Co-funded by
the European Union

IN.TUNE

Innovative Universities in Music and Arts in Europe

Inventory and comparative analysis of research activities in partners and of joint research areas to be pursued

Strengthening our research dimension (WP4)

www.intune-alliance.eu

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Document details

Project number:	101124302
Alliance name:	IN.TUNE - Innovative Universities in Music & Arts in Europe
Acronym:	IN.TUNE
Call and topic:	European Universities – Development of new deep institutional transnational cooperation (ERASMUS-EDU-2023-EUR-UNIV-2)
Start / End date:	1 January 2024 / 31 December 2027
Work Package:	Strengthening our research dimension (WP4)
Work Package leader:	Taideyliopisto, Finland (UNIARTS)
Contributors:	• Norges musikkhøgskole, Norway (NMH) • Universitatea Națională de Muzică din București, Romania (UNMB) • Conservatoire National Supérieur de Musique et de Danse de Paris, France (CNSMDP) • Taideyliopisto, Finland (UNIARTS) • Escola Superior de Música de Catalunya, Spain (ESMUC) • Universität für Musik und darstellende Kunst Wien, Austria (MDW) • Stichting Hogeschool der Kunsten Den Haag, The Netherlands (HdK) • Univerzitet umetnosti u Beogradu, Serbia (UAB)
Deliverable:	**Inventory and comparative analysis of research activities in partners and of joint research areas to be pursued (D4.2)**
Due date:	Month 12 (M12)
Type of document:	Document, report
Dissemination level	Public
Version / Status	Version 3 / Final
Date	31/10/2025

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Table of Contents

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

List of abbreviations

Partner institutions:

CNSMDP	=	Conservatoire National Supérieur de Musique et de Danse de Paris, France
ESMUC	=	Escola Superior de Música de Catalunya, Spain
HdK	=	Stichting Hogeschool der Kunsten den Haag, The Netherlands
MDW	=	Universität für Musik und darstellende Kunst Wien, Austria
NMH	=	Norges musikkhøgskole, Norway
UAB	=	Univerzitet umetnosti u Beogradu, Serbia
UNIARTS	=	Taideyliopisto, Finland
UNMB	=	Universitatea Națională de Muzică din București, Romania

Other abbreviations or acronyms in the text:

ACPA	=	The Academy of Creative and Performing Arts
AR	=	artistic research
CERIF	=	Common European Research Information Format
CoARA	=	The Coalition for Advancing Research Assessment
CRIS	=	current research information system
D4.2	=	Deliverable 4.2 Inventory and comparative analysis of research activities in partners and joint research areas to be pursued
ERC	=	European Research Council (research panel structure)
FoR	=	field of research
IAM	=	institutional alliance manager
KABK	=	Royal Academy of Art, The Hague
PEEK	=	The Arts-Based Research Programme by the Austrian Science Fund
RILM	=	Répertoire International de Littérature Musical (classification system)
RIS	=	research information system
SG	=	(co-)secretary general of the IN.TUNE alliance
SR	=	scientific research
WG	=	working group
WP	=	work package
WP4 admin	=	administrative person from UNIARTS supporting the work package four

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

WP4C = work package 4 committee

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Executive Summary

IN.TUNE

The European University Alliance IN.TUNE – Innovative Universities in Music & Arts in Europe brings together eight universities across the continent, committed to the development of a joint long-term strategy for excellence in education, research, innovation and service to society. This strategy is built on a shared perspective on our institutions' roles within society, a joint vision and approach towards deep institutional cooperation, and a shared dedication to the European values of diversity, democracy, social and human rights.

Through the establishment of IN.TUNE, we aim to:

- Build an effective, systemic and sustainable framework for deep institutional cooperation, drawing on our previous and existing collaborations to drive transformational change across our institutions.
- Strengthen, through this deep institutional cooperation, artistic and educational innovation and research, not only within our institutions, but also throughout the higher music education sector and the broader cultural and creative sector industries, providing students and professionals with unique educational opportunities that will improve their ability to access, create and maintain sustainable careers.
- Play an active role in shaping the future of our sector and our societies by addressing contemporary educational, professional, societal, technological and ecological challenges. Together, through the joint creation of forward-looking institutional environments, we will empower students and staff to engage with these challenges through their creative work, both at institutional and transnational level.

Work Package 4: Strengthening our research dimension

Strengthening our research dimension (Work Package 4) focuses on enhancing the research capacity of the alliance by developing a comprehensive IN.TUNE Research Cooperation Framework that embeds research within the alliance-wide educational collaboration. This includes conducting an inventory and comparative analysis of existing research resources, policies, and expertise across partner institutions.

Based on this analysis, three IN.TUNE Knowledge Hubs will be established, bringing together (doctoral) students, teachers, and researchers. These hubs will facilitate multidisciplinary research collaboration in a higher music and arts education context. The aim is to address how diverse research approaches link education and research, including how research results feed back into education.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Additionally, the work package will focus on improving research supervision through annual training programs, leading to the creation of an IN.TUNE Register of Research Supervisors. This register will provide access to specialised supervision across the alliance across study programmes. Furthermore, the development of an IN.TUNE Repository of Research Outcomes has been planned to offer students and staff a digital platform for sharing outputs for educational use and promoting collaboration.

Based on the experiences gained in the alliance through these activities, a Position Paper on Research will be published by the end of month 48 of the Alliance (December 2027), outlining the position of the alliance with regards to research in artistic education, including proposals for improvements as compared to the current state of play and how research feeds back into learning, teaching and training, in alignment with the principles of the Vienna Declaration on Artistic Research, which acknowledges the importance of the 'knowledge triangle' of education – research - innovation.

Deliverable summary

This is an inventory and comparative analysis of the existing resources, policies, traditions, fields of expertise and needs with regards to research in the IN.TUNE alliance partner institutions (D4.2). As the first deliverable, it lays the basis for the subsequent stages of the Work Package 4 (WP4), Strengthening our research dimension.

We used a matrix approach as a heuristic tool and devised a bifurcate framework: an "environment matrix" for the inventory and analysis of existing resources and policies of research, and a "content matrix" for those of research traditions and fields of expertise in higher education in the arts. Of research environments, data was gathered and analysed at institutional level, through five main questions by the work package committee. Of research traditions and fields of expertise (or research areas), data was produced and gathered with broad consideration to the research practices in education, and analysed through four critical questions by working group 1 of the work package. During the processes, shared online documents were widely accessible, and members circulated the matters in their institutions based on relevant needs and institutional practices. The published deliverable will subsequently be further disseminated and will serve the setting up of knowledge hubs and conferences, connecting faculty and students into an alliance-wide research-infused learning community, and finally developing of the position paper and the IN.TUNE Research Cooperation Framework.

A major outcome of the inventory and comparative analysis was the acknowledgement of the significance of the **interplay between research and education**. To develop their own (artistic

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

or pedagogical) practices, their field, and to contribute to the societies and the human life at large, our students need the skills and competences required to operate successfully and sustainably in the changing world of the 21st century. For that, education must provide also the necessary research skills: most of the students will work in the renewing field on the basis of these skills, while others will be trained as researchers – and these are not mutually exclusive. This calls for examining research education: how research and "researchness" are part of the curricula of the institutions from bachelor level to doctoral level, and how research outcomes feed back into educational practices. With the term "researchness" we refer to the nature and characteristics of research, to the acknowledged principle of education based on research the quality of being research-oriented, and to the being and becoming involved with research, to the process of engaging and contributing to it. Thus "researchness" serves as an instrument to provide a broader frame for incorporating these difference approaches. Research communities in higher education are requisite for that training to take place. The basic functions of a university, higher education, research and societal engagement, are not separate entities, quite the contrary.

In terms of research, and research environments, the partner institutions differ greatly from one another. There are differences in national operating environments, research leadership, availability of information about research, HR policies, funding mechanisms and opportunities to acquire external funding. *The plurality and the context need to be taken into account when making projections about future collaboration. Strengthening calls for systematic incorporation of research or "researchness" into curricula. Coupling this with the systematic development of diverse career models for researchers as part of their educational pathways, could lead toward positive, virtuous circle* building research communities, with a good dynamics and balance of researchers' career stages, and with integrative synergies between research, education and artistic practices.

All eight institutions have or will soon have repositories for research outputs, as it is important for students and teachers to have access to research outcomes as part of educational processes. *In the discussions on the development of IN.TUNE repository, it became clear that this will strengthen the interplay of research and education.* All the alliance institutions have artistic research, and all are committed to its further development. *However, further discussion is needed on definitions of artistic research within and across institutions.* The distinction between artistic and scientific research ought to be a question of methods more than a question of research areas. In any case, the link to artistic education will be a core focal point.

The matrix approach made apparent many research areas found at all partner universities. These include research in music education, composition, music analysis and theory, music and wellbeing, early music, music history and music technology. Significant overlaps can be found

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

where the practice of musicology, ethnomusicology, music theory, and music pedagogy intersect with art practices. Furthermore, more strategic discussion – perhaps decisions as well – seems needed in the institutions, and jointly, on *where we want to position ourselves in the future on the continuum from music conservatories or art academies to universities and research universities*, and how we will get there, and how IN.TUNE institutions will use the results of the alliance activities to strengthen the interplay between research, education, and artistic or societal activities.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Inventory and comparative analysis of research activities in partners and of joint research areas to be pursued (D4.2)

1 Objectives of the deliverable, and associated tasks

Higher education institutions in music (and the arts, more broadly) have been making a gradual shift from being mere professional training institutions to institutions where research is conducted in addition to traditional professional training roles. Institutions are not just expected to engage with research with the aim to educate and train musicians and artists as self-reflective practitioners that are able to deal with changes in the profession and in society, but also to create new knowledge for the field and engage with new forms of research that are relevant for artistic practice, for academia and for the audience at large.

The name of the Work Package 4 (WP4) is **Strengthening our research dimension**. It has the objective of developing an IN.TUNE Research Cooperation Framework. This document – *Inventory and comparative analysis of research activities in partners and of joint research areas to be pursued* – serves that objective and lays the basis for the subsequent stages of the work in the work package. It provides an inventory and comparative analysis of the existing resources, policies, traditions, fields of expertise and needs with regard to research in the alliance partners, and how research feeds back to education. This means that no original research is conducted as part of the alliance activities; instead, the focus is on mapping and leveraging research for educational enhancement[1]. To that extent, it is associated with two task, to identify issues with regards to research and its link to education and innovation that core partner institutions share and which could be the basis for joint cooperation activities (T4.2), and to make an inventory and comparative analysis of the existing resources, policies, traditions, fields of expertise and needs with regards to research and its link to education in the alliance's partner institutions (T4.3). The planned durations of the tasks were months 1–12[2].

2 Applied methods and encountered constraints

From its onset, the committee of Work Package 4 (WP4C) perused the guiding documents of WP4, and engaged in planning the implementation of the WP, and in designing a framework

[1] Similarly, identified joint research areas to be pursued are prospective and tied to educational collaboration rather than immediate research projects.

[2] It is emphasised that all activities and tasks under this work package, including the ones mentioned here, are limited to preparatory and coordination tasks eligible under the European Universities Initiative and in line with the Description of the Action of the Grant Agreement. Any activities identified as outside the scope of the grant and European Universities Initiative, such as conducting research projects or the publication of research, will not be carried out under IN.TUNE funding; all activities focus on integrating existing research insights into education.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

for the current deliverable 4.2 (D4.2), considering how D4.2 could best serve as a basis for the subsequent tasks and deliverables of the WP. Having the framework established, an open call was launched for the WP's first working group (WG1), which then began its work in Sep 2024. The present deliverable has been a joint effort by WG1 and WP4C in ways described below.

2.1 Designing the deliverable

An inventory and comparative analysis of topics, themes or subject matters across a number of cases calls for a matrix approach. Here, **a matrix approach was adopted as a heuristic tool for the bifurcate framework of D4.2.** On one hand, the objectives of the deliverable entail an inventory and comparative analysis of **the existing resources and policies** with regards to research; on the other, they entail that of **research traditions and fields of expertise** in the alliance institutions. The former, mapping the partner institutions' research environments that set the conditions and affordances for the potential future collaborations in research within the context of learning and teaching practices, has been referred to as "the environment matrix"; the latter, in turn, "the content matrix", mapping the research areas to find potential for joint research. However useful as starting point, the analysis processes revealed **necessities to go beyond a mere basic grid** afforded by the lattice of institutions as columns and topics, themes or subject matters as rows. Finally, **the needs with regards to research and how it interacts with education in the alliance partners,** are addressed particularly in the conclusions of this deliverable as outcomes of the analyses (see 4.1).

The perusal of the guiding documents and considerations of the long-term objectives of WP4 and the alliance led WP4C to critical discussion on how to interpret the given tasks and key notions therein, what should and could be included in the tasks and the deliverable. The discussion included issues such as:

- how "research" should be defined, and what exactly should be counted as research, e.g.
    - research vs. "researchness" in artistic or pedagogical practices
    - research by staff vs. doctoral students vs. master's or bachelor level students
    - only peer-reviewed vs. peer-reviewed and non-peer-reviewed research
    - published vs. unpublished research
- inclusion of both artistic and scientific research in music, and the notion of artistic research
- inclusion of research in music and other fields of arts, and the resources available
- how research is pursued at departments and research centres, research groups etc.
- how the differences between institutions e.g. in scopes of research or organization should be taken into account
- whether incipit research or research interests should or could be included in addition to research already pursued, with outcomes
- what counts as research outcomes
- who the end-users of the deliverable are

and finally

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

- what is to be understood by "research areas", and what information is needed for their identification and analysis

In short, it became soon evident that **the tasks are more complex than an initial reading of them might suggest.** For instance, the committee recognized that in having a responsibility to develop future research collaboration, we have the future-oriented need to take into account the full path of becoming a researcher and thereby "researchness", starting from first- and second-cycle studies in higher education.

What is to be understood by "research areas" was indeed not the least issue. This was first noted by WP4C in designing the framework for the deliverable, and, later, by WG1 in its efforts to fill in the content matrix, to identify research areas that the partner institutions share and which could be the basis for joint research activities. To address this, WP4C considered the pros and cons of the following four options for the content matrix, the last of which was adopted as a reasonable compromise for the D4.2 framework.

A. Using a predefined, existing categorization of fields of research (FoR) such as the R&D classification of the Frascati manual, the Common European Research Classification Scheme of the Common European Research Information Format (CERIF), ERC research panel structure, or the RILM classification system
B. Starting with existing projects and potential areas and topics of interests
C. Using our existing organizational structures as the starting point
D. Using our organizational structures for artistic research (AR), organizational and robust, art-field-specific FoRs for scientific research (SR)

Furthermore, there were needs to specify **the data model** for the content matrix, that is, what kind of information is used for the identification and analysis of research areas, and how the matrix would be parsed through the help of accompanying texts. The outcome was a suggestion that the data model for the content matrix would have the name of the unit, keywords for current and future research, and links to e.g. repositories or research information systems available. However, a caveat in such a data model was recognized: **the keywords.** The committee discussed if a controlled vocabulary was needed and that it could make the analysis easier but the inventory more laborious. However, there seemed to be no applicable European system for keywords for the controlled vocabulary, nor would there be resources for producing one. Reversely, using free descriptions could make the descriptions for the inventory easier, but complicate the analysis. Both controlled vocabulary and free descriptions could, for different reasons, also lead to challenges in **the resolution of the description of research:** too general keywords could be uninformative albeit easier to compare; too specific keywords could pose challenges to comparative analysis, in turn. Regardless, the keywords would need to be accessible or readily producible, and compatible so that the joint areas could be found from the inventory and that these findings could be made in a trustworthy way. In turn, any

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

blanks in the matrix would show the emphasis that some partners have and some do not – in other words show us the important differences.

Based on the considerations above, the committee decided on **the matrix approach and the framework as a pragmatic compromise, with a suggestion for the data model – leaving further specifications to be decided** by WG1 or the committee as needed during the inventory and analysis stages. In particular, the specifications for the inventory and comparative analysis of research environments – policies and resources for research – were dealt with separately by WP4C (see 2.3 below). Some issues were considered pragmatically settling for an interim understanding or stance on the matters and leaving further considerations for later. For instance, for the definition of research, it was deemed sufficient to rely on the general descriptions found in the Frascati manual and the Vienna declaration – it was recognized that too strict a definition could be detrimental, and that the matter can better be addressed to the extent necessary once we mutually understand our research pursuits and objectives more in detail through subsequent stages of the WP. The method for the comparative analysis and identification joint research areas was perceived and communicated as content analysis. Furthermore, WP4C considered that the current information may get outdated and therefore it could be useful to return to making similar inventories and analysis, or to continue by deepening or broadening the current endeavour after the completion of this deliverable.

2.2 Methods for inventory and analysis of research resources and policies

Following the notion of the bifurcate framework, WP4C dealt with the inventory and comparative analysis of research environments – policies and resources for research – separately from that of research traditions and fields of expertise. **The main objective was to find out similarities and differences between institutions, national policies and common challenges in regard to research environments which support and enable – or could in worst cases hinder and disable – research and its connection to education**. WP4C decided a) to gather the data per partner institution (as opposed to departments or like), b) to capitalize on previous, applicable surveys or institutional research assessments (such as the UNIARTS research assessment), c) to adjust such surveys for the current context, and d) direct the questions to be answered by a vice rector of research or similar who would not only be able to answer the questions without a need of extensive gathering of the information, but who could also circulate or engage more widely in the institution's community before submitting them.

To develop the set of pertinent questions, the WP4C members were to engage discussion in their institutions e.g. with their quality assurance, research admin and library staff, what kind of data (catalogues, output statistics, research assessment materials, strategies and plans) there already exists that we could make use in our research environments inventory and analysis, and

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

to find out what human resources we have in use to help us to meet our tasks with the inventory and analysis and discovering joint research areas. The topics suggested and considered for the questions in WP4C included but were not limited to

- policies for connection between research and education, curricula
- research mission, vision
- research personnel
- policies of research as part of contracts
- funding of research and channels of distribution
- policies for sabbaticals
- policies for individuals, teams, groups, collaborations
- policies for research outputs
- policies for research outcomes and societal impact

However, due to limited resources it was evident that we needed to prioritize and choose only a few, most central and urgent questions that could be instrumental for the subsequent stages as well. The committee decided to take the concrete steps and let WG1 continue with the inventory and analysis of the research areas while welcoming their ideas and feedback for the inventory and analysis of the research environments. Furthermore, in many cases the committee members are in such positions in their institutions that they could be the main respondents.

A task force was set up (WP4C members UNIARTS, NMH and CNSMDP) to develop the environmental matrix. The committee approved the proposal by the task force to address **five central questions** (see table 1 below). The committee members then took the responsibility to fill in answers to the five questions on behalf of their institutions. After the answering stage, WP4C went jointly through the answers together in the November 2024 onsite meeting, allowing additions and adjustments to be made, if needed.

Table 1. The five questions deemed central at this stage for the analysis of research environments.

1	Please describe, in brief, **your institution as a research organization.** Please provide a description (e.g. a scheme) of research in departments, faculties, institutes, centers or the like. Please consider administrative and social organizations, and the leadership. Feel free to include a general description of research culture at your institution.
2	Please describe, in brief, **the funding model of research** at your institution. Please consider public and private funding from external sources, by whom that funding is acquired, and whether that funding is earmarked to research. Feel free to include a description of your internal model of funding research, if there is one.
3	Please describe, in brief, **the human resources and HR policies in regards to research** at your institution. Please consider policies for research time allocation and researcher's career models, if any. Feel free to include descriptions of how research personnel is assessed.
4	Please describe, in brief, **research education** at your institution. Please describe, in brief, doctoral education, if any, and how research (or "researchness") is present in degrees and curricula at

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

	master's and bachelor levels. Feel free to include descriptions of admission and assessment policies.
5	Please describe, in brief, **what kind of key figures or statistics on research your institution has available or can provide for further analysis**. Feel free to include descriptions of how the key figures or statistics are produced.

Subsequently, the task of analysis was divided between the WP4 members so that one to three analysed the responses to one of the five questions and relayed the outcomes in the jointly shared online document. The outcomes of this thematic analysis are reported in chapter 3.2.

2.3 Methods for inventory and analysis of research traditions and fields of expertise

WG1 used the following procedure t**o collect data to describe the research areas that could lead to research collaborations between the alliance partners.** The starting point was the idea of WP4C, that if one has a description of all broad categories of research areas of all institutions in a matrix form, it would make it possible to identify those that are common and then decide what collaborations can be set. To make this comparison, the task of WG1 was to fill a matrix with keywords that describe the research activities at the different institutions, linked to the departments and research centres. Each column of the matrix described a different institution, and the rows described general research areas, such as those concerning the teaching of music (music education; music pedagogy, and so on). Every working group member added the data for their own institution. Data was collected from public reports (e.g. the MDW Wissensbilanz, the intellectual capital report) and internal reports from each alliance institution's administration.

The first consideration was to set the precision of keywords for the research activities of the departments and research centres (cf. the issue of keywords and resolution described above in 2.1). If a keyword is too precise, then research is particular to maybe only one institution (for example using title-level descriptions such as "Music, Musicology, Humanities: Intellectual Sociabilities, Aesthetic Commitments, and Disciplinary Misunderstandings (1870–1970)"). If a keyword is too broad, it may correspond to too many different research activities (e.g. "musicology"). The second consideration was to choose the research area where to put an entry with a keyword. It happens that one keyword appears in different categories for different institutions because the structure of the organizations is different. The third consideration concerns the keywords that do not perfectly fit into one research area (like "spatial acoustics"). Then there is the choice of putting the keyword in the "other" category or to try to put it in a quite close category (like "digital music & music technology"). The fourth consideration, bearing in mind the limited resources, was to focus for now only on research areas related to music, leaving out other fields of arts such as fine arts, dance or theatre for the time being.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

These considerations had to be taken into account by the group also for the subsequent step of data analysis.

Once WG1 finished filling the data into the matrix, it analysed this complex dataset. The group dealt with the complexity of the interactions between the "level of research" and "level of detail" for the research activity keywords, as described above. Nonetheless, **the matrix showed what is common between the institutions and eventually also showed some differences**. This information from the matrix was used as **the basis to have in-depth discussions** between the working group members (online and offline, in different configurations like a plenum, small groups, pairs of two) **around the four themes** or questions of

- How research is part of higher music education
- Disciplinarity: towards distinguishing areas and methods of research
- Distinguishing artistic research and scientific research

and

- The value of research in higher arts education institutions

The objective was to consider the different modalities for future joint collaboration activities within the alliance. The results of the thematic analysis are reported in chapter 3.3.

2.4 Methods of dissemination

Throughout the process of developing the WP and in subsequent designing and producing the deliverable D4.2, we have worked in the IN.TUNE alliance online environment, with shared documents and discussions. A working area was set up for WG1, with access to documents by its members, the WP4C members, alliance co-secretary generals (SGs) and administrative managers, chairs of other work packages, institutional alliance managers (IAMs), the WP4 administrative person, and the liaison from the quality assurance Work Package 7 (WP7) . The working area of WP4C was accessible by the same, except for WG1 members, although key documents were shared to the WG1 as well. The meetings of WP4C and WG1 were participated, from time to time, by a SG and IAM as well. Separate meetings were arranged between the WP4 chair, WP4 admin and SG, and between the chair, admin and the WP7 liaison. In addition, the chair consulted e.g. the informaticians of the coordinating partner.

During the process, the WP4C and WG1 members circulated the matters in their institutions based on each partner institution's practices and the relevant needs for producing the deliverable. For instance, for the May 2024 meeting the committee got homework to discuss and make sure in one's institution that for the inventory and analysis of research traditions and fields of expertise, matrix option D is the one we can proceed with, to test the data model, to find out what data there exists that we can make use of, and to collect comments also about

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

proceeding with the environmental matrix. In completing the deliverable, a draft version was shared to the SGs and WP4C members for comments and possible circulation depending on the partner institution's practices, before the final meeting of WP4C and the delivery of the final version of D4.2 to the SGs, executive committee (ExCom) and the governing board (GB) of the alliance on 20 Dec 2024, and subsequent internal communication and publication on the IN.TUNE website.

For after the delivery, we have a plan to disseminate D4.2 more widely within the alliance institutions, in cooperation with the Work Package on Communication, dissemination and advocacy (WP8). The goal is to have the media release coordinated with the subsequent steps of WP4, such as an announcement of the first WP4 knowledge hub and a call for papers for the upcoming WP4 conference, thereby engaging the personnel and students at the partner institutions, and the alliance partners. This in line with the overall concept of the work package, in that the current deliverable D4.2 serves as a basis for the subsequent tasks and deliverables of the WP, carrying towards the development of the final deliverable D4.1, the position paper and the IN.TUNE Research Cooperation Framework, and to the objective of the work package, strengthening of our research dimension.

3 Obtained results

3.1 General description of results

Through the analyses it has become evident that there is a number of practical and principal issues in our research environments to discuss, develop and resolve – jointly and at each institution – that affect how the future development of joint collaboration will unravel.

The obtained results show that **the partner institutions differ greatly from each other with regard to a number of variables with significance for research and research environments, both providing affordances and setting constraints to the development of research and its interplay with education.** Their **official status** within their respective countries varies, affecting education offered, institutional organization and **the relationship of education and research**, expectations and goal setting, perceived value and recognition of research (such as artistic research at large), as well as funding mechanisms and opportunities. These carry to the **institutional conditions,** where the circumstances for research are nurtured and constrained by research leadership, principles of research time allocation and other HR policies, researcher's career paths and possible models thereof, and the assessment mechanisms in use, as well as the availability of information about research pursued and its conditions.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

We have identified **several research areas that the core partner institutions currently share,** and which could be the basis for joint activities. However, **it could be misleading to declare those areas as the ones for future collaboration**. Instead, we have needed to critically consider the notion of research areas, and e.g. the roles of artistic research and scientific research, disciplinarity of our research now and in the future, the "researchness" of our study programmes, and how **not only similarities but also complementarities in research areas can turn out fecund**. While the matrix approach has been a useful tool at this stage, to go further we need to learn more of ourselves and of one another, and to develop new ways to address the complexity of potential areas of interest.

For strengthening our research dimension and paving way for research collaboration, it has turned out to be **vital to consider research education,** and **how research and "researchness" stand in relation to the position of education** and the respective curricula in our institutions, from the bachelor level through doctoral level, in order to address the full path of researcher. The same applies to **the relationship between research and artistic and societal activities** of the institutions.

3.2 Resources and policies of research in IN.TUNE alliance institutions

Below, we report the analyses of the responses to the five questions deemed central at this stage for the analysis of existing resources and policies with regards to research in the IN.TUNE alliance partner institutions. The questions address the institutions as research organisations, funding models of research, human resources and HR policies, research education, and research information.

3.2.1 The institutions as research organisations

The partner institutions of the IN.TUNE alliance can all be considered higher education organisations engaged in research, but they **differ greatly from each other with regard to a number of variables with significance for research and research environments**, such as official status of the institution, how research is organised, time allocated to research at the level of each employee, and the existence and organisation of doctoral programs. The institutions' similarities seem to be most visible in the fact that most institutions engage in both scientific and artistic research, as well as in the overarching perception of what research culture stands for in an educational context.

Although all partner institutions provide higher music education and related research, their **official status within their respective countries varies**. This affects, among other things, the breadth and levels of education offered, the size of the institutions, to which degree research output is expected, and, in some cases, even whether or not the institution is eligible to apply

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

for external research funding (see 3.2.2). Three partner institutions can be categorised as broader universities of the arts, with music being centred into one faculty, department or academy, which is then surrounded by other units of higher arts education (MDW, UAB, and UNIARTS). One institution has the status of being a music university (UNMB) and another is a music academy recognised as a specialised university institution (NMH), whereas three of the alliance partners are higher arts or music education institutions without formal university status (CNSMDP, ESMUC and HdK).

All partner **institutions have some kind of formal structures connected to research leadership but differ in where such leadership is located** within the organisational structure. At MDW, the rector is currently the head of research, other institutions have vice-deans, vice-rectors or heads of research units responsible for the institution's research activities and outputs. In HdK, **research is organised around a number of research professors** who are responsible for the research placed within their respective areas. In six of the institutions – NMH, UNMB, MDW, HdK, UAB, UNIARTS – much of the ongoing research activities are organised into distinct **research centres**, spanning from one such centre to six and eight, these clusters altogether emphasising a variety of topics and areas, all with relevance to music research as perceived in its full breadth. In one of the arts universities (UNIARTS), **a research institute** is comprised of four **networks** which seem to gather researchers from several arts-related disciplines under specific topics, while field-specific research is pursued at the departments of the three academies. In UAB, the 13 departments also have the function of being research centres. In addition to being organised into research centres, **research also takes place within the departmental structure of most institutions**, where the link to education also ensured.

Given the variation in official status, and in national guidelines and regulations, **the partner institutions differ greatly with respect to time allocated specifically to research**, both generally and at the level of the individual employee (see 3.2.3, 3.3.3). Yet, at all but one institution, research is expected of all or a specified part of full-time or permanently employed staff. The conditions and expectations vary from all or most staff member having a certain percentage (e.g. 30%) of their time allocated to research, to research being part of the work contract but not specified in hours or percent, to research not being explicitly in the contract but still expected to some extent (see 3.2.3). In CNSMDP there is currently no system or possibility for buy-out of time to do research, although research is expected and supported at some level.

Doctoral programs, with their enrolled **doctoral candidates, often make up an important part of an institution's research environment**. Of the IN.TUNE partners, seven institutions –

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

NMH, UNMB, MDW, UAB, UNIARTS, HdK and CNSMDP – offer one or more doctoral programs within the field of music, either scientific, artistic or both. Two institutions, CNSMDP and HdK, collaborate both with a number of other universities to provide education at the tertiary level, and ESMUC has offered a small number of doctoral courses in collaboration with other universities, but no complete degree. (For more, see 3.2.4 and 3.3.3.)

Most partner institutions engage in both scientific and artistic music-related research, but the distribution between these two areas vary, as do the ways the areas are distinguished (see 3.3.2). **In some institutions, artistic research is a quite new phenomenon, and the scientific output is the largest, whereas in other institutions artistic research is highly encouraged and emphasised.** Yet again, in certain institutions, the distribution between the two forms of research seems to be rather balanced. Another similarity lies within the area of research culture. One institution describes its general culture as being characterised by **"high teaching intensity"**. Given that most of the IN.TUNE partners, perhaps all, must be said to belong to the European conservatoire tradition, we believe this to be a valid description of all the partner institutions, and we also believe that this trait to a rather large extent **impacts on the research culture** (see 3.2.4 and 3.3.4). That said, partner institutions exist, in which certain departments (CNSMDP) or positions (HdK) are entirely dedicated to research, but this form of **"research intensity" is more an exception than the norm** within the IN.TUNE alliance. Typically, departments across the alliance institutions operate both in research and education, with the emphasis on education and research often contributing to its development.

3.2.2 The funding models for research

In all institutions, the largest share of research funding comes from the public sector, i.e., through the overall budget allocated to them from the respective Ministries or, in the case of UAB, the Serbian Science Fund. These funds are received **annually; in two cases** they are negotiated for longer time periods: MDW every three years and UNIARTS every four years. In three (MDW, UNIARTS and UNMB) of the eight institutions **the procedure for determining the funding** received includes performance-based indicators. UNIARTS and UNMB have additional indicators (e.g. value of publications) shared with other universities.

Regardless of their status as universities **the institutions differ regarding whether this funding is earmarked for research or not**. For example, in two of the institutions with non-university status and of comparable size like HdK and ESMUC, HdK's funding is earmarked for research while ESMUC's has not been until the 2024–2025 budget. On the other hand, comparing universities like MDW and UNMB with UNIARTS, the funds of the former two are earmarked for research (e.g. through research-related indicators) while those of the latter are not. In the case of UNMB 30% of the funds are specifically allocated for research. The effects

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

of these differences, due to tradition and legislation, can be mitigated since all funds are then distributed internally. For example, while NMH's funds are not earmarked for research, since all staff with more than 50% employment have 30% of their hours allocated to research, part of the funds is implicitly allocated to research. Starting in 2023, the Faculty of Music at UAB receives a fund to all areas of scientific research.

In summary, the funds from the overall institutional budget, being the primary source of the eight educational institutions, can be considered as internal basic funding used varyingly for a range of research activities and structures: salaries for researchers, research supervisors, and research support staff; additional funding for research projects can be regarded as strategic: e.g. internal competitive funding for small-scale projects as well as research events and publications. There is a case worth mentioning in reference to such internal funding: Academy of Creative and Performing Arts (ACPA) receives funding from both HdK and Leiden University for scientific personnel.

In addition to the funding described above, all institutions have access to external funding, which is in most cases also public, e.g., from national funding agencies. The amount of funding acquired from external sources varies considerably between the eight partners and is generally less pronounced than at research universities. These funds are commonly acquired by individual researchers, often with support from the institution, and for specific projects. In some cases, they are applied for by the institutions themselves (e.g. CNSMDP) to fund specific events or even structural elements (e.g. ESMUC can apply for public grants to cover a specialist position for up to four years).

Since these are competitive funds, the degree of **acceptance of artistic research or artistic institutions as research institutions within each country plays an important role** in their acquisition (see 3.3.2). Even in contexts where research in the arts is fully accepted and integrated into the research culture, to varying degrees all institutions are at a disadvantage when applying to these funds. Competing with other universities with more experience with applications and projects that align more with scientific research is the main challenge. There are few funding programs at national levels that are exclusively dedicated to arts-based research (e.g. The Arts-Based Research Programme PEEK by the Austrian Science Fund). Norway (where NMH is located) has until recently had a funding scheme for artistic research only. From last year on, this scheme has been closed, which currently means that external funding for artistic research cannot be found at the national level. Norwegian higher arts institutions are currently working towards establishing such a scheme under the Research Council of Norway, which up until now only has accepted applications for scientific research.

External funds come mostly from national research councils and funding agencies, national institutions (e.g. museums) and the EU (Horizon Europe, Creative Europe, Erasmus+

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Partnerships). HdK occasionally receives funds of this type (mostly from the Dutch Research Council) as does ACPA where these funds have recently been growing in comparison to direct government funding. UNIARTS has a clear incentive to increase this funding source and has been doing so in recent years: two of the research indicators that affect their funding are directly related to their ability to secure external funds. Access to external funds for research has increased in some institutions, enabling innovation and international collaboration as well as employment for early career researchers (MDW). Most institutions have participated in European funded projects but only MDW notes an increasing relevance of these sources.

Some of the institutions have occasionally received private funds for their participation in partnerships but for the most part, private funding is rare except for UNIARTS. UNIARTS receives some funding from businesses and, notably, from private foundations. Of the supplementary external funding to UNIARTS, ca. 60% is destined for research. At both HdK and UNIARTS as well as at MDW, some doctoral and master's students receive support from private foundations on an individual basis.

To summarize: Funds for research in the alliance members are mostly public. Of the total institutional budgets received, the proportion of funds that go specifically to research activities is small. More and more, institutions rely on external funding (also mostly public) to support and increase research activity. This funding is generally acquired by competing against other universities and institutions with greater capacity and experience in these processes. An added challenge is that even though artistic institutions have now gained access to these competitions, the protocols have not always been adapted to evaluate research in artistic fields. So, while some funding is provided for artistic expression (e.g. concerts, festivals, tours, commissions) comparatively little is given to research in the arts and arts-based research.

3.2.3 HR policies

Today, and increasingly so in the future, higher education institutions in music are expected to engage with research in order to educate and train musicians, artists and pedagogues who are able to deal with the changes in the profession and the society, to create new knowledge for the field and to engage with new forms of research relevant for artistic and pedagogical practices, and for academia at large. An important goal of the alliance is to build capacities through the professional development of teaching and supporting staff in the alliance institutions, and for that, it is also important for us to develop our research activities and research policies further. The HR policies are central in this.

The eight IN.TUNE partner institutions show significant differences with regard to HR policies for research, which can be largely explained by different national legislations and agreements. This is the case, for example, for the standard allocation of research time (30%) to contracts of artistic or scientific teaching staff in one of the eight institutions (NMH). In three other

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

institutions, (UNMB, MDW, UNIARTS) research may also be part of full-time or permanently employed teaching staff job descriptions, but without a clear policy on research time allocation. At four institutions (UAB, HdK, CNSMDP, ESMUC), research is not allocated to contracts or part of the job description of the teaching staff. At the HdK, teachers and non-teaching staff can apply for small-scale, project-based research that is supported by three lectorates (professorships) and their research groups. At the CNSMDP, the teaching staff is currently conducting research in addition to their teaching and admin duties, and some of the admin (including technical) staff may carry out research tasks as part of their duties, whereas in ESMUC only recently a perspective on research HR policy is developing, following a new law (2024) that recognizes research as a principal task for higher artistic education institutions. Currently, staff in ESMUC have the possibility of trading teaching time (typically 2h/week) for research time, supported by specific pilot groups in departments, and authorized by the head of research on an annual basis. An interesting observation is that even in institutions where research is not part of contracts, a research-driven statutory mission exists (although in the case of ESMUC, only recently). It should be noted that recent changes in the organizational models of institutions (e.g. CNSMDP, ESMUC) are leading to new research HR policies yet still to be developed.

Some differences in HR policy seem to relate to the fact that some institutions are universities of the arts, whereas others are music universities, music academies, or higher arts or music education institutions without formal university status (see 3.2.1). If the task of doing research is usually clear for scientific personnel, **in artistic departments there seems to be more of a grey zone, and a growing need to distinguish between time spent on artistic creation and teaching, time spent on research,** and their interconnections. This also requires **further discussion on definitions of artistic research** and its relationship with artistic education within institutions (see 3.3.2).

The differences between institutions in terms of allocated research hours translate also into different policies for research career paths. At some institutions researchers can follow the typical academic model by starting as a doctoral researcher or assistant professor, then becoming an associate professor and eventually full professor. Depending on national legislation, in some cases, artistic researchers can follow a similar route, but in most institutions, their possibilities are more limited, and research activities remain an add-on to artistic and teaching activities. Nevertheless, a doctoral degree has increasingly become an important criterion for hiring staff, even in artistic departments. For instance, whereas in most institutions artistic professors with a doctoral degree are still a minority, in UAB the majority of the teaching staff has already obtained it. (See also 3.3.4.)

The growing acceptance of artistic research at national levels leads to new opportunities to acquire external funding (see 3.2.2). However, externally funded artistic research programmes

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

are often pilot programmes without clear long-term prospects to advance in a career path as a researcher (e.g. at UAB) and also run the risk of being discontinued at some point (e.g. in Norway). In general, **the possibilities for artistic researchers to secure external funding remain more limited than for their scientific counterparts.**

However, the precarity of (young) researchers' careers is a more general phenomenon that transcends the artistic-scientific divide and can also be linked to austerity measures, and to the tendency of institutions to seek a balance between permanent and flexible contracts. Young researchers often stay in temporary and insecure positions, especially when working in externally funded projects (e.g. at MDW). But the requirement for researchers to have a teaching contract before they can apply for internal or external research funding can also be a barrier for young researchers to advance their career path after obtaining a master's or doctoral degree (e.g. at HdK). Measures to support early-career researchers are generally still under development in the IN.TUNE institutions, which may also be due to a lack of scale or mass. As an exception, the MDW has developed several measures to support early-career researchers through a number of programmes, including mobility, individual counselling, funding programmes, post-doctoral fellowships, and DEI measures. NMH and UNIARTS are also involved in the Coalition for Advancing Research Assessment (CoARA) action plan that aims at sustainable researcher recruitment and assessment.

All partners have some kind of assessment system for research achievements in place at the institutional level. Possible benefits of institution assessment include funding for the lab, research group or department. Six of the eight partners also have a system at the personnel level. At ESMUC, the research group is evaluated by the region every three years, and staff members also have the option of being assessed individually. At CNSMDP, only the institution is assessed as a whole every five years. Possible benefits of personnel assessment include promotion, continuation, the right to teach at a certain level, and funding.

Two partners have established specific assessment criteria for artistic research, with a locally developed form (NMH), or in agreement with a National Music entity (UNMB). One has a plan to do so, following an international entity (UNIARTS). At all three, peer-reviewed publications are taken into consideration in the assessment, but only for the scientific staff at NMH, and with a point-based system at UNIARTS that does not have an equivalent yet for artistic research outputs. At HdK, a unique system of critical friend assessment is taking place before members of staff upload their research outcomes on the Research Catalogue.

3.2.4 Research education

A major outcome of the inventory and comparative analysis was the acknowledgement of the significance of the interplay between research and education. By default, all higher education must be research-based, and if there is no research, the objective cannot be achieved, and

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

graduates will not have a) up-to-date research-based skills, nor b) the skills and competences needed to operate sustainably in the changing world of the 21st century that are required to develop their own (artistic or pedagogical) practice in their field. Reciprocally, institutions of higher education recruit future faculty members from the graduates of higher education institutions.

To develop their own (artistic or pedagogical) practices, their field, and to contribute to the societies and the human life at large, our students need the skills and competences required to operate successfully and sustainably in the changing world of the 21st century.

For that, education must provide also the necessary research skills: most of the students will work in the renewing field on the basis of these skills, while others will be trained as researchers – and these are not mutually exclusive. This calls for examining research education: how research and "researchness" are part of the curricula of the institutions from bachelor level to doctoral level. Research communities in higher education are requisite for that training to take place. The basic functions of a university, higher education, research and societal engagement, are not separate entities, quite the contrary.

Research is pursued in all the alliance institutions – at different levels of education. With "research education", we refer to education that aims at developing awareness of research, understanding of research processes, capabilities of applying research results, outcomes or methods to professional needs, skills to pursue research, growth into research communities and researcher identities, and furthermore – depending on the level of education – acquisition and maintenance of professionalism in research. In this sense, **research education is present in all eight institutions, mainly at master's and doctoral levels, but in ways also at the bachelor level.** Successful researchers, vibrant research communities and flourishing research culture are outcomes of high-quality research education.

Research education at the bachelor level. At NMH, basic research skills are taught at the bachelor's level in some programs, especially in student projects. For the UNMB, research education is integrated into the university through the Department for Teacher Personnel Training, supported by both the Faculty of Music Performance and the Faculty of Composition, Musicology, and Music Pedagogy. Similarly, ESMUC has research as part of the bachelor curriculum and a graduation requirement, including a final thesis paper and defence. Research-led teaching is a core principle at MDW integrating current research into all curricula. Scientific research courses are included in both artistic and pedagogical bachelor and master programs (about 10%).

Research education is also found in CNSMDP, where it varies by department, by staff research activities with intensive student assessment or in partnership research programs involving

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

students. The undergraduate courses at the UAB have research dimensions and all scientific departments offer courses in these fields. Likewise, at the UNIARTS, "researchness" has recently become a core theme in the bachelor's curricula, emphasizing critical examination and multiple perspectives to deepen understanding of art and art-making. Even though research is less developed at the bachelor than the master's level at HdK, it involves learning basic skills such as argumentation, formulating questions, working with information, and presentation. Students are encouraged to be critical thinkers regarding the repertoire they perform and the professional world they will enter.

Research education at the master's level. Research education at the master's level is offered by all eight institutions. A similar approach to the bachelor level is found at the NMH, where the master's students are taught basic research thinking or philosophy and skills or methods in relation to their work with the master's thesis or project. The same holds for the UNMB, where research education is conducted through the Department for Teacher Personnel Training (DPPD). Furthermore, all six official degrees offered by ESMUC at the master's level include research in the curriculum and graduation requirements. Like at the bachelor level, CNSMDP has research education in some programs, such as musicology, pedagogy, sound recording and in programs for performers and dancers. Likewise, the scientific departments of UAB provide master courses with research dimensions and in the artistic departments independent research-oriented program called specialization is conducted. At the UNIARTS, "researchness" manifests in master's curricula as a pedagogical activity that builds a deeper understanding of art and art-making by examining them critically and from multiple perspectives. However, not all master's programs at UNIARTS require research components in their curricula, while some artistic programs have recently adopted specific options for researcher paths in their curricula, and others are research-based or scientific.

Research is deeply embedded in the master's curricula at HdK, where the students take introductory research courses, individual supervisors, focus areas, master circles and a research symposium with an international jury. MDW integrates scientific research into all curricula, covering both artistic, pedagogical and scientific-artistic master's programmes, combining academic education with artistic practice.

Research education at the doctoral level. Research education is mostly developed at the doctoral level. Doctoral programmes are offered in all partner institutions except ESMUC, which doesn't have a university status. Nevertheless, there is a strong research dimension present at ESMUC at the bachelor and master's levels, and a strong connection with doctoral education since certain departments and staff members are involved in master's and doctoral programmes at universities.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Scientific doctoral programmes exist in six institutions. In NMH, there is one in Music Research that covers Music Education, Music Therapy/Music and Health, and Practice-oriented Musicology. In UNMB, the scientific doctoral programme is called Music Education and covers Musical Performance, Composition and Musicology. CNSMDP offers two doctoral programmes: one in Music Performance and the other in Composition. At the MDW it is possible to complete a doctoral programme in disciplines spanning Music Education, Music Acoustics, Vocal Research, Musicology, Music Sociology, Popular Music Studies, Gender Studies, Cultural Management, Ethnomusicology, Film Studies, Music Therapy Research and Music Physiology. In UAB, scientific doctoral programs include Musicology, Ethnomusicology, Music Theory and Music Pedagogy at the Faculty of Music and Theory of Dramatic Arts, Media and Culture at the Faculty of Dramatic Arts. Doctoral education at the Sibelius Academy of UNIARTS is currently organized jointly by the two doctoral schools. The degree has three specialization areas, Arts Study Programme, Applied Study Programme, and Research Study Programme, in which the degrees offered are either artistic or scientific doctoral degrees, in essentially any field taught at the academy and in which supervision can be provided. Across the partner institutions, Music Education and Musicology are the most common areas in the field of scientific doctoral studies.

Artistic doctoral programmes are not offered in CNSMDP and ESMUC, although there are plans for developing an internal DMA at CNSMDP. Doctoral degrees based on the artistic research exist in NMH, MDW (Doctor Artium Programme), HdK (docARTES in music and PhDArts in visual arts and design), UNIARTS (Sibelius Academy, Academy of Fine Arts and Theatre Academy), UNMB (professional doctorate) and UAB (Music Performance and Composition at the Faculty of Music, but also at other three faculties of UAB – for dramatic arts, fine arts and applied arts).

Important to note, master's studies, especially in the artistic fields, do not necessarily provide research expertise sufficient for doctoral studies. The entrance exams for doctoral level are usually highly competitive (with ratio up to 5:1 in UNIARTS) and the number of admitted students is significantly low. In Norway, doctoral student is a paid position, making it even more competitive: only 8 students are admitted at NMH per year.

It is very important to consider the cases of students progressing from a not research-oriented artistic master level to a doctoral level without enough expertise in this field. One solution is to provide intensive introductory courses in methodology of research. In any case, **the variety in research education described above calls for more systematic ways of assessing our current higher education curricula and the value of incorporating research or "researchness" in them, starting from the bachelor level, continuing to the master's level, and further to the doctoral level, develop the curricula with objectives, contents,**

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

pedagogical methods and alignments deemed appropriate, and engage in subsequent implementation and reassessment of the curricula.

Doctoral studies are often organised in collaboration with other institutions, either external or internal between entities belonging to the same university. At CNSMDP they are created in partnership with the Sorbonne (Music Performance) and PSL University (Composition). At MDW, numerous doctoral students are completing their doctorates within the framework for externally funded research projects and also within the framework of the structured doctoral programme "Music Matters. Materiality, Knowings and Practices in Performing Arts". In the Hague, students of HdK can apply after master's studies to a doctoral programme in artistic research at ACPA. The Ph.D. programme in music is offered in the framework of docARTES, a collaboration between the HdK, the Conservatory of Amsterdam, Leiden University (ACPA), Leuven University, Antwerp University, and the Orpheus Institute in Ghent. The doctoral programme for visual artists and designers is PhDArts, a collaboration between Royal Academy of Art, The Hague (KABK) and ACPA at Leiden University. Internal doctoral collaborations are possible in UNIARTS and UAB, which reflects the core issue of the institutional organization mentioned above. In UAB, there are interdisciplinary doctoral and master programmes in collaboration between four faculties. At the doctoral level there are two artistic programmes (Polymedia Art, Digital Art) and one scientific programme (Theory of Arts and Media).

3.2.5 Research information

The IN.TUNE aims of **building effective, systemic and sustainable framework for cooperation,** joint creation of forward-looking institutional environments, and, in particular, strengthening artistic and educational innovation and research require sufficient basis of information regarding our operations, especially those pertaining to research. Through the opening months of the alliance, we have learned a lot – and that we need to know more of ourselves and of one another, in order to develop the collaboration and to make well-reasoned, sustainable decisions. This leads to an objective to know more of what we know and what not, and what kind of research information we have available or can readily produce, what are the mechanisms for producing research information data, what kind of research information systems we may or may not have, and what role these systems play with regards to research-based education. Research information systems (RIS) serve as reservoirs of our knowledge capital.

The fifth question for the analysis of research environments asked what kind of key figures or statistics on research the institution has available or can provide for further analysis. The responses were supplemented by a small, more detailed internal survey directed at the WP4C members, with questions about use of RIS's and repositories, data sources available on funding, national level RIS's, availability of information on personnel, projects, and groups, applicant

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

and study data of doctoral students, and research reporting and assessment. The obtained results reflect the variety present in other aspects of our research environments.

Six institutions have publicly accessible RIS's (NMH, UNMB, UNIARTS, ESMUC, UAB, and MDW, with a new Current Research Information System (CRIS) in progress), either institutional, national, or both. However, **the contents, searchability, reporting capabilities, and technical platforms used vary.** For example, the RIS website of Serbia can be searched by researchers, teachers, students, organizations, outputs (or results), and filtered by data, type and version. It can also produce various statistics but may not include artistic research. Three have internal RIS's (UNMB, CNSMPD, UNIARTS), at least two of which use similar technical platforms. HdK sends an annual survey to collect data from researchers on publications, activities and impact for their annual report, while ACPA uses the Leiden University RIS. The data for RIS's appears to be produced partly by such annual surveys or input by researchers who are asked or required to report, partly through library or other services. Most institutions are required to report their research and other activities annually, although reports may also be fully or partly non-public. The same holds for financial information. The formats and contents of the yearly reporting vary according to national practices. For instance, UNIARTS participates in the national gathering of data for the Finnish Ministry of Education and Culture, the data of which is published in the national RIS and Educational Statistics Finland website. In turn, MDW produces annually an intellectual capital report – Wissensbilanz – which in textual form, supported by key figures, describes e.g. annual activities and developments, scientific and arts-based research, highlights newly initiated projects, research infrastructure and services, curricular development and other educational matters, and e.g. societal responsibilities, personnel, partnerships and external funding. The data is collected by the Department of Quality Management.

The institutions typically have web service for contact information of the personnel, but in them only rarely can research personnel be directly searched by research position or by research topics or areas – RIS's may first be needed to identify the individual researchers. However, the search systems for personnel are in flux as well.

The data available on research projects is often incomplete, or may be limited to finished projects, or externally funded ones. Moreso, the data available on research groups either is incomplete, the system is in development or not existing – or there are no (known) research groups.

Seven institutions have public repositories for research outputs (NMH, UNMB, CNSMDP, UNIARTS, UAB, ESMUC although selectively, and HdK through its association with ACPA and thereby Leiden University LUCRIS). MDW will soon have **a new combination of research repository and a research data repository**. In addition, three institutions use **Research**

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Catalogue as public repository (NMH, UNIARTS, HdK), and a fourth one will do so next year (MDW). UAB uses another repository system for doctoral dissertations and artistic projects.

Finally, **six institutions have undergone research assessment exercises** (UNIARTS, HdK, UAB, UNMB, CNSMDP, ESMUC), in one form or another. For some, the assessments are public (e.g. UNIARTS), for others, non-public.

3.3 Fields of expertise and traditions in our eight institutions

The following pages elaborate an account of the ways in which research is present at our institutions, the way it can be represented and the challenges that emerge in conceiving a future articulation of collaborative research. This account is the result of the process of elaboration of a matrix containing an overview of research currently carried out by the eight institutions in the alliance. As noted in 2.3, we now focus on research related to music, leaving out other fields of arts such as fine arts, dance or theatre. In addressing the research traditions and fields of expertise, the analysis below also elaborates and extends some of the themes presented in chapter 3.2 at the level of research environments of the partner institutions. The two analyses of the bifurcated approach support one another. This analysis is structured across four fundamental questions or themes:

1. Disciplinarity: towards distinguishing areas and methods of research
2. Distinguishing artistic research and scientific research
3. How research is part of higher music education
4. The value of research in the institutions

The idea of making an inventory of research areas in the form of a matrix was to create a broad overview of the kind of research done in the partner institutions and the kind of possibilities for collaboration that could exist in the future. The matrix shows that many research areas are found at all partner universities. These include, as per the overview we carried out: **research in music education, composition, music analysis and theory, music and wellbeing, early music, music history and music technology.** Besides corroborating that these research areas are shared across institutions, what the matrix elaboration has shown is that these areas have been consolidated and institutionalized. On the other hand, certain research areas can be found only in some universities (e.g. global music in UNMB, UNIARTS, MDW, and UAB), meaning that specializations exist. Furthermore, other relevant areas do not appear as categories in the first version of the matrix (e.g. music and the environmental crisis, sound materialism, music and diversity, curatorial practices or music and AI). This last point is significant, since it draws attention towards areas which have not yet become consolidated or institutionalized as such, although they have been addressed by projects within the institutions

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

and are significant in the present world. What can be learned from this is that a different instrument, diverse from the preliminary matrix, ought to be developed or adopted which would allow for addressing and enabling the temporary and malleable nature of research areas. This, however, may have to take place outside of the scope of alliance activities.

3.3.1 Disciplinarity: towards distinguishing areas and methods of research

We faced a number of challenges in analysing the commonalities and differences of research practices. The first obstacle was the different internal structures of our faculties. The second one concerned the difficulties in gathering and selecting keywords to input in the matrix. Distinguishing between broad research areas and highly specific topics proved to be a complex task. Often, we found that individual research topics could be classified under multiple research areas. What came across is that:

A. **Certain keywords – which serve to identify the main problems or the notions that structure research projects – may need to be distributed across different research areas**[3]
B. **Research areas are not necessarily aligned with specific departments but rather spread across a variety of practices and methods.**

This can be properly observed, for example, in the multi-disciplinary approach that characterizes the research area music history. This area cannot be attributed to a particular department or specialized group, but is studied by different institutions, different disciplines and in diverse contexts. While some institutions address it from the point of view of classic scientific perspectives (i.e. musicology), this area is very much addressed also by other disciplines and other methods across all institutions, even if no separate research category has been identified institutionally in such university. Music history is researched by musicologists in one way, by artist-researchers dealing with genealogies of music practices in a different way, by acousticians concerned with material traces in another, and by cultural studies scholars interested in political contexts of music making in another way.

Significant overlaps can be found in areas where the practice of musicology, ethnomusicology, music theory, and music pedagogy intersect with art practices.

[3] As an outcome of the WP4C considerations for the framework (see option A–D in 2.1), the matrix listed the following categories as research areas: Scientific research areas: general music education, instrumental music education, research on musical praxes, music analysis and theory, music philosophy, music history, ethnomusicology, cultural studies in music, social studies in music, music psychology, music and wellbeing, music management, arts management. Artistic research areas: composition, conducting, folk music, local ethnic music, global music, world music, jazz contemporary, commercial music, digital music & music technology, early music, organ and sacred music, vocal music, including opera, accompaniment, piano, chamber music, ensembles, strings, winds, percussion.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Scientific practices are naturally interdisciplinary, as, broadly speaking, musicology intersects with performance theory and music history, and these practices become necessary for the elaboration of scientific and artistic endeavours.

The temporary and malleable definition of research areas can be observed, for example, in the case of the definition of the research area of music and wellbeing. In examining the matrix, it became clear that certain areas have been identified because they have already been institutionally recognized (in one social context or another). For example, the research area of music and wellbeing testifies to the fact that a framework and set of criteria has already been established around these terms and that this has entered public agendas. Nonetheless, other possible areas or points are absent, which might relevantly express research interests that are in-development or soon to be developed in our institutions, such as for example **cultural diversity, sound materialism, or environmental crisis.** This means that the definition of research areas needs to be left open for in-development questions and concerns, as well as for their naturally inter-disciplinary definition. Also, we found that these areas are an example of possible and relevant future areas for collaboration.

A common ground for research in music and wellbeing is the connection that is widely interesting to the large public, and that relates to the established discipline of music therapy. We have seen that all institutions, on the other hand, and from various perspectives, are able to offer different perspectives on the relationship between music and health. The topic can become a crossing point for different approaches offered by all institutions, some of them closely linked to music psychology, although also open to connections with topics such as music and vulnerable groups, music and its impact on children's development (which is also related to music pedagogy) or on hospice and eldercare.

Furthermore, **questions of disciplinarity become fundamental for the articulations and distinctions between artistic and scientific research** (see 3.2.3, 3.3.2). For example, specific topics such as **gesture theory** or **narrativity** can be tackled e.g. by music theory as a scientific discipline, while they also intersect with artistic research. The study of the content of the music is carried out by both performers and analysts. Music theory entails a scientific approach in its traditional form of expression, and yet, every artistic research involves a consideration of form, harmony, counterpoint, and the like. Music pedagogy coincides with methodological disciplines related to instrument playing, although it is difficult to make a distinction where the study of pedagogy relates to working with children under the heading of general music education. Here, an interdisciplinary scientific approach and the use of knowledge e.g. from music psychology is necessary. This also concerns the diverse threads which open from the links between music philosophy and musicology. Music philosophy could also be presented in

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

a popular manner to instrumentalists, but it is tied to higher levels of music studies, especially musicology.

We observed that **the grid structure of the matrix in its current form is not sufficient to account for how research areas are often defined across disciplines**, and for how several research projects (both individual and collective) at our institutions are interdisciplinary, i.e. cross the boundaries of given categories of research and are explored from different perspectives or in collaboration across departments. **The matrix has been useful to identify the way areas and departments have been institutionally defined.** Nonetheless, the identification of this limit of the matrix seemed crucial to us, since it points towards the need to develop a more flexible and productive definition of research areas. This alternative possibility we envision for the future should cater to the changing landscape and changing research interests, as well as to the interaction of disciplines and methods taking place in our institutions.

3.3.2 Distinguishing artistic research and scientific research

In our account of different traditions and perspectives towards research across our institutions we were faced with a diversity of approaches, values and formal implementations of the distinction between scientific and artistic research. Some institutions have a bigger musicological or scientific infrastructure, while others have diverse ways of structuring the articulation and distinction between scientific and artistic research. Some rely on centres rather than departments, some organize their research around doctoral centres, etc. (see 3.2.1). In any case, **all institutions include the practice of artistic research in one way or another, and all are committed to its further development** (cf. 3.2.2, 3.2.3). Across this analysis, we came up with an increased awareness of the overlap of research areas and research practices and came to value **the distinction between artistic and scientific research as a question of methods more than a question of areas.**

Furthermore, music research is inherently interdisciplinary, and it is sometimes difficult to draw a line concerning which aspect of a phenomenon could be studied: artistic or scientific. Both approaches are often legitimate for the same thing we are studying and appear as alternative (and sometimes complementary) methodologies.

This distinction should be explored further in the future (cf. 2.1), and we have faced the reality that **different institutions have different perspectives towards this.** For example: At the HdK-ACPA, artistic research is conceived as a pluri-disciplinary approach in which research is created in and through artistic practice. The development of artistic research entails

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

epistemic reconsiderations. This means that artistic research presupposes the existence of forms of knowledge-making that require tools and practices which are diverse from those customarily accepted in scientific practices, namely those that are non-discursive. Across several institutions, for example in the case at NMH, artistic research which follows the specific Norwegian model, so-called "artistic development work", is considered equal to scientific research by law. In artistic development work, the artistic processes are at the core and the artistic output is of great importance. At UNIARTS, a distinction has recently been promoted – however not adopted by all – between "art research" and artistic research. The notion is that "art research" would refer to research that defines art as its object, whereas in artistic research, the term of which is well-established, art offers a premise and an aim for research: a motive, a terrain, a context and a whole range of methods. The priority objective in artistic research is to identify and describe the kind of framework of research that does not reduce art only to a subject matter of research.

The definition of artistic research as a tradition of research still requires further development. For example, it is still to be clarified what methods and components characterize one and the other. This concerns the role of hypothesis validated via pre-established methods, the role of imagination, the role of methods which incorporate subjectivity and auto-ethnographic principles, for example, and their relevance to characterize one and the other practice.

Overall, we observed the need to develop further the forms in which artistic research is understood across our institutions, the need to share insights and experiences and to fundamentally continue refining the ways in which artistic and scientific research are articulated. This endeavour could be conceived as one of the fundamental topics to be explored in a knowledge hub.

3.3.3 How research is part of higher music education

As noted in 3.2.4, successful researchers, vibrant research communities and flourishing research culture are outcomes of high-quality research education. Through our analysis we realised that **the integration and role of research in our programs of higher music education is fundamental for the dimension that is given to the practice of research.** As described earlier (3.2.4), several partners already explicitly embed research in their curricula. For instance, at ESMUC, every bachelor's student must complete a research-based thesis as a graduation requirement, and at MDW, **research-led teaching** is a core principle, integrating current research into all study programs. This kind of integration influences how research is conducted and valued in our institutions – for example, it shapes research as a core part of professional development for staff and students (see 3.3.4). We discovered **differences and commonalities in this respect across the members of the alliance.**

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Commonalities: Research is generally considered central to higher music education because it is essential to **improving teaching practices and student achievements**. It provides evidence-based knowledge that can inform teaching practices, curricular developments, and assessment strategies. As noted in 3.2.4, research is pursued in all the alliance institutions – at different levels of education. There is a distinction between the position of research at student level vs. at post-doctoral or staff level. For a student, research is naturally linked with the pursuit of the degree (see 3.2.4). To make a rough generalization, the higher the degree, the more research – or "researchness" – is included in the study programs and their curricula and in the students' final work or thesis. A teacher, on the other hand, can engage with research in different situations, e.g. when they build their own courses, when they help students in research situations, when they develop an individual field of research, or when they participate in a research project involving different actors, inside or outside the institution. Depending on the context, these encounters or projects may be open to students as well. All the institutions participating in the alliance share a common goal: to collaborate and to develop innovative research methodologies and research education together.

Differences: The institutions are different in the way they help students and teachers to develop research, and that implies many factors. Within the rough generalization above, **there is diversity regarding the presence of research in the study programs between the institutions: at the bachelor level only some institutions include it, whereas at master's level almost all, and at doctoral level all of them do.** Similarly, the student's final works include research according to different curricular requirements. **There may also be significant diversity in this respect within an institution's programs.** Furthermore, each institution deals with different balances between e.g., "playing music" and "working on how and why we play music", i.e., the artistic practice in action and the understanding of the practice, and this balance is different in a complex way in every institution. The mere articulation of these two aspects is to be explored, whether these two are "distinct parts of research", whether these are "two aspects of the research process" or how these should be understood, and to what extent research is part of the artistic and pedagogical practices in the first place.

As noted (3.2.1), the institutions have different organizations for research, that depend on the way staff, departments, and centres are organized. This, together e.g. with the research funding environment (3.2.2), the HR policies (3.2.3) and the differences in curricula, contribute to **the varying positions of research in relation to education – and in relation to other basic missions of the institutions, such as innovation and service to society. The positions, in turn, manifest to students and staff as settings of constraints and affordances for research.**

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Let us continue with a brief look at the organization of doctoral education, in particular – a key group of researchers and research education (see 3.2.1). For example, at the HdK, a lectorate is in charge of coordinating and facilitating research carried out by staff across all departments of the Royal Conservatoire. Research is deeply embedded in the master's curricula at HdK, but for a doctorate in artistic research, the master's students of HdK may continue to ACPA (3.2.4). At ACPA, doctoral research is carried out following a specific curriculum and through individual supervision by a group of professors as well as guest supervisors external to the university. In contrast, at UNIARTS, especially at the Sibelius Academy, doctoral education and research takes place in departments and doctoral schools, in which it is possible to do both scientific and artistic research, i.e. there are no separate units for them. In addition, there is a Research Institute that is joint for all three academies of UNIARTS and promotes cross-artistic and interdisciplinary research projects. However, the relationship of the Research Institute (est. 2023) with the academies is still in development. With 25 departments and 9 research centres, MDW offers both scientific and artistic research. For doctoral training, scientific doctorates (Ph.D.) are carried out at the departments of MDW, while the artistic doctorate (Doctor Artium Program) is based at the Artistic Research Center. In addition, MDW offers an interdisciplinary structured doctoral programme in cooperation with various departments, implemented by the office of the Dean of research (see 3.2.4). NMH offers two Ph.D. programs. There exists one Ph.D. program in music research (Music Education/Educational Research in Music, Music Therapy/Music and Health and Practice-oriented Musicology including Performance Practice and Music Theory) and one Ph.D. program in Artistic Research in the Norwegian model labelled "Artistic Development Work". The first Ph.D. program is organized entirely by NMH, whereas some of the compulsory courses of the second program are organized under the umbrella of the National Artistic Research School that serves fellows from different art institutions in Norway, such as institutions for fine art, film, game development and theatre. UAB offers distinct doctoral tracks: one for artistic disciplines (composition, conducting, instrumental performance, and chamber music) and another for scientific pursuits (music pedagogy, music theory, ethnomusicology, and musicology). Both tracks require two years of coursework, culminating in either an artistic doctoral project and performance (for artistic candidates) or a traditional dissertation (for scientific candidates). Notably, artistic doctoral candidates often enlist a scholar to provide feedback on the written component of their project, complementing the guidance of their primary artistic mentor. While scientific doctoral candidates may also have a commentator, particularly for highly interdisciplinary projects, this is less common.

All in all, how doctoral education and supervision, in this case, is organized, affects what kind of social encounters between the doctoral students, their teachers and supervisors, and subsequently what kind of teams, groups or communities may spontaneously emerge; how

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

research pursued in conjunction of doctoral education ends up being present to all staff and students e.g. in departments vs. centres potentially contributing to the local perceptions of the relationships of research, education and artistic practices; how matters of disciplinarity (3.3.1) may manifest as supportive to (growth of) intradisciplinary vs. interdisciplinary research; and how different strands of research – taking the broad categories of artistic and scientific research as tokens of this – may be offered opportunities for interaction with one another, and with the basic missions of higher education, and artistic and societal activities.

Challenges: The position of research as part of the process of higher music education in our institutions faces several challenges. For instance:
- It has been recognized that the academic staff needs more material and economic support and more time to dedicate to research. This leads to the question of resources (see 3.2.2, 3.2.3). How can we develop the position of our research in our institutions – and, for external funding, compete with other, perhaps more research-oriented institutions? To what extent is research recognized and accepted as a strategic choice – or as investment? (See 3.3.4.)
- The number of academic staff involved in research is very diverse. How many people are in fact involved in research in the institutions, and how (see 3.2.5)? In teaching intensive environments, how can more teachers be involved in research activities?

It is also difficult to perceive the standard of research in different research areas at the bachelor and master's level. In fact, WG1 discussions concluded that **the differences are extensive: research skills given in some degree programmes are very limited, while the best master's theses are like doctoral dissertations.** This opens opportunities to better understand the level of research education of the students within the alliance institutions, as, at the first glance, **not all degree programmes seem to offer the same capabilities to go on the academic path.** The role of research should thus be equally strong in all degree programmes, regardless of the specific research area or the research methodologies.

3.3.4 The value of research in the institutions

Corroborating our analysis, the strategic starting point maintains, that **research is of highest value for all academic partners in the alliance.** Scientific and artistic research functions as the foundation for knowledge production and makes substantial contributions to teaching and learning. Documents that outline the importance of research and the connected responsibilities can be found with some of the alliance partners e.g. such as the UNIARTS Research Strategy 2021–2030, The mdw Research Strategy, and the NMH Research Strategy 2025.

However, in our comparative analysis we found that research is differently embedded into the organizational structure and operation of the alliance partners (see e.g. 3.2.1,

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

3.2.3, 3.2.4 above). This leads to a question **how the partner institutions position themselves – and want to position in the future – in regard to the balance and integration of the institutional missions of research, education, innovation, artistic activity and societal engagement**. In many partner institutions (CNSMDP, ESMUC, UNMB, UNIARTS, MDW, UAB) research is embedded into the different departments that function as both educational units and research facilities, thereby **connecting research and teaching**. Some partners have other structures: for example, research at HdK is centred around three lectorates, among which the lectorate Music, Education & Society that caters to all departments of the Royal Conservatoire – HdK, and research at NMH is focused around three dedicated centres (CREMAH, CERM and NordART). In CNSMDP, research on audio applied to music is conducted by the Audiovisual service (who act as a research centre) and by the sound department FSMSI, with a part of collaboration and a part of independence. At NMH, the employees who have research and development time in their positions are connected to both a department and to a research centre, which can sometimes be confusing for the employees not knowing where their research "belongs" in the institution. Projects organized in specific centres can potentially lead to silo thinking instead of taking benefit from cross-disciplinary practices. Nonetheless, also with the other partners some dedicated research facilities can be found, such as the Doctoral School Constantin Brăiloiu at UNMB and the 2020 established Artistic Research Center at MDW for the Doctor Artium Program.

Yet, this is not only about our organizations as research organizations (3.2.1). The question involves all other themes reported above as well, from research funding to research in curricula, and from disciplinarity questions to the academic staff and its HR. It is also a question of what financial and operative data we have of our research – and last but not least, a question of fostering research culture and researcher identities.

Challenges. An overview of the presence of research across our institutions and how it links to education brings up the following questions:

- **How does the strategic valuing of research manifest in solutions that sustainably strengthen our research dimension as an alliance and as institutions in the alliance?**
- How can we best foster research culture and the development of researcher identities – with synergies rather than competition between the basic missions of the institutions, so that clear links emerge between research and education?
- How can we create and maintain an environment to share experiences of research and how it impacts education, both inside an institution and across the alliance?
- How can we best maintain and strengthen specific research areas in each institution?
- How can we best improve the chances and support collaborations in joint projects?

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

To answer the last question, **one must consider different types of collaborations, and motivations, affordances of and possible obstacles to collaborating.** Collaborations can e.g. be initiated in a research area shared by researchers, teachers and students, through their **encounters at a knowledge hub** where they can communicate, exchange ideas and documents, and find information about research findings or methods from peers and colleagues, **and how these feed back to education**. Effective collaboration requires a shared language, which in this context, is likely to be English. Some institutions are more ready to deliver content, some need more time (and money to pay for the time to do so) to organize the production of content in this language. In our time, the increasing use of artificial intelligence applications ought to be monitored for these needs. Some institutions are already equipped to participate, especially if staff members are allocated time for such activities or if a research centre exists. However, for others, this type of collaboration may require additional funding. The students' involvement is **a curricular matter** (see 3.3.3). Similarly, this kind of model could be useful to promote collaboration between different, complementary research areas, and there are plenty of potential combinations (see 3.3.1). This option could mobilize current and potential researchers (those who are mobilizable) from the institutions.

4 Discussion, with conclusions

4.1 Summary and outcomes of the inventory and analysis

A matrix approach and a bifurcate framework were used to produce an inventory and comparative analysis of the existing resources, policies, traditions, fields of expertise and needs with regards to research in the IN.TUNE alliance partners.

WP4C gathered and analysed the institutions' responses to five main questions concerning research resources and policies. WG1 produced data concerning research traditions and fields of expertise, and with broad consideration to the research practices, critically produced an analysis with four themes.

4.1.1 Summary and outcomes of the analysis of research resources and policies

To recapitulate from 3.1, **the partner institutions differ greatly from each other with regard to a number of variables with significance for research and research environments**, both providing affordances and setting constraints to the development of research. Their official status within their respective countries varies, affecting education offered, institutional organization and the relationship of education and research, expectations and goal setting, perceived value and recognition of research (such as artistic research at large), as well as funding mechanisms and opportunities. These carry to the institutional conditions, where the circumstances for research are nurtured and constrained by research leadership, principles of

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

research time allocation and other HR policies, researcher's career paths and possible models thereof, and the assessment mechanisms in use, as well as the availability of information about research pursued and its conditions. *Clearly, this plurality and the constraints as well the affordances inherent need to be taken into account when making projections about future collaborations and steps to be taken toward them.*

All partner institutions have some kind of formal structures connected to **research leadership** but differ in where such leadership is located: depending on the institution, research may be organised around individual professors, into research centres (whose profiles and scopes vary), a research institute and its networks, or departmental structures. *Exchange of experiences of research leadership within the alliance may be beneficial.*

Currently, our organization models depict us primarily as educational organizations, rather than research organizations. *More strategic discussion – perhaps decisions as well – seems needed in institutions and jointly on where we want to see ourselves in the future on the continuum from music conservatories or art academies to universities and research universities, and how we will get there, and how we perceive the interplay between research, education, and artistic or societal activities.*

Non-public institutions and public national **research information systems** exist, and six institutions have publicly accessible research information systems. However, their contents, searchability, reporting capabilities and technical platforms vary. Similarly, we produce yearly reports or data on research, but the formats, contents and publicity vary according to national or institutional practices. Six institutions have undergone research assessment exercises, with one half of the reports being public.

Seven institutions have public **repositories for research outputs** and the eighth will soon have a combination of research repository and a research information system. Three institutions use Research Catalogue as public repository, a fourth one will do so next year, and another institution has another repository system for doctoral dissertation and artistic projects. These repositories play a vital role in ensuring access to research outcomes to teachers, students and researchers, so that **research-based teaching can be supported**. *Discussions on developing the IN.TUNE repository accessible for learning purposes highlighted the need to prioritize public access to research outputs to enhance the connection between research and education*.

The HR policies of research vary between institutions, e.g. for the allocation of research time. Recent and ongoing changes lead to new stages in research HR policies, which yet call for further developing. Staff research constitutes the backbone of research communities and should be nourished. At the same time, the precarity of (young) researchers' careers is a general phenomenon. For strengthening our research dimension and paving way for research

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

collaboration, it has turned out to be ***vital to consider research education, and how research and "researchness" stand in relation to the position of education*** and the respective curricula in our institutions, from the bachelor level through doctoral level, in order *to address the full path of a researcher*. Research education is present in all eight institutions, mainly at doctoral and master's levels, but also at the bachelor level. Doctoral candidates often make up an important part of an institution's research environments. Important to note, **master's studies, especially in the artistic fields, do not necessarily provide research expertise sufficient for doctoral studies**. Research skills given in some degree programmes are very limited, while the best master's theses are like doctoral dissertations. Not all degree programmes seem to offer the same capabilities to go on the academic path. Note, however, that research skills are not only for the academic positions as career choices, but for working life outside academia, too. *The variety in research education calls for more systematic ways of assessing our current higher education curricula and the value of incorporating research or "researchness" in them,* starting from the bachelor level, continuing to the master's level, and further to the doctoral level, develop the curricula with objectives, contents, pedagogical methods and alignments deemed appropriate, and engage in subsequent implementation and reassessment of the curricula. *Coupling this with systematical developing of researcher career models could lead toward positive, virtuous circle building research communities, with a good dynamics and balance of researchers' career stages, and with integrative synergies between research, education and artistic practices.*

In the alliance institutions, the largest share of **research funding** comes as direct national public funding. The national funding mechanisms are different and provide different rewards and demands for the acquisition and use of research funding. The institutions differ regarding whether this funding is earmarked for research or not. Supplementary funding, that is, funding acquired from external sources varies considerably between the eight partners and is generally less pronounced than at research universities. These funds are commonly acquired from national sources by individual researchers, and in competition with other universities with often more experience with applications and projects. Overall, acquisition of private research funding is rare. While multinational sources exist, an increasing relevance of EU sources was noted only by MDW. Internally, research funding may be allocated for core research according to preset mechanisms akin to the national ones, or to projects regarded as strategic or based on internal competition. Notably, the possibilities for artistic researchers to secure external funding remain more limited than for their scientific counterparts. *In planning and preparing for joint research, the ramifications of funding mechanisms need to be taken into account. We see potential in the alliance sharing experiences and good practices of internal research funding mechanisms and external research funding acquisition.* This would also connect with services supporting research, but that aspect was left out of the current inventory and analysis.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Regarding the developing of HR policies, there is a growing **need to distinguish between time spent on artistic creation and teaching, time spent on research, and their interconnections**. *This requires further discussion on definitions of artistic research within institutions, and jointly*. In some institutions, artistic research is still a quite new phenomenon, and the scientific output is the largest, whereas in other institutions artistic research is highly encouraged and emphasised. Naturally, the acceptance of artistic research or artistic institutions as research institutions within each country plays an important role. However, all the alliance institutions have artistic research, and all seem committed to its further development. Through this analysis, we developed an increased awareness of the overlap of research areas and research practices and came to value the distinction between artistic and scientific research as a question of methods more than a question of areas.

4.1.2 Summary and outcomes of the analysis of research traditions and fields of expertise

The matrix approach was useful to identify the way areas and departments have been institutionally defined. It made apparent many research areas found at all partner universities. These include research in music education, composition, music analysis and theory, music and wellbeing, early music, music history and music technology. **However, other areas, assessed relevant in the analysis, did not appear as categories in the matrix.** The analysis showed the need to develop a more flexible and productive definition of research areas and approaches. It also identified the need to develop a different tool that will enable artistic higher education to define their research areas and approaches, highlighting their naturally interdisciplinary definition. In the future, *a new instrument may be developed or adopted*, with an alternative form to the current matrix, *that could help us better perceive the possibilities of multidisciplinary collaboration, understand the multiple protocols and methods that can inform research areas and explore how they are positioned within the educational context of the institutions*. This instrument could be eventually conceived for example, as a dynamic, multi-thread structure that allows a user (e.g. a faculty member from partner institutions or an external researcher) to have access to more detailed information. The future IN.TUNE knowledge hubs could provide such an instrument.

Significant overlaps can be found in areas where the practice of musicology, ethnomusicology, music theory, and music pedagogy intersect with art practices. Overall, we observed *the need to develop further the forms in which artistic research is understood across our institutions, the need to share insights and experiences and to fundamentally continue refining the ways in which artistic and scientific research are articulated.* This endeavour could be conceived as a fundamental topic to be explored in a knowledge hub. A knowledge hub could be considered as one tool for the further perception of the possibilities of collaboration. As such, it could be seen as a place for pooling expertise and resource to enhance research

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

collaboration and thereby, education by bringing (latest) research findings into learning and teaching.

4.2 Changes from the original proposal, constraints

The tasks undertaken were more complex than an initial reading of them might suggest. As the analyses in chapter 3 demonstrate, there is notable diversity and complexity in the relevant elements that deal with research resources and policies as well as research traditions and fields of expertise at different levels of the institutions. Clearly, recognizing the diversity and complexity involved has been utmost rewarding and makes a significant contribution to subsequent implementation of the work package. While doing so, to some extent it has also constrained us from producing something that might have been expected. However, a straightforward reporting of a well-defined set of joint research cooperation areas that will definitely be pursued in future collaboration, for instance, would not have been true to life. The completed analyses have efficiently paved way for the subsequent steps of the work package.

In the original application, WG1 would have started its work already in 2024. This was challenging, as the WP4C only started its work then and had to get settled, design the closer implementation of the work package, how to approach the first deliverables and what kind of competence, commitment and participation they would require from the working group members and also how to divide the tasks between the three different working groups. Therefore, the call for recruiting the members to the WG1 did not open before June 2024, which led to WG1 starting its work in September 2024. This put the WG1 on a tight schedule, especially considering the complexity of the tasks. While deemed useful as a starting point for identifying research areas for further cooperation and for the inventory of research traditions and fields of expertise, the matrix approach could be helpful only until the work necessarily progressed beyond institutionally established research. The situation was mitigated by the fact that members were recruited to the WG1 from each partner institution which guaranteed sufficient expertise and knowledge of the research pursued at the institutions, and safeguarded sufficient workforce to perform the task successfully, and by their commitment. Even then, it was deemed necessary and well-reasoned that WP4C carry the main responsibility of producing the inventory and analysis of resources and policies of research, also on grounds of efficiency: several members of the WP4C were in positions to carry out the duty of responding or having someone respond to the questions about research environments. Partly due to the time constraints, but partly based on purposeful stepwise scheduling, WP4C addressed only five main questions regarding the research policies and resources.

In this deliverable, we have presented several topics identified for further cooperation. However, we have not presented them in the forefront, because that would not do justice to

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

the spectrum of potential research themes, topics, methods, objects, or phenomena that could afford collaboration in future, nor to the analysis accomplished by WG1, which has critically observed the existing traditions and fields of expertise, considered the matrix structures, and reached interim conclusions reported here. In our opinion, the analyses presented is more useful than what a simple listing of institutionally defined research areas would be: *both analyses serve well the objective of strengthening our research dimension.*

4.3 Conclusion

This inventory has brought a large amount of information on the position of research as one of the four missions in the alliance institutions. In order to gain a deeper understanding of the current status quo so that further steps could be decided upon, it was deemed necessary to take a broad look at the position of research in the institutions, including issues such as HR policies, research information systems and funding, as these also define how resaerch is organised and supported within the context of the institutions represented in this alliance. This should be seen as part of a recent development, in which higher arts education institutions, with their traditionally strong emphasis on education and their societal role as cultural centres, have started to see the importance of research as a tool to support teaching and innovation, as well as develop critical reflection as a vital competence for the future employment of their students. This growing awareness of the importance of research has also brought about the emergence of artistic research as a form of research that is specific to the sector and links artistic practice, teaching and learning, research and presentation in a public sphere.

Based on these findings, the WP4 has a well-thought-out implementation strategy for setting up the first knowledge hub, and curating the first conference, as planned. In doing so, it is aware that the alliance should not support research activities per se, but rather focus on how research feeds back into teaching and innovation, in line with the call for proposals for the alliance funding. It will continue to be responsible for policy development and will oversee the development, implementation and monitoring of all activities in this work package, assisted by WG1 and later with two groups (one on research education and one on access to research results for teachers, students and researchers to support research-led teaching) for the establishment and implementation of the three knowledge hubs and conferences.

The first knowledge hub will be launched with an open call inviting faculty and students from all partner institutions to participate. Knowledge Hub 1 will serve as an incubator for the content of the first Annual IN.TUNE Research in Education Event (AIRE 1), to be held in November 2025. Engagement in the Knowledge Hub shapes contributions to the event and is expected to continue beyond the event itself. At the first AIRE, there will be contributions from all eight IN.TUNE partner universities, with a focus on enabling discussions, comparisons, and exchange across different approaches that bridge research and teaching practice. The four chosen themes are Research-Led Teaching and Artistic Practice in Higher Education,

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Challenging Canons and Rewriting Music Curricula, Interdisciplinary and Transdisciplinary Teaching Approaches, and Community Engagement, Diversity, and Field-Based Learning. The second and third knowledge hubs and conferences will continue this work, with the interconnection of research and education emphasized as a strategic priority.

Besides being the core of the activities of WP4, the closer connection between research and education will also be addressed more widely across the alliance, through the development of initiatives in other work packages in which WP4 will be closely involved. One such example is the **development of the new joint online course on artistic research,** which was selected within the Call for new educational formats within the Work Package 3 in January 2025. Each working group, knowledge hub, and research event will also contribute to the devising of the final deliverable D4.1, the position paper and the IN.TUNE Research Cooperation Framework, due in 2027. This deliverable will present the framework for future cooperation in the IN.TUNE alliance in the area of research, with a focus on the connection between research and education.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.