Solberg, R.T., Hagen, A.N., Nærland, T.U. & Duch, M.F. (2024). Introduction: The changing landscape of music creation. In A.N. Hagen, R.T. Solberg, T.U. Nærland & M.F. Duch (Eds.), *Når musikken tek form: Om skapande praksisar i musikk [When music takes shape: on creative practices in music]* (pp. 11–37). Fagbokforlaget.

Introduction: The changing landscape of music creation

Ragnhild Torvanger Solberg, Anja Nylund Hagen, Torgeir Uberg Nærland and Michael Francis Duch

Shifting practices

Music is created for different purposes, in different spaces, and by different actors through processes that employ a diversity of methods, materials and technologies. The schemes for music funding and dissemination also vary. Some practices appear to be individual in character, while others have a more collective and collaborative nature. Creative practices can be linked to music as written scores, to music as recorded or live sound, or to music as a performed, improvised or an embodied act. Creative practices do not solely occur in processes where the music is created

in isolation, to be performed at a later date. Creative practices take place equally often in processes where roles and relationships between creators, performers, producers and originators are fluid and subject to (re) negotiation.

Today's technology influences how music is created and *what kind of* music is created. With the help of numerous media and technologies, music is created across space, time, geography and culture, and in both fragmented and complex processes. Digital processing expands not only the music creation toolkit but also the aesthetic and expressive form of the music. New media have a major impact on the competitive landscape and markets in which music exists, and on the opportunities individual artists have for self-expression. This, in turn, leads to changes in the structure of the industry and field-specific dynamics that are also reflected in creative artists' practices, needs and collaborations.

Music as a practice field is constantly influenced by various cultural, social, political and economic forces. Migration, globalisation, climate change, new and traditional forms of social and musical gatherings, institutional conditions, educational opportunities and the development of music in combination with other forms of artistic expression are just some of the many impulses that help define specific aspects and development trends within the practice of music creation.

Given this backdrop, understanding the practices employed when music is created is important from an aesthetic and musicological perspective. Such an understanding also provides insight into the position music has in society and its development.

In this introductory article, we first highlight some experiences and research-related challenges encountered in the course of the research programme. In the following pages, we describe some similarities and differences between musicological research and artistic research. We also argue that a richer and more multidimensional understanding of music creation may be obtained through a combination of perspectives – both inside-out and outside-in. Next, we explore different understandings of the three key terms – practice, creation and music. We examine

the "practice turn" that has taken place in music research, which has, for example, challenged the romantic artistic stereotype and the powerful fixation with the musical work. Instead of understanding music as a fixed object, it is now seen as an active process and a social practice, in which both aesthetic and interpersonal relationships are in play. We then highligh some key findings and shared features, based on the insights and results presented in the 12 articles, before concluding with a presentation of each individual article, grouped according to the three main categories: i) development, expansion and exploration of understandings and working methods; ii) collaborative and collective creative processes; and iii) music technology practices.

The articles address music within and across various areas of music, academic traditions and musical genres, using a number of different research methods. We are given detailed and specific descriptions of the working methods, procedures and compositional strategies that are used by the creative practitioners and that shape their musical expressions. We combine this practice-focused lens with studies and discussions linked to overarching themes with respect to terminological understanding, development trends, traditions, and cultural and social conditions.

The contributors' combined approach has enabled the research programme to uncover some distinctive aspects of music research. Different theoretical and methodological starting points are evident in the book, and invite the reader to reflect on and, hopefully, provide insight into, musical practice as an interdisciplinary research tradition. At the same time, the range of theoretical and methodological starting points has also proved a challenge along the way, in part because we have had to discuss a number of questions about what is required for and what defines different types of knowledge production. This book is, as far as we know, one of few research anthologies to combine musicological research and artistic research. The combination of these approaches provides a view of the creative musical practices from both the inside out and the outside in. We believe these perspectives are complementary and that they constitute one of the book's strengths.

This book contributes updated and research-based knowledge about a field that is changing rapidly, also within a Norwegian context. Most of the contributors are either active music creators or have experience of music creation or performance. Furthermore, the book represents a wide range of genres and approaches to the field, addressing folk music, improvisation, pop music, music technology, contemporary music, early music, sheet music, electro-acoustic music and post-acoustic music.

The book provides examples of the breadth of opportunities and challenges to be encountered in the field of music research today, which helps to highlight what the research of musical practice is and, perhaps, should be.

An interdisciplinary invitation with research challenges

A novel aspect of this research programme, compared with previous endeavours by Arts and Culture Norway, was that the call for proposals sought contributions based on both musicological research and artistic research. The programme therefore opened itself to a wide range of approaches, methods and perspectives within the field of music. Artistic researchers, musicology researchers and other relevant professionals could all apply for financial support. As a result, the selected projects come from a variety of research traditions, and the contributors answer the question of what constitutes creative music practices through different schools of musicology research and artistic research.

However, multiple questions and issues arise when both musicological contributions and artistic research are to be presented side-by-side in the same research anthology. This applies to the research itself, its write-up, the process of peer review and the way the research is disseminated. What, for example, is an artistic reflection compared with a scientific discussion? In what format and in accordance with what standard should the research in this programme be presented, assessed and

communicated? What is a piece of artistic research, often delivered in the form of an exposition, compared with a scientific presentation of results and findings? The programme's interdisciplinary nature has prompted a continuous requirement for reflection on how music-related knowledge is produced, assessed and presented.

Both musicology and artistic research have established themselves as separate research traditions at several arts education and research institutions in Norway and abroad. Yet it was not until 2018 that Norway established a separate doctorate-level course of study and related statutory instrument granting the right to award a PhD in artistic research, based on a national bursary programme from 2003. Although artistic research has been recognised as a field of academic study in Norway since the introduction of the University and University Colleges Act of 1995, it was the creation of a specific PhD degree that put artistic research on an equal footing with other research at the institutional level.

The Vienna Declaration on Artistic Research was adopted in 2020. This international declaration aims to clarify artistic research (AR) concepts and impacts, and to "ensure the performance and recognition of successful research activity in the field"[1] (Grünfeld, 2022, p. 3). Despite this attempt to standardise, there is a multiplicity of creative processes and reflections in the AR field. Professor of film direction Nina Grünfeld therefore claims that "the frameworks which largely underpin the process of peer review are irrelevant"[2] to parts of the AR tradition (2022, p. 3). In an anthology like this, where research contributions from AR and musicology are placed on the same footing, a key premise has been to adopt shared and binding guidelines for peer review. Each article has been assessed by various peers, based on the respective research traditions in which the authors situate themselves. The assessments have been made in accordance with shared guidelines which emphasise that the articles

1 Translated from Norwegian.
2 Translated from Norwegian.

must present methodology, theory and results in a way that is stringent, transparent, precise, well contextualised and original. As commissioning editors, we have observed how different assessment traditions have played out in the peer reviews. We maintain that our editorial awareness has been important to ensure a fair assessment that is also rooted in the characteristics particular to the different traditions.

The research traditions differ with respect to research practice, even though they are both part of the doctoral research training programmes. The ideologies that underpin musicology and AR can and do vary, with differing epistemological and ontological research standards and substantial variations within the fields with respect to the presentation of results, reflections and methodologies used. Although musicology and AR share a strong interest in music research, the degree of collaboration between these research traditions also varies significantly. In practice, there is relatively little contact between them.

The field of musicology involves the systematic study of music history, music's aesthetic dimension, the emergence of music and the place music has in society, from different perspectives. In this endeavour, a diversity of theoretical and methodological starting points may be found. The sounding music – the actual *object of the research* – is exceptionally flexible and diverse, and has therefore been examined and understood with the help of various theoretical orientations. Research disciplines in the field of musicology include music history, music psychology, music sociology, the philosophy of music, music anthropology, music therapy, music analysis, music ethnography, music pedagogy, music technology, popular music research, sound studies, music cognition and music aesthetics – to name but a few. Many of these areas overlap and the topics often transcend disciplinary boundaries, both within the field of musicology and outside of it. The range of methods is also broad and includes hermeneutic analysis, notation and sound-based music analysis, fieldwork, participatory observation, analysis of music and movement, qualitative interviews, quantitative methods such as questionnaires, experimental methods – and artistic research.

In musicology, one performs research *on* music, while artistic research also embraces two other dimensions. Here, the researcher conducts studies *in* or *through* the art. Instead of traditional scientific methods, researchers often employ action research, a self-reflexive and systematic examination of their own practices (Borgdorff, 20112, pp. 37–39). The research is undertaken through "action-based experience and acknowledgement"[3] (Hovik, 2012, p. 97), using methods that are often

> [...] performative and interactive with objects and surroundings. Sometimes, this is described as "through the making", a field of study where the researcher participates as an active subject in the investigative process. Its roots in the artist's practice are strong and often based on that person's own experience, professional expertise and creative abilities (Grünfeld, 2022, p. 3).[4]

It can therefore be difficult to point to scientific evidence in the field of AR, since the process itself and the results may be largely self-experienced. Reflection is achieved through the systematic production of diary entries or blogging. Much of the value of AR lies in these notes and associated documentation in the form of audio-recordings and images. It is the self-experienced processes and results that form the basis for the research, and they are frequently embodied and difficult to describe in the standardised language of a purely scientific text.

In AR, the end product – the artwork itself – has a significant inherent value. However, when other musicians or researchers attempt to learn from each other's artistic creation or research endeavours, the surrounding reflections are just as important. Communication of the experience-based results constitutes a symbiosis between contextualisation,

3 Translated from Norwegian.
4 Translated from Norwegian.

reflection and the artwork itself, generally presented in an exposition. As a whole, the exposition makes the value of the artwork and the process visible to others. This enables "verification" of the artistic outcome and provides a better understanding of process, contexts and reflection in other people's AR.

The core objective of AR is therefore to draw knowledge from one's own experiences. Nevertheless, when are experiences simply experiences? How can they be made valid or interesting at an overarching level and for the *outside* world? How can reflecting on one's own musical work be of any general interest? Can this knowledge function in a traditional framework where science is defined by the observed, measurable and objective? On the other hand, it is just as important to ask what observation can reveal without experience. What insight can an *outside* gaze actually capture of what is happening on the *inside* in a creative moment or creative act or a relationship? Is it not precisely the nature of experience that can best answer a research question about what it means to create something? These discussions are also familiar within the humanities and social sciences, for example, in the fields of phenomenology and psychology, and in various academic disciplines' qualitative approach to understanding the experiences of other cultures or individuals – or verbalising one's own.

Based on the topic for this anthology, creative music practices, we argue that the combination of musicological and AR approaches is particularly fruitful. To clarify this argument, it may be useful to draw a parallel with a pair of terms from the realm of social anthropology: the "emic" and the "etic" perspective (Harris, 1976). The emic perspective involves seeing a culture from the *inside* and describing practices and experiences based on the culture's own premises. The etic perspective, on the other hand, involves viewing the culture from the *outside*, often with the help of specific models or theories. Our simple, yet important argument is that a richer and more multidimensional understanding of creative musical practices may be obtained when they are illuminated from both the inside and outside.

At the same time, there is a risk that the inside/outside dichotomy could seem simplistic with respect to the contributions in this anthology. For example, several of the authors who adhere to a musicology tradition also have extensive experience as practitioners, while those whose contribution focuses on experience-based AR are engaged in a constant dialogue with "outside" theories, models and methods. We would therefore argue that this book is innovative in its openness to interdisciplinary approaches, both theoretical and methodological. The book's primary ambition is to provide an example of how empirical analysis and experience-based approaches can be combined successfully in one and the same anthology.

The *practice* turn in music research

As previously mentioned, the study of music is inherently interdisciplinary and therefore subject to internal tugs of war about what should be put under the research microscope. The musicologists Krogh and Nielsen highlight an increasing orientation in music research towards music as practice, which places it in an ongoing and "binding ontological discussion about what we consider to be music"[5] (2014, p. 10). This practice orientation turns attention away from music as a static object towards music as a dynamic activity. Instead of emphasising the musical work's status, form and documentation, more weight is attached to understanding music as an active practice. The practice turn as the focus of attention changes fundamentally what is researched and therefore also what fundamental questions are asked, which methods and procedures are applied and also who actually engages in the research.

Despite this overarching turn towards practice in humanities and social science research, including music research, it is clear that creative

5 Translated from Danish.

music practices have disparate starting points. These practices differ with respect to their origins, the conditions under which they take place, the understandings and competences required, and the relationships that are developed, challenged or maintained along the way.

Practices can be difficult to define or explain, precisely because they – unlike theories, procedures or models – are actions and skills which unfold in space and time. This is why some of the research into music practices, also in this book, is carried out by musicians and composers themselves, people experienced and skilled in the creation and performance of music. At the same time, practices, like skills-related knowledge, may also be understood through a theoretical lens. In other words, insight into what a practice is may be broken down and highlighted through a theoretical prism which helps us to understand it philosophically, sociologically, culturally or technologically – or from the perspective of practice theory.

Sociologist Andreas Reckwitz defines a "practice" (*Praktik*) as a routine type of behaviour which comprises several linked elements (Reckwitz in Nielsen & Krogh, 2014, p. 15). Practices may be various *physical or mental activities*, *"things" and their usage*, and *background knowledge* in the form of understanding, knowledge, emotional states and motivations. Reckwitz underlines that the existence of the practices depends on the relationship between the specific elements involved, i.e. something that cannot be reduced to individual elements alone and still remain a practice (Reckwitz in Nielsen & Krogh, 2014, p. 15). Only a few of the articles in this anthology actually define practice in this or any other way. However, with Reckwitz's categories as a starting point for expressing what a practice is, it is clear that the articles are indeed exploring practices, as the article summary at the end of our introduction underlines.

Understood as theory, the concept of practice has a looser foundation, but nevertheless demonstrates some clear characteristics (Schatzki in Nielsen & Krohg, 2014, pp. 13–14):

1. Practices are not individual activities, but an *ordered activity* or a structured and ordered collection of activities.
2. Practices are human activities that help to understand shared or collective symbolic structures.
3. Practice theoretical approaches have a shared resistance to dualisms or conceptual dichotomies (structure v. agency, the human v. the non-human).

Based on these practice theory understandings, we will explore what defines the creative in music, across established boundaries.

What is the *creative* element in the practices?

The 12 articles explore what it means to create something musically – and different ways this is both understood and practised. The creative in musical practice may comprise artistic ideas, specific procedures, conventions or habits, emotional responses, physical or technical skills, traditional practices, or exploration, renewal and improvisation, although this list is far from exhaustive. Music is created both before, during and after it has been performed. It may be craft, artwork, intellectual work and network – all at the same time.

Music history is full of mythical narratives about music creation, including the notion of the artist communicating an idea drawn from something larger than and outside themselves, that creativity is inherent rather than something that can be learnt, and that the creation emerges effortlessly and requires little revision (Cook, 2018, pp. 2–3). Musicologist Pamela Burnard argues that the concept of musical creativity needs to be expanded. She names three aspects she wishes to revise: i) the romantic stereotype of the musical creative as an individual genius; ii) the fixation on composition, mythologised as a fixed artefact, deeply embedded in history; and iii) the canonisation of certain genres as high culture (Burnard, 2012, pp. 2–3). These myths and stereotypes have largely been

rebutted by more recent research, and an updated understanding emphasises creation as something active, which encompasses both human action and, not least, *inter*action (Cook, 2018, pp. 8–10).

With the practice turn in music research in mind, the three areas that Burnard highlights as requiring an expanded understanding of creativity may be of assistance. In line with Schatzki's practice theory, the individual, music-creating genius who composes works that become fixed and embedded in musical history may be challenged both empirically and conceptually if the researcher seeks to define musical creativity as structured and ordered collections of human actions and how these contribute to an understanding of shared or collective symbolic structures. In very simple terms, it is not what the composer *is* or *has produced* which defines creativity; it is what the composer *does*.

Furthermore, according to Schatzki, the resistance to dualisms and conceptual dichotomies which characterises all understanding of practice contributes to an emphasis on the *relational* rather than the *universal* when attempting to understand creativity (Schatzki in Nielsen & Krohg, 2014, p. 11). In this way, both the focus on the *individual and the work*, as well as the *canonisation of high-cultural genres* may be positioned as part of a social, cultural and relational process and thus still retain its status within a domain, but only *in a certain context*. In other words, the turn to practice promotes an updated and more universal understanding of the concept of creativity. It is the understanding of practice in context that gives life to the music (perhaps even to its genius), rather than to the creator or the work (and perhaps to their inherent genius).

This kind of practice-oriented understanding of creation and creativity is also clearly evident in this anthology. Today, music creators and performers are trained in a variety of different musical fields in order to acquire and develop skills, conventions, working methods and traditions. This represents a change from the earlier understanding of skills as traits inherent to the individual composer. Music creation has therefore become highly institutionalised and professionalised, even in genres like folk music which have traditionally been passed on orally. At the same time, the

democratisation of music creation has increased, in large part due to the availability of music technology, which makes it possible for more people to record and disseminate their music regardless of formal training. In addition, there are multiple types of subcultural musical expressions which elect to remain outside institutions and established industry structures, and therefore challenge the professionalised approach to music creation.

Many of the article authors highlight co-creation and collective processes as a characteristic of music creation in their fields. But how does this differ from performing music that someone else has created? When is something performance, and when is it creation? Several contributors to this anthology would probably describe themselves as both creators and performers, or as creative performers. Performing and creating are not necessarily two fixed categories. In some cases, the difference is perceived as artificial and outdated, a point that several of the articles address. In general, there is a creative element in performance. At the same time, to create is also to *perform* a creative practice. In many cases, however, there will be a difference between creating, producing and performing a work of intellectual property, although it may be difficult to determine exactly where the lines between them should be drawn, as this book demonstrates.

What is the *music* in the practices?

There are many ways to understand what music is. For example, as an audible phenomenon, music may be said to be organised sounds (Risset, 2015). However, this understanding does not encompass social and cultural meanings which are "baked into" the music. As such, music is not a neutral phenomenon. The philosopher Theodor W. Adorno is one of several who have described music as a form of encrypted subjectivity (Ruud, 2016, p. 19).

Traditionally, musicology and music history have placed heavy emphasis on the musical work, in other words, on music as an artefact (Goehr, 1992). This approach has been challenged in recent years, including by several of the contributors to this anthology. Attention has shifted in the direction of understanding music as an active process and a social practice where both aesthetic and interpersonal relationships play a role (Small, 1998, p. 9). The role of the body has further been underlined by describing music as both an active and embodied process (Jensenius, 2022, p. xv). The Danish musicologists Nielsen & Krogh (2014) translate Small's term "musicking" as "*at musikere*". At the same time, music technologist Jensenius talks about "*å musikkere*" and points to music in this embodied situated understanding as ordered sound-producing *actions* (Jensenius, 2022, pp. xiv–xv).

In this anthology, the understandings and the actual music discussed are extremely varied. This applies to both the specific field and genre understandings and how sound is reproduced and referred to at different levels. The book examines folk music, improvisation, music production, music technology, contemporary music, early music, sheet music, electroacoustic music and post-acousmatic music. Furthermore, the contributors refer to the sounding music as an object (work, tune, song, piece, track, oeuvre, composition) or as a process (network, groove, improvisation, oral transmission, recording, sessions) – or as both at the same time. One of the central pillars of musicology has traditionally been the idea that what is created invites interpretation and analysis. This is linked to the understanding of music as an object. In this book, greater emphasis is placed on a process-oriented understanding, that is, on how what is created invites interpretation and co-creation.

The intellectual property and the individual(s) who originated the creative musical idea naturally go hand in hand with the concept of the work. According to section 1-2 of the Norwegian Copyright Act (*Lov om opphavsrett til åndsverk mv.*), an intellectual work is a "literary or artistic work of any kind, which expresses an original and individual creative

intellectual endeavour"[6]. However, under music, it is once again the work that matters. Here, the law says "a musical work, with or without text"[7]. Nevertheless, understanding and practice differ considerably with respect to who has ownership of what has been created in such areas as folk music and more electronically oriented genres. In this book, copyright issues are problematised in several fields: in folk music between tradition and performer; in pop music productions between songwriter and producer; in contemporary music between performer and composer; and in the interaction between human and artificial intelligence (AI).

The changing landscape of music creation: interdisciplinary and exploratory perspectives

While working on the research programme, it has become clear that the articles describe changes and tensions within and across creative music practices. Although the field is diverse, as are the musical genres, the practices share several commonalities and challenges. Three issues in particular are addressed in several of the contributions, albeit through somewhat different approaches. These issues are: i) development, expansion and exploration of understandings and working methods; ii) co-creation and collective creative processes; and iii) music technology practices.

One of the first trends relates to expanded understandings and the development of working methods. Several contributors discuss the disadvantages of existing and narrow concepts and how, in various ways, these restrict both understanding and practice. For example, the manner in which the musical material, i.e. "the work", is understood shapes its creation. The various fields and practices are constantly changing, as is the way we understand practice, creation and music. What we mean by

6 Translated from Norwegian.
7 Translated from Norwegian.

the terms we use and how we use them are also the subject of constant negotiation. The working methods used in the various fields change and expand in step – or out of step – with this. Many of the articles explore concepts and describe working methods that the authors use in their music creation.

The field of music is, moreover, characterised by various forms of collaboration and collective creative processes, and this co-creation takes place in several musical contexts and in different ways. The co-creative element is highlighted in several of the articles by referring to music creation not as a purely individual act or a purely individual activity, but as something which engages in a dialogue with a number of "co-creating" actors, ranging from history and tradition, contexts and other people, to technology. In this understanding of (co-)creation, tools, instruments and digital technologies are also included.

Unsurprisingly, music technology impacts the way music is created. Here, we refer to the use and significance of various forms of music technology in a fairly broad sense. Through the anthology, light is shed on the ways music technology sets the premises for, inspires, stimulates and enables new working methods and aesthetic expressions. Nevertheless, the technology may also be a barrier: access to it and the opportunities it affords are not equally distributed. The technology can blur the boundaries between roles, which means, for example, that clarifying copyright issues remains challenging.

In this anthology, we see several examples of how artistic research (AR) can take the form of reflection on one's own practice combined with interviews with others and their reflections on their own artistic practices. An important aspect of AR is contextualisation – positioning oneself in a context to better understand one's own work and the work of others. We also see that methods sometimes find common ground: something that may initially be perceived as AR can take a more musicological direction. This illustrates that the field is developing and that researchers can learn from each other's different artistic and academic practices.

Several contributions explore the landscape between artistic research (AR) and scientific research. A number of the articles are characterised by originality and an interdisciplinary approach. Some of these original and interdisciplinary combinations comprise:

- AR as dedicated concert series and practice analysed through a music philosophical lens
- focus groups and AR using machine learning in combination with discourse analysis
- autoethnography in combination with qualitative interviews
- the use of others' AR as a starting point for self-reflection combined with reflection on one's own AR
- text analysis in the context of social criticism, exemplified by self-composed cases
- compositions developed to theorise on specific fields and practices

The book is also interdisciplinary in the sense that the 12 articles reflect fairly different theoretical perspectives. The theoretical approaches employed include critical theory, practice theory, network theory, a variety of musicological theories, historically informed performance practices, performance theory, the philosophy of music and creativity theory.

Between and across practices: summary of the anthology's articles

This anthology is divided into three sections, each of which highlights different dimensions related to music-creating practices. Dividing the contents in this way is intended to highlight some key themes across the 12 articles. Part 1 concentrates on the development, expansion and exploration of understandings and working methods. Part 2 explores co-creation

and various forms of collective creative processes, while music technology practices are the focus of attention in Part 3.

Nevertheless, it is important to underscore that this is a pedagogical decision taken by the editorial group, which may (perhaps) be simplistic and mask other key topics addressed by each individual article. In other words, there are multiple overlaps among the themes, several of the articles could easily have been presented under other headings. To varying degrees, however, the articles engage each other in a dialogue across the book's different parts and collectively explore a diversity of issues concerning creative practices in the field of music.

Development, expansion and exploration of understandings and working methods

In the first article, musicologist **Tom Eide Osa** and folk singer **Berit Opheim** investigate changes in Norwegian folk song practices from 1950 to the present day. The objective was to discover what happens to the Norwegian folk song when it migrates from a private to a professional setting. It is clear that practices within the folk song genre are created and develop in a complex field of tension between tradition and modernisation, and between stability and change.

The authors point to several areas of tension in the creation and development of the Norwegian folk songs, based on interviews with key figures in the folk song world and an autoethnography written by Opheim herself. These tensions may be found between practices that conserve and practices that reach out, between the grassroots and a musical elite, between the normative and a musical diversity, and between musical tradition and modernisation. Spirituality and its co-creation are then highlighted as two fundamental dimensions, both by the interviewees and Opheim. The groundbreaking work carried out by Osa and Opheim links musicology's scientific methods to reflection on the researchers' own folk song practices. There are few systematic studies of practice within the field of folk music. The lack is particularly acute when it comes to folk

songs. This article therefore contributes more knowledge about how a music practice takes shape and develops within a tradition influenced by history and social development.

While Osa and Opheim describe the development of the folk song over the past 70 years, the next article focuses on how new music is created within the folk music genre today. **Unni Boksasp, Per Åsmund Omholt, Mats Johansson** and **Ragnhild Knudsen** investigate what characterises creative practices within today's Norwegian folk music genre, and which preconditions shape these practices. Through interviews with seven folk music creators, the authors describe working methods and contextual factors, what expectations the interviewees experience from different communities and administrative bodies, and how tradition can be both inspiring and constricting.

Furthermore, the article shows how financial frameworks can influence music creation in an ever more professionalised folk music field. The creative practices are analysed and described according to the categories: *recreation and shaping*, *reshaping and arranging*, *innovation in folk music* and *innovation around folk music*. A key finding is that the practice in itself helps to shape what innovative folk music is understood to be and how it is evaluated. The normative framework is a product of a constant discourse through and around the music. As a result, folk music is constantly (re)negotiating how the genre expresses and understands itself. The categories recreation, reshaping and innovation in and around folk music are therefore never static.

In the article "Blikk på øyeblikket. Eksempler på ulike arbeidsmetoder hos improviserende musikere" [Being in the moment. Examples of different working methods used by improvising musicians], **Ivar Grydeland** examines preparatory work and the impact this has on musical direction in improvisation. The article presents various examples of how performers work when they improvise, also with an emphasis on the portion of the work that takes place *before* the music is performed. Grydeland claims that the term improvisation fails to adequately convey the thoroughness of the preparatory work involved, and that this work is also

underappreciated. One finding is that certain creative musical performers wish to control the music so specifically that improvisation may no longer be a suitable term to describe the sounding outcome. One of the article's goals is to demystify what improvisation means. Grydeland's work therefore contributes new and important insights in the field of improvisation by presenting some specific working methods used by musical improvisers. Furthermore, the article helps to show the various ways in which these musicians challenge an outdated understanding of improvisation as a musical method.

The next article, written by **Rebecka Ahvenniemi**, investigates compositional strategies and critical music, based on an imaginary opera within the genre of contemporary classical music. She calls the five compositional strategies that she has developed through her own work: i) musical denaturalisation; ii) dumpster diving, iii) cultivation of ambivalent beauty; iv) embracing guilty pleasures; and v) cultivating synthetic landscapes: the authentic v. the inauthentic. One of Ahvenniemi's key points is that music is never neutral, it always contains different cultural codes and connotations with which the composer converses in their work. Another point is that society is clearly present when music is composed. Her work provides composers with tools designed to challenge their own views and biases through so-called critical composition. Ahvenniemi's study illustrates how artistic research can be used to link music and society more closely together and make that link relevant.

In the article "'Det er for mye interdisiplinært sirkus der ute'. Å utforske en flermedial partiturmusikk" ['There's too much interdisciplinary circus out there'. Exploring multimedia score-based music], **Hild Borchgrevink** discusses examples of creative practices in Norwegian score-based music after 2000. She focuses on music that actively combines musical sounds with other materials and tools. Borchgrevink describes a multimedia change of course for sheet music that occurred around the turn of the millennium, when a group of younger Norwegian composers and performers took a functional approach to the compositional material. The article also shows how the process from rehearsal to first public

performance takes place in two recent multimedia sheet music compositions. Through several musical examples, light is shed on the terms creative, practices and music. The article contributes to the development of theories concerning sheet music for non-sonic materials and tools, in addition to documenting, comparing and discussing examples of these multimedia practices. The study thus helps to shed light on a field that has undergone little theoretical development in a Norwegian context.

Co-creation and collective creational processes

In her article "Solastalgia – Toward new collaborative models in an interdisciplinary context", Karin Hellqvist describes an artistic collaboration between herself, the composer Carola Bauckhold and the visual artist Eric Lanz. Hellqvist seeks to explore how she can expand her creative identity by engaging actively in artistic co-creation, and her method is to describe, analyse and contextualise her own artistic practice. In the process, Hellqvist develops an artistic palette which enables her to better understand her own ability to act and her own creativity as a performer. The palette is centred around ownership, a safe space, resources and eco-anxiety. The study provides a detailed and practice-oriented insight into artistic processes, contributes to further discussion about where the boundary between music performance and creation actually lies, and problematises what loyalty to and ownership of a musical work entail.

In the article "*VERK vs. NETTVERK?* Om å forstå musikk på nye måtar i lys av historisk praksis" [WORK v. NETWORK? Understanding music in new ways in light of historic practice], the lutenist **Solmund Nystabakk** investigates alternative ways of understanding the work, how the performer can be a (co)creating artist, and meaning-making in musical performances as a collective process. Through his artistic practice as a performer of early music, Nystabakk explores the terms network, co-creation and intertextuality to understand historic and contemporary music practices and how they may be used as creative resources in the work of performance. He uses historically informed performance practices as

a theoretical framework and is interested in the interaction between the philosophy of music and performing practices.

Nystabakk helps to demonstrate how musical works and performances have, historically, come about through co-creative processes between multiple participants. In addition, he outlines an expansion of the way music is defined by examining the contexts in which it is situated. He also points out that musical practice and material are inextricably linked. By means of artistic research, the article sheds light on aspects of historic performing practices that have previously been underinvestigated.

Notto Thelle and **Bernt Isak Wærstad** explore what happens to musical co-creation when artificial intelligence (AI) is included as part of the creative mix. They also examine how the collaboration is impacted by potentially inherent cultural biases in the technology and the musicians. The authors have applied discourse analysis to transcripts of two workshops with four musicians from the project *Co-Creative Spaces*. One of the main findings is that the machine can be a musical co-creator, but only if people are prepared to adapt to the technology's aesthetics and not try to create the technology in their own image. AI and machine learning can thus lead to new forms of creative musical practices. By giving the machine more space and reducing their own playing, performers can find a balance between considering the machine a tool and a co-creator. This can give music creation a direction that is different from a collaboration between people.

In his article, **Audun Molde** explores the boundaries between songwriting and production in recorded pop music, and discusses working methods and copyright, as well as how the work and roles may be understood, by means of qualitative interviews with seven Norwegian producers/songwriters. One of Molde's main findings is how the roles of producer, songwriter and performer overlap and are closely linked to each other through the use of shared tools, i.e. the digital audio workstation (DAW). The study describes how the actors deal with the issues that arise when the terminology is limited, and shows that existing industry structures and copyright practices are insufficiently adapted to collective

work processes and the terms "songwriting" and "song". Molde's work introduces nuance to the role of the producer as a co-creating actor and thereby sheds light on a little-explored challenge in the music industry.

Music technology practices

In the article "Endringer i nyere teknologibaserte musikkpraksiser" [Changes in recent technology-based music practices], music technologists **Jøran Rudi** and **Ulf Holbrook** pose the following questions: What characterises the creative endeavour in the practices that have emerged since the 1990s? What do the artists themselves think about the challenges and opportunities that are associated with a technology-based practice? More specifically, the authors examine so-called *post-acousmatic* music, which describes a musical pluralism, to which end they have interviewed 23 different music creators and artists. Rudi and Holbrook's study shows that genre boundaries have become less pronounced and that creators often work across different fields. Music technology is seen as a collaborator, a source of inspiration and a tool for the exploration of artistic ideas. It is so deeply embedded in the way the artists think and work that it is perceived as an integral part of their creative practices.

The next article also addresses technology-based music practices, specifically the composition of *acousmatic* music. The study of **Natasha Barrett** and **Anders Tveit** is based on two specially composed *miniatures* to describe the actual process of composition and show how the starting point for acousmatic music is the structure and meaning of sounds. One of the authors' main points is that knowledge of technology and innovation are integral aspects of the composition process. Furthermore, their study leads them to point out that listeners, theoreticians and analysts must abandon their emphasis on note-based scores if they are to understand the genre and the compositional endeavour that underpins it. Barrett and Tveit's study helps to highlight a complex work process involving the collection and recording of audio material that may be discarded. It also helps to problematise the fact that the commissioning rates applied

by various composers' associations are not adapted to these kinds of compositional techniques.

In the anthology's final contribution, **Yngvar Kjus, Ragnhild Brøvig** and **Solveig Wang** investigate what characterises women's first experiences with the use of digital audio workstation (DAW) technology to create music. Through interviews with eight female course participants and three course holders, the authors find that the way the technology is explored is impacted by the fact that it takes place in a male-dominated arena. The women are left with a feeling of standing slightly on the outside – or in the shadow of a boys' club – and that mastering the technology is necessary to achieve control over, ownership of and recognition for their own artistic practice. They find both areas of opportunity and obstacles. For example, various forms of male dominance limit both their opportunities to learn how to use DAW and their further creative development. While mastering the technology for themselves is an important step towards creative independence, there is also a need for creative fellowship. Kjus, Brøvig and Wang draw attention to a field about which more knowledge is needed and help to illuminate the gender perspective within creative music technology practices. Their article thus adds nuance to the narrative with respect to how democratic the digitalisation of music technology really is by showing that access to it and the opportunities it affords are still not equally distributed. Molde's study also illustrates this gender imbalance within the music technology field, since practically all informants are men.

Conclusion and next steps

Hopefully, this book provides a richer understanding of a complex field. The inside-out/outside-in perspectives are both effective – the generally applicable and overarching lines are combined with detailed descriptions and experiences from different practices. Together, this contributes to a more complete picture of the creative music practices in effect at this moment in time. We also see that these perspectives on creative music

practices and practice research, i.e. artistic research and musicology, are mutually beneficial. Instead of getting in each other's way, the combination provides a more holistic picture of how music is created today. This is also one of few anthologies to explore research into creative music practices in a Norwegian context. The bulk of the research in this book (10 out of 12 articles) has been written in Norwegian.

Furthermore, the book illustrates how the field of creative music practices is constantly changing, with genres and areas continuously developing. A consequence of this is an ever present need to obtain updated knowledge about these practices and to explore these changes. Of course, the anthology does not cover every musical genre or field. Nor was this our objective. Nevertheless, a slightly greater diversity of genres could have been represented, and the book could have contained more about genre-typical practices and practices linked to the groups highlighted in Arts and Culture Norway's diversity mission. Other practices that could also be relevant for further investigation include those engaged in by people from multicultural backgrounds and diverse geographic origins, cross-artistic practices, practices developed for and with children, practices at the intersection of the professional and the amateur, and practices in bands and groups. To include some of these perspectives, we have, in partnership with the research programme and our work on this anthology, also published a collection of essays. Here, other voices, both new and well-established, have been able to describe their creative practices in a freer textual format. While this collection complements the anthology, there is still a need to further examine these different practices.

In this research programme, we have focused on practices and have limited the investigations to the creative, performative and production stages. This illuminates only one side of music practices, because these generally meet a recipient at the other end. The created and creative are interpreted and experienced by an audience in whom the meaning of the creative takes root. A natural next step would be to look at how the music that is created is perceived and received. This and other topics

are included in Arts and Culture Norway's next research initiative, which examines the general population's cultural habits.

In this anthology, we have attempted to shed empirical light on a broad and evolving field by creating new theoretical and artistic understandings of what creative music practices can be within a variety of contexts. Three characteristics in particular seem to be prevalent in the creative music practices examined in this book: i) development, expansion and exploration of understandings and working methods; ii) co-creation and collective creative processes; and iii) music technology practices. By combining empirical analysis with experience-based approaches, we have attempted to provide a richer and more multidimensional understanding of what creative music practices can be. In this way, we hope this research anthology can inspire similar research initiatives in the future.

References

Borgdorff, H.A. (2012). *The conflict of the faculties: Perspectives on artistic research and academia.* [PhD thesis]. Leiden University.

Burnard, P. (2012). *Musical creativities in practice*. Oxford University Press.

Cook, N. (2018). *Music as creative practice*. Oxford University Press.

Goehr, L. (1992). *Imaginary museum of musical works: An essay in the philosophy of music*. Oxford University Press.

Grünfeld, N. (2022). Metode i kunstnerisk utviklingsarbeid [Method in artistic research]. *Norsk medietidsskrift, 29*(4), 1–4. https://doi.org/10.18261/nmt.29.4.6

Harris, M. (1976). History and significance of the emic/etic distinction. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 5, 329–350.

Hovik, L. (2012). *Mamma Danser*: Teater for de minste som kunstnerisk forskning [Mummy Dances: Theatre for infants as artistic research]. *InFormation – Nordic Journal of Art and Research, 1*(2), 94–111.

Jensenius, A.R. (2022). *Sound actions: Conceptualizing musical instruments*. The MIT Press. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/14220.001.0001

Nielsen, S.K. & Krogh, M. (2014). At musikere: En praktisk orientering i musikvidenskaben – i et faghistorisk og videnskabsteoretisk lys [Musicking: a practical guide to musicology – seen in an academic history and scientific theory-based light]. *Danish Musicology Online*, *Special Edition*, 5–17.

Reckwitz, A. (2002). Toward a theory of social practices: A development in culturalist theorizing. *European Journal of Social Theory, 5*(2), 243–263.[8] https://doi.org/10.1177/13684310222225432

Risset, J.-C. (2015). Recollections and reflections on organised sound. *Organised Sound*, *20*(1), 15–22.

Ruud, E. (2016). *Musikkvitenskap* [Musicology]. Universitetsforlaget.

Schatzki, T.R. (2001). Introduction: Practice theory. In T.R. Schatzki, K.K. Cetina & E. von Savigny (Eds.), *The practice turn in contemporary theory* (pp. 10–23). Routledge.[9]

Small, C. (1998). *Musicking: The meanings of performing and listening*. University Press of New England.

Norwegian Copyright Act (2018). *Lov om opphavsrett til åndsverk mv*. (LOV-2018-06-15-40). Lovdata. https://lovdata.no/dokument/LTI/lov/2018-06-15-40

8 These books are not primary sources but are included in texts cited by Nielsen & Krogh (2014).

9 Ibid.