

Listening, Mediation, Event:  
Anthropological and Sociological Perspectives  
GEORGINA BORN

(published in the *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*, 2009)

RATHER than a response to Ian Cross's paper, I offer a complementary approach to the issues he discusses from the perspective of the anthropology and sociology of music. The humanities and social sciences evidence, both historically and today, two tendencies that are in tension or might even appear to be opposed. On the one hand they search for universals and for things to converge, itself usually as part of a project of foundational explanation of why things are the way that they are; on the other hand they seek to analyse difference, fuelling complexity in understanding, permitting categorization and comparison, and being more concerned with the distinctiveness of arrangements than with the identification of universals. Ian Cross's paper takes the first form: it purports to identify a scientific, cognitive and communicative basis for listening as a human activity, claiming that cultures are to be understood in the terms of biological species, that listening is necessarily adaptive, and – a strong epistemological claim – that what is scientific must also be general. The last three of these four proposals have long troubled and divided the human sciences, and I will not rehearse the controversies in full here. However, I will note that to identify all modes of listening as adaptive is to risk criticisms of tautology and functionalism;<sup>1</sup> and that the analysis of difference and specificity does not amount to 'mere description'<sup>2</sup> and should not be considered unscientific. Indeed,

recent scholarship in the history of science has stressed the critical importance of sciences which address phenomena that cannot be understood in terms of a general analysis.<sup>3</sup>

Betraying my disciplinary prejudices, my own intervention weighs entirely the other way. In contrast to Cross, and in line with recent cultural-historical scholarship that takes as its problem space locating listening within the relevant ‘auditory culture’ or soundscape characteristic of an era, society or culture<sup>4</sup> – research that adheres more and less closely to music as the centre point of the analysis – I want to suggest that there is a need for systematic and comparative empirical study of listening as a focal musical activity. Like this scholarship, we should begin by asking: what is it to listen, and how should we conceive of listening? Or: how should we frame, or what are the boundaries of, this activity called listening? Does it take place within the mind, or (also) within the body? Is it something that is primarily individual in its operations, or that is socialized and encultured? I want to propose two immediate conceptual moves in response to these questions. The first is to shift the terms of the discussion from listening to the broader category of musical experience, in this way allowing for questions of the corporeal, the affective, the collective and the located nature of musical experience (aka listening) to arise in a stronger way than heretofore. The second is to suggest that in answering these core questions, it is helpful to take initial theoretical and conceptual bearings from a critique of Adorno, who proffers at once a sophisticated but flawed account of listening, one that uneasily combines philosophy and speculative sociology.

Max Paddison, in his commentary on Adorno, notes that his analysis of music consumption ‘gives priority to the Object [the musical work] and to the sphere of production’. He continues by asserting that Adorno ‘recognizes the socially and

historically mediated character both of the Object and of the experiencing Subject'.<sup>5</sup> Yet, *pace* Paddison, while Adorno certainly develops throughout his work an analysis of the social and historical mediation of the musical object, he fails to do this for listening in the guise of ordinary subjects. The limitation of Adorno's analysis of consumption is that it falls back on a normative account of structural listening and, in its absence, a hypothetical set of negative Weberian ideal types: the culture consumer, emotional listener, resentment listener, jazz expert, entertainment listener and so on.<sup>6</sup> What is required instead is precisely a focus on the relations between musical object and listening subject, where the latter demands an analysis of the social and historical conditions and the mediation of listening, as well as the changing forms of subjectivity brought to music.<sup>7</sup> The combined methodological and theoretical point is that neither these conditions, nor the forms of music's mediation, nor the relations between musical object and subject can be fully known in advance. Despite his commitment to the historicity of critical theory, Adorno thus remains ambivalent about the empirical socio-historical research that should properly provide the evolving substrate for any analysis of listening.

But idealization is not only a feature of Adorno's work. Discussions of listening commonly have recourse to a split between the notion of 'active' listening, which, it is implied, is intentional and concentrated, entailing understanding and 'co-creation', and its negation – hearing, conceived as passive and inadvertent, disengaged and unconcentrated. It is against such reductive binarisms that the historians, anthropologists and sociologists set their course. Their goal is to de-idealize listening, while moving beyond abstracted notions of implied or structural listening, bound as they are to the reifying paradigm of the 'music itself', and to insist on the mediated nature and the

materiality of all musical experience. They converge, that is, in requiring a theory of mediation which transcends the opposition between the ‘music itself’ and the (active or passive) individual subject who listens. While there is not space here to develop this point,<sup>8</sup> it is worth noting immediately the considerable methodological and conceptual challenges posed by the focus on listening as a changing relation or mediation between subjects and objects. We might ask: where does musical experience begin and end? Or to put it another way, what are the outer boundaries of music’s mediation? These challenges are generative precisely because, unlike notions of implied or structural listening, they resist easy closure.

In light of these initial comments, I want to sketch three perspectives from anthropology and sociology that indicate the kinds of questions opened up by empirical research that takes listening-as-musical-experience, and the situated, relational analysis of musical subjects and objects, as its focus. Each addresses also, while stretching and questioning, the notion of listening as ‘active’.

The first pursues the question of boundaries, unsettling assumptions about where musical experience begins and ends, and how it operates in social life. Moreover, it highlights the musical division of labour, destabilizing the orthodox separation of the roles of composer, performer and listener. In his seminal anthropological study of the Kaluli people of the tropical rainforests of highland Papua New Guinea, Steven Feld contends that Kaluli musical experience cannot be divorced from, nor understood without reference to, their wider ontology and ecology. For Kaluli music is embedded in and constitutive of their cosmology, environmental ecology, social relations, rituals, and collective experience of emotion, space, time and labour. ‘Kaluli expressive forms are

constituted by analogies with nature’,<sup>9</sup> such that through elaborate processes of metonymy and metaphor both birdsongs and water sounds form a vital part of the musical culture. Thus, ‘Kaluli song terminology and conceptualization of musical form relate systematically to the terminology of waterfalls, water sounds, and water motion’; while certain birdsongs, with which Kaluli engage in sung weeping, are ‘simultaneously heard as indicators of the avifauna and as “talk” from the dead’.<sup>10</sup> All Kaluli are thought to be musical and capable of composing, and all sing and perform, although some are considered exceptionally talented or original; people often sing alone, without a human audience, duetting with a stream, waterfall or bird. Feld charts in his analysis of both ordinary and ceremonial music-making a series of ambiguities and fluidities concerning the boundary between collective emotion and the aesthetic and symbolic valencies of performance, as well as between improvisation and composition (concepts that the Kaluli have themselves), between music-making and everyday routines of work and play, and between individual and collective experience. Musical expression therefore weaves through and forms an indissociable part of the mundane and the extraordinary in Kaluli social life. These properties are striking in Feld’s account of the *gisalo* ceremony, which conveys how inadequate a term listening – in the sense employed by the theorists of structural listening – is for capturing the embedded nature of Kaluli musical experience:

Gisalo [...] takes place from dusk until dawn inside a longhouse lit by resin torches.

Members of a guest community stage the singing and dancing for a host longhouse. [...]

Once it turns dark, the dancers enter the longhouse and begin their performance. They dance up and down the hall, singing with the accompaniment of rattle instruments and a chorus. The songs are sung in a plaintive voice, and the texts are sad and evocative,

reflecting on loss and abandonment. They cite places and events familiar to all [...] and are composed with the intention of making the hosts nostalgic, sentimental and sad. The hosts listen intently. [...] At points in the songs where they become overcome with sadness and grief, the hosts burst into tears and loud mournful wails. This may set off a chain reaction of wailing throughout the house. Angered by the grief they have been made to feel, one of the hosts jumps up, grabs a torch from a bystander, and rushes onto the dance floor to jam the flickering torch into the shoulder of a dancer. The dancer continues as if unaffected and may be burned repeatedly. [...] In the aftermath [...] discussion recalls how the songs made the hosts cry and burn the dancers. For Kaluli generally, it is not the burning that is central, rather it is the extent to which the compositions and their manner of performance were effective, as judged by the extent to which they moved the hosts to tears.<sup>11</sup>

What this dramatic episode and other material suggest is that the entire edifice of Kaluli aesthetics and poetics rests on the ambiguities noted earlier, which power an expressive momentum: a cycle of evocation and response moving between weeping (emotion), song (aesthetic and emotion), and weeping and anger (in empathy and appreciation triggered by the aesthetic), one in which performance, aesthetics and collective emotion continually overlap and converge. Moreover, these dynamics entail a particularly malleable musical division of labour where the lines between composition, improvisation, performance and reception are blurred, and in which host listeners and guest performers engage in strenuous forms of co-creation. The separation of listening from participation, mind from body, appreciation of form from affect and its expression: all are problematized in this culture. But, to return to the wider picture and my opening comments: the point is not to analogize this state of affairs to all musical cultures, thereby

rendering it banal; it is to notice rigorously through comparison the *differences* between Kaluli practices and those many musical cultures of the developed world that lack the palpable fluidities of Kaluli socio-musical life – with the productive effect that Kaluli musical life problematizes our own.

A second perspective comes from the sociology of culture in the guise of analysts of cultural consumption and taste. In contrast to the microsociological and ontological insights offered by Feld's work, writers such as Bourdieu, Hall, Morley, Gillespie, Katz and Liebes<sup>12</sup> and others chart another dimension of the inescapably social character of what may appear to be the individual, introspective and affective modes of subjectivity engendered by aesthetic experience. This body of scholarship demonstrates unequivocally that in complex societies the consumption of all kinds of cultural objects, including music, is at the same time a means for the active production of social divisions or antagonisms. Cultural consumption is differentiated, then, in terms of what is consumed, as well as the meanings and the modes of experience derived from it, a differentiation that correlates with social location along lines of (variously) class, ethnicity, age and generation, and gender.

Bourdieu's classic work *Distinction*, based on extensive qualitative and quantitative empirical research carried out in France in the late 1960s, is exemplary in this regard. While the study is concerned with the class-based nature of cultural consumption in general, music has a central place. According to Bourdieu, one of the foremost determinants of class distinction – that is, of how status differences between classes are constituted through consumption – is the unequal acquisition across the class structure of cultural capital, where the latter is defined as knowledge of and competence

in appropriate formal, aesthetic and generic codes. The abstract, esoteric qualities of musical competence make it a powerful carrier of such distinctions, a finding demonstrated by marked variations in musical taste and in what is listened to between even adjacent class fractions.<sup>13</sup> ‘Nothing more clearly affirms one’s “class”, nothing more infallibly classifies, than tastes in music. [...] Music is the “pure” art par excellence. [...] [It] represents the most radical and most absolute form of the negation of the world [...] which the bourgeois ethos tends to demand of all art.’<sup>14</sup> At the class extremes, Bourdieu argues, one finds two kinds of musical appreciation: among the intellectual and upper classes a preference for form over function, manifest in listening to highly legitimate art music, itself differentiated between the avant-garde and the canon; and among the working class a hostility to formal experimentation and a search for continuity between art and life, finding affirmation in music that is experienced as easy and functional. For Bourdieu, then, music acts as a particularly strong mediator of class rivalries, articulating cultural differences and oppositions between classes.<sup>15</sup>

Lest it be thought that Bourdieu’s findings are limited to their original time and place, a recent study updates his research for contemporary British society and finds, like Bourdieu, that class position followed by age and gender are the most salient variables for understanding differences in cultural tastes, including musical tastes, in Britain today.<sup>16</sup> Music has a special significance in this later study in that it is the most polarizing of cultural forms, eliciting extreme likes and dislikes. Moreover, although classical music is listened to and found agreeable by two-fifths of those interviewed, the majority of them experience it as powerfully somatic, speaking of it repeatedly as a means of relaxation. Only a tiny proportion of those interviewed exhibited musical competence – that is, had



an informed, formal appreciation of classical music – often as part of ‘omnivorous’ musical tastes that crossed over into jazz and legitimate popular music genres. Thus, according to this research, the great majority of music consumption in Britain today – even that of the well-educated middle classes – does not accord with Bourdieu’s analysis of the capacity to appreciate aesthetic and formal codes, indicating that British adherents to classical music tend to lack the competences attributed by Bourdieu to the French cultured classes of the 1960s. Instead, consumption of classical music is both densely somaticized and semanticized, invested with concrete meanings – a finding that will later return.<sup>17</sup> In sum, these sociological studies suggest that, in line with all cultural consumption, we listen *differently*: that our very experience of music, our disposition to listen, and our semantic and affective engagement with music are mediated by social and cultural location and identities, particularly class differences and all that they imply in terms of musical socialization and experience, and therefore variable musical competence.<sup>18</sup>

A third perspective is opened up by recent studies that ask: how has musical experience been mediated by technologies of recording, electronic and digital music media? The profound transformations of listening wrought by such technological mediation now span more than a century. To answer therefore requires us first to take stock of the evolving strategies of the music and media industries as, through the commercial release of a stream of musical consumer goods and services, and by repeatedly coining new listening devices and new ways to engender consumption, they condition musical experience.<sup>19</sup> This in turn requires us to acknowledge the novel aesthetic modalities proffered by these devices. In recent years commercial strategies

have attempted to incorporate both non-commoditized musical experience and non-musicalized temporal, spatial and embodied experience, proffering entirely new kinds of aesthetic experience: both an aesthetic of music's fluidity and openness to recombination in internet-based music applications, and an aesthetic of the simultaneous or multiple in the Walkman and iPod – music *and* movement *and* place. This additive aesthetic logic is captured well by Michael Bull's work on the Walkman and iPod,<sup>20</sup> and by Shuhei Hosokawa, who writes of the Walkman experience as 'walk'n'eat'n'drink'n'play 'n'listen' (boy on roller skates eating McDonalds, drinking coke, listening to Michael Jackson...) – a kind of 'secret theatre' in which 'the user controls the art of their coordination'.<sup>21</sup> The industries' drive to proliferate music's mediatized consumption therefore multiplies both the spaces and activities colonized by consumption (the car, pub, mall, underground, queue ...; walking, jogging, driving, eating, waiting ...), and the forms of aesthetic experience proffered by these media.

In a commentary on these developments, Arild Bergh and Tia DeNora identify an apparent paradox: new media platforms now make it possible to listen to music in an expanding number of spatial locations and existential situations, while this unprecedented availability of music is accompanied by a lessening of focused listening. This, say Bergh and DeNora, amounts to 'ubiquitous listening', the aural equivalent of ubiquitous computing, such that 'it is possible to speak of music "choosing" listeners as well as the opposite'.<sup>22</sup> The paradox points us in the direction of empirical studies of music consumption by DeNora and Bull,<sup>23</sup> both of which give access to the otherwise invisible, elaborate everyday rituals and practices of heightened and regulated emotion, and of the choreography of memory and identity, that appear to be the stuff of ordinary, mediated

musical experience.<sup>24</sup> DeNora charts the many ways in which music is utilized as a ‘technology of the self’, ‘a means for creating, enhancing, sustaining and changing subjective, cognitive, bodily and self-conceptual states’:<sup>25</sup> from manipulating mood and energy levels, to evading painful or unwanted emotional states, to stoking concentration, to the nourishing of relationships with both the self and intimate others. In her material, music is employed also as a connective tissue activating memories that connect present to past, or linking the present to imagined futures. Bull, in turn, offers acute analyses of the Walkman and iPod’s affordances in terms of how they orchestrate the subjective experience of urban space, time and movement. He recounts their use to manage and deny contingency, to block out social contacts and disavow the moral demands thrown up by urban social interactions. He notes users’ aestheticizing practices and ‘ambiguous imperatives of constructed [...] “individualism”’, their ‘minimalisation of the social through [an] “imaginary” social inhabited within personal stereo space’, and their ‘narcissistically orientated’ disposition towards the urban ‘other’ manifest in ‘culturally solipsistic travelling’.<sup>26</sup> In this way Bull highlights the ‘atomistic subjective expressiveness and instrumentalism’ of many users.<sup>27</sup>

From these studies of the nature of contemporary musical experience, two dominant effects are palpable: an intensified semanticization, along with an intensified sovereign and narcissistic individualism. We might sum up these twin effects with the epithet ‘late-liberal listening’; both recall aspects of Adorno’s thought. Yet it is difficult to reconcile the contradictory tendencies evident in these studies, which replay the polarized diagnoses of both Benjamin and Adorno.<sup>28</sup> To an unprecedented extent music today is available, individually chosen and engaged with, thereby forming a

‘democratized’ part of everyday existence. At the same time, music is folded into the psyche as a direct extension of self in a project of compulsive self-identity creation,<sup>29</sup> one that occludes any distance between subject and object, and thus any resistance that the musical object may contribute to subsumption by the consuming subject – just as it occludes any resistance by the musical subject to the incessant imperative to listen issued by the capitalist music media. By combining examination of the social and historical conditions of musical experience, its material transformations and multiple valencies, and the forms of subjectivity brought to and catalyzed by it – in short, in its insistent critical focus on music in the terms of subject–object relations – this research approaches the analytics of mediation that I set out at the start of this paper.<sup>30</sup>

<line space>

What is it to listen? I have suggested that musical experience (or listening) both results from and engenders mediation. Musical experience entails and proffers relations between objects and subjects; indeed it construes what might be called a musical assemblage – a series or network of relations between musical sounds, human and other subjects, practices, performances, cosmologies, discourses and representations, technologies, spaces, and social relations. Music is never singular, but always a multiplicity; it exists only in and through its multiple and changing mediations, in the guise of such assemblages.<sup>31</sup> There is no musical object or text – whether sounds, score or performance – that stands outside mediation; just as, we might say, there is no musical subject that exists prior to an engagement with the musical object in the act of listening. Yet it is

perhaps uncontentious to suggest that for most listeners a significant musical experience is one in which the listener, entangled in a musical assemblage, feels and finds herself transformed. That is to say, by producing particular engagements, confrontations or combustions between musical objects and subjects, as shown so vividly by Feld, musical experience can generate affect and create transformative effects. Such effects are not universal but fragile; they can never be assured. In this sense musical experience can take the form of an *event*, one that effects transformations in the object–subject relation – in the assemblage. To borrow from literary theory, such an event might be conceptualized as involving ‘an indeterminate “sharing” between writer and reader’.<sup>32</sup> This is an encounter in which ‘the writer and reader do not share an intent posited originally with the writer; they share their discontinuity [...], their difference, and their difference suggests itself as a task’.<sup>33</sup>

As I have argued, then, an analytics of mediation does not necessarily imply a universe of seamless, unified or positive relations. Rather, it encompasses and addresses conceptually the kinds of difference and antagonism that routinely inform musical experience, as well as the question of the social, historical and musical conditions that may engender the mutual transformation of musical object-and-subject. Music can, of course, be analysed in itself, and listening can be grasped in terms of ‘adaptive’ cognitive or biological processes. But what I have tried to indicate with this brief excursion through anthropological and sociological perspectives is how many arresting dimensions and momentous transformations of musical experience that demand to be recognized and understood are obscured when the analytical frame taken to listening is at once so general and so restrictive.

---

**Notes:**

<sup>1</sup> Two examples of maladaptive forms of listening follow. On music's capacity to engender fantasized identifications with other cultures that can be less than benign for the cultures evoked, see Georgina Born, 'Music and the Representation/Articulation of Sociocultural Identities', *Western Music and its Others: Difference, Representation, and Appropriation in Music*, ed.

Georgina Born and David Hesmondhalgh (Berkeley, CA, and London, 2000), 31–7, esp. pp. 35–

6. For a critique of the tendency in some recent music sociology to conceive of music listening universally as 'a positive resource for active self-making', see David Hesmondhalgh, 'Towards a Critical Understanding of Music, Emotion and Self-Identity', *Consumption, Markets and Culture*, 11/4 (2008), 329–43.

<sup>2</sup> Cross, p. 000.

<sup>3</sup> Andrew Barry, 'Materialist Politics' chapter 4 in Bruce Braun and Sarah Whatmore (eds.), *Political Matter: Technoscience, Democracy and Public Life* (Minneapolis MN 2010).

<sup>4</sup> See, *inter alia*, James Johnson, *Listening in Paris* (Berkeley, CA, 1995); Bruce Smith, *The Acoustic World of Early Modern England* (Chicago, IL, 1999); Matthew Riley, *Musical Listening in the German Enlightenment* (Aldershot, 2004); Mark M. Smith, *Hearing History* (Athens, GA, 2004); Jonathan Sterne, *The Audible Past* (Durham, 2003); and Tim J. Anderson, *Making Easy Listening* (Minneapolis, MN, 2006). See also Michael Bull and Les Back, *The Auditory Culture Reader* (Oxford, 2003), and Veit Ehlman, *Hearing Cultures: Essays on Sound, Listening and Modernity* (Oxford, 2004).

<sup>5</sup> Max Paddison, *Adorno's Aesthetics of Music* (Cambridge, 1993), 216.

<sup>6</sup> Theodor W. Adorno, *Einleitung in die Musiksoziologie: Zwölf theoretische Vorlesungen* (Frankfurt am Main, 1962), trans. E. B. Ashton as *Introduction to the Sociology of Music* (New York, 1976), chapter 1. Adorno insists that he does not intend to disparage the listening types

---

described (trans. Ashton, p. 18), but nonetheless they are negatively drawn. For a discussion of the history of the radio research on which the types are based, and how it embodies Adorno's hostile relationship to commercially orientated empirical sociological research, see Richard Leppert, 'Commentary [on Culture, Technology, and Listening]', Theodor W. Adorno, *Essays on Music*, ed. Leppert (Berkeley, CA, 2002), 000–00, esp. pp. 213–31.

<sup>7</sup> Philosophically, this approach recalls Alfred N. Whitehead's focus on the shifting relations between prehending subject and prehended object. See Alfred N. Whitehead, *Process and Reality* (New York, 1978), chapter 2.

<sup>8</sup> But see Georgina Born, 'On Musical Mediation: Ontology, Technology and Creativity', *Twentieth Century Music*, 2/1 (2005), 7–36, and *eadem*, 'Recording: From Reproduction to Representation to Remediation', *The Cambridge Companion to Music*, ed. Nicholas Cook *et al.* (Cambridge, 2009), 000–00.

<sup>9</sup> Steven Feld, *Sound and Sentiment: Birds, Weeping, Poetics and Song in Kaluli Expression* (Philadelphia, PA, 1982), 41.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 164, 30.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 6.

<sup>12</sup> Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste* (London, 1986); Stuart Hall, 'Encoding and Decoding', *Culture, Media, Language*, ed. Stuart Hall *et al.* (London, 1980); David Morley, *The Nationwide Audience* (London, 1980); Marie Gillespie, *Television, Ethnicity and Cultural Change* (London, 1995); Tamar Liebes and Elihu Katz, *The Export of Meaning* (New York, 1990).

<sup>13</sup> See Table 1, p. 15, and Figure 1, p. 17, in which musical tastes are correlated with class fractions.

<sup>14</sup> Bourdieu, *Distinction*, 18–19.

---

<sup>15</sup> It is worth noting that Bourdieu's critics find his heavily structuralist, deterministic reading of the pattern of relations between class structure and consumption reifying and contentious, and lacking an account of the positivity of the aesthetic experiences of the working class. See, for example, Richard Jenkins, *Pierre Bourdieu* (London, 1992), esp. chapter 6; and Georgina Born, 'The Social and the Aesthetic: Methodological Principles in the Study of Cultural Production', *Meaning and Method: The Cultural Approach to Sociology*, ed. Isaac Reed and Jeffrey C. Alexander (Boulder, CO, 2009), 84–5.

<sup>16</sup> Tony Bennett, Mike Savage, Elizabeth B. Silva, Alan Warde, Modesto Gayo-Cal and David Wright, *Culture, Class, Distinction* (London, 2009).

<sup>17</sup> Such a semanticization is obvious also in the instrumental design of the radio station Classic FM, which builds its music programming around pieces selected according to the planned orchestration of mood.

<sup>18</sup> A key limitation of Bennett *et al.*'s (2009) study is that it lacks an analysis of the changing nature of musical competence today in relation to the wider historical transformations which have seen jazz and the 'art' end of certain popular music genres, as well as experimental, minimalist, systems, neo-Romantic and other late twentieth-century postmodern compositional styles, accrue the cultural legitimacy that they previously lacked. This is signalled by numerous changes in recent decades: the development of serious critical discourses devoted to these musics, as well as the rise of academic studies, educational programmes in colleges and universities, and changes to the music curriculum in schools such that they are increasingly taught. All of this has led to their growing, if variable, public cultural legitimation, as well as to the existence of new bodies of knowledge about their musical, formal and aesthetic properties – that is, new sources of musical competence. To understand the significance of the changing forms of musical consumption and competence, some account of this picture of wider transformations in the hierarchies of musical and cultural value should have been brought into this research.



---

<sup>19</sup> For a historical overview of these evolving conditions, see Sterne, *The Audible Past*.

<sup>20</sup> Michael Bull, *Sounding Out the City* (Oxford, 2000); *idem*, *Sound Moves: iPod Culture and Urban Experience* (London, 2007).

<sup>21</sup> Shuhei Hosokawa, 'The Walkman Effect', *Popular Music*, 4 (1984), 176.

<sup>22</sup> Arild Bergh and Tia DeNora, 'From Wind-Up to iPod: Techno-Cultures of Listening', *The Cambridge Companion to Recorded Music*, ed. Nicholas Cook, Eric Clarke, Daniel Leech-Wilkinson and John Rink. (Cambridge, 2009), ms. 17.

<sup>23</sup> Tia DeNora, *Music in Everyday Life* (Cambridge, 2000); Bull, *Sounding Out the City* and *Sound Moves*.

<sup>24</sup> It should be noted that the focus of the studies by Bull and DeNora is on British music consumers.

<sup>25</sup> DeNora, *Music in Everyday Life*, 49.

<sup>26</sup> Bull, *Sounding Out the City*, 180–1.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 194.

<sup>28</sup> Walter Benjamin, 'The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction' (1936), *Illuminations*, ed. Hanna Arendt, trans. Harry Zohn (New York, 1969), 000–00; and Theodor W. Adorno, 'On the Fetish-Character in Music and the Regression of Listening' (1938), in Adorno, *Essays on Music*, ed. Leppert, 000–00.

<sup>29</sup> These processes are particularly evident in the role that music is enjoined to play in social networking sites such as MySpace and Facebook, where music becomes an extension, illustration or adornment of some advertised facet of the self.

<sup>30</sup> For further discussion of the technological mediation of musical experience, see Georgina Born, 'Recording: From Reproduction to Representation to Remediation'.

---

<sup>31</sup> On the concept of the musical assemblage, see Georgina Born, ‘On Musical Mediation’, which draws on Deleuze’s reading of Foucault: see Gilles Deleuze, *Foucault* (London, 1988)), and Paul Rabinow, *Anthropos Today* (Princeton, NJ, 2003), chapter 3.

<sup>32</sup> Gayatri Spivak, ‘Ethics and Politics in Tagore, Coetzee, and Certain Scenes of Teaching’, *Diacritics*, 32/3–4 (2002), 17. I am grateful to Ben Etherington for this reference, provided in his paper detailed in note 33.

<sup>33</sup> Ben Etherington, “‘Setting to Work’ in Ignorance: Sartre, Fanon and the Problem of Literary Knowledge’, paper presented to the Postcolonial Pedagogies Conference, Centre for Research in the Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities, University of Cambridge, 11 October 2008.