

Introduction—Music practices across borders

(E)valuating space, diversity and exchange

Glaucia Peres da Silva & Konstantin Hondros

Music practices, understood as activities connected to humanly organized sound, extend beyond enclosed spaces both physically and metaphorically, crossing borders of all kinds. When they cross the borders of national states and create stable networks among musicians, fans, people involved in the music business, etc., they can be considered transnational. Central to this concept is the idea that members of this network are embedded in more than one national state at the same time, combining elements of all of them to create and experience music. Analyses of transnational music practices (see, for example, Guilbault 1996; Glick Schiller/Meinhof 2011) point to the importance of the social space created through transnational music practices, where different forms of exchange take place and result in a diversity of sounds, performances, ways of listening, involved actors, etc. Interestingly, transnational music practices enjoy different meanings and statuses according to the context in which they happen (see, for example, Gaudette 2013). Although the literature describes cases where it applies, we still know little about the ways in which music practices are valued and evaluated in transnational contexts. For this reason, we consider it important to gain insight from new developments in the Sociology of Valuation and Evaluation (SVE) (Lamont 2012) in order to better understand how space, diversity and exchange are entangled with the valuation and evaluation of transnational music practices.

Literature on valuation has indicated that the concept of value has several meanings and that different perspectives can be distinguished. Central to our understanding is John Dewey's seminal differentiation between the perspectives of value as a verb and thus as a process and value as a noun. As a noun, values appear to be fixed entities; it is the perspective of valuing as

a process or verb that allows for several meanings of valuation to emerge. Dewey makes us aware that valuing might come in the form of prizes, in the sense of regarding something as precious. In music, this prizes could be connected to the intrinsic value of the music based on aesthetics or the listener's emotions. Valuing can also be used to appraise, which indicates an assigning of value, whereby value is used instrumentally. In music, we can find these kinds of valuations in the form of criticism or rankings. Thus, evaluation is connected to the existence of multiple criteria and categories that are used to judge and classify objects in comparison to each other. With Lamont, we understand valuation as practices which give worth or value and evaluation as practices that assess "how an entity attains a certain type of worth." (2012: 205) In our approach, we opted to use both concepts in the form of (e)valuation. Putting the "e" in parentheses—creating "(e)valuation"—indicates the fluid boundaries of and challenges associated with separating value and evaluation in practice.

Inspired by these ideas, we organized a conference at the University of Duisburg-Essen in June 2018, entitled *(E)valuating Transnational Music Practices: Space, Diversity, and Exchange*, in which 23 scholars from different parts of the world participated. This book presents a selection of the papers discussed at the conference, offering a colorful overview of the current research on the (e)valuation of transnational music practices. The result is deliberately interdisciplinary, comprising contributions from sociology, history, musicology, anthropology and ethnomusicology. The papers presented in this volume discuss a myriad of coordination modes mobilized by actors involved in transnational music practices when faced with evaluative processes in different parts of the world and during different historical periods. Together, these papers broaden the perspectives of each discipline and contribute to a better understanding of their main topics in connection to transnationalism, (e)valuation and music practices.

In order to offer a guideline for exploring the papers that follow, this introduction delineates a theoretical framework to shed light on the intersection of both migration studies and the sociology of valuation and evaluation in the analysis of music practices. We start by defining our object—music practices—and point to its connection to both transnational aspects and (e) valuation processes. Then, we present some considerations on the study of music practices in the literature on migration and globalization before moving on to discuss the theory of valuation and the value of music. In the final

part, we present a short case study on the (e)valuation of transnational music practices emerging from the Eurovision Song Contest (ESC).

Music and music practices

Discussions on the definition of music as a scientific concept have produced a series of approaches that are difficult to reconcile. Most basically, music can be understood as “sound organized into socially accepted patterns.” (Blacking 1969: 36) For Blume and Finscher (1994: 1195), “music” originally refers to a group of key words—Musiké, musica, Musik—whose history, definitions, classifications and meanings interweave in complex ways and are interpreted differently in each subject area. For this reason, they state that every attempt to grasp music conceptually stresses only those aspects of the phenomenon that are considered meaningful and noteworthy in this area. For example, musicologists differentiate between theoretical, practical and poetic music, situating the phenomenon somewhere between science and art (Cadenbach et al. 1994: 1792). In popular music studies, this definition is considered a mystification, since it suggests that its denotative content (musical material) exclusively determines its discursive function. As in popular music, there is a strong divergence between denotative and discursive functions, with researchers in this field preferring to define music as a concrete set of social, cultural and aesthetic practices that are communicated through sound (Wicke 2004: 166). Ethnomusicologists attempt to avoid the Eurocentrism inherent in musicology’s concept of music, speaking of musics in plural in order to grasp the various meanings of music in different regions of the world (Christensen et al. 1994: 1280). For Keller (2011), this debate reveals that every culture sets the limits of what their representatives call music in their practices differently, since all concepts refer to sound design and the use of sound. So, he suggests that music has to be defined in context. Aware of these difficulties surrounding the concept of music, we do not intend to refine definitions of music, but rather we suggest focusing on music practices, thereby shifting the focus to actors’ doings and sayings (Schatzki 1996) through which tacit (e)valuations become feasible.

We understand practices as “embodied, materially mediated arrays of human activity centrally organized around shared practical understanding.” (Schatzki 2001: 11) This concept allows us to grasp the different concepts

of music in various contexts and, at the same time, stress its performative character as “an actual phenomenon generated by instruments, machines, hands and actions.” (Hennion 2001: 2) As practices constitute social relationships (cf. Swidler 2005: 95), music practices have to be understood as emerging within interactions. Music is created, can be played, heard, danced to, recorded and discarded, thereby attaching or detaching people and creating social realities. In this sense, music practices have intrinsic cognitive and emotional dimensions (cf. Acord/Denora 2008: 230) which cannot be confined to audibility. They synesthetically intertwine with visual, haptic and olfactory aspects: music is “seen” when the YouTube video is clicked, “felt” when a subwoofer vibrates through every muscle and “smelled” when the sweating festival crowd rocks.

Moreover, notions of origin or ancestry, ideas of the sacred, certain places, political claims, aesthetic norms or economic exchange create compound contexts for defining music and its connected practices. From this perspective, contexts are not fixed and may change as actors move and technology evolves. It follows that music practices may interconnect people in new ways, create new relations between physical and virtual spaces, or even create new kinds of spaces themselves. In this process, boundaries between genres and categories are spanned, raising questions about belonging and distinction, as Haworth (2016) demonstrates in the analysis of the category Computer Music at the Prix Ars Electronica festival. Concerns about the local or global status of music practices also emerge, expounding on the problem of borders, as the case of Korean American musicians on YouTube demonstrates (Jung 2014). While occupying a marginal position in the American music market, they have managed to become popular musicians in South Korea through their use of YouTube. This constant movement of people, ideas, objects and capital across borders in physical and virtual spaces leads to the emergence of transnational spaces, formed by the interlocking of these movements and shaped by national states which, in turn, cannot contain them (cf. Glick Schiller 2010; Pries 2013). Music practices that cross borders are thus embedded in multiple contexts simultaneously, being differently defined in each one of them.

Thévenot stresses that practices in general also have a moral element, in the sense of “actors’ preoccupation with the good.” (2005: 67) This individual or collective worry with the good “shapes the evaluative process governing any pragmatic engagement.” (Ibid: 65) This means that actors mobilize con-

ceptions of good in order to rank people and things in their practices when engaging with their material environment. In turn, this environment responds and leads actors to adjust to it using a specific mode of coordination that keeps life going. Applying this approach to the case of music, according to actors' preoccupation with "good music", music practices gain meaning, are rehearsed and brought to perfection, may be forgotten or move across borders. The evaluation processes involved in music practices are also different according to the contexts in which they occur and the environments with which actors engage. In the case of music practices that are embedded in multiple contexts, we find many evaluations taking place simultaneously, fostering actors to engage in diverse adjustments in each environment with which they engage. The quandary for actors involved in transnational music practices is related to how their engagement with "good music" can be adjusted to the concepts of "good music" in the multiple contexts in which they act and which modes of coordination should be used to mobilize their practices. After focusing on music practices that cross borders and the different standards and contexts they interact with, we turn now to discuss the relationship between migration studies, globalization and music.

Migration studies, globalization and music

The concept of migration describes a process of an enduring change of residence which may take place at different levels (cf. Pries 2009: 475). Rural-urban migration and the movement from city to hinterland are considered local phenomena, whereas domestic migration concerns the national level. When peoples' movements cross the borders of national states and connect geographically distant regions, migration gains a transnational scope. In order to grasp immigration in its complexity, researchers focus on its forms, causes and effects. In this section, we will discuss how understanding migration has informed the interpretation of music practices. The first approaches to international migration considered it as a unidirectional and nonrecurring movement from residence-country A to residence-country B, which could include in some cases a second movement back to the original society (return migration). From this perspective, analyses concentrated on the sending regions, where the population shrank, or in the receiving region, where the population diversified. Among the main causes of migration were geograph-

ical and economic factors as well as prestige (cf. Hoffmann-Nowotny 1970). Its effects were grasped through concepts of assimilation, integration and incorporation (cf. Park 1928; Taft 1953). Assuming that migrant musicians are physically displaced from a culture which is familiar to them and embedded in another culture in which they tend to be in the minority, comparative musicology concentrated on “the diffusion of artefacts such as musical instruments from one culture to another” (Baily/Collyer 2006: 168) that followed migrants’ movements. Later, as ethnomusicology was in its formative phase, research focused on “issues of acculturation, cultural change and cultural innovation” (Ibid: 169) involving music practices.

In the last decades, however, developments in communication technology, transport facilities and modern capitalist production relations as a result of globalization processes have brought about new possibilities for connecting distant regions that affect migration. On the one hand, people could be connected to each other through communication technologies without traveling. On the other hand, more people were able to travel. These facts affected migrants’ lives in a particular way: they could be simultaneously incorporated into more than one nation-state. These changes led to an increase in empirical research on immigration, and a new paradigm for these studies emerged: transnationalism (Glick Schiller 2010: 448). As a consequence, researchers observed that immigrants also moved according to their network contacts, which are not confined to one territory and may include many transit areas. In this sense, they may move forth and back again repeatedly, giving up their statuses as immigrants temporarily, or commute between countries. Besides, the motivation to emigrate may vary within migrants from the same region, since the pioneers may stimulate new waves of migration to the same receiving country as a consequence of their settlement. Thus, migration may be based in social capital and have a cumulative causation (cf. Massey et al. 1998).

From this perspective, it is possible to identify the formation of transnational social spaces (cf. Pries 1996) through the analysis of multiple interlocking egocentric networks (cf. Glick Schiller 2010: 455) which cross the borders of national states. Often referred to as “de-localized” or “de-territorialized”, transnational social spaces clearly reconfigure nation-states and their relationships (cf. Wimmer/Glick Schiller 2002: 301). In these spaces, there is a compression of relatively stable social relations and networks (cf. Pries 2013: 885), monetary flows (cf. Mazzucato et al. 2006), political influence

(cf. Fitzgerald 2000; Østergaard-Nielsen 2003), and cultural exchange (cf. Kennedy/Roudometof 2002) which connect distant places. People moving in this transnational social space are called transmigrants, since their actions, decisions, subjectivities and identities refer simultaneously to two or more nation-states (cf. Basch et al. 2005: 7).

To be sure, transnational social spaces are to be distinguished from other notions connected to the “-national”. International refers to the relationship between nation-states taken as single entities, considering that their borders are kept stable. Supranational builds on the same idea of stable borders but refers to structures that are constructed above the nation-states. Postnational stresses the opening of the border of nation-states under the pressures of globalization (Habermas 2001: 58f). They all reflect a dispute over how to grasp the borders nation-states create as a consequence of globalization processes. From a transnational perspective, the borders of nation-states do not disappear, but are crossed and reconfigured by actors and their practices. Still, borders are perceived in “legal regimes, policies and institutional structures of power.” (Glick Schiller/Meinhof 2011: 23)

Transmigrant music practices are considered “a product of social relations that link multiple localities and people of various cultural backgrounds within and across borders.” (Glick Schiller/Meinhof 2011: 34) Interestingly, these localities may not continue to exist as they did when migrants left them, but they can be re-enacted by migrants in their private spheres by repeating music practices that reinforce and respond to feelings of nostalgia (cf. Baily/Collyer 2006: 171). In this sense, a transnational social space may include spaces in memory.

A transnational view on the music practices of migrants sheds new light on discussions about authenticity and identity, as Gilroy shows in his analysis of the black Atlantic world (cf. Gilroy 1993: 72). Making references to jazz, soul, reggae and hip-hop, he points to the entanglements of identities in the case of being black and British at the same time, for example, raising questions about double consciousness and “ideas about the integrity and purity of cultures [...] which concern] the relationship between nationality and ethnicity.” (Ibid: 7) In his accounts of the historic development of black music, Gilroy reveals how racism and resentments against migrants and their descendants in different host countries contribute to the configuration of transmigrant music practices. This is the case for Apache Indian, a British musician of Indian descent who referenced Punjabi music, sound system

culture and the reggae of the Caribbean as well as soul and hip-hop from the United States to make his music.

Looking at the black Atlantic perspective from the Brazilian coast, this transnational social space also includes a “reinvented Africa” (Pinho 2004) based on the ethno-political organization of the continent dating back to the slave trade. Music practices such as samba reggae recall and revive cultural identities that are, at the same time, black (African) and “baiano” (from Bahia, a Brazilian state), discarding a national identity in favor of a transnational way of belonging (cf. Glick Schiller 2010: 458). These music practices are thus not directly connected to transmigrants but are rather built upon a history of forced migration.

Taking the perspective of Caribbean artists, Guilbault (1996) points out that there is a particular migrant tradition in the transnational space of the black Atlantic that forces people to leave their home countries in response to marginal positioning but also to reinforce ties to home in their host countries through the politics of multiculturalism. It follows that soca and calypso superstars lead a transnational life regardless of the country where they have their permanent homes, sharing the same fluid experiences despite their migrant status. For this reason, Guilbault (1996) argues that a transnational perspective avoids “the conflation of geographic space and social identity”¹, blurring the differences between migrants and non-migrants.

Adopting a different view, now focusing on the experience of Africans in Kenya, Mukasa Situma Wafula (Chapter 2) shows that there are transnational social spaces which may not be connected to migrants at all, as in the case of the Kenya Music Festival. If we keep the identification between nation and ethnicity but consider that the limits of this identification do not coincide with the geographic borders of a state, Kenya can be reframed as a country with several sub-nations. In the space of the festival, these sub-nations present music practices that both adhere to and defy the Western concept of music, being at the same time faithful to their ethnic culture and suitable to academic music standards. The borrowings of references and practices among performing groups which meet yearly at this huge event effectively constructed a transnational social space in which migrant status does not play any role.

¹ Beyond the »World Music« Label”, February 26, 2019 (https://www2.hu-berlin.de/fpm/textpool/texte/guilbault_beyond-the-world-wusic-label.htm).

For these reasons, Glick Schiller and Meinhoff argue that researchers should “step out of the migrant/native divide [... in order] to study and theorize creative processes that bring together the intertwining of cultural influences.” (2011: 22) Assuming a global power perspective, the authors plead for the consideration of local differences within the nation-states as well as the participation of both migrants and natives in transnational networks. They suggest focusing on the connection between actors within transnational networks of relationships and on the forms of exchange that occur in this space (and also in specific places) which mutually construct the global, the national and the local (Ibid: 25). Following this argument, a transnational social space becomes a space of exchange across borders which may be a country (El Kahla, Chapter 6), a city (González, Chapter 7), a festival (Lell, Chapter 3) or a trade fair (Le Coz, Chapter 4).

It follows that the focus on transnational spaces of exchange brings the creative process involved in music practices to the foreground, not its results—whether it is conceptualized as hybrid, pure or authentic (cf. Glick Schiller/Meinhof 2011: 22). In doing so, a transnational approach sidesteps the problem of how to imagine the ambivalent cultural consequences of globalization—as an irresistible force that tends to homogenize all aspects of our lives, destroying the diversity of cultures and life forms (cf. Barber 1996; Hauck 2008; Ritzer 1996), or as new hybrid forms (cf. Appadurai 1990; Bhabha 2004; Nederveen Pieterse 1995). Building upon Robertson’s suggestion to focus on “the production of cultural pluralism” (Robertson 1995: 31), research on musicians’ transnational networks suggests that ethnic connections may be both “a creative necessity *and* a limitation, a nostalgic identification *and* a strategic tool for surviving as a professional musician in a hugely competitive commercialized scene [... becoming] discursive registers within the artists’ transnational repertoire.” (Glick Schiller/Meinhof 2011: 30) In this sense, ethnicity is only one aspect of the musicians’ links.

As Bystron and Santana (Chapter 8) show, music practices like samba, which emerged in transnational social spaces, may keep connecting new actors, spanning its borders to include “batucada” groups in Germany that might not share any ethnic link with other samba musicians in Brazil. Their connection results from the contact with Brazilian migrants, the diffusion of scores or videos on the Internet, a shared taste for the music or a desire to belong to the same transnational network. Apart from seeing this process as harmful for the samba tradition, the authors reveal the diversity of music

practices found under the category samba. A similar account of the diversity of creative processes in transnational spaces of exchange is presented by Riva (Chapter 5). His analysis of fusion projects between classical music and a notion of African music (with or without the participation of African composers and musicians) highlights the idea that this transnational space of exchange accommodates different creative settings and reaches diverse results.

However, transnational social spaces are also marked by inequalities (Glick Schiller/Meinhof 2011: 31). Not all members of these interlocking networks have the same access to resources and places. One factor affecting musicians' position and mobility within these spaces is the evaluation of their music practices, which may vary according to the different environments with which musicians engage. There are hierarchies in transnational social spaces that are induced by the distinct modes of coordination mobilized in music practices. In order to better understand how music practices are valued in transnational social spaces, we turn now to the discussion of the theory of valuation and the value of music.

The valuation and evaluation of transnational music practices

In transnational spaces, where actors with diverse national backgrounds come together through different modes of coordination, we find an especially dense field to observe how actors distinguish value and evaluate music practices according to their concepts of "good music". This evaluation starts with simple comparisons of music practices but can evolve into strict hierarchies of music's worth. As Michelle Lamont (2012) points out from a more general societal level, strict modes of valuation can lead to a thriving of inequality, which the literature has described as a "winner-take-all society." (Frank/Cook 2010) Thus, there is a major concern underlying what she calls the sociology of valuation and evaluation (SVE) in opposing unidimensional conceptions of worth and focusing on how value can be perceived in a multitude of ways. In this way, the SVE aims for heterarchies or pluralities of worth. For Lamont, the key question is how to understand better the processes sustaining heterarchies, ensuring that "a larger proportion of the members of our society can be defined as valuable." (2012: 202)

Thinking of the millions and millions of songs never heard on Spotify—some of them eventually become visible and differently valued on “forgotify”²—appears instructive for sociological work about the valuation, evaluation and worth of music practices. From our perspective, transnational social spaces are where we can find a heterarchical diversity of exchange forms and results that shows the multidimensionality of value attached to music practices. Following Lamont, we also differentiate two key processes of (e)valuation in the discussions of our anthology: categorization and legitimization. While categorization is a requirement for determining singular entities and making them comparable, legitimization refers to recognition, which is often connected theoretically to the accumulation of symbolic capital as proposed by Bourdieu (1993).

A valuable background for the discussion about heterarchies, modes of coordination, or, as Boltanski and Thévenot (2006) call it, orders of worth, is their seminal work *On justification*. In their study opposing a neo-classical model of economics and economic rationalization, they show how several different and distinguishable modes of attaching value exist. While their model was initially comprised of six orders of worth (market, industrial, civic, domestic, inspired, and fame) (Boltanski/Thévenot 1999), it is based on actors' practices and is neither qualitatively, quantitatively, nor temporarily fixed. Diverting orders of worth usually become apparent in situations of conflict, called critical moments, where justifications for a value judgment are uncertain. This makes values contingent. Yet, one of Boltanski and Thévenot's main arguments is that coordination between actors is still possible, and they show how diverting orders of worth can converge and allow for compromises.

In entrepreneurial and organizational studies interested in heterarchies, we find that it is exactly this struggle between opposing values and evaluations that allows for creativity and, thus, for entrepreneurial success (Stark 2011). However, despite the contingency and diversity of values, the literature also points out that valuing through pricing—the typical economic mode of ascribing value—has become a dominant practice, ubiquitous in realms of reality formerly separated from this numeric form of value, as well. Viviane Zelizer (2017) demonstrates how this market logic guided by pricing was applied to life to assert its value in the form of life insurance. In another

² “Forget me not”, January 17, 2019 (<http://forgotify.com/>).

study about the pricing of children, Zelizer shows how valuations may have changed over time from economic assets in the 19th century to economically worthless but emotionally priceless in the first decades of the 20th century. She thereby traces the emerging markets of child insurance, compensation for wrongful deaths of children and the adoption and sale of children, all of which are connected to a pricing of children. Thus, in her historical analyses, she discusses how market and moral values interact, revealing that economic values are also contingent and diverse. In music, we find similar dynamics between commercial and aesthetic valuations, where economic evaluations may oppose artistic evaluations of “good music”.

Considering the multidimensional values of music practices with their contingencies and diversities, it is important to highlight that value attachment has much to do with particular features of “music”. Music practices in the sense of songs, concerts, events and so on can be considered as containing singularities. Following Lucien Karpik (2010), singularities are unique and, thus, incommensurable. Determining the value of a singular good entails a high degree of quality uncertainty. In order to gain some certainty about a singularity’s value and to legitimize it, we apply instruments or, as Karpik says, judgement devices. These can be personal networks (peer groups), cicerones (critics, guidebooks), rankings, appellations (labels, certifications, brands, titles) or confluences (company techniques to channel buyers). Yet these devices not only assess value and evaluate, but they also give value, as was shown with rock music and the value creation surrounding it (Regev 1994).

In the case of music practices, one device employed to attach value is the charts, which position songs in hierarchical orders, often depicting a simplistic picture of current evaluations purely based on consumer behavior. Examples of judgement devices in music marketplaces are expensive special editions of albums, used often to increase their value with more or less interesting gimmicks, the possibility of cheap downloads of single pieces of the album, or also subscriptions to streaming services where the value of a single song becomes more and more difficult to determine. In this context, playlists, tags, numbers of plays and the like become valuable judgement devices.

Devices for judging cultural value, also seen as a performing of rites (Frith 1998), are connected to tastes and are often related to habitual explanations and justifications of different social groups (Bourdieu 1987). For example, critics evaluate by referring to and combining subjective taste and

expert knowledge in order to justify their judgment on the aesthetic value of a particular piece of music, album or live performance. Similarly, discussions about music among peers, distinguishing “good” from “bad music” through arguing (Frith 2013), are means to value and evaluate music that are based on taste and knowledge. In this sense, taste is “redefined during the action, with a result that is partly uncertain” (Hennion 2001: 1) and cannot be explained only by reference to the social origins or aesthetic properties of the works.

Categorization and legitimization are central as judgment devices, since these processes allow for a certain comparability of singular objects. The usage of categorizing and legitimizing can thereby be very visible, as in the case of competition at a festival (Wafula, Chapter 2), tacitly interwoven in the process of artistic creation (Fryberger, Chapter 1), or connected to a transnational network of actors (Le Coz, Chapter 4). John Blacking (1969) considers music value as inseparable from its creation and performance and, thus, from human experience itself. However, this individualistic point of view is connected to a social embeddedness of value, since music value emerges from performative situations in the form of communication through what he calls “humanly organized sound.” (Blacking 1969: 71) A key feature for Blacking is that the composer brings together distant social elements of her or his society like bourgeois conventions and peasant melodies, revealing music’s ability to fuse. In a similar vein, observers who think of the value of the music experience as “being alone together” simultaneously stress diverse possible forms of participation in this communication (Bowman 2002). In this sense, the notion of singularities implies that isolated items, like songs, are not ordered vertically in value hierarchies from the start, but are rather ordered horizontally, reinforcing the possibility of heterarchies. Each piece of music initially has the “same” value. This process is connected to the value and evaluation of diversity that is regularly encountered in transnational music practices.

Diversity has been a constant companion especially in world music, hip hop and electronic music, but recently also in classical music. Diversity is almost considered to be a value in itself, supported in international cultural policy (as in the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions) and fostered by musicians from different world regions. However, especially historically, we see how the evaluation of diversity has been an issue due to unequal power relations in transnational

spaces, causing discrimination (Gonzalez, Chapter 7) and passiveness towards preservation (El Kahla, Chapter 6). In this line of thinking, diversity of music practice might hardly be more than a consumer-friendly multiculturalism (Feld 2000), envisioning a democratic image of music by flooding the market with diversified musical products. Thus, the (e)valuation of diversity can blur distinctions between rules in some fields of music practice (Bystron/Santana, Chapter 8), and its forms can vary so strongly that it can lead to new forms of homogenization under new categories.

Focusing on the (e)valuation of exchanges that underlie the diversity of music practices in transnational spaces, we consider them twofold. On the one hand, (e)valuation of exchange focuses on the economic relationship between sellers and buyers, raising questions about product availability, range of market coverage and shifts in musics' value and pricing in both physical and digital music practices (Chu/Lu 2007; Buxmann, Strube/Pohl 2007). On the other hand, (e)valuation of exchange refers to relationships between musicians that cross the borders of their musical tradition (see Riva, Chapter 5) and also between musicians and their fans (see Lell, Chapter 3). Transnational exchange can thereby be evaluated as happening on different levels, showing especially how collaborations between diverse music actors gain from transnational backgrounds and how the appropriation of symbols, creation of styles and formation of communities are part of this process.

In this sense, (e)valuation of diversity and exchange point to identity and identity building. As the example of identity-building for Christian youth through Christian heavy metal music (Moberg 2007) shows, communication among peers as a judgement device based on taste may lead to the formation of an identity connected to transnational music practices. This process may unfold with a focus on local identity construction, as in the case of Singapore (Kong 1997), or on the construction of transnational identity, as in the case of a Vietnamese identity emerging between nostalgia and political resistance (Valverde 2003). In these examples, the national borders are crossed to create a transnational space for music practices. However, there is also a backlash against it in projects of nation branding (Gienow-Hecht 2016), which aim to reposition the nation in transnational spaces using music as a national symbol. This is part of a strategy of sound diplomacy that is mobilized by national states and cities, which encourages festival visitors to take part in cultural tourism and attaches values to sites, cities or communities, reframing spaces through music, and since it happens in very localized and

culturally embedded settings, fostering attention to their liveness (Lange/Bürkner 2012).

An example of this complex and intertwined process of (e)valuation of space, diversity and exchange in transnational music practices will be discussed below in a short case study on the Eurovision Song Contest.

The Eurovision Song Contest—A transnational music practice

In the following, we discuss the Eurovision Song Contest (ESC) as one example of the role played by space, diversity and exchange in yielding both value and categories to evaluate transnational music practices. As a music contest between nation-states and based on a supranational European connection with representatives coming together for a “sing-off”, the ESC constitutes a great case for what we understand as a transnational music practice as well as a very good match for a music practice going beyond the usual assumption of music as a mainly audible sensation. Far more than that, it is an interwoven web of practices that together unfold at the ESC. Through the omnipresent nature of the contest, the event is also of high interest from the perspective of evaluation. As a short case study, this example aims to introduce the depicted conceptual framework *in situ* and thereby provide a first glimpse at the opportunities for analysis it opens up. We thus shed light on a couple of interesting aspects.

In general, we want to discuss the ESC as an event construing transnationality by shifting between forms and engagement with “nation(s)”. In a nutshell, the ESC could be seen as an international contest between (allegedly) national actors that forms a transnational media event with worldwide recognition. Our perspective on the ESC as one interrelated music practice is connected to recent developments in practice theory that go beyond a micro-foundation of practice. These theoretical contributions argue for a flat ontology that does not differentiate in a conventional manner between micro and macro (Schatzki 2016; Nicolini 2016). Here, even a large-scale phenomenon like the ESC can be viewed as a practice itself. However, that does not mean that there are plentiful further practices as noted above in connection to the ESC, together establishing a web of practice (Schatzki 2005b). In this way, we will take a look at evaluation practices that are part of the

contest and betting practices that have been a valuable asset in the contest for decades.

The ESC is a famous and successful annual music contest in Europe. The literature depicts this contest as a large-scale media event (Dayan/Katz 1994), comparing it to contemporary sports events or, historically, to the World Trade Fair (Bolin 2006). Though highly successful, its evaluation approach is very controversial. Hardcore fans celebrate ESC-parties, but many critics deny the aesthetic and artistic quality of the participating songs in general. In any event, someone who grew up in Europe is very likely to be at least partially informed about the event, since it is an important topic of media coverage. A lot of historical narratives are connected to it, fostered by media formats like Eurovision's Greatest Hits, which values particular performances.

In 1956, the European Broadcasting Union introduced this event. The exact format has changed slightly over time, yet the main threads remain: each participating nation-state sends a song to the competition, with a voting system determining a winner at the end. Starting with seven nations in 1956, the competition has significantly increased in scope, with 43 nations participating in 2018. Chronologically, music takes the central position at the ESC in its recurrent and schematic composition, yet there are several practices accompanying the contest that are interwoven with the singular pieces of music and influence the whole event. Entertainment practices are central. Different sorts of films contribute a lot of non-musical visual material. The evaluation practices at the end of the show take hours and last as long as the musical part, building a climax towards the end that is hardly connected to any of the music. Interestingly, betting practices are strongly connected to the event, with media coverage very casually speaking about favorites for the bookkeepers. Also, practices of fan culture and tourism need to be added, depicting a colorful picture of linked practices that together can be called the ESC.

Obviously, basic elements of the contest are connotated nationally. Contestants are nominated on a national basis with one representative per nation. The representative, however, need not be a citizen of the nation she or he represents, yet this is most often the case anyways. Her or his migrant status does not play any role. This leads to a nation's representative eventually being chosen as a winner. Also, national symbols are omnipresent in this event. Recent broadcasts of the contest seldom show images without the symbol of a nation somewhere—despite the performances themselves,

where national symbols are tacitly interwoven (Miazhevich 2010; Mitrović 2010). Still, research has shown how ambiguous the ESC's relation to the “nation” is. While some reflect mainly on national aspects (Wolther 2006), others stress an interrelation between the national and international (Mitrović 2010). These reflections on the ESC often take a critical stance towards the affirmative “Eurovision” promise of the contest that in many respects does not stand for what actually takes place. Depicted as the “gay Olympics” (Baker 2017), the ESC has an influence on the visibility and integration of queerness in the public and is evaluated as playing an important role in building belonging for this group in relation to the transnational concept of Europe.

From a structural perspective, introduction, performance and evaluation make up the ESC's music practice. The table below illustrates the temporal distribution of broadcasting time in minutes in the main parts of the event looking at three events from three decades³:

Table 1: ESC structure

Phase / Event	Brighton, 1974 ⁴	Dublin, 1981 ⁵	Jerusalem, 1999 ⁶	Moscow, 2009 ⁷	Lisbon, 2018 ⁸
Introduction	7 (6,4%)	8,5 (5,6%)	15,75 (8,1%)	13 (6,6%)	16,5 (7,2%)
Performance	68,5 (62,4%)	83,5 (55,4%)	103,75 (53,5%)	98 (50%)	112,5 (49%)
Evaluation	34,25 (31,2%)	58,75 (39%)	74,5 (38,4%)	85 (43,4%)	100,5 (43,8%)
Total	109,75	150,75	194	196	229,5

Source: data gathered by authors based on videos on YouTube

3 We determined the broadcasting length by the length of a YouTube-Video of the whole event. The duration of each part was measured by hand. All time specifications have been transcribed to minutes. As introduction we understood the time from the beginning of the video until the first performance. Performance is the time from the start of the first to the end of the last contest performance. Evaluation is the period from the end of the last performance until the end of the video.

4 “Eurovision Song Contest 1974”, February 18, 2019 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D-GOqrXzEl9Y&t=4551s>).

5 “Eurovision Song Contest 1981”, February 18, 2019 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G-f7l2hVXpo8&t=5530s>).

6 “Eurovision 1999”, January 16, 2019 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Am4Ci-l46Fo&t=7157s>).

7 “Eurovision Song Contest 2009 Final”, January 15, 2019 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c6jCuOzSyUk>).

8 “Eurovision Song Contest 2018 - Grand Final - Full Show”, January 16, 2019 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4AXTB-iShio&t=7740s>).

Describing this table, we learn that the distribution of broadcasting time and the broadcasting time of the event have changed dramatically throughout the last decades. However, the underlying structure of the event has proven its usefulness. The introduction is between 7 and 16 minutes long, and the amount of time invested in the introduction has surely increased. Since the early days of the competition, the most time has been distributed to the performance part, where one country after another performs its song. However, the evaluation part has become of nearly equal temporal importance and has extended significantly over the last decades. Combined, the “non-musical” parts of the show today are roughly the same length as the musical performance part. This was very different in the earlier days of the contest. In 2018, we even observe that the evaluation and introduction together used up more broadcasting time than the musical performances. Looking at the numbers provided here lends the impression that “non-music” parts are gaining importance at the expense of the performance part. Obviously, the event extends temporally, which has to do with the increasing number of participants as well as the general configuration of the evaluation part. The ESC has more than doubled its length between 1974 and 2018. The event lasted nearly four hours in 2018, underlining the notion that it has become a large-scale media event.

Going into more detail about the single parts of the show and its diverse practices, the introduction is usually accompanied by filmed sequences depicting the host country. Following this, the competitors enter the arena, typically a big multi-purpose hall in the host nation’s capital. Their entrance resembles the opening ceremony of the Olympic Games. Then, the competition starts with the first songs being performed. A short film introducing the performer and her or his country, the so-called “postcard”, is shown before the performance itself. After all songs are performed, the evaluation phase starts with the opening of the telephone lines used to vote for one’s favorite song. During this phase, gaps are filled with fast and short replays of all participants, entertaining talks by the hosts and further “interval acts”. After the telephone lines are closed, points are allocated from two perspectives of each country: first, the vote of a professional jury with the infamous “Twelve points go to”; and then the popular vote. Thus, the interesting, complicated, and usually hours-long evaluation process is divided into expert judgments and public opinion (Haan et al. 2005). Although this separation has obtained for quite a while, it is only since 2016 that the jury and the public each award

up to twelve points, thereby doubling the pool of available points. Before that, there was one combined evaluation.

The terms of evaluation have generally been a topic for recurrent critique and have been changed several times⁹. Between 2008 and 2018, a total of eight changes were applied. The critique was often directed towards the promotion of countries belonging to a common cultural space, and the changes in evaluation were aimed at broadening the transnational diversity of the competition's results. Yair and Maman (1996), for instance, show how different national "blocs" and their structural relationships are a fitting explanation for what they call a persistent hegemony within the contest. With Simmel's concept of the *tertius gaudens*, they show how a "Western Bloc" profits in the final evaluation stages from a "Northern Bloc" and a "Mediterranean Bloc" ignoring each other more or less when it comes to distributing points. However, for instance an "Eastern Bloc" which could be of importance in their structural analysis is missing since these countries first entered the competition in the 1990s or sometimes only in the 2000s. The possibility of buying jury votes has also led to a diversification of the terms of evaluation, with the goal being to balance the judgment device.

During the preliminary stages of the contest, evaluations are of similar importance and show an interesting connection to Wafula's depiction of the Kenya Music Festival in this book. In many participating nation-states, events took place that, at least in the case of Germany, arose suspicions that participants were recruited based on federal state heritage. From 2005 to 2015, the Bundesvision Song Contest used a smaller level of "national" to determine, through a similar evaluation process to the ESC, the final representative. Before the main event, "semi-finals" are held to reduce the number of participants to a number that fits the broadcasting schedule—however, the main sponsors of the European Broadcasting Union, Germany, France, Great Britain, Italy and Spain as well as the host nation, have a fixed place in the final. Still, all these big nations have to broadcast the semifinals¹⁰, even if they do not take part, underlining the idea that the Broadcasting Union understands the contest transnationally. In the final event, every country enters with two evaluations: one from a professional jury and one from the

⁹ "Biggest change to Eurovision Song Contest voting since 1975", February, 7, 2019 (<https://eurovision.tv/story/biggest-change-to-eurovision-song-contest-voting-since-1975>).

¹⁰ "Rules", February 7, 2019 (<https://eurovision.tv/about/rules>).

participating public through calls to a hotline. Even countries that do not make the cut in the semifinals are allowed to vote in the finals. It is not the sole privilege of participating nations to take part in the evaluation and finally decide a winner. The evaluation itself seems to be at the transnational center of the whole event.

Very interesting transnational exchanges take place, especially during the evaluation phase. Typically, one spokesperson per country is connected live to the main event. Thus, the hosts “phone” each country and ask them if their evaluation is ready. However, to facilitate the entertaining aspects of this rather boring and standardized practice, or to extend the broadcasting time, the involved actors try to find space to exchange beyond the trivial numbers and to build a climax towards the awaited “twelve points”. This space is often filled with attempts to exchange in a funny, sophisticated, or alternatively interesting way in English, which is usually neither the spokespersons’ nor the host nation’s native language. Thereby, the actors involve diverse national patina, for instance by saying some words in the host nation’s language or in the language of the evaluating country. They may also refer to national clichés. We would argue that doing so leads to the emergence of short transnational dialogues, especially when these speech acts are broadcasted throughout more than 40 countries.

From a transnational perspective, the contest’s ability to expand and thereby incorporate further geographical spaces that have just recently become what is understood to be “European” is noteworthy. The contest might even be looked at as a means for European integration, especially after the collapse of the Soviet Union. The song contest seemingly incorporates a geographic space similar to that of the European Union. However, the ESC did not stop at what is considered Europe geographically, but incorporated further cultural spaces especially through the recurrent entries of Israel. In 1980, even Morocco was allowed to enter the competition one time. In this way, the ESC resembles UEFA, the European Football Association, with its practice of incorporating non-European members like Israel or even Georgia or Kazakhstan. Still, the ESC has not stopped here, but recently allowed Australia to take part in the competition, justifying this extension by noting that Australia has broadcast the ESC since 1974. The ESC has thereby developed a very unique and transnational construction of a European competition.

To further stress the transnational dimension of the contest, Catherine Baker (2008) argues that the transnational audience of this event combined

with its contest nature is pressuring the participants into representing a national background through simplified images. The use of clichés is justified in that reading by the need to convey messages connected to a nation with little time and a lot of “nation-branding”. The perspective of nation-branding (Dinnie 2015) is a recurring topic in studies about the ESC (Miazhevich 2010; Jordan 2014; Pajala 2012; Vuletic 2018) and is even depicted as a diplomatic tool (Boric/Kapor 2017). Paul Jordan (2014), for instance, describes the contest in Estonia as “a modern fairytale”, looking at the role of the ESC in European identity politics and the connection between nation-branding and nation building, which the Song Contest has promoted particularly in the cases of post-Soviet countries.

Some important transnational aspects of the music practices can be understood as rather “intangible”. Language is a major issue in this respect. The ESC has struggled to find a way of dealing with the hegemony of the English language; however, this seems to be the “transnational” thing to do. While the organization of the ESC wanted to foster—even with force—the use of the official national language of the participant, songwriters obviously have a more transnational stance towards writing songs. At the moment, participants are allowed to sing in whatever language they want to sing. In 2016, for instance, this led to 33 out of 36 participants singing in English, with the exceptions of Macedonia and Bosnia-Herzegovina, which sang in their respective native languages, and Austria, which sang in French. With respect to transnational exchange, using only one main language might be evaluated as a perfect match, with an obvious loss in diversity.

A tacit visual effect that accompanies the event might also be noteworthy. Usually, all long shots from the multi-purpose hall show a confusing image of chaotically waving flags of nation-states. There are so many flags that from a distance they become indistinguishable, leaving a colorful blanket without direct connotation. Through the comparison with a football event, this point becomes clearer: while in a football game there are usually two kinds of flags and the fans of the teams are usually separated from each other leaving them easy to distinguish, the ESC viewed from the distance offers a far more colorful and more importantly indistinguishable scene, thus lending the event a transnational impression. There is an “ocean of flags” that seems very intentional. It is a confusing visual impression of transnational diversity. One could argue further, referring to our dimensions, that within and especially through the crowd of national supporters, a transnational space emerges.

Furthermore, we would like to understand the astonishingly relevant betting practices from a transnational perspective. On the homepages of the bookkeepers offering bets on the contest, we find the participating nations listed in order according to their wagering odds. In these environments, the nation-states completely lose their national identity, are stripped of any national particularity and become mere calculated variables in a game of probabilities. Naturally, that does not mean that individuals bet on a certain nation with a national identification as the main reason (betting on the country with the worst odds, just because one comes from there, does not a sound wager make). Yet the environment itself creates a market based on calculations (Callon/Muniesa 2005).

While all these short glances at the music practice of the ESC require deeper consideration, we believe that they already point to how our conceptual and theoretical frameworks relate to the often plentiful and sometimes confusing dimensions belonging to the (e)valuation of transnational music practices like the ESC.

The structure of the book

Our anthology presents a collection of eight articles that discuss the (e)valuation of transnational music practices from the perspective of different disciplines and in relation to various contexts. The question of valuation of music practices in contemporary art music is the central concern of Annelies Fryberger's article *Valuation in a reversed economy: The case of contemporary art music in France and the United States*. Calling attention to the fact that transnationalism in this context is construed by keeping national borders very clear, Fryberger concentrates her analysis on the praxis of French and American composers, mainly in the way they show disinterestedness to economic values. Her analysis is based on Bourdieu's concept of reversed economy, which characterizes economic action in pure artistic fields, and is complemented by the discussion of production volume and position taking in this field, which are both seen as fundamental valuation forms. Interesting in her analysis is the fact that, although contemporary art music is considered to be one of the purest artistic fields, aesthetic values are not the only ones considered while judging artistic work. Other forms of non-aesthetic valuation are equally important and vital to asserting the value of contemporary

art music compositions. Thus, the transnational practices of contemporary art music also include the discourses and talks on a composer's productivity, basic motivation and knowledge about the history of the field.

Another way of discussing valuation of music practices is presented by Mukasa Situma Wafula. Departing from a conception of ethnic community as a nation, Wafula analyses the Kenya Music Festival (KMF) as a space in which the interactions and musical exchanges between ethnic nations can be considered as a form of transnationalism. The article *Culture, Creativity and Practice: (E)valuating the Kenya Music Festival as a transnational music space* focuses on the history of the festival—conceived as a transnational space—including its content, community and its integrated discourse. In the context of the KMF, transnational music practices appear both in the creative use of different cultural elements brought about by the British tradition, the interactions among members of Kenya's 43 ethnic communities and the festival's organization. The huge number of categories created to accommodate all possible groups, from children visiting nursery schools to university students, and performance modalities, including vocal solos, choirs of different sizes, elocution, performances of instruments, among others, reveals the desire of the festival organizers to foster unity in diversity. They avoid the idea that the winner takes all and reveal how heterarchies in values and evaluation can be experienced.

If Wafula focuses on the organization of a festival, Peter Lell inverts the perspective to incorporate audience experience in the transnational spaces of world music festivals in his chapter *“Come and expose yourself to the fantastic music from around the world”: Experiencing World Music Festivals*. Basing his ethnographic work on two well established world music festivals, WOMAD-The World of Music, Arts and Dance at Charlton Park, United Kingdom and Africa Festival in Würzburg, Germany, Lell points to five signifiers that are central to evaluating audience experience in these contexts: music exoticism, exceptionalism in visual appearance, visible happiness, the idea of music as a universal language and the political side of music. This analysis reveals that these evaluative aspects emerge in connection to music practices that are beyond audibility, embedded in the exchange among participants, and between them and the musicians on the stage. The signifiers also show the standardization of diversity in these transnational spaces which were paradoxically created to celebrate diversity itself.

Entering the global connections of the world music market, Sandrine Le Coz discusses in her chapter *From desire for recognition to desire for independence: World music filtered in the market economy* how transnational networks of actors and their decision-making across borders form the basis of valuation processes in music practices. She stresses the relevance of transnational spaces like markets, exhibitions or fairs for valuation processes and follows these spaces around the globe as an insider. Of special interest to her are intermediaries, their practices of objectifying and thus legitimizing valuations of certain music, and how their methods of interpersonal linking lead to a mixture of collaborative and competitive practices that influence exchange in the transnational world music market. However, going beyond this personalized market, she further discusses which changes in valuation occur when the world music market goes digital and becomes more and more dependent on transnational platforms' evaluations.

The evaluation of exchanges happens not only on these platforms but also among musicians. Nepomuk Riva's contribution *The invention of African art music: Analyzing European-African classical cross-over projects* deals with transnational exchange in classical cross-over projects that involve musicians and composers from Europe and Africa. Comparing "Pieces of Africa" by the Kronos Quartet, "Lambarena" by Hughes de Courson and Pierre Akendengué, "Mozart the Egyptian" by Hughes de Courson and Ahmed El Maghraby, and "Zulu music meets Mozart" by MoZuluArt, the author depicts in detail the creation process of four important classical crossover productions from the last 30 years. From an ethnomusicologist's perspective, he is interested in the influence the involved musicians and composers from diverse cultural backgrounds had on these transnational production environments and how these influences might become perceptible in the music finally developed. Furthermore, he looks at the impact of these productions on the respective musicians' careers. Riva points out how many of these productions struggle to meet on what the author calls "eye-level" between Western and African artists and music traditions, but also how an opposing example might provide ways for a genuine transnational exchange, leading to a successful fusion of African and Western classical music as well as to that creation of sustainable careers.

The question of transnational music exchange is also an important step in rethinking some historical moments. In his contribution *Contemplating musical life in Tunisia under the French protectorate: The society and challenges*,

the ethnomusicologist Alla El Kahla develops an historical perspective on music practices in Tunisia by analyzing developments from the early 18th to the early 20th century. He focuses on the political influence during the period of the French protectorate and discusses how this changed music practices. In his chapter, El Kahla gives hints for future research to come and argues that an explicit ethnomusicologist perspective can aid our understanding about music practices in Tunisia, in particular, but also from a more general perspective suggests how diverse music practices in transcultural environments affect each other. By reviewing research done mainly from a historical perspective with only marginal references to music practices, El Kahla depicts a colorful picture of musical diversity and exchange between various music cultures that opens up a promising research field for ethnomusicologists interested in a historical perspective on transnational music practices.

A similar account of how historic analyses connect with a transnational perspective on music practices is presented by Daniela Anabel González in the chapter *The construction of an Italian diasporic identity in the city of Buenos Aires at the turn of the 19th century*. Directly approaching the question of immigrants and their identity formation in the receiving country, she focuses on the experience of Italians in Buenos Aires, Argentina, in adapting different strategies of appropriation and resistance to build their identity in the symbolic arena of popular art and music expressions at the turn of the 19th century. Particularly interesting is that neither of them, Argentinians nor Italians, are presented as representatives of essentialized cultures, but as members of very diverse groups which are constantly negotiating their identities. If Buenos Aires indeed was a transnational space with a high number of foreign newcomers, with Italians constituting the largest group, the exchanges between its inhabitants resulted in a variety of music practices which differentially evaluated the presence of Italians. While the local elite equated the Italian contribution with Argentine civilizing efforts, members of the Italian elite tried to distinguish themselves through the creation of art magazines that celebrated their intellectual tradition. Among the popular classes, in turn, there were more hybridization processes in which a new language came into being, namely the cocoliche (a mixture of Italian and Spanish). Creole people and Italians disputed its use as means to deride the other and to affirm their identity. In this sense, the article offers an interesting case about the adjustments that music practices go through when engaging with different environments.

Closing the book, Janco Boy Bystron and Chico Santana, in their contribution *Brazilian grooves and cultured clichés*, introduce a methodological discussion that departs from nationally framed clichés in and about music practices. Looking at the case of samba and the differences between Brazilian and German percussion groups, they take a look at a transnational music practice that generates diverse performance forms through diffusion across cultural and national borders. To access these tacit aspects of music practices, they aim for a method that elaborates the musical macro- and microstructures subsumed under the term samba and investigate how these structures differ in Germany and Brazil. By analyzing the microstructure of samba rhythms, they inquire whether an interactionistic concept of identity is connected to the repertory of a samba group. Examining the macrostructure in the creation processes of samba, they distinguish between samba rhythms that are recreated from traditional styles, those developed innovatively and those that are newly invented but played on samba instruments. Developing a methodology for the analysis of transcultural processes in musical practices based on three main dimensions (visualization of samba rhythms, auditory perception, and corporal conversion), the authors suggest a multidimensional set to approach transnational music practices analytically.

All these contributions offer pieces to the puzzle faced by actors involved in transnational music practices in deciding which modes of coordination to mobilize in their practices and how values, valuation and evaluation are parts of this process. In this way, this book contributes to an interdisciplinary dialog on the (e)valuation of transnational music practices in their entanglements with space, diversity and exchange, offering insights into further research in this field.

Bibliography

Acord, Sophia Krzys/DeNora, Tia (2008): "Culture and the arts: From art worlds to arts-in-action." In: The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 619/1, pp. 223-237. doi:10.1177/0002716208318634.

Aspers, Patrik/Beckert, Jens (2011): "Value in markets." In: Patrik Aspers/Jens Beckert (eds.), *The worth of goods: Valuation and pricing in the economy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 3-38.

Appadurai, Arjun (1990): "Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy." In: *Theory, Culture & Society* 7, pp. 295-310. doi: 10.1177/026327690007002017.

Baily, John/Collyer, Michael (2006): "Introduction: Music and migration." In: *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 32/2, pp. 167-182. doi: 10.1080/13691830500487266.

Baker, Catherine (2017): "The 'gay Olympics'? The Eurovision song contest and the politics of LGBT/European belonging." In: *European Journal of International Relations* 23/1, pp. 97-121. doi: 10.1177/1354066116633278.

Baker, Catherine (2008): "Wild dances and dying wolves: Simulation, essentialization, and national identity at the Eurovision Song Contest." In: *Popular communication* 6/3, pp. 173-189. doi: 10.1080/15405700802198113.

Barber, Benjamin (1996): *Jihad vs. McWorld: How globalism and tribalism are reshaping the world order*, New York: Ballantine.

Basch, Linda/Glick Schiller, Nina/Blanc-Szanton, Christina (2005): *Nations unbound: Transnational projects, postcolonial predicaments, and deterritorialized nation-states*, London: Routledge

Bhabha, Homi K. (2004): *The location of culture*, London, Routledge.

Blacking, John (1969): "The value of music in human experience." In: *Yearbook of the International Folk Music Council* 1, pp. 33-71.

Blume, Friedrich/Finscher, Ludwig (eds.), (1994): *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart: allgemeine Enzyklopädie der Musik*, Kassel: Bärenreiter.

Bohlman, Philip V. (2002): *World music: A very short introduction*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bolin, Göran (2006): "Visions of Europe: Cultural technologies of nation-states." In: *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 9/2, pp. 189-206. doi: 10.1177/1367877906064030.

Boltanski, Luc/Thevenot, Laurent (2006 [1991]): *On justification: Economies of worth*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Boltanski, Luc, and Laurent Thévenot (1999): "The sociology of critical capacity." In: *European Journal of Social Theory* 2/3, pp. 359-377. doi: 10.1177/136843199002003010.

Borić, Zrinka/Kapor, Ana Radović (2017): "The European Song Contest as a tool of cultural diplomacy." In: *Zbornik sveučilišta Libertas* 1-2/1-2, pp. 225-240.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1987): *Die feinen Unterschiede: Kritik der gesellschaftlichen Urteilskraft*, Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1993): *The field of cultural production: Essays on art and literature*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Bowman, Wayne D. (2002): "Why do humans value music?" In: *Philosophy of music education review* 10/1, pp. 55-63.

Buxmann, Peter/Strube, Jochen/Pohl, Gerrit (2007): "Cooperative pricing in digital value chains—the case of online music." In: *Journal of Electronic Commerce Research* 8/1, pp. 32-40.

Cadenbach, Rainer/Jaschinski, Andreas/von Loesch, Heinz (1994): "Musikwissenschaft." In: Friedrich Blume/Ludwig Finscher (eds.), *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart: allgemeine Enzyklopädie der Musik*, Kassel: Bärenreiter, pp. 1789-1834.

Callon, Michel/Muniesa, Fabian (2005): "Peripheral vision: Economic markets as calculative collective devices." In: *Organization Studies* 26/8, pp. 1229-1250. doi: 10.1177/0170840605056393.

Christensen, Dieter/Simon, Artur/Béhague, Gerard/Geldenhuys, Daniël G. (1994): "Musikethnologie." In: Friedrich Blume/Ludwig Finscher (eds.), *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart: allgemeine Enzyklopädie der Musik*, Kassel: Bärenreiter, pp. 1259-1291.

Chu, Ching-Wen/Lu, Hsi-Peng (2007): "Factors influencing online music purchase intention in Taiwan: An empirical study based on the value-intention framework." In: *Internet Research* 17/2, pp. 139-155. doi: 10.1108/10662240710737004.

Dayan, Daniel/Katz, Elihu (1994): *Media events*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Dewey, John (1939): *Theory of valuation*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Dinnie, Keith (2015): *Nation branding: Concepts, issues, practice*, London: Routledge.

Feld, Steven (2000): "A sweet lullaby for world music." In: *Public culture* 12/1, pp. 145-171. doi: 10.1215/08992363-12-1-145.

Feld, Steven (2005): "From schizophonia to schismogenesis: On the discourses and commodification practices of "World Music" and "World Beat"." In: Charles Keil/Steven Feld (eds.), *Music grooves: Essays and dialogues*, Tucson: Fenestra, pp. 257-289.

Fitzgerald, David (2000): *Negotiating extra-territorial citizenship: Mexican migration and the transnational politics of community*, Monograph 2, Center for Comparative Immigration Studies, San Diego: University of California.

Frank, Robert H./Cook, Philip J. (2010): *The winner-take-all society: Why the few at the top get so much more than the rest of us*, München: Random House.

Frith, Simon (1998): *Performing rites: On the value of popular music*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Frith, Simon (2013): "What is bad music?" In: Christopher J. Washburne/Maiken Derno (eds.), *Bad music: the music we love to hate*, London: Routledge, pp. 25-46

Gaudette, Pascal (2013): "Jembe hero: West African drummers, global mobility and cosmopolitanism as status." In: *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 39/2, pp. 295-310. doi: 10.1080/1369183X.2013.723259.

Gilroy, Paul (1993): *The black Atlantic: Modernity and double consciousness*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Glick Schiller, Nina (2010 [2004]): "Transnationality." In: David Nugent/Joan Vincent (eds.), *A companion to the anthropology of politics*, Malden: Blackwell, pp. 448-467.

Glick Schiller, Nina/Basch, Linda/Blanc-Szanton, Cristina (1992): "Transnationalism: A new analytic framework for understanding migration." In: *Annals of the New York academy of sciences* 645/1, pp. 1-24.

Glick Schiller, Nina/Meinhof, Ulrike Hanna (2011): "Singing a new song? Transnational migration, methodological nationalism and cosmopolitan perspectives." In: *Music and Arts in Action* 3/3, pp. 21-39.

Goldman, Alan H. (2014) "Value." In: Theodore Gracyk/Andrew Kania (eds.), *The Routledge companion to philosophy and music*, London: Routledge, pp. 165-175.

Gracyk, Theodore (2014): "Evaluating music." In: Theodore Gracyk/Andrew Kania (eds.), *The Routledge companion to philosophy and music*, London: Routledge, pp. 176-186.

Guilbault, Jocelyne (1996): "Beyond the "World Music" label: An ethnography of transnational musical practices." *PopScriptum* [Online]. Available at https://www2.hu-berlin.de/fpm/textpool/texte/guilbault_beyond-the-world-wusic-label.htm (Accessed 18 January 2019)

Haan, Marco/Dijkstra Siemon Gerhard/Dijkstra, Peter T. (2005): "Expert judgment versus public opinion—evidence from the Eurovision song contest." In: *Journal of Cultural Economics* 29/1, pp. 59-78. doi: 10.1007/s10824-005-6830-0.

Habermas, Jürgen (2001): *The postnational constellation: Political essays*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hauck, Gerhard (2008): "Das Lokale als Widerpart destruktiver Globalisierung?" In: *Leviathan* 36/4, pp. 576-589. doi: 10.1007/s11578-008-0033-y.

Haworth, Christopher (2016): "All the musics which computers make possible": Questions of genre at the Prix Ars Electronica." In: *Organised Sound* 21/1, pp. 15-29. doi: 10.1017/S1355771815000345.

Hennion, Antoine (2001): "Music lovers: Taste as performance." In: *Theory, Culture & Society* 18/5, pp. 1-22. doi: 10.1177/02632760122051940.

Hoffmann-Nowotny, Hans-Joachim (1970): *Migration: Ein Beitrag zu einer soziologischen Erklärung*, Stuttgart: Enke.

Jordan, Paul. (2014): *The modern fairy tale: Nation branding, national identity and the Eurovision song contest in Estonia*, Tartu: University of Tartu Press.

Jung, Eun-Young (2014): "Transnational migrations and YouTube sensations: Korean Americans, popular music, and social media." In: *Ethnomusicology* 58/1, pp. 54-82. doi: 10.5406/ethnomusicology.58.1.0054.

Karpik, Lucien. (2010): *The economics of singularities*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Kartomi, Margaret J. (1981): "The processes and results of musical culture contact: A discussion of terminology and concepts." In: *Ethnomusicology* 25/2, pp. 227-249.

Keller, Marcello Sorce (2011): "Was ist Musik? Einige Gründe dafür, warum wir die "Musik" nicht mehr als "Musik" bezeichnen sollten." In: *Schweizer Jahrbuch für Musikwissenschaft* 30, pp. 11-26.

Kennedy, Paul/Roudometof, Victor (eds.) (2003): *Communities across borders: New immigrants and transnational cultures*, London: Routledge.

Kong, Lily (1997): "Popular music in a transnational world: the construction of local identities in Singapore." In: *Asia Pacific Viewpoint* 38/1, pp. 19-36.

Lamont, Michèle (2012): "Toward a comparative sociology of valuation and evaluation." In: *Annual Review of Sociology* 38, pp. 201-221. doi: 10.1146/annurev-soc-070308-120022.

Lange, Bastian/Bürkner, Hans-Joachim (2013): "Value creation in scene-based music production: The case of electronic club music in Germany." In: *Economic Geography* 89/2, pp. 149-169. doi: 10.1111/ecge.12002.

Massey, Douglas S./Arango, Joaquin/Hugo, Graeme/Kouaouci, Ali/Pellegrino, Adela/Taylor, Edward J. (1998): *Worlds in motion: Understanding in-*

ternational migration at the end of the millenium, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mazzucato, Valentina/Kabki, Mirjam/Smith, Lothar (2006): “Transnational migration and the economy of funerals: Changing practices in Ghana.” In: *Development and Change* 37/5, pp. 1047-1072. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-7660.2006.00512.x.

Merriam, Alan P./Merriam, Valerie (1964): *The anthropology of music*, Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Miazhevich, Galina (2010): “Sexual excess in Russia’s Eurovision performances as a nation branding tool.” In: *Russian Journal of Communication* 3/3-4, pp. 248-264. doi: 10.1080/19409419.2010.10756776.

Mitrović, Marijana (2010): “New face of Serbia at the Eurovision Song Contest: International media spectacle and national identity.” In: *European Review of History* 17/2, pp. 171-185. doi: 10.1080/13507481003660829.

Moberg, Markus (2007): The transnational Christian metal scene expressing alternative Christian identity through a form of popular music, Linköping: Linköping University Electronic Press.

Nettl, Bruno (1985): *The Western impact on world music: Change, adaption, and survival*, New York: Schirmer Books.

Nicolini, Davide (2016): “Is small the only beautiful? Making sense of “large phenomena” from a practice-based perspective.” In: Allison Hui/Theodore Schatzki/Elizabeth Shove (eds.), *The nexus of practices: Connections, constellations, practitioners*. Milton Park: Taylor & Francis, pp. 98-113

Öğüt, Evrím Hikmet (2015): “Transit migration: An unnoticed area in ethnomusicology.” In: *Urban People* 17/2, pp. 269-282.

Østergaard-Nielsen, Eva (2003): *Transnational politics: The case of Turks and Kurds in Germany*, London: Routledge.

Pajala, Mari (2012): “Mapping Europe: Images of Europe in the Eurovision Song Contest.” In: *VIEW Journal of European Television History and Culture* 1/2, pp. 3-10.

Park, Robert Ezra (1928): “Human migration and the marginal man.” In: *American Journal of Sociology* 33/6, pp. 881-893. doi: 10.1086/214592?journalCode=ajs.

Pieterse, Jan Nederveen (1995): “Globalization as hybridization.” In: Mike Featherstone/Scott Lash/Roland Robertson (eds.), *Global Modernities*, London: Sage Publications, pp. 45-68.

Pinho, Patricia de Santana (2004): *Reinvenções da África na Bahia*, São Paulo: Annablume.

Pries, Ludger (1996): "Transnationale soziale Räume: Theoretisch-empirische Skizze am Beispiel der arbeitswanderungen Mexico - USA." In: *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 25/6, pp. 456-472. doi: 10.1515/zfsoz-1996-0603

Pries, Ludger (2009): "Soziologie der Migration." In: Georg Kneer/Markus Schröer (eds.), *Spezielle Soziologien: Ein Handbuch*, Wiesbaden: Springer VS, pp. 475-490.

Pries, Ludger (2013): "Transnationalisierung." In: Steffen Mau/Nadine M. Schöneck (eds.), *Handwörterbuch zur Gesellschaft Deutschlands*, Wiesbaden: Springer VS, pp. 881-894.

Regev, Motti (1994): "Producing artistic value: the case of rock music." In: *The Sociological Quarterly* 35/1, pp. 85-102. doi: 10.1111/j.1533-8525.1994.tb00400.x.

Ritzer, George (1996): *The McDonaldization of society: An investigation into the changing character of contemporary social life*, Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press.

Robertson, Roland (1995): "Glocalization: Time-space and homogeneity-heterogeneity." In: Mike Featherstone/Scott Lash/Roland Robertson (eds.), *Global Modernities*, London: Sage Publications, pp. 25-44.

Schatzki, Theodore. R. (2001): "Introduction: Practice theory." In: Theodore R. Schatzki/Eike von Savigny/Karin Knorr-Cetina (eds.), *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*, London: Routledge, pp. 10-23.

Schatzki, Theodore R. (2005): "Peripheral vision: The sites of organizations." In: *Organization Studies* 26/3, pp. 465-484. doi: 10.1177/0170840605050876.

Schatzki, Theodore R. (2016): "Praxistheorie als flache Ontologie." In: Hilmar Schäfer (ed.), *Praxistheorie: ein soziologisches Forschungsprogramm*, Bielefeld: transcript, pp. 29-45.

Schatzki, Theodore R. (1996): *Social practices: A Wittgensteinian approach to human activity and the social*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stark, David (2011): *The sense of dissonance: Accounts of worth in economic life*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Swidler, Ann (2005): "What anchors cultural practices." In: Theodore R. Schatzki/Eike von Savigny/Karin Knorr-Cetina (eds.), *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*, London: Routledge, pp. 83-101.

Taft, Ronald (1953): "The shared frame of reference concept applied to the assimilation of immigrants." In: *Human Relations* 6/1, pp. 45-55. doi: 10.1177/001872675300600103.

Thévenot, Laurent (2005): "Pragmatic regimes governing the engagement with the world." In: Theodore R. Schatzki/Eike von Savigny/Karin Knorr-Cetina (eds.), *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*, London: Routledge, pp. 64-82.

Valverde, Kieu Linh Caroline (2003): "Making Vietnamese music transnational: Sounds of home, resistance and change." In: *Amerasia Journal* 29/1, pp. 29-50. doi: 10.17953/amer.29.1.1g7nm7m4715l4ohv.

Vuletic, Dean. (2013): "The Eurovision Song Contest in the musical diplomacy of authoritarian states." In: Frédéric Ramel/Cécile Prévost-Thomas (eds.), *International relations, music and diplomacy*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 213-234.

Wicke, Peter (2004): "Über die diskursive Formation musikalischer Praxis: Diskurs-Strategien auf dem Feld der populären Musik." In: Stephan Aderhold (ed.), *Festschrift Dr. Reinäcker zum 65. Geburtstag*, Berlin, pp. 163-174.

Wimmer, Andreas/Glick Schiller, Nina (2002): "Methodological Nationalism and Beyond: Nation-State Building, Migration and the Social Sciences." In: *Global Networks* 2/4, pp. 301-334. doi: 10.1111/1471-0374.00043.

Wolther, Irving (2006): *Kampf der Kulturen: der Eurovision Song Contest als Mittel national-kultureller Repräsentation*, Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann.

Yair, Gad/Maman, Daniel (1996): "The persistent structure of hegemony in the Eurovision Song Contest." In: *Acta Sociologica* 39/3, pp. 309-325. doi: 10.1177/000169939603900303.

Zelizer, Viviana A. Rotman (2017): *Morals and markets: The development of life insurance in the United States*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Zelizer, Viviana A. Rotman (1994 [1985]): *Pricing the priceless child. The changing social value of children*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Websites

“Biggest change to Eurovision Song Contest voting since 1975”, February 7, 2019 (<https://eurovision.tv/story/biggest-change-to-eurovision-song-contest-voting-since-1975>).

“Eurovision Song Contest 1974”, February 18, 2019 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DGOqrXzEI9Y&t=4551s>).

“Eurovision Song Contest 1981”, February 18, 2019 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Gf7l2hVXpo8&t=5530s>).

“Eurovision 1999”, January 16, 2019 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Am-4CiiI46Fo&t=7157s>).

“Eurovision Song Contest 2009 Final”, January 15, 2019 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c6JCuOzSyUk>).

“Eurovision Song Contest 2018 - Grand Final - Full Show”, January 16, 2019 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4AXTB-iShio&t=7740s>).

“Forget me not”, January 17, 2019 (<http://forgotify.com/>).

“Rules”, February 7, 2019 (<https://eurovision.tv/about/rules>).