

## “Now you see it, now you don’t”

On the challenge of inclusion in the perspective of children’s everyday musical play

Ingeborg Lunde Vestad

### ABSTRACT

*This article discusses children’s musical play and inclusion in everyday life settings. The Norwegian Framework Plan for the Content and Tasks of Kindergartens (2011) states that staff must “ensure that children extend their understanding of cultural similarities and differences, and work towards creating an inclusive environment that counteracts bullying and racism”. The Framework Plan has, however, been criticized for its lack of consideration of the theoretical and discursive background of the concept of diversity, and for leaving much of the important work on inclusion in kindergarten to the attention and reflection of each professional (Otterstad & Andersen 2012). This article sets out to deconstruct and make visible some aspects that seem taken for granted. Taking an empirical example of children’s musical play as its point of departure, the lack of adequate interpretative repertoires to describe and latch on to unfamiliar ways of relating to music will be addressed. In addition, the article points out that the fear of “othering” marginalized children may come in the way of inclusion. This point will be discussed with respect to how the gaze of whiteness works in relation to children’s musical everyday lives, and how children themselves oftentimes constitute children’s musical culture in ways that sustain parallel cultures rather than a joint culture. Finally, it will be argued that in order to work against a one-dimensional understanding of musical diversity, uncertainty and doubt will need to be understood as positive and productive resources.*

*Key words: Children’s culture, musical play, inclusion, diversity, whiteness*

In his book on classic magic *Now You See It, Now You Don't: Lessons in Sleight of Hand* (1976) Bill Tarr writes that magic is “far and away one of the most interesting, rewarding and enjoyable hobbies ever” (p. 9). At some point in life we have probably all marveled at the magician’s tricks and skills when objects and people disappear and reappear whether in their original shape or altered (e.g. cut in half). Life itself may play similar tricks on us. In this article I will take a closer look at what we see and what is easily missed when it comes to children’s own music making in everyday life. From the hierarchy we make from discourses available to us, and their mutually constitutive subject positions, some discourses stand out as “natural” interpretative resources, while other discourses and subject positions become invisible (Potter & Wetherell 1987; Smith 2005; Wetherell & Potter 1992). In this context I will look at children’s own music making in terms of *inclusion*. In lay terms *inclusion* is defined as “the action or state of including or of being included within a group or structure” (Inclusion, n. d.). *To include* is to “allow (someone) to share in an activity or privilege” (Include, n. d.).

The Norwegian *Framework Plan for the Content and Tasks of Kindergartens* [Hereafter: Framework Plan] states that “[a]ctive and clearly expressed staff are needed to create a warm and inclusive social environment” (Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research [NMER] 2011: 30) and that staff must “ensure that children extend their understanding of cultural similarities and differences, and work to create an inclusive environment that counteracts bullying and racism” (NMER 2011: 41). Otterstad and Andersen (2012) argue that there is a lack of consideration of the theoretical and discursive background for the concept of diversity applied in the Framework Plan, and that too much of the important work on inclusion in kindergarten is left to the attentiveness and critical reflection of each professional.

One way to contribute to critical reflection from a research point of view is to argue that our culturally constituted *gaze* – the way we look at “others” – embodies certain relationships between the observer and the observed (Lacan 1973/1988). Sturken and Cartwright (2001) argue from a post-structural perspective that the gaze is integral to systems of power and ideas about knowledge. So too is the gaze partly regulated by a hegemonic discourse, that makes kindergarten teachers and school personnel strive towards the inclusion of all children. From the perspective of music education Dyndahl (2006) (among others) points out that to make visible what is marginalized and what is taken for granted in this respect is an ethical obligation. In this article I will take an empirical example as a point of departure and discuss processes of how children in kindergarten include and exclude each other in more informal educational settings (Folkestad 2006). Moreover, I will discuss how the researcher’s gaze also creates blind spots and misses important aspects, in this case

how my own researcher's gaze overlooked and had difficulties in grasping aspects of children's musical everyday life in kindergarten.

## **Inclusion and disappearance in a post-structural perspective**

Before I present the empirical example of children's musical play that forms the empirical core of this text, I will elaborate on "the magic tricks of discourse" from a theoretical perspective, supported by previous research. Making something disappear in a discursive sense is less concrete than in the case of the magician. The things we do *not see* in everyday life are challenging, because we do not know when we are being tricked. In real life most often we do not set out to *deliberately* make objects or ideas and processes disappear. On the contrary, as researchers we strive to counteract our own biases and blind spots. But often we – whether we are researchers or not – might *think* that we are focusing on a matter, when in fact we only do so in certain cultural and discursive practices. An illustration of a kindergarten program that has sought to overcome a possible "now-you-see-it, now-you-don't"-effect between the classroom-like settings and the rest of the activities in kindergarten, is a program by Kari Lamer. The program is designed to support the development of children's social competence, and inclusion is an essential part of it (Lamer 2001; 2002). One of the program's advantages is that social competence is not only focused in limited, more classroom-like settings during the day, where children are taught *about* and asked to reflect on social competence, for instance based on stories read from a book. In addition Lamer encourages kindergarten staff to regard five defined areas of social competence as a pedagogical framework, and to utilize these perspectives in actual situations that occur in the everyday lives of the kindergarten children. The idea of inclusion then becomes an ideal that the children are encouraged to live by, supported by the kindergarten staff in naturally occurring social situations, and not something that they only hear *about*.

According to a post-structuralist position a complete and clear view of what we perceive and what we do not "see" is impossible to obtain. What we see and what we miss is regulated by the complicated relations between available discourses and the subject positions that we hold. An individual in a certain subject position will have other interpretative repertoires available than an individual in another subject position (Jørgensen & Phillips 1999). Thus, the two individuals will, by their respective subject positions, constitute different hierarchical structures of interpretative repertoires

(Smith 2005). In *Mothering for Schooling* (2005) Allison Griffith and Dorothy E. Smith illustrate this in a research project in which they interview heads of schools and the mothers of children in their respective schools, as people holding different subject positions within a discourse of schooling. When ascribing meaning to the fact that a student was absent from school, one of the principals interviewed stated clearly that he found that the absence was due to low interest in school and poor mothering. The mother, on the other hand, regarded her allowing the child to stay home from school as a way of taking good care of her child, and as a sign of *good* mothering. She supported her choice by explaining that the child had some social problems in school and was not feeling very well.

My point here is not to discuss who is right and who is wrong in this example, but to focus on the differences in interpretative repertoires between heads of school and mothers, respectively, and the effects of discursive stereotyping. Griffith and Smith point out that the heads of schools seemed to expect that single mothers do not support their children's learning as much as other mothers. This attitude was influenced by the fact that the single mothers often lived in poorer neighborhoods. Griffith and Smith's research reveals that the school leaders often saw little point in informing the single and poorer mothers as thoroughly as married mothers living in middle-class neighborhoods about school-related issues, because "such mothers" (poorer/single) would seldom be interested in following up on the information. An awareness of biases in the attitude towards single mothers was also shown from a parental point of view. It turned out that one of the mothers interviewed as a married, middle-class mother, was in fact a single mother. She had not informed the school about her status, fearing that she and her child would be treated differently if her family status became known.

From these examples it is evident that what we *think* about people (single/poor mothers do not follow up their children's homework because they are not interested) regulate what we *do* (principals do not inform single/poor mothers as thoroughly as married/middle-class mothers), and that what we do have an impact on other people, thus becoming a self-fulfilling prophecy (single/poor mothers do not follow up their children as well as married/middle-class mothers – partly because they do not have the same information as married/middle-class mothers). In this manner the principal's discourse about schooling and interpretative repertoires about mothers create a subject position for the poor/single mothers which makes it impossible for them to obtain a subject position as a "good mother".

What has not been addressed so far, is the fact that some single/poor mothers' failure to tutor their children at home, is due to their need to hold more than one job to make ends meet and that as a consequence there is very little time and energy left

for supporting their children’s schoolwork. Holding two jobs in order to provide for their children (lodging, food and clothing) did not contribute substantially to a status as “good mother” in the discourse of schooling. Returning to *inclusion*, the topic of this article, the principal’s interpretative repertoires contribute to exclude children by making a particular kind of mothers feel alienated. While other mothers get their subject position and status as “good mothers” confirmed by being able to (and being made able to) meet the school’s discursive requirements, these mothers do not fit in. The single/poor *good* mothers virtually disappear, like a magic trick of school discourse.

This example comes forth as rather shocking. The consequences of such discursive “tricks” are disturbing, especially seeing how easy we think they are to avoid. With this example as support for the importance of addressing the tricks that discourses play on us, I will explore the challenges I experienced as a researcher and the challenge of inclusion in kindergarten.

## **Dancing the Arabian way**

In the following paragraphs I will describe the event that forms the empirical basis for this article. The observation is part of the empirical data generated for my doctoral thesis, which focused on how children aged three to six use recorded music in their everyday lives. Observations and interviews were conducted in two kindergartens and nine family homes over a period of approximately seven months. In addition to the children themselves, kindergarten personnel and parents participated in the study. In one of the kindergartens a little less than 20 children participated (one wing of the kindergarten) and in the second kindergarten all wings participated, making the total number of children participating in the study about 70. From these 70 children nine selected participants were observed and interviewed in their respective family homes. By linking up with the Nordic research on children’s culture and the new sociology of childhood, children’s own use of recorded music was focused.<sup>1</sup> However, as is discussed within the research field of children’s culture, children’s culture is an adult perspective on children’s lives, and moreover, it is not “a lonely island” separated from the “surrounding” culture, the so-called “adult culture” (Rasmussen 2001; Ekrem, Tingstad & Johnsen 2001). The cultures of children and adults (if one wishes to sustain the two as somewhat separate categories) can be understood as mutually constitutive, and even as the *one and same* culture. This is important in relation to the matter of inclusion, a point to which I will return later in the text. The example at hand was fully organized by the children themselves:

*Amanda (4 years old) is peeking in through the door, into the dolls room of the kindergarten. Her golden face and black straight hair frames her deep, brown eyes and shy smile. The sun is shining quite brightly in through the only window of the room, bathing the six-seven square meters in sunlight. Rays of light touch the wooden play kitchen, as well as the pots and pans that are disorderly scattered around on the counter, table, chairs and floor. The pieces of furniture fill about half the room. The other half consists of open floor space, apart from a wooden chest filled with fancy dress costumes. There are some knobs on the wall where pieces of costume dressing, purses and pieces of glittery plastic jewelry are hanging. Some items have been left on the floor by the three or four girls who have just left the room after having played whilst listening to recorded music in the background. The music is still sounding from the CD player, placed on the floor beneath the window. I – the researcher – am still in the room, sitting with the video recorder in my lap. Amanda enters and aims for the CD player. She bends down, presses one of the buttons a number of times, and skips between different tracks. She stops when the sound of music from one of the faster tracks on the CD fills the room. She seems satisfied with the music now, walking across to the chest with costume dressing. From it she pulls out a pink skirt, made of a very light and transparent fabric. It has fake diamonds and silky ribbons stitched on to it. Amanda puts the waste of the skirt around her head, leaving the rest of it hanging down her shoulders and back. She grabs another skirt and puts it on in the regular way, but on top of her trousers. Although her dressing went quite quickly, the music has slowed down again in the meantime. Amanda goes back to the CD player and skips once more to a faster track. She stands up and starts moving along to the music in a sideways manner, with her hands lifted up in the air on either side of her head. Her posture and the manner of her movements – soft and sliding, although rhythmic – evoke associations of Arabic or Indian dancing. Suddenly she stops and walks back to the CD player. She explains that the music was not good after all. She skips again and when she finds what she describes as good music, she dances. The music is good for dancing, she says.*

*Another girl of about the same age as Amanda has entered the room. She looks interestedly at Amanda's dancing moves. Her facial expression is difficult to understand, but it seems to shift between a kind of astonishment and a smile that suggests a hint of distance. The smile does not signal an insider's understanding or a wish to be included in Amanda's dancing. It is as if the blue-eyed girl shrugs her shoulders, and she leaves the room. Amanda continues dancing for a shorter while, and then she too leaves the room.*

## **Amanda dancing as a mirror for *whiteness***

The description above is of a virtually invisible situation in the everyday lives of children. The incident occurred at the end of another longer observation that I at the time found more important and necessary to concentrate on. Given the scope of the project, I directed my research focus towards how children use music and towards what music can do for and with people (Campbell 2010; DeNora 2000). Amanda’s dance appeared not to get fully started, which contributed to it being categorized as a less important part of the data material. The material consisted of approximately 30 hours of video recordings (in addition to field notes) and these few seconds had been practically “invisible” to me as a researcher, and were only rediscovered when I was considering the selection of children participating in the dissertation project. Even though I had carefully chosen between available kindergartens so that the material would include participants from a diversity of cultures, virtually only white, middle-class children used the CD player in kindergarten. This is an interesting finding, which can be discussed by pointing to research on how middle-class children are brought up (Griffith & Smith 2005; Stefansen & Aarseth 2011). In this article, though, I will concentrate on the gazes of the children and of the researcher. To start with the latter, I had a strong feeling that my gaze as a researcher and cultural individual embedded in and regulated by western history and culture had contributed to a discursive magic, which led to overlooking Amanda’s use of recorded music. Also, when I discovered her participation in the music, I lacked the concepts needed to describe it relevantly and to understand the meaning Amanda ascribed to it. According to Lacan’s theory of subjectivity, any other person can be set up as a mirror, to fill in the fantasy image of oneself. For this purpose it is pleasant to let a person who one sees as a good role model fill in the fantasy image. The relationship between oneself and the person one sets up as a mirror is a narcissistic relationship (Lacan 1973/1998). When I discovered what I had overlooked, it was as if Amanda functioned a mirror for myself, staring back at me like the scull in Hans Holbein’s (1533) painting *The Ambassadors*, evoking an unpleasant and uneasy feeling of my own lack of a fruitful subject position within a discourse of diversity and inclusion. I was being watched (Lacan 1973/1998), and my effort to understand the children’s uses of music was at this point found unsatisfactory. My inadequacy stared me in the face, depicted as a frightening scull.

I was struck by a feeling of helplessness since my culturally constituted interpretative resources did not seem to do justice to the observation. Would describing her dance by my available and culturally constituted interpretative repertoires serve to include her, or would these repertoires serve to overlook what was important for

her? I felt I knew too little about Amanda's cultural musical context and – because of that – that the cultural-personal significance of her musical engagement was not accessible to me. On the other hand, I was afraid of "othering" Amanda by describing her use of music as something "different" than the other children's uses of music and thereby constituting a rigid position for her as being different. On the flipside, however, "othering" was nevertheless what came out of my hesitation: By the lack of relevant interpretative resources, I marginalized and "othered" her by not being able to confirm her dance properly, making her position uncertain and ambiguous (Jaworski & Coupland 2005).

Recent research on multiculturalism has revealed that the feeling of lacking in ways to express oneself when facing another culture and discourse is not a singular experience. The subtitle of Patti Lather's (2004) paper is telling: "Ethics Now: White Woman Goes to Africa and Loses Her Voice". In order to overcome the challenges of the complexity of such everyday discourses in kindergarten settings, Gjervan, Andersen and Bleka (2012) set out to deconstruct the discourses. In this way the three writers contribute to making visible what seems taken for granted. More specifically, they provide a critical approach to everyday discourse in kindergarten through a discussion of *whiteness*. They problematize the invisible advantages of being white in the western world, and by pointing to whiteness as a social construction they argue that research on whiteness can contribute to an understanding of racial categories as non-universal. A critical approach to whiteness is understood as part of a larger anti-racist project, because whiteness works as a system by which people with white skin color are granted power and other advantages. White children grow up in the same system (ibid.: 56). Whiteness (and on the other hand, *coloredness*) and the discourses that constitute it are embedded in the children's, the kindergarten personnel's and the researcher's respective gazes. "I was taught to see racism only in individual acts of meanness, not in invisible systems conferring dominance on my group", Peggy McIntosh (n. d.) writes. She continues by listing 50 advantages of being white. Among them are the following: 6) I can turn on the television or open the front page of the paper and see people of my race widely represented. 7) When I am told about our national heritage or about "civilization," I am shown that people of my color made it what it is. 8) I can be sure that my children will be given curricular materials that testify to the existence of their race. (...) 42) I can arrange my activities so that I will never have to experience feelings of rejection owing to my race. (...) 45) I can expect figurative language and imagery in all of the arts to testify to experiences of my race.

Inspired by a critical approach to whiteness that contributes to making visible that we all have a skin color and that skin color provides (in a cultural context) certain advantages and disadvantages, I will focus on children's uses of music. This approach



can be considered a contribution to the understanding of how inclusion and exclusion “works” in children’s everyday life settings, from an ethnographic point of view (cf. Smith 2005). Important to note, however, is that the concept of whiteness in some respects seems to de-complicate complex matters too much. It presupposes and sustains a split between people of different colors. In this manner, it can be argued that the concept of whiteness does not encompass people who see themselves as belonging to more than one color, such as adopted children brought up in a culture that does not “correspond” to their skin color. Nevertheless, the concept of whiteness serves well as a starting point for a discussion of inclusion and power relations because the concept underscores that “white” is not neutral ground. By making white visible as a color culturally speaking, one can discuss the consequences of being colored from a more multilayered perspective. This brings out more of the complexity of the matter of inclusion, and underscores self-reflection as important.

## **Culturally constituted *hooks* – something to latch on to**

The concept of whiteness can be applied to open up a discussion of ethnic Norwegian children’s advantages in kindergarten when it comes to playing with music. In order to discuss how inclusion can work in this respect I will go by the theoretical concept of *musical hooks*.

Various theories of popular music underline the effect of “hooks”, and describe it as something in the music that the listeners *get hooked on*. A musical hook is explained by John Covach, as “that part of the song meant to catch the ear of the listener” (2005: 71). “Perhaps the most useful and succinct definition of hook is Monaco and Riordan’s (1980): ‘a musical or lyrical phrase that stands out and is easily remembered’ (p. 178)” Gary Burns writes (1987: 1). DeNora (2000) writes about music as a cultural material for the personal and emotional and she underscores that listeners *latch on to* music. The musical hook then lends itself to a definition not only as a riff, chain of chords or rhythm in a structural sense, but moreover as something constituted by how the listener appropriates the music. By this cultural definition, a hook is constituted by its meaning culturally, socially and personally. Compared with a knob on the wall, to hang clothes on, a musical hook is something that “stands out” relative to specific musical contexts. But a knob is not just a knob. An old, large and heavy brass knob is quite different from a wooden one, carved from a twig found in the woods or a steel nail hammered into a wall to hang one’s coat on. They all “stand out” physically, but the associations and emotions they elicit are seemingly quite different from one another.

Moreover, something might be recognized as a knob by some individuals, but not by others. Hanging one's jacket on the knobs of a drawer is one example. Another example is designer knobs that fold when not in use. A person who is not familiar with this kind of knob, might mistake the knob rack in someone's hall for instance for a panel of light switches, and conclude that there is nowhere to hang his or her coat. Musical knobs or hooks can work in similar ways. Although physical, they elicit associations that are cultural and personal, and sometimes invisible for a listener who is unfamiliar with the specific kind of music and how it is used. If nothing "stands out" there is virtually nothing to latch on to. From this approach musical hooks can be seen as physical musical structures, but they may be understood and latched on to differently across cultures.

A situation observed in the same kindergarten, which showed a multitude of hooks to latch on to for the children, helping to constitute their musical play as a joint activity, was when four girls "played Blåfjell" (Vestad 2010; 2013). This was the children's own description of their activity. *Jul i Blåfjell* [Christmas in Blue Mountain] is a Norwegian television series for children that the four children mentioned knew quite well. They had all seen most of the episodes on TV, and one of them owned a CD, a spin-off product containing the songs from the series, sung by the actors. One of the girls brought the CD to the kindergarten, and their play can perhaps best be described as dramatic role play (Guss 2001), but also as a way of listening to the music. As the music sounded from the CD player, the girls entered roles from the TV series, and acted out the series' stories of life, death, childbirth, environmental protection, inclusion, secrecy, sorrow and joy. The music served as a script, both in the sense of knowing when to do what, and emotionally, since the music was composed to support the themes and different characters. The combination of dramatic play and music listening seemed to allow the children to "live the music", and to live the identities of the characters in the series through music (Frith 1996; Ruud 1997; Vestad 2010; 2013).

The way the girls' play unfolded the music seemed to offer an abundance of hooks for the girls, hooks that they had in common. They danced to the music, and referred verbally, as well as bodily, to the TV-series, by reminding each other that the way they moved was how it was done in the series. They sang along with the lyrics and they all seemed to know when to do what, and what to latch on to. Their joy and engagement make Kjetil Steinsholt's comparison between children's play and "being in love" seem relevant (Steinsholt in Samuelsson & Carlsson 2009).

At one point during the observations in this kindergarten, two of these girls wanted to play Blåfjell, but needed to find children that could fill in the other roles. Amanda was mentioned as a possibility, but the other girl turned the suggestion down, explaining that "Amanda doesn't know Blåfjell", and therefore she would not know what

to do for each of the tracks. This music provided a kind of “hooks” for the children, that Amanda was excluded from, not being familiar the music’s context, i.e. the TV series. As a result she had no chance of latching on to the music in the “right” way, in order to make their role play flow uninterruptedly. For a discussion of inclusion, this is an interesting point. In order to be included in the Blåfjell play, there is an entrance fee: One has to know something before one can be included. In this case, a lack of knowledge about Blåfjell was the reason explicitly given for not to include. As a matter of fact, it turned out that Amanda did not watch the Blåfjell series, and she did not know the themes of the story nor much about the different characters. The privilege of being white in this context is that the children’s culture, understood as what the children do when adults are not present, works on the majority’s premises. Children are culturally constituted individuals and by the kindergarten age they already possess a whole lot of cultural knowledge and capital. To enter a community of play, cultural capital is necessary. Moreover, it has to be the *right* cultural capital. It is important to note that the exclusion that takes place here did not seem to be a result of the children’s meanness, and it can even be interpreted as a way of showing respect for another child’s culture and identity. It can be interpreted as an adequate reflection for making the group of children’s play work. Teaching another child who has not watched the TV series the details “Blåfjell” is a demanding task that would interrupt the play. Whether their exclusion is a result of respect or not, however, the example at hand shows how easily difference is sustained and how inclusion/exclusion in children’s everyday life settings work in subtle ways.

## **An anthropological gaze and the discourse of inclusion**

A discussion of whiteness in connection with children’s musical play and inclusion can further be informed by taking into account the concept of *anthropological gaze*. In their book *Practices of Looking* (2001) Marita Sturken and Lisa Cartwright discuss the gaze of the anthropologist, pointing to Gauguin’s depiction of the Tahiti islands and its people as highly idealized. However, Gauguin “can be understood within a larger tradition of white men who travelled to ‘faraway’ places”, they write (2001: 102). They criticize the images for operating within the binary opposition of civilization/nature and white/other. One of the photos in the book shows two white men facing the camera. Each of them has one arm stretched out straight to the side, and with their outstretched arm they touch each other’s shoulders. Between them, two native women are standing. Although they stand up straight, their heads do not reach up to

the men's arms. The gaze of the camera contributes to establishing categories of the normal and the exotic, the binary opposition white/dark and a relationship of power (ibid). It is relatively easy to agree with this analysis of gaze and to what it does. Linked up with a resource-oriented perspective of inclusion that seeks to recognize diversity and that understands cultural diversity as a positive resource rather than a problem (Otterstad & Andersen 2012) it is also fairly easy to agree to a description of the photo as suppressive and condescending.

The next photo in Sturken and Cartwright's book is more ambiguous. It shows a boy sitting on the ground with a greyish wall behind him. He is wearing a men's skirt made of leaves and pieces of cloth. Around his neck there is a tight necklace that reaches down to his bare chest. The text explains that he is described as a "Mania" ("Buck of village"). Sturken and Cartwright comment:

Commercial images of natives in ceremonial dress, which were produced throughout the nineteenth century, clearly have different meanings in different contexts. The image ... would mean something very different in the context of this boy's family or village than in the photographic album of the western traveler (2001: 103).

The photograph has a central role in establishing differences, and as Derrida, Sturken and Cartwright have pointed out that difference is central in establishing meaning; meaning is established through difference. The binary oppositions of man/woman, masculine/feminine, culture/nature and white/black are commonly used. However, one needs to be aware that binary oppositions work reductively, seducing us to fail to grasp the complexity of difference (2001: 104). As mentioned earlier, the concept of whiteness can in some respects be criticized for sustaining the white/black binary opposition, but it can be applied as an initial tool for taking a closer look at one's own subject position and open up a discussion of complexity. Dyndahl (2006), as mentioned above, has argued that the deconstruction of binary oppositions is fruitful in order to make visible what is marginalized and what is taken for granted within the field of music education. To make the marginalized visible is understood as an ethical obligation, and therefore necessary for researchers to engage in. Considering kindergarten as a music educational field and music in kindergarten as a field of inclusion/exclusion, I will continue by discussing Amanda's dance in relation to the anthropological gaze, as described by Sturken and Cartwright (2001).

If we had a photograph of Amanda dancing, would we look at her as a family member or as someone exotic, as a photograph from a holiday in a "faraway" country (cf. Sturken & Cartwright 2001)? Or would we be able to truly deconstruct this

dichotomy (family member/exotic) and rebuild it by constituting a *both – and* position? In order to discuss Amanda's possible position as a family member, we would have to deconstruct the concept of family. In a narrow sense, some of the premises for being regarded a family member seem to be that one knows each other well, live under the same roof, possibly have some of the same genes (although as a criterion this is changing with new family structures) and share many of the same memories and values. Children in the western world have been described as emotionally priceless (Zelizer 1994) with tight emotional relations between family members serving as hallmark of a well-functioning family. The resource-oriented approach to diversity in kindergarten indicates that linguistic and cultural diversity ought to be integrated and part of the ordinary (NMER 2011; Otterstad & Andersen 2012). However, a discursive naturalization of the presence of non-ethnic Norwegians does not necessarily lead to inclusion in the sense that one understands each other like in a relationship between family members.

In our search for something to latch on to in Amanda's dance and use of music, do we regard her as a family member or do we look at her with the gaze of a traveler when we utter things like "you dance so beautifully", "what kind of dance is this?" or "other cultures are really exciting"? In my description of Amanda I described her face as "golden". This is in many respects a provoking description that might come across as almost derogatory. On the other hand it could be interpreted as describing her beauty, that is, to be a positive description. But still this description entails the danger of romanticizing and "othering" the described person. (When is it normal to describe a child by underscoring that she has a white face?) Lastly, "golden" can be interpreted as a neutral description of how the girl actually looked, without giving rise to a debate. What effects do such utterances have? Do they enhance inclusion or establish difference? In the introduction I suggested that the discourse on inclusion constitute an "includer" and an "includee", respectively. Typically it is the white adult employed in kindergarten who is urged to include the dark-skinned child. This order is perhaps more in line with the tourist photograph, although with a larger ethical obligation involved. Otterstad and Andersen (2012) cite Vike (2006) and argue that diversity, in the way it is practiced in the Scandinavian welfare states, has a tendency to constitute difference between normality and deviation, between the privileged and deprived, and between the Norwegian and those of a "different" culture. Diversity, they argue, is understood one-dimensionally (2012: 5). The relationship between the "includer" and "includee" is a power relation. If turned upside-down, the dark-skinned child will include the white adult, and one can argue that the adult needs to be interested in including himself or herself in the culture of the dark-skinned child. In the child-child-relations it is often the (advantaged) white child who is to include

the “coloured”, but this can also be turned the other way around, so that Amanda is ascribed a position as family member and the “white” children become exotic – or so that they are both exotic family members, “includers” and “includees”. There are complicated relations between the one who owns the gaze and the one who is gazed at. The one who is gazed at gazes back. Amanda also has a gaze, and her interpretative repertoires regulate how she ascribes meaning to other people’s utterances and actions. A perspective on whiteness is embedded in some of the same structures of power and is not neutral. This implies that a deconstruction of such power relations beyond the concept of whiteness is needed in order to reconstitute a power relation in which everyone wields influence (Allan 2012).

Although systems work to exclude or include people (McIntosh n. d.), inclusion in everyday life will also be individual acts (Butler 2006; Smith 2005). Sturken and Cartwright (2001) criticize the (older) anthropological gaze of reducing people from “other” cultures; they are all made to look the same. From the perspective of intersectionalism it is argued that categories such as race/ethnicity, gender, class and age are each categories that help people to sort, define and understand each other, but that for every person, these categories are intersecting (Knudsen 2006). Thus, a child is never just “a child”. Children are also race/ethnicity, gender, class, age and all the other categories. In addition, the cultural and social effects of such categories are not always visible, for instance how children are brought up and how they through their upbringing are “resourced”, i.e. capacitated for life, are connected to class and ethnicity (Lareau 2002; Stefansen & Aarseth 2011).

A deconstruction of power relations, then, has to take into account the intersection of cultural categories, and aim for a kind of intersectional deconstruction. Nevertheless, there will still be individual differences left unaccounted for.

From a musical perspective the theoretical perspectives presented here call for a discussion of musical discourse. What do we want from music in kindergarten? From the perspective of children’s culture as culture *by* children (Mouritsen 2002; Rasmussen 2001) and inclusion, it seems necessary to work towards shared musical experiences. One of the kindergartens that participated in the study had invited a band to perform in the kindergarten’s large kitchen. While playing one of their songs, the singer asked all the children to stand up and jump and clap their hands to the music. The head of the kindergarten bought the band’s CD, and when this song was played on the CD player, the children gathered on the sofa, jumping and singing along with the music, creating a “being-in-love”-like play situation that included all the children. Such a joint concert experience provided the children with virtually the same background knowledge of the song, making it easier to constitute the hooks’ meaning among the children.

As far as diversity and inclusion is concerned, it seems important to support all the individual children’s musical engagement, as well as creating joint experiences. By understanding children as individuals in the sense that they are subjectivities constituted by the intersection of several cultural categories, one can contribute to the understanding of kindergarten as a place where the musical culture is constituted by the contribution of multiple voices.

## Complication as relief

This article takes as its empirical point of departure an observation of a child of Arabian heritage dancing in kindergarten. It addresses how children themselves often constitute children’s culture in ways that sustain parallel musical cultures rather than a joint culture. Further, it is suggested that offering children with various cultural backgrounds mutual experiences with music can be a way of working towards inclusion, as joint experiences afford mutual constitutive work regarding musical meaning and “hooks” that the children can latch on to when they listen to the same music later.

In her discussion of inclusion, Julie Allan (2012) writes that philosophy does not provide solutions. However, new concepts can stimulate and provoke (Bains 2002). Allan (2012) states that philosophers like Foucault, Derrida, Deleuze and Guattari offer the possibility to “think again” or to *re-think* issues. When it comes to Otterstad and Andersen’s (2012) critique of a resource-oriented approach to diversity, it is interesting to note that Allan points towards a theoretical foundation that understands doubt as something positive and productive. This kind of philosophy can encourage kindergarten staff and children to see themselves as capable of inclusion, she continues. To complicate rather than to explicate is a part of traveling this route, which can be liberating. Provoking thoughts make inclusion a more realistic possibility (Allan 2012).

In this article I have sought to discuss the complexity of children’s musical play in relation to inclusion by taking a closer look at what we see and what we do not see. Our discursive positions clearly have an impact on how we, as professionals – whether kindergarten teachers, music educators or researchers, think about and carry out inclusion in everyday life. Barthes (1973) states that we as human beings are both the masters and slaves of language. Although our subject positions are made available to us through history and culture, we have an ethical obligation to strive towards the master-end of this continuum and work towards changing the discourses that exclude minorities. From popular culture the song lyrics of “Man in the Mirror” by Michael Jackson (1988) tell us to start with our inner selves (i.e. the man in the mirror) to

change the world. From a theoretical perspective Lacan (1973/1998) complicates the mirror image, showing us that what we see elsewhere also “looks back” at us in a narcissist manner, like a mirror. Starting with ourselves, a way of re-thinking the matter of inclusion is to face the ugliness and shame of the lacks of our own gazes and to understand doubt as being positive and productive.

## References

- Allan, Julie (2012). Å tenke nytt om inkludering. In: A.-L. Arnesen (ed.) *Inkludering. Perspektiver i barnehagefaglige praksiser* (pp. 228–246). Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Bains, Paul (2002). Subjectless subjectivities. In: B. Massumi (ed.) *A shock to thought. Expressions after Deleuze and Guattari* (pp. 101–116). London: Routledge.
- Ballard, Glen & Garret, Siedah (1988). Man in the mirror [CD single]. New York: Epic.
- Barthes, Roland (1973). *Mythologies*. London: Paladin.
- Burns, Gary (1987). A typology of “hooks” in popular records. *Popular music*, 6(1), 1–20.
- Butler, Judith (2006). *Gender trouble. Feminism and the subversion of identity* (2nd ed). New York: Routledge.
- Campbell, Patricia Shehan (2010). *Songs in their heads. Music and its meaning in children's lives* (2nd edition). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Covach, John (2005). Form in rock music. A primer. In: D. Stein (ed.) *Engaging music. Essays in music analysis* (pp. 65–76). New York: Oxford University Press.
- DeNora, Tia (2000). *Music in everyday life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dyndahl, Petter (2006). Dekonstruksjon av/og/eller/i musikkpedagogisk forskning. Noen sentrale perspektiver. In: F. V. Nielsen & S. G. Nielsen (eds.) *Nordic Research in Music Education. Yearbook vol. 9* (pp. 59–75). Oslo: NMH-publikasjoner 2007:3.
- Ekrem, Carola, Tingstad, Vebjørn & Johnsen, Helle (2001). BIN-Norden – en historisk och kulturell kontekstualisering. *Tidsskrift for børne- og ungdomskultur*, (43), 149–164.
- Folkestad, Göran (2006). Formal and informal learning situations or practices vs formal and informal ways of learning. *British Journal of Music Education*, 23(2), 135–145. Doi: 10.1017/S0265051706006887



- Frith, Simon (1996). Music and identity. In: S. Hall & P. du Guy (eds.) *On record. Rock, pop and the written word*. London: Routledge.
- Gjervan, Marit, Andersen, Camilla Eline & Bleka, Målfrid (2012). *Se mangfold! Perspektiver på flerkulturelt arbeid i barnehagen* (2nd ed). Oslo: Cappelen Damm Akademisk.
- Griffith, Allison I. & Smith, Dorothy, E. (2005). *Mothering for schooling*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Guss, Faith Gabrielle (2001). *Drama performance in children's play culture. The possibilities and significance of form*. Oslo: Høgskolen i Oslo.
- Include. (n. d.). In *Oxford dictionary of English*. Retrieved from <http://www.ordnett.no/search?search=include&lang=en>
- Inclusion. (n. d.). In *Oxford dictionary of English*. Retrieved from <http://www.ordnett.no/search?search=inclusion&lang=en>
- James, Allison & Prout, Alan (eds) (1997/2007). *Constructing and reconstructing childhood: Contemporary issues in the sociological study of childhood* (2nd edition). London: Routledge Falmer.
- Jaworski, Adam & Coupland, Justine (2005). Othering in gossip. “You go out you have a laugh and you can pull yeah okay but like ...”. *Language in society*, 34(5), 667–694.
- Jørgensen, Marianne Winther & Phillips, Louise (1999). *Diskursanalyse som teori og metode*. Fredriksberg: Roskilde Universitetsforlag/Samfundslitteratur.
- Knudsen, Susanne V. (2006). Intersectionality. A theoretical inspiration in the analysis of minority cultures and identities in textbooks. In: E. Bruillard, M. Horsley, S. V. Knudsen and B. Aamotsbakken (eds.) *Caught in the web or lost in the textbook*. Paris: IUFM de Caen.
- Lacan, Jacques (1973/1998). *The four fundamental concepts of psychoanalysis. The seminar of Jacques Lacan. Book XI*. J.-A. Miller (ed.). New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Lamer, Kari (2001). *Du og jeg og vi to! Om å fremme barns sosiale kompetanse. Teoriboka*. Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag.
- Lamer, Kari (2002). *Du og jeg og vi to! Et rammeprogram for sosial kompetanseutvikling. Håndboka*. Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag.
- Lareau, Annette (2002). Invisible inequality. Social class and child rearing in black families and white families. *American Sociological Review*, 67(5), 747–776.
- Lather, Patti (2004). Ethics now. White woman goes to Africa and loses her voice. Retrieved 30th April 2013 from <http://people.ehe.osu.edu/plather/files/2008/09/ethics.pdf>

- McIntosh, Peggy (n. d.). Unpacking the invisible knapsack. Retrieved 29 April 2013 from <http://www.library.wisc.edu/edvrc/docs/public/pdfs/LIReadings/InvisibleKnapsack.pdf>
- Mouritsen, Flemming (2002). Child culture – play culture. In: F. Mouritsen & J. Qvortrup (eds.) *Childhood and children's culture* (s. 14–42). Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark.
- Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research [NMER] (2011). Framework plan for the content and tasks of kindergartens [framework plan]. Retrieved from [http://www.udir.no/Upload/barnehage/Rammeplan/Framework\\_Plan\\_for\\_the\\_Content\\_and\\_Tasks\\_of\\_Kindergartens\\_2011\\_rammeplan\\_engelsk.pdf?epslanguage=no](http://www.udir.no/Upload/barnehage/Rammeplan/Framework_Plan_for_the_Content_and_Tasks_of_Kindergartens_2011_rammeplan_engelsk.pdf?epslanguage=no)
- Otterstad, Ann Merete & Andersen, Camilla Eline (2012). “Ressursorientert tilnærming til språklig og kulturelt mangfold”. Diskursive lesninger av inkludering i barnehagen. *Nordisk barnehageforskning*, 5(2), 1–21.
- Potter, Jonathan & Wetherell, Margareth (1987). *Discourse and social psychology. Beyond attitudes and behaviour*. London: Sage.
- Rasmussen, Kim (2001). Børnekulturbegrebet – set i lyset af aktuelle barndomstendenser og teoretiske problemstillinger. In: B. Tufte, J. Kampmann & B. Juncker (eds.) *Børnekultur. Hvilke børn? Og hvis kultur?* (s. 31–51). København Akademisk Forlag.
- Rud, Even (1997). *Musikk og identitet*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Samuelsson, Ingrid Pramling & Carlsson, Maj Asplund (2009). *Det lekende, lærende barnet i en utviklingspedagogisk diskurs*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Smith, Dorothy (2005). *Institutional ethnography. A sociology for people*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Stefansen, Kari & Aarseth, Helene (2011). Enriching intimacy. The role of the emotional in the “resourcing” of middle-class children. *British Journal of sociology of education*, 32(3), 389–405.
- Sturken, Marita & Cartwright, Lisa (2001). *Practices of looking. An introduction to visual culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tarr, Bill (1976). *Now you see it, now you don't! Lessons in sleight of hand* (Vintage books edition). New York: Random House, Inc.
- Vestad, Ingeborg Lunde (2010). *To play a soundtrack. How children use recorded music in their everyday lives*. *Music Education Research* 12(3), 243–55. doi: 10.1080/14613808.2010.504811

Vestad, Ingeborg Lunde (2013). Barns bruk av fonogrammer. Om konstituering av musikalsk mening i barnekulturelt perspektiv [Children’s uses of recorded music. On the constitution of musical meaning from the perspective of children’s culture]. PhD diss., University of Oslo.

Wetherell, Margareth & Potter, Jonathan (1992). *Mapping the language of racism. Discourse and the legitimation of exploitation*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Zelizer, Viviana A. (1994). *Pricing the priceless child. The changing social value of children*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

## Noter

- 1 The new sociology of childhood builds on the sociological work from the 1970s, but aimed in its beginning to move research on children center stage, away from a marginalized position within sociology. James and Prout (1997/2007) abstract some of the new sociology of childhood’s predominant and characteristic features. According to James and Prout the most important theme within this paradigm is that childhood is to be understood as a social construction. The institution of childhood can be thought of as an interpretative frame for understanding the early years of human life, and this institution varies cross-culturally. A second theme is that childhood can never be separated from other variables such as class, gender, and ethnicity. In this text on children and music a parallel approach is applied to children’s everyday uses of music; these can never be separated from other variables, such as the notions of children and childhood. The third theme is that children’s social relationships and cultures are worthy of study in their own right. However, as James and Prout address in the second edition of their book, this position entails that children’s worlds are not constructed as “worlds apart”. Rather, children are seen in their relationships with adults. In this text on children and music, children’s musical cultures are constructed as co-productions between children and adults. Thus, children are not regarded merely as the outcome of social processes, but as actors within them.

Associate Professor, PhD  
Ingeborg Lunde Vestad  
Hedmark University College  
Department of Music  
[ingeborg.vestad@hihm.no](mailto:ingeborg.vestad@hihm.no)