University of Reading

More than a day job, a fair job: music graduate employment in education

Article

Accepted Version

Brook, Scott, Comunian, Roberta, Jewell, Sarah ORCID logoORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4413-6618 and Lee, Jee Young (2020) More than a day job, a fair job: music graduate employment in education. Music Education Research, 22 (5). pp. 541-554. ISSN 1469-9893 doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/14613808.2020.1840539 Available at https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/93767/

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See Guidance on citing.

To link to this article DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14613808.2020.1840539

Publisher: Taylor & Francis

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the End User Agreement.

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

University of Reading

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

RMIT Classification: Trusted

Submission to 'Musical Livelihoods', Special Issue of *Music Education Research*

Title:

"More than a day job, a fair job: music graduate employment in education"

Authors

A/Prof Scott Brook, School of Media and Communication, RMIT University

Dr Roberta Comunian, Department of Culture, Media and Creative Industries, Kings College London

A/Prof Sarah Jewell, Department of Economics, University of Reading

Dr Jee Young Lee, News and Media Research Centre, University of Canberra

Abstract

The focus on graduate employability for the Creative Industries has tended to overlook the significance of the education sector as a destination. This article makes a case for the educational logic of music careers considered as an example of the developmental agenda embedded in the concept of 'culture'. It further supports this account by looking at longitudinal graduate destination data in both Australia and the UK that shows the importance of the education employment to music careers. It considers music graduate outcomes in both countries according to university tier, graduate level employment, and career satisfaction. It finds that outcomes differ significantly in terms of gender, and that careers in education are no less rewarding than those in music professions. Attention to the 'educational logic of culture' suggests there are opportunities for creative industries policy to better support links between the creative economy and education.

Keywords: music graduates; Creative Industries; cultural education; creative graduate outcomes

Words: 8179 (inclusive of this page)

Introduction

There is a growing research literature on work in the Creative and Cultural Industries (CCIs) that seeks to promote a greater industry-focus amongst tertiary educators and students. The study of work prospects in the music industries is now both a research field in its own right (Hall 2019, Hughes *et al* 2013) and a key vital resource for preparing graduates of music degrees. Two familiar and interrelated themes emerge from these discussions. Firstly the need for a post-traditional career preparation that would combine both enterprise skills in preparation for creative self-employment or business management, and the inculcation of 'employability skills' via a flexible, protean career persona that is adjusted to the exigencies of the gig economy (Bridgstock 2007, 2013). Secondly, such career resetting is accompanied by new digital economy accounts of the challenges and opportunities of technological disruption in terms of the major refiguring of the circuits of production and consumption of creative content (Comunian, Faggian, and Jewell 2015). In the case of tertiary music education, such a focus notes the importance of IP contract management and royalties, personal branding, freelancing and networking, and, crucially, the significance of online platforms for distributing and monetising creative goods and services (Hughes et al. 2016, Le Rossignol and Wilson 2015).

While such a focus on the practicalities of creative and cultural work is highly welcome, the new focus on industry has notably come at the expense of appreciating the place of education more broadly in relation to the creative economy. In Australia, since the 1980s the Artists Careers Survey has repeatedly shown the importance of arts related work (of which around 70% consists of teaching) to the financial viability of the careers of professional artists. As we discuss below and reported elsewhere (Comunian, Faggian, and Jewell 2014), teaching in both public and private institutional settings remains of major significance to the professional outcomes for music graduates, rivalling the significance of music industries employment. In this article, we draw on 3 and 3.5 year longitudinal data from Australia and the UK to analyse occupational outcomes by gender, university type and skills level. We focus on these two countries due to both their cognate systems of Higher Education and educational statistics, as well as the advanced state of policy research on the CCIs. We compare graduate outcomes in both countries in terms of the continuing significance of this finding, as well as explore the association of work outcomes with gender

and university type, as well as indicators of graduate satisfaction with their career outcome and the qualification and subject areas studied.

Our focus on education is not merely a matter of coding or mapping – i.e. that music education (as occupation or industry) should be included in CCIs. Rather, we take the opportunity to raise a more fundamental set of theoretical questions concerning the place of education in the broader discussion of the creative skills that sustain the creative economy, including their contribution to innovation.

The article also contributes to questioning the current policies that have seen the gradual exclusion or under-funding of creative education across a range of educational pathways in UK and Australia. The disconnect between creative education and the creative economy we believe undermines the future development of the sector.

The following section, 'Music education', outlines the theoretical orientation that informs our interest in music graduates, and is revisited in the Conclusion. The section on creative graduate research reviews some of the literature music graduates, including our own, while the following twos sections outline our methodology and findings for music graduate outcomes in relation to employment (both countries), salary (UK) and satisfaction (UK) and retrospective study choices (AU).

Music education: an exemplary cultural field

That teaching is common to arts careers is a routine finding of artists' surveys. The sixth edition of the Australian Artists Careers Survey showed that 64% of Musicians and 80% of Composers were engaged in paid teaching and training occupations, and this was strongly reflected in their incomes. In the 2014/15 financial year, median incomes from creative work for musicians accounted for only 29% of their total income, with arts-related work accounting for 28% of median incomes (with non-arts related work accounting for 42% of median incomes). In the case of composers, arts-related work accounted for 42% of median incomes. (Throsby and Petetskaya 2017, 66). Such figures were reproduced for many artforms, with education being the most common industry sector for all artists to work in outside of the arts (OzCo 2017).

Of course, just as the CCIs are a far broader category than the arts, the work opportunities for music graduates in the music industries are far broader than arts-based practices like performing and composing. The category of 'arts-related work' used in the survey references a range of arts industry-specific activities, including arts management, curating and administration. It includes, of course, creative education as work pertinent to the sector. However, the importance of teaching roles to professional music careers, including music graduates (Comunian, Faggian and Jewell, 2014), does raise the question of how this activity is situated in relation to our discussions of the music industry both concerning arguments of knowledge pool and worker supply (Comunian, Gilmore, and Jacobi 2015) as well as human capital development (Comunian and England 2018).

Music graduates would appear to pose a particular problem for CCI mapping, in so far as their routine vocational outcomes (as providers of music education) sit awkwardly in CCI coding frames. Teaching professions and the education sector are generally excluded from codings of CCI occupations and industries (Bakhshi, Freeman, and Higgs 2012, Higgs and Lennon 2014), with the occasional exception of those models that include available industry and occupation classifications that nominally appear aligned. For instance, the economic satellite accounts of the Australian Bureau of Statistics includes 'Music Teacher (Private Tuition)' as a cultural activity, but is consistent with other coding frames in excluding those numerically greater number of music educators who work in schools and the tertiary system (See Appendix 1 and 2 in ABS 2014).

Such exclusions are understandable. Coding frames are pragmatic documents organised around the stakeholder interests of key policy agencies, and the policy remit of education as a government portfolio and industry sector is so broad that inclusion would introduce problems of scale and utility. Nevertheless, these exclusions do suggest the limits of national coding frames for local accounts of the vocational rationality of fields of creative education, in so far as they would suggest music graduates working in education are somehow outside the cultural economy; as 'mismatched' with their occupational outcomes at worst, and as 'embedded creatives' at best (by virtue of their studies).

In this article we suggest that the occupational outcomes of music graduates in education, as of many creative graduates in general, cannot be reduced to a supporting occupation, or a default choice of those who do not go into the music industries (as such frameworks

would suggest). While the income associated with teaching is clearly a key resource for creatives to maintain their practice and develop an industry-based career (in line with the 'work preference model' of artists careers), and many will decide to move into teaching in order to sustain that practice (a move that in Australia and the UK will require specific teaching qualifications), such a model fails to appreciate the intrinsically pedagogic aspect of music as a specifically cultural practice.

In terms of the occupational aspirations of music students, studies in the US are instructive. Music graduates require local certification rather than further specialist teacher training, with the consequence that those undertaking an Arts degree with a Music major have both performance and teaching open to them as occupational outcomes. Studies have found that career orientations towards teaching or performance in this cohort have quite distinct motivational characteristics (Parkes and Jones 2012) and that the positive value attributed to music teaching as an outcome is apparent in high school (Bergee 1992). In the UK, Garnett has documented the vocational shift towards a teaching identity many graduates undergo post-graduation, suggesting that music degrees might better prepare graduates for their careers "if pedagogy was to be considered a form of musicianship from the outset."(Garnett 2014, 127).

If we consider music education as a form of training for a field of cultural practice organised around aesthetic values of one kind or another, then from an historical perspective it appears as a legacy of the societal annexing and deployment of aesthetic education for essentially pedagogic purposes (Hunter 1988). Following Ian Hunter, we note that the incorporation of aesthetic disciplines into all levels of the education system in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries did not follow any vocationalist logic in terms of industry growth in cultural goods and services or workforce demand for creativity, but rather their suitability for training the social and ethical capacities of the liberal subject. For Hunter, drawing on Michel Foucault, aesthetic practices were useful as a means of forming the person (Foucault 1993); as such they were intrinsically 'ethical' in the sense that they were a resource (content and activities) for forming the sensibilities of the person. This incorporation had implications for the cultural norms of middle-class families, who via the acquisition of cultural goods, such as books, pianos, radios and televisions, brought 'culture' into the home as a form of domestic *Bildung* in the twentieth century, thereby established

cultural consumption as a central feature of family life. Indeed, it was this citizenly rationale in the emergence of the infrastructures of twentieth-century Public Culture, including public broadcasting, that has supported their growth as early enablers of modern commercial cultural industries.

This historical account has contemporary corollaries. That there is significant demand for creative educators would be a prime example of the 'ProAm' ('Professional Amateur') economies documented by early Creative Industries advocates (Leadbeater and Miller 2004), and which have been supercharged with the emergence of informal and peer-to-peer online learning and social media (eg the category of 'how to' videos on YouTube, which is one of the most popular YouTube genres). Even in the context of social media entertainments, we see a creative industry organised around exemplary performances of the digital self that are models for reiteration and modification by consumers (Cunningham 2018). Indeed, such informal spaces of popular innovation and DIY media-making have successfully established a new civics of 'creative citizenship' (Hargreaves and Hartley 2016), while the notion of a social network market – peer-oriented competition around creative performances (Potts et al 2008) – as an engine of innovation has much to offer this historical account. Indeed, new accounts of the value of creative skills appear themselves a refiguring of this history, one that encourages people to self-improvement within the context of an enterprise culture (Brook 2016; Reckwitz 2017). What is common to these accounts is the notion that the consumption value of cultural performances – whether TikTok videos, gaming commentaries, or Beethoven concerts – is always to some extent addressed to the potential of an audience for certain kinds of behaviours and identity formation. This means to take the 'cultural' as something more than an industry taxonomy (a domain of culturally valued 'goods and services') and the economic significance of 'creativity' as more than a set of skills that are redeemed in the moment of a labour market transaction. Such an approach allows us to appreciate the educational logic that has historically organised our inherited taxonomies of cultural value.

The value of this approach is twofold, and we discuss these in the conclusion. Firstly, it enables a view of the CCIs as existing at the historical meeting and overlap of two historical governmental projects; one focused on the role of culture as a means of acting on the person (culture as development), and another more recent project focused on the role of

creativity for an innovation economy (creative skills). Secondly, it allows research to appreciate the continuities of these projects by considering the inherited logic of 'culture' as a form of human capital theory.

Music graduates and creative graduates research

In response to a growing attention towards the creative economy as a new post-industrial employment sector, there has been a growing attention towards the careers of creative graduates[1] in the literature (Ashton 2015, Ball, Pollard, and Stanley 2010, Bridgstock et al. 2015, Comunian, Faggian, and Jewell 2011, Comunian, Faggian, and Li 2010). This research, mainly based in the UK and Australia, highlights some key challenges faced by creative graduates in relation to three interrelated dimensions. Firstly, *entering a creative occupation or a portfolio career*. It is widely recognised that creative graduates struggle to enter creative occupations (Comunian, Faggian, and Li 2010, Abreu et al. 2012) often because of the precarious and unstructured nature of these occupations (Morgan and Nelligan 2018). It has therefore been suggested that 'portfolio careers' and project-based networks allow creative graduates to piece together a professional profile (Ashton 2015, 2014). Secondly, *achieving a salary that provides them with a sustainable livelihood* (also as a return to their investment in a HE degree). It has been noted (Comunian, Faggian, and Li 2010) that the salary of creative graduates is in general lower than the one of other graduates, independently on whether they enter the creative economy or not (Comunian, Faggian, and Jewell 2011). However, creative occupations in general tend to offer better economic rewards than the general labour market. At the lower end of the spectrum – for graduates who do not find the right occupation or match – there are problematic considerations emerging as they often end-up taking day jobs that are at non-graduate level, which raises questions about the value of their HE education overall (Comunian and Brook 2019). While for graduate artists this may be evidence of the 'work preference model' that suggests professional artists subsidise their practice with part-time 'day jobs' that do not make use of their skills, such a model is not plausible for all creative graduates, many of whom do not

[1] We use the term 'creative graduates' here following from Comunian et al. 2011 to refer to graduates that study degree subjects connected with the creative and cultural industries fields.

prefer to work in a non-graduate job and do aspire for employment that makes use of their skills (Throsby and Zednik 2011). Finally (3) *the balance between 'art's for art sake' values and livelihood, connected with career satisfaction*. The commitment of creative graduates to their creative practice often results in sacrificial mode or free labour (Terranova 2000), while the vocational rhetoric and the opportunities to enter the CCIs informally allows for self-exploitation (Brook and Comunian 2018). Career satisfaction also tends to be higher as measured by the opportunity to take part in the creative economy and not necessarily by the salary or career opportunities that the sector offers (Jackson and Bridgstock 2019).

All of these considerations are valid when looking specifically at music graduates (Bennett 2007, Comunian, Faggian, and Jewell 2014). In relation to 'portfolio careers', the music sector is considered exemplary amongst the CCIs. There has been increased pressure placed on HE (Bennett, 2007) to build more entrepreneurship and portfolio development to support work transitions. However, as Comunian *et al* (2014) suggest, music graduates also seem to be able to retain more value from their degree when entering the labour force relative to other creative graduates. Research in the UK has highlighted how the high number of music graduates from elite institutions (Russell-group Universities) allows students to 'signal' their status beyond creative occupations and obtain better economic rewards. UK music graduates appear to be able to better articulate their transferable skills and pursue alternative career paths beyond the music sector, which is often not an option for other creative graduates.

Data and methodology

The dataset

The data used in this analysis were the 2012/2013 Longitudinal Destinations of Leavers in Higher Education (LDLHE) survey for the UK, and the 2014 Graduate Outcomes Survey - Longitudinal (GOS-L) 2017 for Australia. The LDLHE survey is undertaken by the Higher Education Statistical Authority (HESA) and is a follow up survey to a Destinations of Leavers from Higher Education (DLHE) survey which is a census of individuals who finish higher education degrees in the UK. The DLHE survey takes places roughly six months after graduation and the LDLHE survey takes a sample of those individuals who responded to the original survey, approximately 3.5 years after graduation (in November 2016). For the

2012/2013 cohort we have a sample of 65,110 British domiciled first degree graduates who responded to the LDLHE survey and represents around 20% of the full British domiciled first degree graduating student cohort for 2012/2013 and about 26% of those who responded to the DLHE survey. The LDLHE collects information on activity and includes information on employment activity, job characteristics such as occupation and industry, as well as information on salary and career satisfaction. The LDLHE information is matched to the individual's student record so we have information on subject studied and type of institution attended. Some groups, such as ethnic minorities and those unemployed at 6 months, were over-sampled so the descriptive statistics presented here are weighted using the weights provided by HESA to account for this and hence we report base observation numbers[2]. The descriptive results reported here were statistically significant, so we report the significance tests for each table below. As per HESA guidelines for data reporting, all percentages have been rounded up to 0 decimal places.

The Graduate Outcomes Survey (GOS) is funded by the Department of Education, Skills and Employment of the Australian Government, and is managed by the Social Research Centre at the Australian National University.[3] The GOS is administered at around 4 months after graduates to all recent domestic graduates of Australian universities, and the GOS-L at 3 years. In total the GOS-L 2017 contains 21,366 bachelor's degree respondents who graduated in 2014, which is about 16.5% of the total population of Australian bachelors graduates from that year. The GOS-L collects very similar outcomes data to that of the LDLHE. Music graduates were identified using the field of study code '100101, Music' from the Australian Standard Classification of Education (ASCED) in Australia, and W3 Music of the Joint Academic Coding System (JACS) in the UK. In the UK, music graduates were defined as follows: any single honours graduate with a JACS code of W3; or joint student for whom had at least 50% of their degree was music related[4]. In Australia, graduates whose first or

[2] For more on the LDLHE sample design and methodology see https://www.hesa.ac.uk/support/definitions/longitudinal-destinations

[3] For more on the GOS-L sample design and methodology see https://www.qilt.edu.au/qilt-surveys/graduate-employment

[4] We excluded so called partial creatives i.e. joint students for which the other subject(s) were not creative (based on the UNESCO definition of creative graduates).

second major was coded with the ASCED 6-digit code 100101 were defined as music graduates.

In total, 301 graduates from the GOS-L and 935 graduates from the LDLHE were identified as music graduates. Given the small sample size from Australia, the descriptive results for this cohort were not statistically significant, so further research on other GOS-L cohorts would be needed to test how robust these results are. The sample size from the UK was statistically significant, so we report the significance test results for this cohort for each table below

The proportion of female music graduates (56.5%) was higher than that of male music graduates in Australia, whereas it was the opposite in the UK where more male music graduates (58%) were observed than females. 62.5% of the music graduates were from the Group of Eight (G8) universities and 37.6% from non-G8 universities in Australia. In the UK 77% were from the cognate Russell Group of universities and 23% were from non-Russell Group of universities. Therefore, overall, while creative disciplines are usually over-represented in non-elite universities (Comunian et al. 2010) for music graduates the contrary is true. This would reflect the historical presence of established Music Conservatories that have a strong emphasis on classical music performance, composition and musicology, as well as the class backgrounds of those students who have greater access to this university tier. These findings are important in terms of the role of prestigious universities in labour market 'signalling' and the effects this might have for graduate outcomes (Spence, 1973)

Individuals in the UK were classed as being in the labour market if their main activity was full-time (FT) work (including self-employment and those primarily in work with study), part-time work (PT) or in unpaid/voluntary work. Those who are in further study (including primarily in study with work), unemployed or inactive were classed out of the labour market. The majority of the analysis focuses on those classed as in the labour market; however, for the analysis of UK annual salaries (from the main job) we only focus on those in FT work (i.e. excluding PT and unpaid workers as these salaries are deemed unreliable by HESA) who report a usable salary (HESA excludes those reporting a salary below 10,000 or above 100,000).

Definitions

For the UK, we define a 'graduate job' using the typology of Elias and Purcell (2013). We create four occupation groups based on the 5 digit standard occupation classification (SOC) code: music (SOC code 34150), other creative (based on SOC codes covered by the UNESCO[5] definition) education (SOC Codes start 231) and non-creative occupations (all other SOC codes). For Australia, we define a graduate job as all those occupations coded to 'Skill Level 1' in the Australia New Zealand Standard Classification of Occupations (ANZSCO 2006, 6-8). We define as Music industry occupations all six digit coded occupations within ANZSCO 2112 'Music Professionals', Education occupations as all six digit coded occupations under ANZSCO 12 'Education Professionals', all 'other creative' occupations all those coded to the CCIs that are not within 2112 'Music Professionals', and All other (all remaining ANZSCO codes). Our measures relating to graduate jobs are hence based on local codings and are essentially 'nominalist', in so far as they are based on employer perceptions of occupational skills requirements, and are not comparable in terms of a common skills measure.

Results

Music graduates' employment status and gender differences

In general, Australian music graduates were much less likely to be employed full-time and more likely to be employed part-time, than British music graduates. While most of the British graduates (72%) were employed full-time, only 37.9% of Australian graduates held a full-time job. Interestingly, female graduates were more likely to be employed full-time than male graduates in both countries: 40% females and 35% males in Australia, and 74% females and 70% males in the UK. On the other hand, male music graduates were slightly more likely to work part-time than female music graduates in both countries: 22.9% females and 23.7% males in Australia, and 10% females and 11% males in the UK.

The significant differences in FT and PT employment rates in Australia and the UK is consistent with broader graduate outcomes in both countries. That is, graduates across all areas of study are significantly more likely to be employed PT in Australia when compared

[5] For details of the UNESCO coding of the CCIs for both Australia and the UK, see Brook, Comunian, Corcoran, Faggian, Jewell and Webb (eds) *Gender and Creative Careers*. Palgrave, 2021 (forthcoming).

to UK graduates, and this effect appears particularly acute for creative graduates. The rates of FT employment for all creative graduates in the UK and Australia were 76 and 53.5 respectively. There would appear to be several major factors for this divergence. Firstly, graduates in Australia are significantly more likely to return to study, and music graduates are no exception to this (see below table 1). Secondly, OECD data on involuntary part-time employment suggests graduates face a far more competitive labour market for full-time work in Australia than the UK. An international comparative study based on OECD data found that in 2014 8.5% of all Australian employees were classified as 'involuntary part time', whereas the figure for the UK was 4.7% (Table 3.221 in Mavromaras, Sloane and Zhu 2016).

As mentioned, Australian music graduates were more likely to return to study (19.3%) compared to British music graduates (11%). While there was no significant gender difference in music graduates returning to study in Australia, female music graduates were slightly more likely to return to study (12.2%) compared to male music graduates (9%) in the UK.

Australian music graduates were far more likely to be unemployed (7%) than British music graduates (2%) overall. While there was no equivalent measure for graduates' unpaid/voluntary work in Australia, the UK data shows that male graduates (6%) were more likely to be involved in unpaid/voluntary work than female graduates (2%) overall.

Table 1. Employment status

	Australia			UK		
	Men	Women	All	Men	Women	All
Full-time	35.1	40.0	37.9	70.0	74.0	72.0
Part-time	23.7	22.9	23.3	11.0	10.0	11.0
Return to study	19.1	19.4	19.3	9.0	12.0	11.0
Unemployed	9.2	5.3	7.0	3.0	1.0	2.0
Inactive	13.0	12.4	12.6	1.0	2.0	1.0
Unpaid/voluntary work	-	-	-	6.0	2.0	4.0
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Base N	131	170	301	525	410	935

*Please note that self-employment is included in the UK
For the UK the (unweighted) distributions are statistically different by gender at the 5% significance level (chi2=14.6, p value=0.012)

We compared self-employment among music graduates in Australia and the UK (table 2), and the results were strikingly similar between the two countries in relation to gender. Male music graduates were far more likely to be self-employed (either working freelance and/or running their own business) than female music: 31.4% (male) > 17.4% (female) in Australia, 26% (male) > 12% (female) in the UK. The gender gap was more prominent among British music graduates.[6]

We also compared graduate skills jobs between the two countries. Overall, Australian music graduates are more likely to be employed in graduate jobs (76.9%) than British music graduates (70%). This difference is striking, given that the difference for all graduates in general is negligible; 72% for the UK,[7] and 73.7 for Australia.

Table 2. Self-employment and graduate job*

	Australia			UK		
	Men	Women	All	Men	Women	All
Self-employed (%)	31.4	17.4	23.2	26.0	12.0	21.0
	(86)	(121)	(207)	(455)	(355)	(810)
Graduate job (%)	76.9	76.8	76.9	67.0	73.0	70.0
	(91)	(125)	(216)	(440)	(350)	(790)

*Excludes 'other or uncertain' responses (13) for the self-employed, and 'unknown' responses for graduate jobs. For the UK self-employment rates are significantly different by gender at the 5% level (t=5.03, p=0.000) but graduate employment rates are significantly indifferent by gender (t=-1.31, p=0.189).

Music graduates' occupation outcomes

[6] 78% of those British music grads in music occupations were self-employed (base N=100) compared to only 18% in education (base N=180), 28% of 'other creative occupation' (base N=135) and 6% (base N=375) in non-creative occupations
[7] For the UK the base N value is 43,700

Consistent with previous studies on creative graduates (Comunian, Faggian, and Li 2010), in our results we can see a clear 'mismatch' of music degrees with professional music employment, with only a minority working as music professionals. Compared to British music graduates, those in Australia were more likely to achieve professional music employment, with 16.8% working as a music professional compared to 12% in the UK. A noticeable gender gap was observed in both countries, with male music graduates being far more likely to enter a music profession than female music graduates: 26.1% (male) > 10.2% (female) in Australia, 15% (male) > 7% (female) in the UK. While employment outcomes in music were stronger in Australia, the gender gap in music employment was higher again.

As expected, female music graduates were more likely to work in education sectors in both countries. It is also worth noting that almost half of Australian music graduates (43.2%) entered education occupations after graduating, which is almost double that of British graduates (23%). Interestingly, half of the British music graduates (48%) entered non-creative occupations, and this is more prominent among male graduates than female graduates. In Australia, however, it was female music graduates who were slightly more likely to enter non-creative occupations (30.5%) than male music graduates (27.2%).

Table 3. Music graduates' occupations (%)

	Australia			UK		
	All	Women	Men	All	Women	Men
Music	16.8	10.2	26.1	12.0	7.0	15.0
Education	43.2	49.2	34.8	23.0	32.0	16.0
Other creative*	9.5	8.6	10.9	17.0	16.0	19.0
Non-creative	29.1	30.5	27.2	48.0	45.0	51.0
0Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Base N	220	128	92	790	350	440

* For the UK, this group includes SOC groups '34170 Photographers, audio-visual and broadcasting equipment operators' (5% of UK total), '34160 Arts officers, producers and directors' (3% of UK total) and '34130 Actors, entertainers and presenters' (1% of UK total). All these groups capture occupations and roles, such as sound engineering, performance direction and musical entertainment, that make use of music degree specific skills. For the UK the (unweighted) distribution is significantly different at the 1% level (chi2=27.9, p value=0.000).

Salary outcomes and career satisfaction

We further examined salary outcomes by occupation and gender using the UK data. (We did not use the Australian data as the numbers were too small to be reliable). Table 4 shows

that the average salary of music graduates in full-time employment is 23,158 GBP. Male graduates' salaries (23,439 GBP) were on average higher than female graduates' salaries (22,776 GBP). The gender gap was more prominent in graduates employed in music where male graduates earn around 4,000 GBP-plus more than female music graduates. However, the gender gap in salary is not prominent among graduates employed in education and other creative sectors where female music graduates earn slightly higher salaries than their male counterparts. Music graduates employed in education (23,979 GBP) earned more than music graduates in other professions, whereas graduates employed in non-creative sectors earned the lowest salaries. Graduates employed in music also earned less than graduates in education and other creative sectors.

Table 4. UK music graduates' salary (GBP) by gender and occupation
(Full-time employees, salary from the main job)

	All	Women	Men
Music	22,705	20,008	23,945
	(50)	(15)**	(30)
Education	23,979	24,213	23,634
	(100)	(60)	(40)
Other creative	23,931	24,786	23,509
	(85)	(30)	(55)
Non-creative	22,577	21,591	23,238
	(220)	(95)	(125)
Total	23,158	22,776	23,439
	(455)	(200)	(255)

* Excluded anyone who reports a salary below 10,000 or above 100,000 as these are bottom (at -10,000) and top (at -100,000) coded. **Please note the base N is very small.

Career satisfaction was also examined by occupation. Table 5 shows the percentage of music graduates in the UK who were very satisfied with their careers. Overall, those employed in education and music were more likely to be very satisfied with their career than those in other creative and non-creative occupations. Women in education were the most satisfied relative to other occupations, including music, whilst men employed in music (49%) were the most satisfied across occupational groups

Table 5. UK music graduates' career satisfaction by gender and occupation (% very satisfied)

	All	Women	Men
Music	47.0	42.0	49.0
Education	50.0	54.0	43.0
Other creative	39.0	35.0	41.0
Non-creative	29.0	33.0	26.0
Total	38.0	41.0	35.0
Base N	780	350	430

While there was no equivalent measure for career satisfaction in Australia, graduates' retrospective course choice was examined to see whether there were significant differences between women and men. The majority of music graduates stated that if given the choice again, they would study the same qualification (63.6%) or subjects (11.4%). Interestingly, female music graduates were more likely to be satisfied with their *qualification* (66.4%) than male graduates (59.8%), whereas male music graduates were more likely to be satisfied with their *subjects* (13%) than female graduates (10.2%). This is a significant finding in terms of the occupational outcomes observed above. While women are less likely to achieve employment in the music sector, they are more likely to indicate satisfaction with their degree.

We also compared the retrospective course choice by occupation. Table 7 shows the percentage of music graduates who are very satisfied with their qualification and/or subject. Overall, those employed in music were more likely to be satisfied with the qualification and subjects they studied (72.6%) than other graduates employed in education (67.6%) and non-creative sections (46.4%).

Table 6. Australian music graduates' retrospective course choice by gender (%) (% very satisfied)

	All	Women	Men
Would study the same qualification	63.6	66.4	59.8
Would study the same subject	11.4	10.2	13.2
Would study something completely different	9.6	9.4	9.8
I would not study at all	1.4	0.8	2.2
Item skipped	14.1	13.3	15.2
Total	100	100	100
Base N	220	128	92

Table 7. Australian music graduates' retrospective course choice by occupation (% very satisfied)

	Satisfied with qualification and/or subject	Base N
Music	72.6	95
Education	67.6	37
Other creative*	81.3	16
Non-creative	46.4	69

*Please note the base N is very small.

Discussion of findings

The data presented highlight the relevance of education as a career outcome and destination of music graduates both in UK and in Australia. These results confirm that education is a major employer of music graduates, especially women. We have suggested that this needn't be interpreted as a 'default' outcome, indicating a thwarted career in the music industry, but rather might be understood as part of the educational rationality of music degrees. Secondly, the UK data can be read as suggesting that education is potentially the better career option in terms of *financial* returns. While further research would be needed to understand the effect of gender in relation to other variables, such as university tier and the costs of further study, the descriptive tables here suggest that education is a better career option for female music graduates.

In relation to the first point, it is clear from the data that music education makes a major contribution to the employment of music graduates. Music education provides livelihoods for recent graduates but also a safety-net that allows them to remain in the talent pipeline of the music industry. It is not just about using education as a day-job (Throsby and Zednik 2011) but also about offering opportunities for further career development and growth that do not preclude future opportunities for self-employment or entering the music industry. (Raffiee and Feng 2014).

While education might be regarded in the literature as the alternative career choice for graduates who cannot 'make it' in industry (Comunian, Faggian, and Jewell 2014) or as a mean for financial support (day-job) for graduates trying to enter, such narratives partly reflect the policy rhetoric of the CCIs that regards creative work as by default independent

(DCMS 1998, Leadbeater and Oakley 1999). Such narratives do not acknowledge the invisible challenges of creative careers (Comunian and Conor 2017), especially after the global financial crisis of 2008 (Comunian and England 2020). The significance of education occupations in the case of music graduates suggests a different narrative, one that sits within a broader framework that includes the value of culture for human development, the public good value of higher education, and the importance of stable careers and fair remuneration for creative skills.

The fact that gender plays also such an important role in explaining music careers within education is also very telling. One could argue that the education sector might appeal to female graduates for a range of reasons – from the possibility to work part-time or shorter hours, to the opportunity to reconcile work with having a family as well as other socio-cultural gender dynamics (Sabbe and Aelterman 2007). Labour market researchers point to economics research on gender and preferences, noting that women exhibit a lower preference for risk-taking in some contexts and competitive environments compared to men (Azmat and Petrongolo, 2014; Croson and Gneezy 2009). Overall, we see a strong gendered pattern emerging. While men seem more attached to idea of having a music occupation and less satisfied when this happens, for women education scores very highly in reference to satisfaction and does not appear here as a source of dissatisfaction or regret. We know that the music industries are highly gendered, in terms of experiences of the workplace as exclusionary and roles as exploitative (Gill 2002, 2014, Conor, Gill, and Taylor 2015, Cannizzo and Strong 2020), music being a sector that does not allow women to reconcile work with motherhood (Dent 2019) or to progress into senior roles (Leonard 2007). To focus on these outcomes in education is not to suggest that initiatives to counter the gendered nature of music sector work and to improve women's career opportunities and work experiences are not important. They are. It is to suggest that education might also be valued and better appreciated as a valid career outcome for music graduates, and that an exclusive focus on music industry outcomes would be to misunderstand the employment opportunities for music graduates. This is a matter of both observed employment outcomes *and* how we account for the value of creative and cultural skills. We have suggested that their value for the education sector is not simply an epiphenomenon of underemployment in the CCIs, but a reflection of an historically well-established concept of culture.

Conclusion: music education and the creative economy

In this article we have made a case for the inherent educational logic of music, considered as an example of western aesthetic practices that answered to a distinctive policy logic of 'culture'. We have supported this case with an empirical study of music graduates in Australia and the UK. While evidence supports the idea that education is a major occupational outcome for music graduates in both countries, it is clear that further more detailed statistical research is required in relation to the factors that contribute to these outcomes.

In is clear from the data that gender plays a clear role, but so too will social class and ethnic background. As access to higher education is highly stratified, a key consideration for further research will be the diversity of music curricula across the different tiers of the HE sector, and the role this diversity of institutional settings play in contributing to the diversity of employment pathways.

A second line of research would look at the role music education plays within the creative economy. Fields of musical production given to aesthetic, technological and commercial applications of avant-garde practice, contain numerous examples of the kinds of disruptive 'creative skills' creative industries researchers regard as engines of the innovation economy (Potts *et al* 2008). Research here might focus on the various roles the education system plays in the maintenance and reproduction of these domains of avant-garde practice, as well as the complex and highly variable relationships they entertain with popular music industries. While one major study has suggested music avant-gardes are institutionalised in a process that makes them resistant to the popular (Born 1995), we should not assume this is always the case.

Finally, and as signalled in our introduction, we see this attention to the educational logic of culture as enabling a broader discussion about human capital. While the CCI agenda is now substantially defined by its focus on creative skills, it is surprising that this is yet to articulate with a focus on human capital and the variety of domains in which its value is realised. In terms of policy, such an approach would return attention to the role of creative education in the spirit of report of the UK National Advisory Committee on Creative and Cultural

Education (otherwise known as the Robinson Report) *All Our Futures: Creativity, Culture and Education* (NACCCE 1999). While this initiative was subsequently eclipsed by the policy turn to the creative industries, its arguably informed many major initiatives in the UK, such as the Creative Partnerships program (2002-2011) developed by Arts Council England (ACE), and later managed by the Creativity, Culture and Education (CCE) foundation, as well as, more recently, the Local Cultural Partnerships Program of the Arts Council England in conjunction with the Department of Education (BOP 2006, Harland and Sharpe 2015). These projects linked school communities to local creative economies through the work of creative agents and local creative industry networks. While they had a clear focus on building capacity within the creative economy, including employment opportunities for creatives, such goals were 'nested' in a broader educational mission that had cultural development at its core. As such they are laudable examples of cultural policies that work with the vocational logics of music careers.

Funding acknowledgement:

This research was supported by funding from the Australia Research Council for the Discovery Project '*So what do you do?* Tracking creative graduates in Australia and the UKs Creative Cultural Industries'. (DP#160101440, 2016-2020)

Bibliography

Australia Bureau of Statistics (ABS) (2014) Australian National Accounts: Cultural and Creative Activity Satellite Accounts, Experimental 2008-09. Canberra: ABS.

Australia Bureau of Statistics (ABS) (2006) Australian and New Zealand Standard Classification of Occupations. Canberra, ABS.

Abreu, M., A. Faggian, R. Comunian, and P. McCann. 2012. ""Life is short, art is long": The persistent wage gap between Bohemian and non-Bohemian graduates." *Annals of Regional Science* 49:305-321. doi: 10.1007/s00168-010-0422-4.

Ashton, D. 2014. "Making Media Workers: Contesting Film and Television Industry Career Pathways." *Television & New Media* 16:275-294. doi: 10.1177/1527476414532956.

Ashton, D. 2015. Creative work careers: pathways and portfolios for the creative economy. In *Journal of Education and Work*: Routledge.

Azmat, G and Petrongolo, B. (2014) Gender and the Labor Market: What have we learnt from Field and Labour Experiments? , *Labour Economics*, 30, 32-40

Bakhshi, H., A. Freeman, and P.L. Higgs. 2012. A dynamic mapping of the UK's creative industries. London: NESTA.

Ball, L., E. Pollard, and N. Stanley. 2010. *Creative graduates creative futures*: Institute for Employment Studies London.

Bennett, D. 2007. "Utopia for music performance graduates. Is it achievable, and how should it be defined?" *British Journal of Music Education* 24 (2):179-189.

Bergee, M.J. 1992. "Certain attitudes toward occupational status held by music education majors." *Journal of Research in Music Education* 40 (2):104-113.

Bridgstock, R. 2013. "Not a dirty word: Arts entrepreneurship and higher education." *Arts and humanities in higher education* 12 (2-3):122-137.

BOP Consulting (BOP) (2006) *Study of the Impact of Creative Partnerships on the Cultural and Creative Economy*. London: Creativity, Culture and Education.

Born, G (1995) *Rationalizing Culture: IRCAM, Boulez, and the Institutionalization of the Musical Avant-Garde*. Berkeley and London, University of California Press.

Bridgstock, R., B. Goldsmith, J. Rodgers, and G. Hearn. 2015. Creative graduate pathways within and beyond the creative industries. In *Journal of Education and Work*: Routledge.

Bridgstock, R.S. 2007. "Success in the protean career: A predictive study of professional artists and tertiary arts graduates." Queensland University of Technology.

Brook, S. "The exemplary economy: a Hunterian reading of the Creative Industries as educative project". *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 22 (1); 27-40.

Brook, S., and R. Comunian. 2018. "“Dropping out and working”: The vocational narratives of creative graduates." In *The Palgrave Handbook of Creativity at Work*, 125-141. Springer.

Cannizzo, F., and C. Strong. 2020. "‘Put some balls on that woman’: Gendered Repertoires of Inequality in Screen Composers’ Careers." *Gender, Work & Organization*.

Comunian, R., and S. Brook. 2019. "Accounting for creative graduates." *Creative Industries Policy and Evidence Centre*, 01/01/2020. https://www.pec.ac.uk/blog/accounting-for-creative-graduates.

Comunian, R., and B. Conor. 2017. "Making cultural work visible in cultural policy." In *The Routledge Handbook of Global Cultural Policy*, edited by V. Durrer, T. Miller and D. O'Brien, 265-280. Routledge

Comunian, R., and L. England. 2018. "Creative regions: from creative place-making to creative human capital." In *Handbook on the Geographies of Regions and Territories*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Comunian, R., and L. England. 2020. "Creative and cultural work without filters: Covid-19 and exposed precarity in the creative economy." *Cultural Trends* 29 (2):112-128. doi: 10.1080/09548963.2020.1770577.

Comunian, R., A. Faggian, and S. Jewell. 2011. "Winning and losing in the creative industries: An analysis of creative graduates' career opportunities across creative disciplines." *Cultural Trends* 20 (3-4):291-308.

Comunian, R., A. Faggian, and S. Jewell. 2014. "Exploring music careers: Music graduates and early career trajectories in the UK." In *Social Networks and Music Worlds*, edited by N. Crossley, S. McAndrew and P. Widdop. London: Routledge.

Comunian, R., A. Faggian, and S. Jewell. 2015. "Digital technology and creative arts career patterns in the UK creative economy." *Journal of education and work* 28 (4):346-368.

Comunian, R., A. Faggian, and Q.C. Li. 2010. "Unrewarded careers in the creative class: The strange case of bohemian graduates." *Papers in regional science* 89 (2):389-410.

Comunian, R., A. Gilmore, and S. Jacobi. 2015. "Higher education and the creative economy: Creative graduates, knowledge transfer and regional impact debates." *Geography Compass* 9 (7):371-383.

Conor, B., R. Gill, and S. Taylor. 2015. "Gender and creative labour." *The Sociological Review* 63:1-22.

Croson, R. and U. Gneezy (2009) "Gender Differences in Preferences." *Journal of Economic Literature* 47 (2): 1-27.

DCMS. 1998. Creative Industries Mapping Document London: Department for Culture, Media and Sport.

Dent, T. 2019. "Devalued women, valued men: motherhood, class and neoliberal feminism in the creative media industries." *Media, Culture & Society*. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443719876537

Elias, P. and K. Purcell (2013) 'Classifying graduate occupations for the knowledge society'. Futuretrack Working Paper No. 5. Warwick Institute for Employment Research.

Foucault, M. (1993 [1980]) 'About the beginning of the hermeneutics of the self: Two lectures at Dartmouth', *Political Theory* 21(2): 198-227.

Garnett, J. 2014. "Musician and teacher: employability and identity." *Music Education Research* 16 (2):127-143. doi: 10.1080/14613808.2013.847073.

Gill, R. 2002. "Cool, creative and egalitarian?: Exploring gender in project-based new media work in Europe." *Information, communication and society* 5:70-89.

Gill, R. 2014. "Unspeakable inequalities: Post feminism, entrepreneurial subjectivity, and the repudiation of sexism among cultural workers." *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society* 21 (4):509-528.

Hall, R. 2019. "An analysis of undergraduate motivations, perceptions of value and concerns in pursuing higher popular music performance education." *International Journal of Music Education* 37 (2):327-341.

Harland, J and C. Sharpe (2015) Cultural Education Partnerships (England): Pilot Study. Berkshire, National Foundation for Education Research.

Higgs, P.L., and S. Lennon. 2014. "Applying the NESTA Dynamic Mapping definition methodology to Australian classifications."

Hughes, D., M. Evans, G. Morrow, and S. Keith. 2016. "Popular Music Education." In *The New Music Industries*, 97-116. Springer.

Hughes, D., S. Keith, G. Morrow, M. Evans, and D. Crowdy. 2013. "Music education and the contemporary, multi-industry landscape." Australian Society for Music Education National Conference (19th: 2013).

Jackson, D., and R. Bridgstock. 2019. "Evidencing student success and career outcomes among business and creative industries graduates." *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* 41 (5):451-467.

Le Rossignol, K., and C.R. Wilson. 2015. *Freelancing in the creative industries*: Oxford University Press.

Leadbeater, C., and P. Miller. 2004. *The Pro-Am revolution: How enthusiasts are changing our society and economy*: Demos London.

Leadbeater, C., and K. Oakley. 1999. The Independents: Britain's new cultural entrepreneurs. London: DEMOS.

Leonard, M. 2007. *Gender in the music industry: Rock, discourse and girl power*: Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.

Mavromaras, K., P. sloane and R. Zhu (2016) An International Comparison of minimum wages and labour market outcomes, Research Report produced by National Institute of Labour Studies. Fairwork Commission, Commonwealth Government of Australia, Canberra.

Morgan, G., and P. Nelligan. 2018. *The Creativity Hoax: Precarious Work and the Gig Economy*. New York: Anthem Press.

National Advisory Committee on Creative and Cultural Education (NACCCE), 1999. All Our Futures: Creativity, Culture and Education. London, Department for Education and Employment.

Parkes, K.A., and B.D. Jones. 2012. "Motivational constructs influencing undergraduate students' choices to become classroom music teachers or music performers." *Journal of Research in Music Education* 60 (1):101-123.

Raffiee, J., and J. Feng. 2014. "Should I quit my day job?: A hybrid path to entrepreneurship." *Academy of management journal* 57 (4):936-963.

RMIT Classification: Trusted

Sabbe, E., and A. Aelterman. 2007. "Gender in teaching: a literature review." *Teachers and Teaching* 13 (5):521-538. doi: 10.1080/13540600701561729.

Spence, M. 1973. "Job Market Signaling." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 87:355-374.

Terranova, T. 2000. "Free Labor: Producing Culture for the Digital Economy." *Social Text* 18 (2):33-58.

Throsby, C., and K. Petetskaya. 2017. "Making art work: An economic study of professional artists in Australia."

Throsby, D., and A. Zednik. 2011. "Multiple job-holding and artistic careers: some empirical evidence." *Cultural trends* 20 (1):9-24.