COLLABORATIVE FIELDWORK, "STANCE," AND ETHNOGRAPHY

by Deborah Justice and Fredara M. Hadley

Engaged with a discipline built on music, participant-observation, and fieldwork, ethnomusicologists position the experience of music and culture as a lens for studying the social creation of meaning. Ethnomusicologists' methodologies (e.g., approaches to fieldwork, analysis, and ethnography) are collaborative social acts and defining elements of the discipline. Yet in the second edition of *Shadows in the Field*, a foundational reader on ethnomusicological field research, Bruno Nettl laments that "most of our literature treats these matters at best as an essential step toward what we are trying to find out and not as a central activity" (2008:viii). While increasing numbers of ethnomusicologists are engaging fieldwork and its theories as objects of inquiry, this area would benefit from still greater scholarly attention. In this article, we explore the methodological implications of collaborative fieldwork by analysing what happens when ethnomusicologists deliberately go into the field together.

Our call for attention to collaborative fieldwork as a research technique follows developments in ethnomusicological and anthropological methods over recent decades. As anthropologist Luke Eric Lassiter explains, "Collaboration—in very general terms, the wide range of theories and practices that relate to the dynamic and complex processes of navigating joint projects and partnerships—has always been a vital, albeit often implicit, facet of what we do as anthropologists" (2008:vii). "Collaborative fieldwork" is often used to refer to ethnographic techniques that position those studied in equal relation to researchers. Our usage of "collaborative fieldwork," however, refers to scholars going into the field together and working through the ethnographic process as a team. To conduct mutually beneficial collaborative ethnography, each researcher must have a good sense of the identity that s/he brings to the table. When Timothy Rice suggested a remodelling of ethnomusicology (1987), he emphasized the need to attend more closely to the role of individual experience in fieldwork. This move within ethnomusicology followed a general shift towards reflexive ethnography throughout the social sciences (cf. Clifford and Marcus 1986, 2010; Abu-Lughod 1993). In conjunction with helping communities understand and represent themselves over the last fifty years, the voices in ethnographic writing have shifted to acknowledge the complicated relationship that we as analysts share with our researched communities.

As part of this growing awareness, it has become standard practice for ethnographers to position themselves explicitly in their writings. On one end of the spectrum, researchers explain their relationships to communities of study even when self-reflexivity does not form a central aspect of the text. For example, Mark Slobin's *Chosen Voices* (1989) does not centre on his own experience. Rather, the

https://doi.org/10.5921/yeartradmusi.47.2015.0064 Published online by Cambridge University Press

beginning of the text positions Slobin's own Jewish upbringing and his personal relationship to Judaism. Similarly, in Judah Cohen's ethnography on cantorial training (2009), after initial mention of his relationship to the community, Cohen is largely absent from the book. At the other end of the spectrum, ethnographers sometimes integrate themselves into their narrative. For example, Katherine Hagedorn's study of Santería (2001) prominently features her experiences in the field. In *Seize the Dance* (2000), Michelle Kisliuk responds strongly in first-person voice to relationships she observed between the BaAka, with whom she worked, and western Christian missionaries. Between these two polarities, Kay Shelemay's book-length publications present a third option for self-reflexivity. She follows her scholarly monograph about Ethiopian Jews (1989) with a narrative volume about her fieldwork experiences (1994). These varied approaches to self-representation demonstrate ethnographers' increasing awareness of how their socialization to and experiences of research shape their approaches to the work.

By the end of the twentieth century, discussions about these different approaches to the relationships between researchers, subjects, and subject matter had begun to prompt new interest in fieldwork methodology. Over time—for example, building from Ruth Stone's work with phenomenological interviewing (1982) to Anthony Seeger's long-term field immersion (2004) to Matthew Rahaim's embodied ethnography (2012)—scholars came to discuss how their own research experiences and perspectives were variables that needed to be taken into account as they developed better ethnographic methods. As a result, ethnographers transitioned from a product-based focus that tried to represent the lived experience of the people under study to a more process-based approach that also focuses attention on ethnographers' own lived experiences as integral to methodology. Since ethnographers cannot help but perform analyses from their subject positions, they necessarily approach texts, or musical processes from different perspectives, even if they have similar training. Yet despite this awareness, ethnographers rarely conduct fieldwork together in ways that build upon perceptual differences to develop deeper insights and richer scholarship.

A perceptive critic might point to a few teams of ethnomusicologists and some powerful sociological research teams as counter examples. Kay Shelemay (1988) discusses the dynamics of creating a student team to document Syrian-Jewish music in New York City in her article, "Together in the Field." When asked about her participation in this project, ethnomusicologist Carol Babiracki judged the project as pedagogically valuable, but also expressed regret that similar collaborative research involving scholarly peers has not become commonplace in the social sciences:

> I think that the whole academic apparatus—hierarchy, promotion, individualism, competition, disciplines and departments—mitigates against the kind of collaboration you're talking about. When it does happen, it is exceptional. Such collaboration happens in the theoretical sciences (I'm thinking physics) all the time. Just think how it could advance our understanding of "knowledge-making" in the humanities if we had space and incentives to play with it. (Carol Babiracki, pers. comm., 21 July 2014)

https://doi.org/10.5921/yeartradmusi.47.2015.0064 Published online by Cambridge University Press

While students often collaborate on class projects, and a few similar collaborative ethnomusicological projects exist (e.g., Araújo and Cambria 2013; Cohen 2008; Shelemay 2001; Diamond et al. 1994), these ventures are generally based in larger research institutions and lie outside of the purview of the average ethnomusicologist (especially in many North American universities where academic departments often employ only one ethnomusicologist). Many of these projects highlight potential difficulties of working collaboratively. Gathering team members in one place, for example, requires coordinating schedules and funding.

Team work often necessitates methodological and interpretive compromise as well as consideration of the types of relationships that are possible in research contexts. Team projects that rely on uniform procedures and results can limit the relationships built between scholars and the communities they are studying. Indeed, Shelemay's exit surveys following the team research project of Syrian Jews in Brooklyn revealed a disconnect between ethnographers and community members; student ethnographers commented on feeling "anonymous and unable to establish the personal rapport that makes fieldwork a two-way, give-and-take experience" (Shelemay 1988:378). Traditionally conceived models of fieldwork—more commonly employed by ethnomusicologists—often involve greater intensity and duration than that which team research in the social sciences more generally employs. Like anthropologists, ethnomusicologists often deeply immerse themselves in the cultures they study through long-term participant-observation.

As the net result of privileging models of fieldwork that require long-term and experience-driven engagements with communities and individuals, many ethnomusicologists opt to work alone. We may talk through ideas with colleagues, and, likewise, fieldwork often involves an assistant, translator, or spouse/partner who plays a significant role in facilitating and/or talking through the field experience. Research relationships, however, tend to remain unequal, with a distinct sense of ownership over the research retained by one individual. While acknowledgement sections overflow with gratitude, in the main the people who support fieldwork are not ascribed equal status as co-investigators or co-authors in resulting publications. Joint publication ventures are exceptional amongst shelves of single-authored monographs or edited collections featuring a range of authors who may not even know other contributors in the volume. Even shorter journal articles tend to be single-author affairs. Contributions to *Ethnomusicology* (a major journal in the discipline) between 1997 and 2006, for example, bear witness to this tendency: there are only four co-authored articles in this ten-year period. These trends across various types of publication demonstrate strong preferences for solo work.

Ethnomusicology's emphasis on understanding how individuals value sound resonates with the way that Fenella Cannell describes anthropology as positioning meaning as central (2006). Ethnographers want to understand the experience people are having, and why it matters to them; furthermore, ethnographers want to understand how and why it matters to them as researchers. While reflexive ethnography presents a relatively new development, the implications of single researchers' subjectivities, and discrepancies between them, have long interested theoretically minded scholars. By way of example, one well-known

https://doi.org/10.5921/yeartradmusi.47.2015.0064 Published online by Cambridge University Press

early ethnomusicological experiment comparatively analysed approaches to transcription. In 1963 the Society for Ethnomusicology invited Robert Garfias, Mieczyslaw Kolinski, George List, and Willard Rhodes to submit their own transcriptions of the same musical example, a Hukwe song with musical bow. This experiment had a focus similar to the collaborative methodology that we suggest. The 1963 symposium, convened by Nicholas England, did not seek to showcase the intricacies of Hukwe song, but rather to understand how different ethnographers might perform the same analytical task. England concluded that the experiment demonstrated that "one great strength of our Society lies in the varied individual approaches that are (and have been) made toward the data of our discipline" (1964:224). Comparative studies such as these highlight how researchers' stances influence their methods and analyses, which have taken on added importance as the disciplinary focus of ethnomusicology has expanded from data as transcription, recording, and artefact, to encompass process, participation, and the lived experience of ethnography.

From rich examples like the 1963 symposium to now-classic fieldwork texts like Barz and Cooley's *Shadows in the Field* (1996, 2008), Lofland's *Analyzing Social Settings* (2006), and Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw's *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes* (1995), the issue of "varied individual approaches" or subjectivities in ethnographic fieldwork and writing has largely come to be understood as foundational to qualitative research. The elusive quest to engage and understand experience constitutes a messy business that patches together fragments of truth and understanding that combine perspectives from study participants, researchers' scholarly training, and both of their lived experiences. Ethnographers are encouraged to embrace the ambiguities and complex relationships within their research communities, and work these perspectives into their analysis. They are thinking about what it means to observe the musical experience of others through the filter of their own sociomusical experiences. In other words, ethnographers should interrogate their own backgrounds because personal and professional subjectivities are inherent influences on the scholarly process and product.

At the same time, the studies involving reception and phenomenology that examine other communities have the potential, if deployed reflexively, to provide a more nuanced look at the ways researchers themselves perceive and assign meaning. Rather than comparatively analysing ethnographic productions, we suggest that conducting fieldwork together offers a unique opportunity for feedback on ethnographic processes. Simply glossing over differences as "perspective" or "subjectivity" allows this aspect of fieldwork to retain a mythical quality that seems to eschew the possibility of analysis. The mechanisms of individual perception can be identified and studied, but only if we acknowledge particular realities: first, that our individual histories and dispositions effect how we see what we see; and second, that we cannot see these dynamics by ourselves. Working with another social scientist trained to ask similar questions, yet in slightly different ways and from a different vantage point, provides a new level of insight. Working together in the field concretizes the abstract qualities of subjectivity, or stance, making them both easier to talk about and put into practice.

https://doi.org/10.5921/yeartradmusi.47.2015.0064 Published online by Cambridge University Press

"Stance"

Folklorist Harris Berger's recent phenomenological exploration of "stance" provides a hermeneutic for considering the nuances and subjectivities of fieldwork. Phenomenology considers how consciousness is experienced and structured, most often from a first-person perspective. Berger offers "stance" as a new phenomenological term, providing language to talk about the shades of meaning created through a combination of perception, style, and structure. "Stance" refers to "the valual qualities of the relationship that a person has to a text, performance, practice, or item of expressive culture" (Berger 2010:3). Whether it's a musical genre, a particular piece, or dance move, stance begs the question of how a receiver shapes his or her perceptions. Does he like this song because it conforms to a genre or because of his nostalgia for a place mentioned in the lyrics? Does she regard this piece as a "great" and innovative crossover or is it only "good" because of the celebrity of the famous artist experimenting with an unfamiliar style? Berger elaborates, "Whatever the person's role in…shaping or forming [perception], the person's experience of that material never comes about through a mere registering of shape and form, but involves a social and agentive relationship with that material that emerges when she grapples with that form and brings it into her experience" (Berger 2010:16–17). What is missing from scholarly analysis, Berger argues, is not attention to formal aspects of expressive material, but rather how form is engaged by producers or receivers of expressive culture.

To put these ideas into context, let us think about a concrete example. Think about a hymnal. One worshipper might appreciate it because she is a trained musician and finds the notation useful for singing unfamiliar songs. Another might like it because he was raised in a church that used hymnals and the physicality of touching the pages brings forth warm memories. But when he notices that this hymnal is a new edition that contains revised politically correct lyrics, he may see it as a discomforting sign of change. A third singer may not be able to read music and thus sees the book as a symbol of knowledge that she does not have. A small child might temporarily repurpose the hymnal as a heavy object with which to hit her sibling, regardless of its musical function. These people all have different valual relationships with this single object.

It is especially important to highlight the fluidity that stance affords. One person does not retain a single relationship with a text, performance, practice, or item of expressive culture. Individuals may be predisposed to experience a relationship in a particular way, but relationships also emerge and change according to circumstances. Within the space of seconds, one might alternate between seeing the hymnal as part of a nostalgic past to seeing it as a marker of instability. This example relates to Berger's view of stance as a dynamic relationship in which researchers need to consider "not just light, sound, or word, but light, sound, or word as it is grasped by the brush, bow, or pen, by the eye or ear, by the social person in a social world—the way that the eye of the painter or viewer of the painting 'palpates' the landscape or canvas" (2010:3). For ethnomusicologists, a theory of stance compels a consideration not only of music-makers' and listeners'

https://doi.org/10.5921/yeartradmusi.47.2015.0064 Published online by Cambridge University Press

experiences, but their own fieldwork experiences. If ethnographers are only concerned with hymnal revisions as positive signs of change, they may never take the time to notice how new words might erase the past for others. Conversely, if they are only focused on congregants' responses to the ethnic diversity represented in the hymnal's new repertoire, they may never consider asking how many of the congregants possess the musical literacy to read the hymnal's scores. In any of these cases, the ethnographers' stances invariably colour the ways in which they approach their objects and communities of study. Attention to stance calls for a more holistic consideration of the music culture as it is grasped by the analyst.

In applying Harris Berger's theory on stance, we suggest that, rather than being an amorphous mix of micro-details and individualisms, the experience of ethnographic research has a shape and structure that can be described and analysed. Further, we suggest that collaborative fieldwork provides a rich environment for becoming more aware of stance and improving scholarship as a result. Thus, having established a working understanding of stance and following in the spirit of the comparative transcriptions of the 1963 symposium, we will move on to considering stance in comparative fieldwork: two ethnomusicologists participating in and observing a single event, and sharing their findings with each other.

Case study: Two ethnomusicologists, two congregations

We offer the following case study as an example of collaborative fieldwork. We conducted shared fieldwork while both working on our dissertations, but scholars at any level—from entry-level students to faculty emeriti—could benefit from similar undertakings. Since we focus on the methodological potential of collaborative fieldwork, this reflexive exercise voices the backgrounds and thought processes of the researchers, as opposed to predominantly focusing on the voices of our researched population. We feel that, ideally, this type of collaboration produces research with a strong focus on the musical content and communities under study, while the self-reflexive analysis of the research process remains part of the fieldwork itself.

Both of us are culture bearers in the traditions that serve as the backdrop for this methodological experiment. Both of us come from denominations of Protestant Christian practice that are common in the United States. I (Deborah) was raised in the Presbyterian Church in the USA—the same denomination as the Presbyterian congregation discussed in our joint research. The Presbyterian Church (USA), a theologically moderate-to-liberal institution comprised predominantly of members who are white, well-educated, and middle-to-upper class, is one of the United States' oldest mainline churches.[1] I (Fredara) was raised in the National Baptist Convention, USA, which was founded in 1880 and is the largest denomination of African American Baptists in the country. While our stance as culture bearers is

1. While no official, formal definition exists, mainline Protestantism has historically constituted the largest group within American Christianity. For more see Justice (2015, 2012).

https://doi.org/10.5921/yeartradmusi.47.2015.0064 Published online by Cambridge University Press

material to our observations during our collaborative fieldwork, we do not mean to suggest that only culture bearers are qualified to undertake this type of project. Nor does the status of culture bearer give any single individual (ethnographer or otherwise) *carte blanche* to speak as the definitive representative for any particular demographic. Nevertheless, our respective heritages and religious choices hold strong implications for our stances in the field.

Congregational exchange: Deborah

In February 2009, I (Deborah) was working on my dissertation fieldwork in a Presbyterian church in Nashville, Tennessee. I had chosen my field site, Hillsboro Presbyterian Church, because it provided a reasonably typical representation of an average Presbyterian congregation. The demographic configuration of the church is the same now (in 2015) as it was in 2009. Most of the three hundred congregants are white-collar workers and professionals who come from upper-middle-class white suburbs around the Nashville metropolitan area. This demographic profile mirrors averages for the Presbyterian denomination as a whole. In addition to fulfilling many of the musical and sociological criteria that I wanted in a research site, Hillsboro felt familiar to me personally, although it was not my own congregation. My family's socio-economic and cultural experiences are quite similar to those of the average Hillsboro congregant. The ways in which the congregation conducts Sunday worship resonate with patterns of worship and social interaction that have become familiar to me over the course of my involvement with the Presbyterian Church as a denomination.

For twenty years, however, Hillsboro Presbyterian had been doing something rather unorthodox for a mainline church: they have partnered with their neighbours at Spruce Street Baptist Church. In stark contrast to suburban Hillsboro, Spruce Street Baptist Church is a faith community of about three hundred mostly African American members located near Nashville's urban centre. Known as the "mother church" of African American churches in Nashville, the Spruce Street congregants are of mixed socioeconomic levels. As part of their mission "serving as a lighthouse drawing lost men to the ark of safety," Spruce Street hosts a weekly soup kitchen[2] in their basement fellowship hall. Twice every year, the two congregations come together for a type of exchange. The Spruce Street–Hillsboro exchange surpasses the annual pulpit exchanges that some churches have, in which the pastors swap pulpits and preach to each other's congregations for one Sunday. Instead, the Spruce Street–Hillsboro exchange involves inviting both the other preacher and the other congregation. This means that in the spring the Spruce Street congregation goes to Hillsboro Presbyterian where the Spruce Street preacher delivers the sermon and the Spruce Street choir provides the music. In autumn the exchange is reciprocated: Hillsboro's congregation goes to Spruce Street where the Hillsboro pastor preaches and the Hillsboro praise team provides the music. In both cases, the hosting congregation provides a buffet lunch that everyone shares.

2. "Soup kitchen" is an American expression for a cost-free food service, generally run by a charitable organization, that provides meals to needy, hungry people.

https://doi.org/10.5921/yeartradmusi.47.2015.0064 Published online by Cambridge University Press

My experience of these exchanges prompted interest in what an alternative perspective might bring to my research. I thought of Fredara, another doctoral candidate in my programme, who had been raised in a black Baptist church in Florida and who was also addressing aspects of sacred music in her graduate work. We had already had some fruitful discussions about how our backgrounds informed our experiences in the field, but I wondered what would happen if we both observed the same joint worship service. How would our individual perspectives, cultural and religious backgrounds, and professional training influence our analysis of the event? Would the experience prove that stance really could be tested and observed at play in fieldwork situations? If so, how might comparative ethnography help us to better understand phenomenological stances and investigate the role they play in our fieldwork, analysis, and writing?

Congregational exchange: Fredara

When I (Fredara) heard about this congregational experiment, I promptly accepted Deborah's invitation to attend an exchange. I was particularly interested in a collaboration because my research is perhaps best described as "home ethnography." I am an African American woman, a long-time member of the soul music community, and my dissertation (Hadley 2013) addressed the independent soul music scene in Atlanta, Georgia—that is, a "home" community.[3] Religious music pervades many aspects of African American musical experience, including my own: I have been a member of African American churches and religious communities since birth. This proximity, however, makes studying African American religious music and worship experiences one of my toughest research challenges. The idea of conducting fieldwork with Deborah was appealing because it was an opportunity to unearth interpretations that were hidden from my view as a musical and religious practitioner. While African American popular musics and sacred music return me to "home territory," approaching fieldwork collaboratively was an opportunity to grapple with alternative perspectives. It was also a chance extend and test our traditional fieldwork training.

The year before we attended the Spruce Street–Hillsboro exchange, Deborah and I both took a course entitled "African American Religious Music." As part of the course, we went to an African American Protestant church in Indianapolis, Indiana to practise participant-observation. I remember being slightly surprised when Deborah mentioned that she had attended other black church services. Following the Indianapolis field trip, Deborah said that she felt comfortable asking me questions that she was too intimidated to ask of a worshipper at the church. This was because she felt her questions were too basic or identified her too strongly as an outsider to the cultural context: many addressed the sensitive dynamics of race, religion, and cultural repertoire. I encouraged her to discuss aspects of the service that seemed foreign to her, that did not make sense to her, or that she did not fully understand. Trusting me as a friend and colleague, she was forthcoming

3. The doctoral research was born out of an earlier project in which I looked at the influence of gospel music in nightclub DJ performances.

https://doi.org/10.5921/yeartradmusi.47.2015.0064 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with her responses. While the volume of questions did not surprise me, some of the content did. Deborah asked about aspects of the service—from musical features to people's clothing and ways of interacting—that I had not thought about critically. My familiarity with this style of worship, furthermore, blinded me to certain elements of the service. Talking about what we had seen and how we had seen them was helpful for both of us. We had participated in similar comparative discussions during the African American Religious Music course, but being in the field together at the Indianapolis church and talking through our ethnographic stances influenced both of us strongly. This experience planted the seed for Deborah asking me to join her at the Spruce Street–Hillsboro exchange.

Varied stances in the field

The Spruce Street–Hillsboro congregation exchange that we observed took place on Sunday, 8 February 2009. That morning, the Spruce Street Baptist congregation came *en masse* to lead worship at Hillsboro Presbyterian: Reverend James Bowman occupied the pulpit; Spruce Street's youth choir filled Hillsboro's chancel; and Spruce Street's musicians led the joint congregation. Hillsboro's sanctuary pews were filled with members from both churches sitting interspersed amongst each other. As ethnomusicologists and women of faith, we walked into the church together, sat next to each other, and, as our conversations later revealed, experienced different aspects of the same service.

Deborah's stance

My writing in this section expands upon my field notes from the service with a view to exploring the significant role that my stance played in my perception of the event's meaning. Speaking with Fredara later illuminated the ways in which my role as participant-observer—with my own personal worship preferences, familiarities, and analytical observations of others—was shaped by my own relationship to the material. My perspective both limited and enriched my fieldwork in different ways. Discussing our perceptual differences helped me to see how my perspective influenced my valual relationships to the subject matter; in other words, our analytical co-participation embodied theories of stance.

Stance itself was embodied at points in the worship service. To close the service, the youth choir led the congregation in singing, and Reverend Bowman enjoined everyone to "take hands and sing to each other, 'God be with you until we meet again.'" I took my neighbours' hands and was vaguely pleased that these congregations shared this piece of music in common. I assumed the song was a piece of music dear to me, "God Be With You, Til We Meet Again," composed in 1906 by Ralph Vaughan Williams to Jeremiah Eames Rankin's 1880 lyrics (#540 in the Presbyterian hymnal). Both the liturgical scholar and worshipper in me agreed that the shared repertoire would make a warm, embodied moment of corporate physical, textual, and spiritual unity. However, when the music began, I quickly discovered that although the title seemed familiar, the words and melody were completely

https://doi.org/10.5921/yeartradmusi.47.2015.0064 Published online by Cambridge University Press

different and foreign to me. When I asked about it, Fredara later identified the song as Kirk Franklin's 1993 "Til We Meet Again." This song was, she assured me, an "old favourite." We had both just used our bodies to create the same sounds, but we had experienced drastically different stances towards our music-making. Multiple stances overlapped in my analysis of the song. I would never have been able to identify the selection on my own, yet I know enough about Franklin to recognize that this song ties Spruce Street to broader flows of African American sacred music. Despite my lack of familiarity with the song, ideas about Franklin's prominence translated to an intellectual understanding of the song as well-known. That piece of information retroactively enriched my understanding, but at the moment of the singing I was disappointed not to be active in the benediction, that is, the closing of the service. Experientially, my participation in worship had given way to observation and the search for meaning. My stance—the comparison of my own expectations versus the song that was actually played—shaped my analysis of the nearly twenty-year-old piece of music as quite new and innovative.

The music that was foreign to me was familiar to Fredara. She knew the song and sang along. Like the Spruce Street congregant holding her left hand, she also slightly swayed her body and arms back and forth with the music. I was holding Fredara's right hand in my left, but I was holding the hand of a young adult Hillsboro congregant on my right. The teenager looked slightly uncomfortable. This might have been for any number for reasons, but I assumed that it was most probably because holding hands while singing presents a departure from Hillsboro's usual Sunday morning practice. The swaying movement coming from Fredara on my left was in stark contrast to the relative lack of activity to my right. I felt like an unbalanced pivot point, trying to somehow move my left side without moving my right. I wanted to participate while observing, not only physically by moving but also to convey that, although I did not know the song and could not sing along myself, I did indeed affirm the singing and wanted to take part insomuch as I could. I also wanted to exhibit some degree of bi-musicality and cross-cultural competence to Fredara, the visiting Spruce Streeters, and the Hillsboro congregants. On my right side, however, there was no singing and no movement. I was surprised at the impact this lack of response had upon me: I had too many stances competing for prominence in my mind. I was uncomfortable trying to bridge this participatory gap because it somehow felt as though my swaying would seem out of character for "us" (read: white Presbyterians), like an odd code switching or a false pretence of participation for show. Unable to reconcile options, I split the difference and settled on letting Fredara swing my left side while keeping my right side still.

As I looked around the congregation, I noticed that I was not alone in this experience: there were oases of movement and stillness. In general, the black congregants were singing and swaying while the white congregants stood still and silent. I could not help but think of jokes about Calvinist predestination and reserved behaviour in worship—what we Presbyterians self-deprecatingly label as being the "frozen chosen." Since the two groups were dispersed randomly throughout the sanctuary, the varying levels of participation resulted in an interesting rippling visual effect: small cells of three or four Spruce Streeters bobbed and swayed like

https://doi.org/10.5921/yeartradmusi.47.2015.0064 Published online by Cambridge University Press

an ocean tide against steady bulkheads of Hillsboro worshippers. When I recounted these observations and my own mental tensions about the congregational singing after the service, Fredara was surprised; she had not noticed this embodied aspect of the service. My movement had kept her from being personally, physically confronted with immobile difference.

Fredara also questioned me about the service. She asked if I had noticed the pastor's eloquent use of hymn and song titles in his sermon. Indeed I had not, though I had noted that the Spruce Street congregation seemed to be more verbally responsive than the Hillsboro folks. I had also wondered what prompted the apparent murmurs of approval to what seemed to me to be fairly random phrases in the pastor's sermon. Fredara had taken notes and when we listened to the recording later, she was able to point to certain instances of the congregation responding to the pastor's incorporation of musical titles. I thought that I had followed the sermon's content because it had made sense theologically. Through my initial stance, I had understood it as having less exegetical content than Hillsboro's usual Presbyterian fare, and fewer references to systematic theology and Protestant theologians like Karl Barth and Dietrich Bonhoeffer. However, Fredara's stance as a black Baptist ethnographer, by contrast, demonstrated how Bowman's oratory referenced a different canon of musical culture and history rather than the socio-historical biblical analysis that usually flowed from Hillsboro's pulpit. Fredara had heard a sermon rich with references that I did not have the background to understand. My expectations as a Presbyterian shaped my ethnographic stance to hear what was not there rather than what was. While this could just be seen as an outsider not knowing what to look for within an unfamiliar culture, the comparative discussion allowed us to ask questions about how meaning is created and studied in these two music cultures. What questions had we learned to ask about black worship music? About white worship music? To what extent were these the same, to what extent were they different, and to what extent was the whole experiment helpful?

Fredara's stance

On the day of the pulpit exchange I attended two services at Hillsboro Presbyterian. Although I have spent my entire life in a traditional African American Baptist church, I had never experienced this type of pulpit exchange and was curious to see how the different denominational services would mesh (or not), both liturgically and culturally. What follows is my recollection of the impressions of these singular events.

The collaborative fieldwork experience helped me to better understand how my role as culture and tradition bearer affects my ethnographic stance. Working in the field together foregrounded the complex relationships that Deborah and I both had with the church rituals that we experienced during the pulpit exchange at Hillsboro. Harris Berger's concept of performative stance is a productive framework in which to discuss these relationships. Berger defines performative stance as "the performer's relationship with any entity understood as a preexisting composition… The term applies to genres well outside of music, as storytellers, actors, those who

https://doi.org/10.5921/yeartradmusi.47.2015.0064 Published online by Cambridge University Press

take part in rituals, and anyone who enacts a preexisting course of action will have a performative stance on the steps that have been laid out for them" (Berger 2009:8).

In the context of this definition, Deborah and I were both performers in a Protestant church liturgy on the day of the exchange. She was a white Presbyterian and I was a black Baptist in a white Presbyterian church in which black Baptist congregants were rendering service. We not only shared the role of worshipper, but we were (presumably) the only two present as researchers. This last role is what separated us from the other congregants and placed us at an analytical distance. Our roles as culture and tradition bearers are important to our respective performative stances because of our deep personal connection to our respective liturgies. We each know the intricacies of a "good church service" as worshippers in our own denominations and regions. Contrasts in culture, theology, and worship practices, mean that equally "good" or "successful" services might look and sound different from each other.

There were two worship services held at Hillsboro Presbyterian on the morning of the exchange. The earlier 8:30 a.m. service was conducted by and for the Hillsboro congregation, as the church normally has two Sunday morning services. Deborah and I attended both services. My experience of the early service was in sharp contrast to the later exchange service; despite the unfamiliar environment, I slipped seamlessly back into black Baptist routines when the members of Spruce Street Baptist led the later service.

My African American ethnicity did not go unnoticed by Hillsboro parishioners: at the early service, in which Spruce Street was not present, I was the only African American and people looked at me with smiling curiosity; in the later service, in which Spruce Street was present, Hillsboro members, who assumed I was a Spruce Street visitor, warmly greeted me. I remember one particularly awkward exchange: an older couple that Deborah knew came over to wish us welcome. The woman greeted Deborah by name and then, turning to me, said, "Welcome to our church! I have to tell you, I just love your choir! They are wonderful! We so look forward to hearing them." Deborah and I looked at each other as I diplomatically answered, "Um, well, thank you very much, but I'm not actually from Spruce Street, or even Nashville. My home church and my choir are in Florida!" "Oh!" The Hillsboro member's face flushed beet red as she realized her *faux pas* and fumbled for a graceful phrase to extract herself from the now uncomfortable situation. It was a situation that I had mentally seen unfolding before it actually happened; it was logical to conclude that I, the lone black person in Hillsboro church at that moment, was a member of Spruce Street. It was just the wrong conclusion. As I was anticipating the Hillsboro member's approach, I had a quick internal dialogue to decide whether I should just go along with her assumptions or whether I should tell her the truth. The former was the easier choice, but I felt it was important that I be honest: my identity was central to our methodological experiment and critical to unearthing our respective stances, as well as those of others.

Deborah and I spoke about the incident later. On one hand, given the pulpit exchange and Hillsboro's ethnic constitution, it was logical to assume that I was a Spruce Street member. On the other hand, such an assumption exposed

https://doi.org/10.5921/yeartradmusi.47.2015.0064 Published online by Cambridge University Press

normally tacit truths about the difference between Hillsboro's ideals and realities of diversity.[4] Deborah said that she appreciated how the exchange challenged the Hillsboro congregant's assumptions about belonging. As a colleague and Christian, she was uncomfortable with the racialized dynamic in the church.

Another set of relationships had to be negotiated when members of Spruce Street arrived for the second service; I caught a few warm but puzzled looks from members of the Spruce Street congregation, that I read as, "Who are you? Because you're not a member of Spruce Street and you are probably not a member of Hillsboro." The Spruce Street members' puzzlement stems from the same root as the Hillsboro member's assumption: "This probably is not your space. Welcome, but who could you be?" This exchange reminded me that we are not invisible interlopers who drop into our research sites unnoticed and unanalysed. Just as we enter the field to observe, understand, and interpret, so are we observed, understood, and interpreted. Based on past experiences at Hillsboro and familiarity with the racial demographics of mainline Protestant denominations in the United States, Spruce Street parishioners probably assumed that they would be the only African Americans in attendance that day. In that service my fear was that Spruce Street members would see me as incompetent in, or unfamiliar with, the performance of African American culture that the moment required. I wanted my performative stance to be read by Spruce Street parishioners as "insider" or "tradition bearer" (see Burnim 1985). I tried to glance at Spruce Street members to gauge if they noticed my involvement in the service. Occasionally I would catch someone's eye and receive a nod of what I read as approval.

Hillsboro and Spruce Street members gathered in the church sanctuary for the service. Pockets of Spruce Street members mixed in with the Hillsboro congregation, but I was not sitting in any of the Spruce Street pockets. Instead, I sat with Deborah in a pew of mostly Hillsboro congregants. As the service began, I felt like it became important for me to heighten my performative stance as one who was intimately familiar with the flow of black Baptist worship services because I wanted to show support and proficiency to Spruce Street congregants. My awareness of this type of cultural negotiation sensitized me to how we think about research methodology.

After such a complicated mash-up of Protestant traditions, it was a relief to have a co-investigator who was versed in both religious practice and ethnomusicological theory with whom I could unpack the experience. We both wondered how our stances had informed the totality of our work. Moreover, we wondered how awareness of our stances and interrogating them might result in richer, better scholarly relationships and analyses. After the services we spoke at length about aspects of the worship that we had processed differently. We were not only recounting the specifics of the service, but were—in Berger's terms—"grappling"

4. Part of the necessity for this type of pulpit exchange is to counter the reality that religious segregation along denominational lines remains a stark reality in the United States. Thus, the racial makeup of many churches remains homogenous or heavily predominated by one racial group. Pulpit exchanges such as this one are thoughtful attempts, built on the shared premise that they "serve the same God," designed to foster affiliations between denominations and perhaps social groups that may not otherwise interact.

https://doi.org/10.5921/yeartradmusi.47.2015.0064 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(2009) with the performance of both congregant and ethnomusicologist. In contrast to Deborah, I felt that Spruce Street's choir was restrained relative to how they probably sing when rendering a service in their own church. I understood the choir and the pastor to be consciously negotiating just "how Baptist" they should appear when presenting their worship to the hosting Presbyterian congregation. For example, sermons in African American churches are collective performances between the preacher and the congregation in which the preacher is reliant on the verbal responses of the congregants. But appropriate responses require that the congregants know what to say and when to say it. I felt that Reverend Bowman was unsure whether there were enough knowledgeable congregants present to fully engage in Baptist sermonic repartee.

As a lifelong Baptist, I felt the same tug during the service. What were normally unconscious behaviours and cultural performances within the walls of a black Baptist church were now very obvious choices. Parallel to Deborah's physical grappling with her performance as an ethnomusicologist and Presbyterian—revealed in her decision to sway and be still—I had many internal conversations with myself about "appropriate" participation. My decisions to stand up and join the choir, or to verbally respond to Spruce Street's pastor during his sermon were not inconsequential; they spoke to the function of the music and sermon. The performance of African American Baptist sermons follows certain oratorical guidelines that require the congregation to participate. Experiencing these elements in a consciously comparative ethnographic setting forced me to consider alternative possibilities for worship events that I had previously accepted as natural.

Conclusion

Having two sets of eyes and ears processing the same performative events prompted rich discussion about the nature of fieldwork. Our individual perspectives on the same elements—including congregational singing, movement, and song texts—resulted in contrasting ethnographic analyses and conclusions. Given our different musico-religious histories, this was, in many ways, to be expected. Yet given our similar ethnographic training, the contrasts revealed the central role that stance plays in shaping ethnography and how our interpretations reflect both our own backgrounds within our religious traditions and related trends within the research of these traditions. While we both learned something about the religious musical practices of the "unfamiliar" group, discussions of our individual stances as participants and scholars were the most valuable results of this ethnographic process.

Conducting fieldwork together can help ethnomusicologists become aware of their stances, to more fruitfully draw upon the "varied individual approaches" that Nicholas England (1964) identified as one of ethnomusicology's strengths. Ethnomusicologists (and likewise anthropologists and other fieldwork-based researchers) need to combine individual approaches in the field more often. Certainly, most of us do communicate with each other about our work through

https://doi.org/10.5921/yeartradmusi.47.2015.0064 Published online by Cambridge University Press

methods that include casual conversations, joint panels, and informally reviewing each other's work before publication. In the rare cases when researchers do publish collaboratively, rather than working from shared experience in the field, they more commonly focus on shared theoretical considerations. That is, they are often in dialogue about theory and then move on to demonstrate how that theory is reflected in their own fieldwork or how each individual's fieldwork and analysis resonates with the other's. For example, in *Identity and Everyday Life: Essays in the Study of Folklore, Music and Popular Culture* (2004), Harris Berger and Giovanna Del Negro use their own field studies of heavy metal and Italian social customs as the basis for suggesting new ways of considering performance and reflexivity in light of American folklore, French "everyday life" theory, and British cultural studies. Charles Keil and Steven Feld bring us a step closer to a collaborative field experience in *Music Grooves: Essays and Dialogues* (1995). They frame analytical essays on their own independent fieldwork within "dialogues"; these dialogues are edited down from week-long conversations spent "gabbing about music and playing and listening to it together" in order "to more personally and vocally unite the essay materials" (ibid.:vii).

Steven Feld gives an additional nod to spending time in the field talking with other researchers about process in a footnote. Studying the Kaluli at the same time as linguistic anthropologists Bambi and Buck Schieffelin, Feld describes dialogue in the field as different from working together:

> Although we had separate houses and most of the time pursued our work separately, we had meals together and were constantly in dialogue about everything from everyday village life and practical details of the Kaluli language to the specific nature of our linguistic, musical, and ethnographic projects…Although we rarely presented our work together and even less frequently co-authored papers in the years following our initial fieldwork, we have consistently drawn on each other's expertise and special interests and routinely benefited from each other's insights, readings, and criticisms. (ibid.:44–45)

To date, the only co-authored work resulting from this field relationship has been the *Bosavi-English-Tok Pisin Dictionary* (Schieffelin and Feld 1998). These examples are representative of a larger trend: conducting fieldwork primarily alone, discussing work with others to the great mutual benefit of all parties (yet remaining clear that it is the work of an individual), and publishing alone. In other words, although a scholar benefits from discussing her fieldwork and analysis with others, in the end, it remains just that: hers.

Drawing upon behind-the-scenes dialogues between researchers has unquestionably made ethnography stronger. Formalizing the experience of conducting collaborative research has not been, however, a primary methodological focus. It is worth exploring how to strengthen collaborative ethnography within ethnomusicology curricula and doctoral research processes. Of course, this would have to be predicated on creating a greater place for collaborative ethnography

https://doi.org/10.5921/yeartradmusi.47.2015.0064 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in postgraduate research and writing spaces. A number of factors, including intellectual property, pressure to publish, building a tenure portfolio, and concerns over treating communities under study ethically, contribute to a sense of ownership over ethnographic material. Proprietary orientation towards the scholarly process stems from a combination of motivations.

Nevertheless, we suggest that a slight reorientation towards process would benefit ethnomusicological scholarship substantially. Team fieldwork projects provide rich opportunities for researchers to (1) better identify and articulate their own ethnographic perspectives, and (2) attend to overlooked structures of experience that inform the dialogic relationship between stance, fieldwork, and ethnography. Particularly for those of us who conduct research in communities in which we are both tradition bearers and scholars, pulling back the curtains of our individual fieldwork and allowing others to join us enriches the musical, analytical, and ethnographic experience.

Researchers will have to consider the challenges that come with collaborative field methodologies. Practical concerns of joint scheduling and potentially expensive transportation pose considerable issues, but may ultimately constitute the least academically significant worries. One of the goals of ethnomusicology is to present portraits of communities of people. While researchers may acknowledge their own voices to varying extents, the ultimate scholarly product should focus on the musical community under study. It is difficult enough to untangle autoethnographic elements from one researcher's work. Introducing another ethnographer should make some biases clearer, but does inserting yet another set of filters potentially obfuscate local voices even more? Even when the researchers come from the communities under study, or from similar communities, care must be taken to present a balanced analysis.

Our goal in this article has not been to provide a set of best practices for collaborative fieldwork. Rather, we call for deeper engagement with the following areas: (1) the fieldworker's stance and experience of research as central to ethnomusicology's theoretical concerns; and (2) the contribution of collaborative fieldwork to the discipline's long tradition of reflecting upon and analysing methodologies. Consciously accounting for who we are as individuals in the field and working that out in collaboration with each other will help us to better understand how we build our analytical approaches to music and culture.

REFERENCES CITED

Abu-Lughod, Leila
1993 *Writing Women's Worlds: Bedouin Stories.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

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* 45: 28–42.

https://doi.org/10.5921/yeartradmusi.47.2015.0064 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Barz, Gregory F. and Timothy J. Cooley
2008 Ed. *Shadows in the Field: New Perspectives for Fieldwork in Ethnomusicology*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
1996 Ed. *Shadows in the Field: New Perspectives for Fieldwork in Ethnomusicology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Berger, Harris M.
2010 *Stance: Ideas about Emotion, Style, and Meaning for the Study of Expressive Culture*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
Berger, Harris M. and Giovanna P. Del Negro
2004 *Identity and Everyday Life: Essays in the Study of Folklore, Music and Popular Culture*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
Burnim, Mellonee
1985 "Culture Bearer and Tradition Bearer: An Ethnomusicologist's Research on Gospel Music." *Ethnomusicology* 29/3: 432–47.
Cannell, Fenella
2006 *The Anthropology of Christianity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Clifford, James and George E. Marcus
2010 *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. 25th anniversary ed. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
1986 *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
Cohen, Judah
2009 *The Making of a Reform Jewish Cantor: Musical Authority, Cultural Investment*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
2008 "Shadows in the Classroom: Encountering the Syrian Jewish Research Project Twenty Years Later." In *Shadows in the Field: New Perspectives for Fieldwork in Ethnomusicology*, ed. Gregory F. Barz and Timothy J. Cooley, 157–66. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Diamond, Beverley, M. Sam Cronk, and Franziska von Rosen
1994 *Visions of Sound: Musical Instruments of First Nations Communities in Northeastern America*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
Emerson, Robert M., Rachel I. Fretz, and Linda L. Shaw
1995 *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press.
England, Nicholas
1964 "Symposium on Transcription and Analysis: A Hukwe* Song with Musical Bow: Introduction." *Ethnomusicology* 8/3: 223–33.
Hadley, Fredara
2013 "Reframing the Narrative: Defining African American Alternative Music in 21st Century Atlanta, Georgia." PhD dissertation, Indiana University.
Hagedorn, Katherine J.
2001 *Divine Utterances: The Performance of Afro-Cuban Santeria*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Books.
Justice, Deborah
2015 "A Cosmopolitan Dichotomy: Mainline Protestantism and Contemporary versus Traditional Worship Music." In *The Oxford Handbook of Music and World Christianities*, ed. Suzel Reily and Jonathan Dueck, New York: Oxford University Press. doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199859993.013.28.
2012 "Sonic Change, Social Change, Sacred Change: Music and the Reconfiguration of American Christianity." PhD Dissertation. Indiana University.

https://doi.org/10.5921/yeartradmusi.47.2015.0064 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Keil, Charles and Steven Feld
1995 *Music Grooves: Essays and Dialogues.* Chicago: University Of Chicago Press.
Kisliuk, Michelle
2000 *Seize the Dance! BaAka Musical Life and the Ethnography of Performance.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Lassiter, Luke Eric
2008 "Editor's Introduction." *Collaborative Anthropology* 1: vii–xii.
Lofland, John
2006 *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis.* Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
Nettl, Bruno
2008 "Foreword." In *Shadows in the Field: New Perspectives for Fieldwork in Ethnomusicology*, ed. Gregory F. Barz and Timothy J. Cooley, v–xi. London; New York: Oxford University Press.
Rahaim, Matthew
2012 *Musicking Bodies: Gesture and Voice in Hindustani Music.* Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
Rice, Timothy
1987 "Toward the Remodeling of Ethnomusicology." *Ethnomusicology* 31/3: 469–88.
Schieffelin, Bambi B. and Steven Feld
1998 *Bosavi-English-Tok Pisin Dictionary.* Sydney: Australian National University.
Seeger, Anthony
2004 *Why Suyá Sing: A Musical Anthropology of an Amazonian People.* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
Shelemay, Kay
2001 "Toward an Ethnomusicology of the Early Music Movement: Thoughts on Bridging Disciplines and Musical Worlds." *Ethnomusicology* 45/1: 1–19.
1994 *A Song of Longing: An Ethiopian Journey.* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
1989 Ed. *Music, Ritual, and Falasha History.* 2nd ed. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.
1988 "Together in the Field: Team Research among Syrian Jews in Brooklyn, New York." *Ethnomusicology* 32/3: 369–84.
Slobin, Mark
1989 *Chosen Voices: The Story of the American Cantorate.* Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
Stone, Ruth M.
1982 *Let the Inside Be Sweet: Interpretation of Music Event among the Kpelle of Liberia.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

https://doi.org/10.5921/yeartradmusi.47.2015.0064 Published online by Cambridge University Press