

# DOWNLOAD PDF UN)DOING FIELDWORK : SHARING SONGS, SHARING LIVES MICHELLE KISLIUK

## Chapter 1 : Open Access and Ethnography - JustPublics@

*(Un)doing Fieldwork: Sharing Songs, Sharing Lives, Michelle Kisliuk Confronting the Fieldwork Journal in the Field: Sounds, Music, Voices, and Texts in Dialogue, Gregory Barz.*

Additional Information In lieu of an abstract, here is a brief excerpt of the content: I continued asking myself, why had mainstream anthropology and ethnomusicology largely ignored the insights of feminist music analysis and theory and moved on instead to larger, more global, interests? What had happened to real women and men in real-life gendered musical contexts? Why had the revolutionary attempts of feminist poststructuralists to dismantle the rigidity of the self/other binary not yet completely revolutionized our ways of thinking and talking about women, men, and musics? This article has an unusual history but highlights the frustrations I had been feeling for a long time. I first wrote it in the early s and delivered it as a paper at an annual Society for Ethnomusicology conference. In the ensuing years, I reworked and updated it, using it as the basis of various discussions on the relative usefulness of the self-other binary and on fieldwork as a profitable context for teasing out ways that scholars had discovered to minimize the power differential in this method. I never worked it into a publishable article, though, and it still reads more like a paper than an article, using a more colloquial, intimate voice. I decided, nonetheless, to leave it that way here, because it comes closer to the way I think and might speak in a conversation with a like-minded friend or colleague. Finally, although not explicitly concerned with gender or feminist issues, this article presents a working out of certain issues that I began to see as stumbling blocks to the acceptance of a feminist ethnomusicology more broadly. The teacher passed out maps of the United States and gave everyone a new box of crayons. She asked us to find Pennsylvania, our state, and to color it. I opened my box of crayons and selected my favorite, the red one. I admired its vividness and shiny pointedness and eagerly set to my task. But something stopped me. I simply could not color Pennsylvania red, not because I disliked the color or the assignment, but because I had this creepy feeling that if I colored Pennsylvania red, I would be coloring the people who lived there red, their houses, their cars, their dogs, their yardsâ€” even my own house, my own yard, even myselfâ€”literally everything, red! I was, for an instant, simultaneously outside the map, a giant with the power to obliterate the varied colors of Pennsylvania with one stroke, and inside the map, an unsuspecting victim of my own red crayon. I could not do the assignment. As I got older, of course, I learned better to distinguish real topography from its symbolic map, but I never forgot that overpowering and frightening feeling I experienced when I first realized that I could simultaneously exist both inside and outsideâ€”and could not always tell the difference between the two. I then look more closely at this model and its usefulness for ethnomusicology; finally, I play with some different understandings of this model and suggest methods for its use. You are not currently authenticated. View freely available titles:

## DOWNLOAD PDF UN)DOING FIELDWORK : SHARING SONGS, SHARING LIVES MICHELLE KISLIUK

### Chapter 2 : Why I'm not an Ethnomusicologist: A View from Anthropology | Michelle Bigenho - calend

*book Shadows in the field: new perspectives for fieldwork in ethnomusicology Gregory F Barz, Timothy J Cooley  
Published in in New York by Oxford University Press.*

About this product Synopsis Ethnomusicological fieldwork has significantly changed since the end of the the 20th century. Ethnomusicology is in a critical moment that requires new perspectives on fieldwork - perspectives that are not addressed in the standard guides to ethnomusicological or anthropological method. The focus in ethnomusicological writing and teaching has traditionally centered around analyses and ethnographic representations of musical cultures, rather than on the personal world of understanding, experience, knowing, and doing fieldwork. *Shadows in the Field* deliberately shift the focus of ethnomusicology and of ethnography in general from representation text to experience fieldwork. The "new fieldwork" moves beyond mere data collection and has become a defining characteristic of ethnomusicology that engages the scholar in meaningful human contexts. In this new edition of *Shadows in the Field*, renowned ethnomusicologists explore the roles they themselves act out while performing fieldwork and pose significant questions for the field: What are the new directions in ethnomusicological fieldwork? Where does fieldwork of "the past" fit into these theories? And above all, what do we see when we acknowledge the shadows we cast in the field? The second edition of *Shadows in the Field* includes updates of all existing chapters, a new preface by Bruno Nettl, and seven new chapters addressing critical issues and concerns that have become increasingly relevant since the first edition. Basic solar system facts are brought to life with a focus on what questions scientists are still trying to solve. Each book ends with a section on how scientists discovered the facts that have been presented. Bright, colorful illustrations and straightforward text make this topic accessible for even the youngest astronomer. The contributors consider fieldwork as an issue-laden practice rather than as a methodology requiring a prescriptive manual, challenging the very notion of fieldwork, its goals and its place in historical studies. The focus in ethnomusicological writing and teaching has traditionally centered around analyses and ethnographic representations of musical cultures, rather than on the personal world of understanding, experiencing, and doing fieldwork. *Shadows in the Field* shifts the focus of ethnography from representation text to experience fieldwork and proposes a "new fieldwork" that moves beyond data collection to engage scholars in more meaningful human contexts. In this new edition of *Shadows in the Field*, renowned ethnomusicologists explore their various roles while performing fieldwork and pose significant questions: Will fieldwork continue as an integral part of ethnomusicological theory and practice, or will new methods emerge and dominate future discourse? Above all, what do we see when we acknowledge the shadows we cast in the field? The second edition of *Shadows in the Field* includes updates of most original chapters, a new foreword by Bruno Nettl, and six new chapters addressing the latest critical issues.

**Chapter 3 : JustPublics@ - reimagining scholarly communication for the public good**

*12 (Un)doing Fieldwork Sharing Songs, Sharing Lives In the ethnography of musical performance we are particularly challenged, as writers, to present or re-present the experiential since performance is experience.*

Given the time and energy to do so, I always resist this categorization that has implications on all sides of the disciplines. The simple answer to the question of why I am not an ethnomusicologist is that my degree is in the discipline of anthropology. But the differences run much deeper, rooted in ideologies about music, disciplinary histories, institutional structures, and pedagogical agendas. Indeed, as I understand it, ethnomusicologists have maintained quite rigorous discussions on these very issues, with the US flagship journal publishing multi-vocal debates on the theme see Kingsbury ; Seeger ; Titon a; Keil ; Kisliuk ; Wong I resist being classified as an ethnomusicologist because the label often inadvertently carries with it certain assumptions. When music becomes the object and geographic mapping becomes the project, many compelling anthropological and theoretical questions are swept to the sidelines. I contend that even though maintaining the idea of music participation as a special realm of ethnographic work may have its benefits, such framings also have significant drawbacks. All forms of fieldwork participation are different and unique, but constructing music participation as a privileged realm works hand in hand with an ethnocentric ideology that affords music an autonomous space. While anthropologists seem to be quite adept at opening their minds to absorb complex specialized information about kinship or linguistics, strong ideologies about musical knowledge, who has access to it, and who is empowered to speak about it, shape their open-ness to hear about musical details of ethnographic work. Not everyone who learns Quechua as a fieldwork language ends up speaking it fluently, but having studied it at all is considered one of the many ways to struggle toward an anthropological understanding. But the claim to privilege comes with the usual thorny issues about gaining or being assumed to have insider-ship. Furthermore, such privileging also carries problematic assumptions about experience. He then suggests that experience as a social construct comes with specific ideas about Western selfhood as characterized by depth, interiority, and reflexivity When music participation is claimed as a privileged form of ethnographic experience the claim plays into hidden Western ideologies about talent and giftedness see Kingsbury , about music as an autonomous sphere, and about experience and personhood. Does being a musician provide a privileged form of insider-ship, and is that insider-ship anything like being a native ethnographer? Timothy Rice writes about how his music participation put him in the ambiguous position of being neither an insider nor an outsider Some people may justifiably object to the parallel I am drawing here between musician as insider and native as insider. Similarly, musicâ€™unless it is closely allied with linguistic anthropology see Feld and Fox â€™may be seen as a realm of too much pleasure, a realm from which substantive theoretical contributions are imagined to rarely emerge. As mundane as it may sound, I want to propose that music participa- tion in ethnography is more like other forms of participant-observation. All ethnographers, at one time or another, embody the paradox of observing and participating, of entering messy situations of both personal commitment and social conflict, of negotiating the terms of insidership and outsidership, and yes, of even at times suffering some pleasure. When anthropologists present work with intricate details of kinship, linguistics, and the law, these details are not the object of analysis, but rather the lenses through which to examine broader cultural questions. Ethnomusicology may benefit from a closer positioning with musicology and a focus on specific questions of music practiceâ€™a positioning where ethnomusicology might wield a productive influence over transformations within the older and usually dominant of the two disciplines. But institutional organizations and publications within the disciplines tell a different story, and these are the conceptual spaces where anthropologists and ethnomusicologists teach, conduct research, and write. I must admit, I was rather puzzled by the pedagogical project of covering a musical map. While anthropology has been linked to mapping projects and is still connected to geographic expertise, the critique within the discipline has gone hand in hand with an array of debates about area studies.

Anthropologists today do not always claim a geographic expertise and in some cases it has even become more fashionable to disclaim a geographic expertise. But anthropologists have critically analyzed these academic ways of mapping the world Fardon ; Hale ; Herzfeld For example, the debates about Andeanism Starn ; Mayer hit the press at the beginning of my graduate studies. Just as scholars do not want to be accused of Orientalizing Said , students of my generation did not want their work in the Andes to be to be critiqued for Andeanism. I still locate my work within Latin American Studies even as I am critical of the historical formation of this area studies construct see Mignolo So why does this imperative seem to linger in the organization of textbook projects? The authors of one of these tomes recently contacted me. How anthropologists do fieldwork, far from being in juxtaposition with the crisis of representation Cooley Perhaps Kingsbury is right to suggest that ethnomusicology has been rather disconnected from the anthropology of the last three decades Anthropology departments rarely hire ethnomusicologists and within music departments, ethnomusicologists often seem to sit in token representation of non-Western music, for as much as they may protest that classification Kingsbury Musicology colleagues ultimately hire or not and tenure or not their ethnomusicology colleagues. I do not propose to solve this dilemma by invoking inter-disciplinarity or a quick and easy abolition of the disciplines. Inter-disciplinarity is no easy task. Hampshire College, my teaching institution since , sells itself as an experimental and experimenting liberal arts college. The College has no departments. All students design their own majors. A School of Social Science, rather than a department of anthropology, is the body that reviews my work, and professors are encouraged to explore inter-disciplinarity by team-teaching courses. Within this supposedly inter-disciplinary haven, disciplinarity still runs very deep. While I do not consciously create any stealth anthropology majors, I do find myself identifying quite strongly in disciplinary terms, wanting students in my courses to be familiar with methods, approaches, and debates within anthropology. I agree with many of my colleagues who point out the impossibility of teaching inter-disciplinarity when undergraduate students may arrive at our classroom doors without a disciplinary grounding of any kind. That said, the post-disciplinary principles of Hampshire College have provided me with an incredible amount of liberty in the courses I teach. Let me follow with some curricular examples. Instead I encourage students to think about different kinds of socially contextualized performances and encourage them to think about and critique an interpretive frame that views social life through a performance model. While performance studies has its own set of problems i. Bigenho ; Bigenho Participation in music performance led me to these broader questions, but I resist claiming a privileged position for this kind of ethnographic participation. Like many anthropologists, I am engaged in the practice of participant-observation, a problematic methodology of ethnographic fieldwork, no matter how you slice it. In developing the ideas presented here, I also benefited from comments, debate, and suggestions from Daniel Noveck, Stefan Senders, and students at Hampshire College. Of course, I assume responsibility for the views expressed here as well as for any shortcomings in my analysis. Authenticity in Bolivian Music Performance. In Natives Making Nation: Indigeneity, and the State in the Andes. University of Arizona Press. The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art. Clifford, James and George E. The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography. University of California Press. In Shadows in the Field: New Perspectives for Fieldwork in Ethnomusicology. A Cultural Phenomenology of Charismatic Healing. Sanity and Selfhood among the Homeless. University of Pennsylvania Press. The Regionalization of Ethnographic Accounts: Regional Traditions of Ethnographic Writing. Annual Review of Anthropology In The Senses Still: Perception and Memory as Material Culture in Modernity. The Interpretation of Cultures. Boundaries and Grounds of a Field Science. Anthropology Through the Looking Glass: Critical Ethnography in the Margins of Europe. Theoretical Practice in Culture and Society. Talking with Chronic Pain Patients. University of Chicago Press. Music, Talent, and Performance: A Conservatory Cultural System. The Power of Kiowa Song: Ethnography Through Thick and Thin. Anthropology as Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences. The Anthropology of Music. The Idea of Latin America. Gender and Culture in Everyday Life. The Remaking of Social Analysis. The Violence of Everyday Life in Brazil. In Ritual, Performance, Media.

**DOWNLOAD PDF UN)DOING FIELDWORK : SHARING SONGS, SHARING LIVES MICHELLE KISLIUK**

London and New York: A Musical Anthropology of an Amazonian People. A Particular History of the Senses. The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas. Journal of Anthropological Research

# DOWNLOAD PDF UN)DOING FIELDWORK : SHARING SONGS, SHARING LIVES MICHELLE KISLIUK

## Chapter 4 : Shadows in the field ( edition) | Open Library

*Ethnomusicological fieldwork has significantly changed since the end of the the 20th century. Ethnomusicology is in a critical moment that requires new perspectives on fieldwork - perspectives that are not addressed in the standard guides to ethnomusicological or anthropological method.*

Wednesday, May 11, Ethics in Ethnography An ethnography is the work product of the ethnomusicologist. It is both the observation and the description of a culture Cooley , 4. For the ethnomusicologist, the field is where music culture is observed, experienced, and learned. Fieldwork is the effort through methods and practices employed to obtain the data that is used in the ethnography. So here I am, a brand new ethnomusicologist – a neophyte - standing at the precipice of a budding life as an ethnographer. I have read all the books that I think I needed to get me started and have packed them in my backpack for reference. I have all the tools I think I need to be successful on my journey. Digital recorder, video-recorder, and tablet set up to capture and edit the moments witnessed? Check, check and check. I even have my informant – that special interlocutor that has agreed to ensure I have access to people and to provide the contextual interpretation I will undoubtedly need. But wait a minute! What exactly am I going to do? And how exactly am I going to do it? What approach should I take? How do I view the musicians that I hope to describe? Standing in the field – so to speak – does not make me an ethnographer any more than standing in a garage makes me a car. The frustration is overwhelming, so I take a minute to compose myself by sitting down on the ground and looking out over the field. I will definitely need an attitude adjustment. So, as I sit on this grassy knoll, up walks Dr. Kwame Appiah who teaches philosophy at Princeton. He suggests I take a cosmopolitan world-view. See the value in the music that is created, it allows you to see outside of the constraints of a relativist who agrees to disagree. It opens you up to understand what has been performed As I reflect on Dr. Appiah listens intently and turns to Dr. This little bit of contamination that you bring into the mix is what sparks change in musical traditions. Now this is not a bad thing – it is inevitable. But it makes studying a culture in its pure form more complicated, because your very presence changes everything. It turns out to be Dr. The ethnographer becomes a part of the tradition. The ethical dilemma is that participation in the tradition changes the very tradition you are trying to preserve in your writing Shelemay He then interjects that part of the difficulties of interacting with that steady stream of people lies in the limitation of language. We do not have the same vocabulary. The very language we use, while interacting or even to evaluate, can cause problems when trying to communicate to one group about the other. So the dilemma here is what vocabulary do you use in your ethnography to communicate the music tradition effectively? I see the performers I planned to work with just up ahead of me. As I walk a little closer to the performers, I notice the men are playing the instruments and the women are dancing. I am not sure of the significance, but they sit in separate areas of the room. There is no audience, per se; everybody is participating in some way – maintaining the intricate beat, swaying to the music, or singing along with the singer, who happens to be female. I wonder out loud as to how I will approach the group, especially the males. I am cognizant of the gender roles. I did not consider how my very presence can introduce conflict with social norms. The frustration on my face must have been apparent to Dr. Am I going to just observe and record the events that unfold before me? Or will I participate? Will my participation create conflict among the individuals in the music culture? Yet another ethical dilemma that needs to be resolved. Can the researcher be truly gender neutral, Dr. She tells me that I will need to be flexible in every situation. My gender may make a difference as to whether I gain access to some aspect of the music tradition. Perhaps my interlocutor can help. Perhaps I will not get the interaction for which I had hoped Babiracki Let me put you on speaker. There are so many people here that would love to hear what you have to say about me stating as an ethnomusicologist. You will start in the position of the etic outsider looking in and as you work with the people and they get to work with you, as you learn the language or lingo , as you play more within the culture you will transition to a middle ground that is neither etic or emic from the inside looking out Everyone nods

## **DOWNLOAD PDF UN)DOING FIELDWORK : SHARING SONGS, SHARING LIVES MICHELLE KISLIUK**

in agreement as they start to walk away. Appiah turns and says to me that I should look for the similarities between the musical culture I am studying and my own. I jump up from what must have been a dream because I am suddenly alone, but surrounded by enough knowledge that I have a renewed sense of the approach I will take. I head towards the music, but realize I should bring my instrument. Running quickly to my car I get my clarinet and get to the group just as introductions begin. I tell them, I am Cheryl and I am an ethnomusicologist! Works Cited Appiah, Kwame Anthony. Ethics in a World of Strangers. Reflections on Gender and Research in Village India. Oxford University Press, Inc. Sharing Songs, Sharing Lives.

**Chapter 5 : Project MUSE - A Feminist Ethnomusicology**

*Kisliuk, Michelle. "(Un)Doing Fieldwork: Sharing Songs, Sharing Lives." In Shadows in the Field: New Perspectives on Fieldwork and Ethnomusicology, edited by Gregory F. Barz and Timothy Cooley.*

Hsu on October 21, - 9: Please join us at YellowBuzz was meant to share my field notes from observing and participating in the indie rock music scenes first with my research associates and by extension the broader public online. These public field notes were written in the style of performance and album reviews accessible for a general audience outside of academic ethnomusicology. I took the voice of a field correspondent and committed to a fast no-more-than-a-couple-of-week turnaround. Through highlighting these unusual performances and connecting them to theories of identity formation and community building, my blog lived in a liminal space in which it served both as a part of the process and a product of my research. My participation as a blogger in these music scenes gave Internet-visibility to the Asian American musicians that I came to know in my fieldwork. At a high point, my blog became a hub for readers interested in all things related to Asian and Asian American indie music scenes, and was subsequently cited in two Wikipedia articles. Blogging and academic writing are two modes of knowledge production. They are framed differently – short vs. In my own work, I find and leverage the productive tension between these two modes of communication, where one ends drives the beginning of the other. Sharing bits of field findings live as the research is undergoing can question the subject-object binary in ethnographic research. The multi-year arc of a print-based scholarly publication project for academic ethnographies present a dissonance with the principle of participatory engagement. Conducive to fast and creative reuse of content, digital and online media can contribute to changing modes of scholarly communication. Elements such as media synchronicity; networked, iterative structure; and efficiency make digital media a great vehicle to open access to scholarly materials. These digital affordances can drive the transformation toward an ethos of openness. For those of us engaged in ethnographic work, this means a wider and more open ethnographic feedback circle – from fieldwork to publication and impact in and around the field. In the space below, I offer two stories about how I conceptualize openness in my own scholarly communication practices, with a bit of commentary on the politics and economics around scholarly transparency from the perspective of a young non-tenure-track scholar. I also hope that these stories serve to illustrate the possibility of a generative relationship between blogging and journal article publication. I have experienced a few arcs from the time of field research to peer-reviewed journal article publications through my research project lifecycles. A blog post I wrote in marks the beginning of my field engagement with the band Hsu-nami. An article-length version of this chapter became published in a peer-reviewed journal in , seven years after my initial research interaction with the band. My second peer-reviewed journal article publication followed a similar arc. Both of these publication arcs concluded with a less than ideal closeness. My research associates, among them professional journalists, tried and failed to access the article about their music. What does this say about the informational and epistemological politics? Both journals that I published in are non-open-access with fairly strict copyright terms. This option appeared to be a non-option for me, a postdoc fellow in a double-contingency trap: Like other neoliberal models, this framework equates the labor and production of academic knowledge with its consumption, and outsources the financial responsibility to deliver products to the content producer. In more than one way, it defies the tenants of the actual open access movement. So I tweeted my stance resoundingly: Throughout this project lifecycle, I experimented on various digital platforms to play with the content and form of my research expressions. In these experimentations, I iterated my research in an open form as a post on a blog associated with my graduate fellowship program at University of Virginia; then as I developed my work within a postdoctoral context, I began publishing it on my personal site. Two years ago, an editor-at-large of DH Now and by extension Journal of Digital Humanities spotted my work on blog and contacted me to explore an interest in developing the blog post on my personal site into a full-length journal

article. Around the same time, the editor of the Ethnography Matters blog invited me to serialize my research on digital ethnography. I thought I would take this set of opportunities to develop my blog post series, staging it as an open forum to invite feedback on my work. This helped me polish the writing for the eventual manuscript submission for the Journal of Digital Humanities. More than just an open access journal, JDH transforms the peer-review process by leveraging the open web protocols to source and distribute scholarly content. The editorial and review process begins with an identification of a likely submission based on blog feedback, comments and social media metrics. The evaluation and review process with JDH, for the reasons above, felt so human to me. Each touchpoint was encouraging and yielded constructive insights to further the development and refinement of the paper. When the paper was published in this past spring, I felt confident about the timeliness and relevance of my work. Through its lifecycle, this research project published content in various lengths, types, and formats. This multiplicity of form and content reached a wide network of readers, ranging from academic to applied ethnographers, digital humanities scholars, and geographers. The technological affordances of these publication platforms allowed me to engage with complex layers of content and voices across disciplinary and social perspectives. Publishing, to me, in its simplistic sense, is to make something public. If our public precludes those who have been our research associates, or individuals without institutional affiliations or access to scholarly journals, then we should rethink how we communicate our scholarship. Lastly, I return to the question of research impact, an inquiry central to the ethnographic perspective and a critical step of the ethnographic feedback loop. The issue of transparency can set the course of impact of our research. Having an open and transparent channel of communication is the beginning of a meaningful dialogue we ethnomusicologists can foster with the public. Informational openness, however, is a complex discourse that requires further contextualization and its discussion would not complete without a full consideration of access, ethics, and responsibility Christen The scholarly publishing industry itself is a cultural field with policies and infrastructures driven by commercial values Miller that mostly defy public interests. We should maintain our critical viewpoints as we engage with our own scholarly communication practices. Works Cited Christen, Kim. Indigenous Knowledge Systems and the Question of Openness. Fortun, Kim and Mike Fortun. Peer Reviewed but Not Conservative. Journal of Ethnographic Theory 2 1: Sharing Songs, Sharing Lives. Barz and Timothy J. Paulo Freire Research Center, Finland [http: Towards a More Open Ethnography](http://Towards a More Open Ethnography). These postings are not peer reviewed and do not reflect the opinion of Ethnomusicology Review. We support the expression of controversial opinions, and welcome civil discussion about them. We do not, however, tolerate overt discrimination based on race, sex, gender, sexual orientation, or religion, and reserve the right to remove posts that we feel might offend our readers. We were interested to know the journey that led her through Ethnomusicology, The project, originally titled,

## DOWNLOAD PDF UN)DOING FIELDWORK : SHARING SONGS, SHARING LIVES MICHELLE KISLIUK

### Chapter 6 : Shadows in the field : new perspectives for fieldwork in ethnomusicology - University of Liverpool

*Shadows in the field* by , Oxford University Press edition, in English - 2nd ed.

YellowBuzz was meant to share my field notes from observing and participating in the indie rock music scenes first with my research associates and by extension the broader public online. These public field notes were written in the style of performance and album reviews accessible for a general audience outside of academic ethnomusicology. I took the voice of a field correspondent and committed to a fast no-more-than-a-couple-of-week turnaround. Through highlighting these unusual performances and connecting them to theories of identity formation and community building, my blog lived in a liminal space in which it served both as a part of the process and a product of my research. My participation as a blogger in these music scenes gave Internet-visibility to the Asian American musicians that I came to know in my fieldwork. At a high point, my blog became a hub for readers interested in all things related to Asian and Asian American indie music scenes, and was subsequently cited in two Wikipedia articles. Blogging and academic writing are two modes of knowledge production. They are framed differently – short vs. In my own work, I find and leverage the productive tension between these two modes of communication, where one ends drives the beginning of the other. Sharing bits of field findings live as the research is undergoing can question the subject-object binary in ethnographic research. The multi-year arc of a print-based scholarly publication project for academic ethnographies present a dissonance with the principle of participatory engagement. Conducive to fast and creative reuse of content, digital and online media can contribute to changing modes of scholarly communication. Elements such as media synchronicity; networked, iterative structure; and efficiency make digital media a great vehicle to open access to scholarly materials. These digital affordances can drive the transformation toward an ethos of openness. For those of us engaged in ethnographic work, this means a wider and more open ethnographic feedback circle – from fieldwork to publication and impact in and around the field. In the space below, I offer two stories about how I conceptualize openness in my own scholarly communication practices, with a bit of commentary on the politics and economics around scholarly transparency from the perspective of a young non-tenure-track scholar. I also hope that these stories serve to illustrate the possibility of a generative relationship between blogging and journal article publication. I have experienced a few arcs from the time of field research to peer-reviewed journal article publications through my research project lifecycles. A blog post I wrote in marks the beginning of my field engagement with the band Hsu-nami. An article-length version of this chapter became published in a peer-reviewed journal in , seven years after my initial research interaction with the band. My second peer-reviewed journal article publication followed a similar arc. Both of these publication arcs concluded with a less than ideal closeness. My research associates, among them professional journalists, tried and failed to access the article about their music. What does this say about the informational and epistemological politics? Both journals that I published in are non-open-access with fairly strict copyright terms. This option appeared to be a non-option for me, a postdoc fellow in a double-contingency trap: Like other neoliberal models, this framework equates the labor and production of academic knowledge with its consumption, and outsources the financial responsibility to deliver products to the content producer. In more than one way, it defies the tenants of the actual open access movement. So I tweeted my stance resoundingly: A more open and efficient research publication arc I experienced was with my project on digital ethnography. Throughout this project lifecycle, I experimented on various digital platforms to play with the content and form of my research expressions. In these experimentations, I iterated my research in an open form as a post on a blog associated with my graduate fellowship program at University of Virginia; then as I developed my work within a postdoctoral context, I began publishing it on my personal site. Two years ago, an editor-at-large of DH Nowand by extension Journal of Digital Humanities spotted my work on blog and contacted me to explore an interest in developing the blog post on my personal site into a full-length journal article. Around the same time, the editor of

theEthnography Matters blog invited me to serialize my research on digital ethnography. I thought I would take this set of opportunities to develop my blog post series, staging it as an open forum to invite feedback on my work. This helped me polish the writing for the eventual manuscript submission for theJournal of Digital Humanities. More than just an open access journal, DH transforms the peer-review process by leveraging the open web protocols to source and distribute scholarly content. The editorial and review process begins with an identification of a likely submission based on blog feedback, comments and social media metrics. The evaluation and review process with JDH, for the reasons above, felt so human to me. Each touchpoint was encouraging and yielded constructive insights to further the development and refinement of the paper. When the paper was published in this past spring, I felt confident about the timeliness and relevance of my work. Through its lifecycle, this research project published content in various lengths, types, and formats. This multiplicity of form and content reached a wide network of readers, ranging from academic to applied ethnographers, digital humanities scholars, and geographers. The technological affordances of these publication platforms allowed me to engage with complex layers of content and voices across disciplinary and social perspectives. Publishing, to me, in its simplistic sense, is to make something public. If our public precludes those who have been our research associates, or individuals without institutional affiliations or access to scholarly journals, then we should rethink how we communicate our scholarship. Lastly, I return to the question of research impact, an inquiry central to the ethnographic perspective and a critical step of the ethnographic feedback loop. The issue of transparency can set the course of impact of our research. Having an open and transparent channel of communication is the beginning of a meaningful dialogue we ethnomusicologists can foster with the public. Informational openness, however, is a complex discourse that requires further contextualization and its discussion would not complete without a full consideration of access, ethics, and responsibility Christen The scholarly publishing industry itself is a cultural field with policies and infrastructures driven by commercial values Miller that mostly defy public interests. We should maintain our critical viewpoints as we engage with our own scholarly communication practices. Indigenous Knowledge Systems and the Question of Openness. Fortun, Kim and Mike Fortun. Journal of Ethnographic Theory 2 1: Sharing Songs, Sharing Lives. Barz and Timothy J. Paulo Freire Research Center, Finland [http:](http://) Wendy Hsu is an ethnographer, musician, and community arts organizer who engages with multimodal research and performance practices informed by music from continental to diasporic Asia.

*(Un)doing Fieldwork: Sharing Songs, Sharing Lives / Michelle Kisliuk 3. Confronting the Field(Note) In and Out of the Field: Music, Voices, Text, and Experiences in Dialogue / Gregory F. Barz.*

From Threatened by Modernity to Reinvented by Modernity: Quizzically, Daniel Neuman aimed for the same twenty-six years earlier. His *The Life of Music in North India*, also endeavored to provide an anthropological account of modern Indian classical music culture. The fact is, both authors were firsts, since what it meant to bring this music under the purview of anthropology—or history and ethnography for that matter—had significantly changed after twenty-six years. Most notably, twenty-first century scholars no longer saw modern Indian classical music through the lens of culture and tradition. Rather, they reframed it as a product of nationalism, modernity and colonialism. Thus, whereas Neuman and Jon B. Higgins portrayed the music as an evolving ancient tradition adapting to the threat of modernity, scholars like Lakshmi Subramanian and Weidman argued that nationalism fueled a re-invention of Indian classical music in response to the legacy of colonialism. If Neuman and Higgins were under the ideological sway of structural anthropology and the Indian nationalist music-reform movement, the new scholars used postcolonial theory to re-cast Indian classical music in new light. In tracing the emergence of nation, modernity and colonialism as the dominant analytics for discussing Indian classical music in English-language ethnomusicological scholarship, this paper tries to understand the logic behind this shift and suggests a new avenue of inquiry. In his introduction, Neuman articulated the theory that music and culture were somehow interrelated. He explicitly theorized culture, society and civilization—terms he used interchangeably—as a system or a structure. Singer wrote, “to my mind—a plausible explanation [for change in Indian society] is that Indian civilization has built into it adaptive mechanisms for incorporating new techniques, new ideas, and newcomers, with only a gradual replacement of the old. Structuralist studies called for an investigation into the relationships between these parts, such as the relationship between music and caste, or music and religion. A glimpse into the chapters of *The Life of Music in North India* articulates what innovative ethnomusicology was in Neuman first explored the thoughts and ideas that musicians held about Hindustani music and about being a musician. Then, instead of turning to the actual music and poetry, he investigated the hierarchical social organization involved in who played which instruments and sang which performance genres. The caste divisions of musical labor provided American ethnomusicologists with a discovery of sorts that strengthened their hypothesis on the connections between music and culture. Neuman was not alone. In addition, Higgins viewed the history of Indian classical music as the Indian nationalists viewed the history of the Indian nation. He wrote, “Far from being the enemy of tradition, change has been rather the core, the soul of a vital art form constantly in the process of becoming. Over the past two thousand years and more, every new generation has received the oral corpus of musical repertoire and style, transformed it and in turn transmitted it to the next generation. So far as we know the tradition has undergone a constant process of evolution. This kind of music history corresponded with nationalist histories of the Indian nation that anachronistically projected the present nation-state back in time, and construed the past as evolving towards the present nation-state. The Postcolonial Politics of Music in South India, the study and theorization of the Indian classical music tradition had undergone a radical transformation. These works shifted the scholarly imagination from espousing the concept of an evolving tradition, to espousing a tradition reinvented in the colonial encounter. Although these two authors ascribed different degrees of significance to the role of colonialism, the bastion of scholarship that had imagined an autonomous Indian classical tradition had breathed its last. Unlike Neuman, Subramanian and Weidman were not interested in theorizing about the relationship between music and culture, but instead turned to the ways that South Indian nationalists theorized the relationship between music and the nation. Nor were native music terminologies, or kinship charts found in their work. Instead, they gleaned their insights into nationalism, modernity, and colonialism, largely through discourse analysis. Yet, although Subramanian and Weidman

agreed the tradition had been reinvented in the twentieth century, their vision of this reinvention was significantly different. For Weidman, the period of royal patronage had no connection to the twentieth century, but rather the definition of Karnatic music as spiritual or devotional and the preoccupation with the figure of Thyagaraja as a saint who refused royal patronage were responses to anxiety about the commercialization of music. The arguments of this chapter reappeared throughout her entire monograph. Her first argument was that scholars had misunderstood the ways Karnatak music had profoundly been created in the context of colonialism. For Weidman, modernity itself was a result of the contact of cultures in colonial regimes and she viewed the Karnatak violin as the very embodiment of this colonial encounter. Next, Weidman argued that the gramophone—presenting a way for women to be heard without being seen to escape the associations of their bodies *ibid*: While Neuman and Higgins argued Indian classical music was threatened by modernity the latter argued that it was created in modernity and argued that the Brahman middle class undertook the project to modernize, spiritualize, standardize and disseminate their brand of Indian classical music because music was emblematic of the very nation for which they sought independence. Thus, if nationalists wanted progress for the nation, they wanted progress for their music as well notation, for example was imagined as a site for progress. Neuman and Higgins on the other hand, conceptualized Indian classical music as an ancient tradition. Yet, however clearly we can articulate these differences in historicism one question left unanswered is why the historicism of Indian classical music of the same period changed. Perhaps the biggest limitation for a comprehensive answer to this question is confining the discussion to only texts, for this problematically ignores the historical context in which the authors wrote. And at the same time, it is a fallacy to think the paradigm shift ensconced in the print of English language scholarship is an exact report of actual historical change. No doubt, the onset of postcolonial theory transformed how ethnomusicologists viewed cultural change. This must be due to the lack of postcolonial theory in their time. In it Anderson argued that the spread of printing was a very significant factor in the rise of nationalism. In his view, with the onset of printing standardized scripts in books and newspapers, readers in their respective languages began to feel connected to each other due to their shared printed language devoid of dialect differences and began to see themselves as a community. Thus print capitalism, Anderson argued, was the primary medium for developing nationalism. She wrote, The modern discourse on the performing arts, especially music, in nineteenth and twentieth century India was shaped largely in the convergence of Orientalist scholarship with print culture, and its dissemination among the urban Indian middle class. Moreover, Weidman had assimilated Chatterjee to the point where her language sounded like it could be his own. An Avenue of Inquiry It is clear that the works of Anderson and Chatterjee have significantly influenced the shift in historicism of Indian classical music in the modern period. Yet, as mentioned above, confining an investigation into this paradigm shift to only texts reduces change to the words of scholars. It ignores the historical context in which they wrote. Thus, I propose scholars write histories of modern scholarly patronage. This would lead to larger questions about the history of the interaction of American universities, American financed but South Asian based language-training programs, and fellowship organizations, fieldwork experience, and with the scholarship ethnomusicologists produced in the twentieth century. Such a history of scholarly patronage would include a comprehensive understanding of change in historicism. However true this is, reflexive writing often ignores the fascinating interactions of American universities, language-training programs, and fellowship organizations, with fieldwork, scholarship and the maintenance of academic disciplines. These kinds of investigations would get at the logic behind the paradigm shift found in the scholarship of Higgins, Neuman, Weidman, and Subramanian. For a lucid discussion of Indian nationalist linear history in relation to North Indian classical music see Kobayashi I owe this point to Kobayashi However, she did not stop with the eighteenth and nineteenth century but devoted thirteen pages to a two-thousand year old history of South Indian classical music culminating in descriptions of the trinity composers. I have chosen Anderson and Chatterjee since this paper has been more about nationalism and the colonial regime and less about gender, modernity or linguistic nationalism. Two Men and Music: Nationalism in the Making of an Indian Classical Tradition. The Indian Subcontinent, edited by Alison

## DOWNLOAD PDF UN)DOING FIELDWORK : SHARING SONGS, SHARING LIVES MICHELLE KISLIUK

Arnold, â€” The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories. The Interpretation of Cultures: Journal of the American Oriental Society 1: Sharing Songs, Sharing Lives. Barz and Timothy J. The Life of Music in North India: The Organization of an Artistic Tradition. Wayne State University Press. Asian Music 15 2: Music in the Mind: The Concepts of Music and Musician in Afghanistan. Holt, Rinehart and Wilson. Singing the Classical, Voicing the Modern: Garrett Field Winner of the James T.

### Chapter 8 : Ethnomusicology

*The article, in its later stages, was greatly influenced by Gregory Barz and Timothy Cooley's collection Shadows in the Field: New Perspectives in Fieldwork in Ethnomusicology ( []), and especially by Michelle Kisiuk's "(Un)doing Fieldwork: Sharing Songs, Sharing Lives" ().*

### Chapter 9 : Shadows in the Field - Gregory F. Barz; Timothy J. Cooley - Oxford University Press

*Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.*