International Journal of Education & the Arts

Editors

Tawnya Smith
Boston University

Kristine Sunday
Old Dominion University

Eeva Anttila
University of the Arts Helsinki

Christina Gray
Edith Cowan University

**Expanding Professional Responsibility in Arts Education:
Social Innovations Paving the Way for Systems Reflexivity**

Heidi Westerlund
University of the Arts Helsinki, Finland

Sari Karttunen
University of the Arts Helsinki, Finland

Kai Lehikoinen
University of the Arts Helsinki, Finland

Tuulikki Laes
University of the Arts Helsinki, Finland

Lauri Väkevä
University of the Arts Helsinki, Finland

Eeva Anttila
University of the Arts Helsinki, Finland

Abstract

This article urges a reconsideration of professional responsibility in arts education, moving beyond an emphasis on narrow technical expertise and strict disciplinary boundaries in order to respond to the needs of complex late modern society. We reconsider 'professionalism' in arts education as a site of struggle that requires 'systems reflexivity' to engage in the transformation of wider society. By presenting three cases, conceptualised as social innovations in the arts education system in Finland, we illustrate how multi-professional collaboration and systems entrepreneurship, flexible institutional boundary-crossing, and performing social categories in professional education of artists help tackle exclusion and inequalities. We also argue that a degree of activism may be necessary for the field to expand its sense of professional responsibility beyond 'what is' towards 'what could be'.

Introduction

Publicly funded arts and arts education services in contemporary societies are increasingly expected to contribute to tackling major societal challenges. Whilst responsibility for issues such as exclusion, inequality, and social injustice have been widely discussed in contemporary theatre, dance, visual arts, and music education, the arts field has not unanimously welcomed the call for expanding its professional obligations beyond artistic quality. Even socially committed practitioners may find that such demands to take action towards change violate the freedom of the arts professions as an autonomous realm of expertise. These cross-pressures make it difficult for arts education professionals to find a coherent 'mode of existence' and narrative for the purpose of their work. As art sociologist Pascal Gielen argues, "[t]he art world today is a field full of paradoxical meanings that constantly contradict, undermine, and invoke each other" (Gielen, 2015, p. 22).

In this theoretically-oriented article, drawing upon empirical cases taken from the Finnish context, we will approach this current dilemma in arts education from the perspective of the *expansion of professional responsibility through social innovations* (Bouchard et al., 2015; Nicholls et al., 2015). As such, 'professionalism' is seen as building upon the foundational constitutive relationship between disciplinary expertise and the whole of society (e.g., Cribb & Gewirtz, 2015; Dyrdal Solbrekke & Sugrue, 2011). Therefore, to claim 'professionalism' in

the arts and arts education requires that the work, education, and conduct of professionals is conceived in relation to the whole of society and its policies, institutional settings, and horizontal changes (Gaunt & Westerlund, 2021). Professional responsibility thus involves struggles over how a rapidly changing society is organized and demands a readiness to see professional work "in the context of broader debates about social and civic purposes" (Cribb & Gewirtz, 2015, p. 71). In the same conceptual vein, professionalism in arts education refers to *a sense of responsibility* that is more collective than self-oriented, and also implies using one's expertise in the interests of wider society, such as for enhancing social equality. However, this realm of responsibility is far from being clearly organised by sets of rules or codes; rather, it "holds lofty ideals in tension with everyday professional workplace realities […] embodied by professionals as they attend to their work" (Dyrdal Solbrekke & Sugrue, 2011, p. 11). Therefore, professionalism in arts education needs to be seen as *a site of constant struggle* (Evetts, 2014), which requires 'systems reflexivity' (Voß et al., 2006) from individual professionals and more collectively from arts education institutions; a type of institutional reflexivity with "the capacity to see, interrogate, and reimagine the taken-for-granted structures that sustain current systems and people–planet relationships" (Moore et al., 2018, para 13). In other words, in systems reflexivity, the macro- and micro-elements of professional work can be seen as being in dialogue when navigating the emergent (Moore et al., 2018). In this way, arts educators need to look beyond the boundaries of art and even education to conceive and grasp opportunities for 'systemic intervention' (cf. Midgley, 2000).

Social innovations are one of the recent conceptualizations that require systems reflexivity for creating concrete, action-based interventions toward social transformation. Only a few examples of the conceptualization of 'social innovations' can be found in the arts (see, however, Tremblay & Pilati, 2013) and arts education research (Väkevä et al., 2017; Westerlund et al., 2019) as critical solutions to wider systemic problems, such as the exclusion of certain groups of people from educational services, inherited cultural poverty, or segregation. Social innovations have four key elements (Portales, 2019): "satisfaction of a need, innovation of the solution, change of social structures and relationships, and the increase of society's capacity to act" (p. 4). They are therefore not merely individual teachers' innovative practices but embody a potential to produce long-term social change and transformation of social systems (Baker & Mehmood, 2015).

Underlying this perspective is the Luhmannian understanding of public services, such as publicly funded arts education services, as social systems in which a system's purpose is seen to regulate its functions and boundaries and make it meaningful in a given social setting (Luhmann, 1995). In this framework, problems arise when society changes, creating expectations by policymakers and funders regarding not just the practice but the system's boundaries to change and, hence, the need for professionals to reconstruct their relationship to

society. Although systems-level changes relate mainly to the transformative power of the arts and arts education professions and institutions as collectives, they do not exclude the possibility of individual activism. Quite the contrary, as we will show, this may be a necessary condition for social innovations to emerge. They also require the above-mentioned 'systems reflexivity'. Social innovations are concrete attempts in which the systems boundaries of institutions are reimagined and in which learning, knowledge exchange and new ideas emerge hand in hand, and collaboration and change take place in relation to each other (see also, Kumari et al., 2020). From artists and arts pedagogues' social innovations require therefore both capacity for systems reflexivity and an active change agency.

We will first position arts education professionals[1] within the wider sociological field of the arts, in order to make a connection between contemporary discourses on the work of artists and arts education. We will then demonstrate, through three cases in the Finnish context, how professional responsibility among arts educators can expand beyond institutional frames through social innovations. Finally, we will highlight the varying degrees of deliberation in relation to professional responsibility by arguing that in order to fulfil professional responsibility in its widest, transformative sense, reflective practices in arts education require systems reflexivity. The three examples of social innovations featured here have been selected from a large-scale national research initiative, *Arts as Basic Service: Strategic Steps Towards Equality* (ArtsEqual).[2]

The Arts and Arts Education as a Socially Embedded Praxis

In the arts, the recent expansion in understanding professional responsibility and artists' relationship with people and society is manifested in how the arts are increasingly conceptualised as *a socially embedded praxis*. Researchers have coined concepts such as 'hybrid artist', 'crossover artist', and 'postmodern artist' (see, e.g., Abbing, 2002; Markusen et al., 2006) to refer to artists who by choice explore new practices, partnerships, and environments, accumulating and merging skills while crossing established spaces and boundaries. The social turn and hybridization in contemporary arts practice undercuts the previous mythical conceptions of the 'great artist' and challenges the modernist notions of professionals as technically highly specialised experts in their own 'art world', as well as also embodying critique of the distribution of power and rising inequality (McQuilten et al., 2020).

---

[1] By arts educator we refer to professionals working both in schools and extra-curricular contexts, or in any context in which learning takes place but is not necessarily the only goal of the activities of arts educators in theatre, dance, the visual arts, or music.

[2] More information at www.artsequal.fi.

On the one hand, these trends have led to the discussion of artists' professional competencies beyond artistic skills (Hempel & Rysgaard, 2013; Lehikoinen, 2012, 2018a)—the kind of competences that reach beyond those established practices that apply so-called "value-free, technically defined authoritatively prescribed competences" (Cribb & Gewirtz, 2015, p. 73). They also relate to the ongoing discussion about the deskilling, or reskilling, of artistic practices (Roberts, 2010). Visual artists, for instance, no longer necessarily produce physical objects out of tangible materials, but can deal with social relations linked to service, urban, or social design processes. As a consequence of this expansion of professional territories, artists increasingly find employment in less usual institutional contexts, such as hospitals, prisons, schools, building companies, and other businesses. For instance, partnerships where teaching artists, subject teachers, and classroom teachers collaborate to provide arts education have become more common, testifying also to the insufficiency of institutionally structured arts education services. Pursuing this newly conceived work of an artist in traditional educational contexts requires not only pedagogical tact and skills related to group dynamics, but understanding and coping with different professional, institutional, and educational cultures (Ansio et al., 2017).

Critical voices have, on the other hand, connected the emerging professional hybridization to the 'dedifferentiation' or 'deinstitutionalisation' of art, and observed that if the boundaries between the art system and its wider systems environment blur, the idea of art existing solely for the sake of itself loses importance (McQuilten et al., 2020; Røyseng et al., 2007). Related concerns have been expressed regarding the instrumentalization of the funded arts by contemporary governments (see, e.g., Belfiore, 2012; Hadley & Gray, 2017). Although these developments in the work of artists and arts educators create a sense of uncertainty, they also engender an environment of flexibility and openness in which novel inclusive practices may emerge.

In the established arts education systems, hybrid flexibility may be less obvious than in the arts in general. For instance, Väkevä, Westerlund and Ilmola-Sheppard (2017) have analysed in the Finnish context how the dominant mental model for professionals in music education within the state-supported arts education system still follows a linear model that emphasises a talent-picking career-oriented study path towards professional expertise, despite the democratic and inclusive ethos of the national policies and curricula. A teacher's professional responsibility is limited to "sustaining the purpose of the system…[which] has no other connections with society other than being resourced on the basis of selecting the musically talented in the population, providing the optimal conditions for training professionals" (Väkevä et al., 2017, p. 137).

In this article, we identify the danger that this expert culture in arts education will lead to a self-interested, self-sustaining, and self-advocating occupation that withdraws from the wider societal responsibilities that are increasingly shaping 'the art world' at large. Yet, we also recognise the danger of privileging managerial voices from outside the field in order to create "a discourse of compliance" over the field's self-identified interests when engaging the contradictory discourses (Bourke et al., 2013, p. 399). The urge to 'use' the arts and arts education 'to solve systemic social problems' is not therefore seen as an instrumentalizing of the field in which the arts disappear (Biesta, 2017) and professional autonomy and specialized expertise vanishes (Edwards et al., 2009). Rather, we identify both the arts and arts education as professional fields in which the historicity of institutionalized professional practices and path-dependent educational systems easily create self-protecting professional silos, which in turn tie the hands of individual professionals through various institutional norms and organizational boundaries. We highlight the potential of expanding professional responsibility in arts education towards actively intervening in these institutional practices and their field-specific epistemic frames through social innovations and their reconfigurations. We therefore suggest an understanding of arts education as an ethico-political praxis, reaching well beyond deliberation over artistic and pedagogical matters, towards a norm-critical systems reflexivity that identifies how things could be better in society, socially speaking (Gale & Molla, 2016). In this understanding, the arts and arts-related educational activities, do not simply follow the cultural principles of the arts, but also *search for structural social change* within the realm of these practices (Westerlund & Partti, 2018).

Social Innovations and the Transformative Potential of the Arts Services

We will next present three cases of social innovations that exemplify the expanding professional responsibility in the arts and arts education through (a) the use of interprofessional collaboration and 'systems entrepreneurship'(Schlaile et al., 2020) to tackle the opportunity gap in arts education; (b) employing flexible institutional boundary-crossing and the development of competences to work with people in elderly care as a response to changes in population structure; and (c) addressing the exclusion of certain social categories in the professional education of arts educators by 'performing inclusion' with teachers with disabilities. While the first case illustrates how arts educators' systems reflexivity covers not just artistic and pedagogical quality but also institutional practices that may silently sustain exclusion, the second case shows the need for new professional competencies in new social contexts. The third case illustrates how arts education in colleges and universities can become an activist force in professional arts education by counter-performing social categories that define the professional boundaries and territories of action by means of exclusion due to disabilities. All three cases are action-based social innovations that change some elements of the arts education system itself in order for it to become more inclusive and that at the same time exemplify how dominant excluding power structures operate in arts and arts education

services in Finland.

Diminishing the opportunity gap (*Floora project*)

Our first case, the Floora project, is situated in the context of Basic Education in the Arts (BEA), which in the Finnish educational system is meant to parallel arts education in public schools by providing opportunities for minors to study arts subjects in their spare time. Väkevä, Westerlund and Ilmola-Sheppard (2017) have studied Floora as a social innovation within a social system—the BEA—that has been slow to react to fundamental changes in its environment and the continuous critiques posed by policymakers and funders (Väkevä et al., 2017). While the network of BEA institutions is nationwide, and in principle anyone can apply, recent reports indicate the existence of social mechanisms that maintain unequal access, especially to music education, within the system (e.g., Räisänen & Sariola, 2016). Socioeconomic status and cultural legitimacy, at least, seem to influence who gets to study music in the fee-based BEA system, and on what terms. To guarantee social justice, accessibility, participation, and the institutional resilience needed for transformation within, the BEA system thus needs additional measures on the part of its funders and, as we argue, systems reflexivity from the professionals working within the system.

A variety of policy instruments have been devised in recent years to rectify this seemingly unjust situation. The Helsinki Model of Cultural Work (Kuusi et al., n.d.), adapted from Lyon, France, has helped some Finnish BEA providers to develop easy access options for children who might otherwise not be able or willing to apply to the extracurricular arts programs. In line with the Lyon model, which highlights the co-operation between cultural and educational institutions, a group of individual instrument teachers working within the music school system initiated *Floora*. The project's boundary-crossings and special arrangements to help systematically excluded students, often with an immigrant background, to claim their cultural rights include the following: 1) the children are selected for music studies by social workers and child welfare, who offer the possibility to the parents or caretakers; 2) teaching can take place in school buildings instead of music schools, to make access to music lessons as easy as possible; 3) the tuition is free and even instruments can be provided; and 4) the initiators have had to create new ways for gaining external funding to provide continuity.

One might worry that this kind of expanding responsibility might turn the instrumental teacher into a social worker. However, the collaborations beyond one's own profession do not necessarily have, or need to have, an impact on the micro-level interaction between teachers and students in educational processes; rather, the collaboration changes the structural premises (e.g., recruiting practice) and professional expectations that have guided Finnish arts education in certain historical times and societal situations. As Floora was initiated and developed by individual music teachers, it also provides a point of departure for discussion

between music professionals, suggesting new ways for the BEA instrument teachers to act based on an enhanced sense of professional responsibility in contemporary society. However, Floora has also brought to the surface the inherent resistance towards the voices that urge arts institutions to react to the inequalities produced by the very boundaries of the professional field itself. Consequently, even after having been independently funded over several years and involving teachers from the national BEA system, Floora still is not accepted as an official part of the BEA and music school system, but continues its activities as a separate, teacher-initiated project.

Reaching those who cannot reach the arts: Arts-based initiatives in elderly care (Dance ambassadors)

The dance ambassadors' case in Finland provides an example of a social innovation that was developed into a dance-based service concept and a professional practice aiming to enhance the availability and accessibility of dance art amongst elderly people. Arts in elderly care is one of the growing niches for artists and arts educators, due to the demographic ageing of society and the consequential sustainability gap that affects public services. For instance, Eurostat's population projections suggest that low birth rates and higher life expectancy will mark a shift towards a significantly older population structure and an expanding number of retired people in the near future in most countries, including Finland (Eurostat, 2021). Consequently, it has become necessary for states to take better care of people in late adulthood to reduce the growing costs in public health and social services. More importantly, however, from the perspective of social equity and cultural rights, it matters that everyone can benefit from engaging in the arts and culture throughout their lifespan and in all life situations, and that such engagement can contribute towards improved wellbeing and quality of life. The dance ambassadors provide opportunities for people in later adulthood to participate in dance in their own living environment, as most often these people do not have opportunities to experience dance performances, take dance classes, or go dancing due to physical or other limitations; some are bedridden, and others may live with different degrees of dementia. The dance ambassadors engage the participants in dance improvisation and conversations on dancing and everyday matters in the contexts of home care and nursing homes.

In his ethnographic study, Lehikoinen (2017, 2019) focused on the holistic combination of macro- and micro-aspects of the everyday work environments of the dance ambassadors, in home care and in two nursing homes. The objective in dance ambassadors work is to provide meaningful dance-based encounters for the participants regardless of their skills, abilities, or limitations, and to establish a dialogue with the participants that generates ideas or frameworks for collaborative dance and movement improvisation that can trigger more social interaction and co-reflection. In their work, the dance ambassadors interact with people either one-on-one in their own private setting or in small groups. They do not follow an entirely

fixed schedule but, instead, spend their day initiating dance- and movement-based interactions as they encounter people in the hallways, dayrooms, and private rooms of the residents. In home care, they pay visits to single people at their private homes. Hence, the work of the dance ambassadors differs radically from the more traditional modes of arts-focused dance education in the above-mentioned goal-oriented basic arts education (BEA), as well as from rehabilitation-focused dance therapy: the dance ambassadors' practices take place in the middle of the everyday activities of the participants, and the point is not to 'teach' or choreograph dances, but rather to facilitate opportunities for dancing that open up a co-reflective dialogue on anything from mundane matters to significant life issues. Hence, the focus can be seen to be on the dance-based social and physical engagement of people in later adulthood. Yet, through active engagement in improvisatory movement exploration, the participants learn not only about principles of movement improvisation, but also about composition and performing within their particular individual limits and how to interact physically and communicate with the body and gestures. Within this wider understanding of the goals, it is not mere entertainment, but can be seen as dance education manifested as a socially embedded praxis.

The dance ambassadors' work demands particular people-related competencies, as the practitioners need to monitor the participant's condition, activity level, mental state, interest, and endurance to adjust both the social interaction and the dance activities fittingly. The work requires not only resilient play with the practical rules of dance, movement improvisation, and choreographic composition, but also a deep understanding of the *eudaimonic* intention of the dance ambassadorship and the importance of specific ethical virtues such as tactfulness, mindful attention, and appreciative dialogue when encountering the participants (Lehikoinen, 2019). Moreover, as the dance ambassadors operate in the care work context and also negotiate with the personnel and the supervisors in elderly care, they need to understand the language and the occupational culture of care work, at least to some degree. These requirements call for competencies that higher dance education rarely covers. Therefore, both in-service education to become a dance ambassador and peer support and guidance for the practicing dance ambassadors is currently provided for professionally trained dancers and dance teachers by the employer organisation Dance Centre of Western Finland.

Expanding professional expertise in higher arts education through the inclusion of teachers with disabilities (Resonaari Music Centre)

Notwithstanding the general *inclusive ethos* in global education policy (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2011), persons with disabilities are often at risk of being excluded from participation in public activities such as education, employment, and political decision-making. This leads disabled people to be assigned *pathologized* identities that they cannot avoid, while in actuality disability resides in the individual within a

myriad of social conditions (Goodley, 2011, p. 6). In education, disability is categorized through processes of social differentiation where students with disabilities are labelled as *special* or *exceptional* (e.g., Spielhagen et al., 2015). Moreover, according to current policy criticism (e.g., Liasidou, 2012), efforts to build more inclusive educational environments have resulted in making inclusive education a sub-category of special education rather than bringing 'regular' and 'special' closer to each other. In the performing arts, disability continues to be primarily viewed from the marginalized and medicalized perspective, concentrating on the learning difficulties, physical deficiencies, and therapeutic needs, rather than seeing the person behind the disability as a potential professional artist at the centre of cultural activity (Kuppers, 2001).

In their case study within the context of a Finnish arts university, Laes and Westerlund (2017) considered this broad criticism on slow and ineffective educational policy development aiming to renew the structural considerations of inclusion within the university level arts education. By reaching beyond the ordinary solutions and understandings regarding 'inclusion of disability' into mainstream environments, in this case disability was understood as an "often forgotten, dismissed or overlooked as an important part of what we consider to be diversity" (Darrow, 2015, p. 204) – in other words, contesting the narrow, medicalized notion of disability as an individual deficiency rather than a socially constructed, cultural concept. More specifically, the case demonstrated how disability can, or should be, performed in the education of arts educators in order to enhance reflexivity that aims towards an interruption of the existing order (Biesta, 2009). Examining how disability is *performed* in public social contexts, both the case and the subsequent research on it aimed to dispute the tensions around performativity that have limited the representations of different abilities within university level arts education. The study itself focused on a social innovation located within the system of the professional education of artists and a special education course at the University of the Arts Helsinki, where two musicians with cognitive disabilities conducted workshops for music, dance, theatre, and visual art teacher students. The background of the musicians is in the Resonaari, an exceptional music school that promotes accessible and inclusive music education within the Finnish music school system, which is goal-oriented and strongly regulated (see Laes & Schmidt, 2016). The musicians have been studying music in Resonaari, and are now participating in the vocational music program, subsidized by the government to support the employment of disabled people in art and culture fields in Finland. This social innovation thus fundamentally depended on inter-institutional collaboration that resulted in concrete pedagogical experiment.

In the study, the students' written reflections on the workshop were analysed to examine how *performing disability,* as constructed in these workshops, may disrupt, expand, and regenerate normative discourses and transform inclusive thinking in teacher education. Encountering

these musicians in teachers' roles rather than as *care-recipients* (Lynch et al., 2009) is apt to create spaces for radically reconsidering professionalism in arts education. For instance, during the workshops, musical criteria seemed to be weighed within a wider ethical framework, in anticipation of a counter-narrative. The student teachers' reflections entailed a tension between *maintaining* the traditional norms and *expanding* the prevailing professional discourses. Instead of *bringing* disability into teacher education as an *alternative* in terms set by the abled (Goodley, 2011, pp. 59-60), performing disability appeared as striving for collaborative, inclusive, and transformative action together *with* diverse experts, and disrupted the existing epistemological and hierarchical order of normalcy. As such, the practices of Resonaari are the result of interprofessional collaboration between music educators and music therapists. This professional collaboration has made it possible for one school not only to develop more inclusive and fair practices inside their own walls, but to also reach beyond the local environment towards wider institutional structures and policies, thus exemplifying the rise of new expertise and professionalism within the arts. Such initiatives can slowly change perspectives on professional responsibility and develop new socially embedded praxes that aim at inclusion and social justice within the system.

Social Innovations and Systems Reflexivity in Arts Education Professionalism

In this article we argue that social innovations, such as the above-mentioned cases and systemic interventions in arts education, require systems reflexivity in the logic of professional deliberation. Reflexivity as a "dialectic interplay between thought and action" and translating thinking into action is at the heart of what it means to be a professional (Gale & Molla, 2016, p. 249). Gale and Molla (2016) have analysed how professional reflexivity can vary by making a distinction between four different kinds of professionals. The *effective professional* has "little to no recognition of contextual differences or choice in what practices to employ, while the expertise of knowledge domains and professional communities is overlaid, even usurped, by an explicitly political dimension" (p. 251). Effective professional work "corresponds with government standardisation of professional practice aimed at achieving national priorities" (p. 251). It is from this stance that much of the resistance to social innovations arises, as they appear as exceptions and anomalies that intervene in the established system, in this way shaking the secure foundations of that system. The *reflective professional* has more capacity for "carefully considering the particulars of a context in order to discern what techniques should be applied" (p. 251) in order to tackle problems "confined to determining what the problems are (based on pre-existing research), which are the most pressing and which pre-learned interventions match the problems at hand" (p. 252). The third category, the *enquiring professional*, is "not just a user of expert knowledge and skills but also a producer of them […] [as] part of an enquiring professional community with which they share the results of their research deliberations" (p. 252). Finally, exhibiting characteristics from both the reflective and enquiry models, whilst being more reflexive than reflective, the

transformative professionals are "committed to enquiry that contributes to change, not just new understanding" (p. 252), thus involving a moral and 'activist' dimension in their work. Our third case illustrated how such enquiring professional work can be conducted in university level arts education that aims at professional transformation whilst intervening and shaking up the taken-for-granted mental models pertaining to arts education professionalism and professional education.

Gale and Molla (2016, p. 259) emphasize that to be able to work as a transformative professional requires investing time, being exposed to opportunities in which to deliberate and to be deliberative, and being challenged to critically reflect on the inequities of social, political, and economic arrangements. Our cases show how transformation through social innovations is not simply an individual attitude but requires a multi-level capacity to rethink and re-organize institutional practices as well as to initiate new collaborations and partnerships. Whilst social innovations stem from an experimental mind-set employing systems reflexivity and even activist courage towards the development of new reconfigurations, as in the case of Floora, the proposed transformation processes do not necessarily occur in a single event but may well involve multiple phases as well as discomfort and continuous tension. They may involve the development of specific types of education for inclusive practices, and at the same time related abilities for arts educators to 'see' the complexity, to act at the same time within and against the system and its status quo, and to develop systems entrepreneurship in order to be able to bridge the macro and micro, the inside and outside, aspects of their institutional work. In this kind of work, systems reflexivity is "less of a fixed capacity than it is an ongoing process of inquiry" and "may require constantly experimenting with these system reflexivity provocations" (Moore et al., 2018, para 3).

All of the three presented cases illustrate how social innovations focus on the social and ethico-political aspects, resulting in "creative destruction" (Schumpeter, 2017) within the established system and a rupture in its purpose. The cases thus inform the arts education system in Finland on the plethora of possibilities for how arts educators can try to tackle systemic inequality and exclusion *in* and *through* their specialized expertise. It is noteworthy how various kinds of collaborations underlie all three cases, indicating that much of institutional work has become too siloed, individualised, and turned-inward through the processes of extensive specialization, protecting advocacy, and falsely assumed political neutrality. Allowing Resonaari musicians to take the expert roles within the music university context opened up spaces for novel professional reflexivity beyond any repertoires or pedagogies typical for the usual, normative teaching and learning structures and curricula. The open-minded, reflexive work of dance ambassadors takes shape when the boundaries between the sectors and the individuals' roles—such as caretaker and cared-for, teacher and learner, performer and consumer—are crossed and blurred towards a genuine communicative dialogue

in the everyday environments of the participants. Furthermore, as the case of Floora particularly shows, social innovations in arts education do not necessarily demand that the entire pedagogy needs to change, as the problem of exclusion might lie elsewhere or in some institutionalised details that fundamentally affect the whole system. It should be noted, however, that social innovations should not be restricted to administrative solutions. They are catalytic attempts towards change that are often born spontaneously and are based on silent knowledge and experience (Bouchard et al., 2015, pp. 70, 76). They require individuals who are committed to enquiry and systems reflexivity.

Conclusion

When arts education is understood to be not only a cultural and educational, but also a socially embedded praxis, new possibilities are opened up for arts educators to enact responsible professionalism without having to compromise the 'value' of art per se. We may need to raise the moral tail of arts educators to ask: what is the purpose of professional work, how has the practice been determined by the historically shaped arts education service system, and how do the local and global systems boundaries prescribe the content, forms and participation in specific national arts education services? There is a need for professional arts education institutions to encourage future arts educators in their becoming transformative professionals, by developing systems reflexivity in the polyvalent logic of professional work in contemporary societies and being active—even activists—in creating social innovations to expand professional responsibility beyond 'what is' towards 'what could be'. Such systems change does not stop with the transformation of individual students but expands professional responsibility towards critical deliberation on the entire service system and how the established arts and arts education institutions necessarily "sit within larger systems" (Senge, 2006, p. 342). Indeed, it may be possible that arts education will need no self-affirming advocacy should such work become visible, active, and functional in society.

References

Abbing, H. (2002). *Why are artists poor? The exceptional economy of the arts.* Amsterdam University Press.

Ansio, H., Seppälä, P., & Houni, P. (2017). Teachers' experiences and perceptions of a community music project: Impacts on community and new ways of working.

International Journal of Education & the Arts, 18(37), n.p..

Baker, S., & Mehmood, A. (2015). Social innovation and the governance of sustainable places. *Local Environment: The International Journal of Justice and Sustainability, 20*(3), 321–334.

Belfiore, E. (2012). "Defensive instrumentalism" and the legacy of New Labour's cultural policies. *Cultural Trends, 21*(2), 103–111.

Biesta, G. (2009). Sporadic democracy: Education, democracy, and the question of inclusion. In M. Katz, S. Verducci, & G. Biesta (Eds.), *Education, Democracy, and the Moral Life*, (pp. 101–112). Springer.

Biesta, G. (2017). *Letting Art Teach.* ArtEZPress.

Bouchard, M. J., Trudelle, C., Briand, L., Klein, J.-L., Lévesque, B., Longtin, D., & Pelletier, M. (2015). A relational database to understand social innovation and its impact on social transformation. In A. Nicholls, J. Simon, & M. Gabriel (Eds.), *New Frontiers in Social Innovation Research*, (pp. 69–85). Palgrave Macmillan.

Bourke, M., Ryan, E., & Lidstone, J. (2013). Reflexive professionalism: Reclaiming the voice of authority in shaping the discourses of education policy. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 41*(4), 398–413.

Cribb, A., & Gewirtz, S. (2015). *Professionalism*. Polity Press.

Darrow, A-A. (2015). Combating ableism and embracing social justice. In C. Benedict, P. Schmidt, G. Spruce, & P. Woodford (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Social Justice in Music Education*, (pp. 204-220). Sage.

Dyrdal Solbrekke, T. & Sugrue, C. (2011). Professional responsibility – back to the future. In C. Sugrue & T. Dyrdal Solbrekke (Eds.), *Professional responsibility: New horizons of praxis*, (pp. 11-28). Routledge.

Edwards, A., Daniels, H., Gallagher, T., Leadbetter, J., & Warmington, P. (2009). *Improving Inter-professional Collaborations*. Routledge.

Eurostat. (2021, May 20). *Eurostat Statistics Explained: Population structure and ageing*. http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Population_structure_and_ageing#Further_Eurostat_information

Evetts, J. (2014). The concept of professionalism: Professional work, professional practice and learning. In S. Billett, C. Harteis, & H. Gruber (Eds.), *International Handbook of Research in Professional and Practice-based Learning (*Vol. 1), (pp. 29-56). Springer.

Gale, T., & Molla, T. (2016) Deliberations on the deliberative professional: Thought-action provocations. In J. Lynch, J. Rowlands, T. Gale, & A. Skourdoumbis (Eds.), *Practice Theory and Education. Diffractive readings in professional practice*, (pp. 247-262). Routledge.

Gaunt, H., & Westerlund, H. (2021). Invitation. In H. Westerlund, & H. Gaunt (Eds.) *Expanding Professionalism in Music and Higher Music Education: A Changing Game* (pp. xiii-xxxiii). Routledge, Sempre. DOI: 10.4324/9781003108337

Gielen, P. (2015). *The Murmuring of the artistic multitude* (3rd ed). Valiz.

Goodley, D. (2011). *Disability studies: An interdisciplinary introduction*. Sage.

Hadley, S. & Gray, C. (2017). Hyperinstrumentalism and cultural policy: Means to an end or an end to meaning? *Cultural Trends, 26*(2), 95–106.

Hempel, G. & Rysgaard, L. (2013). Competencies – in real life. In J. Heinsius & K. Lehikoinen (Eds.), *Training Artists for Innovation: Competencies for New Contexts*, (pp. 28–47). Theatre Academy of the University of the Arts Helsinki.

Hoffman, J. (2012). *The studio.* MIT Press.

Kumari, R., Kwon, K.-S., Lee, B.-H., & Choi, K. (2020) Co-creation for social innovation in the ecosystem context: The role of higher educational institutions. *Sustainability, 12*(1)*,* 307. doi.org/10.3390/su12010307

Kuppers, P. (2001). Deconstructing images: Performing disability. *Contemporary Theatre Review, 11*(3–4), 25–40.

Kuusi, S., Räisänen, P. & Tolvanen, A. (n.d.) *Kohti tasa-arvoisempaa kulttuuri-Helsinkiä Helsingin malli – väliraportti.* Helsingin kulttuurikeskus.

Laes, T., & Schmidt, P. (2016). Activism within music education: Working towards inclusion and policy change in the Finnish music school context. *British Journal of Music Education, 33*(1), 5–23. doi.org/10.1017/S0265051715000224

Laes, T., & Westerlund, H. (2017). Performing disability in music teacher education: Moving beyond inclusion through expanded professionalism. *International Journal of Music Education*, *36*(1), 34–46. doi.org/10.1177/0255761417703782

Lehikoinen, K. (2012). Arts-based work with people with dementia. In A. Smith (Ed.), *Quality of life: Using the arts to help people living with and affected by dementia* (pp. 50–67). Quality of Life/LiveMusicNow.

Lehikoinen, K. (2017). Cultural rights, well-being and democracy in elderly care: The dance ambassadors as a case study. *Nordic Journal of Dance, 8*(2), 30–41.

Lehikoinen, K. (2018). Setting the context: Expanding professionalism in the arts – A

paradigm shift? In B. Revelli & S. B. Florander (Eds.), *Careers in the Arts: Visions for the Future* (pp. 16-30). ELIA.

Lehikoinen, K. (2019). Dance in elderly care: Professional knowledge. *Journal of Dance Education, 19*(3), 108–116.

Liasidou, A. (2012). *Inclusive education, politics and policymaking.* Continuum.

Luhmann, N. (1995). *Social systems*. Stanford University Press.

Lynch, K., Baker, J., Lyons, M., Feeley, M., Hanlon, N., O'Brien, M., Walsh, J., & Cantillon, S. (2009). *Affective equality: Love, care and injustice.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Markusen, A., Gilmore, S., Johnson, A., Levi, T., & Martinez, A. (2006). *Crossover: How artists build careers across commercial, nonprofit and community work.* Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota.

McQuilten, G., Warr, D., Humphery, K., & Spiers, A. (2020) Ambivalent entrepreneurs: Arts-based social enterprise in a neoliberal world. *Social Enterprise Journal, 16*(2), 121–140.

Midgley, G. (2000). *Systemic intervention: Philosophy, methodology, and practice.* Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Moore, M.-L., Olsson, P., Nilsson, W., Rose, L., & Westley, F. R. (2018). Navigating emergence and system reflexivity as key transformative capacities: Experiences from a global fellowship program. *Ecology and Society, 23*(2):38. doi.org/10.5751/ES-10166-230238

Nicholls, A., Simon, J., & Gabriel, M. (2015). Introduction: Dimensions of social innovation. In A. Nicholls, J. Simon, & M. Gabriel (Eds.), *New Frontiers in Social Innovation Research,* (pp. 1-26). Palgrave Macmillan.

Portales, L. (2019). *Social innovation and social entrepreneurship: Fundamentals, concepts, and tools.* Palgrave MacMillan. doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-13456-3_11.

Roberts, J. (2010). Art after deskilling. *Historical Materialism*, *18*(2), 77–96.

Räisänen, P. & Sariola, R. (2016). *Taiteen perusopetuksen tila ja kehittämistarpeet Helsingissä*. Helsingin kulttuurikeskus.

Schlaile, M. P., Urmetzer, S., Ehrenberger, M.B., & Brewer, J. (2020). Systems entrepreneurship: A conceptual substantiation of a novel entrepreneurial "species". *Sustainability Science, 16*, 781–794. doi.org/10.1007/s11625-020-00850-6

Senge, P. (2006). *The fifth discipline: The art & practice of the learning organization.* Doubleday.

Spielhagen, F., Brown, E., & Hughes, C. (2015). Outliers: Political forces in gifted and special education. In B. Cooper, J. Cibulka & L. Fusarelli (Eds.), *Handbook of Education Politics and Policy*, (pp. 365-383). Routledge.

Tremblay, D.-G. & Pilati, T. (2013) Social innovation through arts and creativity. In F. Moulaert, D. MacCallum, A. Mehmood, & A. Hamdouch (Eds.), *The International Handbook on Social Innovation. Collective Action, Social Learning and Transdisciplinary Research*, (pp. 67–79). Edward Elgar Publishing. doi.org//10.4337/9781849809993.00015

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2010). *UNESCO and education: Everyone has the right to education.* https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000212715/PDF/212715eng.pdf.multi

Voß, J. P., Bauknecht, D., & Kemp, R. (2006). *Reflexive governance for sustainable development*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Väkevä, L., Westerlund, H., & Ilmola-Sheppard, L. (2017). Social innovations in music education: Creating institutional resilience for increasing social justice. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education, 16*(3), 129–147. doi.org/10.22176/act16.3.129

Westerlund, H., Väkevä, L., & Ilmola-Sheppard, L. (2019). How music schools justify themselves: Meeting the social challenges of the 21st century. In M. Hahn & F.-O. Hofecker (Eds.), *The Future of Music School–European Perspectives, (*pp. 15-33). Musikschulmanagement Niederösterreich GmbH.

Westerlund, H., & Partti, H. (2018). A cosmopolitan culture-bearer as activist: Striving for gender inclusion in Nepali music education. *International Journal of Music Education, 36*(4)*,* 531–546. doi.org/10.1177/0255761418771094

About the Authors

Heidi Westerlund is a professor at the Sibelius Academy, University of the Arts Helsinki, Finland, where she is responsible for music education doctoral studies. She has published widely in international journals and she is the co-editor of several books: Collaborative Learning in Higher Music Education (Ashgate, 2013/Routledge, 2016); Music, Education, and Religion (Indiana University Press, 2019); Visions for Intercultural Music Teacher Education (Springer, 2020); Politics of Diversity in Music Education (Springer, 2021), and Expanding Professionalism in Music and Higher Music Education (Routledge, 2021). She is currently leading two research projects funded by the Academy of Finland: The arts as public service: Strategic steps towards equality (ArtsEqual, 2015-2021) and Music Education, Professionalism, and Eco-Politics (EcoPolitics, 2021-2025). She is also the Co-PI in Music for

social impact: practitioners' contexts, work, and beliefs (2020-2022), funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council, UK.

Sari Karttunen, DSocSc, is University Researcher at the University of the Arts Helsinki and Senior Researcher at the Centre for Cultural Policy Research CUPORE, Helsinki. She also holds the position of Adjunct Professor at the University of Jyväskylä, Finland. Her previous employers include the Arts Council of Finland and Statistics Finland. She specializes in artistic occupations, and her current interests include community art practice and gender equality in the art sector.

Kai Lehikoinen holds an MA and a Ph.D. in Dance Studies from the University of Surrey. He leads the Center for Educational Research and Academic Development in the Arts (CERADA) at the University of the Arts Helsinki in Finland. Formerly professor in CERADA, his more than 90 publications stretch from socially engaged artistic interventions and expanding professionalism in the arts to higher arts education and dance and masculinities. He is a representative board member of the European League of Institutes of the Arts (ELIA). His work to support political decision-making regarding arts, health, and wellbeing includes research-informed policy recommendations, memberships in ministerial task forces, and a temporary advisor's position in WHO Regional Office for Europe. Currently, he investigates the alternative futures of higher arts education in Europe.

Tuulikki Laes is post-doctoral researcher at the The Center for Educational Research and Academic Development in the Arts (CERADA), University of the Arts Helsinki, Finland. In 2015–2019 Laes was involved in the ArtsEqual project in two research teams: Basic Arts Education for All and Visions – Systems Analysis and Policy Recommendations. As part of this project, she assumed the role of a visiting scholar at the International Institute of Systems Analysis (IIASA) in Austria (2018). In her research, she approaches the transformative politics of music education from many perspectives, including societal challenges such as inequity, ableism, and aging population. Laes has worked as a lecturer with special education and adult education in the arts as her specialization areas. She has published her work in numerous peer-reviewed journals and books and served as an invited keynote speaker in Finland, Norway, Denmark, Netherlands and Germany.

Lauri Väkevä is the vice-rector responsible of education at University of Arts Helsinki and a professor in music education at Sibelius Academy of the University of the Arts in Helsinki. A co-author of three books, he has also published several book chapters and numerous articles in peer reviewed journals, as well as presented papers in international conferences in the fields of music education, musicology, music history and popular music studies. His main research interests cover Afro-American music, popular music pedagogy, history of popular music,

pragmatist aesthetics, philosophy of music education, informal learning, digital music culture, educational systems and history of education. Aside of academic career, his work assignments have covered working as a musician, music journalist, general music teacher, and instrumental teacher. Email: lauri.vakeva@uniarts.fi

Eeva Anttila works as a professor in dance pedagogy at Theatre Academy of University of the Arts Helsinki, Finland, and leads the MA program for dance pedagogy. Her research interests include dialogical and critical dance pedagogy, embodied learning, embodied knowledge, social justice and equality in arts education, as well as practice-based/artistic research methods. She has led the Arts@School research team in the ArtsEqual research initiative (2015-2021) funded by the Strategic Research Council of the Academy of Finland (artsequal.fi/en). Currently, leads the ELLA -research project (2021-2024) that focuses on embodied language learning through the arts, funded by Kone Foundation. She has published several articles and book chapters nationally and internationally and is actively involved in national and international dance and arts education organizations. She served as the Chair of Dance and the Child International (2009–2012).