

Crossing affordances: Hybrid music as a tool in intercultural music practices

Camilla Kvaal

ABSTRACT

Crossing affordances: Hybrid music as a tool in intercultural music practices

The article discusses aspects of intercultural musicking and how to analyse hybrid music as a tool in such practices. It investigates joint musicking as a field of negotiation, the result being more and less beneficial to the participants. The article thus suggests a way to analyse discourse in music as much as about music. Musical engagements are addressed in terms of affordance. By applying Simondon's concept of the technical object, musical affordance is explored as played and made according to certain functions or playing rules, struggling to achieve a certain technicity, or way of functioning. The music realised may block or maintain various affordance logics. This perspective makes hybrid music a matter of point of view, as a relation of relations, implying different affordances at stake for different people. According to Simondon, a technical object is at the same time an aesthetical object, leaving it open to the discovery of new functions and playing rules not intended in the making. This suggests two different dimensions to music as a tool in intercultural practices: the fact that practices are maintained or interrupted and the fact that something new may happen. The article is based on an on-going research project and contains data material from an ethnographic fieldwork carried out within the group Fargespill (Kaleidoscope). Further results will be published in a forthcoming dissertation.

Keywords: intercultural musicking, hybrid music, affordance, technicity, Fargespill

When I first heard the combination of [name of song] and that one.. (sings), I felt the combination was a bit um.. ... But then it turned out to be cool with the dance of [other actor] and ... when we saw it in total, and then just «oh, but this is in fact quite cool», and you hear feedback from people, «oh, [actor], you know what, this was totally s-,» then I think it wasn't that bad after all, it was only me being in that little square box of mine.

(Interview with Fargespill actor 03.02.15)

Introduction

To research an intercultural music practice involves considering a meeting of diverse music, people, practices and identities. Burnard et al. (2016: 1-2) states that though there is no established agreement on how the concept 'intercultural art' should be defined or enacted,

[t]he term 'intercultural' acknowledges the complexity of locations, identities and modes of expression in a global world, and the desire to raise awareness, foster intercultural dialogue and facilitate understanding across and between cultures.

In such practices, music material is exchanged between participants and often strategically combined into hybrid forms, investing in it a belief that the music affords communication and sharing. This is a fundamental idea within the collaborative performance group Fargespill (Kaleidoscope):

[The] shows consist of songs and dances that participants have brought with them from their various countries of origin. These cultural treasures are combined with elements of our own Norwegian folk heritage. The result is a meeting between different historical and cultural threads that merge in an expression of our common future (Hamre, 2012: 12).

If music, and preferably hybrid music, is regarded as the key to success in this respect, it is of particular interest to put it under scrutiny to see how it works. The present discussion takes as its point of departure an on-going ethnographic project in which

I explore how participants in Fargespill engage with music in various ways and how these engagements may cross and work upon each other, for instance amplify or block each other. In this article I will arrive at a notion of hybridity in which it is not sufficient to speak about pieces of music as merged material in and for itself; it is also necessary to consider how the music works, not in general, but for the different people involved. As I will show, this implies exploring the *logics* according to which the participants engage with the music, and according to which the music is combined. Such a notion of the hybrid allows multifaceted exploration of musical affordances considering simultaneous and different layers of exclusion and inclusion and possibilities for experiencing music in old and new ways. This way hybridity entails both critical and aesthetic perspectives.

My theoretical and analytical framework is inspired by Tia DeNora's (2000, 2003, 2013) ethnographic work including her notions of *affordance* and *musical event*. By engaging a kind of discourse analysis allowed by some of Gilbert Simondon's (1958/1980, 1958/1992, 1958/2011) perspectives, I pick up her call to situate the musical experiences in question properly and to rethink the dichotomy of music on the one hand and the subject or society on the other. Simondon's perspectives afford an understanding that music and the people engaging with it are simultaneously constituted according to what I prefer to call *logics*¹, or one could say playing rules. By considering music as a *technical object* created to fulfil certain functions, or in other words reach a certain *technicity*, I attempt to research music *as* discourse as well as *in* discourse. The hybrid music may thus serve as a kind of emerging knot suitable for the analysis of music, subjects and society connected. The way Simondon (1958/1980: 1) sees it, «culture must come to terms with technical entities as part of its body of knowledge and values». The hybrid music becomes a pivot in a micro-sociological discourse analysis.

Starting with a brief introduction to Fargespill as my field of research and presenting some recently published work by other scholars, I continue to discuss affordance in light of technicity and how this may suggest a specific take on hybridity. I arrive at some aspects considering the faith in music as a tool² for intercultural equity practices.

1 By using the term *logics* I intend to keep open a notion of musical sense that is not exclusively associated with musical meaning in the way for instance *logics* of signification, interpretation or representation are. *Logics* may indicate any function or use, as I will show referring to Simondon, or *affordance*, as I will show referring to DeNora. The term also hints at Bourdieu's (1980/1990) perspectives on habitual *logics* of practice.

2 For the purpose of this article I mainly use the word «tool» in a vernacular way to indicate that music is seen as a remedy or device intended to accomplish something, though Simondon frequently uses *tool* as

Through and through I will attempt to answer the following question: *How may a notion of the hybrid read with the philosophy of Simondon allow for multifaceted readings of affordances and power structures in intercultural music events?*

Fargespill – an intercultural³ collaborative music practice

Fargespill (Kaleidoscope) is an ensemble of young people from all over the world now living in Norway.⁴ Some of them are newly arrived refugees, others are Norwegian born with Norwegian born parents or parents born outside Norway. The group aims to make spectacular performances presenting music and dance brought to the group by the participants. The adventure started in Bergen in 2004 and has turned into an enterprise with several local departments in Norway and some in Sweden. They are about to reach a sort of «best practice» status within Norwegian inclusion and equity policy and they are bestowed with prizes. Western Norway University of Applied Sciences and Fargespill has developed a teacher educational course based on what they call the Fargespill method (Western Norway University of Applied Sciences, n.d.). When Fargespill was part of the official program for the 200th anniversary of the Norwegian Constitution, the show was described as «a great polyphonic mantra of togetherness» (The Norwegian National Opera & Ballet, 2014). Over and over again they move their audience, myself included, to tears.

The performances are facilitated by a group of leaders and administrators running and promoting the foundation. The leaders encourage the participants to bring their own music and dance material, often referred to as «the treasure hunt». They are also in charge of the rehearsals, often in co-operation with the actor who knows or «owns» the song. The music and dance is arranged and choreographed, mostly

a term. For instance, he sees the artisan as a tool-bearer (Simondon 1958/1980). Read (2016: 104) writes that «[t]he tool is recognised as subordinate to the individual». A machine, on the other hand, «is a part of a technological system, a system that displaces the mastery of the individual, incorporating individuals and their tools as part of its general functioning». A Simondonian perspective of music as a tool may thus add the dimension that music, and the individuals engaging with it, may enter a constellation with a machine, which alienates the individual from the overview of the connection between the immediate task and the totality, thus «seeing the part without grasping the whole, or understanding the totality without grasping the parts» (Read, 2016: 105). To become aware of the technicity of the machine, to become aware of the implicit logics or playing rules governing it, is the way to overcome this alienation.

3 Fargespill does not frequently talk about the ensemble as 'intercultural', but the study that is based on their methods is labeled 'intercultural pedagogy' (Western Norway University of Applied Sciences, n.d.).

4 Fargespill literally means «play of colours». Kaleidoscope is their English branding name. Visit www.fargespill.no to see how they present themselves and their project.

combined into hybrid expressions. The material is preferably associated with ethnic and traditional music cultures, but the arrangements also feature jazz and popular music forms like hip-hop. The founders of Fargespill stress that what they do is an art project, not a social project, as they have discovered that «toning down the social motives has positive social consequences» (Hamre, 2012: 12). The insistence on the artistic aspect also aims at rejecting simplifying and «almost racist» (quote from interview with leader 03.02.15) tendencies to assume that all projects involving a culturally diverse group are social projects by definition. Nevertheless, the leaders do not underplay the social and empowering implications of the project, in which music and dance play a major part: «Kaleidoscope is about giving each other the best our cultures have to offer in the form of song and dance» (Hamre, 2012: 12). When the kids bring «musical gifts», there is potential for a successful meeting. Learning and singing the kids' songs «open some doors», «reaching out to them, meeting them halfway» (Bræin, 2012: 35). The powers assigned to music by the Fargespill staff are not limited to the value of music as a gift:

[Folk music] is the defining element. It's not possible to use Disney or Shakira. The material we use speaks to everyone because it has universal qualities. The kids immediately love each [others'] songs, no matter where in the world they come from (Bræin, 2012: 35).

Our experience is that *Kaleidoscope* represents an effective method of integration and that music, dance and song are the best arenas for an equal, constructive meeting between people of different backgrounds, experiences and cultures. We must facilitate these sorts of meetings if we are to reap the rewards that a diverse society has to offer (Hamre, 2012: 13).

These quotes may serve as examples of two common perceptions regarding music as a tool in intercultural music practices. The first is that music is some kind of universal language available to all people across cultures. The other, maybe leaning on the first, is that meeting through music, and maybe particularly hybrid music, brings people closer to each other. White (2012) has similarly pointed out these two conceptions as discursive patterns in the rhetorics of 'world music'. He states:

For fans of world music, cultural hybridity is valued not only because it combines desirable aspects of several identities (thus representing the possibility of having the "best of all worlds") but also because it is the protagonist of

an epic myth of the future: a world without racism, without hate, and with a multitude of colors living together in harmony and style (White, 2012: 195).

There seems to be a good force in music; it seems like a bridge over troubled water. An important concern in my work is *how, if at all, do such powers work?*

Until recently, there has been little, if any, criticism of Fargespill. In a textual reading of Fargespill's performances, Solomon (2016: 188) draws attention to how the «Fargespill formula» becomes a staging of «a reassuring story white Norwegians tell themselves about multicultural Norway». As a general example of this formula of combining foreign and Norwegian elements, Solomon refers to a recording of a performance published on YouTube in 2009. He sketches the musical form and overall texture by listing the national origins of the music featured in the medley, the themes of the lyrics, the duration of the different parts, and a short characteristics of musical features such as «highly rhythmic arrangement» and «free-floating layer». He concludes that what appears to be, or is said to be, a musical dialogue, is in fact a monologue, because all difference is related to the Norwegian as the normal standard. In response to this, Kvifte (2016, my translation) writes that

integration is not about performances; it is about possibilities for practical, collaborative action. Thus, Fargespill is a success no matter how the performances appear – the success is implied in the collaboration between the participants during the process.

I would claim that both Solomon and Kvifte may be right. Their analyses coincide with some of my findings too. However, I also suspect that they may be occasionally wrong, as they both draw general assumptions. Solomon reads a general structure into a piece of music. His experience is no guaranty that this is how Fargespill participants, or the audience for that matter, experience the event, though he might belong to communities sharing similar experiences. On the other hand, that they are preoccupied with the process rather than the performance, as Kvifte states, is no guaranty that the structures do not work the way Solomon suggests. According to my findings, the audience's experiences and what happens on stage are very present in the musical negotiations. I will not accuse Kvifte of ignoring in general how music is shaped by people's conceptions, but in this case, the argument seems to be that power is just a matter of interpretation, and that a piece of music is a piece of music, regardless of different views. Both the critical perspectives of Solomon and Kviftes more open ended, processual approach may be fruitful, yet none of them will suffice. This is, the way I

see it, a question of assembling a method and a theoretical framework appropriate for a kind of microsociological analysis which I will now turn to.

Method

DeNora uses affordance as a pivot to conduct ethnographic studies that are careful not to generalise from a particular, maybe private semiotic analysis, to assure «a 'right' level of generality» (DeNora, 2003: 58). She therefore calls for case studies that are designed to

consider both questions [how society shapes music and how musical discourse shapes society] at once, melding them together as a theory of musical affordance and a practice of ethnographic investigation, historically informed, devoted to the study of how music's affordances are accessed and deployed (DeNora, 2003: 58).

As I read her, DeNora thus makes a crucial point: the mutual shaping of society and music is also a matter of possibilities through music. The question of what music makes possible is connected to what makes music possible. In my project I try to investigate how this two-way flow of possibilities works for the people involved. Through interviews and observations I explore different participants' relations to and comprehensions of what might be taken to be the same event, for instance engaging with a song, a dance, a musical detail or the Fargespill ensemble in general. My fieldwork in Fargespill was carried out over a period of seven months. I conducted 19 semi-structured interviews with a total of 17 participants, four of them leaders of the project and the others young dancers and musicians participating in the ensemble. For a total of around 60 hours I observed the participants on stage during concerts and off-stage and backstage during rehearsals and concerts. During the interviews I initiated conversations around their experiences of musical events, asking for instance what they appreciated or what they found difficult. Some times they showed me by singing or dancing and taught me how to do it, and I would follow them. This way I was able to generate different affordance logics which I thought might be at stake.

Affordance

The aforementioned descriptions by the Fargespill staff of what music may be good for can be articulated by the notion of *affordance*, describing a mutual relation between a living being and its environment. Gibson, from a point of view of perception psychology, states that «[t]he affordances of the environment are what it *offers* the animal, what it *provides* or *furnishes*, either for good or ill» (Gibson, 1979/2015: 119). DeNora (2000, 2003), introducing the concept to music-sociological studies, states that «to speak of ‘what music makes possible’ is to speak of what music ‘affords’» (DeNora, 2003: 46). Here we can imagine examples like marching, remembering a friend, putting a baby to sleep or understanding each other across cultures. It is worth remarking that music can be bad for something as well, depending on values or actions in question. A crucial idea of affordances according to both Gibson and DeNora is that what the environment affords is equally dependent on the living beings who percept it, that is how their preconceptions and interests contribute to how it is perceived. This mutual formation demands a rethinking of the subject-object dichotomy. I suggest it is relevant to speak not just of *what music affords* but also simultaneously *what affords music*. As Chemero (2012: 18) states, we can tell something about observer and environment, but nothing about observer or environment separately. Music is marked by the persons who engage with it, and the personal engagements are marked by the music.

Taking a closer look at the musical experiences in Fargespill, they are not just a straightforward outcome, and they are certainly not straightforwardly universal. Two actors may relate to the same song quite differently. One actor describes one of the songs as a «touching and sad song»:

And when we sort of stand together and ... are giving our best and just sing it out ... I feel that, like ... (draws breath) ... that we are all in it together, in a way, in the pain, sort of. (Interview with actor, 03.02.15)

If I try to put this in terms of affordance, it might be something like *the music affords a feeling of companionship and compassion*. Another actor describes the same song as a «really atmospheric song»:

So you, you like totally forget that you are standing there ... singing with a bunch of people ... in Fargespill. You are sort of inside the song. (Interview with actor, 15.10.14)

In terms of affordance, it might be something like *the music affords to forget the others and be one with the song*. One might think they were conflicting experiences, yet clearly they are not in this example. One actor's 'giving it all together' might as well amplify another actor's 'being one with the song' and vice versa. It would not be correct to state that they have the same experience, though according to some logic it could be compatible, but they might very well have the experience that they experience the same.

DeNora (2003: 49) puts up a scheme for analysing what she calls a *Musical Event*, «a specific act of engagement with the music». The scheme features the importance of considering actor(s), music, and further conditions and environment, both material and discursive. I read the scheme as a kind of reminder of «how we might begin to situate music as it is mobilised in action and as it is associated with effects» (DeNora, 2003: 49.), in other words: affordances. So far, DeNora's take on affordances in a musical event works quite well for my purpose. It underscores how music affords something to the listeners according to how they experience it. However, I find it necessary to expand DeNora's model to account for different analyses connected to different subjects, as it is clear that these analyses do not coincide. Though these experiences exist side by side, maybe without anyone even noticing that they differ, there are musical situations where the participants' conditions of experiences do not co-exist that peacefully. Rather than amplify each other, they block each other. This is an observation note from a dance rehearsal, where [Actor 1] is teaching the group a particular dance:

The dancers are practising to a recorded drum track. [Actor 1] plays the basic beat, a 3+3+2 clave, on a djembe, as the beat is not audible in the recording. [Actor 1] leaves the drum to rehearse with the others, but soon returns to it, counting «one-two-three, one-two-three, one-two» to direct the other dancers. [Actor 2] approaches [Actor 1] and offers to do the drumming. [Actor 2] starts off steadily with the basic pattern and after a while puts in a rhythmic fill. [Leader] turns towards [Actor 2] with a smile doing flamenco like moves. Soon [Actor 2] breaks into energetic elaborative fills, and the dancers lose it, stop and laugh. [Actor 1] approaches [Actor 1], smiles and says: «You can drum. It's OK. I'll drum with you.» [Actor 1] insists on the basic pattern and [Actor 2] is soon following. However, it doesn't take long before [Actor 2] breaks out of the pattern (Based on field note, 06.10.14).

The way I read it, the drummers play according to quite different logics. To [Actor 1], the basic pattern is *a steady compass for dancing*. To [Actor 2] it seems that it is *a*

point of departure for playful improvisations. The two ways of engaging with it, or the two affordances, seem incompatible in this event. Either it is impossible to dance or it is boring to play.

Technicity

Music as played, made and conceived of according to the logics of what it affords, is very similar to how Simondon (1958/1980) describes a technical object. Artefacts are made according to ways of functioning, and every refining or repairing of a technical object is performed in line with this. The musical material as a part of the environment is conditioning what is possible and may thus be conceived of as troublesome, counteracting the functioning of the object, or the object's technicity. By pointing to how objects occur in this way, Simondon re-establishes the link between an object and the environment in relation to which it is shaped.

[I]n trying to understand technicity it is not enough to start with constituted technical objects; objects emerge at a certain moment, but technicity precedes and surpasses them; technical objects result from an objectification of technicity; they are produced by it, yet technicity is not exhausted in these objects and is not entirely contained in them. (Simondon, 1958/2011: 410)

I find it rewarding to read such principles of function analogous to affordance. The logics to which people engage with music may be connected to a wider «outcome» like doing your homework, being famous, expressing yourself or mending society, but also to structural engagements with musical sounds and gestures. The actual act of drumming according to this or that logic may in turn have implications for who gets to play for an audience or who will have success, because the audience has certain affordance preferences or expects a certain technicity. Making music together may thus be understood as Foucault's notion of power caught in the very act, as «an action upon an action» (Foucault, 1982/2001: 340). DeNora (2000: 124) states that «aligned with and entrained by the physical patterns music profiles, bodies not only *feel* empowered, they may be empowered in the sense of gaining a capacity». Negotiations about how music should sound and be played, and further what is musical quality, happen according to some logics. How music sounds and how music is experienced are closely tied together. What we further make of it, whether the logics are assigned

to a cultural habitus, institutional framing, personal inclinations or other situational circumstances, should for the moment be unclear. Maybe it matters, maybe it doesn't. Thus, there is no structural hierarchy outside or overarching the microstructural crossroads. The structures are crystallised *in* them, abling and disabling according to affordance logics.

Hybridity according to affordance and technicity

Thus, when Fargespill is described as «a meeting between different historical and cultural threads that merge in an expression of our common future» (Hamre, 2012: 12), there is reason to consider the potential problematic in this, which engages a notion of the hybrid. What do such merging threads imply, and what do they look like «in real time»? If music is played and appropriated according to logics, it is not sufficient to have a typological take on the hybrid (see e.g. VanValkenburg, 2013), merely considering two pieces of music or musical genres in terms of the music «itself», combined into a new one. Nor is it sufficient to read the hybrid as an ambiguity of meaning and use of an object, due to different cultural takes on it (e.g. Bhabha, 1994/2004: 55), though this is certainly an important point. The technicity of an object also shapes what it affords. Hence, a musical hybrid may look different according to different affordance logics. One Fargespill actor says that «the atmosphere» of a certain song is «killed» when it is combined with a new beat, because the initial rhythm disappears: «It's like the spinal cord of the song, that rhythm» (Interview with actor, 03.02.15). Regardless of whether this is happening because the drummer is unaware of the spinal cord affordance, prefers other affordances or suspects that the audience would be ignorant of that affordance, the combination does not look like a hybrid to the actor because the music does not really afford the crucial affordance. However, that does not mean that any combination is fatal or that a combination is fatal in any way. The actor also explains how someone playing chords to the traditionally chordless music «creates a lovely atmosphere» (Interview with actor, 03.02.15). A musical hybrid in this sense may look a lot like a technical object the way Simondon describes it:

The technical object stands at the point where two environments come together, and it ought to be integrated into both these environments at the same time. Still, these two environments are two worlds that do not belong to the same system and are not necessarily completely compatible with each other. Hence, the technical object is delimited to a certain extent by human

choice which tries to establish the best compromise possible between these two worlds (Simondon, 1958/1980: 54).

Furthermore, this is also similar, as I read it, to an *event* according to Deleuze. An event in Deleuze's perspective (and he draws heavily on Simondon) is a *disjunctive synthesis* (Deleuze, 1969/1990: 174). It is a combination, an allowance, an affirmation, of two different singular events, or for that matter of two different affordance logics.

Such disjunction does not deny or exclude, it is strongly affirmative (it is prepared to conjoin incompatible predicates): it affirms difference, makes distance a positive characteristics, thus allowing the conjoining of the two series that remain apart by the circulating event. The disjunctive synthesis is the logical operation that is needed by a philosophy of absolute or 'asymmetrical' difference, not the traditional philosophy of identity and representation (Lecerle, 2010: 19).

Thus, a musical event is the ontologically prior unit, not musical substances. A «proper hybrid» in the sense that it works for the people involved, should aim to allow a synergy between the preferred affordances, so that they do not block or overrule each other. A song is not just a song, but a song experienced in a certain way by a certain individual. One actor puts it this way, answering what is a successful Fargespill performance:

In my view it is when you manage to mix two songs, that's like typical for Fargespill when you manage to.. (draws breath) em... like, find common features in two different kinds of song. ... And uh, maybe not mm, change the songs totally, keep the most important components of the music, ... the rhythm, maybe.. (draws breath) and uh, that the melody is kept. (Interview with actor, 03.02.15)

Creating music to bring forth a diverse history and a common future is thus no easy task, especially not when an important expectation is that music affords to represent people and cultures. That brings me to another fruitful aspect of Simondon's philosophy: his concern with the problem of *ontogenesis*, with how things become what they are.

According to Simondon (1958/1992), everything is always more or other than what is *individuated*, than what has momentarily come to be decided as an individual. Individuation is the emerging of an individual, either in terms of a subject or an object. The boundaries and meanings of individuals are perpetually challenged and

revised, because there is a *pre-individual* dimension to everything individuated, which is putting current individuations under pressure, leading to an endless row of individuations. For Simondon, individuals are created through individuation, not the other way around. In fact, no individual exists as essence prior to the individuation of it. Thus, when considering music, people and culture in Fargespill, and of course even Fargespill as an individuation, there is always potentially more or other to it. The technical object, or the hybrid music, is thus

not merely a thing designed by its maker to perform a determined function; rather, it is part of a system in which a multitude of forces are exercised and in which effects are produced that are independent of the design plan» (Simondon, 1958/1980: 31).

This infidelity is what makes the technical object also an *aesthetical* object, according to Simondon. The pre-individual dimension is an opening to different experiences. Thus, a technical object is not purely technical. An artefact made with the prospect of being an aesthetical object, like a piece of art, is not purely aesthetic either; it is at the same time a technical object, because it cannot be grasped except through a logic. «[I]t is the technicity of the artwork that prevents aesthetic reality from being confused with the function of universal reality» (Simondon in Barthélémy, 2013: 207). As I understand it, music may thus be universal only in the sense that there is a pre-individual dimension carrying an unlimited potential, which is not to be confused with a notion that everybody experiences the same *as music, as humans*. Ironically, the universal is what nobody has grasped. Music as grasped ceases to be universal. This adds an interesting reading to what Costall and Richards (2013) call *canonical* affordances. Canonical affordances are normative, encultured, habitual practices. However, «any object with a canonical affordance still also affords, in principle, limitless other uses and meanings» (Costall & Richards, 2013: 88). This way, musical experience and affordances are due to individual and social functions, and at the same time there is a chance, perhaps however small, for a crack in the crust of discourse by which to «escape» old structural habits and make new ones.

Revisiting the quote introducing this discussion, then, it might be read both as an interruption of affordances at stake and as a discovery of new ones: «it wasn't that bad after all, it was only me being in that little square box of mine». However, there is probably no obvious answer to whether the total result of this is inclusion or exclusion for the person in question. It might very well be both at the same time.

Conclusion

To conclude, I suggest that hybrid music may be seen as a knot of individuation, an event, in which it is possible to read how music, people, practices and identities are simultaneously moulded according to affordances, which in the perspectives of Simondon will be playing rules connected to a certain technicity, certain modes of functioning. Following this, musical equity practices such as Fargespill or other intercultural projects, should balance between strategies of practice maintenance and the fact that something new could happen. It is important to consider engagement with musical hybrids in terms of being both technical objects and aesthetical objects in order to address dimensions of power and what potentially escapes them. Musical practitioners should be empowered by raising an awareness of how musical practices may block or amplify each other and that hegemonic practices tend to overrule possibilities for minor music experiences. At the same time there is a responsibility to think musics, individuals, practices and cultures as potentially other than what is individuated at the moment. Several kinds of cross-fertilisations or synergies may occur at strange places and new modes may be discovered or invented.

References

- Barthélémy, J.-H. (2013). Glossary: Fifty key terms in the works of Gilbert Simondon. In A. De Boever, A. Murray, J. Roffe & A. Woodward (Eds.) *Gilbert Simondon. Being and Technology*, pp. 203–231. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994/2004). *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. (1980/1990). *The logic of practice*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bræin, I. (2012). Free experience for sale. In O. Hamre & S. Saue (Eds.) *Kaleidoscope*, pp. 30–43. Bergen: Kaleidoscope.
- Burnard, P., Mackinlay, E. & Powell, K. (2016). Introduction and overview. In P. Burnard, E. Mackinlay & K. Powell (Eds.) *Routledge handbook of intercultural arts research*, pp. 1–9. New York: Routledge.
- Chemero, A. P. (2012). With the most profound misgivings: Interview. *Avant* 3(2), 17–27. Retrieved from <http://avant.edu.pl/en/en22012>
- Costall, A. & Richards, A. (2013). Canonical affordances: The psychology of everyday things. In P. Graves-Brown, R. Harrison & A. Piccini (Eds.) *The Oxford handbook of the archaeology of the contemporary world*, pp. 82–93. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Deleuze, G. (1969/1990). *The logic of sense*. London: The Athlone Press.
- DeNora, T. (2000). *Music in everyday life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DeNora, T. (2003). *After Adorno: Rethinking music sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DeNora, T. (2013). *Music asylums: Wellbeing through music in everyday life*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Foucault, M. (1982/2001). The subject and power. In J. D. Faubion (Ed.) *Essential works of Foucault 1954–1984: Vol. 3. Power*, pp. 326–348. London: Penguin.
- Gibson, J. J. (1979/2015). *The ecological approach to visual perception*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Hamre, O. (2012). What is Kaleidoscope? In O. Hamre & S. Saue (Eds.) *Kaleidoscope*, pp. 12–15. Bergen: Kaleidoscope.
- Kvifte, T. (2016). Fargespill og eksotifiserende akademikere [Kaleidoscope and exoticising scholars]. *Ballade.no*. Retrieved December 30, 2016 from <http://www.ballade.no/sak/fargespill-og-eksotifiserende-akademikere/>
- Lecerle, J.-J. (2010). *Badiou and Deleuze read literature*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Read, J. (2016). *The politics of transindividuality*. Leiden; Boston: Brill.
- Simondon, G. (1958/1980). *On the mode of existence of technical objects*. [London, Ontario]: University of Western Ontario.
- Simondon, G. (1958/1992). The genesis of the individual. In J. Crary & S. Kwinter (Eds.) *Incorporations: Zone 6*, pp. 297–319. New York: ZONE.
- Simondon, G. (1958/2011). On the mode of existence of technical objects. *Deleuze Studies* 5(3), 407–424. doi: 10.3366/dls.2011.0029
- Solomon, T. (2016). The play of colors: Staging multiculturalism in Norway. *Danish Musicology Online Special Edition. 17th Nordic Musicological Congress 2016* 187–201.
- The Norwegian National Opera & Ballet (2014). Fargespill – Ja, vi elsker [Kaleidoscope – Yes, we love]. Retrieved May 25, 2016 from <http://operaen.no/Forestillinger/Arkiv/Fargespill-Ja-vi-elsker/#sectionIntro>
- VanValkenburgh, P. (2013). Hybridity, creolization, mestizaje: A comment. *Archaeological Review from Cambridge*, 28(1), 301–322.
- Western Norway University of Applied Sciences. (n.d.). Interkulturell pedagogikk og fargespilmetodikk [Intercultural pedagogy and Kaleidoscope methods]. Retrieved December 15, 2017 from <https://www.hvl.no/BPED-INT>
- White, B. W. (2012). The promise of world music: Strategies for non-essentialist listening. In B. White (Ed.) *Music and globalisation: Critical encounters*, pp. 189–217. Indiana: Indiana University Press.

PhD Student
Camilla Kvaal
Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences
Faculty of Teacher Education and Natural Sciences
P.O. Box 400
2418 Elverum
Norway
camilla.kvaal@inn.no