

CHAPTER NINE

SHARED RESEARCH PRACTICES ON AND ABOUT MUSIC: TOWARD DECOLONISING COLONIAL ETHNOMUSICOLOGY

SUSANA SARDO

To live together in the world means essentially that a world of things is between those who have it in common, as a table is located between those who sit around it (Arendt 1958: 52).

***Abstract.** The contemporary contexts relating to ethnomusicology and other disciplines interested in music research are changing radically. Two main reasons are at the crux of this change: (1) the presence of music in academia has grown substantially over the last 20 years; consequently, research has considerably increased; (2) the persons who until now have been crucial for our research, especially in the field of ethnomusicology, are now very conscious of their importance for research outcomes and sometimes refuse to accept their “objectification”. The latter can be seen across a large spectrum of contexts, such as those belonging to the field of subaltern studies focusing on depressive urban communities or socially marginalised groups, as well as in the context of “high culture” universes-research developed by art music performers about contemporary composers, for example. In both cases, the researcher represents an academically powered subject of authority. His/her work aims to promote the involved subjects but, mainly, to validate him/herself as the owner of a kind of knowledge which is socially more qualified. This situation generates deep asymmetries and has been discussed by different scholars, proposing methods and research actions based on “participative-action-research” practices. This is the case of Orlando Fals Borda in Colombia*

(1991, 2003) and Paulo Freire in Brazil (1970, 1990, 1996). This paper proposes to develop a critical approach to the canonical practices of research in music and ethnomusicology. I suggest the possibility of building shared research practices in music and ethnomusicology, based on the articulation of individual knowledges and experiences (academic/non-academic; performance/composition; practice/theory) for the construction of common new knowledge. In this sense, shared research practices can generate a de-hierarchisation of knowledges and, therefore, define a possible condition for the construction of more ecological relations between different subjects involved in research.

The contemporary scenario relating to research in ethnomusicology and other disciplines interested in music is radically changing. We can identify many signs of these changes, amongst which I would like to emphasise four:

- (1) Research has increased considerably due to the diversification of disciplinary fields in music in academia.
- (2) The number of academic jobs for researchers in the areas of arts, social sciences and humanities is decreasing. In the field of ethnomusicology, many researchers are searching for different job opportunities outside universities, in a process that Klisala Harrison designates “the second wave of ethnomusicology” (Harrison 2014).
- (3) The search to justify a social and humanist importance for music disciplines, in a context that Timothy Rice defines as “times and places of trouble” (2014), prioritises applied forms of research over forms of fundamental research.
- (4) People in the field refuse to accept their “objectification” and are very aware of the importance of their music for academic interests. Therefore, researching the music of the “other” requires different modes of being in the field.

The latter can be seen in a large spectrum of contexts, from those belonging to the field of subaltern studies focusing on depressive urban communities or socially marginalised groups, to “high culture” universes such as research developed by art music performers about contemporary composers.

This text proposes to develop a critical approach to the canonical practices of research in music and ethnomusicology. I will focus on the last two signs listed above and I will use my experience as a researcher, focused on postcolonial issues, and as a teacher belonging to a European university where Western art music occupies a hegemonic place. I

suggest the possibility of drawing *shared research practices* in music and ethnomusicology, based on the articulation of individual knowledges and experiences (academic/non-academic; performance/composition; practise/theory) for the construction of common new knowledge. In this sense, shared research practices can generate a de-hierarchisation of knowledges and, therefore, define a condition of possibility for the construction of more ecological relations between different subjects involved in research.

Adjectivised ethnomusicology

Over the last 15 years, we have witnessed different ways of labelling ethnomusicology through a process of adjectivising the word. The case of *Applied Ethnomusicology* is probably one of the most vibrant. In 2007, a study group on Applied Ethnomusicology was established at the core of the International Council for Traditional Music (ICTM) advocating “[...] the use of ethnomusicological knowledge in influencing social interaction and course of cultural change”¹. Since then the study group has organised five international meetings and two publications: a book entitled *Ethnomusicology: Historical and Contemporary Approaches* (Harrison, Mackinlay and Pettan 2010), and a special issue of a transdisciplinary academic journal, edited by Klisala Harrison, under the subject of *Applied Ethnomusicology in Institutional Policy and Practice*² (2016).

Before the ICTM’s initiative, a section on Applied Ethnomusicology was created within one of the largest professional associations, the Society for Ethnomusicology (SEM) based in the USA. According to the SEM website:

The Applied Ethnomusicology Section is devoted to work in ethnomusicology that puts music to use in a variety of contexts, academic and otherwise, including education, cultural policy, conflict resolution, medicine, arts programming, and community music³.

Members of these two organisations authored the book edited by Svanibor Pettan in 2015: *The Oxford Handbook of Applied Ethnomusicology*. In this book, as well as in all publications related to the field, it remains clear that “Applied Ethnomusicology is elusive to define” as it is expressed by the promoters of the SEM’s section on the subject, where it is possible to find different attempts at a definition. Nevertheless, the definition expressed in the mission statement of the study group, approved during the 39th World Conference of the ICTM held in Vienna in 2007, is probably the most consensual one and is clearly based on a

particular way of doing ethnomusicology instead of defining an academic field. According to this definition, Applied Ethnomusicology is

[...] the approach guided by social responsibility, which extends the usual academic goal of broadening and deepening knowledge and understanding toward solving concrete problems and toward working both inside and beyond typical academic contexts (Harrison and Pettan 2010: 1; Pettan 2015: 30).

This quotation is frequently used in different texts and websites related to Applied Ethnomusicology. The way it is adopted is always an attempt to defend the field towards its consolidation in academia. However, it is clear that all scholars that identify themselves with this adjectivised proposal for the discipline are particularly worried about the role of the same discipline beyond academia. Their perspective intends to provide a disciplinary transformation, especially in the field of research practices, including new practices without losing previous ones. As Svanibor Pettan argues, this is not a case of antagonising or opposing academic ethnomusicology but “should be viewed as its extension and complement” (Pettan 2015: 30).

The inclusion and adoption of new research practices in ethnomusicology is a consistent action of disciplinary transformation. But the main goal of this action is to contribute to social transformation and justice and this can only occur if ethnomusicology acquires what Jeff Todd Titon defines as a “practical use”. Titon, from his North American place, refers to Applied Ethnomusicology as

[...] a music-centered intervention in a particular community, whose purpose is to benefit that community [...]. It is music-centered, but above all the intervention is people-centered, for the understanding that drives it toward reciprocity is based in the collaborative partnerships that arise from ethnomusicological fieldwork. Applied ethnomusicology is guided by ethical principles of social responsibility, human rights, and cultural and musical equity (Titon 2015: 4).

In fact, what intersects all the discourses that tried to justify the existence of a so-called Applied Ethnomusicology is the necessity to justify the ethic existence of the discipline through its capacity to add new insights to societal challenges. This means that the traditional technology of “inquiring, observing, analysing and writing” is clearly insufficient. Acting outside academia is also required in order to transform. However, adjectivising ethnomusicology with the word applied is also insufficient, as it doesn't establish any distinction from the traditional way of doing

ethnomusicology. In fact, as Anthony Seeger argues, “every time we design a syllabus or teach a class we are applying ethnomusicology” (Seeger 2013: 21-22). What applied ethnomusicology distinctly proposes is to use particular practices of research “based in the collaborative partnerships” (ibid) whose results, *in extremis*, can include non-conventional academic outputs⁴. In this sense, other ways of adjectivising ethnomusicology seem to be more appropriate in establishing a difference because they explicitly address particular practices in the way as they are labelled. I’m referring to the case of *participative* ethnomusicology, *collaborative* ethnomusicology, *dialogical* ethnomusicology, or *engaged* ethnomusicology. These adjectives are focused on *how to do* ethnomusicology while labels like *advocative*, *adjustment*, *administrative* or *action* ethnomusicology (Pettan 2008: 90) as well as *public* (Averill 2003; Dirksen 2012; Ostashewski 2014), are more focused on *why* and *for whom* to do ethnomusicology.

I do not intend to use this paper to discuss the conceptual impasse that each of these terms implies or the semantic load that each designation involves. I believe that all the texts related to one or more of these different ways of classifying ethnomusicology include a large discussion on the subject towards the adoption of a particular designation and the rejection of the others. I’m referring to texts by Jeff Todd Titon (1992, 2015), Angela Impey (2002), Gage Averill (2003), Svanibor Pettan (2008, 2010, 2015), Samuel Araújo (2008, 2009, 2013), Klisala Harrison (2012, 2014, 2016), Rebecca Dirksen (2012), Marcia Ostashewski (2014), and Ana Flávia Miguel (2016). All of them are related by their greater or lesser proximity to the big umbrella called Applied Ethnomusicology. And in spite of disagreeing about how to adjectivise ethnomusicology, all of them are trying to overcome the niggling question: *what kind of advantage does ethnomusicological research offer to the musicians or other subjects studied by the ethnomusicologists?*

This question is valid in almost all contexts. And although the majority of the projects developed under the umbrella of the above “adjectivised” ethnomusicology are related with depressed contexts (conflict situations, subaltern groups, refugee people, liminal communities, forced migrants, etc.) we can also apply the same question to research developed about popular or art music (eg: research developed by a performer about the work of a living composer). In all cases, the researcher represents a subject of academically empowered authority, whose work contributes to unveiling knowledge about the subjects involved, but above all to the validation of the researcher himself/herself as the holder of a socially better qualified knowledge. The greater the social distance between the researcher and his or her study context, the greater the abyssality between

this relation of gain and interest⁵. Until what point can we continue to "use" musical knowledge and the "music of others" as a way of legitimising our professional situation as academics and, consequently, to legitimise the disciplines we represent?

The legacy of the South

This situation is apparently new in ethnomusicology and in music studies in general. It is, however, presented in other fields of humanities, especially since the end of the First World War, through the use of the so-called "participative-action-research". The action of the American sociologist John Collier to solve inter-racial conflicts between Amerindians towards culture preservation in the USA during the 1940s and 1950s is a landmark. But it is especially in the south—referred to by the Portuguese sociologist Boaventura de Sousa Santos as the "abysmal south"—after the pioneering work of the Brazilian Paulo Freire and the Colombian Orlando Fals Borda, where we can testify a research praxis defined by Eric Lassiter as "an effort to serve humankind more directly and more immediately" (Lassiter 2005: 83). Lassiter addresses this while referring to the aims of collaborative ethnography as a practice which "puts together academic and applied anthropology" (*ibidem*).

The emphasis on "putting together academic and applied" subsumes an apparent antagonism. And it is this antagonism that guided the actions of Paulo Freire and Orlando Fals Borda, among others, in a way that today is addressed as a decolonial epistemology. It is an antagonism that includes the colonial dichotomy between academia and "the rest" where academia is a place of knowledge and "the rest" is a place for inspiration or to apply the knowledge produced in academia. It is an antagonism that generates hierarchies of knowledges and, by consequence, reiterates colonial hierarchies produced by the hegemony of a concept of academia shaped, especially, in the north (Europe and the USA). When Paulo Freire defines his concept of the "Pedagogy of the Oppressed" he clarifies that it is "a pedagogy which must be forged with, not for, the oppressed (whether individuals or peoples) in the incessant struggle to regain their humanity" (2005: 46). According to Freire, this goal, which aims to erase oppressor-oppressed contradiction, can only be achieved if the oppressed confronts "reality critically, simultaneously objectifying and acting upon that reality" (*ibid*: 51).

Freire's proposal emerges in a particular context of "conscientisation" which, from his perspective, is the basis for emancipation. As the Colombian sociologist Orlando Fals Borda points out, this was a

convergent movement that started in 1970 in different “poor underdeveloped regions where there was blatant economic exploitation and human cultural destruction” (2001: 27).

The year 1970 was the first in a series of turning points for those of us (mostly in sociology, anthropology, education and theology) who were increasingly preoccupied with life conditions which appeared unbearable in communities around us [...]. We just could not blind or silent when we were witnessing—and suffering—the collapse of positive values and attitudes toward humankind and nature (ibid).

Fals Borda's concerns, common to those of Paulo Freire and Darcy Ribeiro in Brazil, Ginige Vernon Stanley de Silva (GVS de Silva) in Sri Lanka, Niranjana Mehta in India, Anisur Rahman in Bangladesh, Rodolfo Stavenhagen in Mexico, Marja Swantz in Tanzania, and Father Camilo Torres and Maria Cristina Salazar in Colombia, among others (Fals Borda 2013), are the result of a critical confrontation with two realities whereby he was one of the involved subjects. One reality was a result of post-colonial policies that generated tremendous social inequities and discriminations, which, in some cases, are completely opposite to any values of humanity. Another reality derives from the conscientisation that the ways in which academia were training researchers was completely distant from the social reality and this constitutes a deep ethical problem for any researcher, but especially in human and social sciences.

This seemed to require a radical critique and reorientation of social theory and practice. Our conception of Cartesian rationality, dualism and “normal” science were challenged, as we could not find answers or supports from universities and other institutions which had formed us. Therefore, as we became more and more unsatisfied with our training and with our teaching, many of us broke the shackles and left the academies. During the course of the year 1970 some of us started to formalize alternative institutions and procedures for research and action focused on local and regional problems involving emancipatory educational, cultural and political processes (Fals Borda 2001: 27).

The result of this indignation, coincidentally raised in such different places⁶, has led to radical positions in a dual emancipation convergence process: academic researchers challenged traditional academia and social theory, breaking their relationship with the past and breaking down the wall between academia and “the others”. Consequently, research was then conceived as a participatory action, by including different subjects from different backgrounds (academic and non-academic) in the research team,

and carrying out a very collaborative process toward social justice and the transformation of academia itself⁷.

This process has emerged on three continents where the history of modern colonisation—begun in the 15th century by Europeans—has generated an extremely oppressive human landscape. In spite of the "colonial difference" (Mignolo 2008) the end of political colonisation engendered a very violent process in the former colonies: the former oppressed incorporated the oppressor (the coloniser) and produced abyssal social ghettos in the new postcolonial countries. This is very well explained by Paulo Freire in his "Pedagogy of the Oppressed", a text that constitutes, in my opinion, the most complete inspiration for what has been called "decolonial thinking" in the aftermath of postcolonial theory⁸.

The decolonial agreement is an epistemological proposal, based on the evidence that all knowledge has been produced over a colonial matrix patented by Western academia. Therefore, we are all living under a kind of Occidentalism, neglecting the idea that "Geo-politics of knowledge goes hand in hand with geo-politics of knowing" (Mignolo 2009: 2). In this sense, the decolonial project proposes what Walter Mignolo defines as a de-linking:

[An] epistemic disobedience which takes us to a different place, to a different "beginning" (not in Greece, but in the responses to the "conquest and colonization" of America and the massive trade of enslaved Africans), to spatial sites of struggles and building rather than to a new temporality within the same space (2011: 45).

Mignolo's statement is based on the seminal text of Anibal Quijano where he argues that

It is necessary to extricate oneself from the linkages between rationality/modernity and coloniality, first of all, and definitely from all power which is not constituted by free decisions made by free people (Quijano 1992: 19; 2007: 177).

This is a significant manifesto against all types of epistemicide, whether related to the production of knowledge or to the forms of knowledge considered valid. Accepting the coloniality of power and of knowledges is also accepting the existence of a kind of epistemic hegemony (of colonial origin), which hides other possibilities of understanding the world. That is why Walter Mignolo argues that delinking is "necessary because there is no way out of the coloniality of power from within Western categories of thought" (2011: 45). This radical

vision is at the origin of new ways of addressing conciliation possibilities of different epistemologies toward what Boventura de Sousa Santos defines as an “ecology of knowledges”. Founded on the idea that all knowledge is inter-knowledge, the ecology of knowledges is “based on the recognition of the plurality of heterogeneous knowledges (one of them being modern science) and on the sustained and dynamic interconnections between them without compromising their autonomy” (Santos 2007: 66). However, to achieve a knowledge ecology—an idea that is also inscribed in Raimon Panikkar's proposal of “diatopic hermeneutics” (1979), or Walter Mignolo's “border thinking” (2000) or António García Gutiérrez's “Logical Pluralism” (2007)—, two premises must be adopted. The first is to consider all knowledges that until now have been relegated to a status of secondary or subaltern knowledge because they cannot be translated as a scientific and rational. Music and all other expressive behaviours, which are provisional or ephemeral, have been one of them (Sardo 2013). The second premise is to adopt other ways of producing knowledge by developing practices of working *with* people rather than working *on* people. At this point, we are going back to the way that research should be conceived and the proposal of Fals Borda (2001, 2013) and Paulo Freire (1990) for participatory action research on social justice and academic transformation. And we also return to how music can be included in the “convergence of disciplines” toward a real ecology of knowledges, and the proposals of the above collection of “adjectivised ethnomusicology”.

As I wrote elsewhere (Sardo 2016), in the case of some ethnomusicological practices, the dichotomy between academic and non-academic analyses has gradually disappeared. This is probably due to the fact that ethnomusicologists share with their field collaborators the passion for music and also the ability to perform it. Therefore, a very early awareness arose that the voice of the ethnomusicologist could not be valid without the voice and the action of their field collaborators. And this must be conducted through an attitude of deep dialogue and conscious awareness whereby the knowledge that the ethnomusicologist produces is a result of the interactions he/she has with their collaborators in the field, always in dialogue, always in a constant process of mutual learning, on the path toward the decolonisation of knowledge. Since the turn of the century, some ethnomusicologists have taken a step forward and began to develop their research with the conscientious intention of acting in the field as mediator for transformation and social justice. That is when adjectivised ethnomusicology began.

What kind of concerns intersects this new way of doing ethnomusicology? First, the ethnomusicologist becomes aware that he/she

is always acting alongside their collaborators in the context of research, surpassing the myth of invisibility already marked by many scholars after Merriam like K. Gourlay (1978). Second, the ethnomusicologist seems to assume acting as a transformative practice that can contribute to the success of others and not just their own. Thirdly, there is a tendency to disseminate the results of the research carried out in a "collaborative" manner, that is, presentations are made at conferences by groups that involve academic and non-academic researchers who have played different roles in the same research. The results of this action frequently result in co-authored publications. Finally, there is a tendency to transform the ethnomusicologist into a kind of militant/activist /advocate, decentralising the research focus now more devoted to humanitarian causes and often political awareness, than to music. In this case the research results can be quite risky for ethnomusicology. As Miguel García points out, trying to conjugate militancy with research,

[...] seem to show that both actions become mutually impoverished. The questions that must be answered in this case are: if what is sought is to do militancy, isn't militancy without research more effective? And, if what is sought is to do research, won't it be more effective without militancy? (García 2013: 2)

Based on this approach, I want to focus my analysis on my own action as an ethnomusicologist since 1987. I will analyse two research experiences carried out with different migrant communities in Lisbon: Goans and Cape Verdeans. I believe that I have always consciously worked with my collaborators in a transformative sense—and not only for myself—by adopting full visibility in the field and by authoring collective outcomes. I have never used any of the adjectives listed above to classify my praxis in ethnomusicology. But revisiting my past, I can see these adjectives in many of my actions as a researcher, starting in 1989 by replacing the word "informant" by "collaborator" in all of my texts and discourses.

Experience 1-Goan music and dance in Lisbon: double bind collaboration

In 1989, after three months of fieldwork in Goa, India, in late 1987, I started a research project for my master's degree about the Goan migrant community in Lisbon. My research was focused on the activities of a music and dance group (Ekvât) that was founded in the same year at the core of the House of Goa, a non-profit organisation established in Lisbon

in 1987 whose mission is *to defend, maintain and promote Goan culture in Lisbon* (Cf. Statute Article No.4). This mission reveals at least two main concerns: firstly, the need to create a space for Goan culture in Lisbon so that its differences from the host culture can be defined and made known; secondly, the will to extend this space over time to the younger generations that must take responsibility for this by joining and engaging in this project, thereby learning about their own Goan identity. The second objective is achieved by the Ekvât group, which generates multiple effects, attracting members of the first and second generation of migrants, the latter dedicated mainly to dance and attracted by the possibility of performing on stage, dancing the "exoticism of India" in Lisbon through the representation of Goa.

The Ekvât group incorporated about 25 members including singers, instrumentalists and dancers. And the profile of its members was completely different from that which I was learning through the bibliography related to migrant music at the time. In fact, the Goans in Lisbon—at least those with whom I worked—were not a fragile minority struggling for reconnaissance, for their rights or to strengthen social ties within the host society. They were particularly well integrated in Portugal, occupying important professional positions, all graduates of Portuguese or foreign universities, in some cases holding doctorate degrees.

I was completely obedient to the methodological canon of fieldwork, using participant observation as my primary tool. So, I tried to be as invisible as possible and take action to avoid any modification of the field that could be attributed to me. However, as the Ekvât group incorporated doctors, sociologists, professors, economists and researchers from different fields of science, I began to be questioned about the results of my own research. Different members of the group wanted to know what kind of data I was collecting, what kind of methodology I was using, and what kind of conclusions I was drawing from them. In addition, they were advising me on the bibliography, not only about Goa, but about social theory or anthropology, especially relating to migration phenomena.

All of this was very carefully done by my collaborators in the sense of helping me and, at the same time, with great curiosity about my work as an ethnomusicologist. In addition, I was invited to their homes for dinner and family parties, so our relationship became closer and closer and our friendships grew. I was working on the "Goan identity" in the diasporic context, but in a way, I was feeling that my identity was changing as much as a person as an ethnomusicologist (Sardo 1997). And after discussing the subject with my academic supervisor, I decided to share with the group members the texts that I was writing for my master's dissertation about

them. Thus, they became my first advisors and discussants, and all the chapters of my thesis, including the theoretical chapters, were reviewed and discussed by them before my examinations.

After almost 30 years I'm still collaborating with the group, performing with them whenever needed, and immediately after my master's degree they started to use some of my texts in their presentations or programme notes. I also helped the group to release their first CD (1998) as a mediator with the publisher and the sound engineer and also by helping to rehearse the group for live studio recordings. And whenever they request, I provide new repertoire for their programmes, repertoire that I have been collecting in Goa since 1987. At the same time, whenever I need it, the group helps me in my academic activities, performing during my classes or at different venues, such as musical moments during international conferences of ethnomusicology organised by myself or by my colleagues in Portugal.

Experience 2-Cape Verdean music and dance in Lisbon: the case of Skopeofonia

In 2013, I returned to the field of music and migration, this time related to the Cape Verdean community in Lisbon. The situation was quite different as I was working with a project funded by the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology, as a result of an outstanding international assessment especially grounded by our adoption of the so-called "participative-action-research". The project title is *Skopeofonia: Participatory and dialogical research about musical practices in neighbourhood Kova M*.

Skopeofonia is a team project based at the University of Aveiro and in a neighborhood of Lisbon, the Cova da Moura neighbourhood (Kova M), inhabited mainly by immigrants of Cape Verdean origin. It is inspired by the Musicultura project, which has been developed in the Maré favela of Rio de Janeiro since 2003 under the guidance of the ethnomusicologist Samuel Araújo (Araújo 2008). A transdisciplinary team—which incorporates academic researchers, and researchers who are not linked to the university—has raised Skopeofonia. The latter are musicians, residents of the neighbourhood, politically involved in actions of militancy, and the unemployed. In total, our team included eleven researchers: eight from the University and three from the neighbourhood.

The main goal of the project was to show how music in a neighbourhood of Cape Verdean immigrants, branded by a public image associated with drug trafficking and crime, could reverse the threatening

image that the neighbourhood seems to have in the Portuguese public opinion. In order to fulfil this goal our practical work was dedicated to mapping the different musical practices existing in the neighbourhood and to building a sustainable archive of those practices where we included all the agents and materials responsible for them. In order to democratise the communication of our research, we decided to prioritise the use of audio-visual tools instead of writing academic papers, as video technology was considered more accessible for all the members of the team.

During our research, our weekly meetings were shared between the University and the neighbourhood: three days in the university and three days in the neighbourhood. At the University of Aveiro, the researchers from the neighbourhood attended classes in *script writing*, *digital imagery* and *music creation*, in addition to meetings for discussing different themes related to research. The days in the neighbourhood were dedicated to field work, interviews with the different musicians and musical agents, reading and discussing academic texts, bibliographic research, and participation in almost all activities related to music which took place in Cova da Moura. At the same time, the team was present in critical situations—such as the entrance of police in the neighbourhood with consequences that were sometimes tragic—, promoted events both in the neighbourhood and in the university, while ensuring that music was always at the centre of every event. In addition, we were invited to present and deliver papers at international conferences like the ICTM World Conference in Kazakhstan and the annual meeting of the African Music and Dance Study Group of the ICTM in South Africa. Furthermore, the team spent ten days sharing experiences with the Musicultura Group in Rio de Janeiro, during August 2014, participating in the regular meetings of the group in the favela of Maré and also at the university.

To a certain extent, Skopeofonia was a place of learning and transformation for all of us. Each member of the team had different knowledge and experiences of music, as a musician, as Cape Verdean and as Portuguese. However, sharing our different knowledge and experiences opened the possibility of reaching places of knowledge that we could not achieve if we all had the same background. After three years of working together, the way we share our individual identity has produced changes in all of us—and even in our professional or family milieu—fostering an increasingly stronger proximity between the different worlds each of us represents.

Decolonising colonial ethnomusicology

What kind of differences can we find in these two examples according to different methods and knowledge production? Is it possible to identify any of the adjectivised ethnomusicology listed above? While in the first case I was following the field and changing my method on the path of reciprocity and collaboration, in the second case we went to the field with the very objective proposal of using “dialogical/participatory/collaborative ethnomusicology”. We may say that in both cases knowledge was collectively produced. However, while in the first case this was a consequence of the field conditions and requests, in the second case this was a previous condition of the academic segment of the team, which was later incorporated by all. And this establishes a big difference according to the use of methods toward knowledge production and the conscience of the collective. Actually, when analysing my own discourse for this text, I realise that in the case of the work with the Goan community, the distinction between *me* and *them* is quite visible. I accept and highlight that a collective knowledge has been produced but I still maintain a split between the *researcher* and the *researched*. In addition, and despite a strong collaboration that has been taking place since 1989 between myself and the members of the Ekvât, I acquire a double bind condition: when I’m dancing or playing with the group I disappear, that means that I’m integrated in the collective and acting as a team member. Nevertheless, when I’m acting in academic contexts using knowledge that was produced collectively with the group, my academic identity becomes visible and I represent myself individually.

In the second case, as can be seen in this text, the collective discourse overlaps the individual and there is no difference between *me* and *them*. There is only “we” or “the team”. And, in this case, in spite of recognising our differences, we also recognise that it was because of these differences that we could articulate and complement previous knowledges and experiences of each other in order to collectively produce new knowledge. A knowledge that represents not only the Cape Verdean community in Cova da Moura neighbourhood and its music, but also the academic and theoretical labour related to the subject. We may say that in this case the permeability between academic and non-academic members of the team was better balanced as all of us were participating in all research activities, including writing collective papers, conference presentations and audio-visual documents. And in the name of the team the *ethnomusicologists* “disappeared”, as all of us were self-identified as *researchers*.

How can we classify these two ways of doing ethnomusicology? Is it possible to apply any of the above-mentioned adjectives to these two examples? What I have learned with my experience is that it is possible to legitimise new research practices, which I define as *shared research practices*, inspired by the concept of *shared anthropology* proposed by Jean Rouch in his work on ethnographic filmmaking. According to Rouch, by adopting shared anthropology

The anthropologist has ceased to be a sort of entomologist observing others as if they were insects (thus putting them down) and has become a stimulator of mutual awareness (hence dignity). This type of totally participatory research, as idealistic as it may seem, appears to me to be the only morally and scientifically feasible anthropological attitude today (Rouch 2003: 44).

Rouch used the camera and filmmaking as technology for sharing anthropology. In the case of music studies, and in particular ethnomusicology, we already have an important tool to share: music. In fact, research in ethnomusicology has a particular characteristic: all participants in the research scene, academics and non-academics, have a relationship with music as musicians. In this sense, *shared-research-practices in ethnomusicology are a way of producing collective knowledge on or about music by putting together different subjects who own different musical knowledges and experiences*. It connects people with different skills and proficiencies on research and, furthermore, with different interests in it. And this is based on the agreement that producing knowledge through research is a goal that can be achieved using different methods and approaches.

Shared research practices do not imply the sharing of canonical methods of social sciences and humanities. They can include canonical methods, but they can also include non-academic processes to achieve knowledge, something that only can happen through practice. Consequently, research goals will be defined during research and collectively through a process that requires more time than conventional methods. Therefore, all subjects enrolled in the research must be conscientious that they are all required to contribute towards the production of new knowledge on or about music by sharing their own expertise.

To some extent, shared research practices in ethnomusicology are a proposal to incorporate all the forms of adjectivised ethnomusicology (collaborative, participatory, dialogical, engaged, advocate, etc.) in order to unveil knowledge that is hidden every time we intend to classify (music?) (García Gutierrez 2007). It is also a means of inquiry to the

coloniality of knowledge and power (Quijano 2005) by promoting a contra-hegemonic action that allows the inclusion of other forms of knowledge and other possibilities to produce knowledge on and about music.

According to my experience, shared research practices in ethnomusicology should be applied in all contexts definitely erasing the abyssality between categories of knowledge (forms of knowledge and knowledge production). However, we cannot avoid the ideological framework of this proposal—linked to participatory action research—and the entire historical and social context where it was born. In fact, we tend to adopt shared research practices in ethnomusicology every time we are trying to contribute towards the social transformation and justice, both in academia—by reinforcing the place of all musical knowledges as “important/valid” knowledge—, and in society—by working side by side with musicians through participatory, collaborative, or dialogical actions in research. Ideally, shared research practices in ethnomusicology lead us to the dilution of all social and knowledge hierarchies as all subjects participating in the research and the knowledges they have must be seen as fundamental to it. They also contribute to the ecology of knowledges by encouraging logic pluralism as a way of interpellating conflict and social asymmetries.

Nevertheless, this process has its limits that are defined by a social disorder and a timetable. Actually, when the research ends, each of the subjects involved (?) return to their original social place: the ethnomusicologist back to the university and the non-academic researchers, now former researchers, return to their condition as musicians. Those limits are more visible in the case of academic research related to master’s or PhD degrees, or even when we intend to apply for individual funding programs. In fact, the requirements for academic works include the identification of precise goals, timetables, and outcomes that must be previously defined by the research fellow. This means that the desire to produce collective knowledge through sharing research practices is institutionally blocked by academia itself where, coincidentally, we develop the contra-hegemonic framework to propose those practices. When the research ends, the master’s or PhD degree is attributed to one single person who signs the written document then endorsed by academia. Sharing research practices, in these cases, can only be adopted if all the research fellows involved accept their dual condition facing the limits of academia: they are all researchers during the research process but only one can author the research results. And this unfair situation can only be overcome if all participants can find some added value in the research.

In fact, living together for a while and sharing experiences and knowledges would certainly produce changes in all individuals taking part, in some way, of a process of research and, ideally, in the context where they interact. In this sense, shared research practices in ethnomusicology are an instrument that allows all people acting as researchers to access each other's worlds and operate in them to produce more democratic, more ecological and certainly more just knowledge through music and about music. Shared research practices promote a possibility to *work with* instead to *work on*, by transforming individual and frequently abyssal shared knowledges and emancipatory knowledges, through collective actions toward decolonising colonial ethnomusicology.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Ana Flávia Miguel and Aoife Hiney for their critical and very careful review of a preliminary version of this text. I would also like to thank all my colleagues in Skopeofonia and my friends in Ekvât who have guided me to think about these issues, as well as all the colleagues with whom I have discussed, in recent years, the so-called applied ethnomusicology. Finally, I want to thank my colleague and friend Samuel Araújo and the Musicultura Group, with whom I learned so much about how to act with and in the field.

Notes

¹ Cf: <http://www.ictmusic.org/group/applied-ethnomusicology>.

² As announced on the website, this special journal issue will be transformed into a book, to be translated into Chinese and published in China in 2017. (Cf: <http://www.ictmusic.org/group/applied-ethnomusicology>)

³ Cf: http://www.ethnomusicology.org/?Groups_SectionsAE.

⁴ This transformation is inspired by the orientations of other disciplines, in particular anthropology, where the use of the "applied" concept has been documented since the beginning of the 20th century. The term has been widely used in different contexts and with different proposals, since Radcliff-Brown first adopted it in his 1930 paper "Anthropology as Public Service and Malinowski's Contribution to It" (Van Willigen 1993).

⁵ This concern is valid for many research fields, including the embryonic "artistic research", but for ethnomusicology in particular. The most interesting evidence of this move is the theme chosen by the organisers of the first joint conference of the two largest professional associations of ethnomusicologists (SEM and ICTM), held in Limerick, Ireland in 2015—Transforming Ethnomusicological Praxis through

Activism and Community Engagement.

⁶ Fals Borda refers to this movement as a surprising “telepathy induced by the urgency for understanding the tragic, unbalanced world being shaped, and by the stimulation of recent revolutions” (2001: 27).

⁷ One of the most recent projects related to this issue is taking place in the University of Brasilia since 2010, organised by the anthropologist José Jorge de Carvalho. The “Encontro de Saberes” (meeting of knowledges) consists of the inclusion of masters of traditional knowledge—such as indigenous and quilombolas—as teachers of regular subjects offered in institutions of higher education. Subjects include health, architecture, performing arts and so on, setting the dialogue between different sources of knowledge for an interepistemic knowledge. (More info can be seen here: <http://www.inctinclusao.com.br/encontro-de-saberes/edicao-2010>).

⁸ It is not my goal, in this text, to focus on the subject of “decolonial thinking”, a critical –and sometimes polemical–approach that emerged especially in the South, the abysmal South, as proposed by Boaventura de Sousa Santos in *Epistemologies of the South* (2016). Since the 1990s, it has been developed as a possibility for fighting against the epistemicide produced by a monologic way of interpreting the world and knowledge, imposed by the “global North”. However, its connection with the adoption of different research practices in human and social sciences is evident. Some important proposals and manifests were signed by Walter Dignolo (2007, 2009, 2011), Enrique Dussel (2011), Anibal Quijano (2005), Edgardo Lander (2005), Nelson Maldonado-Torres (2011), and Lewis Gordon (2011), among a huge bibliography, which has greatly increased since the turn of the 21st century.

Bibliography

- Araújo, Samuel. 2008. “From Neutrality to Praxis: the Shifting Politics of Ethnomusicology in the Contemporary World.” *Musicological Annual*, edited by Svanibor Pettan, 44 (1): 13-30.
- . 2009. “Ethnomusicologists Researching Towns They Live in Theoretical and Methodological Queries for a Renewed Discipline.” *Musicology* 9: 33-49.
- Araújo, Samuel, and Vincenzo Cambria. 2013. “Sound Praxis, Poverty, and Social Participation: Perspectives From a Collaborative Study in Rio de Janeiro.” *Yearbook for Traditional Music* 44: 28-42.
- Arendt, Hannah. 1958. *The Human Condition*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Averill, Gage. 2003. “Ethnomusicologists as public intellectuals: Engaged ethnomusicology in the university.” *Folklore Forum* 34 (1-2): 49-59.

- Dirksen, Rebecca. 2012. "Reconsidering Theory and Practice in Ethnomusicology: Applying, Advocating, and Engaging Beyond Academia." *Ethnomusicology Review* 17. Accessed May 23 2017. <http://ethnomusicologyreview.ucla.edu/journal/volume/17/piece/602>
- Dussel, Enrique. 2011. "From Critical Theory to the Philosophy of Liberation: Some Themes for Dialogue." *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World* 1 (2): 16-43.
- Fals Borda, Orlando and Luis E. Mora-Osejo. 2003. "Context and diffusion of knowledge: a critique of Eurocentrism." *Action-Research* 1 (1): 29-37.
- Fals Borda, Orlando. 1991. *Knowledge and social movements*. Santa Cruz: Merrill Publications, University of California.
- . 2001. "Participatory Action Research and Social Theory." In *Handbook of Action Research: Participative Inquiry and Practice*, edited by Peter Reason and Hilary Bradbury, 27-37. London: Sage Publications Inc.
- . 2013. "Action Research in the Convergence of Disciplines." *International Journal of Action Research* 9 (2): 155-67.
- Freire, Paulo. 1990. "Criando métodos de pesquisa alternativa: aprendendo a fazê-la melhor através da ação." In *Pesquisa Participante*, edited by Carlos Rodrigues Brandão, 34-41. São Paulo: Editora Brasiliense (1st ed. 1981).
- . 1996. *Pedagogia da autonomia*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra.
- . 2005. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York, London: Continuum (1st ed. 1970).
- García, Miguel A. 2013. "A challenging scenario." *El Oído Pensante* 1 (1): 1-3.
- García Gutiérrez, Antonio. 2007. *Desclasificados. Pluralismo lógico y violencia de la clasificación*. Barcelona: Anthropos Editorial.
- Gordon, Lewis. 2011. "Shifting the Geography of Reason in an Age of Disciplinary Decadence." *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World* 1 (2): 95-103.
- Gourlay, K. A. 1978. "Towards a Reassessment of the Ethnomusicologist's Role in Research." *Ethnomusicology* 22 (1): 1-35.
- Harrison, Klisala. 2012. "Epistemologies of Applied Ethnomusicology." *Ethnomusicology* 56 (3): 505-29.
- . 2014. "The Second Wave of Applied Ethnomusicology." *MUSICultures* 41 (1): 57-72.

- . 2016. “Why Applied Ethnomusicology?” *COLLeGIUM: Studies across Disciplines in the Humanities and Social Sciences* 21: 1-21.
- Harrison, Klisala, Elizabeth Mackinlay and Svanibor Pettan, eds. 2010. *Applied Ethnomusicology: Historical and Contemporary Approaches*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Impey, Angela. 2002. “Culture, Conservation and Community Reconstruction: Explorations in Advocacy Ethnomusicology and Participatory Action Research in Northern Kwazulu Natal.” *Yearbook for Traditional Music* 34: 9-24.
- Lander, Edgardo. 2005. *A colonialidade do saber: eurocentrismo e ciências sociais. Perspectivas latino-americanas*. Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires: CLACSO.
- Lassiter, Luke E. 2005. *The Chicago Guide to Collaborative Ethnography*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Maldonado-Torres, Nelson. 2011. “Thinking through the Decolonial Turn: Post-continental Interventions in Theory, Philosophy, and Critique—An Introduction.” *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World* 1(2): 1-15.
- Mignolo, Walter D. 2000. *Local Histories/Global Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border-tinking*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . 2007. “Delinking: The rhetoric of modernity, the logic of coloniality and the grammar of de-coloniality.” *Cultural Studies* 21 (2-3): 449-514.
- . 2008. “Hermenéutica de la democracia: el pensamiento de los límites y la diferencia colonial.” *Tabula Rasa* 9: 39-60.
- . 2009. “Epistemic Disobedience, Independent Thought and Decolonial Freedom.” *Theory, Culture & Society* 26 (7-8): 1-23.
- . 2011. “Epistemic Disobedience and the Decolonial Option: A Manifesto.” *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World* 1 (2): 44-66.
- Miguel, Ana Flávia. 2016. *Skopeologias: música e saberes sensíveis na construção partilhada do conhecimento*. PhD diss. University of Aveiro.
- Ostaszewski, Marcia. 2014. “Engaging Communities and Cultures in Ethnomusicology: An Introduction.” *Musicultures* 41 (2): 1-14.
- Panikkar, Raimon. 1979. *Myth, Faith and Hermeneutics*. New York: Paulist Press.

- Pettan, Svanibor. 2008. "Applied Ethnomusicology and Empowerment Strategies: Views From Across the Atlantic." *Musicological Annual* 44 (1): 85-99.
- . 2010. "Music in War, Music for Peace: Experiences in Applied Ethnomusicology." In *Music and Conflict*, edited by John Morgan O'Connell and Salwa El-Shawan Castelo-Branco, 177-192. Urbana, Chicago, and Springfield: University of Illinois Press.
- . 2015. "Applied Ethnomusicology in the global era." In *The Oxford Handbook of Applied Ethnomusicology*, edited by Svanibor Pettan and Jeff Todd Titon, 29-52. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pettan, Svanibor and Jeff Todd Titon, eds. 2015. *The Oxford Handbook of Applied Ethnomusicology*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Quijano, Anibal. 1992. "Colonialidad y modernidad/racionalidad." *Perú indígena* 13 (29): 11-20.
- . 2005. "Colonialidade do poder, Eurocentrismo e América Latina." In *A colonialidade do saber: eurocentrismo e ciências sociais. Perspectivas latinoamericanas*, edited by Edgardo Lander, 107-30. Buenos Aires: CLACSO.
- . 2007. "Coloniality and Modernity/Rationality," *Cultural Studies* 21 (2-3): 168-78.
- Rouch, Jean. 2003, 1973. "The Camera and the Man." In *Ciné-Ethnography*, edited by Steven Feld, 28-46. Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. 2016. *Epistemologies of the South: justice against epistemicide*. New York: Routledge.
- . 2007. "Beyond Abyssal Thinking: From Global Lines to Ecologies of Knowledges." *Review*, 30 (1): 45-89.
- Sardo, Susana. 1997. "A Pesquisa em Etnomusicologia e a Problemática da identidade." *Revista Portuguesa de Musicologia* 7-8: 203-09.
- . 2013. "Etnomusicologia, música e ecologia dos saberes." *Música e cultura: revista da ABET* 8 (1): 66-77.
- . 2016. "Ethnomusicology and its Sisyphus. Inter-knowledge, dialogue and prudence for a disciplinary (re)classification." In *World Music Studies*, edited by Regine Algayer- Kaufmann, 149-66. Berlin: Logos Verlag.
- Titon, Jeff Todd. 1992. "Music, the Public Interest, and the Practice of Ethnomusicology." *Ethnomusicology* 36 (3): 315-22.
- . 2015. "Applied ethnomusicology: A descriptive and historical account." In *The Oxford Handbook of Applied Ethnomusicology*,

edited by Svanibor Pettan and Jeff Todd Titon, 4-29. New York:
Oxford University Press

Van Willigen, John. 1993. *Applied Anthropology: An Introduction*.
Westport: Bergin & Garvey.