Informal and non-formal music experience: Power, knowledge and learning in music teacher education in Chile[1]

Carlos Poblete[a], Adrian Leguina[b], Nicolás Masquiarán[c], Bárbara Carreño[a]

[a]: Universidad de O'Higgins, Chile.
[b]: Loughborough University, England.
[c]: Universidad de Concepcion, Chile.

Abstract
Previous research recognises the importance of musical experiences on music teacher education. However, current efforts do not provide a comprehensive view of the way their students learn music before starting university. The objective of this study is to portray their musical experiences, identifying the distinctive mechanisms underlying the relationship between practices, repertoires and training contexts for music learning. A combination of pedagogical, social and musical dimensions, inspired by sociological theories of P. Bourdieu and B. Bernstein, examine the pre-university musical experiences and the mediating role of students' sociocultural origins. Empirically, multimodal information from four Chilean universities (n=55) was collected through the application of a survey questionnaire and semi-structured interviews, and analysed using a set of mixed techniques, including descriptive statistics, text mining and content analysis. Findings reveal relevant associations between practices, repertoires and learning contexts, especially in terms of the specialized nature of musical training and the habitus and cultural dispositions of practitioners. Particularly relevant is the predominance of informal and non-formal learning contexts and their translation into specific types of learning. These challenge current perspectives and contribute a tool kit for the understanding of the relationship between power and knowledge in future professional teachers.

Keywords: pre-university musical experiences, music learning, music teacher, education, Chile

Introduction

Despite the relevance given to teacher education over the last 20 years of educational policies in Chile (Ávalos, 2014; Cox 2003), and important advancements in many fields of educational research, little attention has been paid to the study of music learning processes in Chile and internationally.

This is surprising due to the centrality musical experiences have for the configuration of teaching practices, which are a substantial part of musical know-how, as well as contributing to the beliefs and dispositions towards music and teaching (Georgii-Hemmings & Burnard, 2013). Although existing research recognises the critical role played by musical experiences and its relationship with culture, contexts, socialization and learning (Barret, 2010; DeNora, 2004), these are not enough to provide a comprehensive view of the ways students of music teacher education programmes develop their learning before starting university, nor about its impact on the configuration and legitimization of professional teaching knowledge.

The main objective of this study is to portray pre-university musical experiences of future music teachers, identifying the distinctive mechanisms underlying the relationship between practices, repertoires and training contexts used for music learning. The combined analysis of pedagogical, social and musical dimensions of musical learning, we argue, contributes a set of tools for the understanding of the relationship between power and knowledge in future professional teachers.

Our research addresses the problem through a systematic review of the elements that constitute individuals' musical experiences, linking socio-demographic characteristics, cultural and social capital provisions, and cultural consumption, with a set of musical practices performed in formal, non-formal and informal training settings. For this, we use conceptual tools inspired by sociological theories of P. Bourdieu and B. Bernstein. Empirically, we have compiled multimodal information through the application of a survey questionnaire and semi-structured interviews with music teacher education students from four Chilean universities. Data was analysed using a set of mixed techniques, including descriptive statistics, text mining and content analysis.

By applying the proposed conceptualization to the Chilean context, where university selection process do not require to demonstrate previous musical studies, this study is a valuable contribution to music education research, providing an unique overview into how music learning is conceived, and illustrates how they dialogue - in different and surprising ways - with theorizations in the discipline.

Perspectives on musical experience and learning.

The existing literature on musical experiences addresses the topic from both, the social sciences and music education perspectives. Great efforts have focused on the identification of its constituent elements, as well as the development of individual and community-based processes in different social and cultural settings.

Together these studies provide important insights into the relation between musical experiences and contexts and spaces of socialization: from studies that distinguish the influence of diverse agents in the configuration of the musical experience (Cremades, 2011; Graziano, 1991; Stålhammar, 2003, 2004); the acquisition of new repertoires and the development of new ways of learning in different contexts (Cremades & Herrera, 2008; Green, 2001; Karlsen, 2011; Poblete, 2016; Wright, 2008, 2016), as well as the influences of cultural capital, contexts of practices and the sociocultural configurations of the musical experience (DeNora, 2004; Wright, 2010; Wright & Froehlich, 2012).

Literature has also examined from different perspectives how music is learned. Here we can distinguish three relevant areas for this study. First, those related to approaches and theoretical perspectives on music learning contributing to objectify musical learning (Demorest, 2013; O'Neill and Senyshyn, 2011; Webster, 2011). Second, studies that describe various manifestations of musical learning, from perspectives centred on social and cultural dimensions of music (Campbell, 2010; Green, 2008, 2011; Johansen, 2014; O'Neill, 2010,

2014). Third, research that relates to both, learning and musical experiences that connect the configuration of the individual experience to forms of learning and training contexts, especially those of an informal nature (Johansen, 2010; Louth, 2012; Wright & Kanellopoulos, 2010).

The formation of musical learning is also closely related to musical preferences and taste configurations. Contributions from the sociology of cultural consumption are particularly relevant for this research, objectifying contemporary practices from perspectives that explore how cultural taste reproduces socioeconomic, digital and geographic inequalities (Leguina et al, 2017; Leguina & Miles, 2017), as well as the relationship between cultural consumption and mobility in the context of musical gentrification (Dyndhal et al, 2014).

In summary, these studies provide solid grounds to elaborate a more holistic understanding of musical experiences, differentiating between practices, repertoires and training contexts, by objectifying differentiated forms of musical learning, which are mediated by students' sociocultural origins.

Characterizing the musical experience: principles of distinction and analysis

This study aims to answer the following research questions:

1. How are pre-university musical experiences of students in early stages of their university formation shaped around practices, repertoires and learning contexts?

2. Are pre-university musical experiences and social background related to differentiated forms of musical learning?

At the core of our examination are three key dimensions that determine what we understand as musical experiences: *practices*, *repertoires* and *learning contexts*. *Practices* are defined as the set of *doings* tied to musical knowledge acquired before starting university. Individuals are carriers of practices in the form of bodily behaviour and routinized ways of

understanding, knowing how and desiring (Warde, 2005). Practices that compose musical doings in our research combine elements of expressive nature (singing, playing instruments, composing, improvising), as well as those of cultural consumption (including musical items).

Bourdieu's seminal work La Distinction (Bourdieu, 1979) is one of the most ambitious attempts to understand how and why cultural practices are unevenly distributed in our society. Concepts of habitus (Bourdieu, 1979), cultural capital and social capital (Bourdieu, 2001), explain the correspondence, or homology, between social class structure and aesthetic preferences, as well as the mechanisms that allow higher levels of cultural capital to translate into other forms of privilege. More recent studies show a less clear-cut association between social position and cultural tastes. Peterson and colleagues coined the concept of cultural omnivorism (Peterson, 2005), broadly defined as the opposition between individuals from higher social positions who simultaneously prefer several highbrow and lowbrow cultural items (omnivores), and individuals from lower positions who prefer one or few lowbrow items (univores). Although cultural omnivorism was initially seen as a challenge to the supremacy of cultural capital, it demonstrates that appreciation for diverse forms of culture across hierarchies function as a new form of cultural capital (Karademir Hazir and Warde 2016, Purhonen and Heikkila 2017). Similar arguments have been developed around the idea of 'emergent' and 'cosmopolitan' cultural capital (cf. Prieur and Savage 2013).

Both the realization of expressive practices and cultural consumption are powerful indicators of habitus, by accounting resources that generate dispositions towards actions that are connected to objective conditions in which subjects build their musical experience. They obey the nature of music students' habitus i.e. a specific and hyper-specialized group of university students among the Chilean population. For them, musical experiences are constructed from practices that are both cultural and social manifestations of music doings,

where cultural consumption constitutes a central source that is never separated from the acquisition of knowledge and cultural competences.

Repertories are understood as a complex area of musical knowledge that conceptualizes aesthetic and cultural boundary making processes. In the words of Poblete (2016), musical repertories constitute a specialized cultural basis, part of the professional knowledge of music teachers, which represents the hearth of knowledge for the discipline. It implies the mastery of technical knowledge, as well as highly elaborated cultural devices that respond to intra and extra musical factors. Here we classify repertories by combining categories described by Tagg (1982) and concepts of vertical and horizontal discourses of Bernstein (1999) to establish a relation of homology between musical repertoires and types of knowledge, differentiated in terms of specialized languages associated with specific practices, and the culture and contexts in which they are performed (Poblete 2016).

Learning contexts are qualities that structure spaces in which practices and repertoires are done. According to fundamental principles that regulate the transmission of contents within those spaces, it is possible to distinguish three categories of learning contexts: formal, non-formal, and informal. We understand *formal* contexts as those oriented to education, based on institutionalized educational structures, where objectives, contents, sequencing rules, progression of learning and assessment are explicit, and aim to obtain an official qualification. *Non-formal* contexts are also oriented to education, but based on non-institutionalized educational structures. Objectives, sequence rules and assessment are explicit, do not follow an explicit sequence of progression, and does not seek to achieve a qualification. Finally, *informal* contexts are spaces not oriented primarily to education, arising from everyday practices based on relationship structures, and where objectives, contents, rules of sequence and evaluation are blurred, and dependent on the preferences of the subjects who are participating in these contexts.

To understand distinctions between different categories of music learning contexts, concepts of *classification* and *framing* (Bernstein, 1990) are particularly relevant. Classification is used to define the limits that distinguish each context of realization, in terms of their specific characteristics. Following Bernstein's ideas, we can recognize two kinds of classification: *strong* classification has clearly defined boundaries between contents and insulated categories inside them. To the contrary, *weak* classification features more blurred boundaries between contents, and/or less explicit categories.

The concept of framing is applied to understand the principles that regulate relationships within each context, based on control established to transmission, selection, structuring and sequence of contents, as well setting up criteria for what is legitimate to be addressed or not within each context. A strong framing refers to the vertical control exerted by an institution, a teacher or a connoted family member, to regulate learning relationships. Conversely, a weak framing indicates potential autonomy from more horizontal relationships in the distribution of power, such as collective learning contexts (for example garage bands or folk ensembles) or even autonomous learning practices developed by subjects.

From the integration of classification and framing concepts, we define *formal* contexts as those in which classification and framing are strong in term of practices, repertoires, and pedagogy. *Non-formal* contexts are less strong and display a more flexible organization of classification and framing. Here, relationships lean towards horizontality, allowing dialogue in the realization of practices. Students can, for example, choose certain repertories within a range of possibilities. Finally, *informal* contexts have weak classification and framing. Here there are no solid principles regulating decisions regarding boundaries between repertoires and practice and, more generally, decisions on selection, structuring and sequence are under the control of subjects, either as part of groups or as individuals who develop autonomous learning. A special case could be practices within the family, where a

weak classification, but strong framing, will generate a context in which repertoires selection can be more flexible and permeable, but with a vertical control over the organization of the practices, exercised i.e. by the head of household.

Sample

Music teacher education in Chile takes place at universities, as postsecondary education, in *full-time* and *consecutive* modalities. Full-time students enter directly after finishing high school, via a standard university selection process and are not required to demonstrate previous musical studies. The majority of courses available nationwide offer four-year musical and pedagogical training at a bachelor level. Consecutive programmes are offered to students who have completed musical instruction at degree level in universities or conservatoires. Students are trained in pedagogical disciplines during a maximum of two years. Candidates on full-time courses are evaluated by national standardized tests in Spanish, Maths, History and Sciences applicable to any other university degree. Some programmes also include diagnostic tests without selective character in psychomotor, listening and musical performance skills. Unlike other educational systems, a teaching qualification is granted upon completing the degree. Further teaching qualifications are not required to work within the Chilean educational system.

This study collects information from 55 students of both genders (convenience sampling) belonging to full-time music teacher university courses at four Chilean universities: Universidad de Talca (UTAL), Universidad Metropolitana de Ciencias de la Educación (UMCE), Universidad de Concepción (UDEC) and Universidad Academia de Humanismo Cristiano (UAHC). UMCE and UTAL are public institutions and the other two are private institutions (UDEC, UAHC). These institutions are also representative of their geographical locations: UMCE and UAHC (Santiago), UTAL and UDEC (southern regions).

The criteria for selecting the subjects were as follows: to be a student of music teacher education programmes; to be currently studying within the first three years of their courses; have any kind of musical experience in expressive practices prior to entering university; do not have any experience in teaching. The composition of the sample is summarized in detail in table a.1 (online appendix). It is interesting the predominance of female subjects in UDEC and UMCE compared to UTAL and UAHC. Equally noticed with interest is the concentration of students belonging to indigenous groups in the universities southern regions. Differences between these subgroups and their intersectionality are beyond the scope of this article, but are acknowledge as relevant aspects of our research that will undoubtedly further explored in the future.

Method

Our research adopted a mixed approach, combining quantitative and qualitative techniques. Data was collected using a questionnaire to cover personal and sociodemographic backgrounds, musical experiences (musical practices, repertoires and training contexts, association with people who have made music), and musical learning processes (online appendix). The latter was addressed in depth by a semi-structured interview (online appendix).

For analysis, two main strategies were used. The first step in this process involved descriptive statistical analysis of survey data using SPSS software (version 23). Following this, text-mining techniques were used to explore qualitative data from the interviews. Combining textual data manipulation using Provalis QDA Miner 5 y Wordstat 7, analysis uncovers regularities across components of a text corpus. The procedure rests in 'dictionaries' - meaningful keywords and short phrases selected by the researcher. These dictionaries are compared against the texts loaded into the software (corpus), returning the

frequencies with which these words occur. The dictionary for types of musical learning is composed by 46 unique entries, containing keywords and phrases such as 'memorize' and 'trial and error' (see online appendix). Content extraction of the produced dictionary provides further insights about the diversity of response patterns allowing to uncover common thematic structures across interviewees. This is done via application of natural language processing and factor analysis (Provalis Research, 2014). The technique delivers a summary of potentially relevant themes defined by words in common, revealing commonalities across discourses within a set of interviews.

Results

The analysis summarises the distribution of practices, repertoires, learning contexts and types of learning, according three social position indicators: socioeconomic level (self-reported perception), educational level of head of household, and household monthly income.

Practices

Most of the items considered in the questionnaire are available to more than 60% of the sample, regardless of their social position, with a high percentage of students reported having had access to four or more of them (see table a2). Excluding videogame consoles, perhaps the cultural good less connected to musical practices, it is not surprising that young university students enjoy such high level of technological access to culture (Leguina et al 2017).

In relation to cultural consumption (tables A.3.1, A.3.2, A.3.3 in online appendix), two relevant results arise. Firstly, social position and cultural consumption are not strongly

associated, challenging results frequently presented in cultural consumption studies (Dyndhal, Karlsen, Skårberg and Nielsen, 2014; Leguina and Miles, 2017). Secondly, despite being a culturally active group, only a small portion of sampled students frequently attended music concerts. A possible answer to this situation could be related to the intrinsic characteristics of the sample, immersed in a culturally rich context, where cultural participation has different connotation in comparison to the majority of the population. Cultural participation here is conceived as part of everyday life, and not as a set of special activities solely for entertainment.

Table 1. Patterns of musical repertoires

Frequency/Row %		None	Cl	Pop	Folk	Cl + Pop	Cl + Flk	Pop + Flk	Cl + Pop + Flk
Socio economic level (self reported)	*Low - Mid low*	1	7	7	1	3	4	3	2
		3.6	25.0	25.0	3.6	10.7	14.3	10.7	7.1
	Mid	0	2	2	5	1	2	7	4
		0.0	8.7	8.7	21.7	4.3	8.7	30.4	17.4
	Mid high - High	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
		0.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Educational level of head of household	*No - Basic*	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0
		0.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	0.0
	High school	1	4	5	1	2	3	6	3
		4.0	16.0	20.0	4.0	8.0	12.0	24.0	12.0
	Degree or equiv	0	5	4	6	2	2	3	3
		0.0	20.0	16.0	24.0	8.0	8.0	12.0	12.0
Income (in monthly CLP)	*<200,000 – 400,000*	1	5	5	1	3	5	3	2
		4.0	20.0	20.0	4.0	12.0	20.0	12.0	8.0
	400,001 – 700,000	0	5	4	4	0	1	2	2
		0.0	27.8	22.2	22.2	0.0	5.6	11.1	11.1
	700,001 or more	0	0	1	2	2	0	5	2
		0.0	0.0	8.3	16.7	16.7	0.0	41.7	16.7

Expressive practices, are organized into four categories: music performance; music performance and creation; music performance and others; music performance, creation and others (see table a.4). Here it is possible to observe a heterogeneous distribution among practices and social positions, with higher concentrations towards a single practice in mid and high groups, and a tendency to combine diverse practices concentrated at middle and lower levels. These results reveal that engagement in specialized practices is more frequent for higher socio-economic levels, in contrast to a more diversified pattern of practices associated to lower positions. Practices are embedded within different lifestyles and cultural choices, however broader engagement is not only expressed by musical taste, but also by processes of taste formation. Cultural taste is deeply rooted in the everydayness of learning processes, and is part of relational practices between participants and their communities.

Repertoires

Exploring the variety of combined repertoires (columns 4-8 in table 1), it is not surprising that students from households with the highest educational and income levels are those that most frequently combine genres. This constitutes a way to establish the association between repertoires and a family's cultural capital, and is in line with theorizations of cultural inequalities (Karademir Hazir and Warde 2016, Purhonen and Heikkila 2017). In terms of income, a proxy to a family's economic capital, results show a more dispersed distribution of repertoires, as single genres and their combination. A third element of social position, self reported socio economic level, shows differences with the two preceding criteria. Interesting to note is that while *Low - Mid low* and *Mid* concentrate preferences on single and combined genres, *Mid high - High* are concentrated on only single genres.

Table 2. Patterns of learning contexts.

Frequency/Row %		None	Informal	Non-formal	Formal and non-formal	Informal and non-formal	Formal, informal and non-formal
Socio economic level (self reported)	*Low - Mid low*	1	5	1	2	14	5
		3.6	17.9	3.6	7.1	50.0	17.9
	Mid	2	5	0	2	14	0
		8.7	21.7	0.0	8.7	60.9	0.0
	Mid high - High	2	0	0	0	2	0
		50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
Educational level of head of household	*No - Basic*	0	3	0	0	1	1
		0.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0
	High school	3	4	0	1	14	3
		12.0	16.0	0.0	4.0	56.0	12.0
	Degree or equiv	2	3	1	3	15	1
		8.0	12.0	4.0	12.0	60.0	4.0
Income (in monthly CLP)	*<200,000 – 400,000*	2	4	0	3	11	5
		8.0	16.0	0.0	12.0	44.0	20.0
	400.001 – 700,000	1	3	1	0	13	0
		5.6	16.7	5.6	0.0	72.2	0.0
	700,001 or more	2	3	0	1	6	0
		16.7	25.0	0.0	8.3	50.0	0.0

Learning contexts

Recognise and understand the nature of every music learning context it is necessary to identify how different processes of musical learning constitute the pre-university musical experience of each participant. Here, special attention is given to the symbolic structures that regulate experiences and the rules that affect the distribution of power and control over relationships.

Overall results show that 18.2% of the sample practices in formal contexts, 74.5% in non-formal contexts, and 89.1% in informal contexts. Combined practices only reveal six possibilities (Table 2). The high incidence of informal and non-formal contexts in all social groups is immediately obvious, and so it is the absence of exclusive formal or a mixture of formal and informal contexts. It is also note with interest that a minority of students combine the three contexts, mostly associated to disadvantaged social groups. In this sense, diversity could be an indication of specific ways to approach musical knowledge, based on the necessity to reach different sources. Formal training and previous knowledge is not a requirement to study music education in Chile. Most students receive this kind of instruction for the first time in higher education.

The predominance of musical experiences in non-formal and informal learning contexts (workshops, practices among peers or within the family), to the detriment of formal learning contexts, has a direct incidence on the access to knowledge: from a sociological perspective, formal learning contexts constitutes access to elaborated codes, across a strong classification, visible in terms of high regulation on the selection, organizations and sequence of music learning and practices (for example, classes in conservatories or specialized music schools). The opposite - musical experience built on non-formal and informal learning contexts - implies access to elaborated codes mediated by objective possibilities of agents and/or agencies that are participating on the contexts, resulting in unpredictable ways of strong - weak classifications and framing.

Here it is pertinent to summarize the three elements already studied. Firstly, relationships between cultural capital, economic capital, and access to music learning contexts, validate the possession of cultural capital as an element of social differentiation. Here, however, differentiation is not perceived in terms higher volume as the omnivore hypothesis suggest, but as the degree of specialization expressed by students from

advantageous backgrounds. Secondly, results suggest alignment with Bernstein's pedagogical discourse theory (Bernstein, 1990), around possibilities of access to elaborated codes, represented here by those musical experiences acquired inside formal learning contexts. Third, the results indicate that the relationship between cultural and economic capital within different learning contexts require a negotiation between habitus and personal dispositions. The following results will elaborate upon these ideas further.

Types of learning

Considering the broad presence of informal and non-formal learning contexts in the constitution of musical experiences of the sample, *types of learning* represent a set of approaches autonomously developed in the formation of the personal music experience.

To identify possible grouping patterns, we built two categories based on specific activities developed to obtain music learning. These categories, obtained from students' interview data, were defined by the identification of specific words from the compiled dictionary that, used together, reveal those components that define learning strategies used by the students. Analysis indicates the existence of five groups of terms, highlighting the importance of self-learning practices that in our local context apply indistinctively to vocal and instrumental practices. Additionally, content analysis of the groups was conducted. The terms were first organized according to their denotative meaning in actions, characteristics or attributes. Subsequently, these are grouped according to the level of complexity they imply. As a result, two large groups according to the disposition of the elements grouped in each category are identified: *action-based* and *strategy-based* types of learning.

The first macro category, action-based, reveals a qualitative progression concerning the nature and complexity of actions included in each group. The first action-based practice, identified as A1, is present in 21.8% of the sample and is mostly composed of references to

informal learning contexts. Explanations around learning experiences here involve imitation of online videos or playful explorations ('game-like experiences'). Experiences of students in this category are mostly unguided. Within non-formal environments, A1 involves trying to copy family members or more advanced peers. A second practice, A2 (27.3% of the sample), facilitates the study of technical aspects such as rhythms and arrangements by exploration and improvisation. Students in this category explain how skills like reading sheet music were acquired by memorizing repertoires. These are strategies displayed in formal, informal and non-formal contexts. Finally, A3 (10.9% of the sample) is composed by specific action-based learning practices set to overcome difficulties when playing instruments, mainly search for learning resources and supporting material ('Internet', 'song books') during early stages of learning. These strategies are frequently used at informal and non-formal contexts.

The second, strategy-based, refers to actions that involve mastery of elementary knowledge from the beginning, which are also placed at different logical levels, achieving a more comprehensive approach to learning. Unlike before, it does not necessarily imply an internal progression. The first strategy-based set of practices, S1 is broadly used across formal, informal and non-formal learning contexts (54.5% of the sample). Students here emphasize reflective aspects of listening and imitation as part of more structured learning practices. This category also includes a mention to a specific resource, music tutorials from YouTube. Same reference is also found in S2 (30.9% of the sample). However in this case, the streaming service takes a support role, and is used to answer specific questions around music theory and voice changes. Practices in this category include personal investigation and music sheet reading are done in formal and non-formal (with stronger framing) learning context supported by family or teachers.

Table 3 shows how the five groups of practices are distributed in terms of our social position indicators. Here, each cell corresponds to the percentage of cases in which the

practice is present. In other words, the first cell indicates that 21% of students from low/mid-low socioeconomic level perform practices typified as A1. The first three columns refer to action-based practices, which are the least frequent. Students from middle and upper strata display higher rates of practices regarded as A2 and A3. The next two columns contain the distribution for strategy-based practices. These are evidently the most popular strategies. While S1 is especially prevalent among individuals from high-income households, S2 is more prevalent among middle and lower-income individuals. Finally, the last column from Table 3 reveals how practices are combined. It is important to note that about half the students from our sample use more than one strategy simultaneously. From that subsample, only one student uses more than one action-based practice and seven other use both strategy-based practices simultaneously. The remaining cases, which combine action and strategy types of learning, are prevalent in households from intermediate and higher social positions. Those, we argue, are the students benefiting the most from richer music experiences that combine a multiplicity of practices.

The importance of these results arises from the possibility to understand different ways of learning, from a perspective that jointly explores pedagogical processes, social contexts and musical practices, using a set of sociological tools for their thorough analysis. Combined analysis of pedagogical, social and musical dimensions of musical learning provides a tool kit for the understanding of processes that involve relationships between power and knowledge. Distinctions between contexts and types of musical learning, and their relationship with social contexts constitute key concepts to understand the ways in which the social world shapes individuals' learning processes.

Table 3. Distribution of grouped types of learning

Frequency/ % within category		A1	A2	A3	S1	S2	A and S
Socio economic level (self reported)	*Low - Mid low*	6	6	1	11	15	7
		21.4	21.4	3.6	39.3	53.6	25.0
	Mid	6	9	5	6	13	10
		26.1	39.1	21.7	26.1	56.5	43.5
	Mid high - High	0	0	0	0	2	0
		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
Educational level of head of household	*No - Basic*	1	0	0	2	3	0
		20.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	60.0	0.0
	High school	5	11	4	7	14	10
		20.0	44.0	16.0	28.0	56.0	40.0
	Degree or equiv	6	4	2	8	13	7
		24.0	16.0	8.0	32.0	52.0	28.0
Income (in monthly CLP)	*<200.000 - 400.000*	7	6	2	10	12	8
		28.0	24.0	8.0	40.0	48.0	32.0
	400.001 - 700.000	2	4	0	4	8	3
		11.1	22.2	0.0	22.2	44.4	16.7
	700.001 or more	3	5	4	3	10	6
		25.0	41.7	33.3	25.0	83.3	50.0

Conclusion

Based on theoretical and empirical evidence, the aim of our research was to explore and measure musical experiences of future music teachers during the early stages of their education, identifying practices, repertoires and contexts, their associations with socio-cultural contexts and backgrounds, and the relation between musical experience and musical learning types. The following conclusions regarding our research questions can be drawn from the present study.

Regarding our first research question (1), exploration of quantitative and qualitative data has found in general that volume of cultural consumption practices do not reveal strong

differences across indicators of social position. These results do not only account for the specialized nature of musical training, specific habitus and cultural dispositions of practitioners, but also the limitations of traditional survey indicators of cultural engagement as tools to measure cultural capital, particularly in its embodied form (Leguina et al, 2017). Having said this, the predominance of individual or group practices focused on musical performance, is indistinctively present in instrumental and vocal experiences and seems to shape a disciplinary basis grounded on procedural acquaintance, more than a holistic education based on practices, investigation and transmission of knowledge.

Findings suggest that the acquisition of heterogeneous musical repertoires, those including folk and popular music, result from the use of non-formal and informal learning contexts. These findings enhance our understanding in several ways. Repertoires are linked to specific cultural codes, referring to a cultural basis historically built from experiences of "doing music." At the same time, the distinction between performing one or another type of repertoire implies assuming a degree of specialization inherent in each one of them (Bernstein 1999). In particular, popular and folk repertoires done by our respondents refers to a type of language segmentally defined as "oral, local, context-dependent and specific, tacit, multi-layered, and contradictory but not within contexts" (Bernstein, 1999, in Poblete, 2016, p 39).

Consistently, the predominance of informal and non-formal learning contexts (research question 2) reveals a formative experience based on weak forms of classification and framing (Bernstein, 1990), which suggests that sampled students are formed in contexts with low distinctions between repertoires, defined under rules of selection and organised horizontally. Closely related to the findings from repertoires, we also unveil the impact of the contextual differences in the generation of specific types of learning. Here, forms of autonomous learning prevail, where realization of actions (A1-A3) and/or strategies (S1-S2),

and the control over what is learned, is organized and legitimized by the student, according to the acquisition frameworks established by sociocultural contexts (access, conditions, contents and social relations).

Transversally, we consider it fundamental to incorporate into the analysis the socio-temporal context in which the sampled group lives. They are part of a generation with greater opportunities to access information, learning alternatives and forms of communication, as a consequence of the progress and massification of ICTs. In this sense, we consider that culture at its macro level - as a Zeitgeist - constitutes a highly relevant variable to understand the modes in which macro-historical socio-historical contexts are connected with the construction of musical experiences at the micro level.

Although limited in relation to the particular characteristics of the qualitative sample itself, this research provides an account of the richness of the musical experience. Underlying this view, the description presented here highlights interesting perspectives of analysis regarding the specific incidences socio-cultural contexts could have in the configuration of students' musical experiences and their translation into specific types of learning, as well as the nature of the incorporated musical experiences that students carry during university.

The elements covered in this research are particularly important for music teacher education in Chile and the development of educational and cultural policies. This is particularly relevant, given the non-existent entry requirements to university degrees and the variety of pre-university musical experiences displayed by the students. The relevance of these results lies in the possibility of systematize under a comparative framework, views about music teacher education so far only locally verified by institutions. Likewise, we consider that results, as well as the theoretical and analytical tools presented here, provide grounds for a fertile area for further work.

References

Ávalos, B. (2014). La formación inicial docente en Chile: Tensiones entre políticas de apoyo y control. *Estudios pedagógicos, 40,* 11-28.

Barrett, M. (2010). *A cultural psychology of music education*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bernstein, B. (1964). Elaborated and restricted codes: Their social origins and some consequences. *American Anthropologist, 66*(6), 55-69.

Bernstein, B. (1990). *Class, codes and control, vol 4. The structuring of pedagogic discourse*. London: Routledge.

Bernstein, B. (1999). Vertical and horizontal discourse: An essay. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *20*(2), 157-173.

Bourdieu, P. (1979). *La distinction. Critique sociale du jugement*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.

Bourdieu, P. (2001). Poder, derecho y clases sociales. Bilbao: Desclée de Brouwer.

Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L. (2005). *Una invitación a la sociología reflexiva.* Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI.

Campbell, P. S. (2010). Musical enculturation: sociocultural influences and meanings of children's experiences in and through music. In *A cultural psychology of music education.* (Margaret Barret, ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cox, C. (2003). Las políticas educacionales de Chile en las dos últimas décadas del siglo XX. In *Políticas educacionales en el cambio de siglo. La Reforma del sistema escolar en Chile.* (Cristian Cox, ed.). Santiago de Chile: Editorial Universitaria.

Cremades, R. (2011). Familia, música y educación informal. *Música y educación: Revista trimestral de pedagogía musical*, *20*(4), 35-46.

Cremades, R. & Herrera, L. (2008). Importancia de la educación formal e informal en la adquisición de conocimientos sobre estilos musicales en estudiantes de conservatorio. *Arte y Ciencia*, *1*(19), 363-381.

Demorest, S. (2011). Biological and environmental factors in music cognition and learning. In *MENC handbook of research on music learning: Volume 1 Strategies*. (Richard Colwell and Peter R. Webster, eds.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

DeNora, T. (2004). Musical practice and social structure: a toolkit. In *Empirical musicology: aims, methods, prospects*. (Eric Clark & Nicholas Cook eds.) New York: Oxford University Press,

Dyndahl, P., Karlsen, S., Skårberg O. & Nielsen S. (2014). Cultural omnivorousness and musical gentrification: An outline of a sociological framework and its applications for music education research. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, *13* (1), 40–69.

Georgii-Hemming, E., Burnard, P. & Holgersen, S. (2013). P*rofessional knowledge in music teacher education*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing.

Graziano, V. (1991). *A descriptive analysis of various relationships between home environment and success in piano study*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Columbia University, New York, NY.

Green, L. (2001). *How popular musicians learn: A way ahead for music education*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing.

Green, L. (2008). *Music, informal learning and the school: a new classroom pedagogy*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing.

Green, L. (2011). *Learning, teaching and musical identity: Voices across cultures*. Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Harris, T. (1995). Genre. *The journal of American folklore, 108*(430), 509 – 527.

Johansen, G. (2010) Modernity, identity and musical learning. In *Sociology and Music Education.* (Ruth Wright ed.). Surrey, UK: Ashgate Publishing.

Johansen, G. (2014). Sociology, music education, and social change: The prospect of addressing their relations by attending to some central, expanded concepts. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, *13*(1), 70–100.

Karademir Hazir, I. and Warde, A. (2016) The cultural omnivore thesis: Methodological aspects of the debate. In L. Hanquinet and M. Savage (Eds.), *Routledge International Handbook of the Sociology of Art and Culture*. London: Routledge.

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

Leguina, A., Arancibia-Carvajal, S., & Widdop, P. (2017). Musical preferences and technologies: Contemporary material and symbolic distinctions criticized. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 17(2), 242–264.

Leguina, A. & Miles, A. (2017). Fields of participation and lifestyle in England: revealing the regional dimension from a reanalysis of the taking part survey using multiple factor analysis. *Cultural Trends*, 26(1): 4–17.

Louth, P. (2012). Personal knowledge, personal epistemology, and informal music education. In *Personhood and music learning: Connecting perspectives and narratives, Research to practice.* Vol. 5. Waterloo, ON: Canadian Music Educators' Association.

O'Neill, S. (2010). Learning in and through music performance: understanding cultural diversity via inquiry and dialogue. In *A cultural psychology of Music Education.* (Margaret Barrett, ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

O'Neill, S. (2012). Personhood and music learning: Connecting perspectives and narratives, *Research to practice.* Vol. 5. Waterloo, ON: Canadian Music Educators' Association.

O'Neill, S. (2014). Music and media infused lives: Music education in a digital age. *Research to practice.* Vol. 6. Waterloo, ON: Canadian Music Educators' Association.

O'Neill, S. & Senyshyn, Y. (2011). How learning theories Shape our understanding of music learners. In *MENC Handbook of Research on Music Learning*. Volume 1. (Richard Colwell and Peter R. Webster eds.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Peterson, R. A. (2005). Problems in comparative research. The example of Omnivorousness. *Poetics* 33(5-6), 257-282

Poblete, C. (2016). *Profesores de música en Chile y sus repertorios: contextos de origen, formación universitaria y prácticas de enseñanza*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Santiago de Chile, Faculty of Education, Pontifical Catholic University of Chile.

Prieur, A. & Savage, M. (2013) Emerging forms of cultural capital. *European Societies 15*(2), 246-267.

Provalis Research. (2014). *Wordstat 7 User's Manual*. Montreal: Provalis Research.

Purhonen, S. and Heikkilä, R. (2017). Food, music and politics: The interweaving of culinary taste patterns, 'highbrow' musical taste and conservative attitudes in Finland. *Social Science Information*, **56**, 74-97.

Stålhammar, B. (2003). Music teaching and young people's own musical experience. *Music Education Research*, *5*(1), 61-68.

Stålhammar, B. (2004). Music-Their Lives: The experience of music and view of music of a number of Swedish and English young people. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education, 3*(2).

Tagg, P. (1982). Analysing popular music: theory, method, practice. *Popular Music*. *2,* 37 – 65.

Warde, A. (2005). Consumption and theories of practices. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 5(2), 131-153.

Webster, P. (2011). Construction of music learning. En *Handbook of Research on Music Learning*, *1*, New York, Oxford University Press.

Wright, R. (2008). Kicking the habitus: power, culture and pedagogy in the secondary school music curriculum. *Music Education Research*, *10*(3), 389–402.

Wright, R. (2010). *Sociology and Music Education*. Basingstoke: Ashgate Publishing.

Wright, R. (2016). The complexities of informal learning and non - formal teaching in 21st Century Society. In *21st Century Music Education: Informal learning and Non- Formal teaching*. (Carol Beynon, Ruth Wright, Betty Anne Younker eds.). Canadian Music Educator's Association.

Wright, R. & Froehlich, H. (2012). Basil Bernstein's theory of the pedagogic device and formal music schooling: Putting the theory into practice. *Theory Into Practice*, 51, 212-220.

Wright, R. & Kanellopoulos, P. (2010). Informal music learning, improvisation and teacher education. *British Journal of Music Education*, *27*(1), 71 – 87.

Appendix (to appear online)

1. Survey questionnaire

I General Information

1	Institution: UTAL, UDEC, UAHC, UMCE
2	ID (Case number)
3	Sex: Male, Female, Other
4	Do you belong to any indigenous ethnic groups? Yes, No
5	Age range: 17-20, 21-23, 24-27, Over 28
6	Marital status: Single, Married, Civil partnership, Other
7	Programme start date:
7.1	Semester of the most advanced module currently enrolled:
8	Family structure:

8.1   Family members in the household: Father and mother, Father, mother and sibling(s), Single parent, Single parent and sibling(s), Other

8.2   Household size: 2, 3, 4, 5, Other

II Family socioeconomic indicators

9   Parental educational level

9.1   Highest educational level of father: No education,   Basic, High school, Degree or equivalent, Other

9.2   Highest educational level of mother: No education,   Basic, High school, Degree or equivalent, Other

9.3   Highest educational level of head of household: No education, Basic, High school, Degree or equivalent, Other

10   Household income

10.1   Monthly household income (including all sources): < 200,000, 200,000-400,000, 401,000-700,000, 701,000-1.2 million, More than 1.2 million

11   How would you classify the socio-economic level of your family? Low, Mid-low, Middle, Middle-high, High

III Cultural consumption

12   Before starting university, how often did you do any of the following activities (outside of school)?

1 = Never 2 = 1-3 times in my life 3 = Once a year 4 = Twice a year 5 = Once a month 6 = Once a week or more

12.1	Read a full book
12.2	Go to the theatre
12.3	Go to classical music concerts
12.4	Go to popular music concerts
12.5	Go to folk events (concerts, dance)
12.6	Go to the opera
12.7	Go to dance performance
12.8	Go to the cinema

12.9   Others (visual arts, reading or poetry, etc.)

13   Which of the following items or services did you have in your home before you started university?

Yes, No

13.1   Sound system
13.2   Video player (VHS, DVD, Blue Ray, etc.)
13.3   Cable TV
13.4   Computer
13.5   Internet connection
13.6   Video game console
13.7   Musical instruments
13.8   Books or magazines about music
13.9   Literature
13.10   Smartphone

IV Education

14   Type of high school attended: Humanist-scientist (traditional high school), Technical, Artistic, Other
15   Did you have access to music education in your high school? No, Music as curriculum subject, Extracurricular courses in school, Both

V.   Experiences of musical socialization in the context of origin

16   During your high school years, did you participate in musical activity outside of school?

Select all that apply

16.1   Instrumental lessons or music workshops
16.2   Choir
16.3   Religious groups (choir, ensembles, church orchestra)
16.4   Folklore ensemble
16.5   Rock band
16.6   Children's orchestra
16.7   Other
        Which one(s)?

17   During your childhood or adolescence, did you meet people who made music?

Select all that apply

17.1   Yes, in my family
17.2   Yes, at school
17.3   Yes, peers (friends and their families)
17.4   Yes, others
        Where?

Only for those who answered affirmatively the previous question.

18   Did this have any impact on your interest for studying music at the university? No, Little impact, Medium impact, High impact

VI Musical experience

19   Did you systematically do any of the following musical practices before starting university?

Select all that apply

19.1   Playing instruments
19.2   Singing
19.3   Composing and arrangements
19.4   Improvise
19.5   Other practices related to music (dance, folklore, etc.)

Only for those who answered affirmatively the previous question

20   What instruments did you play?

Select all that apply

20.1   Recorder
20.2   Guitar
20.3   Piano or keyboards
20.4   Electric guitar/bass
20.5   Folk instruments
20.6   Orchestra instruments
20.7   Other   Which one?

21   What authors or works did you use during your musical practices? (open answer)

22   In what context were these practices done?

Select all that apply

22.1   Conservatory or music academy classes
22.2   Singing and/or instrumental classes
22.3   Participation in workshops, community centre and/or non-artistic institutions (church, neighbourhood Council, etc.)
22.4   Self-taught practice
22.5   Learning within the family

23   How old were you when started doing these practices?: 7 years or less, Between 8 to 11 years, Between 12 to 14 years, Between 14 to 17 years, 17 years or more

2. Interview guide

Learning processes (Open answer questions)

24   How would you describe your musical learning process before university? (in terms of how you learned)
24.1   By what actions did you develop your musical learning?

25   How was your vision of music changing while you were learning?
25.1   With regards to your change of vision about music, which elements changed?

26   Name three milestones achieved throughout your pre-university musical learning process

27   When did you notice you started to master what you were learning?

28   Broadly speaking, how would you describe the way you learnt music?
28.1   Does this way of learning have any resemblance to how you learn in other disciplines or contexts?

29   In your opinion, how much did your social context (family, school, peers) influenced the way you develop your musical learning?

3. Text mining dictionary

Original	English translation
APRENDÍ_A_LEER	I LEARNED TO READ
APRENDÍ_A_TOCAR	I LEARNED TO PLAY
AUDICION	LISTENING
AUDIOLIBROS	AUDIO BOOKS
AUTODIDACTA	AUTODIDACT
AUTONOMO-A	AUTONOMOUS
BUSCAR_EN_INTERNET	INTERNET SEARCH
CANCIONERO	SONG BOOK
COMPETIR	TO COMPETE
COMPUTADOR	COMPUTER
CONDUCTISTA	CONDUCTIST
COPIANDO	COPYING
DIDACTICO-A	DIDACTIC
EMPECÉ_A_BUSCAR	I STARTED SEARCHING
EMPECÉ_A_ESTUDIAR	I STARTED STUDYING
ENSAYANDO	REHEARSING
ENSAYO_Y_ERROR	TRIAL AND ERROR
ESCUCHANDO_CANCIONES	LISTENING TO SONGS
ESCUCHANDO_MÚSICA	LISTENING TO MUSIC
ESCUCHAR	LISTENING
ESTUDIANDO	STUDYING
EXPLORANDO	EXPLORING
GRABABA	RECORDED
IMITAR	IMITATE
INTERNET	INTERNET
INVESTIGACIÓN_PERSONAL	PERSONAL RESEARCH
INVESTIGAR	RESEARCH
JUEGO	GAME
JUGANDO	PLAYING
LA_BÚSQUEDA	THE SEARCH
LEYENDO	READING

LIBROS	BOOKS
MEMORIA	MEMORY
MEMORIZAR	MEMORIZE
MIRAR_OBS	TO WATCH
OIDO	EAR
PRACTICAR	TO PRACTICE
PROBANDO	TESTING
PURO_OÍDO	ONLY HEARING
REPETIR	REPEAT
REPLICAR	REPLICATE
SACAR_CANCIONES	PLAY SONGS
SISTEMÁTICO	SYSTEMATIC
TUTORIAL	TUTORIAL
VIDEO	VIDEO
YOUTUBE	YOUTUBE

Table A.1. Sample distribution

Frequency/Row %		UTAL (15)	UDEC (15)	UAHC (11)	UMCE (14)
Sex	Male	10	7	7	3
		37.0	25.9	25.9	11.1
	Female	5	8	4	11
		17.9	28.6	14.3	39.3
Ethnicity (self identification with ethnic minorities)	No	12	13	11	14
		24.0	26.0	22.0	28.0
	Yes	3	2	0	0
		60	40	0	0
Year started university	2015	0	0	0	1
		0	0	0	100
	2016	4	6	5	0
		26.7	40	33.3	0
	2017	11	9	6	13
		28.2	23.1	15.4	33.3
Socioeconomic level (self reported)	Low - Mid low	8	8	5	7
		28.6	28.6	17.9	25.0
	Mid	5	5	6	7
		21.7	21.7	26.1	30.4
	Mid high – High	2	2	0	0
		50	50	0	0
Educational level of head of household	No - Basic	2	1	2	0
		40	20	40	0
	High school	8	7	4	6
		32.0	28.0	16.0	24.0
	Degree or equivalent	5	7	5	8
		20	28.0	20	32.0

	<20000 - 40000	8	8	2	7
		32.0	32.0	8.0	28.0
Income (in monthly CLP)	40001 - 70000	6	3	6	3
		33.3	16.7	33.3	16.7
	70001 or more	1	4	3	4
		8.3	33.3	25.0	33.3

Table A.2. Access to cultural goods and services

Frequency/Row %		Radio/ Boombox	DVD	TV cable	Internet	Videog console	Music instr	Music magazine	General literature
Socio economic level (self reported)	Low - Mid low	26	26	23	26	9	28	19	26
		92.9	92.9	82.1	92.9	32.1	100	67.9	92.9
	Mid	22	18	17	23	10	22	17	22
		95.7	78.3	73.9	100	43.5	95.7	73.9	95.7
	Mid high - High	4	4	3	4	2	4	3	4
		100	100	75.0	100	50	100	75.0	100
Head of household educational level	No - Basic	5	5	5	5	2	5	4	5
		100	100	100	100	40	100	80	100
	High school	24	19	21	25	7	24	16	22
		96.0	76.0	84.0	100	28.0	96.0	64.0	88.0
	Degree or equiv	23	24	17	25	12	25	19	25
		92.0	96.0	68.0	100	48.0	100	76.0	100
Income (in monthly CLP)	<200,000 – 400,000	24	21	20	25	10	25	17	22
		96.0	84.0	80	100	40	100	68.0	88.0
	400,001 – 700,000	16	17	14	18	4	18	14	18
		88.9	94.4	77.8	100	22.2	100	77.8	100
	700,001 or more	12	10	9	12	7	11	8	12
		100	83.3	75.0	100	58.3	91.7	66.7	100

Table A.3.1 Attendance to classical music concerts

		Attendance to classical music concerts			
Frequency/ Row %		Never	Rarely	Regularly	Frequently
Socio economic level (self reported)	Low - Mid low	3	9	6	3
		14.3	42.9	28.6	14.3
	Mid	5	6	5	2
		27.8	33.3	27.8	11.1
	Mid high - High	0	2	2	0
		0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
Head of household educational level	No - Basic	6	10	7	1
		25.0	41.7	29.2	4.2
	High school	3	10	7	2
		13.6	45.5	31.8	9.1
	Degree or equiv.	0	2	2	0
		0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
Income (in monthly CLP)	<200,000 – 400,000	1	9	8	1
		5.3	47.4	42.1	5.3
	400,001 – 700,000	5	3	2	3
		38.5	23.1	15.4	23.1
	700,001 or more	2	5	3	1
		18.2	45.5	27.3	9.1

Table A.3.2 Attendance to popular music concerts

Frequency/ Row %		Attendance to popular music concerts			
		Never	Rarely	Regularly	Frequently
Socio economic level (self reported)	Low - Mid low	6	10	7	1
		25.0	41.7	29.2	4.2
	Mid	3	10	7	2
		13.6	45.5	31.8	9.1
	Mid high - High	0	2	2	0
		0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
Head of household educational level	No - Basic	2	1	2	0
		40.0	20.0	40.0	0.0
	High school	3	9	9	2
		13.0	39.1	39.1	8.7
	Degree or equiv.	4	12	5	1
		18.2	54.5	22.7	4.5
Income (in monthly CLP)	<200,000 – 400,000	7	9	6	1
		30.4	39.1	26.1	4.3
	400,001 – 700,000	2	7	6	0
		13.3	46.7	40.0	0.0
	700,001 or more	0	6	4	2
		0.0	50.0	33.3	16.7

Table A.3.3 Attendance to folk music concerts

Frequency/ Row %		Attendance to folk music concerts			
		Never	Rarely	Regularly	Frequently
Socio economic level (self reported)	Low - Mid low	2	18	6	0
		7.7	69.2	23.1	0.0
	Mid	1	10	10	1
		4.5	45.5	45.5	4.5
	Mid high - High	1	2	1	0
		25.0	50.0	25.0	0.0
Head of household educational level	No – Basic	1	4	0	0
		20.0	80.0	0.0	0.0
	High School	1	13	9	1
		4.2	54.2	37.5	4.2
	Degree or equiv.	2	13	8	0
		8.7	56.5	34.8	0.0
Income (in monthly CLP)	<200,000 – 400,000	2	12	9	0
		8.7	52.2	39.1	0.0
	400,001 – 700,000	1	12	3	1
		5.9	70.6	17.6	5.9
	700,001 or more	1	6	5	0
		8.3	50.0	41.7	0.0

Table A.4. Expressive practices

Frequency/Row %		Expressive practices			
		Performance	Performance and creation	Performance and others	Performance, creation and others
Socio economic level (self reported)	Low - Mid low	7	6	1	14
		25.0	21.4	3.6	50.0
	Mid	3	6	8	6
		13.0	26.1	34.8	26.1
	Mid high - High	2	0	1	1
		50.0	0.0	25.0	25.0
Head of household educational level	No – Basic	1	2	0	2
		20.0	40.0	0.0	40.0
	High School	3	5	5	12
		12.0	20.0	20.0	48.0
	Degree or equiv.	8	5	5	7
		32.0	20.0	20.0	28.0
Income (in monthly CLP)	<200,000 – 400,000	6	5	2	12
		24.0	20.0	8.0	48.0
	400,001 – 700,000	2	3	5	8
		11.1	16.7	27.8	44.4
	700,001 or more	4	4	3	1
		33.3	33.3	25.0	8.3