cats do? [Some boys play their instruments and talk simultaneously.] Hey, what do cats do? [Still talking in the background...] Hey, come on! Please listen now! Only one person at the time… [Talking continues…] Please, stop talking.
Matt	Blah, blah…
Anna	Hey, this cannot work, that everybody talks at the same time. We have to take turns. That's what leading a conversation is about. I have the turn now... Okay, a cat. It is soft and it tiptoes. What else? Please, don't play your instruments yet…
Matt	Well, it traps some mice and chickens…
Anna	Amos? One at the time, please. [To the boys who talk over Amos:] And now it's Amos's turn.
Amos	Well, they have sort of… a moustache. [Laughter.]
Anna	What else? Do they make any sounds?
Ester	Well, they whiz… and purr… and meow!
Anna	Okay! Lets try to play a cat. Starts from here… shh, shh… others, be quiet!
Anna	[To Filip:] Well done! Listen up, listen to Filip... [The pianists come up with a nice 'purring'.] Now we are listening to the violinists. Hey, how would meowing sound with the violins? Could you please try out some meowing? Nice! Thanks! [A lot of noise. Some boys are roaring in the background.]

Although the students came up with some ideas for their improvisation, the situation remained really noisy and restless throughout the activity. I even had to ask one of the students to step aside from playing for a while. This episode illustrates the typical quality of the use of voice in the BoM classroom in Phase One. I had to continually negotiate about the social rules, and the students seemed to use their voice to acquire social power and, at times, even to stand as a gatekeeper to children's participation. Another episode taken from the same lesson, shows this problem even more clearly.

In the following conversation, five boys marginalized the rest of the group by entirely excluding them from the classroom conversation.

Anna	Okay, let's take the textbooks. Please, listen up. Take your books, please. Page 16, page 16, page 16... [A student asks for a pencil.] Yep, I'll give you a pencil. Does everyone now have the right page? Please, don't do that, Julius. Come here, please. [I guide Julius to another table. A lot of noise...] Hey, listen up! Quiet please! Hey, Pete... Well, everybody, as you see, on this

page, we have the octave ranges... [Still a lot of noise.] I'll show you... here,
hey listen up now... as you see, here bove it's explained... please don't
put that over the book... that after these seven... Amos, Sweetie... the series
of these seven root notes... c, d... shh, shh, hey...

Matt   *He's kicking me...*

Anna   *Please, don't kick... can't kick anyone... listen up, please...[The situation*
does not seem to settle down.] Hey, it's up to you now... hey Sweeties, listen
up! You make the choice. Either we end the lesson in time or we continue a
bit longer if we have to... if you continue making a fuss, we just can't finish
in time.

Matt   *I don't want us to finish late.*

Anna   *Well, then...*

Matt   *Otherwise I'm gonna' be late for my pizza... for my chip break...*

Anna   *Hey Sweeties, then you have to be quiet, hey, then you just have to*
be quiet... hey, now you have to be quiet. Listen, please... Julius. But the
lesson...

Anna   *Yeah, but we can't end the lesson before we are finished with this.*
You just have to be quiet now. Listen up, the series of these seven root
notes... [To a student that tries to get up from his seat:] ...please, don't go
anywhere now... are called octave ranges. Max, hey, Max... [Max continues
talking.] ... Hey, buddies, Amos, quiet please!

Jack   *Amos, the earth is calling... [Laughter.]*

After the sixth lesson, I wrote in my diary:

09-09-30
Today, I had decided not to raise my voice, no matter what. Couldn't keep my promise,
though. Some of the students were just impossible. I told them that I didn't want to use any
more of our time for dealing with this issue. I was pretty outspoken and showed my feelings.
For the first time as a teacher, I had doubts about being able to cope with some of these
kids. After the lesson, we had a chat with the boys and once again we made a deal about
improving the situation.

In order to establish a picture of the use of student voice in the BoM classroom, I began my analysis by tracking: the number of conversations; who was using their voice; what the conversation was about; and whether it was about musical things from the lesson topic or about other things. Although the rate varied from one lesson to another, the data revealed that the boys used their voice up to seven times more than the girls did. A notable amount of the conversations were carried out, as in the episodes above, with me – the teacher,

negotiating the classroom social rules with a group of boys, and leaving the girls and about two boys as bystanders. It is worth noting, however, that, for both the girls and boys, the rate of the students' use of voice during lesson-topic conversations remained about the same. Thus, the boys seemed to express their agency more openly than the girls did.

Table 3: Times of engaging in the conversation during the lesson.

Lesson	Girls' use of voice	Boys' use of voice
3	13	91
4	21	117
5	12	85
6	34	83
7	88	183
Total lessons: 5	Total: 168	Total: 559

Lesson Seven included a group assignment that the students' completed without the presence of the teacher. Teacher's absence shows positively in the times of engaging in conversation, however still clearly for the favours of the boys' use of voice.

A closer look at the two episodes above brings up another problematic issue that I have already identified in Chapter Three. Namely, that the on-going discipline problems called for my constant interference and made it impossible for me to pay attention to the students equally. Hence, the situation often was far from my visions about of a dialogical and reflexive learning environment. In her study on third-graders participating in dance lessons, Eeva Anttila (2003) discusses the different tones and intensities of dialogue in conflict situations, varying from softness to firmness or even disapproval in the conflicting situations. She holds that firmness, as such, does not harm the dialogical relationship once it has been established. In The BoM classroom, however, there was a new community of learners, and, as the teacher, I had to delicately balance between the different tones of dialogue from encouraging to scolding.

Later, in the stimulated-recall interview session, I was discussing with the boys about the dialogue in the BoM classroom; Amos reflected:

Well, it was a bit like... like that for example I... I kind of wanted to make the others laugh... and they just came along. The girls then couldn't get their good ideas through... they just couldn't speak out...

Regarding teaching the disruptive students, Anttila (2003) suggests that restlessness, energy and excitement do not necessarily compromise dialogue as long as "some individuals' freedoms do not limit others' freedoms" (p. 303). However, situations in which restlessness and noise hinder someone's right to enjoy, concentrate and learn cannot be considered dialogical, at least not for everyone (ibid.). Hence, in such situations, restlessness and noise may become an issue of power, as was evident in my BoM classroom. While looking at classroom conversations, Fisher (1994) noticed that boys placed in mixed-gender groups mainly boys conversed with each other, talking over and marginalizing the girls' ideas by ignoring or overriding them. Interestingly enough, Amos's reflections revealed situations parallel to these findings.

As discussed above in Chapter Two, gender and education scholars (Renold 2001; Maynard 2002; Gordon 2006a, 2006b; Arnot 2006; Paetcher 2006; Skelton and Francis 2009) widely discuss the ways that girls position themselves and are positioned by others when entering educational spaces. For example, both Gordon (2006a) and Skelton and Francis (2010) claim that like a hidden, cultural self-evidence, girls are expected to show self-control and rational behaviour, whereas boys are allowed more liberties. These roles seem deeply embedded in our educational culture. Therefore, for a girl to intensely show agency and purposefully claim an audible space contradicts with the self-control expected from her (Gordon 2006a, 6-7). Similarly, the girls in the BoM classroom seemed to experience tensions when engaging in classroom conversations. Therefore, this suggests that for girls, their access to mutual negotiation and shaping of meanings (Wenger 1998/2003) was at times compromised.

Emma reflected:

Having the boys around, we don't learn anything, because they are just yelling and being noisy...

Again, the polarization in the use of student voice between girls and boys caused power struggles and directed the localized and shared understanding of group femininity and group masculinity among the children. Gendered border work (Thorne 1993; Bredesen

2003; Paehter 2006; Connell 2009; Berg 2010), that is, a sustainment of stereotypical gendered groupings, seemed to further complicate the processes of negotiation, and the students acting according to their own, individual identities, thus making it difficult, both for the girls and for the boys, to primarily express personal views or attitudes. Hence, negotiating learner identities is not always a reflexive process, but often can be regulated by stereotypical, gendered habits based on earlier individual experiences and social gendered expectations (see Ojala et al. 2009, 22; on gendered agency, see McNay 2004).

Although it is generally preferred to implicit generalizations, Emma's comment may have signalled feelings of disappointment or even exclusion. Silence as such "can also provide an enabling space where girls (or boys) can concentrate for example on educational achievement or on their own fantasies" (Gordon 2006a, 7). Silent girls (or and silent boys, I would suggest) can be competent decision- makers, who are determined to create space for achievements (ibid.).

Girls and the use of student voice

In this section, I will discuss, in light of this study, the implications of the use of student voice when working with divided groups of girls and boys. In Phase One, the girls encountered difficulties in making their voice audible. At the beginning of Phase Two, a change in the use of student voice in the girls' group was immediate and notable. Instantly, from the first Phase-Two lesson, the girls group actively participated in the classroom conversation. Furthermore, the quality of the conversations greatly differed from those in Phase One, when the distractions often led the discussion away from music and the lesson topic. Rather, in Phase Two, the conversations were clearly focused on music and the girls showed intensive agency when engaging in the mutual activities.

The following episode is taken from the Lesson Ten. Here, the students were collectively working on an exercise that dealt with musical time values and adding barlines to a rhythmic sequence:

Veronika	*What did 'C' mean again?*
Anna	*Sweeties, now what does C mean? Who remembers? Who could tell Veronika? Ester?*
Ester	*It means 4/4.*
Anna	*4/4. Yeah, it means 4/4. Hey, where would you add the first bar line? [Iris is raising her hand.] Iris?*
Iris	*Like there… here where the small break is…*

Anna	*Well, actually... it comes a bit earlier... [Some other students are raising their hands, too.]*
Iris	*Or then here... um... or then here...*
Lily	*It comes here... [Lily shows the place to Iris from her textbook.]*
Iris	*... or then in front of it...?*
Anna	*Look, this one [a note] is this long... if you count here to one and half, then it goes: one and, two and, three and, four... so where does the bar line come then?... After this fourth note?*
Ada	*I got it there! One, two, three, four.*
Anna	*Right! So it happens that...*
Lily	*You mean here? [Lily is still a bit confused...]*
Anna	*Look, I'll show you... look at my book... [Meanwhile, the students vividly discuss the solution and count aloud together.] Where does the next bar line come then? [Many raised hands.] Ester?*
Ester	*After the break.*
Anna	*Yeah, after the quarter rest. The second bar goes like this. [Everybody read aloud the second bar with rhythmic syllables.] How about the third bar? Who could figure it out? Rebecka, would you have an idea?*
Rebecka	*Could it come here? [Rebecka shows her suggestion from the textbook.]*
Anna	*Not quite yet... Ada?*
Ada	*Um... could it come here? [Laughing.]*
Rebecka	*I know where it comes!*
Anna	*Rebecka, where then?*
Rebecka	*It comes here... here...*
Anna	*Look, you should count to...*
Iris	*I know, I know...!*
Anna	*Iris?*
Iris	*Well, after the first two notes...*
Anna	*Yes! Exactly!*

To me, this episode demonstrates well the quite notable change in the classroom environment and the learning culture that took place in with the girls' in the BoM classroom when moving during Phase Two. The atmosphere appeared to be relaxed and I did not notice any traces of the tensions and power struggles that often seemed to define the Phase-One classroom interactions. The above classroom conversation demonstrates how the girls now cooperated actively and collectively, and contributed to the problem solving and the shared meaning making (Wenger 1998/2003). Access to participation appeared to be open to everyone involved. Furthermore, the students treated each other respectfully and as legitimate members of the BoM classroom.

Another example from Lesson Ten also depicts well the interaction and particularly the quality of the conversation in the girls' group when engaging in the shared activities and the negotiation processes. The following episode presents the girls working on their group composition:

Anna	Hey, how far did we get last time?
Iris	Until the penguins' jump... Ester starts.
Lily	But I do...
Veronika	Ester starts the jump I mean...
Anna	Please remind me, was it the piano that starts the whole thing? [Julia, the pianist, starts playing.]
Veronika	Yeah, it does.
Lily	Can I start now?
Anna	You sure can... [Lily, the flutist, plays her own ostinato over the piano comping.] ...it's really nice!
Ada	Is this the part where they are marching?
Anna	Yeah, now they are marching... [Playing continues all time.] Great, just something like that! How about the others? [The violinists join in one by one...] Um... is this the right key? [I go through my notes...]
Ester	Yeah it is... or I don't know...
Anna	Hey, did we really play in C major? [Piano comping starts again...] Or could it have been the G major? [The pianist switches immediately to G major.] Hey, hold on...okay? We have to figure out first the right key... could I hear your ostinato, Ester, with the piano, please? [Ester, one of the violinists, plays her ostinato over the piano part.] And then Veronika, how about your part? [Veronika joins in with her violin...]
Ester	This is for sure what I played... [The playing stops...]
Anna	Hey, Julia [the pianist], could you please play your part once again in C major? Okay, Ester and Veronika, could you now join in, please? Please, start together, ...three and, four and... this works! [The flutist joins in. To the third violinist:] How was your part again? [Iris starts to play glissandos...] yeah, right... they are sliding on the ice... [She says tTo the recorder player who is trying to memorize her ostinato:] That's in a different key, I think... could you please try it starting from g? Yeah, that's probably better! [One of the violinists is working on her ostinato.] What if you tried it from another string? [I help the student to is try out an another string...] Yeah, that string... look... there you go! [The playing continues in the background while I turn to the last violinist who still is not playing] How about you Rebecka?

Rebecka   *I wasn't here last time.*

Anna   *I know, it doesn't matter at all. You can work on something new now.*
You can just listen for a little while and then start trying out things...
and when you come up with something you like, then just stick with
it... and you can always change it later on if you want to... [Rebecka
starts to work on her ostinato.] Okay! [After a while Rebecka plays her newly
invented ostinato.] Yeah! And Ester, can you join in?

Anna   *Hey, buddies... [The playing stops...] How are they going to get to the*
water, do they slide or do they jump, or what do they do?

Ester   *Didn't they jump? [Memorizing the story...]*

Veronika   *They could slide, too... [String players start to experiment with the ways of*
sliding to the water...]

Anna   *Yeah, something like that [Experimenting continues...] Yeah, why not... Hey,*
listen how Rebecka slides... [Rebecka plays her sliding.] ...and how do you
jump to the water? [Plays the 'jump'.] Nice!

Lily   *Can this one [penguin] join in?*

Anna   *Sure! Of course! [Everybody is playing...] and then starts the water*
music... they go swimming and are no longer wiggly but really smooth
and great swimmers, right? [The first violinist invents the way to imitate the
waves...] Could you all join in, please?

Ada   *Can I show how you mine?*

Anna   *Sure! [Ada plays her waves with the recorder, and the others continue presenting*
their 'waterly' ideas, as well...]

In this second episode, all the girls actively engaged in the negotiation processes when working on the group composition. The negotiation took place both verbally and through music-making. For example, Julia, the pianist, hardly took part in the conversation, but participated actively by playing almost continuously. She was ready all the time, for example, by quickly reacting to the request of the key change in the piano part and also helping the rest of the players to memorize their ostinati. As discussed earlier, silence as such does not necessarily signal exclusion or lack of agency (Gordon 2006a). Additionally, in Julia's case, her instrument – the piano, positioned her physically in a slightly different way compared to the others, who were sitting in a circle facing one another.

Another student who particularly showed agency, was Ester. When many of the students needed my help to memorize their ostinati in the right key, she was sure about her part all along and told us so, too. All in all, this episode exemplifies the girls intensely engaging in the composing project. The girls showed capability to express their own ideas, while still being sensitive to the views of others, and exploring and considering the possible solutions.

Hence, it was apparent that each and every girl shared in the legitimacy to contribute to the mutual enterprise of composing the penguin story.

In this section, I just have illustrated how in the girls' group the use and the quality of the student voice immediately changed when moving in Phase Two. Dividing the student into gender-based groups had a positive effect for the girls, enhancing their access to mutual meaning- making and participation.

Boys and the use of student voice

With the boys, the start of Phase Two was challenging. Some of the students repeatedly caused distractions and we had to have talks about how we are all responsible in building up a cosy environment for learning to take place, and that we should respect everybody's right to concentrate. Despite these reprimands, as the following episode from Lesson Eleven illustrates, the boys' group situation remained problematic. Although at times one definitely could detect some improvement, the concentration and the modes of participation varied a lot. The lessons were like a roller coaster, the good moments were always followed by the poor ones.

In the following episode, the boys are becoming familiar with the concept of harmonic key systems:

Anna	*Hey, could anyone tell, what are the keys are? What were they again?*
	[One of the boys cannot stay still and I am guiding him back to his seat.]
Amos	*Well, they are those one-line, two-line…*
Anna	*Well, actually not… What are the one-line, two-line, and so on? They are not keys but…*
Max	*Octave ranges.*
Anna	*Yeah, exactly. They are the octave ranges. But what is a key? [One of the students flings an endpin of a cello…] Hey, Sweetie, where did you get that? Is this from your cello? [I take the endpin away…] Let's put it here, okay?*
Jack	*Well… it's that thing that goes to that thing…*
Anna	*Yeah, a cello endpin. Hey, guys, you got the keys mixed up… [A lot of noise.] Hey Jack, please be quiet now. Amos got a bit mixed up with the octave ranges and the keys. Octave ranges are the small, one-line, two-line and so on… [It is getting really noisy, and suddenly one of the boys walk to the piano and starts to play a major scale.] Yeah, there you go…*
Anna	*Okay. You played us a scale in C major. That is one of the keys. What*

other keys do you know? [The same student plays another scale.] That's the c minor… okay. Well then. Listen up please, hey… [A lot of noise.] Please don't do that… where, hey… [It is still really noisy and the same student leaves his seat…] Hey, buddies, now you got have to listen up… please don't go anywhere now…

Max   *To the loo…*

Anna   *Please not now, in a minute, ok? Not until we have finished discussing this. [Another student leaves his seat.] Jack, please come back. Have you played in some different keys? Please, give to me that pen… and sit down, please. Hey, what other keys are you familiar with? Can you memorize any other keys than C major? Amos?*

Amos   *Um… D major.*

The students continue memorizing the keys with which they are familiar with in a quite noisy and restless environment:

Anna   *Hey, please no talking! The turn is here…*

Emil   *I have played in e minor…*

Anna   *Okay, in e minor…*

Max   *I have played in all majors and minors…*

Anna   *Right, hey listen up… Filip…*

Emil   *Can we proceed this week a little faster than we did last week?*

Anna   *Well, it totally depends on you guys… When we played last time played and talked about major scale in C major… [Plays the scale while talking.] we discussed… [It is really noisy and Jonas sings a C major scale along.] Okay, may I please have the word now? Jonas? [Talking goes on.] Hey, may I speak now? There you go… we discussed that the major scale is built following a certain… shhh… pattern so that… hey… [Jonas raises his hand.] Yes, Jonas?*

Jonas   *Well, just that this lesson now probably goes worse than the last one…*

Anna   *No, no… this still can go well if you just stop messing up…*

Jonas   *Yeah…*

Anna   *Really guys, it really is up to you! Okay?*

Jack   *Lets fight…*

Anna   *Yeah, perhaps against acting silly… I'll finish explaining this now…*

Jack   *The warrior that fought against acting silly just died…*

Anna	Okay, sorry to hear… Hey, the major scale is built from having at times whole-steps between the tones and at times half-steps. The half-steps are… Julius shhh… between the third and fourth note and between the seventh and eighth note…
Jack	Now he died.

Obviously, the boys' group still suffered from discipline problems that caused power issues among the students and between the students and the teacher. In the previous lesson, the unproductive situation was discussed collectively as it had many times before. Since the group did not seem to make progress in terms of social behaviour, Emil and Jonas started to make remarks about the learning environment challenges. Emil asked whether we could proceed with the lesson topic a little faster than in the previous weeks. He was frustrated with the constants interruptions. Jonas, for his part, believed that, given the discipline issue, the possibility to make a progress had already been lost halfway through the lesson. In this particular BoM classroom, I understood this lesson to have the first signs of the students themselves starting to negotiate their collective understanding of group masculinity (Paechter 2006) and a new kind of learning culture.

Lesson Eleven, which already had some ups and downs, ended with continuing the penguin story group composition. The students were working in a group with their instruments; at first, they were restless, but then something happened that totally turned the course of the last part of the lesson. One of the students, Filip, came up with an idea that caught the attention of the whole group. For a moment, the boys were cooperating very intensely and made progress with their composition.

Anna	Hey, this is the one where the penguins march along the ice… how are they going to get to the water? Are they going to jump all together or do they jump one by one or how is it going to happen?
Emil	Together. It's gonna' be easier in that way.
Max	No… they kind of sweep to the water, first one, then the next one, kind of in a line…
Anna	Oh, you mean trrrr… [I draw an arrow to the air.] How do they sweep?
Filip	I'll start like this… [Filip plays a glissando with his cello.] … and the trombone or what ever…
Max	Max reacts immediately and plays with the French horn a 'splash'.
Filip	Just like that!
Anna	The French horn…
Filip	Right.

Anna   Could the French horn be the last one? Could the strings perhaps start by
          playing a long glissando? Whiiii…bom!

Filip   Yeah!

Anna   And the rest of you could just join in… let's try this out. Let's try, hey…
          hey, Max and Amos, you guys have to cooperate so that you get to the
          water at the same time, okay? Hey, the strings start, ready? Matt, please
          don't go anywhere… [Matt is putting his violin away.] No, no… we need you
          and your violin now, come back, please. [Matt returns to his seat with his
          instrument.] Okay, we're all set! Filip, what a great idea! Violins, are you ready to
          jump? And go, slide to the water… fantastic! Once more! And,here we go! Yay!
          Hey, let's try to combine this with the beginning. Hey, Sweeties, let's combine this
          now. Starting from the beginning. Piano starts, one and, two and… hey, starts from
          the beginning. Listen, shh, shh, we have start with a silence… one and, two and…
          [The group is playing penguinsmarching on the ice.] …and now they arrive to the
          edge of the ice… slide! And now they are in the water.

Filip   No, no, they don't slide but… uerm… it's more like a take-off ramp going
          down… [Filip plays a glissando with his cello while explaining.] …kosshh!

Anna   Okay. Downwards… you mean low?

Filip   From here. [Filip shows with his cello.]

Anna   Yeah, that works! This sounds cool! Good! Okay, now we are in the water.
          What next?

In the stimulated recall -interview, Filip reflects upon the episode:

Anna   What can you tell about this episode?

Filip   Well, here we were planning our piece… and I was there… I was in a quite
          central part, actually…

Anna   How did you feel? Can you remember?

Filip   Yes I do.

Anna   Can you tell me?

Filip   It felt nice and so… like… like, that here, I invent something great…

Anna   Yeah… what did it look like… looking at it afterwards?

Filip   It felt like a nice situation.

Anna   Nice situation. How did you come up with that idea? Can you recall?

Filip   Well, my original idea was that they [the penguins] kind of would jump
          to the air… and then start to come down from the heights… they go like
          whoom… [Filip draws an arrow to the air and sings a glissando.] …When
          coming down and then the piano and the French horn go like ka-bam when
          they hit the water…

Anna	*Okay, was the outcome what you had had in mind, or did it change along the process?*
Filip	*Didn't change a bit.*
Anna	*Okay. Did it sound as nice as you had pictured?*
Filip	*Yeah!*
Anna	*Okay. How did you feel when you got such an idea and everybody came along?*
Filip	*Yeah, everybody…*
Anna	*How did it feel?*
Filip	*Really nice.*

The conversation shows how significant it was for Filip to have his voice heard. He clearly remembered how everybody accepted his proposal and cooperated to work out the idea with him. So far, this was one of the rare moments where the boys truly were connected and cooperated as a community of learners. And more importantly, the impulse did not come from me, but from one of them. When I asked later, what does it take to get one's ideas to be accepted, Filip said:

Filip	*Well, you have to dare to expose your idea… and you have to want to expose it…*

Filip's remark signals how the use of voice may indeed operate as a legitimator (Arnot 2006) in a learning community, and how direct and open communication rests on a mutual respect, trust and commitment that need to be nurtured in everyday pedagogical situations and in thea social life of a classroom.

Earlier in this chapter, I brought up the notion that when getting to the halfway through of Phase Two, it appeared as if the boys had started to renegotiate their learning culture and collective understanding of group masculinity (Paechter 2006) in the BoM classroom. Two weeks later, the following episode from Lesson Thirteen even reinforced that interpretation. One of the students, Emil, openly showed his resentment about the disturbances:

Emil	*Quiet!*
Anna	*Okay, Amos, let's stop talking… Can you put that stuff away, please? Let's put them here on the table, okay?.*
Emil	*Be quiet! [Still a lot of noise.]*
Emil	*Are you ever gonna' finish talking?*
Anna	*Right…*

Emil	*It's already five past…*
Anna	*Quite. Hey, let's move on. Please, take go to page 32.*
Matt	*I don't have a book.*
Anna	*Well, look on from Jonas's book then…*
Matt	*From grandma's book?*
Anna	*From Jonas's book.*
Matt	*Oh, from Jonas's grandma's book?*
Anna	*Okay, well…how many of you have played some…Julius…Jonas, please turn the page, to the next page…no, I mean properly…shh, hey…how many of you guys have played a minor scale? Just any minor scale?*
Max	*I have played them all.*
Anna	*You have played, and you…[Many of the students have lifted their hands.]*
Amos	*I have played some.*
Anna	*You… and you… you must have played one minor scale…hey, guys, let's first sing a major scale together …*
Amos	*We need silence now…*
Jack	*It's twenty past…*
Anna	*We need silence now, come on Sweeties…shh…hey…Let's sing the major scale now. We all know it for sure.*
Jack	*Really? He's trying to nick my…*
Anna	*Please, don't take Jack's…let's start from here: do, re, mi…[Some of the students participate the singing.]*

In the next example, the group is trying to memorize a major scale by singing it together, but the focus is elsewhere. Emil continues to complain about the noise:

Anna	*Okay guys, let's go again…your concentration cuts out all the time, guys…*
Emil	*Quiet!*
Amos	*Don't you shout there…*
Anna	*Actually, Emil is right. Let's just sing a major scale. Let's try to sing it even once without breaking off. Amos, you too. Do, re, mi…And now, let's sing the third below do. [I sing with the students]. Do, si, la…Hey, here goes, now the minor scale: la, si, do…Jonas, please sing along…*
Matt	*Do you have a picture of a pig?*
Anna	*And again, so that Jonas sings with us, ready? Here we go... Hey, Jonas is still not with us…Jonas, come on…please sing along…*
Jack	*It's mine, it's mine, don't touch it, it's mine!*
Anna	*You don't need it now…*
Matt	*It almost hit my eye…*

Anna	*Hey, not now. Listen, the minor scale that we just sang, hey… [It is really noisy.] Hey guys, this is getting out of hands… Really now. Now it's my turn to talk, okay?*
Jack	*Whose hands?*

Jack goes for contesting the teacher script:

Anna	*Hey Sweetie, please be quiet now and let me talk, okay? The minor scale that we just sang is the related key of the major scale that we first sang. It now happens that every major key has a related minor key. The related major and minor keys have one thing in common, namely the chromatic symbols.*
Jack	*Really?*
Anna	*Yep. And there is always one major and one minor scale that share the same chromatic symbols and those…*
Jack	*Is that right?*
Anna	*Hey, could you be quiet now, please? I could do without your cutting comments, okay? Really, I mean it.*
Jack	*They are not cutting.*
Anna	*Well, I think they are. Could you please just let go now? You don't need to comment* *On everything I say. So, please…*
Jack	*No I won't…*
Anna	*Well, I think you should…*
Jack	*Why is that?*
Anna	*Well, if we can't settle this between you and me, we have to discuss it with other people… the thing is that you just can't behave like this in here.*
Jack	*I can't?*
Anna	*No, you can't.*
Matt	*I'm soon gonna' cry because of this waiting… [To me:] You are clearing something up to this guenon and we just have to sit and wait…*
Anna	*Precisely. You see Jack, you really bore everybody with your behaviour now.*
Jack	*Yay.*
Anna	*All right. Where was I… yeah, a major and a minor scale that share the same chromatic symbols are thus called the related keys...*

The lesson continues with the students familiarizing themselves with relative keys, but the learning is unfocused and Jack continues his mission of challenging the teacher script:

Matt	*Do you have a car?*
Anna	*Yeah I do but let's concentrate on this, okay?. Please, look at the page 32. [Noise.]*
Anna	*Hey, listen up guys, let's concentrate on this… [A lot of noise.]*
Matt	*What kind of a car?*
Anna	*Hey, listen up, here on the page 32, we have the minor scale…*
Jack	*Let's concentrate on this… let's concentrate on this…*
Emil	*Be quiet! Concentrate on this!*
Jack	*That's what kind of car she has…*
Anna	*Hey Jack, for how long are you planning to go on with this? Can you please stop now?*
Jack	*I'll stop when everybody…*
Anna	*Jack, please stop this foolishness? Really.*
Jack	*I'll stop when no-one…*
Amos	*The lesson has been going on for 35 minutes now…*
Anna	*Listen Jack, you have stop now because the others are complaining that it bugs them…*
Max	*We have only ten minutes left… Could everybody be quiet now?*
Amos	*35 minutes and we have got nothing done…*
Anna	*Yes, we have. We've got something done. We have checked the homework and learned a new topic, even though Jack is not willing to go along. So…*
Matt	*He's trying to prevent us…*
Anna	*Hey, Sweetie, let's just leave it now, okay…*

In Phase One, when working with everybody together, Emil was determined to make his own choices by not going along with the rebellious behaviours. Now and then, when a number of the boys ignored the mutual classroom activities, Emil instead participated rather in actively and even tried to act as a teacher's helper. Hence, his behaviour seemed to be directed by his individual choices rather than by the collective understandings of masculinity (Paechter 2006) in the BoM classroom.

Further, the above episode illustrates not only Emil, but also Max, Amos and even Matt, who all express their frustration with the constant interruptions. Jack, instead, is quite resilient in sustaining his social space of underlife (Goffman 1961), challenging the teacher script and giving up only when he notices that (this time) he was not getting any followers.

However, by contesting the classroom discursive practices, Jack actually contributes to creating the potential for a third space (Gutierrez et al.1995) to develop. Consequently, the majority of the boys indeed start to renegotiate their level of engagement and commitment to the shared enterprise;, in that way, these boys participate in the construction of new practices and a new learning culture in the BoM classroom.

In the stimulated- recall -interview Emil reflects:

Emil   *Well, for example, when these boys shouted here... well they have stopped now since there isn't anyone else but you to contest...*

Anna   *Oh... so are you saying that, in your opinion, they're calmer now because of the lack of audience?*

Emil   *Yeah...*

In the absence of the girls, Emil thought that the fact that the boys now had no-one to show off in front of but me, gradually making them to change their behaviour. Another explanation could be simply that the boys were getting tired with studying in such a restless learning environment and therefore wanted to renegotiate the social practices in the BoM classroom. Regardless, the tensions gradually led to the changes in the social environment in the boys' BoM classroom.

4.1.2 The Use of mobility, time and physical space

So far, I have discussed the use of student voice that appeared to be gender-differentiated in the BoM classroom. In addition, the implications of adopting gender- based learner identities showed in the different uses, between the girls and the boys, of mobility, time and physical space. Also, the cultural demand for self-control seemed to direct the girls' engagements. While the boys took liberties in terms of not engaging in the mutual activities, by wandering around the classroom or wrestling with each other, the girls often chose the role of a viewer.

In the stimulated- recall interview, Veronika discussed this topic:

I wouldn't have the nerve to get wild and ramble around in the classroom when the boys are here. The boys, instead, have the nerve... trying to impress the others.

Veronika considered the boys' presence, in particular, to be a reason for her own self-control in the situations in which some of the boys behaved rebelliously. However, to me,

there was more to it. Since the restlessness of some of the students had become an issue in negotiating the classroom discursive practices, I believe that part of her restraint was due to her own observations of that such behaviour, at least in that magnitude, was not deemed appropriate by me, as their teacher. Indeed, according to Mari Käyhkö (2011), girls become trained to be more aware of what kind of social behaviour is expected from them in educational contexts. Surprisingly, some of the boys noticed this as well. In the stimulated- recall session, Amos mentioned that the feedback of the teacher's feedback was more important to the girls than to the boys.

Anna *How about then... some of the boys rambled around the classroom or were lying on the floor... took kind of liberties...*

Amos *A bit...yeah...*

Anna *Do you think girls would like to take same kind of liberties as boys do? Or do you think they wouldn't?*

Amos *Well, I suspect they kind of would... like to take that those kind of liberties, but they necessarily don't do it.*

Anna *They would? Well, why don't they then...*

Amos *Because they might think that when the teacher comes to the classroom... [Imitates the girls.] "Hhmm... we might get a marking, so lets act reasonable"...and so they don't do it...*

Anna *So, are you saying that they think more about the consequences?*

Amos *Yeah.*

Anna *Okay...well, don't boys then?*

Amos *I think not. Well, I don't at least... if I need to, say, make up a visit with my friend, I don't care if I get a marking or not...*

As said above, the clear differences in the mobility and the use of physical space between the girls and the boys seemed to define the social interactions in the BoM classroom. Consequently, the girls (and the minority of boys) often had to wait for the shared activities to go continue. In that way, in the classroom activities, the boys dominated the use of time, as well. Although the girls never openly protested against having to waiting during the lessons, in the group interview, they expressed how annoying it was to wait for the boys to get back to the group activities. Another way to look at the girls' restraint in respect of the use of mobility and physical space is to interpret their behaviour as showing agency by because they noticed the possible connection between school success and their future. Therefore, as Kirsti Lempiäinen (2007) claims, agency is not always a visible, 'Pippi Longstocking' -type of action, doing acting contrarily, but can also be about being quiet and keeping to the norms (p. 113).

In the stimulated- recall -interview, also Amos gave credit for to the girls:

Amos   *...like the boys in our class, they just want to get out and play soccer and*
        so... they don't care too much whether they learn or not... and then when
        we have tests and all, they don't do so well... but the girls go, like, "hey,
        I know this... it goes like this... this is easy"... and the boys, because they
        haven't been practicing, they go, like, "help, I don't know this"...
Anna   *... so the girls kind of put more effort on learning, or…?*
Amos   *Yeah.*

In terms of mobility and the use of physical space in the BoM classroom, another feature that manifested gendered border work among the students, was the presence of tensions in bodily interaction. This was showed particularly evident as an almost compulsory need to maintain a physical space between the girls and the boys. For instance, girls preferred sitting at tables with other girls, and boys with boys; girls preferred doing small-group assignments with girls, and boys with boys; and when asked to join into musical assignments activities that involved bodily interaction, girls selected places next to the other girls and boys next to the other boys. I, and inevitably, there always was a physical gap between these two 'spheres'.

After the third lesson I wrote in my teacher diary:

09-09-09
Today, we were doing some body-percussion. Funny, how the children tend to organize
themselves in a strictly divided circle, half girls and boys, respectively. And, how differently
these half-circles operate, too. The girls' side looks calm and well-shaped. They mostly
listen to the instructions and actually do what is asked of them. On the boys' side, instead,
there is constantly something going on:, purposely stepping on each other's feet, pulling
their neighbour's ears, briefly slapping the person next to them, pushing each other
around, and so on. And you have to repeat the instructions over and over again. Like two
completely different worlds.

Anttila makes similar observations in her (2003) study on third-graders participating in dance lessons. She observed that not only did the qualities of the movements of girls' and boys' differ, but also that there were clear distinctions in the ways girls and boys interacted with each other. She noted that these differences were sometimes so great that they created difficulties in managing the dance class (p. 75). As already discussed in Chapter 1.3, one of these differences is the boys' tendency to often form wider, hierarchically-organized groups with an acknowledged leader, whereas girls often prefer socializing in pairs and

avoid conflicts (Hopearuoho-Saajala & Keskinen 1998).

In the stimulated- recall group interview, Ester reflects:

Ester   *Some boys are wilder than others, but when they are alone... they don't that much...*

Anna   *Get wild?*

Ester   *Well, usually those who kind of have many supporters... how should I put it now... they are the ones who get wild...*

The boys, however, also learn to compromise and withdraw, and to renegotiate their status in the hierarchy (Hopearuoho-Saajala & Keskinen 1998). Not all boys can, nor are even willing to become leaders. Furthermore, boys seem to be more flexible than girls in including new members to in their groups, as Hopearuoho-Saajala and Keskinen (1998) suggest. Although the boys in the BoM classroom indeed often acted in bigger groups, performing stereotypical rebellious behaviours, it is in important to highlight that this study only examines this a single classroom with its unique social features, which were locally negotiated, that is, negotiated among these particular children. In my previous teaching experience, I have worked with groups of children who had similar kinds of social challenges to those described in this study, as well as with groups without these challenges.

In some cases, the boys in this study recognized the cooperation challenges. For example, in the stimulated recall interview, Amos reflected on the cooperation between the girls and the boys:

Amos   *...cause boys, well, our cooperation doesn't work, their [the girls'] works better... Our cooperation doesn't work at all.*

Anna   *Whose cooperation?*

Amos   *Our... the boys'... but their works better...*

Consequently, gendered border work seems to operate not only between the groupings by regulating and stereotyping the collective and localized understanding of group femininity and masculinity (what it means to be 'a proper girl or a proper boy' in a particular nexus), but also inside the groupings by complicating the individual negotiations of femininities and masculinities. In other words, gendered border work enacts performative terms, the a variety of 'doing' girl or boy behaviours (Paechter 2006; see also West and Zimmerman 1987).

The tensions in bodily interactions also manifested themselves in musical situations, involving, for example, musical movement, dancing or body percussion. The next following episode, taken from the third lesson of Phase One depicts how gendered border work can overdrive classroom interaction. Here, the lesson starts with a warm-up game and body percussions, first, given by the teacher. Some of the boys only participate in the activities part-time. Instead, they prefer talking over the rhythmic patterns built by the others, shoving each other and purposely going off -beat. Despite the interruptions, other students keep going on. Next, the students are asked to invent their own rhythmic patterns and body percussions that then were performed and taught to the others. The students seemed to be enthusiastic about sharing their own patterns and, for a moment, cooperated actively. After introducing everybody's body percussions, the next task is to collectively build a percussive piece by using the rhythmic patterns invented by the students and to arrange it to the given instrumentation:, dish brushes and foam mats. Before starting, the students collectively become familiar with their instrument by making sound-inventions and trying out different kinds of articulations when playing. However, engaging the actual runs into difficulties soon after the starting:

Anna   *[The students have been selecting some patterns to start with...] Hey, please be quiet now... [Talking.] Lets start with Pete's pattern. How could we play it? [Most of the students try out different ways of playing Pete's pattern. Four boys, including Pete himself, are quite unfocused.]*

Anna   *Hey, did everyone get this? Did everyone get Pete's pattern? [The four boys still chat with each other while the others continue working on the pattern.]*

Anna   *Hey guys, here goes the pattern for you... Pete... Pete... from you till Amos... the four of you ... it goes like this... Julius, could you please play with us? [I play the pattern with the boys. One of the boys is ripping the foam mat...]*

Anna   *Please, don't rip it. This one is just for you guys... [I show again the pattern to the same fourboys...] Others, please wait just for a little bit... [For a moment the boys are playing the pattern. One of the boys starts to hit another boy with the brush...] Please, don't hit anyone, okay?*

Anna   *[For the next four students:] Now you guys... could you please play your pattern? [For the first group of four boys:] Please, keep your pattern going! [I simultaneously read the new pattern for the second group to support their playing. For the third group:] And now you guys... [I try to guide the third group, but in the meanwhile the first group has already started sword fighting with the brushes...]*

Anna   *Okey, okay... hey, let's try this another time. It just doesn't seem to work out today...*

Looking back, I was not happy with my solution of stopping the playing altogether. Instead, the four boys could have been asked to step aside while the rest of the group could have kept going with the assignment. However, it was only the third lesson and I did not want to carry out that harsh policy in the beginning, but was hoping to negotiate the social rules in the classroom in a more constructive way. Clearly, the downside of my decision was that I ended up devoting a lot of my attention to the four boys (see Francis 1998, 2000; Renold 2007 earlier in this chapter) while the rest of the group had to withstand our negotiations. Hence, for my part, the situation required balancing between two undesirable solutions. Inevitably, here the restlessness of some of the students created an issue of power issue by hindering others' participation.

Later in the stimulated- recall interview, the girls were discussing the situation:

Ester   *It's really annoying when someone is bugging...*

Ada   *Yeah, it feels awful...*

Lily   *Yeah, cause you just want to go on, but then... cause they were so noisy we couldn't do it...*

Julia   *Yeah, you just can't do it...*

However, Ester, Anni, Lilja and Julia were no't the only ones who felt that their access to participation was compromised from time to time. From the beginning, Emil stood out from the rest of the boys by consistently adopting a learner identity that was different from his peers. He wanted to focus on learning and often appealed for silence when the conversations got out of control. In the stimulated-recall interview, he expressed that he was ashamed for of some of the boys' behaviour and that he personally did not have any difficulties in cooperating with anyone, a girl or a boy. Hence, although some of the boys acted as part of a larger group, not all of the boys participated in these group activities. Next, I will discuss what the consequences for the social interaction among the children in terms of the use of mobility, time and physical space after we changed to the groups of girls and boys.

Girls and the use of mobility, time and physical space

As discussed above, gendered border work (Thorne 1993; Bredesen 2004; Paechter 2006; Connell 2009; Berg 2010) seemed to operate not only between the groupings, but also within the groupings, regulating and stereotyping the collective and localized understanding of group femininity and group masculinity (Paechter 2006) in the BoM

classroom. Students manifest gendered border work by adopting quite polarized and gendered social behaviours that created tensions in the classroom interactions. As shown in Chapter Three and earlier in this chapter, these tensions cause inequalities among the students when the access to shared activities, meaning-making and practicing agency is compromised. Despite a great amount of time spent to negotiate a shared understanding of the social rules in the BoM classroom, some students continued to contest the rules every week.

For the girls' group in Phase Two, the social-interaction tensions that, in phase Phase One, seemed to limit participation in terms of the use of student voice, mobility, time and physical space, no longer existed. As mentioned earlier in discussing the use of student voice, the atmosphere appeared to be relaxed and focused and all the students engaged in the activities equally. The social changes in the environment came up later, in the girls' stimulated-recall interviews:

Veronika   *It feels easier because you [teacher] don't all the time have to discipline the boys...*

Iris   *When the boys were here, we couldn't learn so much...*

Ester   *You had to, all the time, interrupt... "no, please don't do that", if they [the boys] were doing something stupid...*

Rebecka   *It always took a half of the lesson to calm them [the boys] down...*

As noted before, in this particular BoM classroom, the use of mobility and physical space was clearly gendered. The boys were extremely mobile and used physical space freely by, for example, running around, laying on the floor or wrestling with each other. The girls' use of mobility and physical space, instead, was disciplined and they never did not take such liberties. The literature explains, the differences in the social behaviours between the girls and the boys, for example, in respect to cultural demands for self-control regulating girls' actions (e.g. Gordon 2006a), and girls being more aware about teacher's expectations (e.g. Käyhkö 2011). Research also suggests that teacher's expectations are different depending on student gender, allowing more freedom for boys than girls (e.g. Skelton & Francis 2009; Renold 2001; Maynard 2002).

Additionally, in Phase One, the girls had in common that in their social interactions, they managed to avoid conflicts. In Phase Two, this trend seemed to continue. However, in the third lesson of Phase Two, Rebecka and Julia ran into a small conflict about the use of physical space. While we were discussing the concept of key signatures, they suddenly started to kick each other. It took a while to convince them to stop their quarrelling.

Anna	Okay, let's figure out how the key system works…
Julia	Are we talking about major or minor keys?
Anna	Actually both. The keys… Hey, Rebecka and Julia, please don't kick. Hey… we already discussed this earlier… Hey…let's make some more space… [I rearrange Rebecka and Julia's seats.]
Julia	I prefer sitting here…
Anna	Are you sure? You can also come here.
Julia	No, I'd like to stay here.
Anna	Okay, but then please don't wiggle your legs in someone else's space… let's just move your chair a bit further… [To Rebecka who still continues the kicking:] Hey, no need to keep on wiggling in someone else's space, okay…
Ada	In someone else's space…! [Laughing.]
Anna	Okay, look… last time, when we spoke about major scales, we found out that… Rebecka, Sweetie, please don't do that anymore. [Rebecka is still kicking.]
Rebecka	It doesn't even hit her…
Anna	Maybe not, but it irritates Julia. Hey, Rebecka… Sweetie… Look, if it irritates the other, it's a good reason to stop. Here you go. And Julia, could you please get up? [Rebecka still continues the kicking.] Hey Rebecka, could you please stop now, because it's irritating. You don't need to do that. Okay?
Lily	"She irritates me"… [Lily imitates Julia.]
Anna	Hey Lily, let's not continue anymore… Where was I? Building a The major scale builds up…

Obviously, this was just only a small quarrel, presumably nothing extraordinary in any classroom. It does, however, demonstrate that rejection or and exclusion also belong to the social realm of girls (Hopearuoho-Saajala & Keskinen 1998). It is worth noting here because, as discussed above, in the girls' group, the Phase Two change in the classroom culture was notable and enabled more equal participation among the students. Moreover, it also seemed to create a new kind of social space in this particular context for negotiating identities, such as what being a 'girl' implied, and for expressing feelings, even if they were negative ones. Hence, even though a quarrel is not desirable, in my interpretation in this case, the message behind it was revealing – that it is legitimate to expressing feelings. Although it is not possible to make any generalizations beyond this particular classroom, for these girls, moving to the girl-only group offered a learning space with a wider range of possibilities to act and interact when engaging in the shared activities.

Boys and the use of mobility, time and physical space

In terms of the use of mobility, time and physical space, Phase Two did not at first bring any changes to the social interaction in the boys' group. The 'mobile boys', who had a desire for physical contacts, were still acting up. The first three Phase Two lessons comprised many social ups and downs, and it required determination to turn the situation around. However, as shown above in episodes taken from previous lessons, the boys themselves, little by little, started to renegotiate the conditions of their learning environment by protesting against the distractions. Especially, the way that some students repeatedly dominated the use of time for the rest of the group evoked protests. Gradually the tensions due to the student underlife (Goffman 1961) maintained by some of the boys led into positive changes in the boys' social life of in the BoM classroom. These conversations were dealt with earlier in this chapter when discussing the use of student voice, so I will not address them again here.

From a teacher perspective in this particular BoM classroom, dealing with the almost overwhelming 'mobility' of some boys was at times troublesome and required constant balancing with the expectations of acceptable behaviour. I deliberately aimed at facilitating a semiformal, laboratory-like learning environment that would invite the students to explore music and exchange opinions in a free manner, to play and experiment in order to gain a sense of agency, a sense of being able to 'do things' with music. This kind of freedom, however, comes with responsibility. Particularly in a classroom- based learning, some students' freedoms should not limit the freedom of the others to engage in the shared activities and the processes of learning (see also Anttila 2003, 303). Hence, what one should do with the given freedoms was a topic of many our conversations when negotiating the social practices in the BoM classroom. In some classrooms, such social sensibility comes naturally; in other classrooms, it requires constant practice. All in all, the children's interactions in this BoM classroom often made me think that the complications in the social behaviours were not that as much about real differences, as such as they were, but rather about holding gendered beliefs and preconceptions due to gendered border work.

4.2 Holding gendered beliefs and preconceptions

In this study, the BoM classroom is examined as a children's music-learning community (Wenger 1998/2003; 2002) but and also as a local community of femininity and masculinity practices (Paechter 2006). In such a contextualized community of practice, femininities and masculinities are negotiated collectively and in relation to various kinds of outside influences, conceptions and representations (Paechter 2006). These transforming and interrelated inner and outer influences construct an ever-changing, localized and shared view about what is fundamental to being a girl or a boy in this a particular context (ibid.). In these negotiations, when falling into gendered border work (Thorne 1993; Bredesen 2004; Paechter 2006; Connell 2009; Berg 2010), femininity is directly defined directly in juxtaposition to masculinity (Paechter 2006, 366-367). In the BoM classroom, such polarizations often seemed to originate, not from the differences as such, but from the holding of gendered beliefs and preconceptions.

The next episode depicts well the juxtaposition driven by gendered border work. It is taken from a group work situation, in which the children were collectively trying to picking a topic for an upcoming music composition assignment. They were asked to collectively come up with an animal, explore its characteristic features and create a small performance using mime.

Veronika	Okay, which animal then?
Amos	A human, a human...
Veronika	It's not an animal...
Ester	A dog. It's an animal. Or what then?
Julius	A human.
Amos	Hey, let's be Minimoys. [Laughing.] They are little elves...
Veronika	Let's be goblins. You namely look like one...
Ester	Let's be penguins...
Jonas	Let's be sharks...
Amos	Yeah, sharks that play rock, ding, di-ding, di-ding, di...
Ester	Okay, that is a penguin then?
Max	Yeah, but we have just ten minutes left...
Ester	Well what then?
Jack	Let's be a dog, or a cat, or a horse, or an elephant...
Julius	A human.
Amos	A monkey... I know what we could be...
Ester	What then?
Amos	Let's be "a little beetle passes here"... let's be worms... let's be... let's be

rappers... oh yeah...

Ester   *Hey, any animal now! [Lots of simultaneous suggestions...]*

Amos   *Hey, now I know, I know... a human!*

Veronika Hey, really! You are going to loose that bet...

Amos   *Really, everybody now... [Amos apes Veronika's voice...]*

Veronika You are going to loose our bet...

Ester   *Yeah, we made a bet with that... [Ester points at Amos...] whether the boys can behave or not...*

Veronika Penguin?

Amos   *No!*

Jack   *A dog?*

Veronika Not a dog...

Amos   *No... [However, everybody starts to practice a 'penguin-walk'.]*

Jack   *A horse?*

Amos   *Let's be penguins. Kviik, kviik... just for your knowledge: this is a penguin.*

Veronika What ever... let's be penguins then.

Ester   *We are penguins. [Lots of simultaneous talk.]*

Jack   *What if they'd walk somewhere and the whole ice would crack?*

Amos   *I'm dying... yeah but we are not penguins. Let's be rather be...say... mammoths... mammoths, mammoths...*

This conversation was carried out when I was working elsewhere with half of the group and was not present in the classroom. It appears to be a typical gendered border work situation that involved power negotiations among the children. It looks as if the girls and the boys would have disagreed and taken an oppositional stand only just on principle, in order to maintain a the gendered groupings and draw a line within the group between the girls and the boys.

This was also confirmed by Ester:

Boys think that they ought not to agree with our ideas just because we are girls... because we are so different and like such different things...

And Julia continued:

Even if they [the boys] liked the idea they just don't want to agree with the girls...

In the second group, the situation was looking quite the same:

Lily   Okay, James Bond is not an animal…

Emil   An elephant…

Jonas   Nah…nothing with ears…

Emil   A frog…

Iris   No…[Matt plays secret agent in the background.]

Matt   I'm a monkey…

Lily   Let's pick monkey…monkey is a cute animal…[Laughter.]

Matt   Okay, I'm a monkey…

Emil   A gorilla…

Jonas   Nah…

Emil   Let's pick a beaver then…

Matt   Yeah, a beaver…[Matt starts immediately to play beaver.]

Lily   An elephant…[Laughter.]

Filip   A lizard then…

Iris   No…

Lily   An elephant…

Jonas   No…

Emil   A hippo…

Matt   A hippo?

Emil   Just a suggestion…well, a panther then…

Ada   Nope…

Emil   A leopard…

Lily   No…Hey, you're going to loose the bet…

Matt   Well, who came up with this?

Iris   I don't wanna' imitate any…

Lily   A turtle…how could we imitate a turtle? I know, we can be like this…
          [Two of the students try to imitate turtles…]

Emil   Turtles are not that high…I suppose they are this high…[Three more
          students start to imitate turtles.]

Emil   A lizard…

Lily   No!

Emil   A snake…

Lily   No!

Filip   Let's vote…

Jonas   Yeah, let's vote…

Matt   Okay, I'm going to be an ape anyway…

Jonas   I'm not in…

Emil	An owl, a hawk, an eagle…
Lily	[To Jonas:] You don't accept anything…
Emil	Okay…this is simple…
Matt	I can be a tree…
Lily	You don't even try…Hey, really…
Emil	Really now…Stop…Cut the hassle…
Matt	Hey, I could tell a joke…
Ada	This doesn't help…you're just mixing everything up…
Emil	We don't get anything done, if you don't stop…[Some boys are hassling around.]

Also in this group, the negotiation seemed to keep breaking down because of gendered border work. However, Emil who worked with this group, was consistent in his agency and was in cooperating with everybody and following his personal preferences rather than just falling into gendered groupings.

In the stimulated recall interview, Emil reflects:

Well, they [girls] have a little bit different taste... that's why it was so difficult... they [the girls] wanted us to be bunnies or something... that would have been fine by me, but the others thought that it was lousy...

And later:

Well, you know, I accepted quite many of the proposals that the girls made... some of them were a little... say, I for example, I suggested a hippo... but as an example, had they proposed a hawk or a chicken... well, I think I wouldn't have accepted a chicken right away...

Emil's agency in acting and interacting with others importantly refers to something that salient when trying to understand children's gendered negotiations; namely that gendered border work is situational. Gender differences are emphasized in some situations and overridden in others. As discussed in Chapter 1.3, the recent literature suggests that children do not socialize to in gendered categories passively, but create agency in gender by stepping in and out of these conventionalized categories (Thorne 1993; Bredesen 2004; Paechter 2006; Connell 2009; Berg 2010). Consequently, gendered border work is important per se, because it is a part of the natural process of growing up. However, when not addressed in the social life of a classroom, it easily causes polarization, emphasizing stereotypical groupings rather than individual thinking. Also here, maintaining the

gendered groupings seemed to be more important than acting according to personal likes, even if it meant accepting proposals that came 'from the other side'.

Phase Two of the research project reinforced my impressions about the polarization, which from time to time complicated the cooperation among the children when working all together. Although, the children themselves had recognized that the girls and the boys simply had a different taste from each other; it looked as if the choices they made were driven by the desire to maintain the groupings rather than by the aesthetic views. Now in Phase Two, when working in the groups of girls and boys, the students in both groups interestingly made similar kinds of choices when not knowing of the choices made by the other group. Both the girls and the boys, for example, settled upon composing the story of the penguins just because it generated more musical ideas for the composition.

Although the gendered beliefs and preconceptions neither directed the making of choices, nor did they drive the classroom interactions in the same manner as in Phase One, I still think that they were evident in the children's own conceptions about different behaviours that were, in their mind, expected from the girls and the boys, respectively in the educational contexts. In next section, I am discussing how the children balanced between their own expectations, my expectations as their teacher, the cultural demands and the localized understandings of group masculinity and femininity, when negotiating learner identities in this particular BoM classroom.

4.3 Shifting between 'good student' and 'rebel student' identities

So far, I have discussed the different modes of participation that sometimes even caused inequalities among the students, and the complications in the interactions due to holding gendered beliefs and pre-conceptions, both between the gendered groupings and inside the groups of girls and boys. The third salient feature that characterized the social interaction in the BoM classroom was the gendered polarization between the girls and the boys in adopting learner identities. In Chapter 4.1, I addressed the use of voice, mobility, time and physical space related to situations in which the students negotiated access to participation. In addition, two different forms of underlife (Goffman 1961) emerged when students adopted one of two polarized identities, the so-called 'good student' or 'rebel student'.

These two identities often follow according to gender identities, that is girls and boys respectively adopt the 'good student' and 'rebel student'. Similarly, Becky Francis (1998, 2000) has identified a sensible/silly dichotomy in English classrooms, suggesting that primary school -age children construct the two genders as oppositional. The female

construction is valued with 'sensible' qualities. Girls are expected to be mature, obedient, neat, selflessly giving and facilitating. The masculine construction involves 'silly' qualities. Boys are identified as immature, messy, and naughty, selfishly taking and demanding (Francis 1998; Paechter 2006). According to Paechter (2006), constructing group versions of femininity or masculinity does not mean that they are monolithic or all-embracing. Drawing from Ali (2003), she claims that some aspects of group femininity or group masculinity, however, cross settings, class and ethnic boundaries "with the overarching effect of distinguishing girls from boys" (p. 367). These dichotomies are not only pervasive in the ways that children understand femininity and masculinity, but are also common to teachers and widespread in the society, Paechter (2006) claims.

As discussed earlier, in this particular BoM classroom, the learner identities adopted by the girls and the boys appeared to be gender-specific and even consistent. Moreover, both the girls and the boys seemed to have gendered beliefs not just about the 'other side', but also about themselves as a group. In that way, these localized and shared understandings seemed to define their ways of engagement also inside the groups, emphasizing the classroom polarization (see Chapter 1.3).

4.3.1 The double-edged sword of being a 'good student'

As shown above, the girls effortlessly adopted the role of a so-called 'good student'. They were focused, engaged in all the shared activities and did not cause distractions. However, the findings indicate that their access to participation was at times limited. The majority of the boys, instead, engaged in the shared activities selectively. They dominated the classroom talking (see Table 3, Chapter 4.2.1) and the use of mobility, time and physical space by repeatedly interrupting the shared activities, generally compromising the participation for others. Evidently, in these situations, the girls were marginalized to a bystander role. In the stimulated-recall group interview, I asked what would make a nice learning environment; Ester and Iris reflected:

Ester	*Well… um… that it was peaceful… that the others wouldn't bug… peace…*
Iris	*Yeah, same as Ester…*
Anna	*That it would be peaceful?*
Iris	*Yeah…*

Consequently, the girls' view and their role of a 'good student' are not unambiguous. Despite girls often being recognized as the 'good students', a number of studies suggest that the image of an active, exploring and learning child is a masculine-one; this masculine

characterization can make it difficult for girls to adopt the identity of an active learner [or a learning agent] in a classroom (Walkerdine 1984; Renold 2001; Skelton & Francis 2002; Gordon 2006a; Paetcher 2006). Instead, girls often adopt quasi-teacher roles keeping an eye on boys (Walkerdine 1984; Paechter 2006). Moreover, although girls often display cultural literacy (Schirato & Yell 2000), a recognizetion of the social rules, and have a sense for negotiating those rules, the BoM-classroom girls' reflections also revealed a sense of powerlessness and frustration being marginalized.

The following episode demonstrates how the girls monitored the boys while they were all trying to finish a group assignment. After a long negotiation, the group managed to choose a penguin as their animal topic. Outside the classroom before the lesson even started, the girls had made a bet with the boys that they would not be able to behave during the lesson. Since the group assignment did not quite progress as they were hoping, the girls reminded the boys about the bet and tried to persuade them into cooperating and finishing the task. The girls' 'sweeat talk' already started in the previous episode in (discussed in Chapter 4.2); the bet ends here with the acknowledgement that the boys have now lost the bet.

Ester	*All right, everybody... let's practice...*
Julius	*Let's do first like this and then...*
Jack	*No, it doesn't work...*
Veronika	*We have like three seconds, three seconds... and you think we can perform this? [Some of the boys are fooling around...] Hey please...*
Ester	*Hey really... look at those... [Ester is pointing at the boys.]*
Julius	*You did that stupid Michael Jackson -thing... [Laughing.]*
Ester	*Hey, come here now... Hey, you are being really stupid...*
Amos	*Okay, once more and then we are ready...*
Jack	*And then just a bit of improvisation if it doesn't work...*
Veronika	*And remember to join us right when they get off the water... Hey, you can't talk... [Some of the boys are dancing around the classroom...] you were supposed to go there, and you shouldn't keep making noise... we'll see if you'll make it then [in the performance]...*
Amos	*Okay... once again...*
Julius	*We still have... [Julius points at his watch...]*
Amos	*Okay, ready... go!*
Julius	*We have thirty seconds minus-time...*
Veronika	*You are so losing your bet now! Sorry, but you already lost the bet...*
Amos	*Really? Silencio! I have for a second time lost a bet to a girl!*
Veronika	*You all lost the bet to the girls! Little embarrassing, isn't it?*

Obviously here, the access to the mutual negotiation and shaping of the meanings (Wenger, 1998/2003) was compromised due to a power struggle caused by gendered border work. The interaction lacked mutual respect and a sense of community; and, despite of their efforts, the boys did not take the girls' suggestions seriously. The girls' attempts to adopt a quasi-teacher role did not pay off either. On the contrary, it only seemed to emphasize the polarization.

In Phase One, practicing self-control clearly distinguished the girls from the more mobile and noisy boys. However, their restraint tended to marginalize them in the situations in which the boys dominated the classroom interactions. As discussed earlier, Wenger (1998/2003) suggests that identities are constructed through the practices in which we engage in, but as importantly, through the practices we do not. Hence, not participating in the boys' doings could be seen, for one, as a means for negotiating the collective understanding of group femininity in the BoM classroom. Another sensible way to look at the girls' restraint would be to understand it as a form of underlife (Goffman 1961), that is, as an attempt to fit into the existing institutional structures, norms and practices that were under negotiation in the BoM classroom.

4.3.2 The vulnerable 'rebels'

Looking from a perspective of teaching practice, the word that best descibed these particular boys' engagements in the BoM classroom was 'unpredictability'. Although I have discussed the subject of the rebellious behaviour of some of the boys many times, a single lesson might include both quite very promising interactions and quite challenging ones. A boy shifting between the identity of a 'good student' and a 'rebel student' was confirmed in three ways. First, the boys repeatedly caused conflicts by creating distractions during the shared activities. Although these conflicts always ended in a mutual agreement about the social rules that one should follow during the lessons, some of the boys repeated the pattern in every lesson. Secondly, the girls confirmed that the role of the boys was rebellious when they made a bet that the boys likely would not be able to behave during the lesson. And thirdly, interestingly enough, two of the boys themselves pushed me to identify them as 'rebel' students.

> Matt   Which do you like more, girls or boys?
> Anna   Oh... both are equally nice.
> Matt   We are naughty... look, I'm touching this... [Matt plays 'naughty'.]
> Anna   Okay... well, to how many would you count in this next piece?
> Jack   I want you to consider us stupid.

Anna	Excuse me?
Jack	I want you to consider us stupid.
Anna	Stupid? Why would you want that?
Jack	Because.
Anna	Hey come on... [laughing]... I was wondering to how many does one count in this next...
Jack	My parents consider me stupid.
Anna	What? Who do...?
Jack	My parents do.
Anna	Your parents consider you stupid? No they don't.
Jack	My father does... he hates me and thinks I'm lazy...
Max	My older brother considers me awfully stupid...
Anna	Hey, I am sure they don't... they consider you really smart...

The previous week's lesson had been quite restless and we had had a long talk about how to turn around the situation around in order to promote a cosy learning environment. Thus, Matt's questioning me: "Which do you like more, girls or boys?", was perhaps was a follow-up to that conversation. In turn, Jack's comment, about wanting me to consider them stupid, took me by a surprise. He obviously wanted to be identified as a rebel, one but at the same time, he exposed his vulnerability, especially when talking about his father. He was quite a visible figure in the classroom, and, in that way, had a notable role when negotiating the collective understanding of group masculinity among the boys. Hence, a student building up a learner identity does not take place only in the relation to the teachers and curriculum, but also in the social spaces of classrooms, playgrounds, peer groups, homes and other places outside school. Furthermore, Jack's comments leave room to suggest that he may have been struggling with low self-esteem, which came out as an attempts to seek attention from the others with rebellious behaviour. Indeed, when studying boys in educational contexts, Francis (1999) was able to identify a 'laddish' construction of masculinity, and found it to be invested with high peer- group status in the secondary- and even in the primary- schooling (see also Skelton & Francis 2009). According to Francis (1999), 'laddish' behaviours in the classroom are disruptive and as such complicate classroom-based learning.

Thus, the boys' intensity in contributing to the shared activities varied a lot, shifting from quite rebellious behaviours to showing a notable learning agency. The following episode depicts Amos, Max and Emil actively cooperating and solving the a task together: conducting a rhythmic dictation. Halfway through the exercise, Jonas also joins in by clapping the pattern with the others.

Amos	*[Amos claps a rhythm...] I got it right! ... Because "daaa-da-daa-"...* *[4/4 ♩ ♪♩ 𝄽]... Hey!*
Amos	*Hey, Anna, I got it right! Anna, I got it...*
Max	*Jeah, jeah, you did it the same way as I did... [Max shows his dictation to* *Amos. Both are laughing.]*
Amos	*Nope, I corrected mine... [Amos claps and reads the pattern 4/4 ♩ ♪♩ 𝄽 with* *the rhythmic syllables.]*
Emil	*It should be "daaa-da-daa-" [Emil claps the pattern once again.]* *[Now Amos and Max clap the rhythm 4/4 ♩ ♪♩ 𝄽 together and also* *Jonas joins in...]*
Emil	*No, it's instead "daaa-da-daa-ZUK!" [Emil claps the rhythm and opens his* *arms when saying 'zuk' in order to demonstrate the rest in at the end of* *the bar. Max claps along.]*
Max	*Daa-daa...*
Emil	*Yeah, but the last-one is only the beat... [Emil continues clapping...]*
Emil	*It goes like this... [Emil claps the rhythm and simultaneously adds the beat to* *with his feet...]*
Max	*I wanna' show, I wanna' show, Anna please come... or... [Max lifts his book,* *wanting to show his solution.]*

The episode demonstrates how the boys indeed were capable of collaboration when committed to the shared activities. When Amos and Max did not seem to get the pattern right, Emil started to coach them, at first, verbally by clapping the pattern simultaneously. When Amos and Max still did not observe the quarter-rest at the end of the bar, Emil added the beat with his feet in order to make his demonstration even more effective, and it paid off. Halfway through the episode, Jonas, who was sitting at the table with everyone, also joined in the collaborative pattern clapping. So, the episode evidently also involved a moment of peer learning.

I have suggested that, in the BoM classroom, students manifested the localized femininity and masculinity practices by adopting polarized learner identities. The femininity practices involved sensible and restrained 'good-student' behaviours, whereas the masculinity practice allowed far more liberties in terms of social interaction, even and involving rebellious behaviours. It could be suggested that these dichotomic student roles could partly be explained by children falling into gendered border work (e.g. Thorne 1993). In order to maintain the gender groupings, the girls had a need to stand out and identify themselves as learners differently from the boys; likewise, the boys identified themselves differently from the girls, even if it implied adopting the 'rebel student' identity. Standing out individually appeared to be complicated when the group identities

were emphasized. However, as Emil's example shows, it also was possible to perform masculinities differently and to make individual choices.

4.4 Summary

To summarize this chapter, I have argued that, in the BoM classroom under study, gendered border work (e.g. Thorne 1993) interfered in the processes of learning when students adopted gender- based learner identities (Gordon 2006a) and held gendered beliefs and pre-conceptions. Gender- based learner identities were evident in the different uses of student voice, mobility, time and physical space between the girls and the boys. Moreover, they were manifested when girls and boys respectively adopted so-called 'good student' and 'rebel student' identities. In the gendered border work -situations, students often negotiated the femininity and masculinity practices (Paetcher 2006) in a juxtaposition to one another, causing social boundaries. These boundaries complicated the forming of memberships (Wenger 1998/2003), hindering the a sense of community from developing; at least my preferred form of community in which everybody could have practiced their agency equally. Evidently, in the social space of underlife, some of the boys constructed their own masculinity community of practice. However, not everybody had an access to their community. Among some students, this complication showed as restlessness and incapability to notice the needs of others in the processes of learning. In particular, the use of student voice divided the girls and the boys, restricting the access to contributing to shared meaning-making and the gaining of ownership of meaning (ibid.), thus causing learning inequalities.

Despite these complications and inequalities, the students learned to cooperate and renegotiate the norms and practices in the BoM classroom. In Phase One, when working as with everybody together, the interaction varied from times of concentration and cooperation to times of distractions and conflicts. All along, the girls showed more cultural literacy (Schirato & Yell 2000) and sensibility in the social situations when engaging in the classroom discursive practices. Yet, their performing of 'good student' identities was not entirely unproblematic when they tried to balance between the others' needs and expectations and their own. In terms of learning environment in Phase Two, when working in the groups of girls and boys, in terms of learning environment, the positive change was notable and immediate in the girls' group, offering a wider range of possibilities to participate and practice musical agency. In the boys' group, the process of negotiating new norms and shared practices took place gradually. After many joint conversations, the crucial impulse for renegotiating the classroom culture came from the boys themselves.

In that way, the forms of student underlife (Goffman 1961) that had particularly in phase one caused tensions and conflicts among the students in Phase One resulted in a gradual social change in the boys' BoM classroom.

In the next chapter, I will discuss the multi-voicedness of the BoM classroom, and the happenings within the classroom discourse that allowed for the crossing of gendered boundaries.

5 The BoM classroom reaching for social change

In Chapter Four, I examined the interactions in the BoM classroom in Phase One, when working with everybody together, and in Phase Two, when working in the groups of girls and boys. My used the constructed themes: 1) modes of participation; 2) holding gendered beliefs and preconceptions; and 3) shifting between 'good student' and 'rebel student' identities. These three themes allowed me to recognize and isolate events and manifestations of the children's gendered negotiations that, in my mind, directed the construction of memberships and ownership of meaning among the children participating in BoM. These events significantly revealed tensions and conflicts among the children when the localized femininity and masculinity practices (Paechter 2006) were negotiated in juxtaposition to one another due to falling into gendered border work (e.g. Thorne 1993). However, the events also demonstrated moments of intensive cooperation when engaging in shared activities, and situations in which the tensions of student underlife (Goffman 1961) led into negotiating new, positive kinds of norms and practices in the BoM classroom.

In this chapter, I focus on the multi-voicedness in the BoM classroom, and the potentials for bridging the multiple social spaces and, potentials for third space (Gutierrez et al. 1995), in order to promote transformation and social change in learning. As discussed in Chapter 1.4, this study understands agency to include one's own conceptions about the range of possibilities to act and interact socially. Some philosophers have argued that the idea of agency also refers to one's capability for self-reflection and self-evaluation (e.g. Taylor 1998). Gendered agency can be conceptualized as constructed through our experiences and accumulated knowledge about gender; in that way, gendered agency connects the processes of identity work to the systems of power that operate in everyday activity, like for example, in the social life of the BoM classroom (McNay 2004).

5.1 'Emma' and 'Amos': Two constructed narratives

This study adopts a standpoint that one's own conceptions about the range of possibilities to act and interact socially are crucial for gaining a sense of agency. Therefore, children's own experiences should be noticed when trying to understand their interaction in the social spaces of learning. According to creativity researcher Mihály Csíkszentmihályi (1990), in children's music education too much emphasis is put on the ways children perform in children's music education, at the same time, overlooking what they children experience. In this study, I aim to give voice to the children themselves in order that they

may reflect on their own learning. The following two constructed characters of 'Emma' and 'Amos' are an attempt to further do so.

The narratives of 'Emma' and 'Amos' reveal children's own reflections about their experiences of the social interaction when participating in BoM. I constructed the narratives using both the group- and the individual stimulated-recall interviews of Phase One; so, they consist of the reflections of several children. I have chosen to present these narratives for two reasons. First, despite their polarization and even provocativeness, they actually serve as to bringing out the flavour of the sometimes ambivalent nature of children's gendered interaction and of what gendered border work may be about. Secondly, their juxtaposition illuminates children's capabilities for making insightful observations when reflecting on themselves as well as on the others.

Here, 'Emma' reflects about the social life in the BoM classroom:

I've been sitting here for a while now. Waiting. I don't mind. Well, actually, I do mind. In fact, I mind a lot. This waiting is making me very cross. Just like always, I'm sitting on my chair and waiting for the boys to calm down. We all do, the girls I mean. The teacher is trying to get on with the lesson. She keeps starting all over again from the beginning, but the boys keep interrupting her. But I know the beginning already – I've heard it three times now. Now she is getting a little bit cross and starts shouting. She is shouting at the boys, but sometimes it feels as if she is cross at us, too, although we're just sitting and waiting nicely and quietly. Anyway, the class is ruined now.

Now the teacher starts again, for the fourth time. The boys keep trying to impress us by doing what they always do. Because that's what it's all about. They think they are so cool when they're being naughty. And they don't mind when the teacher gets cross at with them. But they don't fool me. I think that they are just pretending to be naughty. Because I've noticed that they're never naughty when they're on their own. It's only when they've got an audience. But sometimes it's really annoying when we have to stop doing something that is really nice just because of the boys. Like today, when we were doing percussion with the dish brushes. The boys were mainly sword fighting with each other.

I would never act like that, not even if I wanted to. But I think the boys just think that we're so different from them. Their games are a bit rough. Yeah, I wouldn't play in all of them. Maybe if they just tried out some of our games they'd realize we're actually not very different from each other. What is different, though, is our

121

taste. We like cute things. The boys don't. They would never draw something that's cute. It would be far too embarrassing.

And that's what they hate most of all – getting embarrassed in front of the girls. I can understand that. I wouldn't want to get embarrassed in front of them, either. The thing is, I think, that the boys don't dare to show their feelings to us. If they're happy or sad, it's just too awkward. Sometimes I've seen some of the boys trying not to cry, when they've hurt themselves. I think that's sad.

This noise is starting to get to me. It's so tiring and it's getting a little bit hard to concentrate on the class. But the most difficult thing is when we have to work in groups. That really doesn't work at all. It never does. Sometimes I feel that the boys only want to disagree with us just because they're boys and we're girls. They just can't accept our ideas because they are ours. Every time we suggest something they just say no. And usually after a while, we give up and accept one of their ideas, just to get the job done. See, we really want to get it done, and sometimes we beg the boys to behave themselves, even for a day.

The reflections made by the girls in the stimulated recall group and individual interviews after Phase One illustrate how the uneven power was distribution in the BoM classroom in phase one when working as a whole class. The girls expressed their frustration about that their having their access to full participation being was limited by the disturbances.

Having the boys around we don't learn anything, because they are just yelling and being noisy... (Emma)

You had to all the time interrupt... "no, please don't do that", if they [the boys] were doing something stupid... (Ester)

Usually we eventually give in to their suggestions... cause we don't want to argue... (Ester)

In the lessons, the girls adopted the identity of the 'good student', showing consistent self-control in situations in which some of the boys kept interrupting the classroom activities, leaving the rest of the class to a role of a bystander.

I wouldn't have the nerve to get wild and ramble around in the classroom when the boys are here. The boys, instead, have the nerve... trying to impress the others. (Veronika)

It was however only later in the stimulated recall interview that the girls expressed how irritated they actually felt about the situation. Hence, expressing those feelings and claiming for social space on-site, that is, in the classroom during the lessons, did not seem to be within their reach.

It's really annoying when someone is bugging... (Ester)
Yeah, cause you just want to go on, but then... cause they [the boys] were so noisy we couldn't do it... (Lily)

When analysing the causes for the disruptiveness, individual girls made quite straightforward assumptions about themselves and about the boys as unified groups, about their likes in general, and about their attitudes towards learning.

Well, of course their [the boys'] games are different... (Lily)

Girls are more sensible... girls draw all kinds of cute things... the boys think it's awkward and don't do it even if they wanted to... (Julia)

Boys think that they ought not to agree with our ideas just because we are girls... because we are so different and like so different things... (Ester)

Even if they [the boys] liked the idea they just don't want to agree with the girls... (Julia)

At the same time, however, they tried to come up with some ways to explore and experiment with the activities that commonly were thought to belong to the realm of boys, and to invite the boys to do the same.

Yeah... the boys should also try out the games we like... cause they can't know what they are like, since they've never tried them... (Ester)

They saw the boys' vulnerability under the surface of boys and showed empathy about the situations in which some boys, in their mind, did not dare to show their true emotions or likes.

The boys just play thug... (Lily)
They [boys] think that the girls and the boys have different rules... like that they [the boys] ought not to cry in affront of the others... 'cause that's something the girls do... (Ester)
It feels sad to see someone [a boy] trying to hold his tears... (Lily)

'Amos' might see the things from a slightly different angle:

Ten more minutes to go. I have to leave a little bit early because of football practice. It has been a little bit noisy in here today. The lesson I mean. I feel a bit ashamed about it. Six more minutes. I have to remember to take my guitar when I leave. I kind of like it in here when we actually do something. When we play together or compose our own music. But I'd rather skip the theory part. I know I should work harder and behave myself more, but I'm thinking about other things. I think most of the boys feel the same.

The girls are better in that way at least. They are clever enough to concentrate on doing their work. They don't play around like we boys do. I suppose they don't want to. Or perhaps the older girls do... anyway, they care more about what the teacher says. That seems to be important to them. I don't think too much about it. Sometimes the girls try to calm me down as well. They ask, why don't you just stop playing around before the teacher comes? But it's too much fun. I'd much rather take the risk. And I always stop, eventually. Just not straight away.

The girls are more organized than we are. They always have their things, textbooks and pencil cases, with them. And they never forget to do their homework. They work harder and they make more effort with what they're doing. Maybe that's why they do better in on the tests as well. They're even better than us at handwriting. I'd much rather play football if I had a choice. Or computer games. Although, I do like doing projects that don't go on too long. Maybe I'm not patient enough. Of course, I'm only talking about me. There are actually a couple of boys in our class who really seem to be interested in what we're doing in here, I mean, the theory and everything.

Earlier today we were working in groups composing together. It got a little bit noisy. There were, like, two sides, the girls' side versus the boys' side, and everybody was just shouting. It's just that we like such different things. The girls don't like the wild stuff. I could accept some of their ideas but not all of them. When we had a vote, some of the boys put up their hands, so I did too. Eventually the teacher had to help us to decide which ideas to pick.

I suppose the girls are a little bit more flexible than us, though. They work together better, and get their work done. It looks like it's easier for them to say yes to other people's ideas. Maybe they are more open to different suggestions. To be honest,

the boys' groups don't work together so well. I think it's because we're competing with each other. And we don't care if we don't finish our work. Usually, when it starts to get out of hand, the girls try to calm us down. Like last week when we made a bet. The girls said that they bet we can't behave through the whole lesson. Well, they were right. We lost.

The boys' reflections painted a little different picture. In addition to reflecting on the social interactions in the BoM classroom and on their own engagements that they always were not so proud of, they also talked about their interests and likes outside the sites of formal learning. In general, they saw girls as academically able and more organized and hard-working than themselves.

...Like the boys in our [elementary school] class, they just want to get out and play soccer and so... they don't care too much whether they learn or not... and then when we have tests and all, they don't do so well... but the girls go, like, "Hey, I know this... it goes like this... this is easy"... and the boys, because they haven't been practicing, they go, like, "Help, I don't know this"... (Amos)

...Well, it was a bit like... like that, for example I... I kind of wanted to make the others laugh... and they just came along. The girls then couldn't get their good ideas through... they just couldn't speak out... (Amos)

Furthermore, they considered the girls generally more flexible and cooperative than themselves; they thought this was due to competition between the boys.

...'Cause boys, well, our cooperation doesn't work, their [the girls'] works better... Our cooperation doesn't work at all... (Amos)

...Girls accept easier the ideas of the other's... (Jonas)

Like the girls, they made generalizations about girls as a unified group, but also about themselves, and considered girls as simply having a different taste from boys.

...Well, they [the girls] have a little bit different taste... that's why it was so difficult... they [the girls] wanted us to be bunnies or something... that would have been fine by me, but the others thought that it was lousy... (Emil)

...We like kind of wild stuff and they [the girls] don't want to go along with it... (Max)

They reasoned that there were situations in which the girls tried to, in vain, to restrain the boys' behaviour. Further, the boys said that, although it perhaps was not smart, it just was too much fun to play around. Besides, they claimed, the teachers' feedback did not worry them so much.

...The girls said that it might be wise to calm down a bit before I get a marking... well, usually I do, but not just straight away... I don't care so much if I get a marking... (Amos)

In their opinion, the girls, instead, paid far more attention to the teachers' opinion, and tried to convince the boys to do the same.

[The girls don't participate in acting wild] because they might think that when the teacher comes to the classroom... [Imitates the girls.] "Hmm... we might get a marking, so lets act reasonable"...and so they don't do it... (Amos)

Consequently, both the girls and boys' reflections illuminated the social dynamics, which seemed to direct the interactions in the BoM classroom. To me, in some respect, the emphasis and the ambiance of their reflections differed from one to another. The girls seemed to concentrate more on boys' actions and talked less about themselves. Their most prevalent feeling appeared to be resentment (with the notion thats of the boys not were not able to fool them) about being socially excluded in some situations. Consequently, the girls seemed to experience that their range of possibilities to act and interact socially was limited. Therefore, it could be argued that their sense of agency was more limited, too. The boys, on the other hand, talked more about themselves and their personal likes. They complimented the girls' academic efforts, but at the same time expressed that investing in school work was not their priority. Nothing in their narrations implied that they had experienced any limitations in terms of sense of agency. However, as illustrated in Chapter Four, the situation was not that straightforward and twofold; some of the boys wanted to participate in the classroom discourse actively; therefore their possibilities to act and interact socially was, however, limited at times.

5.2 Bridging the multi-voiced social spaces

The almost overwhelming multi-voicedness of the BoM classroom has been one of the main topics in this inquiry. Supporting the students' negotiations of memberships and ownership of meanings (Wenger 1998/2003/1998) when falling into gendered border work challenged me pedagogically many times in the course of the research project. As the teacher in the BoM classroom, I had to make choices in terms of the social norms and

practices, including protocol concerning leading conversation freely and making noise, and establishing the desired limits concerning the use of physical space and mobility during the shared activities. Hence, bridging the multiple social spaces involved everyone, and was discussed many times in the lessons. In the stimulated recall interviews, both the girls and the boys made efforts to come up with ideas about how to support the multi-voicedness and improve cooperation in the BoM classroom:

Anna   *[To Lily after watching an episode in which the cooperation was suffering:] So, you said on the video clip that "we got to find an understanding"... how could it be done?*

Lily   *Well, you got to be flexible...*

Ester   *... And not think so much if something is 'girls' stuff or boys' stuff'...*

Anna   *No such borders?*

Ester   *Yeah... the boys should also try out the games we like... cause they can't know what they are like, since they've never tried them...*

And in the boys' interview:

Amos   *You got to listen to the others more... and you can ask them to calm down if it gets too wild...*

Jonas   *We just don't seem to notice when it gets too wild...*

Anna   *Whose proposals are then accepted?*

Amos   *Well, those who also accept the proposals of the others, who don't just shout their own suggestions...*

Anna   *What if there are many proposals? How are they negotiated?*

Jonas   *Well, it takes good group work...*

Anna   *What makes it good?*

Jonas   *If everybody would just listen to each other and not talk over [each other]...*

Anna   *Are we able to pull it off here [in the BoM classroom]?*

Jonas   *Sometimes, sometimes not...*

As shown here, the students came up with a range of features, such as flexibility, open-mindedness, avoidance of strict gendered categorizations, listening to the others, group work and mutuality; in their mind, these features supported community. Hence, although the implementation from time to time suffered from the manifestations of children's gendered negotiations, they seemed to have a clear understanding of what it takes to act collectively, as a community of learners.

The different modes of participation and the changing social conditions in the BoM classroom are discussed in many places in this work. Even though every lesson included some moments of dialogue and collaboration, the situations in which the students specifically seemed to be able to cross gender boundaries and negotiate a transformative social space, were connected to the activities that had one thing in common: namely that they involved some form individual creative invention. In other words, they were activities that invited the students to draw from their personal worlds (O'Neall 2012), in that way supporting reflexivity in learning. Thus, as Reimer (1995) suggests, music can be used to manifest selfness. Creative music making may involve critical and on-going self-reflection and the making of personal musical choices, thus promoting meaningful experiences in and through music.

In the BoM classroom, many of the shared practices involved creative, collaborative music-making in some form or extent. There were two examples in which the cooperation was suddenly effortless; what particularly distinguished these was that they enabled the students to engage in creative invention more individually. Hence, both instances began with activities in which the students worked alone or in pairs, thus involving self-reflection and the making of personal musical choices, creating potentials for profound musical experiences (Reimer 1995). The lesson then proceeded with a collective activity in which the students were able to share with their peers something that felt personal. They seemed to be enthusiastic when presenting their own artefacts but and also showed interest to in the ideas of the others. This created a social space, a third space (Gutierrez et al. 1995), for the students to make subjective contributions to a shared endeavour, thus enabling individual and collective musical exploration both individually and collectively. According to Gutierrez et al. (1995), it is precisely between these official and unofficial scripts, in which a third space may occur. Moreover, Reimer (1995) suggests that such group efforts to that create communal musical experiences may add "another dimension to the potential profundity of the experience" (13).

The first example of such an episode was a situation in which the students had been inventing their own rhythmic patterns by using body percussion. After first working individually on their own patterns and body percussions, each students then shared their pattern by teaching it to the rest of the group. Evidently, sharing their own patterns and body percussions with their peers motivated the students, and who also seemed to enjoy of the inventions of the others. All the students participated in the teaching and learning intensively and the patterns were then performed together. The following transcribes the beginning of the episode:

Anna	Well, who wants to start then? [Many lifted hands...]
Lily	Me! This is frog-talk... [Lily adds some croaking to her body-percussion.]
Matt	This is too funny, I just can't continue... how do you do it?
Anna	Lily, can you show the others how to make the croak-sound? [Lily shows again her body-percussion and everybody practice along.]
Amos	I'm the next... [Amos shares his body-percussion with the others.]
Anna	And then Ester?
Ester	Well, mine goes like... [Also Ester teaches her body-percussion to the others.]
Anna	Wow... playing with the fingers sounds different than playing with a palm, doesn't it? Matt, how about your body-percussion? [Matt starts with beat-boxing and adds some other body-percussions to it].
Matt	This is kind of hard to perform, so please don't make me laugh...
Anna	Great! Let's practice. Can you show it again? [Matt's beat-boxing requires some more practicing.]
Matt	I want to add one more thing to it... [Matt further develops his beat-box and the rest of the students keep on practicing it for a little while...]

The second example took place in a situation in which the students had been inventing melodic ostinati, which then were used as 'musical building blocks' to construct miniature compositions. This was done by playing a 'conductor game' in which the students, one at the time, acted as a conductor, selecting or muting the ostinati, thus, always creating their own version of the composition. In the next conversation, taken from an individual stimulated-recall interview, Jonas reflects on his experiences when working with Amos on a piano duo; the two boys, invented a four-hand piano part to be used later in group composition and the conductor game.

Anna	Can you remember this situation?
Jonas	It was nice.
Anna	It was? You were sitting on a piano with Amos. Did you come up with your ideas together?
Jonas	Yes, we did.
Anna	Could you tell about it?
Jonas	Well, first of all, we figured that our part should be cyclic, and that it shouldn't be too melodic, changing all the time...
Anna	Okay, how did you come up with it then?
Jonas	Well, actually, first, Amos came up with a comping idea for me... and then I came up with his part...
Anna	So you were kind of switching... sounds like fun.
Jonas	Kind of yeah...

Anna	*Anyway, you figured out together what would work?*
Jonas	*Yeah.*
Anna	*At that point, did you have any other ideas, such as that it should be cyclic?*
Jonas	*Well, just before finishing we figured that my part was too low after all, so we switched so that I played in a higher [range] and Amos in a lower range.*

Jonas's reflections describe commitment and true cooperation when engaging in the task with Amos. The boys negotiated the desirable musical qualities of the piano part and even tried out different solutions when inventing their four-hand ostinato. In the conductor game, all of the students wanted to act as conductors. They concentrated well in the both roles, as players responding to the suggestions of the conductor, and as acting as a conductor crafting improvised composition using the the 'musical building blocks' performed by their peers. The conductor -game was played until the end of the lesson, and even 'overtime'. It was the last shared activity in Phase One with working as everybody together, and therefore, it was a promising ending for the first part of the research project with its many social ups and downs. A significant factor that seemed to differentiate these two events from the drama group 'animal' assignment, which had ended in difficulties (see Chapter 4.2), was the degree of teacher guidance. In the drama assignment, where there was less guidance, the social difficulties were greater; conversely, in the conductor game, where there was more teacher guidance, the students experienced fewer social problems. Hence, among these children, the teacher guidance seemed to reduce gendered border work (see e.g. Björck 2011; Connell 2009; Thorne 1993).

As a teacher, these findings inform me about the significance of promoting reflexivity in learning. In my inquiry, the sense of subjectivity and individual meaningfulness seemed to operate as a vehicle of inclusion and enhance a sense of mutuality in the classroom discourse.

5.3 Summary

In this chapter, I have discussed the multi-voicedness of the BoM classroom, and presented examples in which the lessons created a social space, a third space (Gutierrez et al. 1995) where it was possible for the students to cross gender boundaries and act as a community of learners (Wenger 1998/2003). In such episodes, the students' experiences that supported reflexivity in learning were crucial. Both examples, in which the students cooperated particularly well, also involved individual, creative invention, which allowed the students to draw from their own personal worlds (O'Neall 2012). Hence, among these children, opportunities to employ subjectivity seemed to promote the a sense of community and to operate as a motivator for collective meaning-making.

The students' reflections in the forms of my constructed narratives of 'Emma' and 'Amos' illuminate how the children were capable of making insightful observations when reflecting on themselves as well as on the others. Further, it demonstrates that they are and capable of showing empathy and giving credit to others. However, the emphasis and the ambiance of the girls' and boys' reflections are different from each other in certain respects. The girls expressed that their range of possibilities to act and interact socially is limited at times. Hence, it could can therefore be argued that their sense of agency therefore is sometimes limited. They also reflect on the student role they adopted and compare their own behaviour to that of the boys. In the interactions of the BoM classroom, this role shows itself in the girls' consistent self-control. Another way to look at the girls' characteristic restraint would of course be to interpret it as a form of student underlife (Goffman 1961), that is, distancing oneself from the official classroom script. However, in many instances in this study, the girls' own reflections and their remarkably active Phase Two participation do not support that view.

The boys, instead, do not express any views or feelings about their agency being limited in any ways. As noted earlier, unlike the girls, their reflections also touched their lives outside the BoM classroom. They appeared to be not too worried about their own performance, although they do notice the girls' academic achievements. Hence, the girls and the boys reflected differently about themselves.

6 Conclusions

This ethnographic practitioner inquiry viewed children's social interaction when learning music in the Finnish Music School Basics of Music classroom. The aim of this study has been to explore children's social interaction, and, particularly, to understand how gender becomes intertwined with the processes of negotiating learner identities and agencies when participating in the BoM classroom activities. Viewing learning as social participation, this study focused on the processes of negotiating memberships in the BoM classroom, and in creating ownerships of meaning through mutual engagements in shared activities (Wenger 1998/2003). To this end, the study sought to identify and understand the tensions related to gender that might have hindered this participation and thus created inequalities in learning, and to recognize situations in which gender boundaries were de-emphasized in favour of negotiating new practices in the BoM classroom.

As common to ethnography, in this study the generation of data, the interpretation and the theorizing have moved forward overlapping with each other (Lappalainen 2007). My dual position has made it possible to evaluate, re-consider and adjust my own choices and comprehension both as a practitioner and as the researcher while moving on with this project. By analysing the data gathered by video recordings, stimulated-recall interviews and my own teacher diaries, I was able to construct three overarching themes that reflected the interaction and the distribution of power in the BoM classroom, and offered illuminating insights to my research topic. The first and perhaps most salient theme was dealing with the different modes of participation that either compromised or promoted learning and the construction of musical agency among the children participating in BoM. In the classroom discourse these varying modes of participation were often dealing with the access to participation, evident in the observation data, as well as in the students' reflections. The second theme addressed children's own gendered beliefs and preconceptions that emphasized the sustainment of conventional gendered groupings, hence complicating the interaction among the children. These beliefs and preconceptions directed particularly the group work situations and showed as a lack of cooperation and mutuality. In addition, they came up in the stereotypical views the girls held about boys, and the boys held about girls, and themselves, as uniform entities. The third theme considered the gendered and polarized student identities that operated as vehicles of exclusion when some some students dominated the classroom interactions in the social space of underlife (Goffman 1961), evident in the observation data as well as in the stimulated-recall interviews.

The study illustrates how the students and the teacher, as a new community of learners, struggled in constructing a shared learning culture in the BoM classroom, and how the manifestations of children's gendered negotiations and an adoption of group identities complicated that process. In these situations the localized and collective understandings of group masculinity and group femininity (Paechter 2006) were often directed by gendered border work (e.g. Thorne 1993), thus emphasizing the juxtaposition between the girls and the boys. Gendered border work (e.g. Thorne 1993) took place in three ways: in adopting gender based learner identities, in holding gendered beliefs and preconceptions and in falling into polarized 'good student' and 'rebel student' identities, thus driving the processes of negotiating memberships and constructing ownership in meaning (Wenger 1998/2003). The study points out how particularly the use of student voice operated as a legitimator when negotiating the memberships and the access to contributing to shared meaning making. In addition, adopting gendered learner identities (Gordon 2006b) was evident in the differences in the use of mobility, time and physical space between the male and female students. In classroom based music learning, when it involves shared processes of creative music making that often take place in relatively free dialogical settings with bodily interaction, as in the BoM classroom examined here, these complications may limit the range of possibilities to act and interact musically and thus construct agency in music.

Secondly, gendered border work was manifested in holding gendered beliefs and preconceptions in that way shaping the localized and shared understanding of group masculinity and group femininity in the BoM classroom. Particularly evident the polarization was in the semi-formal learning situations that involved mutual reflection and the making of collective judgements, such as group work situations. The lack of teacher guidance even reinforced the polarization. When falling into gendered border work (e.g. Thorne 1993), it seemed to be more important to maintain the groupings than to act according to individual identities, and to make personal choices. Hence, gendered border work operated not only between the groupings but also inside the groupings, thus driving the individual negotiations of femininities and masculinities (Paechter 2006), as well. As a result, negotiating what it meant to be a member of this particular BoM classroom often took place in such a juxtaposition. This compromised the sense of community, and limited the possibilities to engage in learning collectively. This is crucial since the sense of agency, and gendered agency, is constructed precisely through these accumulated experiences of legitimacy to contribute to the shared enterprises in the social situations (McNay 2004). In the same way musical agency can be seen constructed through one's accumulated experiences of the range of possibilities to act and interact musically (e.g. Karlsen 2011). Thus, the sense of membership contributes to the process of constructing ownership in meaning, in other words to meaningful learning.

Finally, gendered border work directed the construction of memberships and the ownership of meaning in a form of adopting the quite polarized 'good student' and 'rebel student' identities. Like a norm, the girls adopted an identity of a 'good student'. They engaged in all classroom activities focused and showed capability of recognizing and negotiating the social rules in the BoM classroom. However, the situation was not that straightforward. Their consistency in showing self-control and reasonable behaviour limited their claiming of social space in the situations when some students took liberties and dominated the classroom interactions both verbally and in terms of physical space. Paradoxically, maintaining an identity of a 'good student' operated in some classroom interactions as a gate-keeper to full membership and the access to contributing to the collective production of meanings (Wenger 1998/2003).

Unlike the girls, the boys weren't that consistent or unanimous in their student identity negotiations. Some of the boys adopted a so called 'rebel student' identity by contesting the classroom discursive practices in a social space of underlife (Goffman 1961). However, their behaviour was shifting, and some of the boys did not go along with rebellious behaviour at all. By the midway of phase two when working in the groups of girls and boys, some of the boys started to renegotiate the classroom discursive practices and the localized understanding of group masculinity (Paechter 2006) in the BoM classroom. In that way, importantly, the tensions caused by some students by maintaining underlife, contributed in creating a social space for transformation and a new classroom culture.

The findings suggest, that in a mixed environment, the practices that truly supported reflexivity and the processes of negotiating personal meanings de-emphasized gendered groupings among the children. In the BoM classroom these practices involved individual creative activities, such as inventing own rhythmic patterns or compositions which allowed the students to draw from their own personal worlds (O'Neall 2012). In these situations the students were able to cross the gender boundaries and work towards a community of learners. All in all, the study, however, shows how both the girls and the boys expressed experiences of ambivalence when balancing between the group identities, their individual needs and the cultural demands of what being a 'proper girl' or a 'proper boy' implied in this particular context.

So, what does this tell us about the ambivalent nature of children's gendered negotiations in music education? In the context of teaching Basics of Music the study informs of the importance of promoting reflexivity and social transformation in learning. A teacher needs to consider how the contents of the course, selected teaching practices and the social classroom environments can meet the needs of the students, and create a space for democratic learning (Gould 2007) to take place. Democracy in learning, the

way it is understood in this inquiry, means an equal access to educational and musical resources, and to power when participating in the classroom discourse (ibid.). Hence, equal opportunities to construct memberships and to contribute to shared meaning making (Wenger 1998/2003). In the BoM classroom, in order to promote such processes, the practices involved creative and collaborative music making in varying forms. As the study indicates, however, this alone does not ensure an equitable outcome. Instead, the inherent multi-voicedness (Gutierrez et al. 1995) of any classroom challenges the community of learners and requires thus constant and sensible negotiation in order to cross the social boundaries, such as gender. For students this means practicing of what it takes to act and interact collectively, being sensitive to the needs of others and respecting everyone's access to participation. For a teacher, promoting gender sensitivity means an on-going reflecting on one's own attitudes related to gender, and awareness of the messages one sends to the students, but also reacting frankly to the situations in which the students need guidance. This may not always be an easy task but requires tolerance for conflicts and uncertainties, and reacting to the changing phases and needs in students' lives, such as age-related phase of gendered border work. The ambivalence of gender is necessarily not just about the stereotypes, not something that has to be fixed but rather something that has to be paid attention to and treated in educational contexts in order to enhance participation and equality in music education.

7 Discussion

Although the context of this study is an extra-curricular music school, the phenomena that are discussed are valid in any music classroom or educational context in which children learn music in a group. In the preceding chapters, I have drawn on my own experiences during this study. In this final chapter, I will revisit my contextual, theoretical and methodological lenses, and explore how the themes and findings presented in my study interrelate and interact in the social life of a children's music classroom. Moreover, I will revisit my research questions from the perspectives of the two main theoretical frameworks, namely, socio-cultural learning theory and poststructuralist gender theories. Since my study is a practitioner inquiry, I will also consider my inquiry's implications for practitioner practice.

7.1 Revisiting the community of practice

This inquiry has viewed the social life of a music classroom of 9-year old children, participating in the classroom discourse of the Finnish Music School 'Basics of Music' (BoM) course. In classroom discourse, I also included the artefacts, experiences and practices shared by this local community of learners (Wenger 1998/2003; Gutierrez et al. 1995). I adopted a sociocultural perspective, which understands social participation as inherent to learning. My inquiry examined children's social participation in the BoM classroom by viewing the processes of forming memberships, and gaining ownership of meaning (Wenger 1998/2003). Throughout this inquiry, the community of practice is defined as a pedagogical environment characterized by its participants' mutual engagement, joint enterprises and shared repertoire (Wenger 1998/2003). Further, this inquiry illustrated how the BoM classroom strove towards becoming a community of practice.

The Forming of memberships in the BoM classroom

As discussed above, the BoM classroom was an entirely new community of learners that had only just started to negotiate shared norms and practices. Moreover, the BoM classroom likely differed from a regular school classroom by including dialogue and classroom practices typical to creative processes. Hence, it was only expected that the students needed some time to adjust to the social conditions of the BoM classroom. As discussed

in Chapter 3.5, in participation metaphor, people must learn the shared norms, values and practices of each community they enter (Yamakawa, Forman & Ansell 2005, 179). In the BoM classroom, I, as the teacher, was the one who facilitated the classroom practices and social norms according to my own ideals of a collaborative learning environment. Evidently, not all of the students shared my ideals. Instead, in the social space of underlife (Goffman 1961), some of the boys created their own practices with rebellious behaviours in order to distance themselves from the normative social practices in the BoM classroom. However, by causing interruptions, they limited the participation (Wenger 1998/2003) of those students who wanted to actively engage in the classroom practices actively, and, therefore, complicated the formation of memberships in this classroom.

In the children's own reflections, the girls especially expressed their resentment about being marginalized in the course of the classroom interactions. Their resentment was particularly evident in terms of the use of student voice. At times, they sensed that their range of possibilities to act and interact socially – thus, their sense of agency – was limited. In classroom interactions, this showed, for instance, as consistent self-control. However, their adoption of, so-called, 'good student' behaviours was ambiguous for two reasons. First, it kept them from claiming for their social space in the situations in which some other students dominated the classroom interactions. Secondly, in their efforts to negotiate memberships when engaging in classroom discursive practices, they also ended up performing quasi-teacher roles by 'keeping an eye on' the boys. This monitoring caused tensions among the children and complicated how they formed memberships and acted as a community of learners. Instead, in the Phase Two classroom interactions, the girls actively collaborated as legitimate members of the BoM classroom. Hence, forming memberships was easier for the girls in the girls-only classroom setting.

Despite adopting 'rebellious student' identities in their social space of underlife (ibid.), the boys started to renegotiate their engagement levels and their memberships when engaging participating in classroom discursive practices. The change in the boys' behaviour, however – that started in Phase One (working in co-ed setting) and continued in Phase Two (working in single-gender settings) – took place gradually. It was an exception that, in Phase One, the boys had a tendency to emphasize the polarization between the girls and the boys; this was evident, for instance, in the divided-group work, and in the whole-group situations that involved bodily interaction. Only Emil was consistent in his agency, cooperating with everybody. In that way, Emil could be regarded as having acted as a social broker (Wenger 2009), trying to find mutual understanding (Gutierrez et al. 1995) and to cross gender boundaries in order to support the construction of memberships in the BoM classroom.

However, in this particular BoM classroom, generally speaking, undoing stereotypical gendered behaviours was challenging for the children. Their struggles show how the negotiation of learner identities is not always a reflexive processes, but as discussed above, often can be ruled by gendered habits based on earlier individual experiences and social and cultural gendered expectations.

The Gaining of ownership in the BoM classroom

In the classroom activities, the complications in the forming of memberships were evident as a lack of mutuality and collaboration among the children. When some of the students dominated classroom activities with their rebellious behaviours, access to contributing to the joint enterprises was limited for the others. Hence, the different modes of participation operated as a source of social power, either promoting or compromising the processes of shared meaning negotiation and the gaining of ownership (Wenger 1998/2003). In many ways, these implications are confirmed in the observation data and the students' own reflections. For instance, in the stimulated-recall interviews, the girls reflected about difficulties learning in Phase One because of the disturbances. Again, the use of student voice particularly operated as a strong legitimator (Arnot 2007), regulating the access to participation and the gaining of an ownership of meaning (see Table 3 in Chapter 4.1.1).

The BoM classroom interactions reveal how the negotiation of the shared norms and practices was on-going and shifting. Hence, the same lesson could involve times of collaboration and times of social conflict. As discussed in Chapter 5.2, situations in which the students particularly seemed to be able to cross social boundaries and negotiate a transformative social space were connected to the activities that involved some form of individual creative invention. Evidently, the experiences of reflexivity – that is, incorporating personal meaningfulness and a sense of ownership – were crucial for the efforts to bridge the multi-voiced social spaces (Gutierrez et al. 1995). Despite these many social challenges, this study also demonstrated how the children practiced agency in collaboration with each other in various musical situations, for instance, playing the conductor game; inventing four-hand piano part with a peer; inventing a compositional idea in order to inspire everybody participating; or collaboratively solving a rhythmic dictation with a group of peers. These instances inform us about the significance of having access in negotiating both personal and collective meanings when participating in the classroom discourse (Wenger 1998/2003; Gutierrez et al. 1995). The findings of this inquiry indicate that it is precisely this interplay of private and public meaning-making (see chapter 1.2), involving critical self-reflection and collective exploration, which seems to make a difference.

Rethinking the Finnish BoM classroom as an exploratory space

A pedagogical stance that holds the student's experience as a reference point is not new, but introduced over a hundred years ago by John Dewey (2008/1916) in his laboratory school. Dewey understood learning as, above all, experimenting with what the world is like (Dewey MWs; Väkevä 2013). In the BoM classroom, such an attitude was nurtured by hands-on, workshop-oriented music-making in many forms, including musical invention. This environment aimed at offering opportunities for the students not simply to reproduce, but also to *renew* musical culture, and to seek their *own voice* in it (Ojala & Väkevä 2013; see also Kuoppamäki 2013).

Philosophically, the engagement in the processes of creative exploration with the students, for instance, when improvising or composing in a group, means adjusting to uncertainties, such as a sense of process, and learning outcomes that are not always measurable in conventional ways. Thus, a BoM classroom may operate as a pedagogical space for *practicing* how to deal with feelings of ambivalence and unpredictability, and how to construct strategies in order to navigate the complexity of learning (O'Neall 2012, 117; Partti et al. 2013). Moreover, the BoM classroom can invite students to ambiguity, showing them that for some problems there can be many good solutions (Kuoppamäki 2010; 2013). However, not all teachers – teaching in various fields of music education, including extra-curricular music schools and general music education – are comfortable engaging with their students in such pedagogical negotiations, which enable creative pondering and making musical choices when learning, or include musical invention in some form. For instance, the recent Finnish national assessment of learning outcomes in the subject of music (Juntunen 2011) shows that half of music teachers never, or only occasionally, involve musical invention in their lower secondary-school music teaching (Juntunen et al. 2014). Thus, almost half of the lower secondary school students have no experiences of creative music-making, such as arranging, improvising or composing music (Juntunen 2011, 55). Nevertheless, if one of the aims of schooling is to nurture students' cultural participation, creative thinking and activities, as directed by the Finnish National Core Curriculum (FNCC 2004), then every student should have opportunities to participate in processes of creative invention, thus, having access to cultural authorship and agency (Ojala & Väkevä 2013; see also Kuoppamäki 2013).

As this study shows, facilitating creative exploration may not always be enough. A learning environment in which the students can feel safe and confident to experiment, take risks, ask questions, make choices and reflect with each other can only rest on a sense of mutuality, respect and equal access to contributing to the shared enterprises. Generating and fostering this kind of learning environment is a responsibility of the BoM teacher.

Hence, in order to operate as an exploratory space, a BoM classroom as a community of learners needs to negotiate social conditions in order to make certain conditions possible, including acting and interacting both as an individual, that is, expressing personal views and feelings, and also as a member of a community, entailing being sensitive to the views and needs of others. In some classrooms, such conditions may come naturally; in others, like in this study's BoM classroom, these conditions require on-going efforts and negotiation of shared practices and norms. However, by investing in social interaction and communication skills of the students, the natural multi-voicedness of any classroom (Gutierrez et al. 1995) can become a valuable learning asset, for instance, by offering potentials for mutual reflection with one another and, above all, opportunities for *learning from the peers*.

Despite the explicit intentions, building such a dialogical and cooperative learning environment is not always an easy task for a teacher. A teacher may have *normative expectations* about the students, and about the teaching contents and practices that s/he facilitates, for instance, by assuming that creative practices, *as such*, always produce meaningful learning experiences among the students. When conducting this study, I ran into situations in which some of the students did not respond in the way that I had expected when I planned the activities. Evidently, my own conceptions of the attractiveness of some particular classroom activities did not always correspond to the views of the students. Consequently, sometimes the student's participation and the gaining of ownership may unintentionally suffer from a teacher's normative expectations about the possible outcomes or artefacts. As discussed above, this might be crucial because the findings of this study indicate that, in the BoM classroom in particular, the sense of subjectivity and personal meaningfulness operated as a means for the students to cross social boundaries and work towards becoming a community of learners. Hence, promoting reflexivity in learning by connecting the lesson contents to the students' personal lives and musical activities outside the sites of formal music education is essential for the construction of agency. Students' participation in changing musical arenas, including individually or in a group, and in formal or informal settings, builds webs of learning, importantly giving them experiences of approaching music from different angles (e.g. Partti et al. 2013).

To summarize, promoting the BoM classroom as an exploratory space means understanding learning itself as a socially organized, creative and reflexive process – learning is *becoming* (O'Neall 2012) rather than *being*, and creates social transformation. In this kind of pedagogical space, learning is not simply about addressing topics and questions that only offer clear-cut, 'right or wrong' answers, but rather about encouraging the students to explore and question given conceptions and beliefs (Kuoppamäki 2010). Nurturing such an organic, flexible attitude towards learning requires a social environment

in which students feel confident and safe to express their own views and feelings, an environment based on mutual respect and openness. In order to accomplish creating this environment, certain necessary intersecting social conditions must be met, including recognizing and caring for, as needed, gender-related issues.

7.2 Revisiting performative gender

My inquiry viewed a children's music-classroom and considered how gender intertwines with the processes of constructing learner identities (Gordon 2006a) and musical agency (e.g. Karlsen 2011). More precisely, I examined in my music classroom how the localized femininity and the masculinity practices (Paechter 2006) were negotiated, and how gendered border work (e.g. Thorne 1993) interfered with processes of constructing memberships and ownership of meaning (Wenger 1998/2003).

The Forming of memberships in the BoM classroom

This inquiry adopted the view that children do not passively become socialized into gender categories, but that they construct their own gender agency by stepping in and out of gender categorizations in the form of gendered border work (e.g. Thorne 1993; Connell 2009). From this position, gender was understood as performative and a social, lived relation; as fluid and processual rather than congealed and fixed (e.g. Butler 1990/1999; McNay 2004; Connell 2002; 2009). For children, gendered border work (e.g. Thorne 1993) is a way to experiment with their identity, playing and testing the potentials and limits of gender. Hence, as discussed above, gendered border work is important per se, and as such, a natural part of maturation. However, as this study's classroom interactions illuminated, children in the social life of a classroom also use gender as a tool and an indicator to designate who is included in, and who is left out of the shared activities (Kampmann in Bredesen 2004). Hence, gender also operates as a source of social power, in this way, directing the interactions among the students participating in the classroom discourse. As Connell (2009) insightfully points out, gender difference is not something that naturally exists, but rather something that "must be made to happen" (p. 15). Consequently, it can also be unmade, revised, and made less important (p. 15), as Emil's behaviour showed.

In my inquiry, I also viewed the BoM community of practice as locally-negotiated femininity and masculinity practices (Paechter 2006). In this particular BoM classroom, the processes of negotiating memberships were often complicated by gendered border work (e.g. Thorne). Gendered border work (ibid.) was notably evident in children: adopting

gender-based learner identities; holding gendered beliefs and preconceptions; and adopting, so-called, 'good student' and 'rebel student' identities. In my BoM classroom, when students fell into gendered border work (ibid.), the negotiations were sometimes complicated, causing tensions in the social space of underlife (Goffman 1961) and driving the children to negotiate femininity and masculinity practices (Paechter 2006) in juxtaposition to one another. These localized and collective understandings of group femininity and group masculinity (ibid.) were particularly evident when the children adopted the quite polarized 'good student' and 'rebel student' identities. In the situations in which some of the boys repeatedly performed rebellious behaviours, the girls, instead, consistently showed self-control by not participating in the boys' activities. In these situations, the girls often positioned themselves as passive viewers limiting their potentials to act as full members of the BoM classroom community.

The rapid and obvious change in the girls' femininity practice and the classroom discourse in Phase Two, when the girls and boys were working in the separate groups, illustrates well the dynamics of gendered border work in this particular BoM classroom. As discussed above, the girls' range of possibilities to practice their agency was now wider, showing that in this new situation they were confident and active learners. In the boys' group, instead, the change that already had started in Phase One took place slowly and gradually when the boys themselves started to renegotiate the norms and practices in their BoM classroom. In this way, the tensions that occurred in the social space of underlife (Goffman 1961) generated a new transformative social space, a third space (Gutierrez et al. 1995), in which the renegotiation of the boys' localized understandings of their masculinity practice was possible. This social change in the boys' classroom discourse also widened their range of possibilities to engage in the processes of learning and to act and interact socially as legitimate members of their BoM community of practice.

In order to be able to support children in their gender negotiations and in the processes of constructing memberships in a classroom community, a teacher needs to be able to see beyond these stereotypical gender performances, and guide the students towards negotiating their identities in a sensitive and constructive way, both as individuals and collectively.

The Gaining of ownership in the BoM classroom

Above, I discussed how, due to gendered border work, masculinity and femininity practices were often negotiated in juxtaposition to one another in the BoM classroom. Additionally, among these particular children, gendered border work became evident when they adopted

gender-based learner identities (Gordon 2006a) that were manifested in the differences of the use of student voice, mobility, time and space between the girls and boys. Particularly the use of student voice operated as a legitimator (Arnot 2007) in the classroom discourse, compromising some students' engagement in the shared processes of negotiating ownership of meaning (Wenger 1998/2003), and therefore, causing inequalities in learning (see Table 3 in Chapter 4.1.1). These complications particularly limited the girls' gendered agency (McNay 2004), that is, through their experiences to accumulate gender knowledge when negotiating the potentials and limits of acting and interacting socially within the classroom discourse.

However, the girls were not the only ones to have their experiences, including their range of possibilities to act and interact, limited. All along, the boys, particularly Emil, protested about the social disturbances that some of the boys created in their social space of underlife (Goffman 1961). Unlike the girls, however, he repeatedly brought up the issue of the interruptions, and called for a more focused environment. In this sense, his agency differed from that of the girls. Gradually, some other boys joined Emil in his call to improve the learning environment, and the boys started to renegotiate the problematic social conditions that compromised their access to the shared processes of meaning-making.

In addition, gendered border work was manifested in the students' adoption of gendered beliefs and pre-conceptions, evident particularly in the group-work situations in which the maintaining gendered groupings and acting according to the group identities were more important than making of individual choices. When the access to the shared activities and meaning negotiation was compromised, this polarization of individuals and the group hindered participation, reflexivity in learning and the construction of ownership. In their reflections during the stimulated-recall interviews, the children's gendered beliefs and preconceptions concerning 'the other side', as well as about themselves, came up when discussing the 'girls' and 'boys' (as uniform groups) in relation to, for instance, their school achievement, personalities or likes.

Understanding the music classroom as a gender-sensitive space

Music teachers might not consider that gender issues are their concern. In order to engage in gender and equality negotiations with students in the classroom discourse, a teacher must take children seriously as gendered agents. This means, for instance, that a teacher does not try to anticipate or direct students' conceptions of gender (Bredesen 2004). Instead, students could be given opportunities to consider gender and equality issues in relation to

their own reality, thus, avoiding normative perceptions of what gender or equality is, or what it should be (ibid.). In my BoM classroom, when students fell into gendered border work (e.g. Thorne 1993), these negotiations were sometimes complicated, causing tensions in the social space of underlife (Goffman 1961) and driving the children to act out polarized femininity and masculinity practices. In gendered border work situations, a teacher's guidance might reinforce students' confidences, causing them to contest stereotypical meanings of gender, cross conventional gendered borderlines, and tolerate diversity and various ways of knowing and being within a community of learners. Thus, if the aim of schooling is to promote a sense of community and cooperative learning, gender issues, just like other social issues, need to be recognized and treated explicitly and openly in the classroom discourse. Consequently, participation relies on mutual respect, communication and shared understanding of what it means to act and interact collectively, so that everyone involved has equal access to contributing to the shared processes of meaning-making and learning (Wenger 1998/2003).

From a teacher's point of view, promoting the music classroom as a gender-sensitive space, calls for on-going evaluation of one's own attitudes, expectations and practices. Despite the condition that they hold themselves to be sensitive to children's gender issues, adults often unconsciously reinforce stereotypical conceptions of gender with their own behaviour (e.g. Bredesen 2004). Hence, a teacher needs to critically consider his or her own messages in order to avoid reinforcing stereotypical categorizations, and be able to encounter children as they really are, beyond normative groupings.

In my inquiry, I first viewed the social interaction of my 9-year-old students in co-ed, and then in single-gender environments. I chose to do so for practical, pragmatic reasons, because the social phenomenon that I was particularly interested in, children's gendered border work (e.g. Thorne), is socially played out in a binary position. Adopting a performative view on gender (e.g. Butler 1990/1999; Connell, 2002, 2009) does not undo the socially-constructed dichotomy of children's gendered negotiations. The possibility to view children interacting in two different settings demonstrated how, when entering a learning space, a child's sense of agency is interrelated with the classroom's social conditions. As a result, particularly the girls' behaviour, in particular, significantly differed from one setting to another. Moreover, my research design illuminated how gendered border work (e.g. Thorne) and a shared understanding of the localized group femininity and masculinity (Paechter 2006) directed the individual student's negotiations. Usually, teachers do not have this kind multi-setting vantage point (that is, the different settings of Phases One and Two), but have to make judgements without any intimate knowledge of their students or the causes behind their students' social behaviour. For instance, observing the girls in the Phase One BoM classroom (in co-ed setting) would have given only a

limited picture of their agency as learners. In Phase One, due to gendered border work (e.g. Thorne), the girls adopted learner identities that limited their claiming of social space in terms of use of student voice, mobility, time and physical space (Gordon 2006a), thus hindering their access to the mutual processes of meaning negotiation (Wenger 1998/2003) and their construction of an ownership in learning. In Phase Two (when working in a girls-only group), they instead showed remarkable agency when engaging in classroom discursive practices. Hence, in order to be able to act as a 'culturally responsive teacher' (Villegas & Lucas 2002), it is essentially critical that teachers are careful when making any generalizing or normative judgements about their students that are based on gender or other social dimensions in order that they avoid making stereotypical assumptions or groupings.

My inquiry focused on viewing the social aspects of gender in a specific children's music classroom by examining the ways that gender is negotiated through musical participation and performed in the classroom discourse. To this end, my initial motive was to better understand children's gendered interactions in order to better promote collaborative learning in music (Wenger 1998/2003). However, music as a domain holds many gendered contradictions. For instance, while the musical canon is largely considered as male, music itself is most often related to feminine practice (McGregor & Mills 2006). Consequently, a large body of studies on music classrooms (Green 1997; Abramo 2011; Armstrong 2011; Björck 2011) illustrated a number of attitudes about the gender appropriateness of musical practices related to, for example, music technology, rock-band or composition as musical practices that largely still seem to be valid in today's music classrooms. These gendered attitudes in music education would require further research. Moreover, my inquiry views primary school-aged children's behaviour and an age-related social phenomenon of gendered border work. However, the ways that adolescents negotiate gender in a music classroom context has not yet been studied.

In a music classroom, teachers can contest stereotyped attitudes, for instance, by offering to all students the same instrument choices, musical activities and repertoires regardless of their gender. Further, teachers can discuss with the students the role models and gendered meanings presented in textbooks, song lyrics and musical media, etc. Hence, we can conclude that a teacher having gender sensitivity means maintaining openness about, reacting to, negotiating and treating the social issues related to gender together with the students in the social life of a classroom, as lived relations.

7.3 Revisiting the inquiry as stance – music educator as a change- agent

When conducting this study, I have understood 'inquiry' as an on-going stance (Cochran-Smith & Lytle 2009). By taking the position of a practitioner-researcher, my aim has been to problematize current arrangements in my own local BoM community of practice (ibid.). I wanted to gain a broader and deeper understanding of the dynamics of children's gendered negotiations in order to better promote the social conditions that would enable my students to engage in creative and collaborative learning as a community of learners (Wenger 1998/2003). Hence, the study has examined my own practice in order to generate knowledge towards that end, and to rethink how knowledge and practice can be constructed, evaluated and used through a "critical reflection on the intersection of the two" (Cochran-Smith & Lytle 2009, 42).

The notion of a BoM classroom, or any music classroom, as an exploratory and socially-sensitive space that promotes transformative learning insists on turning our attention to the music educator. In educational literature, a practitioner who is looking for improvement in her or his own pedagogical environment sees an educational site as a unit of change. Further, the literature regards a practitioner, who possesses skills to address problems and has a sense of ownership of these problems, as a 'change agent' (e.g. Villegas & Lucas 2002; Lukacs 2012). This inquiry embodies my efforts to take an active stance as a practitioner in my own music classroom. By experimenting with different pedagogical solutions in an on-going inquiry, I have aimed to gain as multifaceted a knowledge as possible of the social phenomenon in which I was interested – the dynamics of gendered border work (e.g. Thorne 1993) in children's social interaction in classroom-based music learning.

In an effort to seek constructive change, my inquiry has dealt with the social factors that seemed to compromise collaboration among children, and has sought to improve the social conditions of my own music classroom. Ideally, I envisioned my classroom as a creative-laboratory site for collaborative musical exploration to take place, and a social intersection among the various operations of the music school, where students could share their interests and experiences in and through music. However, due to the social challenges discussed throughout this inquiry, at times this seemed to be difficult to accomplish. While saying this, though, I should emphasize that, having practiced as a teacher for many years, these social conditions naturally vary from one classroom to another. In some classrooms, effective collaboration occurs quite naturally; in other classrooms, it requires on-going practice. Nevertheless, I felt that a better understanding of how gendered border work

(Thorne 1993) interrelates and interacts with the construction of learner identities and musical agency would allow me to better support the learning and social transformation of my students.

Although change is something that cannot be designed but that has to be negotiated, a teacher can promote change by designing profitable classroom environments for change to take place. In the multi-voiced social life of a classroom, competing discourses may need a teacher's guidance in order to construct effective dialogue and potentials for third- space and transformative learning (Gutierrez et al. 1995). As the boys' negotiations in my BoM classroom demonstrate, tensions can be transformed into positive responses, bridging the multiple and varied classroom social spaces (ibid.). Thus, in the social space of underlife (Goffman 1961), conflicts can operate as a drive for constructing new learning cultures and for creating opportunities for social change (Gutierrez et al, 1995). However, when not treated in pedagogical practices, student underlife only sustains traditional classroom power relations, in this way, hindering the potentials for social transformation among the students (ibid.). For a teacher to react to the needs for change sometimes entails contesting educational conventions, leaping into the unknown and experimenting and exploring with different solutions, as in my study.

As also Juntunen et al. (2013) have argued, considering the music educator as a change-agent once again places the emphasis on the social relationships established in musical situations and on the construction of the individual and collective identities when engaging in music-making with others. In order to facilitate pedagogical environments that support transformative musical engagement, a teacher must envision how music and music education can be a part of student life and a resource for student empowerment and growth (Väkevä 2013). In that way, a teacher strives beyond what already is, to what *can* be. Then, acts of music-making are not "merely instruments for learning to experience an already existing world, [but] potentially they themselves involve satisfaction and enjoyment and the possibility of change" (Westerlund 2008, 82; see also Juntunen et al. 2013). Nurturing in students an attitude of exploration may encourage the students in future and changing musical arenas, to step into something that is new and yet unexplored – also for the teacher her- or himself. This different kind of teacher role calls for understanding a music educator's work, not as primarily distributing musical knowledge and skills, but as facilitating potentials for experimenting and exploring in and through music. Moreover, it calls for stepping down from being in an expert position, to a position in which a teacher is rather a more experienced agent, willing to engage in learning *with* the students.

7.4 The Trustworthiness of my inquiry – issues of validity

When assessing the trustworthiness of qualitative research, educational literature provides a number of criteria and checklists to measure rigour (e.g. Patton 2003). As my inquiry belongs to the realm of practitioner work that aims at responding to the pedagogical challenges and transformation of practices, I will next consider questions of validity in a criteria framework developed particularly for practitioner research, that: are democratic; relate to process and outcome; and have catalytic and dialogic validity (Cochran-Smith & Lytle 2009).

In this inquiry, I have shared episodes of a social life from one particular music classroom. When I first started to plan my inquiry, one of my starting points was that I wanted to give voice to the children themselves. Hence, my inquiry has observed the happenings in the BoM classroom and discussed the experiences related to those happenings from two perspectives: the students' perspective and mine, as their teacher. Including children as the participants, made me, throughout this inquiry, reconsider my position as a practitioner-researcher and questions of power. In an attempt to recognize my responsibility, as the one who reports the social events, ambiances and the children's reflections as well as my own experiences, and to reach "democratic validity" (Cochran-Smith & Lytle 2009), I have tried to honour every participants' voice and viewpoints as experienced and lived, and to report on my inquiry in a manner that is as rich and multi-voiced as possible.

In the realm of practitioner research, resolving the problems to be addressed can be evaluated as outcome validity (Cochran-Smith & Lytle 2009). When assessing the outcome validity of my inquiry, three aspects particularly arise. First, the aim of my inquiry was to gain knowledge of a social phenomenon that I found problematic in my own practice, and to further develop that practice. Hence, in addition to documenting classroom practice and student learning from an insider perspective, I also documented my own questions, challenges, interpretative frameworks and changes of views over time (Cochran-Smith & Lytle 2009). Therefore, in common with all qualitative-research inquiries, my findings are partial, situational and contextual (Leavy 2009) because I discuss the social life of one particular music classroom as it appeared during the time of the study. Secondly, I also viewed the social life of the BoM classroom as locally-negotiated femininity and masculinity practices (Paechter 2006) and suggested what being a 'girl' or a 'boy' implied in this particular classroom community. Understanding gender as a fluid, multi-dimensional and performative social construction insists on viewing children's gendered performances also as a situational and on-going process. And finally, in my inquiry, I have regarded research as an active stance and a continuum rather than an effort to find fixed

answers to a set of questions. Therefore, outcome validity must be evaluated according to this perspective (Rikandi 2012). Rather than evaluating outcome validity by considering resolutions to addressed problems, I viewed it by considering to what extent my inquiry was able to make the problems that it aimed to address relevant to music education (ibid.). Although gender has been studied widely in music education, the dynamics of children's gendered border work, including the ways it interrelates, interacts and interferes with the construction of learner identities, musical agency and learning, has not been studied in the music classroom context. Therefore, in assessing outcome validity, my inquiry has succeeded in contributing to the current discussions in music education.

A description of the use of adequate and appropriate research methods and inquiry processes is presented in Chapter Two. However, as part of my evaluation of process validity (Cochran-Smith & Lytle 2009), I would like to discuss one particular methodological choice. As discussed earlier, I chose multi-methodological lenses and understood inquiry and acting as a practitioner-researcher as an on-going, active stance. In my research design, I have implemented this attitude by experimenting and exploring with different pedagogical solutions in order to gain as multifaceted a knowledge about my research topic as possible. Hence, although unorthodox in comparison to traditional forms of ethnography, my data collection was carried out in two phases (one phase where students worked in a single, mixed-gender group, and a second phase with students working in two single-gender groups). I support this choice by claiming that my ability to view the classroom discourse and the same children in two different settings, made it possible for me to recognize aspects of my data that I would not have been able to see otherwise. Particularly, when trying to understand the dynamics of gendered border work in the negotiations of localized femininity and masculinity practices, this two-phase process gave an invaluable perspective.

When conducting this inquiry, I engaged in critical and reflective discussions with peers in various ways to achieve dialogic validity (Cochran-Smith & Lytle 2009). First, I engaged in pedagogy conversations with my colleagues in the music school where I was practicing. These conversations often addressed the challenging issues of my study. Some of my colleagues also read parts of my work during the different stages of the inquiry process. Secondly, I regularly discussed my work with peers and teachers in doctoral seminars, and also occasionally with visiting professors. These discussions were fundamental throughout my inquiry process. Thirdly, I participated in data viewing sessions in the faculty of Educational Sciences at the University of Helsinki in order to discuss portions of my data with doctoral students and professors outside of my own university. These dialogues were a valuable supplement, bringing new perspectives to my inquiry process.

In assessing how my inquiry deepened the understanding of all participants, that is, the catalytic validity (Cochran-Smith & Lytle 2009) of my work, I first viewed it from the student's viewpoint. Part of my data collection included stimulated-recall interview sessions with the children. The reason for choosing this method was to give voice to the children themselves, and provide opportunities for them to reflect on their own learning during the process. These sessions took place both individually and in a peer group, thus offering potentials for collaborative reflections and changes in opinions. Throughout the inquiry process, the children's capacity for self-reflection, as well as their reflections on the other students, continued to impress me. As for myself, taking a stance of inquiry has been a long and nuanced process that has influenced my pedagogical thinking in many ways that I did not foresee at the beginning. This study has broadened and deepened my understanding of the complex issues of gender and the dynamics of children's gendered negotiations, as well as the potential implications that these issues and dynamics have for classroom-based music learning. Moreover, it has helped me to detect my own normative expectations that I have held as a practitioner when teaching and engaging in musical exploration with my students. Most importantly, my inquiry has inspired me to continue asking questions, to reassess and revitalize my own practices as a teacher, and to take a stance as an inquiring practitioner.

7.5 Closing words

My inquiry takes a perspective on gender that contributes to the understanding of the dynamics of children's gendered negotiations in classroom-based music learning. When conducting my inquiry, I observed that gender, as a research topic, seems to be emotive; gender as a concept is highly contested and people often tend to have strong opinions about it. I also came to understand that, as any complex issue, gender has many overlapping discourses that often intertwine and sometimes become entangled in people's minds. For instance, talking about children's gender-related identity negotiations as a natural part of the maturation process is not the same as talking about gender equality between adults. The difficulty with such great misconceptions, is that they may prevent educators and policy makers from seeing the significance of gender in children's everyday social lives and, thus, also in the social spaces of learning. Pretending that gender issues do not exist in schools does not help children learn to negotiate gender sensitively. In order for future music educators to be able to deal with the gender issues in the various sites of music learning, it is essential that music-teacher education programs include gender studies. Moreover, music theory pedagogy would benefit from taking part in the wider education conversations, and being more aware of diverse social perspectives. Although my study has experimented with such a pedagogical solution, I am not promoting gender divisions in the classroom, as such. I am promoting that, when they observe problems, teachers respond by trying different solutions to those problems. Taking into account the changing needs of students and treating social issues, like gender issues, when they arise is vital when striving towards reflexive and transformative learning. Music education that offers equal opportunities; encourages collaboration with others; promotes creativity and a sense of agency; and provides tools for cultural participation can be, in a pragmatist Deweyan sense, a source of a good life.

References

Abramo, J. M. 2011. Queering informal pedagogy: Sexuality and popular music in school. Music Education Research 13 (4), 465-477.

Adler, A. & Harrison,S. 2004. Swinging back the gender pendulum: Addressing boys' needs in music education research and practice. In L. R. Bartel (ed.) Questioning the music education paradigm. Waterloo, ON: Canadian Music Educators' Association, 270-289.

Ali, S. 2003. "To be a girl": culture and class in schools.
Gender and Education 15 (3), 269-283.

Anttila, A., Ojanen, K., Saarikoski, H. & Timonen, S. 2011. Tyttöjen juttuja.
Tyttökulttuurin monimuotoiset tilat. [Girls' stuff. Girl culture's diverse spaces]
In K. Ojanen, H. Mulari and S. Aaltonen (eds.) Entäs tytöt. [What about the girls]
Tampere: Vastapaino, 135-172.

Anttila, E.1996. Dance education in theory and practice. Licentiate's Thesis,
University of Helsinki.

Anttila, E. 2003. A Dream Journey to the Unknown: Searching Dialogue in Dance
Education. Acta Scenica 14. Helsinki: Theatre Academy.

Archer, L. 2006. Masculinities, femininities and resistance to participation in post-compulsory education. In C. Leathwood and B. Francis (eds.) Gender and Lifelong Learning. London: Routledge, 70-82.

Armstrong, V. 2011. Technology and the gendering of music education.
Aldershot: Ashgate.

Arnot, M. 2007. Gender Voices in the Classroom. In C. Skelton, B. Francis
and L. Smulyan (eds.) The Sage Handbook of Gender and Education. Thousand Oaks,
CA: Sage, 407-421.

Ashley, Martin. 2009. How high should boys sing?: Gender, authenticity and credibility
in the young male voice. Surrey: Ashgate.

Atkinson, P. & Coffey, A. 2002. Revisiting the relationship between participant observation and interviewing. In J. F. Gubrium and J. A. Holstein (eds.) Handbook of Interview Research. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 801-881.

Atkinson, P. & Hammersley, M. 1994. Ethnography and participant observation. In N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (eds.) Handbook of qualitative research. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 248-261.

Atkinson, P. 2001b. In P. Atkinson, S.A. Coffey, J.S. Delamont, J. Lofland and L. Lofland (eds.) Handbook of Ethnography. London: Sage Publications, 1-8.

Bailey, S. M. (ed.) 2002. The Joessey-Bass reader on gender in education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Barnes, B. 2000. Understanding agency. Social theory and responsible action. London: Sage Publications.

Baron-Cohen, S. 2004. The Essential Difference. London: Penguin.

Barrett, M. 2005. Musical communication and children's communities of musical practice. In R.D. Miell, R. MacDonald and D.J. Hargreaves (eds.) Musical Communication. New York: Oxford University Press, 261-280.

Barry, N.H. 1992. The Effects of practice strategies, individual differences in cognitive style and gender upon technical accuracy and musicality of student instrumental performance. Psychology of Music 20 (2), 112-123.

deBeauvoir, S. 1972. The Second Sex. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Bennetts, K. 2013. Boys' music? School context and middle-school boys' musical choices. Music Education Research. 15 (2), 214-230.

Berg, P. 2010. Ryhmärajoja ja hierarkioita: etnografinen tutkimus peruskoulun yläasteen liikunnanopetuksesta. [Group boundaries and hierarchies: An ethnographic study on middle-school physical education] Dissertation. University of Helsinki, The Faculty of Social Sciences. Helsinki: University Press.

Biesta, G. 1994. Education as Practical Intersubjectivity: Towards a Critical-Pragmatic Understanding of Education. Educational Theory 44 (3), 299-317.

Biesta, G. & Burbules, N. 2003. Pragmatism and Educational Research.
Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Björck, C. 2011. Claiming Space: Discourses on Gender, Popular Music,
and Social Change. Art Monitor Dissertation No 22. University of Gothenburg.

Blair, D.V. 2009. Learner agency: To understand and to be understood.
British Journal of Music Education 26 (2), 173-187.

Bohman, J. 1999. Practical Reason and Cultural Constraint. In R. Shusterman (ed.)
Bourdieu: A Critical reader. Oxford: Blackwell.

Bold, C. 2012. Using Narrative in Research. London: Sage.

Bond, K. E. 1994. How "Wild Things" tamed gender distinctions. Journal of Physical
Education, Recreation and Dance 65 (2), 28–33.

Borgström-Källén, C. 2014. När musik gör skillnad. Genus och genrepraktiker i samspel.
[When Music Makes a Difference. Gender and Genre Practise in Interplay] Dissertation.
University of Gothenburg.

Braun, V. and Clarke, V. 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology.
Qualitative Research in Psychology 3 (2), 77-101.

Bredesen, O. 2004. Uudet pojat ja tytöt – uusi pedagogiikka? [Originally: Nye gutter
og jenter – en ny pedagogikk? New boys and girls – New pegagogy?] Translation into
Finnish Kristiina Antinjuntti. Oslo:. J. W. Cappelens vorlag.

Brendler, B. M. 2012. De-emphasizing gender in talk about texts: Literature response,
discussion, and gender within a classroom community of practice. University of
Minnesota, ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. 3513312. 311 p. Retrieved June
14th, 2014 from http://ezproxy.siba.fi/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/1027
135715?accountid=150397.

Bresler, L. 1996. Ethical Issues in the Conduct and Communication of Ethnographic
Classroom Research. Studies in Art Education 37 (3), 133-44.

Bruner, J. 1996. The culture of education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Butler, J. 1990/1999. Gender Trouble. Feminism and the Subversion of Identity. New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. 1991. Contingent Foundations: Feminism and the Question of "Postmodernism". Praxis International 11, 150-165.

Butler, J. 1993. Bodies that Matter. London: Routledge.

Butler, J. 2006. Hankala sukupuoli. Feminismi ja identiteetin kumous. [Originally: Gender Trouble. Feminism and the Subversion of Identity] Translation into Finnish Tuula Pulkkinen and Leena-Maija Rossi. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Butler, J. 2004. Undoing gender. New York and London: Routledge.

Charles, B. 2004. Boys' and girls' constructions of gender through musical composition in the primary school. British Journal of Music Education 21 (3), 265-277.

Chodorow, N. 1978. Reproducing Mothering. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Chodorow, N. 1995. Family Structure and Feminine Personality. In N. Tuona and R. Tong (eds.) Feminism and Philosophy. Boulder, Co: Westview Press., 199-216.

Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S. 2009. Inquiry as Stance. Practitioner Research for the Next Generation. New York: Teachers College Press.

Coeyman, B. 1996. Applications of feminist pedagogy to the college music major curriculum: An introduction to the issues. College Music Symposium 36, 73-90.

Cohen, M. 1996. Is there a space for achieving girl? In P. F. Murphy and C. V. Gipps (eds.) Equity in the classroom. London: Falmer Press., 124-135.

Coffey, A. & Atkinson, P. 1996. Making Sense of Qualitative Data. Complementary Research Strategies. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Coffey, A., Holbrook, B. & Atkinson, P. 1996. "Qualitative Data Analysis: Technologies and Representations. Sociological Research Online 1 (1). Retrieved May 11th, 2013 from <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/1/1/4.html>.

Coffield, F., Moseley, D., Hall, E. & Ecclestone, K. 2004. Should we be using learning styles? What research has to say to practice. London: Learning and Skills Research Centre.

Connell, R. 1995. Masculinities. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Connell, R. 2002. Gender. London: Polity Press.

Connell, R. 2009. Gender in World Perspective. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Connolly, P. 2004. Boys and Schooling in the Early Years. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Cooper, N.A. 1995. Children's singing accuracy as a function of grade level, gender, and individual versus unison singing. Journal of Research in Music Education 43 (3), 222-231.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. 1990. Flow: The psychology of Optimal Experience.
New York: Harper and Row.

Davies, B. 1989. Frogs and Snails and Feminist Tales. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Davies, B. 1993. Shards of glass: Children reading and writing beyond gendered identities. New Jersey: Hampton Press.

Davies, L. 1984. Pupil Power, Deviance and Gender in School. Lewes: Falmer.

Deegan, M. 2001. The Chicago School of Ethnography. In P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S.J. Delamont, J. Lofland and L. Lofland (eds.) Handbook of Ethnography.
London: Sage, 11-25.

DeLair, H. A. 2000. Power and gender: Issues in community. A practitioner ethnography of the unit block area in a two-year primary early childhood classroom. The University of New Mexico. ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. 9977762. 184 p. Retrieved February 20th, 2012 from http://ezproxy.siba.fi/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/doc view/304614787?accountid=150397

Delamont, S. & Atkinson, P. 1995. Fighting Familiarity. Essays on Education and Ethnography. Creskill: Hampton Press.

Delzell, J. K. & Leppla, D. A. 1992. Gender association of musical instruments and preferences of fourth-grade students for selected instrument. Journal of Research in Music Education 40 (2), 93-103.

DeNora, T. 2000. Music in everyday life. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dewey, J. 1966a. "The Dewey School.". In F. W. Garforth (ed.) Dewey's Educational Writings. London: Heinemann, 181-196.

Dewey, J. MW = "The Middle Works: (1899-1924)". In J. A. Boydston (ed.) The Collective Works of John Dewey 1882-1953. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Dewey, J. 1997/1910. How we think. Toronto: Dover Publications.

Dewey, J. 1999/1929. Pyrkimys varmuuteen. Tutkimus tiedon ja toiminnan suhteesta. Traslation in Finnish Pentti Määttänen. [A Quest for Certainty] Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Dibben, N. 1999. Representations of Femininity in Popular Music.
Popular Music 18, 331-355.

Dibben, N. 2000. The Sound of "Synthetic Fury": Dance music, machines and masculinity. Popular Culture Review 11 (1), 75-84.

Dibben, N. 2009/2002. Gender Identity and Music. In R. MacDonald, D. Hargreaves and D. Miell (eds.) Musical identities. New York: Oxford University Press, 117-133.

Engeström, R. 2009. Who Is Acting in an Activity System? In A. Sannino,
H. Daniels and K. D. Gutierrez. (eds.) Learning and Expanding with Activity Theory. New York: Cambridge University Press, 257-273.

Engeström, Y. 1999. Activity theory and individual and social transformation.
In Y. Engeström, R. Miettinen and R-L. Punamäki (eds.) Perspectives on Activity Theory. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 19-38.

Erickson, F. 1985. Qualitative Methods in Research on Teaching. In M. Wittrock (ed.) Handbook of Research on Teaching (3rd ed.). New York: McMillan, 119-161.

Ericsson, C. & Lindgren, M. 2010. Musikklassrummet i blickfånget: Vardagskultur, identitet, styrning och kunskapsbildning. [The music classroom in focus: Everyday culture, identity, governance and knowledge formation] Research report 2010:1. Halmstad: Halmstad University, School of Teacher Education [downloadable from www.hh.se].

Evans, T. 1987. A Gender Agenda: a sociological study of teachers, parents and pupils in their primary schools. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Fausto-Sterling, A. 1993. The Five Sexes: Why male and female are not enough. The Sciences 33 (2), 20-24.

Fausto-Sterling, A. 2000a. The Five Sexes. Revisited. The Sciences 40 (4), 18-23.

Fausto-Sterling, A. 2000b. Sexing the Body. New York: Basic Books.

Ferm, C. 2004. Öppenhet och medvetenhet. En fenomenologisk studie av musikdidaktisk interaction. [Openness and awareness – a phenomenological study of music teaching and learning interaction] Dissertation. Lulea: School of Music in Pitea. Lulea University of Technology.

Ferm, C. 2006. Openness and awareness –- roles and demands of music teachers. Music Education Research 8 (2), 237-250.

FNCC. 2004. Finnish National Core Curriculum for Basic Education 2004. Helsinki: Finnish National Board of Education. Retrieved September 15th, 2010 from http://www. oph.fi/english/curricula_and_qualifications/basic_education

FNBE. 1998. Finnish National Board of Education. Act and Degree on Basic Education in the Arts. Retrieved September 15th, 2010 from http://www.oph.fi/english/curricula_ and_qualifications/basic_education

FNBE. 2002. Finnish National Board of Education. Framework Curriculum. Extended syllabi. Retrieved September 15th, 2010 from http://www.oph.fi/english/curricula_and_ qualifications/basic_education

FNBE. 2005. Finnish National Board of Education. Framework Curriculum. General syllabi. Retrieved September 15th, 2010 from http://www.oph.fi/english/curricula_and_ qualifications/basic_education

Fisher, J. 1994. Unequal races: gender and assessment. In D. Graddoll, J. Maybin and B. Stierer (eds.) Researching language and literacy in social context. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 168-176.

Fortney, P. M., Boyle, D.J. & DeCarbo, N.J. 1993. A study of middle school band students' instrument choices. Journal of Research in Music Education 41 (1), 28-39.

Foster, V. 1996. Space invaders: desire and threat in the schooling of girls. Discourse: Studies in cultural policies of education 17 (1), 43-46.

Foucault, M. 1978. The Will to Knowledge: The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Francis, B. 1998. Power Plays: primary school children's conception of gender, power and adult work. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.

Francis, B. 2000. Boys, girls and achievement: addressing the classroom issues. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Francis, B. & Skelton, C. 2005. Reassessing gender and achievement. Questioning contemporary key debates. London and New York: Routledge.

Freire, P. 1970. Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: Herder and Herder.

Gee, J. 1990. Social linguistics and literacies: Ideologies in discourses. New York: Falmer Press.

Gibbs, G. 2007. Analyzing Qualitative Data. London: Sage.

Goffman, E. 1961. Asylums: Essays on the social situation of mental patients and another inmates. New York: Anchor.

Goldman, R. 2007. Video Representations and the Perspectivity Framework: Epistemology, Ethnography, Evaluation, and Ethics. In R. Goldman, B. Pea, B. Barron and S. Derry (eds.) Video Research in the Learning Sciences. New York: Laurence Erlbaum Assoc., 3-37.

Gordon, T., Holland, J. & Lahelma, E. 2000a. Making Spaces. Citizenship and Difference in Schools. Basingstoke: Macmillan Press.

Gordon, T., Holland, J. & Lahelma, E. 2000b. Moving bodies/Still bodies: Embodiment and agency in schools. In L. McKie and N. Watson (eds.) Organizing bodies: Policy, Institutions and Work. Explorations in Sociology 58, The British Sociological Association. London: Macmillan; & New York: St. Martin's Press, 81-101.

Gordon, T. & Lahelma, E. 2002. Koulun arkea tutkimassa. Yläasteen erot ja erilaisuudet. [Examining day-to-day life in school. The difference and diversity in middle-school]. City of Helsinki, Education Department A1:2002. Helsinki: City of Helsinki.

Gordon, T. 2006a. Girls in education: citizenship, agency and emotions. Gender and Education 18 (1), 1-15.

Gordon, T. 2006b. Gender and Citizenship. In C. Skelton, B. Francis and L. Smulyan (eds.) The Sage Handbook of Gender and Education. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 279-292.

Gordon, T. & Lahelma, E. 2003. Opetus ja oppiminen virallisessa koulussa. [Teaching and Learning in Formal School.] In T. Gordon & E. Lahelma (eds.) Koulun arkea tutkimassa: yläasteen erot ja erilaisuudet. [Examining day-to-day life in School. The difference and diversity in middle-school] City of Helsinki, Education Department A1:2002. Helsinki: University Print, 74-77.

Gould, E. 1992. Gender-specific occupational role models: Implications for music educators. Update: Applications of Research in Music Education 11 (1), 8-12.

Gould, E. 1994. Getting the whole picture: The view from here. Philosophy of Music Education Review 2 (2), 92-98.

Gould, E. 2004. Feminist theory in music education research: Grrl-illa games as nomadic practice (or how music education fell from grace). Music Education Research 6 (1), 67-80.

Gould, E. 2007. Social justice in music education: the problematic of democracy. Music Education Research 9 (2), 169-189.

Green, L. 1997. Music, Gender and Education. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Green, L. 2002. Exposing the gendered discourse of music education. Feminism & Psychology 12 (2), 137-144.

Gutierrez, K. 1993. How talk, context, and script shape contexts for learning: A cross case comparison of journal sharing. Linguistics and Education 5 (3/4), 335-365.

Gutierrez, K. & Rymes, B. & Larson, J. 1995. Script, Counterscript, and Underlife in the Classroom: James Brown versus Brown v. Board of Education. Harvard Educational Review 65 (3), 445-471.

Hammersley, M. & Atkinson, P. 2007. Ethnography: Principles in Practice (3rd ed.) Wiltshire: Routledge.

Happel, A. 2011. Practicing gender: A feminist ethnography of an all girls' after-school club. Georgia State University, ProQuest, UMI Dissertations. 3501096 188 p. Retrieved June 14th, 2014 from http://ezproxy.siba.fi/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/926827345?accountid=150397

Hargreaves, D. J., Comber, C. & Colley, A. 1995. Effects of age, gender, and training on musical preferences of British secondary school students. Journal of Research in Music Education 42 (3), 242-250.

Harris, A. 1990. Race and Essentialism in Feminist Legal Theory. Stanford Law Review 42 (3), 581-616. doi:10.2307/1228886

Haslanger, S. 1995. Ontology and Social Construction. Philosophical Topics 23, 95-125.

Heimonen, M. 2002. Music Education and Law. Regulation as an Instrument. Studia Musica 17. Sibelius Academy. Helsinki: PB-Printing Oy.

Ho, W.-C. 2009. Gender differences in instrumental learning among secondary school students in Hong Kong. Gender and Education 21 (4), 405-422.

Hopearuoho-Saajala, K. & Keskinen, S. 1998. Tyttöjen ja poikien ystävyyssuhteet sosiaalisen sukupuolen rakentajina. [Girls' and boys' friendships constructing the social gender] In S. Keskinen and K. Lehtonen (eds.) Tytöt ja pojat: Samanlaisia ja erilaisia. [Girls and boys: Similar and different] University of Turku, Faculty of Education Research Series A:187. Turku: Painosalama, 58–70.

Hall, C. 2005. Gender and boys' singing in early childhood. British Journal of Music Education 22, 5-20.

hooks, b. 1989. Talking back: Thinking feminist, thinking black. Boston: South End Press.

hooks, b. 2000. Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center (2nd ed.) London: Pluto Press.

Ilomäki, L. 2011. Search of Musicianship: A Practitioner-Research Project on Pianists' Aural- Skills Education. Studia Musica 45. Helsinki: Sibelius Academy.

Ilomäki, L. & Holkkola, M. 2013. Musiikin perusteet ja muuttuva oppimiskäsitys [Basics of Music and the changing concept of learning]. In M-L. Juntunen, H.M. Nikkanen and H. Westerlund (eds.) Musiikkikasvattaja. Kohti refleksiivistä käytäntöä. [Music educator. Towards a reflexive practice] Jyväskylä: PS-kustannus, 204-221.

Ivinson, G. & Murphy, P. 2007. Rethinking Single-sex Teaching. Open University Press.

Jackson, C. 2002. "Laddishness" as a self-worth protection strategy. Gender and Education 14 (1), 37-51.

Joffe, H. 2011. Thematic Analysis. In D. Harper & A. Thomson (eds.) Qualitative Research Methods in Mental Health and Psychotherapy: A Guide for Students and Practitioners. London: Wiley-Blackwell, 209-224.

Jones, S. & Myhill, D. 2004. Seeing things differently: teachers' constructions of underachievement. Gender and Education 16 (4), 531-546.

Jorgensen, E. R. 2008. Questions for music education research. Music Education Research 10 (3), 331-346.

Josselson, R. & Lieblich, A. 2003. A framework for narrative research proposals in psychology. In R. Josselson, A. R., Lieblich, A. and D. P. McAdams (eds.) Up close and personal: The teaching and learning of narrative research. Washington, DC: APA Books, 259-274.

Juntunen, M.-L., Karlsen, S., Kuoppamäki, A., Laes, T. & Muhonen, S. 2014. Envisioning imaginary spaces for musicking: Equipping students for leaping into the unexplored. Music Education Research 16 (3). London: Routledge, 251-266.

Juntunen, M.-L. 2011. Music. In S. Laitinen, A. Himola and M-L. Juntunen (eds.) Assessment of the Learning Outcomes in Music, Visual Arts and Crafts in the Final 9th Grade of Basic Education, Education Follow-up Reports 2011:11. Helsinki: The National Board of Education, 36-95.

Kankkunen, T. 2004. Tytöt, pojat ja "erojen leikki". Sukupuolen rakentaminen koulun kuvataideopetuksen arjessa. [Girls, boys and 'gender play'. Gender construction in the everyday context of school art education] University of Art and Design of Helsinki Publication A 52. Helsinki: University of Art and Design.

Karlsen, S. 2011. Using musical agency as a lens: Researching music education from the angle of experience. Research Studies in Music Education 33 (2), 107-121.

Knoblauch, H. 2006/2009. Videography. Focused Ethnography and Video Analysis. In H. Knoblauch, B. Schnettler, J. Raab and H-G. Soeffner (eds.) Video-Analysis: Methodology and Methods. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. 69-84.

Koppinen, M. 2001. Tampereen konservatorio 1931-2001. [The Conservatory of Tampere 1931-2001] Jyväskylä: Gummerus.

Koramo, M. 2009. Taiteen perusopetus 2008. Selvitys taiteen perusopetuksen järjestämisestä lukuvuonna 2007-2008. [Basic art education. 2008. An account of organizing of basic art education in 2007-2008] Finish National Board of Education. Retrieved July 13th, 2012 from http://www.oph.fi/julkaisut/2008/taiteen_perusopetus_2008

Korpela, P., Kuoppamäki, A., Laes, T., Miettinen, L., Muhonen, S., Muukkonen, M., Nikkanen, H., Ojala, A., Partti, H., Pihkanen, T. & Rikandi, I. 2010. Music Education in Finland. In I. Rikandi (ed.) Mapping the Common Ground. Philosophical perspectives on Finnish music education. Helsinki: BTJ Kustannus, 16-30.

Koza, J. E. 1992. Picture this: Sex equity in textbook illustrations. Music Educators Journal 78 (7), 28-33.

Koza, J. E. 1993. Big boys don't cry (or sing): Gender, misogyny, and homophobia in college choral methods texts. Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning 4 (4/5), 48-64.

Koza, J. E. 1994. Females in 1988 middle school music textbooks: An analysis of illustrations. Journal of Research in Music Education 42 (2), 145-171.

Kuoppamäki, A. 2007. Vastaako metsä niin kuin sinne huudetaan? Yhteisöllisyys ja tunteet musiikin oppimisen voimavarana. [A sense of community and emotions as a learning resource in music] The Finnish Journal of Music Education 10 (1-2), 114-117.

Kuoppamäki, A. 2010. A tool and the art of using it –- Elementary music theory as a means for enabling musical participation. The Finnish Journal of Music Education 13 (2), Helsinki: 17-22.

Kuoppamäki, A. 2010. Music Education in the Spaces of Gender. In I. Rikandi (ed.) Mapping the Common Ground. Philosophical perspectives on Finnish music education. Helsinki: BTJ Kustannus, 180-191.

Kuoppamäki, A. 2013. Säveltäminen yhteisöllisen vuorovaikutuksen ja toimijuuden rakentajana. Tarinoita musiikin perusteiden tunneilta. [Constructing interaction and group agency through composing. Narratives from Basics of Music Lessons] In J. Ojala and L. Väkevä (eds.) Säveltäjäksi kasvattaminen. Pedagogisia näkökulmia musiikin luovaan tekijyyteen. [Educating a Composer. Perspectives on Creative Authorship] Tampere: Juvenes Print, 148-162.

Kvale, S. & Brinkmann, S. 2009. InterViews. Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Käyhkö, M. 2006. Siivoojaksi oppimassa: etnografinen tutkimus työläistytöistä puhdistus palvelualan koulutuksessa. [Learning to become a cleaning person: an ethnographic study on blue-collar girls participating in cleaning training] Joensuu: Joensuu University Press.

Lahelma, E. & Gordon, T. (eds.) 2003. Koulun arkea tutkimassa. Yläasteen erot ja erilaisuus. [Examining day-to-day life in school. The difference and diversity in middle school] City of Helsinki, Education Department A1:2002. Helsinki: University Print.

Lahelma, E. & Gordon, T. 2007. Taustoja, lähtökohtia ja avauksia kouluetnografiaan. [Backgrounds, starting points and openings on ethnography] In S. Lappalainen, P. Hynninen, T. Kankkunen, E. Lahelma and T. Tolonen (eds.) Etnografia metodologiana: Lähtökohtana koulutuksen tutkimus. [An ethnography as a methodology: Educational research as a starting point] Tampere: Vastapaino, 17-38.

Lamb, R. 1996. Discords: Feminist pedagogy in music education. Theory into Practice 35 (2), 124-131.

Lamb, R. 1997. Music trouble: Desire, discourse, education. Canadian University Music Review 18 (1), 85-98.

Lamb, R., Dolloff, L. A., & Howe, S. W. 2002. Feminism, feminist research, and gender research in music education: A selective review. In R. Colwell and C. Richardson (eds.) The New Handbook of Research on Music Teaching and Learning. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 648-674.

Lamb, R. 2007. Gender issues in music education at the Pan-Canadian Symposium. In K.Veblen and C. Beynon et al. From Sea to sea: Perspectives on music education in Canada, 1-8. Retrieved January 12th, 2014 from http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/musiceducationE-books/1/

Lappalainen, S. 2006. Kansalaisuus, etnisyys ja sukupuoli lasten välisissä suhteissa ja esiopetuksen käytännöissä. [Nationality, ethnicity and gender in children's peer relations and preschool practices] Department of Education. Research Report 206. Helsinki: University Press.

Lappalainen, S. 2007. Johdanto: mikä ihmeen etnografia? [Introduction: What ethnography?] In S. Lappalainen, P. Hynninen, T. Kankkunen, E. Lahelma and T. Tolonen (eds.) Etnografia metodologiana: Lähtökohtana koulutuksen tutkimus. [An ethnography as a methodology: Educational research as a starting point] Tampere: Vastapaino, 65-88.

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. 1991. Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leavy, P. 2009. Methods Meet Art. Arts-Based Research Practice. New York: The Guildford Press.

Lees, S. 1986. Losing Out. London: Hutchinson.

Lehikoinen, K. 2006. Stepping Queerly? Discourses in Dance Education for Boys in Late 20th -Century Finland. Oxford: Peter Lang.

Lembo, L. 2011. The effects of gender-based classroom placement on the academic achievement of boys and girls at the elementary level. California State University, Stanislaus, ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. 3458365. 117 p. Retrieved June 14th, 2014 from http://ezproxy.siba.fi/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/87617 7092?accountid=150397

Lempiäinen, K. 2007. Sukupuolinen toimija. Kysymys olemuksesta, roolista ja tavasta. [Gendered agent. The question of appearance, role and habit] Sosiologia 44 (2), 109-120.

Leppänen, T. 2010. Vallatonta musiikkia. [Childish music. Children's music culture in Finland] Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Länsi-Helsingin musiikkiopisto. 1995. Länsi-Helsingin musiikkiopisto 50 vuotta. [50 years of Music School of West Helsinki] Munkkiniemen Musiikkiyhdistys ry.

MacIntosh, P. S. 2000. Gender and fifth grade general music: A qualitative study of teacher-student interaction. Doctoral dissertation. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan.

MacKinnon, C. 1989. Toward a Feminist Theory of State. Cambridge, Massachusets: Harward University Press.

McWilliam, H. 2003. Gender equity issues in the depiction of female wind band conductors and wind band experts in The Instrumentalist Magazine (August 2000 - July 2002). Dissertation. Madison: University of Wisconsin.

Martino, W. & Berrill, D. 2003. Boys, schooling and masculinities: Interrogating the 'right' way to educate boys. Educational Review 55 (2), 99-117.

Martino, W. & Pallotta- Chiarolli, M. (eds.) 2003. So What's a Boy? Maidenhead: Open University/McGraw Hill.

Martino, W. 2006. The "Right" Way to Educate Boys: Interrogating the Politics of Boys' Education in Australia. In C. Skelton, B. Francis and L. Smulyan (eds.) The Sage Handbook of Gender and Education. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 350-364.

Mattelart, A. & Mattelart, M. 1998. Theories of Communication. A Short Introduction. London: Sage.

Maynard, T. 2002. Boys and Literacy: Exploring the Issues. London: Routledge.

Mead, G.H. 1934/1956/1934. The social psychology of Georg Herbert Mead. Chicago IL: University of Chicago Press.

Mikkola, M. 2012. Feminist Perspectives on Sex and Gender. In E.N. Zalta (ed.) The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2012 Edition), Retrieved May 20th, 2014 from URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2012/entries/feminism-gender/>.

Morton, C. 1994. Whistle, daughter, whistle, and you shall have a man: Sexism in children's song materials. In P. Bourne, P. Masters, N. Amin, M. Gonick and L. Gribowski (eds.) Feminism and education: A Canadian perspective 2. Toronto, ON: Centre for Women's Studies in Education, 203-220.

Moss, G. 2007. Literacy and gender. London: Routledge.

McNay, L. 2004. Agency and experience: gender as lived relation. In L. Adkins and B. Skeggs (eds.) Feminism After Bourdieu. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

North, A., Hargreaves, D. & O'Neill, S. 2000. The importance of music to adolescents. British Journal of Educational Psychology 70 (2), 255-272.

Ojala, H., Palmu, T. & Saarinen, J. 2009. Paikalla pysyvää ja liikkeessä olevaa. Feministisiä avauksia toimijuuteen ja sukupuoleen. [Still standing and moving. Feminist openings on agency and gender.]. In H. Ojala, T. Palmu, & J. Saarinen (eds.) Sukupuoli ja toimijuus koulutuksessa. [Gender and agency in education] Tampere: Vastapaino, 13-38.

Olsson, B. 2007. Social Issues in Music Education. In L. Bresler (ed.) International Handbook of Research in Arts Education 16. Dordrecht: Springler, 989-1006.

O'Neill, S. A. 2012. Becoming a Music Learner: Toward a Theory of Transformative Music Engagement. In G. McPherson and G. Welch (eds.) The Oxford Handbook of Music Education 1. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 163–186.

O'Toole, P. 1994. I sing in a choir but I have 'No voice!'. The Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning 4-5 (4, 1), 65-77.

O'Toole, P. 1997. Escaping tradition: Tensions between the production of values and pleasures in the choral setting. In R. Rideout (ed.) On the sociology of music education. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma, 130-137.

O'Toole, P. 1998. A missing chapter from choral methods books: How choirs neglect girls. Choral Journal 39 (5), 9-32.

Paechter, C. 2003. Masculinities, femininities, and physical education: Bodily practices as reified markers of community membership. In C. Vincent, C. (ed.) Social Justice, Education and Identity. London: RoutledgeFalmer, 137-152.

Paechter, C. 2006. Constructing Femininity/Constructing Femininities. In C. Skelton, B. Francis and L. Smulyan (eds.) The Sage Handbook of Gender and Education. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 365-377.

Paley, V.G. 1984. Boys and Girls. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Palmu, T. 2003. Sukupuolen rakentuminen koulun kulttuurisissa teksteissä: etnografia yläasteen äidinkielen oppitunneilla. [The gender construction in school's cultural texts: An ethonography on middle-school Finnish language lessons] University of Helsinki: Studies of Educational Sciencies 189.

Partti, H. 2012. Learning from cosmopolitan digital musicians. Identity, musicianship, and changing values in (in)formal music communities. Dissertation. Studia Musica 50. Helsinki: Sibelius Academy.

Partti, H., Westerlund, H. & Björk, C. 2013. Oppimiskäsitykset reflektiivisen musiikkikasvattajan toiminan ohjaajina. [Learning conceptions directing the acting as a reflexive music educator.] In M-L. Juntunen, H.M. Nikkanen and H. Westerlund, (eds.) Musiikkikasvattaja. Kohti refleksiivistä käytäntöä. [Music educator. Towards a reflexive practice]. Jyväskylä: PS-kustannus, 54-70.

Patton, M. 2003. Qualitative Evaluation Checklist. Retrieved October 2nd, 2014 from http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/archive_checklists/qec.pdf

Phoenix, A. 2008. Analysing narrative context. In M. Andrews, C. Squire and M. Tamboukou (eds.) Doing Narrative Research. London: Sage, 72-87.

Reimer, B. 1995. The Experience of Profundity in Music. Journal of Aesthetic Education 29 (4), 1-21.

Renold, E. 2000. Coming out: Gender, (hetero)sexuality and the primary school. Gender and Education 12 (3), 309-326.

Renold, E. 2001. "Square girls", femininity and the negotiation of academic success in the primary school. British Educational Research Journal 27, 577-588.

Renold, E. & Allan, A. 2006. Bright and beautiful: High achieving girls, ambivalent femininities, and the feminization of success in the primary school. Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education 27 (4), 457-473.

Renold, E. 2005. Girls, Boys and Junior Sexualities. London: Routledge.

Renold, E. 2006a. They won't let us play... unless you're going out with one of them: girls, boys and Butler's "heterosexual matrix" in the primary years. British Journal of Sociology of Education 27 (4), 489-509.

Renold, E. 2006b. Gendered Classroom Experiences. In C. Skelton, B. Francis & L. Smulyan (eds.) The Sage Handbook of Gender and Education. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 439-451.

Reay, E. 2001. "Spice girls", "nice girls", "girlies" and "tomboys": Gender discourses, girls' cultures and femininities in the primary classroom. Gender and education 13 (2), 153-166.

Rikandi, I. 2012. Negotiating musical and pedagogical agency in a learning community. Dissertation. Studia Musica 49. Helsinki: Sibelius Academy.

Rogers, M.R. 2004. Teaching approaches in music theory. An overview of pedagogical philosophies. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Rogoff, B. 2003. The cultural nature of human development. New York: Oxford University Press.

Roulston, K. & Misawa, M. 2011. Music teachers' constructions of gender in elementary education. Music Education Research 13 (1), 3-28.

Schirato, T. & Yell, S. 2000. Communication and cultural literacy.
St Leonards: Allen & Unvin.

Schmidt, C.P. 1995. Attributions of success, grade level, and gender as factors in choral students' perceptions of teacher feedback. Journal of Research in Music Education 43 (4), 313-329.

Seddon, F. 2012. A book review on: Armstrong, V. 2011. Technology and the Gendering of Music Education. British Journal on Music Education 29 (3), 431-432.

Skeggs, B. 1994. Situating the Production of Feminist Ethnography. In M. Maynard and J. Purvis (eds.) Researching Women's Lives from a Feminist Perspective.
London: Taylor & Francis, 77-92.

Skelton, C. (ed.) 1989. Whatever Happens to Little Women?: Gender and Schooling.
Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Skelton, C. 2001. Schooling the boys: masculinities and primary education.
Buckingham: Open University Press.

Skelton, C. & Francis, B. 2005. (eds.) A feminist Critique. Routledge: London.

Skelton, C. 2006. Boys and Girls in the Elementary School. In C. Skelton, B. Francis and L. Smulyan (eds.) The Sage Handbook of Gender and Education. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 140-150.

Skelton, C. & Francis, B. 2009. Feminism and The Schooling Scandal.
New York: Routledge.

Slavin, R. 1994. Educational Psychology: Theory and Practice (4th ed.).
Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Small, C. 1998. Musicking. The meanings of performing and listening. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

SMOL. 2013. Suomen musiikkioppilaitosten liitto ry. [Association of the Finnish Music Schools.] Retrieved April 14th, 2014 from http://www.oaj.fi/cs/smol/etusivu

Spelman, E. 1988. Inessential Woman. Boston: Beacon Press.

Stone, A. 2007. An Introduction to Feminist Philosophy. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Sullivan, A. 2010. Single-sex and co-educational schooling: lifecourse consequences? London: Centre for Longitudinal Studies, Institute of Education. Retrieved May 16th, 2014 from www.ioe.ac.uk/Research_Expertise/Research_brochure_2010_FINAL.pdf

Swain, J. 2002. The resources and strategies boys use to establish status in a junior school without competitive sport. Discourse 23, 91-107.

Schwartz, L. J. 2009. Music theory pedagogy: An examination of ideological and methodological assumptions that shape current praxis in undergraduate tonal music theory instruction in the north american music academy, and the (possible) turn toward a scholarship of teaching that is informed by critical inquiry, responsible ethics, and a pedagogy of hope. University of Manitoba, ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. NR71735. 236 p. Retrieved June 6th, 2014 from http://ezproxy.siba.fi/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/860140309?accountid=150397

Tainio, L. 2005. Luokkahuoneen vuorottelujärjestyksen rikkomukset. [Breaches of the classroom script] In L. Kuure, E.L, Kärkkäinen and M. Saarenkunnas (eds.) Kieli ja sosiaalinen toiminta. [Language and the social action] The year book of Finnish association for applied linguistics 2005. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, 179-192.

Tainio, L. (ed.) 2007. Vuorovaikutusta luokkahuoneessa. Näkökulmana keskusteluanalyysi. [Interaction in a classroom. Conversation analysis as a viewpoint] Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Tainio, L. 2008. Toisten puhujien matkiminen luokkahuoneessa. [Imitating the speech of others in the classroom] In S. Routarinne and T. Uusi-Hallila (eds.) Nuoret kielikuvassa. Kouluikäisten kieli 2000-luvulla. [Adolescents in the methaphors. The language of the schoolchildren] Helsinki: Finnish Literature Exchange, 148-164.

Tainio, L. 2009. Puhuttelu luokkahuoneessa. Tytöt ja pojat huomion kohteena. [Addressing the others in the classroom. Girls and boys in focus.]. In H. Ojala, T. Palmu and J. Saarinen (eds.) Sukupuoli ja toimijuus koulutuksessa. [Gender and agency in education] Tampere: Vastapaino, 13-38.

Takaya, K. 2008. Jerome Bruner's Theory of Education: From Early Bruner to Later Bruner. In Interchange 39 (1), 1-19.

Taylor, C. 1985. Human Agency and Language. Philosophical Papers, 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thorne, B. 1993. Gender Play: Girls and Boys in School. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Tochon, F. 2007. From video cases to video pedagogy: A framework for video feedback and reflection in pedagogical research praxis. In R. Goldman, B. Pea, B. Barron and S. Derry (eds.) Video Research in the Learning Sciences. New York: Laurence Erlbaum Assoc., 53-65.

Tolonen, T. & Palmu, T. 2007. Etnografia, haastattelu ja (valta)positiot. [Ethnography, interview and (power) positions] In S. Lappalainen, P. Hynninen, T. Kankkunen, E. Lahelma and T. Tolonen (eds.) Etnografia metodologiana: Lähtökohtana koulutuksen tutkimus. [An ethnography as a methodology: Educational research as a starting point] Tampere: Vastapaino, 89-112.

Tolonen, T. 2001. Nuorten kulttuurit koulussa. Ääni, tila ja sukupuolen arkiset järjestykset. [Adolescent's cultures in school. Voice, space and gender in youth cultures at school] Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Väkevä, L. 2013. Informaali oppinen, musiikin opetus ja populaarimusiikin pedagogiikka. [Informal learning, music education and popular music pedagogy.] In M-L. Juntunen, H.M. Nikkanen and H. Westerlund, (eds.) Musiikkikasvattaja. Kohti refleksiivistä käytäntöä. [Music educator. Towards a reflexive practice]. Jyväskylä: PS-kustannus, 93-104.

Vygotski, L.S. 1978. Mind in society: The development of higher psychological process. In M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner and E. Souberman (eds.) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press., 121-133.

Walkerdine, V. 1984. Developmental psychology and the child-centered pedagogy: the insertion of Piaget into early education. In J. Henriques, W. Hollway, C. Urwin, C. Venn and V. Walkerdine (eds.) Changing the subject: Psychology, social regulation and subjectivity. London: Methuen, 153-202.

Walkerdine, V. 1989. Counting Girls Out. London: Virago.

Walkerdine, V. 1990. Schoolgirl Fictions. London: Verso.

Warrington, M. & Younger, M. 2001. Single-sex classes and equal opportunities for girls and boys: Perspectives through time from a mixed comprehensive school in England. Oxford Review of Education 27 (3), 339-356.

Watson-Gegeo, K. 1997. Classroom Ethnography. In N. Hornberger, and D. Corson (eds.) Encyclopedia of Language and Education, Volume 8: Research Methods in Language and Education. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, 135-144.

Weaver-Hightower, M. 2003. The "Boy Turn" in Research on Gender and Education. Review of Educational Research 73 (4), 471-498.

Wenger, E. 1998/2003. Communities of practice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wenger, E., McDermott, R. & Snyder, W.M. 2002. Cultivating communities of practice. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Wenger, E. 2006. Learning for a small planet. A research agenda. Project Overview. Scientific project description. Retriewed August 28th, 2014 from http://www.ewenger. com/research/index.htm

Wenger, E. 2009. Social learning capability: four essays on innovation and learning in social systems. EQUAL Final Report. Retrieved July 14th, 2014 from http://wenger-trayner.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/09-04-17-Social-learning-capability-v2.1.pdf

Westerlund, H. 2002. Bringing experience, action, and culture in music education. Dissertation. Studia Musica 16. Helsinki: Sibelius Academy.

Westerlund, H. 2008. Justifying Music Education: A View from Here-and-Now Value Experience. Philosophy of Music Education Review 16, 79–95. Retrieved March 23rd, 2012 from doi:10.2979/PME.2008.16.1.79.

West, C. & Zimmerman, D. H. 1987. Doing gender. Gender and society 1 (2), 125-151.

Whitehead, A. N. 1929. The Aims of Education and Other Essays.
New York: The Free Press.

Wilson, E. 2013. School-based Research. A Guide for education students (2nd ed.)
London: Sage Publications.

Yamakawa, Y., Forman, E., & Ansell, E. 2009. Role of Positioning: The role of positioning in constructing an identity in a third grade mathematics classroom. In K. Kumpulainen, C. E. Hmelo-Silver and M. Cesar (eds.) Investigating Classroom Interaction: Methodologies in Action. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, 179-201.

Younger, M. & Warrington, M. et al. 2005. Raising Boys' Achievement. University of Cambridge Faculty of Education. Department for Education and Skills. Research Report RR 636. Retrieved July 14th, 2014 from http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130401151715/http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/RR636.pdf

Younger, M. & Warrington, M. 2006. Would Harry and Hermione have done better in single-sex classes? A review of single-sex teaching in coeducational secondary schools in the United Kingdom. American Educational Research Journal 43 (4), 579-620.

Zervoudakes, J. & Tanur, J.M. 1994. Gender and musical instruments: Winds of change? Journal of Research in Music Education 42 (1), 58-67.

Appendix 1: Consent form of participation in the inquiry

Suostumus lapseni osallistumisesta tutkimukseen

_____saa osallistua opetustuntien videointiin

oppilaan nimi

ja ryhmäkeskusteluihin musiikin perusteiden tunneilla syyslukukaudella 2009 sekä
erikseen sovittuihin yksilöhaastatteluihin.

Helsingissä,   /   2009

_____

huoltajan allekirjoitus ja nimenselvennys

Videotallenteet tulevat vain omaan tutkimuskäyttööni, eivätkä lapset esiinny lopullisessa
tutkimustekstissä omilla nimillään.

Appendix 2: Example of a teacher diary

Diary 09-09-09 / 3rd lesson / Phase I

1. Zip-zap -contact game

-the group participates impatiently in the warm-ups
-great atmosphere!

2. Rhythmic circle

-rhythmic patterns given by the teacher
-the students invent their own patterns

-it takes a long time for the boys to get organized
-some of the boys just run around, lie on the floor etc.
-the students invent great rhythms!

3. The students own rhythmic patterns are turned into the body percussions
> the body percussions are taught to the others

- CO-OPERATION!!!
- everybody participates in actively

4. The dish-brush-comping

-sword fighting!
-some of the students can't concentrate and we have to stop the playing
> the situation is discussed together...

5. Discussing the time signatures and reading rhythmic patterns together

6. Exercises from the textbook

NOTES:

- a lesson with contradictions: some nice moments, but also some quite demanding...

Body percussions: everybody participated in actively and taught their own body-percussions to the others really eagerly! GREAT!

The collaborative rhythmic piece with the dish brushes: this did not work out. Some of the boys were just running around... The girls and couple of the boys tried to participate in as actively as they could. I am not happy about cutting down the group task.

Appendix 3: Example of a litteration

A Data Session 10-12-09 / Anna Kuoppamäki: "Girls' and boys' learning communities
and the construction of agency" (SibA)

BoM I a 09-11-11 / boys
00:18:05
A rhythmic reading exercise

Te   Hey, that's a dotted quarter note... it's read like this... daa-a [Te goes to the black board]
       Look, it's a quarter and a half... daa-a. [The students practice the reading of the dotted quarter
       note.] Daa-a da daa-aa.

A   What does this daa-da-stuff mean?

Te   It's like using the rhythmic syllables... daa-a da daa.. Hey, let's look at... please, listen up...
       [noise], let's take page 27. Let's take 27.

B   Can I play now?

Te   Please, not quite yet... let's first read this exercise. Hey, S3, please take it [the book] on your
       lap, so you can follow us easier... hey, this way, okay? And starts: one-and, two-and...
       [Everybody reads the exercise together]. Hey, how long is the rest in the second last bar? S3?
       [S3 is lifting his hand.]

C   Well, it's like... when you get to the... then it's like daa-a... and then you [C claps the rhythm]

Te   Yeah, what's the name of the rest?

D   One and two and...

Te   It's a half... only a half beat long, so it's the eighth rest...

D   So, it's like da?

Te   Exactly! Eighth rest. Please, let's start again. [Noise] Okay, one-and, two-and... [The exercise
       is repeated together.] Good! Let's clap now the same rhythm. [Everybody claps the rhythm
       together.] Yes! Hey, to how many do you count in this second exercise?
       The second... to how many...

E   Do you kind of count these two notes together? [S5 still wonders about the previous exercise.]

Te   [Te goes to S5 and further discusses the matter.] Look, when this is daa-a da daa...

D   Which do you like more, girls or boys?

Te   Oh... both are equally nice.

D   We are naughty... look, I'm touching this... [D plays 'naughty'.]

Te   Okay, well, to how many do you count in this next piece?

F   I want you to consider us stupid.

Te   Excuse me?

F   I want you to consider us stupid.

Te   Stupid? Why would you want that?

F   Because.

Te   Hey come on... [laughing]... I was wondering to how many does one count in this next...

F   My parents consider me stupid.

Te   What? Who do...

F   My parents do.

Te   Your parents consider you stupid? No they don't.

UNIVERSITY OF THE
ARTS HELSINKI
SIBELIUS
ACADEMY

RESEARCH PROGRAMME
MUTRI DOCTORAL SCHOOL