SOME (STILL) LIKE IT HOT: RE-ENVISIONING TRANSDISCIPLINARITY AND COLLABORATION IN FIRST YEAR COMPOSITION AND JAZZ

Krista Laurel Petrosino

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate College of Bowling Green State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

August 2012

Committee:

Dr. Lee Nickoson, Advisor

Dr. Trinka Messenheimer
Graduate Faculty Representative

Dr. Kristine Blair

Dr. Sue Carter Wood
ABSTRACT

Dr. Lee Nickoson, Advisor

The prevailing argument of this dissertation project contends that many of the previous ways of understanding disciplinary knowledge outside of discipline-specific contexts—most frequently metaphors and tropes—are useful when working within abstract, theorized concepts, but do not fare well when a practical application such as collaboration (and specifically transdisciplinary collaboration) is the goal. Rather, in the case of transdisciplinary collaboration between the specific observed classrooms and learning environments, the situated literacies identified within each classroom or learning environment are useful foundations for understanding how knowledge is produced or transferred in those environments and therefore function, in practical terms, as points of engagement around which instructors and students can design discipline-specific or in the case of overlapping or shared situated literacies, transdisciplinary collaborative activities.

This argument was articulated through a synthesis of literature from the disciplines of Rhetoric and Composition and Music that focused on the tropes aurality, interaction, improvisation, and voice within the context of connecting writing and Jazz, potentially through collaboration and community in chapter one, which became the basis for the empirical study that investigated the ways in which writers and musicians in specific First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies classrooms created and shared knowledge. Chapter two frames the aforementioned empirical study within the concept of master narratives before presenting the project’s foundation in teacher research, feminist inquiry, and grounded theory, and illustrating the research site(s) and participants. Subsequently, chapters three and four attended to the collection and analysis
of the data, ultimately moving the focus from metaphorical understandings of aurality, improvisation, interaction, and voice as general means of connecting writing and Jazz, to specific means of facilitating discipline-specific and transdisciplinary collaboration within and between the observed classrooms and learning environments by situating the data in Paul Prior’s concept of literate activity and identifying situated literacies as practical means to discipline-specific and transdisciplinary collaboration.
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I grew up with music; I should say, though, that I grew up with music, and the music I performed and listened to has simultaneously “grown up” with me. Music is inquiry at its deepest level, where every note choice, every phrase inspires the determination to learn its context, to understand the logic behind the composition, to “get it under your fingers,” and most importantly, to question its potential. I would argue that this propensity for inquiry highlights a primary difference between musicians and those who appreciate music; many can understand what they hear, yet fewer cannot help but listen and deconstruct, re-construct or remediate. My earliest memories play out a melody of listening, imitating the feel and the sounds of Bach inventions, opera, a healthy dose of the Beatles, The Rolling Stones, and best of all, John Coltrane, Miles Davis, and Charlie Parker. As I grew, I added to my collection of musical loves. I was a bona fide MTV youth and adorer of Bon Jovi by age 7; by high school, I had added a furious mix of Sonny Rollins, Sonny Stitt, and Joe Henderson to my audio library—two seemingly disparate musical foundations, yet both sparked an undeniable emotional and intellectual urgency: I had to listen, I had to produce, and listening was the most accurate route to learning the pieces that I performed.

Because I have dealt with a learning disability that effected (and still effects) the accuracy with which I read textual material, I cannot always trust my own visual interpretation—it remains an unreliable modality. Music notation provides an especially challenging reading experience because notes on the staff do not offer the same distinguishing characteristics that alphabetic text does. Thus, if I want to learn a musical composition with any efficiency, I have to rely on my ability to listen and to recall. As difficult as the process has been, it has altered the
lens through which I view texts and textual practices, and ultimately influenced me to begin routing music’s potential for inquiry into other areas of interest such as history, language, and finally, composition (and here, I refer to musical and English composition). In my everyday learning situations, listening has been an equivalent process to reading and to writing. My ears dissect each piece of music that I listen to, mapping each melody note by note and phrase by phrase in an immediately repeatable pattern that I can recall quickly, just as a writer maps out each sentence, each phrase on a page or a screen. To listen is to learn, and this concept continues to influence my scholarship and my teaching.

As a writing instructor, musician, and scholar, what interest me are the divisions—or the perceived divisions—between the classical tradition of music (in which one studies and performs a composition note for note, seeking simultaneously a perfect imitation of the original text and a means of adding minor inflections of personal taste without violating the imperative allegiance to the composer’s text) a largely visual, textual pursuit, and the Jazz that emerged during the American 20th century, traditionally learned by oral and aural means with the intent to create new music (or new knowledge) from the extant framework rather than to imitate that framework. I am equally interested in the academic community that is Jazz instruction and performance, and how it relates to transdisciplinary collaboration within the academy and to collaborative writing instruction. By studying the concepts of aurality, interaction, improvisation, and voice through an empirical investigation within First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies classrooms and learning environments within a Midwestern university, I sought to understand how both student and faculty participants communicated their disciplinary knowledge and whether, specifically, elements of Jazz performance and instruction (such as improvisation and interaction) could assist or enhance the instruction of collaborative composition, ideally
translating into situations where First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies students at the particular Midwestern university could feasibly compose collaborative arguments together. On a larger scale, I sought to open doors to interdisciplinary (and transdisciplinary) perspectives—to cross boundaries between traditional academic departments and disciplines, and to encourage the research potential inherent to both cross-disciplinary discourse and the blending of communities within the academy. Because Jazz instruction developed from a non-academic tradition (defined as not initially situated within the formal academy—the university) I wanted to determine how this unique aural, community-based model of instruction might shed light on issues of collaboration, voice, and power in First Year Composition learning situations within the academy.

In response to these initial connections, I developed the following research questions:

• What is the relationship of language to collaboration in collegiate learning spaces involving writing or Jazz performance?

• How might collaboration connect writing and Jazz “through means other than language?”

• What is the nature of social ethos and individual ethos in writing and Jazz learning situations, and how do these positions assist or resist collaboration and the collaborative process?

Using these research questions as a guide, I observed First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies classrooms and learning environments, seeking to examine the status of relationships within those spaces—the individual versus the social ethos—and the language that students and instructors used when discussing their disciplinary work. I began this pursuit with a framework of metaphors—aurality, interaction, improvisation, and voice—that composition and
music scholars often employed when discussing connections between their disciplinary knowledge and that of other fields. These metaphors currently represent potential gateways to facilitating collaboration within and between communities of Jazz musicians and writers within the academy, and subsequently provide insight to improved collaboration and collaborative writing in both transdisciplinary research and First Year Composition contexts. Though textual analysis of these communities’ literature, followed by an empirical study of the literate activity that took place in the observed First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies classrooms and learning environments practices, I have sought to determine whether the metaphors—aurality, interaction, improvisation, and voice—function practically in First Year Composition and Jazz classrooms and learning environments, and subsequently, how they might have assisted in countering the specific issues of multiple voices, individual ethos, social ethos, and power structures within the First Year Composition classroom when collaboration and the instruction of collaborative writing are the goals.

A specific issue at hand deals with the relationship of Jazz performance instruction and writing instruction within the academy (and the continued practice of both art forms) and how, within the bounds of the academy, transdisciplinary metaphors and other figurative uses of language often become the medium by which one discipline discusses the attributes of the other, rather than focusing on specific, literal attributes or modalities. Jazz performance and instruction and writing instruction within the academy remain crucial lenses for this study, because while Jazz and written discourse are not readily connected within academic programs, a productive tension between oral/aural and written processes and products exists in both of these art forms. Ultimately, this study attempted to locate productive, tangible intersections between the disciplinary knowledge of First Year Composition and of Jazz, in addition to mediating the
oral/aural, process/product dichotomies inherent to a side-by-side comparison of those two disciplines’ knowledge, processes, and products. This cross-disciplinary, multimodal approach yielded the potential for pedagogical applications in both the fields of writing and music, with important considerations residing in communication and definitions of literacy, namely in literate activity and the identification of specific situated literacies within the observed classrooms and learning environments.

Given this framework, we might begin by considering the writing classroom and the textual mode as examples. Within the writing classroom, (even one that focuses on multimodality), linguistic and visual (textual) communication remain the primary modes of communication; students and instructors speak with one another, produce textual and visual products, and, undoubtedly, employ some nonverbal communicative patterns as well (such as gestures and facial expressions) in the act of consuming and producing media. Conversely, while Jazz performers within the academy also employ verbal, non-verbal, and textual (or visual) modes of communication in the act of production, in addition to employing some textual artifacts, an additional means of communication is at work. Jazz performers employ sonic communicative practices (which are perceived aurally and produced within the musical production) that remain subtler than verbal or nonverbal communicative elements. These sonic communications, often produced during improvisation, facilitate interaction among the musicians by relaying a sonic pattern that is understood by the other performers as a specific message in a specific context. For example, when performing a song, members of a small Jazz combo will tend to use various combinations of verbal, nonverbal, and sonic communicative patterns to maintain a coherent performance and prevent the musical mistakes inherent to miscommunication.
Because verbal speech and nonverbal gestures are not always aesthetically ideal means of communicating in this situation, a more effective means of relaying a message is through note choice, rhythmic patterns, and other sonically based communication. In the case of a purely sonic message, the soloist does not have to make eye contact or verbal contact with the rest of his or her group; instead, the soloist selects specific notes and rhythmic patterns that either outline the chord progression or the overall form of the tune in a very specific location of the framework, thus “telling” the other members that the improvised solo is ending, or that the direction of the tune is changing without having to “say” it. Thus, the coherence within a Jazz performance is generated not necessarily from a unity of the voices present in the performance (which are expected to “clash,”) but most importantly from the unity of the ideas being articulated—from the forward motion of the conversation articulated through the improvised music.

Naturally, this highly specialized communication requires practice and is sometimes additionally dependent upon the chemistry within the group, not unlike the means by which the chemistry in a classroom or a group of writers affects the process and the end product: tension, taken through the lens of Jazz performance, remains a productive force, just as sonic communications within Jazz performances do not guarantee “seamless” products. Their purpose is to keep the conversation moving. Therefore, understanding the potential of this sonic modality not only requires a discussion of literacy—one that includes as a crucial component, an understanding of the value of forging a personal dynamic within collaborative situations, but also the consideration that the audience of a multivocal text—sonic, or language based—might benefit from the understanding that the concept of unity does not necessarily require both unity of voice and unity of discussion or ideas, that “tension” within the document does not indicate an “experimental” text.
A majority of students within the academy (especially if they have been trained for any length of time within the American education system) have spent much of their educational careers working within and responding to predominantly verbal and textual modes of transmitting information. Students purchase and read textbooks, access websites and electronic documents, listen to lectures, discuss information, and produce largely textually based products within that cycle of information transmission. Thus, the primary literacies at work within the academy tend to favor verbal and textual modes. Given this understanding of the primary modes at work in the academy, a complication arises when, in a transdisciplinary context, aspects of a largely aurally based model such as Jazz performance begin working within a framework that traditionally favors verbal and textual modalities. One would expect that in order for students of a discipline (writing students, for example) that favors textual and verbal modalities to make effective use of another discipline’s preferred modes (Jazz performance’s aural mode, for example) that the students of the first discipline would need to freshly acquire the same complex sonic literacy with which the Jazz performer communicates; however, this is not quite the extensive feat that it appears.

For example, multimodal compositions provide excellent media through which students may work with presenting their voices in aural, textual, and visual (e.g. video or graphic) formats and therefore making as close a use of the blended literacies necessary for transdisciplinary and/or collaborative work. Just as a Jazz musician might recognize the final note of a previous soloist’s improvised work and begin his or her improvisation with the same note or with one in a close harmonic relationship to it, composers of collaborative multimodal texts might input a video after a previous textual contribution for illustration or choose to carry a color scheme from one portion of a web document or graphic to the next. Transitions, and the blending of voices
that they represent do not have to be seamless, but they do need to express the forward motion of the collaborative product—a concept that stands in contrast to the traditional notions of unity in written discourse.

The sonic mode adapted by Jazz musicians to produce clear communications is perceived in the same way that any person who is physically capable would perceive and comprehend non-verbal (gesture or facial expression) communication. These sonic gestures, per se, are filtered through the musician’s extant understanding of the musical framework within which the communications are happening, in much the same way that a person who is visually capable of seeing a website uses his or her literacy—the extant understanding of how to navigate a basic web design—to find the desired information. While the non-music student might not possess the literacy to operate within a specifically musical framework, if he or she is physically capable of hearing or listening, then he or she has the potential to obtain literacy that is sonically rather than verbally or textually based—one that begins with a willingness to understand the important link between hearing, listening, and rhetorical listening (discussed later in this chapter as a form of aurality), and continues with the ability to respond immediately to something as small as a single statement or idea, rather than focusing on integrating larger, more globally based segments of discussion within the collaborative product.

Sonic literacies related to Jazz performance are not necessarily directly transferrable to other disciplinary learning situations or productions, but this dissertation promotes the potential for a contribution of modified sonic literacy to the extant verbal and textual literacies that writing students already employ in the act of collaborating and producing texts. Here, it is important to note that the products of each discipline’s collaborative situations often remain disparate as well—largely sonic products within Jazz compared to textual products of collaborative writing—
and this raises questions not only about medium, but also about the fluid or fixed physical state of each end product and the implications those physical states have on the viability of Jazz and writing as transdisciplinary partners.

Returning to the products of composition, Walter Ong’s discussion of primary and secondary oral cultures provides a helpful frame. From an historical perspective, orality and oral cultures play a key role in the contemporary understanding of these disciplines’ definitions of the art form, as both rely heavily on the oral tradition; thus, in Ong’s terms, it is the group mentality—the group ethos—of both primary and secondary oral cultures that draws rhetoric and music (Jazz) together, and this is a point to which I had to remain faithful within the context of this project. Additionally, Ong’s distinction between primary and secondary orality supports the cultural division (and, unfortunately, the cultural prejudice at one end of the spectrum and privileging at the other) associated with oral versus textually based discourse. For example, in the instance of the oral Jazz tradition, prejudice was assigned to Jazz as an art form not just along racial lines in the United States, but along sociocultural lines as well. The textually based compositions of the European classical music tradition were favored for their static quality and elite status as an irrefutable art form, while Jazz—an ever-changing musical tradition that, with the exception of a few compositions, remained an oral/aural modality—was considered a lesser form of expression. This same privileging of textual literacy remains in the academy itself. The question, then, was whether the collaborative end-product of Jazz and writing situations should found the project, or whether given the ethical considerations of re-purposing concepts within alternate disciplinary contexts, aspects of Jazz performance such as interaction, improvisation, aurality, and voice, could serve as mediating factors for an exploration of the possibility of transdisciplinary means to improved collaborative writing and the pedagogy developed to teach
Given these clear connections to elements of (and complications within) writing and First Year Composition instruction, the benefits of researching Jazz (and elements of the Music discipline in general) to emphasize collaboration, to enhance writing instruction, and to conceptualize a combination of both rhetoric and composition and music theories will, I hope, lead to a revival of interdisciplinary scholarship in Rhetoric and Composition and a re-examination of interdisciplinary (or transdisciplinary) scholarship. However, in building a means toward this goal, it is important to discuss potential complications, such as the concepts of collaboration and community, the use of metaphor in discussions of discipline-based content, and the inherent remediation of the Jazz elements of voice, aurality, interaction, and improvisation.

Collaboration and Community

These terms represent the important framework upon which this dissertation project is based, and within which the modes of voice, aurality, interaction, and improvisation function. Because collaboration and collaborative writing in general require consideration of the elements of voice and interaction, it is important to review the essential discussions of collaboration inherent to the field of Rhetoric and Composition in order to better define how, specifically, this dissertation project will both complement extant work and simultaneously move it forward toward transdisciplinary collaboration between the fields of Rhetoric and Composition and Music, and the means by which that transdisciplinary collaboration aids the instruction of collaboration and collaborative writing in the First Year Composition context. This goal requires, naturally, a significant unpacking of both collaboration and its partner concept, community. The first question we might ask is, how does this project define collaboration? Within this context,
collaboration first refers to collaboration between academic colleagues within both a singular department and separate (seemingly disparate) departments, collaboration between students within a singular academic department or classroom/learning environment, or collaboration between students and instructors. Each of these collaborative situations would benefit from this dissertation’s focus. Collaboration, within this project, must also account for notions of community, voice, conflict, negotiation, and interaction within the epistemological process, as addressed by Yancey and Spooner, Ede and Lunsford, Harris, Kirsch, and Flower.

Kathleen Blake Yancey and Michael Spooner review the field’s responses to multiple issues regarding collaboration, from considerations of dialogic versus hierarchical collaboration to “multivocality” and ownership, and definitions or clarifications of the terms community and cooperation within the context of collaborative writing (and executed within a collaborative text, no less). Key issues covered by Yancey and Spooner that function within this project extend from a statement that Yancey and Spooner credit to John B. Smith: “Collaboration carries with it the expectation of a singular purpose and a seamless integration of the parts, as if the conceptual object were produced by a single good mind . . . . The reader is unable to tell from internal clues which chapters or sections were written by which authors” [sic] (50). This focus on unity—unity of purpose, unity of text, and unity of voice(s)—is precisely what drew my attention to Jazz performance when considering the potential of transdisciplinary collaboration and the instruction of collaborative writing because Jazz performances require the presence of multiple voices, simultaneously interacting, but in a context in which both consonance and dissonance are expected and appreciated.

Although this translates into an acceptance of multivocality, Jazz performances still contain similar issues of power, representation, voice, and authenticity addressed by the field of
Rhetoric and Composition in the context of collaborative texts and collaborative knowledge making. While Rhetoric and Composition discourses provide for the authenticity of multiple voices and multiple perspectives not only within singular documents but within the field’s discourse, multivocality remains a problematic entity on several levels, from textual coherence to the practical assessment of tenure eligibility, to larger discourses on power and representation/underrepresentation. In response to some of these issues, Yancey and Spooner determine that:

Representing the multivocal process of collaboration can provide a source of coherence for a text, since they carry the traces of the interaction between writers . . . When it works—when the representation of the process is sufficient and persuasive—then marks of coherence that we associate with expository text—the mediated ties of Halliday and Hasan, for instance—can be superfluous. . . . The disconnects that characterize any partnership provide a source of coherence when they are designed and expressed to do this. Thus, the reader uses the patterning and rhythm to re-create the collaborative process that created the text and vicariously participates in the processes (of) composing the text. The disconnects, the disruptive, which aren’t random at all, permit a different kind of aesthetic that is itself rooted in difference, an appreciation and articulation of difference.

(59-60)

Gesa Kirsch (“Multi-Vocal Texts and Interpretive Responsibility”) articulates concerns over taking such a consistently positive view of multivocal texts, arguing that these texts limit and complicate factors such as “readability, accessibility, and interpretation,” and that they additionally complicate the reader/author relationship by placing the responsibility for interpretation on the reader. (Kirsch 193-4)
In response to Yancey and Spooner’s acclaim for multivocal texts and Kirsch’s reservations, and especially in the context of this dissertation project, it is important to view collaboration and collaborative texts as both phenomenologically and epistemologically centered, rather than functioning even partially as a transcription of the collaborative process itself. In this case, we can take a cue from Jazz performance in the aspect that the product of interaction and collaboration in that circumstance is not a transcription, but new music, new ideas, new knowledge, invented and presented immediately. Yet, these immediate epistemological moments contain imperfections, and purposeful consonances and dissonances that function as accepted (and appreciated) colors within the product. However, within this project, multivocality functions as an important modality that facilitates the collaborative effort in general rather than remaining a textual element. Thus, multivocality assists the blending of academic communities within transdisciplinary collaboration in a similar spirit to homophonic musical compositions’ employment of multiple, harmonized parts that move in the same rhythm as the melody (Harvard Dictionary of Music). Jazz performance brings to this concept of multivocality an important, more flexible understanding of “homophonic” compositions, as Jazz performances do not rely so heavily on the concept of harmony “following” the rhythm of the leading melody, thus opening and breaking down the power structure within the collaborative group, and subsequently, within the composition itself.

In addition to the necessary discussion of collaboration, an important partner concept, community, also requires contextualization within the project. Yancey and Spooner discuss the juxtaposition of “committee” and “community” within the context of both student and professional collaborative writing, noting factors such as caring about the writing at hand, the idea of a common goal, and the important ties that bring those concepts back to the discussion of
Ede and Lunsford’s hierarchical versus dialogic modes. In the following conversation, Yancey and Spooner debate the nature and function of “community” in the classroom, providing both an important point of contextualization with this project’s understanding of collaborative environments, and an example of multivocality within a single textual space:

A committee is not a community. But maybe a committee (for one example) is not such a bad model, if we can discard the stereotypes for the moment. In fact, it may be an especially appropriate model for group writing in the classroom. There are many similarities: the work is assigned, a deadline is set from outside, an inescapable arbitrariness pervades. Committees have an emotional detachment about them because they belong to the world of work. Developing (or discovering) community is not on the agenda; it might well be a distraction. Yes, but. Students can become invested in their work so that a community develops from committee, and in a class that is student-centered, that would likely be one of the goals, assuming of course that writing you care about is likely to be better writing, as Britton argues. . . . I think that the kind of caring is at issue: students don’t always care about writing the way the teacher wants them to care, and when they do, it isn’t always better for their writing. (Yancey and Spooner 54)

Yancey and Spooner’s discussion of the practical applications of community provides an important perspective, especially when juxtaposed with Joseph Harris’ suggestions for viewing collaboration and community. Harris contends that:

Rather than . . . romanticizing academic discourse as occurring in a kind of single cohesive community, I would urge, instead, that we think of it as taking place in something more like a city. That is, instead of presenting academic discourse as coherent and well-defined, we might be better of viewing it as a polyglot, as a sort of space in
which competing beliefs and practices intersect with and confront one another. . . . I would urge an even more specific and material view of community: one that, like a city, allows for both consensus and conflict, and holds that room for ourselves, our disciplinary colleagues, our university coworkers, and our students. . . . It may prove more useful to center our study, instead, on the everyday struggles and mishaps of the talk in our classrooms and departments, with their mixings of sometimes conflicting and sometimes conjoining beliefs and purposes. Indeed, I would suggest that we reserve our uses of community to describe the workings of such specific and local groups. (Harris 20)

Thus, Harris, Yancey, and Spooner provide an important caution to the goals of this project—that the definitions and functions of community, disciplinarity, and collaboration will inherently depend upon the collaborative participants—the members/creators—and the individual and social ethos, language, and disciplinary knowledge that mediate the collaborative initiatives.

Jazz/jazz, and Metaphor

Within the contexts of disciplinary boundaries and transdisciplinarity, it is important to note the role that metaphor has played in the communication of ideas within and between disciplinary boundaries. Lynn Bloom’s chapter titled “Reading, Writing, Teaching Essays as Jazz” that appears within her 1998 text Composition as a Creative Art illustrates this concept well. In making a case for a more literary approach to essays, Bloom’s chapter relies heavily on Jazz as a metaphor for writing—a metaphor that, while helpful in illustrating her desire for students’ essays to be “fluid and flexible in form,” tends to operate on a relatively superficial level within the chapter (104). The problem is not Bloom’s. Metaphor often illustrates or amplifies concepts within writing theory or writing pedagogy but its inherently unstable nature
has the potential to complicate pragmatic concepts such as collaboration and collaborative writing. Therefore, when considering pedagogy, especially transdisciplinary pedagogy, Jazz-as-metaphor is not enough on its own; in order for the concept to “work” rather than explain or illustrate, Jazz needs to be connected to another, active concept such as rhetoric or music performance techniques. George Lakoff and Mark Johnson explain:

> Metaphor is for most people a device of the poetic imagination and the rhetorical flourish—a matter of extraordinary rather than ordinary language. Moreover, metaphor is typically viewed as characteristic of language alone, a matter of words rather than thought or action. For this reason, most people think they can get along perfectly well without metaphor. We have found, on the contrary, that metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action. Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature. (3)

From an important perspective, however, I.A. Richards criticizes the doctrine of Usage within the context of metaphor.

> Within the third lecture of *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, Richards plainly states: “No word can be judged as to whether it is good or bad, correct or incorrect, beautiful or ugly, or anything else that matters to a writer in isolation. That seems so evident that I am almost ashamed to say it, and yet it flies straight in the face of the only doctrine that for two hundred years has been officially inculcated—when any doctrine is inculcated in these matters. I mean the doctrine of Usage. The doctrine that there is a right or good use for every word and that literary virtue consists in making that good use of it” (51). Richards clarifies “usage” within a note at the end of the third lecture in which he provides four relevant understandings of the word “usage,” all of
which point to fixed or limited contexts for specific words and isolation of meaning within the word itself.

Common metaphors that have crossed disciplinary boundaries between Rhetoric and Composition and Music are voice, aurality, and jazz, each of which carries a host of sub-metaphors. Yet, these metaphors are complicated by the fact that they additionally function as permanent members of specialized, discipline specific terminologies—a compatible concept with the single-meaning, isolationist aspects of the doctrine of Usage. From this perspective, then, the complication resides in the differing understandings of the terms, especially once the terms cross disciplinary boundaries and take on additional or new meanings outside of their specified definitions. Hence, disciplinary boundaries limit the “omnipresent” nature of metaphor and create a perceived instability within language. While numerous discussions in rhetoric and composition have focused on stabilizing metaphors, this practice relates directly to the complicated nature of using metaphor in praxis based humanities subjects such as First Year Composition and is not the most feasible means of rationalizing metaphor to practical application in discussions of writing or of music. Instead, this project considers metaphors through a generative lens as epistemological devices.

Metaphor permeates discussions of jazz and of writing; it appears in ranges from purposeful embellishments to abstract, deeply rooted references that entirely re-contextualize the discussion at hand. Metaphor is both epistemological device and stylistic choice, yet Donald Davidson would counter the notion of metaphor as a generative device. James Seitz paraphrases Davidson’s contention that, “there is no such thing as a separate, distinct form of meaning called ‘metaphorical’ or ‘figurative’ meaning; rather, ‘metaphors mean what the words, in their most literal interpretation, mean, and nothing more.’ In Davidson’s view, metaphor ‘belongs
exclusively to the domain of use’ rather than to the realm of semantics, so that what is
imaginative about metaphor is not its generation of new meanings but its creative employment of
standard meanings in order to stimulate further thought about the subject at hand” (Davidson qtd.
in Seitz 97). While Davidson’s “literalist” discussion of metaphor certainly plays a role in the
treatment of metaphor in this project, I will continue to posit that metaphors function
epistemologically in the act of re-contextualizing the subject to which they are applied.

When an author uses a metaphor such as jazz in a discussion of writing, for example, the
reader begins to re-contextualize both Jazz and writing, thus generating new means of
approaching both subjects—Jazz and writing. Thus, metaphorical uses of Jazz in writing do not
correlate to the “standard” meaning of Jazz. “Stimulating thought” about writing because it was
described as jazz or “like Jazz” does not take the reader beyond questioning “how can writing be
Jazz (the art form)?” The metaphorical notion of jazz within the context of writing alters the
meaning of Jazz within that context, but more importantly, (in the case of this project) the
metaphor moved beyond meaning and forced a change in the application of Jazz. For example,
this project asks both writing and Jazz performance to operate literally as partner concepts in the
creation of a group or classroom communication dynamic and collaborative end product through
the integration of the concepts of improvisation, interaction, voice, and aurality. It is important to
indicate early on that this project will not portray metaphor as a hindrance to writing instruction
or to transdisciplinary conversations; rather, metaphor is understood as a complex rhetorical
device that serves to (sometimes persuasively) re-contextualize the application of specific
conscepts (not just terms) and to amplify specific disciplinary conversations and functions for the
purpose of knowledge making and pedagogy.

As Richards, Lakoff, and Johnson have proposed, metaphors are not “mere
embellishments”—they amplify, yet simultaneously alter the entire context of the discussion. Metaphors are active devices. This is not to say, though, that metaphors enhance texts or create meaning via *clarification*. In explicating the poem “The Motive for Metaphor” by Wallace Stevens, James Seitz (*Motives for Metaphor...*) determines that metaphor simultaneously “represents an impulse that opposes sharp definitions” and “timidly ‘shrinks’ from the importance of making things clear, and from the responsibilities that attend the effort to do so... The value of these contrastive readings comes not so much from one or the other as from holding the two of them in productive tension” (3). Part of this “productive tension” relates to readers’ individual (and often differing) understandings of metaphors—differences that often predicate themselves on the fact that individuals experience their environments differently. Thus, an important complication occurs when re-purposing terminology or concepts between disciplines for rhetorical or philosophical goals, replacing literal understandings of disciplinary terminology with specifically metaphorical uses. Not only does the term and the disciplinary conventions, conversations, and concepts predicated on it become potentially unrecognizable in its metaphorical state, but additionally, individuals employing the metaphor will understand it differently.

With regard to both metaphor and voice, Linda Flower’s 1996 study titled “Negotiating the Meaning of Difference” provides important discussions of the deep connection between metaphor and voice and the power of voices within the context of meaning making:

The competing forces that have the potential to shape meaning may range from cultural expectations to discourse conventions, to sudden insights, to rhetorical intentions. These forces can be said to enter the writer’s negotiation metaphorically as voices. Speaking as voices of advice, opportunity, doom, or challenge, they take the stage of a writer’s
attention to set goals, pose constraints, propose language, promote commonplaces, reveal opportunity, demand compliance, or offer alternatives. Like the voices of jazz musicians in a jam session, they speak over, under, and through one another in the flow of thought. . . . My point is this: The chorus of voices that can enter the construction of meaning is not only large and diverse but an often conflicted chorus (including, for instance, contextual constraints, emotions, attitudes, diverse bodies of knowledge, and hard-to-interpret signs). It can embrace many different ways of representing what we know.

(Flower 68-69, 74)

Thus, voices and the sometimes conflicting “sounds” they produce require, according to Flower, acts of negotiation when constructing meaning and, eventually, texts.

Within the context of this dissertation, Flower’s statement is especially true of collaborative texts. Because voices in textual products range from abstract concepts listed above (such as emotions, attitudes, contextual constraints, bodies of knowledge etc.) to more literal notions of writers’ voices as they appear in the text’s individual sentences and paragraphs (recognizable as “Krista’s voice” or “Linda’s voice” by the familiar reader), the act of negotiating these diverse elements within the process of knowledge making and text production requires collaborators to understand that, “a negotiated meaning may radically rename, reconceptualize the issue of concern, just as the ‘meaning of [Black English Vernacular]’ in [Flower’s] study changed from a matter of linguistic definition to intercultural interpretation” (Flower 73). Given these complex but important functions of metaphor and voice, the following modes of voice, aurality, improvisation, and interaction represent locations where literal and figurative uses of the terms, situated within disciplinary and cross-disciplinary conversations, have produced both productive conversations and complicated or problematic contexts within
which the terms operate.

Voice

Voice—a multifaceted notion in Rhetoric and Composition—remains contested in the field, yet is widely represented from literal discussions of individual voices in writing through abstract, metaphorical understandings of individually and socially constructed knowledge. While metaphor emphasizes the individual’s interpretation, voice represents (and emphasizes) both individual and social constructions, especially in the context of Rhetoric and Composition discourses: voice is a modality. This focus on both individual and social constructions of knowledge places Jazz performance in a uniquely transdisciplinary position, because Jazz represents a location in which both individual voices and the group “voice” (through which the song is articulated) must operate symbiotically even though they remain inherently contradictory forces.

Jazz locates multiple voices in an environment where the tension created by the sound and the “feel” of those voices clashing and harmonizing without submitting to the power of a dominant discourse is an acceptable and even desirable occurrence. The act of composing could benefit greatly from this notion of desirable tension, as a recurring issue within Rhetoric and Composition discourses on collaboration remains the “problem” of unity within collaborative projects. Viewed through the lens of Jazz performance, the collaborative essay need not provide a monotonal structure in which one voice submits to another for the sake of stylistic or grammatical composure. Instead, the polytonal structure (in which multiple voices and ideas clash and harmonize) of multivocal composition provides an ideal location for addressing the individual contributions of each author while reducing the tendency for problems relating to
power or authority within the text. To this end, Kathleen Blake Yancey highlights important points of agreement on voice within the field of Rhetoric and Composition, summarizing that voice depends upon the interaction of “several variables”—actors (including writers, readers, and language) and their cultures (within this project, understood as disciplines). (Yancey xix)

Yancey’s summary of the metaphorical voice as an interactive, social means of connecting to and rewriting previous voices and discourses connects immediately to the core of this dissertation’s focus. Voices in Jazz performance, as in writing, are individual, social, and authoritative means of contributing to a larger cyclical discussion, yet my association of voice with power and authority clashes a bit with Yancey’s attribution of the same elements to the notion of Aurality, which I address later in the chapter. Voice is key to this discussion because of its metaphorical function and because of its typical connections to individuality and authenticity. Within this and later chapters, the metaphor of voice is addressed through the lenses of primary orality and interaction with reference to communication within Jazz combo performances, in order to highlight pragmatically the means by which individual voices maintain authenticity (and individuality) while participating in social, collaborative knowledge making.

According to Lizbeth Bryant, voice is social, environmental, a process, and a product. She aims to “deconceptualize the term ['voice'] and crystallize the metaphor of voice,” essentially maintaining that voice is a situated process and product (7). However, since “voice as product is not complete,” voice must also be understood as “a process of navigating, negotiating, rejecting, and integrating, building hybrid voices. . . . [she argues] that we reconceptualize voice as a process of development, not just as a product, that is based on the relationships we have with ourselves and our world” (7, 10). Voice, for Bryant, is clearly a metaphor; however, I question her notion of “crystallizing” the metaphor if she is also interested in associating voice
with situated contexts. While “voice as process” creates a fixed referent for the metaphor of voice, Bryant also attempts to route the “process” problem by theorizing voice within a post-process frame as a situated element within specific contexts; this appears effective, as she conceptualizes voice-as-process as a “circular process of integration and expansion” rather than a linear process that logically finds an end in a product. I contend that Jazz performance offers a similar non-linear lens to writing, yet one in which the framework is flexible and expected to be challenged—something phenomenologically rather than grammatically or technologically based.

For example, when examining voice within music theory and instruction, we find a contemporary understanding of voice as primary (to borrow from Walter Ong’s description of oral cultures), as authentic, and as individual—an understanding that sometimes differs from contemporary discussions of voice in Rhetoric and Composition studies. These differences problematize, yet highlight possibilities for a phenomenological view of writing. Don Ihde (Listening and Voice: Phenomenologies of Sound) examines voice, listening, and language through phenomenological lenses—a move that, for the purposes of this project, allows me to examine writing-as-technology in relation to writing-as-phenomenology. Simply put, writing as an experiential rather than a technological or grammatical concept.

Ihde’s book, while situated in musicology, provides philosophical grounding for the study of sound as multiple phenomenologies. Ihde’s discussion of the metaphorical treatment of voice in scholarship (past and present) highlights the implicit fact that voice and metaphor are linked deeply by sound and listening, and, therefore, cannot successfully be separated. This notion complicates my treatment of metaphor as an illustrative, amplification device that can complicate interdisciplinary (or transdisciplinary) pedagogy, and writing discussions in general—a device that the discipline of Rhetoric and Composition should attempt to revisit for
the purpose of renewing conversations of collaboration, which require, as Linda Flower’s work
illustrated earlier in the chapter, an understanding of metaphorical uses of voice (and other
elements) for the purposes of negotiation and collaboration. Furthermore, it supports the use of
metaphor as an active, rhetorical device—one that can, depending on the larger context, maintain
ties to authenticity.

For example, Don Ihde speaks of voices in metaphorical terms, but presents them in
literal situations and as authentic representations of both sound and expression. Because each
voice has a specific purpose, it is authentic. This notion provides an alternate lens through which
to view Rhetoric and Composition’s past rejection of the authentic voice as an individual
construction (for the remediated notion that voices are socially constructed). In the case of Jazz
performance as a mediating factor for phenomenologically based collaborative composition, the
authentic voice is both individually and socially constructed, which could assist in better
representing what we want writing to be (and what we want our students to do with it). The
written representation of the voice in text maintains authenticity as both a singular and plural
entity: voice or voices.

Consequently, Peter Elbow discusses this very relationship—positions he deems “The
Traditional View: Indelible Writing, Ephemeral Speech” where writing enacts such a
permanence that it “takes on a life of its own, separate from the writer,” and “Speech as
Indelible, Writing as Ephemeral” where “Speech is inherently more indelible than writing”
because “it is a more vivid medium” (Elbow qtd. in Ede 172, 174). Ultimately, Elbow’s
conclusion—that writing is both ephemeral and indelible—serves the argument for a
phenomenological, polytonal (or polyvocal) approach to writing because his juxtaposition of
writing as both a malleable and permanent entity allows for an examination of how the author’s
voice (or authors’ voices) and the audience (or social situation—agon) in which he or she is writing impact the final product. *Experiential* writing, in theory, would not necessarily fall prey to the confines of traditional grammar or traditional nonfiction prose formats, but would also have the potential to become a lens through which First Year Composition programs to become more accepting of collaborative and multimodal compositions.

**Aurality**

In addressing writing-as-phenomenology (in addition to writing as technology), the sense of hearing, and its more active counterpart listening, play crucial roles in associations of Jazz performance to writing pedagogy and to collaborative writing. While aurality most notably aligns with extant discussions of teaching *creativity* within academic writing instruction and has been an effective means of discussing the improvement of student writing, the concept of writing-as-phenomenology better accommodates the aim of current First-Year Composition courses, and of this dissertation by additionally functioning as a modality. Thus, the two concepts that can help instructors approach aspects of composition from experiential phenomena are aurality and rhythm. It is important to emphasize the concept that *experiential* writing, especially within the context of this dissertation, does not equate to the common criticism of Expressivism, that it produces experienced based, author centered writing. In the case of this project, writing as phenomenology highlights sensory and rhetorical approaches to hearing writing and facilitating collaboration.

The notion of hearing writing brings the concept of aurality into focus; yet, it remains a complicated concept to address here because the disciplines of Rhetoric and Writing and Music often treat it differently. It is possible to relate the separate disciplinary uses of the term when
one examines discussions that involve aurality within both Rhetoric and Writing and Music. Aurality itself, then, is a double bind, but not in an obvious manner. Viewing aurality from a musical perspective, it is most often defined by its component parts: tonality, meter, and style, and in the broader concepts of hearing and listening. Selfe treats these components slightly differently, mentioning them as “speech, music, [and] sound,” and Kathy Liperote re-purposes the concept in much the same manner: “listening, speaking, reading, and writing” (46). Cynthia Selfe defines this re-purposed notion of aurality through three important discourses within Rhetoric and Composition:

1) Power: “how much one is allowed to talk and under what conditions;”
2) Silenced/Underprivileged/Underrepresented: “aurality as an important way of knowing and making meaning for many people in this country—especially for whom, historically, higher education has often been part of a system of continued domination and oppression;”
3) Orality/Literacy: “With the term aurality, I refer to a complexly related web of communicative practices that are received or perceived by the ear, including speech, sound, and music. . . . In using the term aurality rather than the more common orality, I hope to resist models of an oral/literate divide and simplistic characterizations of cultures or groups as either oral or literate in their communicative practices” (634, 635, 646).

In tailoring the concept of aurality specifically within Rhetoric and Composition’s disciplinary conversations, Selfe’s discussion of aurality simultaneously illustrates both the double bind and disciplinary motive, but also the metaphorical purpose—the active rhetorical device. Thus, for the purpose of this dissertation, I have chosen to define and to employ aurality within both the aforementioned musical and rhetorical purposes, and a facilitator for this transdisciplinary
understanding of aurality remains the concept of “rhetorical listening” created by Krista Ratcliffe—a concept that also serves to highlight Selfe’s concept of aurality.

Ratcliffe’s concept of rhetorical listening encourages listening as a way of knowing and knowledge making in the aspect that it promotes an openness (of thought, action, and conversation) within and between those parties involved. Simply, Ratcliffe defines rhetorical listening as “a trope for interpretive invention and more particularly as a code for cross-cultural conduct. . . . Employed in this general way, it functions as one answer to Jacqueline Jones Royster’s question: ‘How do we translate listening into language and action. . .?’ (Jones Royster qtd. in Ratcliffe 17) Ratcliffe specifies that interpretive invention represents a middle ground in which philosophy’s notion of knowledge making—interpretation, and rhetoric’s notion of the same concept—invention might find a productive intersection. (189) Further, Ratcliffe specifies five functions of rhetorical listening that serve to situate the concept:

1. Rhetorical listening turns hearing (a reception process) into invention (a production process) thus complicating the reception/production opposition and inviting rhetorical listening into the time-honored tradition of rhetorical invention.
2. Second, rhetorical listening turns the realm of hearing into a larger space, one encompassing all discursive forms, not just oral ones.
3. Third, rhetorical listening turns intent back on the listener, focusing on listening with intent to hear troubled identifications, instead of listening for intent of an author.
4. Fourth, rhetorical invention turns the meaning of the text into something larger than itself; certainly larger than the intent of the speaker/writer, in that rhetorical listening locates a text as part of larger cultural logics.
5. Fifth, rhetorical listening turns rhetoric’s traditional focus on the desires of the speaker/writer into a harmonics and/or
dissonance of the desires of both the speaker/writer and the listener. (46)

We might easily understand many of the functions of rhetorical listening as accepted pedagogical practice (audience awareness, and multimodal composition specifically), yet by placing responsibility on the listener (and yes, even the “listener” of a text, as reading, according to this concept would require us to “hear” voices of the past and future as we consider the present ideas), this concept of rhetorical listening serves as a mediator for cross-disciplinary invention.

To paraphrase a definition from Debra Hawhee, if interdisciplinary studies connect two similar disciplines in the act of knowledge making, and transdisciplinary studies connect dissimilar disciplines or approaches (naturally, a more complicated process), then Ratcliffe’s rhetorical listening fosters transdisciplinary inquiries and invention by providing a foundation for the kind of openness required of connecting disparate fields. (Hawhee 3) Quite literally, “cross cultural conduct” carries practical applications in the area of transdisciplinary research, which this dissertation explores. Thus for the purposes of this project, “aurality” represents sensory (phenomenological), rhetorical, and philosophical means by which actors connect to and locate themselves within collaborative products, conversations, and cultures (here, cultures includes disciplinary cultures within the academy).

Aurality both requires and facilitates invention via facility and interaction. While the mode of aurality proves far-reaching, it is important to recognize, especially within the context of this project, that situating the mode too deeply into one particular disciplinary function complicates and potentially weakens its function; the act of re-purposing a concept deeply into disciplinary motives—almost to the point of re-defining it—serves as an effective theoretical device yet becomes problematic when working within the context of transdisciplinary theory and praxis. I also contended with this notion of the disciplinary lens as I conceptualized and executed
this dissertation project, knowing full well the potential for transference when considering and interpreting data collected from a disciplinary context outside of Rhetoric and Composition. The very act of employing the elements of voice, aurality, improvisation, and interaction as modalities runs the risk of disciplinizing them rather than opening them.

For example, Cynthia Selfe paraphrases Kathleen Blake Yancey and Peter Elbow while explaining Rhetoric and Composition’s tradition of re-contextualizing concepts within our disciplinary motives: “[Twentieth century Composition faculty] continued to make reference to the oral qualities of language, but often metaphorically and in the service of writing instruction and in the study of written texts (the voice of the writer, the tone of the essay, and the rhythm of sentences)” (627). As the field of Rhetoric and Composition continued to re-purpose various concepts such as aurality into discipline specific terms, the shift was immediately literal to metaphorical—active and direct to abstract, complex, and problematic (at least in terms of cross-disciplinary communication). Within this context, this project addressed the recontextualization of metaphors while developing means toward transdisciplinary research and practice, collaboration, and collaborative writing instruction. Additionally, the project remained attuned to the promise and problems of opening disciplinary contexts, and sought to understand the particular mode of aurality (in addition to the modes of voice, improvisation, and interaction) through Krista Ratcliffe’s motives for rhetorical listening: “1) Promoting an understanding of the self and other; 2) Proceeding within an accountability logic; 3) Locating identifications across commonalities and differences; and 4) Analyzing claims as well as the cultural logics within which those claims function” (26).

Improvisation and Interaction
Most discussions of Jazz in relation to First Year Composition or rhetoric involve the concept of improvisation; these conversations often relate Jazz improvisation to the rhetorical concepts of invention and to mimesis through the lens of individual pursuits. However, these conversations reveal only a fraction of Jazz and its connective potential to Rhetoric and Composition discourses. Because the field of Rhetoric and Composition has recognized composition as a social process, this determination opens the door for more literal and more extensive uses of Jazz in composition discourses. The modes of interaction and improvisation remain partner concepts that result in knowledge making in Jazz performance situations, and equally, can present avenues for collaborative writing and collaborative writing pedagogy.

Improvisation is the process by which new music is produced in Jazz performance situations, but, like collaborative writing and knowledge making, it is not strictly an individual process. The improvising musician must literally and metaphorically “listen” to the utterances (and conversations) of the surrounding musicians, much like collaborative writers must listen to one another’s ideas, to one another’s voices within the product, and to the larger contexts surrounding the ideas at play. Jazz, like writing, then, is both process and product, social and individual.

To this end, improvisation remains a key concept within this dissertation project, but in combination with the notion of interaction, rather than as a freestanding concept correlating to free writing, imitation (mimesis), or other individually based acts of composition. Thus, this project understands improvisation as a social act (as it is already understood in Jazz), and will correlate to writing as a social act discussed within the context of collaborative writing. In regard to the social nature of Jazz performance and communication, especially within Jazz “combo” performances, Paul Berliner notes:
From the performance’s first beat, improvisers enter a rich, constantly changing musical stream of their own creation . . . winding in time through the channels of a composition’s general form. Over its course, players are perpetually occupied: they must take in the immediate inventions around them while leading their own performances toward emerging musical image, retaining, for the sake of continuity, the features of a quickly receding trail of sound. They constantly interpret one another’s ideas, anticipating them on the basis of the music’s predetermined harmonic events. Without warning, however, anyone in the group can suddenly take the music in a direction that defies expectation, requiring the others to make instant decisions as to the development of their own parts. (349)

Berliner’s aforementioned description of the social nature of Jazz performance within a small group or “combo” highlights obvious connections to the composition of written discourse, but the manner in which the Jazz musicians interact with one another, generally deemed “interaction,” has much to contribute to collaborative writing, especially within First-Year Composition classrooms. It is this element of interaction taken in combination with invention (improvisation) which allows for a music/writing partnership that moves beyond individual notions of writing and allows for multiple voices in addition to (even when a written—a textual—composition is the final product of a collaborative act) collaborators achieving an interaction of their voices and ideas that allows for individuality within the social setting, and views the dissonance of close, even contradictory voicings as savory and complex, but not at all unpalatable.

Consequently, the social emphasis inherent to Jazz and to collaboration highlights an important (and opposite) shift in the evolutions of rhetoric and of Jazz in terms of the aim and the
audience. It is important to recall that Jazz changed over time, in virtually the same context that the field of Rhetoric and Composition’s view of writing as individual or social acts changed. According to Branford Marsalis, “Jazz feels different now.” When I asked him to elaborate on this comment in a recent public question-and-answer session here at Bowling Green State University, he indicated that a shift occurred in both the public ethos, and consequently the Jazz performance ethos, that placed the individual (the soloist, in the case of Jazz) over the group. This shift away from the group mentality altered Jazz ultimately into an “intellectually lopsided” entity. Marsalis continued by describing two critical problems in contemporary Jazz performance that resulted from this move toward the individual ethos: first, the “soloist over band” mentality that results in a lack of cohesion in performances, and second, a lack of audience awareness. (Marsalis *Live question-and-answer session 6 October 2010*)

Rhetoric’s integral shift in focus from speaker to audience thus opposes the foundational shift in Jazz performance—from Swing to Bebop—where performances and compositions moved from audience-focused “dance” arrangements to an emphasis on the soloist and more complex, improvised performances that required the musician to demonstrate complete *facility* of the harmonic and rhythmic relationships inherent to Bebop. Composition scholars would associate (and would counter) this “soloist” perspective with encouraging our writing students to write with their audiences in mind, asking themselves how their audiences might react to what they have composed. Thus, we can take a page from Peter Elbow when discussing Jazz performance as a literal feature of writing instruction by first working from the writer’s perspective.

To be clear, (and as Elbow recommends) we are not ignoring audience entirely; we are thinking about Jazz and writing through the collaborative performers’ perspectives—the writers’
perspectives. Jazz performers, in the act of improvisation (invention) are keenly aware that they are working within a relatively stabilized framework—a metasocial discourse/interaction—that operates within a framework of specific harmonic and rhythmic moves, which are dictated by the music theory behind the composition. Jazz compositions and their performers/composers require a careful precision that integrates interaction (collaboration), correctness, improvisation, facility, and (in varying degrees) audience awareness. Because interaction remains the foundation for effective communication and performances where improvisation produces new music (new knowledge), this notion of interaction holds the most potential for mediating discoveries about collaboration, collaborative writing pedagogy, and transdisciplinary scholarship.

This chapter has identified the rhetorical and musical modes of voice, aurality, interaction, and improvisation as mediators through which scholars might route transdisciplinary conversations about collaboration and collaborative writing pedagogy. Each of these modes presents rhetorical and phenomenological lenses through which necessary attributes of collaboration and collaborative writing, and the important conversations involving the individual, social, and community based aspects of such scholarship and pedagogy can be addressed. Moving forward, chapter two addresses the methods and methodology of the project, including a detailed discussion of teacher research and grounded theory, and how each are employed in the observation data collection, coding, and interpretation that took place in a Midwestern university’s First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies classrooms and learning environments between February and April, 2011. Subsequently, chapters three and four serve as the locations for data interpretation, discussion, and findings, and chapter five discusses the conclusions drawn from the study and the means by which those conclusions apply to the fields of Rhetoric and Composition and Music, and the possibilities for future research and publication.
Whether we consider them positive or negative influences, master narratives shape the classrooms and learning situations of higher education, partially by assisting in the perpetuation of disciplinary boundaries to which instructors, researchers, and students are accustomed by providing specialized communicative practices, means to authority, and appeals to tradition that both set apart and sometimes privilege a particular discipline’s practices. Lyotard (The Postmodern Condition) elaborates:

Narration is the quintessential form of customary knowledge, in more ways than one. . . . Narratives allow the society in which they are told, on the one hand, to define its criteria of competence, and, on the other, to evaluate according to those criteria what is performed or can be performed within it. . . . The knowledge transmitted by these narrations is in no way limited to the functions of enunciation; it determines in a single stroke what one must say in order to be heard, what one must listen to in order to speak, and what role one must play to be the object of a narrative. . . . What is transmitted through these narratives is the set of pragmatic rules that constitutes the social bond . . . Thus defin[ing] what has the right to be said and done in the culture in question, and since they are themselves a part of that culture, they are legitimated by the simple fact that they do what they do. (21-23)

The master narratives inherent to academic disciplines help to define not only what is legitimate knowledge within each discipline, but additionally who has the right to participate in and to construct that knowledge, and how much knowledge is required for participation—they bridge
the ‘real’ world and academe by creating historical “rules” for participation, performance, and acceptance that accompany art forms such as writing and music into the academy. These rules often serve to exclude as much as they have the potential for inclusiveness. While these boundaries seem unavoidable given the varied and disparate specialties present in the university setting, the question is not whether these boundaries do, or should exist, it is whether we can work within and across them in a manner that produces meaningful research or pedagogy.

This project operates on the assumption that master narratives exist within academic disciplines and contribute to the epistemological function of each academic faction, while potentially operating simultaneously as boundary-maintaining devices in a direct or indirect manner—a perspective that seems contradictory to the spirit and practical execution of collaboration. Consequently, we must ask, how can we develop the tools to work with extant disciplinary narratives when participants do not belong to the same “society?” Within this larger goal of opening a transdisciplinary means to instructing collaboration and collaborative writing, it is necessary to identify specific master narratives operating within First Year Composition and Jazz Studies/Jazz performance genres through the analysis of classroom discussions, visual observations, and survey data. Identifying the assumptions that define what is legitimate or expected knowledge in specific First Year Composition and Jazz Performance/Jazz Studies learning situations will also assist in determining whether the modalities of aurality, interaction, improvisation, and voice, which grace the literature of both Rhetoric and Composition and Music, ultimately function as potential transdisciplinary bridges in specific First Year Composition and Jazz Studies/Jazz Performance classrooms. This chapter specifically addresses the methodological frameworks—feminism, teacher research, and grounded theory—in the context of the research questions, classroom observations, and subsequent data analysis, before
Collaboration and Feminist Influences

Aurality, interaction, improvisation, and voice represent modalities that are specific to music yet applicable to writing, and as Ede and Lunsford have described in *Singular Texts/Plural Authors*, sometimes the root of a successful collaborative effort is a common vocabulary. For example, Lunsford and Ede describe their discussions with technical writers tasked with trans-linguistic collaboration, where in order to successfully compose operation manuals for various types of construction equipment for use in English and non-English speaking contexts, the writers were limited to a stringent vocabulary where, “the use of a strictly controlled vocabulary helped solve [translation] problems. ‘The key element in the language . . . is that ‘one word can only have one meaning’” (30, 31). This particular technique of bridging translation problems with a specific vocabulary provided a background for this study’s examination of communication practices in specific First Year Composition and Jazz Performance/Jazz Studies learning situations; however, it also raised questions about the feasibility of transdisciplinary vocabulary as a means to transdisciplinary collaboration and the instruction of collaborative writing by highlighting the restrictive nature of successful collaborative vocabularies. The modalities that seem to connect writing and Jazz performance/Jazz Studies within academic contexts apply (in the literature, at least) because each term, each modality, carries multiple connotations. Placing these modalities into a restrictive denotative context, as in the case of Lunsford and Ede’s experience with technical writers, potentially undermines the transdisciplinary goals this study seeks to achieve. Yet, this is precisely the reason for having observed and analyzed actual communicative practices within First Year Composition and Jazz Performance/Jazz Studies classrooms and learning spaces— the emergent categories gleaned from the various observation
data serve to identify points of intersection in the ways in which writers and musicians understand specific disciplinary content.

Because collaboration within and across disciplinary master narratives would first require an understanding of the actual terminologies and other communicative practices used in specific First Year Composition and Jazz Performance/Jazz Studies classrooms, I wanted to explore the means by which current First Year Composition and Jazz Studies instructors and their students communicated about topics or ideas within their classrooms. Initially, I asked “How do writing students talk about writing?” and “How do music students talk about music?” with the hope that the answers to those simplistic questions would begin to reveal both the extant master narratives at work and the building blocks of collaborative processes within each discipline—why they communicate as they do; why specific building blocks of disciplinary knowledge are legitimate; what serves to legitimize these building blocks? These questions led to the development of an empirically based study of First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies faculty members and their students from a Midwestern university that modeled the ethical considerations of teacher research, including reciprocation, equity and equality, and difference, and was executed through elements of grounded theory. This grounded approach balanced my position as a writing instructor and musician researching within writing and music classrooms by foregrounding my theoretical sensitivity within both disciplines, while allowing for a rigorous and systematic approach to the data that is both objective and replicable.

Feminism, a key methodological element of this study, problematizes the focus on collaboration in several ways, including the issues of silence, representation, and the academic rhetorical environment. As Joy Ritchie (“Confronting the Essential Problem…”) summarizes from one of her participants, some women are silenced in the wake of “combative, hierarchical”
classroom environments, and this can hold true for collaborative situations, especially where collaborative relationships are assigned rather than developed as in the case of peer review, peer research, and other common First Year Composition classroom practices (Kirsch et al, 82). Nancy Welch (*Living Room*) assists in defining the combative environment to which Ritchie’s participant refers, framing it in terms of masculine rhetorics before offering a collaboration-friendly alternative. Welch does not wish to “[introduce] our women students to the ‘robust character of what has traditionally been considered masculine discourse’ in order to ‘fortify a woman’s ability to succeed in the academy,’” leaving them to “cross-dress” in an attempt to “master the male idiom” as Patricia Sullivan describes. (Welch 70, Sullivan in Kirsch, et al 126). “Traditional lessons in ‘strategies of rhetorical combat’ focus on the individual rhetor who—in keeping with traditional social/academic structures and rewards—seeks to rise, lead, and succeed alone. Such lessons benefit only the small minority of students going on to jobs defined by autonomy and control. . . . Most of our students’ futures will depend on what they learn now about collective, not individual rhetorical strategies.” (Greenbaum qtd. in Welch 70-71) While Welch’s discussion of “collective rhetorical strategies” carries a broader goal of asking our students to consider their positions in light of the larger social condition, the concept speaks toward the rhetorical environment necessary for effective, collaborative knowledge making.

In the case of classroom environments, the concerns for silenced women articulated by Ritchie, Greenbaum, and Welch can be understood to include any underrepresented students, regardless of gender. Furthermore, even if certain voices are not entirely silenced, the products of collaborative writing experiences can just as easily mask voices and ideas, sacrificing individual nuances for a polished final product. Collaboration, then, presents itself as an inclusive, feminist means of protecting multiple voices and perspectives, but when executed, sometimes stifles the
very voices it could have protected. Thus assigned collaborative work in the First Year Composition classroom, while outwardly feminist, must be carefully weighed for its potentially antifeminist outcomes. Similarly, Jazz performance, an historically male dominated arena, presents a similar problem of the interaction of voices, both in its historically anti-feminist, anti-feminine platform and its means of production—the assembly of performers. While these issues of equity and equality within collaboration certainly affect situations inside and outside of the academy equally, the established academy creates a special circumstance.

Faculty members and students within the academy often operate with expectations of equality and equity—expectations that are encouraged and supported by university regulations designed to ensure these rights. Because of these expectations, issues of inequality, underrepresentation, or bias in university classrooms and learning spaces can be overlooked, or conversely, made more visible than if they occurred outside of the academy. When members of the academy expect equality and equity as a manner of custom, collaboration and the instruction of collaborative writing can seem like a quick fix for issues of inequality—a rubber stamp that says, ‘we teach students to cooperate; we work together. No matter our differences, we collaborate.’ This is precisely where we must be careful: collaboration is not a solution for difference, and consequently, this project’s method of finding means to transdisciplinary collaboration through the examination of master narratives will not attempt to eliminate or to find routes around difference. Effective collaboration works within and across differences in order to produce knowledge that represents all who participate. In the context of collaboration and in the more practical sense, the instruction of collaborative writing, difference functions as a productive tension—much like the productive dissonance inherent to Jazz tonality—that simultaneously identifies each voice and unites them. Thus, collaboration across disciplines and
the resulting collaborative writing products should represent *united* rather than *unified* voices.

Teacher Research

In the case of teacher research, Ruth Ray provides the following definition from Cochran-Smith and Lytle, “‘Teacher research is ‘systematic and intentional inquiry carried out by teachers,’ where systematic implies methodical data gathering, analyzing, and reporting; intentional means planned rather than spontaneous activity; and inquiry implies a questioning, reflective stance toward teaching and learning’” (Cochran-Smith and Lytle qtd. in Kirsch and Sullivan 173). Additionally, Colin Lankshear and Michele Knobel present a discussion of teacher research that complements Cochran-Smith and Lytle’s definition within the context of this study. Lankshear and Knobel add:

The crucial point is that the purposes or objects of teacher research must flow from the authentic (or felt) questions, issues, and concerns of teachers themselves. This is, perhaps, the key point that demarcates teacher research from academic research, contract research and non-practitioner research in general. In teacher research, the ways these issues and concerns are addressed must be answerable and responsive to teachers’ own decisions and ideas about what is helpful and relevant. . . . From this standpoint, we identify teacher researchers as ‘classroom practitioners at any level, from preschool to tertiary, who are involved individually or collaboratively in self-motivated and self-generated systematic and informed inquiry undertaken with a view to enhancing their vocation as professional educators’. . . . Hence, teacher research can be done in classrooms, libraries, homes, communities, and anywhere else where one can obtain, analyse, and interpret information pertinent to one’s vocation as a teacher. It can be undertaken within formal academic programmes, or as an entirely self-directed individual
undertaking, or under any number of semi-formal arrangements that exist in between these two extremes. (8-9)

Considering these descriptions of teacher research and teacher researchers, I have constructed this study in a manner that involves systematic, empirically based data collection, analysis, and reporting with the aim of discovering means by which instructors and later, administrators, can approach the complicated notion of discipline-based instruction while encouraging a de-centered, collaborative learning environment. The research approaches of this study are twofold: first, a rigorous, empirically based qualitative study of communication in First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies classrooms and learning spaces, and second, a rhetorical analysis of metaphorical and literal connections between writing and music (specifically, Jazz) that draws out successful relationships between the two disciplines with the intent to apply those more successful relationships to transdisciplinary collaboration and the instruction of collaborative writing in First Year Composition. In the process of designing and executing this study, I had to address the broad discourse surrounding teacher research as a methodology, considering both the roles and identities of teacher researchers. The following discussion situates my study design within some of the extant conversations.

Ruth Ray summarizes four critical limitations of teacher research: “(1) teachers, as participant-observers, may lack the perspective necessary to see and interpret their own classroom environment; (2) teachers conduct research that does not always meet the expectations of the established research community; (3) teachers do not always frame their findings in terms of theory, and thus their research has little relevance beyond their own classrooms; and (4) teacher research creates a tension in the classroom between researching and teaching, dividing the teacher’s attention between data gathering and instruction” (Ray qtd. in Kirsch and Sullivan
However, Lankshear and Knobel address several of these limitations, which I will organize based on Ray’s four concerns above. First (and fourth), Lankshear and Knobel propose:

Our view of teacher research rejects both aspects of teacher researcher identity associated with the mainstream view. First, we do not believe that teacher research must be confined to direct or immediate research of classrooms. . . . To confine teacher research to immediate investigations of classroom settings may cut teachers off from opportunities to gain important insights and knowledge they might miss by simply doing one more classroom study. Second, we disagree that teacher research should be defined in terms of teachers researching in their own classrooms. This is not the same concept as conducting research pertinent to one’s own professional practice. . . . We often get clearer understandings of ourselves and our own practices, beliefs, assumptions, values, opinions, worldviews, and the like by encountering ones that are quite different from our own, and that throw our own into relief and provide us with a perspective on them. (7-8)

Second, “The ‘bottom line’ requirement for research is that our inquiry be systematic. For inquiry to be systematic means that it is neither random nor arbitrary. This applies as much to ‘professional’ or ‘practitioner’ research as it does to ‘academic’ research. Academic research defines systematic investigation in terms of recognized academic disciplines and their associated theories. . . . A key difference between academic and practitioner research is that practitioner researchers aim to tackle practical problems or issues as efficiently as possible. They are not concerned with creating a sophisticated knowledge of the theory or methodology of an academic discipline area (or a particular ‘paradigm’) as an end in itself.” (20) Third, “We mean here ‘theory’ in the sense of seriously looking for patterns, relationships, principles and ‘regularities’
associated with situations, experiences, and phenomena that help us to understand and explain why something might be the case and how far it might apply beyond our immediate contexts. In this sense a serious teacher researcher is not interested merely in ‘something that works’, but in understanding how and why it works and/or how it might need to be adapted in order to work in other circumstances or apply to other cases.” (10)

Grounded Theory

In order to complement teacher research as a means of study, this dissertation project employs elements of grounded theory as described by Anselm Strauss and Juliet Corbin in Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques, and closely follows the recommendations made by the authors for data collection, theoretical sensitivity, coding and interpretation, and data mapping. However, this project departs from traditional grounded theory in the aspect that rather than allowing the data alone to determine the direction of the analysis and subsequently aiming for one ‘master’ category through which to frame the theory, I have framed the primary data analysis within this project’s research questions, and have reserved broader coding processes for future approaches to this data. However, GT remains a favorable method of data management because, as described by Strauss and Corbin, “its systematic techniques and procedures of analysis enable the researcher to develop a substantive theory that meets the criteria for doing ‘good’ science: significance, theory-observation compatibility, generalizability, reproducibility, precision, rigor, and verification” (Strauss and Corbin 31). Most important for the nature of this project, “While the procedures are designed to give the analytic process precision and rigor, creativity is also an important element. For it is the latter that enables the researcher to ask pertinent questions of the data and to make the kind of comparisons that elicit from the data new insights into phenomenon and novel theoretical
formulations” (31).

With regard to the pedagogical goals of this dissertation project, Joyce Magnotto Neff notes that, “Grounded theory is, itself, a critical research practice with the potential to help compositionists work the borderlands between scholarship and teaching. . . . [It] ‘explains’ and ‘predicts’ and thus is useful for practitioners. It goes beyond description and is recursive in nature. . . . Furthermore, as Glaser and Strauss note, ‘the form in which the theory is presented can be independent of this process by which it was generated. Grounded theory can be presented as either a well-codified set of propositions or in a running theoretical discussion’” (Neff and Glaser and Strauss qtd. In Farris and Anson 132). However, Neff highlights a particular limitation of this project’s use of grounded theory when she states, “Grounded Theory is best done collaboratively; it . . . tests theory through negotiation. . . . The methodology encourages multiple mind-sets, yet is rigorous because each stance is interrogated by other stances” (Neff qtd in Farris and Anson 125, 132). Because, especially within the coding process, the collaborative approach offers important checks and balances of categories that an individual researcher coding through a singular “lens” per se, the models and connections elicited by the data coding process may potentially be less rich, and less complete as those resulting from a collaborative effort. Another important point to consider: because the focus points of this dissertation project—writing and Jazz—evolved through both modern and postmodern influences, it became important to explore alternate views of grounded theory, especially Situational Analysis, as it was envisioned by Adele Clarke.

Clarke proposes to, “supplement basic grounded theory with a situation-centered approach that in addition to studying action also explicitly includes the analysis of the full situation, including discourses—narrative, visual, and historical” (xxxii). In the context of this
project, “Situational Analysis” assures the legitimation of customary knowledge, as the art forms at the core of this study—writing and music—have a rich and valuable history of instruction and invention outside of the formal academy. Clarke continues, “One of the core criteria of a good grounded theory is that it is modifiable—responsive to new data. . . . [she wants] to shift and augment the undergirding assumptions of grounded theory from positivist to postmodern, from Western scientific universalizing master narratives ‘explaining variation’ to creating representations that basically assume differences and multiplicities and seek to explicitly map and represent them” (19). Just as master narratives within a discipline can exclude, reserving a “master” category from which to theorize, as in the case of traditional grounded theory, stands in opposition to the inclusive, transdisciplinary aims of this project. Accordingly, Clarke’s theory of situational analysis will assist in mapping master narratives within First Year Composition and Jazz Studies/Jazz Performance classrooms by framing the building blocks of these narratives: the discussions of instructors and students within the observed classrooms—discussions that have been influenced by “narrative, visual, and historical” knowledge. Clarke’s vision of a modified grounded theory, one that resists positivist models, provides an important system of checks and balances for this project’s goals of working within and across disciplinary narratives and boundaries.

Research Questions

While this project began with two simplistic questions dealing with communication in writing and music pedagogy, the evolved research questions for the dissertation addressed in chapter one offer several directions for inquiry; thus, I would like to address them individually prior to discussing the methods and methodologies associated with them.

1) What is the relationship of language to collaboration in collegiate learning spaces involving
writing or Jazz performance?

In addition to asking how writers and musicians communicate about their respective processes and subjects, this question takes into consideration the means by which language, specialized or not, functions within or facilitates the collaborative process in classroom situations, containing, naturally, the question: How does language facilitate collaboration within writing or Jazz performance learning spaces? Certainly, language is not the only facilitator of collaboration, yet it both mediates and potentially hinders the collaborative process depending on factors such as comprehension and the amount of specialized, discipline specific discourse contained within the conversation. This particular research question seeks to determine not only the extent to which discipline specific terminology exists within specific First Year Composition and Music classrooms, but additionally in what ways this terminology seems to affect the transmission of ideas between individuals. For example, do students better understand their individual processes because this discipline specific terminology exists, or do they find means of communicating their ideas about writing and music within the scope of their own vocabularies, especially when collaborating, thus rejecting discipline specific terms for more general or more personal means of description? How do terms with multiple connotations assist or hinder the collaborative process?

As discussed in chapter one, Jazz performance pedagogy often employs the terms interaction and improvisation as discipline specific vocabulary, yet these terms are examples of potentially transdisciplinary vocabulary that can be understood outside of the Jazz performance context in much the same ways as they are defined within the Jazz performance context. By determining ways in which language seems to assist, remain neutral, or resist collaborative processes in specific First Year Composition and Jazz Performance/Jazz Studies classrooms—building blocks of the relationship of language to the collaborative process—I will be possible to theorize a
means of assisting collaboration and the instruction of collaborative writing within a transdisciplinary context: a means of successfully and repeatedly crossing the boundaries between seemingly contrasting disciplines.

2) How might collaboration connect writing and Jazz “through means other than language?”

Because language remained at the forefront of this dissertation’s inquiry into collaboration and transdisciplinarity, it was important to question whether it was possible to collaborate through non-linguistic means, and then how non-linguistic collaborative efforts might connect the art forms at the heart of this project—writing and Jazz. Accordingly, this question addressed the concept of interaction, but most importantly, it asked this dissertation project to consider both material (e.g. linguistic, verbal, textual, non-verbal) and immaterial moments (e.g. sonic) of interaction as equally important in the consideration of transdisciplinary collaboration and the instruction of collaborative writing. A significant consideration involved with this question is the generation of textual products as both evidence of and modes of the knowledge making process. First Year Composition courses thrive on textual products as representations of both process and final product (and in this case, a textual product represents both traditional, word processed essays as well as multimodal compositions), and Jazz performances rely on the aural product in much the same way. Therefore considering the differences in the representations of knowledge and knowledge making in each discipline was an important aspect of this research question—an aspect that can be clarified by defining orality, aurality, and textuality within the context of collaboration.

3) What is the nature of social ethos and individual ethos in writing and Jazz learning situations, and how do these positions assist or resist collaboration and the collaborative process?
When considering the means by which students of writing and music communicate within and about those specific disciplines, I found it was important to consider how individual and social contributions were defined, valued, and assessed within the disciplines of writing and music. As a means of understanding how a transdisciplinary collaboration or the instruction of collaborative writing might work between writers and musicians, it was also necessary to ask: what specific master narratives exist within the collegiate First Year Composition and Jazz Performance/Jazz Studies learning spaces observed in this study, and how do they influence the individual and the social roles within these two specific disciplinary spaces?—and—how do the varying understandings of interaction and invention within the disciplines of Rhetoric and Composition, First Year Composition, and Jazz affect the interpretation and execution of collaboration within these spaces? Thus, in order to explore the potential of both transdisciplinary collaboration and the instruction of collaborative writing, it was important to determine where the boundaries between individual and social contributions and individual and social practices lie within the art forms of writing and Jazz, and consequently, what assumptions and expectations frame the roles of participants. Highlighting the requirements for participation as an individual or as a group within First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies classrooms and learning spaces assisted in determining whether the master narratives framing these situations were assistive or resistant to collaboration.

Study Overview

This empirical study was designed for the collection and interpretation of data on the communication practices of faculty members and students in First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies classrooms in a Midwestern university setting. The goals of the dissertation were to investigate means to transdisciplinary collaboration through mapping and the
master narratives inherent to specific First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies classrooms and learning spaces, and subsequently to provide practical means toward instructing collaboration and collaborative writing within and across disciplinary boundaries and narratives. The benefits of this study include an exploration of the potential of transdisciplinary collaboration and techniques for the instruction of collaboration and collaborative writing in First Year Composition. The information learned will benefit future students, first-year writing instructors, Writing Program Administrators, and potentially Jazz performance instructors as well. I gathered the data set by visually observing and taking audio recordings of First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies classrooms and learning spaces, in addition to collecting survey responses from instructor and student participants. Readers can find these surveys and accompanying Human Subjects Review Board documents in appendix C, beginning on page 530. Participants in this study included two full time First Year Composition instructors, two full time Jazz performance/Jazz studies faculty members, and students in one section of one course from each of the faculty focus group members. Please see the following table for visual clarification of the participant numbers; I describe the study participants in greater detail later in this chapter.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Participant</th>
<th>Participant’s Specialty</th>
<th>Number of student survey participants per faculty course section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>First Year Composition</td>
<td>15 undergraduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Robert”</td>
<td>First Year Composition</td>
<td>13 undergraduates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chris  | Jazz Performance/Jazz Studies | 17 undergraduates  
---|---|---
David | Jazz Performance/Jazz Studies | 5 graduate students  

Research Sites

Research for this project took place at a Midwestern, residential university campus that serves approximately 20,000 students, of which “Ethnic and racial minority students made up about 19 percent of the entering fall 2010 class.” This university grants Bachelor, Master, and Doctorate degrees, and offers approximately 200 undergraduate programs of study. The two disciplines involved in this study, First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies, are housed within the “Academic Writing” and Music departments on the university’s main campus. In order to present a better “picture” of the individual learning spaces that I observed, please consider the following descriptions.

Amanda’s Learning Space

Amanda taught a First Year Composition course in a computer lab located on the first floor of the English and American Culture Studies departments’ building. The lab housed approximately 20 computers—just enough space to fit a typical composition class at capacity, and her class was at capacity. I sat at the back corner of the classroom because the alternative open space was a square shaped area front and center, and this functioned as the instructor’s only available space to move freely. The rest of the classroom space was organized into two rectangular and two
square “pods” of computers facing monitor to monitor. Had the monitors not been present, students could have communicated face to face in pairs or groups of four depending on where they were sitting. If this were my classroom I would have found the layout challenging, as the arrangement left many students facing the back or sides of the classroom. These students were unable to make eye contact with Amanda, or see anything projected on the large screen without turning away from their computers. Additionally, the English department building’s design contains an atrium, and many of the first floor classrooms’ entrances are located within this large open area. Consequently, the lab that I was observing often became subject to large amounts of ambient noise—conversations, dropped books, skateboards, rolling backpacks and high heels on the tile floor, etc.—echoing through the atrium. Closing the classroom door provided little help, and was not a comfortable option because the room had no windows. In terms of demographics, Amanda’s class was fairly evenly divided between male and female students. While I did not ask each student’s age during the course of my visual observations, most seemed to fit the “traditional” 18-22 year old, post-high school student. A couple of students, however, declined survey participation, offering the information that they were under 18 years of age (a criteria for participation) and were part of the university’s Post Secondary Enrollment Option Program (PSEOP) where current high school students can take college courses for dual credit.

“Robert’s” Learning Space

“Robert” taught a First Year Composition course in a traditional classroom on the first floor of the English and American Culture Studies departments’ building. Here, “traditional classroom” indicates a room containing student desks arranged in straight rows, with a ceiling-mounted projector, AV/computer cabinet, and white board at the front. Therefore, students spent most of their time facing front, with the exception of some group work activities during which they
turned the desks in various directions to facilitate face-to-face conversations. Over the course of my observations, “Robert” made frequent use of both the white board and the projector to supplement his discussions. The room housed approximately twenty students, although space was at a premium. Like the computer lab in which Amanda’s class met, “Robert’s” classroom was also located off of the same, often noisy atrium and his class also had to “tune out” the ambient noise. This classroom was smaller than Amanda’s computer lab, and since the room also had no windows, it was persistently stuffy and hot. I sat in the back corner of this classroom as well, for the same reasons of limited space and limited intrusion that were the case in Amanda’s computer lab. I’m not claustrophobic, but I frequently felt uneasy after spending almost an hour in that room, and I wondered if the students felt the same way. Despite the cramped circumstances, students in this section seemed more openly talkative (with one another) than Amanda’s group, sometimes creating the need for “Robert” to redirect them. Demographically speaking, I did not ask for specific ages, but most of “Robert’s” students seemed to fit the 18-22 age group, and women students seemed to outnumber men. I am not certain if any students in this course section were PSEOP students. However, during the course of my observations, I was not able to witness “full” attendance.

Chris’s Learning Space

Chris taught an undergraduate (Freshman/Sophomore) level Jazz Pedagogy course for vocalists. His classroom was located on the first floor of the Music department’s building and was also organized in the “traditional” sense with student desks organized in rows, facing front. The chalkboards (at the front and one side of the classroom) were similar to others I have observed in music-oriented learning spaces, with some permanent staves for music notation in addition to open writing space. An upright piano sat in a front corner of the room, and wall mounted
speakers were connected to the AV/Computer cabinet. Chris frequently made use of the chalkboard, the piano, and the speakers during the observed class sessions. This room was far larger than the First Year Composition classrooms that I observed, and consequently I was able to sit in different places during the several observations. Chris indicated that his course had approximately 25 students enrolled, and that all were vocalists. Again, I did not ask students’ specific ages, but these students seemed to fit the 18-22 age group, with a fairly equal representation of men and women. I am not certain if any of these students were affiliated with PSEOP. Students in this classroom were frequently talkative and often broke out into seemingly random song (although the singing was coordinated and harmonized). For example, just after the course’s start time, one female student happened to be humming a melody that was almost immediately picked up by an entire group of students sitting around her. They began singing the song in harmony, and within less than a minute, nearly every student was singing along. The instructor let them finish and continued taking attendance as if this was a common occurrence.

David’s Learning Space

David taught a graduate level Advanced Jazz Pedagogy course. In this case, the learning space was not a classroom; David taught the class from his office/studio, which was located on the second floor of the Music department’s building. The studio was small: the students, David, and I sat in random fashion amongst David’s desk, a baby grand piano, and several bookshelves, with a couple of extra chairs and a piano bench as seating accommodations. Although no more than five students attended the observed classes, fitting a total of seven people into the studio space was most certainly a challenge. But, the dynamic was often relaxed, and a fairly large window offered some relief from what could have been a completely uncomfortable environment. In contrast to Chris’s undergraduate Jazz Pedagogy students, this group of graduate students was
often reserved, although not so stifled that they couldn’t laugh at a joke. In this situation, men outnumbered women, but not greatly (3 men to 2 women).

The Faculty Participants

I recruited the faculty participants by individual, face-to-face meetings, and subsequently recruited the student participants for survey by distributing individual informed consent letters with attached consent form in the specific class sections that I observed. These letters described the focus, aims, and methods associated with the study. By distributing the materials in person, I was immediately available to answer questions or concerns about participating in the study; additionally, I made my university email address and office phone number available for potential subjects who wished to ask questions or raise concerns in a less public forum. I chose to personally recruit all of my participants because the scope of my study permitted this approach, and it was important to establish a relationship based on mutual respect and cooperation—something that is more difficult to accomplish through written or electronic recruiting methods. Please recall that the four faculty participants are full time instructors, Assistant professors, or Associate professors: two First Year Composition faculty and two music faculty who specialize in Jazz performance/Jazz Studies. The group consisted of three men and one woman, two of whom instructed First Year Composition, one instructed a graduate level Advanced Jazz Pedagogy course, and one instructed an undergraduate level Jazz Pedagogy course. In consideration of the feminist influences at work in this project, I asked each of my participants if he or she would be willing to write a short biography to serve as the participant descriptions, providing I maintained the assurance of confidentiality promised in the study’s consent forms. I wanted my participants to describe themselves in their own voices, on their own terms. Ultimately, two of the four faculty participants submitted autobiographies, and I have therefore
described the remaining faculty participants in a brief, general manner or quoted online teaching biographies.

Amanda

“Apart from obsessing about food and wine as editor of Connotation Press’ From Plate to Palate and on her blog The Everyday Palate, Amanda McGuire also is co-star of the online cooking show Spatula and food columnist for the BG News. She also writes book reviews which have appeared in Fifth Wednesday Journal and Literary Magazine Review. Her poems have appeared in Noon: Journal of the Short Poem, The Cream City Review, So To Speak, and other literary journals. She teaches first year composition in the General Studies Writing Program at Bowling Green State University in Bowling Green, Ohio. In addition to teaching as a full-time instructor with a 4/4 load, Amanda has served as GSW’s Assistant Director, Instructional Assistant, Program Liaison, and Tutor. She has developed and taught food-theme composition Honors courses as well as service learning courses. Her teaching philosophy is student-centered: “Before students can be expected to write effectively they must be given the tools to do so. My goal is to engage students with the basics of writing: audience, thesis/focus, organization/structure, development, and grammar. I accomplish this goal by explaining these basic concepts of writing during in-class lectures. After lecturing, I provide students with examples and exercises to reinforce the aforementioned concepts. Also, by providing students with careful and liberal feedback on their rough and final drafts as well as conferencing with them one-to-one, I further emphasize how they can apply the material presented in class to their writing assignments in the Composition classroom and writing assignments for courses in other disciplines. Additionally, through exercises such as in-class writing and collaborative groups, it is my hope that students are able to express their thoughts on paper without feeling outside pressures (from themselves,
peers, or even me). I believe that it is my responsibility to help students feel comfortable in their roles as writers and readers. Ultimately, through my student-centered teaching philosophy and pedagogy, my goal is to teach students writing matters, especially their writing.”

“Robert”

“A basic premise of my own educational philosophy is that there is a cognitive link between reading well, thinking clearly, writing proficiently, and responding ethically, but I also try to make sure the student realizes some elements of this on his or her own. With a focus on real world exploration, I expect the writing classroom to share responsibilities between the teacher and the student, responsibilities that include developing an appreciation for subject matter, promoting an independence of inquiry, and gaining a confidence in handling standards of writing situations. At the same time, I want my classes to take upon themselves the task of appreciating their own creativity. Whether we work in groups, do peer-work and evaluations, listen to lectures or observe performance engagements, view videos of a writer’s humorous frustrations or test the skills of juggling ideas in synthesis, I always try to leave space for the students themselves to come to grips with ideas, theories, and recognitions, and feel a sense of personal achievement in having done so. My goal is to set out for them, to whatever extent possible, the idea that they are involved in something wonderful as they undergo the process of exploring ideas in others’ and their own writing.”

Chris

“Chris Buzzelli began playing guitar in 1968 at the age of 9. While still in high school, he began teaching and playing professionally. Around that time he also started to become interested in jazz. After studying with a few teachers in his hometown of Trenton, New Jersey, Buzzelli
enrolled at Trenton State College (now the College of New Jersey) where he majored in classical guitar and studied with Alice Artzt. He also studied in Philadelphia with the great teacher Dennis Sandole during that time. After completing a Bachelor of Arts degree in classical guitar performance, he attended graduate school at North Texas State University (now the University of North Texas) where he studied with guitarist Jack Petersen and was a recipient of scholarships in both jazz and classical guitar and a member of the prestigious One O’clock Lab Band. In 1983 he completed a Master of Music Education degree with a specialization in jazz education.

In 1984, Buzzelli joined the faculty of Bowling Green State University where he continues to serve as Professor of Music, director of the guitar program, and director of the Vocal Jazz ensembles. A number of graduates of this guitar program have gone on to direct guitar programs at other major universities. In addition to his responsibilities for teaching jazz and classical guitar, he has taught in the areas of jazz history, arranging, pedagogy, and small jazz ensembles. He has written articles for Jazz Educators Journal, Just Jazz Guitar, and American String Teacher, and has a number of projects published by Mel Bay Publications. His publications of arrangements and original compositions for jazz guitar ensemble are played by ensembles around the world. On the campus of Bowling Green State University, Buzzelli has performed with artists such as Joe Pass, Herb Ellis, Cal Collins, Mike Stern, Tal Farlow, Jack Wilkins, Randy Johnston, Joshua Breakstone, Mark Elf, Frank Vignola and Gene Bertoncini. In 1993, he was asked to appear on the Schoolkids’ Records debut of organist Winston Walls, “Boss of the B-3”, which also featured the legendary Jack McDuff. This eventually led to his first release as a leader, “What Goes Around”, where he is featured in solo, duo, and trio settings on both six and seven string guitar. He has also done some recording for American Archtop Guitars, and the Just Jazz
Buzzelli maintains an active playing schedule, mostly in the Northwest Ohio area, but has also played in some nationally recognized venues including the Classic American Guitar Showings Long Island, New York and the Chet Atkins Appreciation Society event held each summer in Nashville. Since 1995, Buzzelli has been playing 7 string guitar. He is an endorser for Benedetto guitars and his primary classical guitar was made for him by Gary Zimnicki. He is currently working on another CD, as well as continuing to teach and write.”

David

“[As the] Director of Jazz Lab Band I; Alto saxophonist, composer, and educator David has been steadily garnering attention for his unique playing and writing. Since moving to New York City from his native Wisconsin, David has performed and toured with the orchestras of Lionel Hampton, Toshiko Akiyoshi, and Duke Ellington. In 2000 he joined the Chico O’Farrill Afro Cuban Jazz Orchestra which was the beginning of several musical collaborations with GRAMMY award winning pianist Arturo O’Farrill. In 2008 he was invited to join the pianist’s RISA NEGRA sextet. On the band’s 2009 ZOHO release, “RISA NEGRA”, David is also represented as a composer. His tune, “The Darkness Is My Closest Friend”, was cited by Down Beat magazine as, “the most intriguing offering on the disc.” David’s newest recording, “Auction Project,” which is co-led with Arturo O’Farrill, will be released in September of 2010 on ZOHO. Auction Project is a unique combination of jazz, Latin, and Irish music which fearlessly traverses borders. As an educator and clinician David appears at colleges and universities throughout the world. Since 2008 he has been an Assistant Professor of Jazz Studies.”

The Students
The 50 students who participated in this study were largely undergraduates, with a small faction of five graduate students. Some of the student participants were international students. Most of the student participants could be categorized as “traditional”: generally 18-22 years of age and entering the university directly from high school. Consequently, the five graduate students were all members of the same Advanced Jazz Pedagogy course taught by one of the faculty participants. All undergraduate participants were members of First Year Composition courses or undergraduate-level Jazz Pedagogy courses taught by faculty participants at the time of observation and survey. A unique feature of the observed undergraduate Jazz Pedagogy course is that all of the enrolled students were vocal specialists—a feature not present in the observed First Year Composition courses. At the time this research took place, undergraduate level Jazz Pedagogy students were purposefully divided into an instrumental section and a vocal section that ran in different semesters. Please note the following description from the undergraduate course catalog: “Fall (instrumentalists only), Spring (vocalists only). Prepares student to teach fundamentals of jazz improvisation, history, and jazz ensemble techniques.” Similarly, the five graduate students enrolled in the observed Advanced Jazz Pedagogy course were instrumental music specialists, but the graduate level Advanced Jazz Pedagogy course, offered every other year, does not carry the same instrumentalist/vocalist division that the undergraduate course does. These specialization specific music courses provide an interesting point of comparison with the First Year Composition courses in the context of the classroom community. Would classmates who share the same academic (and in this case, artistic) specialty be more inclined and more equipped to collaborate with one another? Conversely, would the lack of variety in the students’ specialties create an environment resistant to collaboration? These questions represent some of the factors that I took into consideration when categorizing and interpreting the data,
which are discussed in greater detail in the next chapter.

Data Gathering and Analysis

I began data collection during the spring semester 2011 to accommodate the recruitment of participants and to obtain topic approval by means of the graduate lecture, which I completed December 6, 2010. Over the course of eight weeks, I collected data from the faculty group and the participating students by first observing class sessions led by each of the four faculty participants. These class meetings occurred on either a three day, fifty minute or a two day, hour and fifteen minute schedule, and were observed according to the preferences of the individual faculty members. I collected this observation data by means of audio recording and written field notes from February 2011 through April 2011. The second phase of data collection involved the use of online surveys through the survey engine Survey Monkey.

The surveys appeared in “short answer” format and asked both faculty and student participants to answer five questions relating to language, communication, and the roles of individuals and groups or social units in writing and Jazz performance, respectively. Specifically, faculty participants answered two surveys that were identical in length and similar in language, with the exception of adapting some of the language to discipline-specific contexts. Student participants answered one survey that, like the faculty surveys, was adapted to the discipline-specific contexts of writing or of music depending on the course in which the student was enrolled. In order to participate in the survey portion of the study, (beyond being passively observed in their classrooms) students needed to be at least 18 years of age and sign the informed consent document provided to them. Students submitted an email address on the informed
consent document, to which the online survey link was sent. Surveys did not ask for, nor require the names of the participants; additionally, I did not reveal the names of student and faculty participants in the dissertation text unless they specifically requested it. The following table represents graphically the participants and the tasks requested of them:

Key: “**” means a requested task

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Faculty Terminology Survey</th>
<th>Faculty Language Survey</th>
<th>Student Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Year Composition Faculty</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Performance/Jazz Studies Faculty</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYC Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Performance/Jazz Studies Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once I had collected the data, having observed and recorded at least three to four class sessions of a minimum 50 minutes each, per each of my four faculty participants, I began the process of transcribing the audio recordings, ultimately electing to delegate some of the audio
transcription to CastingWords transcription service. All audio files were transcribed into Microsoft Word and/or TextEdit documents, and these documents can be found in Appendix B, pages 484-529. While some open coding of incoming data was performed during the eight weeks of data gathering between February and April 2011, more in-depth analysis took place during the transcription and analysis phase beginning approximately May 2011. As discussed earlier in this chapter, I approached the data analysis using various combinations of open, axial, and selective coding as outlined by Strauss and Corbin (1990) on both the audio transcriptions and the visual observations contained in the written field notes. This process of analysis was performed using both handwritten code notes on hard copies of the field notes and audio transcripts, in addition to employing HyperResearch qualitative analysis software, which supports both coding and theory building functions. I spent much of my time assigning and re-assigning categories to words, phrases, and actions taken from the transcribed classroom discussions and visual observation field notes until I could see (via mapping) where specific connections between the First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz Studies data were emerging. I endeavored, then, to narrow the data to a core category from which I could begin theorizing, but quickly realized that this method of virtually unrestricted coding, while very content-rich, would be best performed by a group of collaborators and would be a process better suited to a multi-year research project. Therefore, the conclusions drawn from this data, which are discussed in chapters three and four, were drawn from categories framed within this project’s primary research questions.

As this study developed, feminism, teacher research, and grounded theory provided important frameworks for the methodological positions of this dissertation project. One of my goals was to research as an instructor for the means of improving pedagogy, and taking Lankshear and Knobel’s discussion of theory into consideration, a complementary purpose of
this dissertation was to theorize relationships between conversations, moments of interaction, and other elements of specific First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies classrooms and learning spaces toward the goal of finding new or alternative means of instructing collaboration and collaborative writing. In this case, I strove to be an objective and less intrusive participant-observer. However, this “objective” position as an instructor and researcher was not without complication. I quickly realized that an “objective” position, which I usually equate with “disinterested,” was not possible here, nor should it be. In the cases of teacher research, case study, and even ethnography, the reciprocal nature of these approaches draws the researcher into the community both personally and professionally, and I found this to immediately be the case with my own study. Additionally, I realized during this process that as an instructor performing qualitative research within the context of instruction, I had framed my inquiry on very narrow terms by focusing on the collection of pedagogy-centered data from a small focus group and its members’ students within one university. Any findings, then, would apply narrowly to this particular instance of collegiate learning.

Lankshear and Knobel address qualitative research projects of this small scope: “Qualitative research does not presuppose large samples or, in many cases, samples at all—let alone samples designed to be representative of larger populations.” (68) However, complementing teacher research with elements of Strauss and Corbin’s grounded theory assisted in drawing out extensive data, which resulted in the ability to map numerous points of intersection between First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz Studies within the context of collaboration and other instances of interaction. Once such interesting connection exists between Karen LeFevre’s discussions of interaction, which she ties to invention and resonance, and the expectations of those practices within Jazz performances. I explicate this
connection fully in chapters three and four. Thus, what began as a narrowly focused participant group resulted in large amounts of data and numerous current and future directions for its interpretation. Continuing then, chapter three describes the data and reports findings from the process of analysis, while chapter four focuses on theorizing those data findings within the frameworks of *literate activity* and collaboration-as-performance, and situating that theory within extant Rhetoric and Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies discourses.
Although having close ties to (and within) the community in which one is researching remains a positive aspect to composition research, this approach was not without conflict. As a writing instructor and researcher, working musician, and former music major, I had to negotiate the emotional ties to the arts that I love, the previous experiences with Jazz instruction where I was the student instead of the researcher, the urge to compare the program and instructors I was studying to the program that I studied under a decade before, and most difficult, the longing for my interrupted performance career. I still felt like a Jazz insider in many respects, but my current position within the Rhetoric and Composition discipline caused the participants to view me largely as an experienced outsider, but an outsider nonetheless. Returning to Jazz learning environments as a writing researcher—an outsider in discipline and affiliation—felt strange and a little unnerving (Could I still cut it as a musician?), and I had to make a conscious effort to set those emotions aside every time I stepped into a Jazz observation. Similarly, observing full time instructors’ First Year Composition courses in the same writing program that I had currently been teaching as a Graduate Assistant provided its own set of challenges.

In the case of these observations, I felt almost too close to the course material, too close to the relationship of the instructors and their students. In order to fit the observations into my own teaching schedule, I would find myself literally running from my classroom to those of my participants (a challenge especially at five months pregnant), having to cognitively shift gears from instructor to participant observer along the way. Sitting wherever I could find space, often the back corners of the classrooms, I still felt the urge to teach rather than to observe. When I would hear a student whisper a question to a peer, or mutter “I don’t get this” to herself while the
instructor was assisting someone else, I had to remind myself to record and categorize the observation rather than to assist the student. When a participant approached an assignment differently than I did, I had to resist the urge to pay attention to the assignment’s content rather than how that content was being received by the students. However, as challenging as it was to study learning environments to which I was so personally connected, in the future, this closeness will be helpful for the sake of reciprocity and will, I hope, make it possible to report the results of the study in an approachable, open manner. This particular narrative about my experience as a researcher highlights important concerns articulated by Ellen Cushman and Terese Guinsatao Monberg regarding social reflexivity and what to do with the authoritative “self” in situations of scholarly inquiry. Cushman and Monberg, citing Joseph Harris, understand socially reflexive scholarship as, “one that does not assume authority in representing others but negotiates that authority by creating ‘a different sort of social space where people have reason to come into contact with each other because they have claims and interests that extend beyond the borders of their own safe houses, neighborhoods, disciplines, or communities.’ . . . The process of reflexivity is an attempt to recognize how one’s personal history(s), ways of behaving and speaking, and social location(s) may be influencing methods of data collection and interpretation.” (Cushman and Monberg in Farris and Anson 166, 170). My hope is that the various types of data that I gathered tell their own stories of how learning took place within these environments while also weaving a collective narrative of what it means to participate, to learn, and to create knowledge within these specific disciplinary environments.

Like re-voicing a chord—re-arranging the same notes in different locations, some higher, some lower where the end result is a new sound— the intriguing and thoroughly enjoyable aspect of this project involved taking a multi-faceted snapshot of that particular time and space,
and then re-mixing it. In the case of this project, I truly enjoyed experiencing those recorded moments with my participants holistically just as much as I enjoyed fracturing the picture to see how those individual moments might fit into new contexts. In re-assembling the moments of interaction—the voices, the words—multiple times and in multiple ways, I hoped to understand what happened in the big picture and how those conclusions might open new perspectives. Presently, these collective moments, these compositions, tell stories; they narrate how real students and instructors created and shared knowledge while navigating the master narratives of their disciplines. From this perspective, this chapter presents the outermost framework of the data analysis: the process by which I narrowed the collected information into specific codes and categories; the codes assigned to the transcribed audio recordings and survey responses, defined explicitly by how each was represented in the data and the relationships that connected codes and categories; and finally, a discussion of the initial narratives about the expected knowledge inherent to the observed classrooms and learning environments that those references produced. This study ultimately became a narrative of narratives, and this is how it played out.

The Data

Over the course of the observation timetable (February 2011 to early April 2011), I visited one course section from each of my four faculty participants three to four times, depending on how many observations each participating faculty member was able to accommodate. Ultimately, I observed faculty participant Amanda’s section of First Year Composition four times, First Year Composition instructor “Robert’s” section three times, Chris’s Jazz Pedagogy course section four times, and David's section of Advanced Jazz Pedagogy four times. These visits usually occurred once a week for each faculty participant’s
section, and the faculty participants and I did our best to maintain a regular schedule; however, scheduling observations was ultimately at the discretion of the faculty participants and occasionally, the observation day would change. For example, since Participant 1 and Participant 2’s First Year Composition courses met on a Monday/Wednesday and Monday/Wednesday/Friday schedules respectively, I would normally visit Participant 1’s class on Mondays and Participant 2’s class on Wednesdays (occasionally switching to a Friday observation when Participant 2 requested it). The observed class sessions were each 50 to 75 minutes in length, depending upon the credit hours assigned to each course. This observation strategy yielded 15 visits. Ultimately, I realized that the amount of data produced by the fifteen observations: 850 minutes of recorded class time, field observation notes for each session, and faculty and student survey responses, would be more than I could feasibly analyze as a solo researcher within the time frame of the dissertation. Therefore, when narrowing the data set, I decided to limit my coding and analysis activities to the transcripts, field observation notes, and survey responses from one class session of each faculty participant. For the sake of continuity, I selected the class sessions for analysis from the same week of observations: March 14th through March 18th, 2011. This particular week represented approximately the halfway point of my observations, so the newness of my presence as a participant observer had largely worn off (the “pregnant lady” faded into the background), and since the academic calendar was post mid-term examinations and post-spring break, the lesson contents and classroom routines were largely back to what the faculty participants described as “normal.”

The process of analyzing the four audio transcripts (one from each faculty participant’s observation session) and the student and faculty survey responses resulted in the application of 1,952 code references to the source material (reports based on this coding process appear in
Appendix A, pages 151-483), which were triangulated with the visual observation notes from the corresponding observed class sessions. The code categories that produced the 1,952 references were developed through lengthy processes of labeling, comparison, and elimination, where I first annotated the entire data set (the transcripts, survey responses, and field observation notes) using Strauss and Corbin’s (1990) open and axial coding techniques, and then continued to narrow the code book through this process of elimination until only the 28 final codes remained. For example, in “Robert’s” classroom, on March 18, 2011, I recorded in my visual observation notes that a student attempted to help another student revise and “correct” an MLA citation during a peer review activity, which I initially coded as “comments or words related to assessment,” “collaborative activity,” and “‘correct’= condition” This process, along with a visual representation of the final code book, is described in greater detail later in this chapter.

Consequently, in order to most clearly present those references, it was necessary to contextualize the results of the coding process with the course content and other relevant details from the individual classes that I observed. Essentially, the transcribed audio recordings tell a story of what happened in a particular class meeting, the visual observation notes verify and enhance that story, and the student and faculty survey responses illustrate whether or not (and where, and how) the story holds true to the expectations of the faculty who facilitates the course and the students who participated in it. What follows are some narrative excerpts (organized by faculty participant) of what, as a researcher, I saw and heard in the four course meetings that were ultimately analyzed, which will give context to the various labels, categories, and questions that emerged from the analysis of those meetings.

Amanda’s Classroom: Monday 14 March 2011
Context: First Year Composition

Mid-term grades, the assessment of a recent essay assignment, and detailed instruction about how students should complete the next writing assignment were on the agenda. Amanda began the class by returning the essays that students had completed just before spring break, and consequently, student conversations within the classroom turned almost immediately to the grades (“pass,” “almost pass,” or “no pass”) they received on their essays and then to their mid-term course grades. Amanda spent the majority of the class meeting describing the next writing assignment—a source analysis essay. She gave very detailed descriptions about how students should approach the essay (e.g. that it was an informative rather than an argumentative approach), the level of detail that she was expecting, and how many sources she expected the students to synthesize within the scope of the short essay. During the course of this discussion, Amanda directed the students to the course’s BlackBoard page, where she had an example of the source analysis essay available for them to analyze. Students were given class time during this meeting to read and interpret the example source analysis so that they might ask questions while Participant 1 and their peers were immediately available.

“Robert’s” Classroom: Friday 18 March 2011

Context: First Year Composition

The assessment of a recent essay assignment and a lesson on MLA citation techniques were the dominant topics of the lesson and of classroom conversations on this particular day of observation. “Robert” began this class meeting by returning the most recently graded essay assignment, and students immediately began asking questions about the general assessments (e.g. “pass,” “almost pass,” or “no pass”) and how those labels were applied to their individual essays.
Specifically, some students asked how ‘close’ an “almost pass” was to a “pass,” trying to determine the distance between their efforts and achieving a passing assessment on the essay assignment. Some students asked for a letter grade equivalent of the pass/almost pass/no pass system. Students also asked numerous questions about the comments that “Robert” made on their essays; most of these questions involved an alphanumerical reference system that “Robert” used for the purpose of highlighting errors in MLA formatting and source citations within the students’ essays. This reference system, as I gathered from “Robert’s” in-class explanation, came directly from the citation and grammar handbook that his students used as part of the required course texts. Thus, when a student made a citation error in the essay, “Robert” would simply write the number and letter combination associated with the sample citation and explanation in the handbook. I am not certain whether “Robert’s” lesson plan for this particular meeting included a lengthy exercise in source citation, but that is ultimately how the majority of the class meeting proceeded. Students spent the majority of the 50 minutes of class time sharing examples of citations from their own graded essays on the white board at the front of the classroom, while “Robert” and the rest of the class analyzed them for context before suggesting corrections or identifying (and making an example of) correct citation efforts. “Robert” directed some students to give an example of their work, while others volunteered to display one of their citations.

Chris’s Classroom: Tuesday 15 March 2011

Context: Undergraduate Jazz Pedagogy for Vocalists

The assessment of the mid-term examination and then a brief lecture and demonstration about music theory (specifically, Jazz theory) comprised the majority of this class meeting. Chris first reviewed the graded mid-term, question by question, to discuss what the correct answers
were and why they were correct. Once the exam review was complete, Chris moved the class into a discussion of Jazz theory that included the functionality of chord progressions and harmonizing scales within the context of pedagogy, using the chalkboard and an acoustic piano as visual and aural media to articulate the examples. Chris stressed to the students that this discussion of Jazz theory was of particular importance to them because even though they are vocal specialists, they could easily find themselves in professional teaching situations where they would have to instruct instrumentalists. Consequently, improvisation was also an integral part of this discussion, both in topic and practice, as Chris stressed the importance of vocalists having the skills necessary to improvise and to understand the theory behind improvising over chord progressions. To facilitate this discussion, Chris often improvised melodies on the piano as a means of demonstration.

David's Learning Environment: Tuesday 15 March 2011

Context: Graduate Advanced Jazz Pedagogy seminar

This particular meeting of David's graduate Jazz Pedagogy seminar involved one of the seminar participants giving a teaching demonstration, and subsequently having that demonstration assessed by David and the other seminar participants. These demonstrations were assigned ahead of time, therefore giving students time to prepare a lesson. In this case, a graduate saxophone specialist gave a half-hour lesson to an undergraduate saxophone specialist in order to demonstrate her personal pedagogical techniques in an individual (as opposed to classroom) instruction situation. After the teaching demonstration, the class discussed her techniques and offered suggestions. As the teaching demonstration progressed, David and most of the graduate students took written notes periodically. At the conclusion of the teaching demonstration, the
undergraduate participant left the room and the presenter was given an opportunity to explain her techniques and offer a critique of her own performance before David and the other students offered their thoughts on the demonstration. What ultimately occurred was a rather lengthy dialogue between David and the presenter, with some other class members only occasionally presenting their opinions or suggestions of the teaching demonstration. The class meeting concluded with a brief reminder about the next presenter’s teaching demonstration the following week.

Within the context of the observations described above, each of the following three elements (classroom/learning environment recordings, field notes/visual observations, and survey responses) holds many moments collected through aural, visual, and textual modes. The organization of these elements reflects the primary modes of interaction within the First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies classrooms: visual, aural, and textual. Collectively, these three sets composed the snapshot that I studied, fractured and studied again.

Element 1: Classroom/learning environment recordings

The recordings captured within First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies classrooms and learning environments provided the largest data sample. These recordings captured an aural portrait, if you will, of the conversations and relationships inherent to each learning situation—an aural archive that preserved living voices as well as context and content. I collected these recordings using a recorder equipped with an internal four-way microphone and SD card capable of high quality audio preservation. While the instrument itself was very capable, I found that unlike using it to record musical performances (its usual duties), classroom audio recording was far more challenging.
Element 2: Field notes/Visual observations

These visual observation notes, collected simultaneously with the audio recordings of classroom/learning space activities, served to refine the process of analyzing the recordings from element 1. Most of my visual observation notes were handwritten, as typing was not always feasible due to classroom space/layout and my physical limitations at the time of the observations. I found, in the process, that handwritten notes also more easily facilitated on-the-spot open coding references. The purpose of my note taking largely focused on the activities that I saw in the classroom, presenting a textual record of elements such as classroom layout, number of students attending, actions taking place that would not be apparent in an audio recording alone (for example, students texting, or interacting with one another), and occasionally, specific lesson-related concepts that I felt would provide background/context when I returned to the audio recordings from element 1 in the future. Understanding the recorded conversations through the corresponding visually observed behavior assisted in determining whether, for example, a discussion that sounded like a specific action matched the actual classroom behavior. This visual data facilitated the definition of analytical categories that comprised the code book, and represented the most frequently repeated actions or contexts from the cumulative data. Without the corresponding visual observation notes, I would not have been able to determine reliably whether specific actions strictly involved the use of verbal language or whether they were mediated through other devices, thus productively complicating the ways in which I viewed my categories under which I organized the aural data.

Element 3: Survey Responses
Please recall that the four faculty participants were presented with two surveys and student survey participants were presented with one survey. Initially, the results of the survey were disappointing. A total of 54 students and instructors consented to participate in the survey (each of the four focus group members and 50 students between First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies), but only two instructors (one Jazz faculty member and one First Year Composition faculty member) and nine students (five First Year Composition students and four Jazz Performance/Jazz studies students) actually submitted survey responses. However, even with this very limited sample, the responses provided a richer means of triangulation with the observation data than initially expected, as discussed later in this chapter.

Coding and Interpretation

As I discussed in chapter two, Strauss and Corbin’s methods of open, axial, and selective coding initially seemed an effective means of organizing and interpreting the collected conversations, visual observations, and textual survey responses. However, combining audio and textually based data within the context of two disciplines was complicated, and it became apparent early in the interpretive process that a paradigm model (Strauss and Corbin 1990) could not be clearly established until I was able to place more clear labels on the concepts that I saw at work in the three data elements. Establishing clear organization ultimately involved Lankshear and Knobel’s approach to categorical analysis, which “involve[d] developing codes that directly match[ed] with preset categories—the category label itself [became] the code.” (271). Returning to my open coding notes from the beginning of the process, I defined specific actions or contexts based on how they functioned or were being implemented by the participants in the observed classrooms and learning environments. These definitions, which appear in this chapter along
with examples and brief analyses of each, resulted in categories that I used to “code” each data source, until I had a much more narrow, stable data set that began to function more clearly within Strauss and Corbin’s paradigm model. In order to facilitate this multidimensional analysis, data from Element 1 and Element 3 above were analyzed using HyperResearch qualitative analysis software, while the visual observation notes from Element 2 (which were largely handwritten since typing was not always physically possible in some of my research sites) were used separately to triangulate the coded information from Elements 1 and 3.

Consequently, I developed a final code book based on the research questions and the process of analysis described above. The code book was narrowed to 28 working categories after repeated analysis of the audio recordings, visual observation notes, and survey data, and therefore reflects categorizable moments—reliable, repeated actions, terms, or concepts that encompass whole or partial stories—from each source (transcripts of classroom recordings, field notes of visual observations, and survey responses) that facilitated drawing connections between pieces of data within and across the two disciplines represented in this study. The evolving code book appears later in this chapter (please see Figure 1), followed closely by a list of the final 28 codes and their definitions/uses within the study. I arrived at the final 28 codes by examining the code frequency report generated by HyperResearch and eliminating codes that were applied only once (meaning that the actions or terms attached to those codes were not repeated in the classroom discourse or the survey responses and therefore were not reliable markers).

I applied the final 28 codes systematically to the sources within each of the three Elements described above, making certain that I applied the entire code book to a source before moving on to another. For example, when completing the final coding process for the audio transcripts (which was the final step in a long process of adding and subtracting codes groups
through repeated analysis of every transcript, survey response, and visual observation note), I began with the categories in the “Assessment” group within the code book, and scanned each transcript for actions, terms, or other elements that represented those categories, applying and tracking them with the assistance of HyperResearch qualitative analysis software. I continued repeatedly coding the same transcript until I had exhausted the entire list of 28 categories. The following screen shot assists in illustrating the process of coding a transcript.

Figure 1: Transcript Coding

The most challenging segment of this procedure involved identifying categories within the
classroom recordings (Element 1) because each 50 to 75 minute recording resulted in approximately 16 to 20 pages of transcribed speech—none of which could be easily organized by speaker because the intent was to capture as many conversations within the physical space as possible.

In order to manage and interpret the 1,952 code references, I used HyperResearch to generate several reports. As a result, I have compiled a 241 page report that presents the specific content to which each code was applied, which breaks down into several organizational patterns: a total frequency report (represented in the figure titled “Frequency” below) that indicated how many times individual codes were applied to the sources and therefore assisted in generating larger categories from the individual codes; reports organized by code group (narrowed to Music, English/First Year Composition, General Codes, Collaboration, and Assessment based on information from the total frequency report) that helped to determine whether (and then how) specific actions and terms functioned across the disciplinary boundary between First Year Composition and Jazz Performance/Jazz Studies; and finally, reports organized by code name that provided a more focused look at where and how individual codes were applied through the source material.

Figure 2: Frequency
The reports organized by code group (Assessment, Music, First Year Composition/Writing, etc.) highlighted some clear intersections of disciplinary activities and language, exhibited by the coding of First Year Composition/Writing sources (transcripts, survey responses, etc.) under “general music vocabulary,” and “Jazz performance/Jazz studies jargon,” and, the coding of Music sources under “general writing vocabulary” and “purpose of writing. For example, the term “quote” originally appeared in the audio transcripts from “Robert’s” First Year Composition class, but was coded as “Jazz performance/Jazz studies jargon” because the term was used and defined in the same manner in observed Jazz performance discussions and in music literature. Similarly, the term “communication” (in the context of communication as a purpose for Jazz performance) originated in a music faculty survey response, but was coded as “general writing vocabulary” and “purpose of writing” because the same term and concept appeared in observed First Year Composition discussions. The ability to view an individual code’s application within the source material helped to generate numerous questions about why
specific concepts or actions functioned as they did within the classrooms and learning spaces, and why students and faculty members applied them in specific ways. For example, “quote” (here, an activity and a term) originated in First Year Composition sources, but was also coded in the context of Jazz performance/Jazz studies as “Jazz performance/Jazz studies jargon” because the term represents the action of playing a portion of a melody or using a specific musical technique that can be immediately credited to one person, within one’s own improvised solo. Here, the question “How does quoting in a Jazz context compare to quoting in a writing context?” highlighted the fact that a quote or the act of quoting retains the same practical and rhetorical purposes, even though the disciplinary contexts differ. Additionally, noting that “communication” and “contribute to the dialogue” originated in Jazz sources but were coded in the context of Writing and First Year Composition as “general writing vocabulary” (because ‘communication’ and creating or contributing to a dialogue were also demonstrated in the First Year Composition sources in that context), I then needed to ask “how does dialogue in a writing context compare to writing in a musical or specifically Jazz context?” “What dynamics (such as individual or group/social roles or responsibilities) comprise a musical dialogue versus a written dialogue?”

This layered approach to analysis assisted first in determining what narratives were at work in the classrooms and learning environments during the observation period, and second, where intersections of concepts occurred both between First Year Composition and Jazz, as well as within the separate disciplinary contexts. Throughout this process of analysis, I found it important to keep the overall context of each element in mind. For example, in the process of coding transcribed classroom audio recordings, rather than coding entirely based on what was present in the singular transcribed session, I would often refer to my visual observation notes
from that class meeting, in addition to referencing my notes regarding the entire experience from that participant’s classroom (e.g. taking a holistic account all of my observation sessions from that specific participant) to better analyze the significance of individual terms, specific conversations, or activities in general. Because this project deals with interpersonal relationships and with the very personal business of teaching and learning, the original context of each piece of data—what it was—is equally important as any new contexts or concepts that it could generate—what it can or will be.

The context of the classroom activities and contexts presented earlier in this chapter assisted in developing the final version of the code book below, which I have subsequently explicated through specific definitions, examples, and brief analyses of the individual codes that were developed based on the actions, qualities, and contexts that the codes ultimately represented in the data sets. Some of these definitions and examples closely align with understandings of these concepts within the fields of Rhetoric and Composition and Music, but others seem to stray from the general context. The examples that follow the definitions are taken directly from the data reports and represent directly quoted words and phrases from the study participants.

Definitions, Contexts, and Analysis

During the process of assigning codes and identifying relationships between concepts, terms, and actions that took place within the observed First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies classrooms, the following definitions of the 28 codes (and explanations of their relationships to one another) have become the initial means of defining the literacies and the expected knowledge inherent to the observed classrooms and learning environments. The intersections of these categories/codes (described in each segment below) begin to illustrate the
locations of similarities between the observed First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies content. I examine these intersections further and in more precise focus in chapter four, through the lens of *Literate Activity*.

**Blatant Criticism:** a sub-category of “Comments or Words Related to Assessment”—a very direct means of criticism (and occasionally brash, based on the students’ reactions) used in the context of making a notable point. Sometimes, this comment also applied to sarcastic comments in the classrooms and learning environments. For example, “You’re really cutting that dotted 16th [note] right there at the beginning— you’re really cutting them off” represents unmistakable criticism of a technique, while “You guys are killing me today. . . . Killing me. Slow death” represents sarcasm that is still intended to make a critical point about the students’ lack of effort.

**Collaboration as an Assessment Tool:** is a means of using a collaborative moment or exercise (usually between an instructor and a student, but sometimes between two or more students) to assess a student’s progress. An example of this often occurred in the Jazz performance learning environments, as characterized by this exchange:

Speaker 1: “Play it with me… one, two, three four”  
*saxophones playing together*  
Speaker 1: “Right, so did you breathe?”  
Speaker 2: “Yeah…”

Collaboration as an Assessment Tool also appeared frequently in the observed First Year Composition classrooms in the form of peer review (represented within the data as both the act of peer reviewing and the phrase “peer review” as it came up in conversations).
Comments or Words Related to Assessment: represents a general category that contained larger references to assessment such as classroom conversations in which the assessment criteria for a specific assignment or technique were discussed, to smaller references such as student comments about assessment (“So just give me the grade.”), and general features of writing or music assessment (“constructive feedback,” “mid-term grades,” and “Good sight reading!”). This category sometimes overlapped with Tools of Writing Assessment and Tools of Music Assessment.

Softened Criticism: a technique, opposite to “Blatant Criticism” where the assessor tempered the critical comment, sometimes to protect the students’ morale. For example, in a Jazz performance learning situation: “You got through it [the song] and most of it was good. There were some funky rhythms, some articulation things, but you did it with good tone throughout the whole thing . . . and to me that’s really important, especially when you’re sight reading.” And in a First Year Composition classroom, “So maybe right now, you might be feeling disappointed with yourself or you might feel like you need to work harder. . . . The next papers are the most important papers; those are the ones I want you to work hard on.”

Tools of Music Assessment: are specific actions or words/phrases that the observed Jazz instructors or students used as assessment criteria or to perform assessments. For example: “sight reading,” “know the music,” and “prepare for performances.”

Tools of Writing Assessment: are specific actions or words/phrases that the observed First Year
Composition instructors or students used to perform assessments or as assessment criteria. For example: “comments,” “portfolio,” “peer evaluation,” “grading rubric,” “constructive feedback.”

**General Writing Vocabulary:** terms specific to writing that appeared in the data. Some of these terms also appeared in music contexts. For example: “quote,” “essay,” “introduction.”

**Purpose of Writing:** terms, qualities, or actions that represented purposes of writing. This code also applied to some music contexts. For example: “communication,” “writing for something beyond a grade,” “emotion,” “argument,” “contribute to the dialogue.”

**Terms Specific to Academic Writing:** a sub-category of General Writing Vocabulary that includes terms, actions, or contexts that appear readily within academic writing situations (as opposed to non-academic writing situations). For example: “source analysis,” “thesis.”

**Specific First Year Composition Program Jargon:** a sub-category of Terms Specific to Academic Writing that includes terms, actions, or contexts specific to the observed First Year Composition program. For example: “no pass,” “MSE essay,” “MLA,” “almost pass.”

**Writing Process:** terms, actions, or contexts that, within the data sets, represented elements of the writing process or the writing process itself. For example: “peer evaluation,” “analysis,” “revise,” “write,” “brainstorm.”

**General Collaboration:** a broad category that represents collaborative moments that either
overlapped with several other codes and/or did not fit a clear category outside of *collaboration*. For example: “maybe we can work up in a dyad here and you and [unintelligible 02:45] can go over some things together.”

**Collaboration as Demonstration**: represents collaborative acts executed for the purpose of demonstrating a concept, especially in the case of an instructor collaborating with students. This category sometimes overlapped with Collaboration as Assessment and Collaboration as Knowledge Making. For example: In a Jazz learning situation, Speaker 1: “So let’s actually play that together. The first chorus— one, two, three, four…” *saxophones playing together* and in a First Year Composition classroom, Speaker 1: “Somebody give me a topic. . . .

Speaker 2: “Professional athletes are overpaid . . .”

Speaker 1: “Professional athletes are overpaid, right?”

Speaker 2: “They are not . . .”

Speaker 1: “Oh, they are not. What’s the argument that they are not overpaid? What’s one of the reasons you’re going to use to argue that they’re not overpaid? . . .”

**Collaboration as Knowledge Making**: this category represents contexts or statements in which the participants were actively and consciously discussing the epistemological functions or possibilities of writing or music. It is important to note that this category, while very small in relation to the number of applied codes, exists separately from the other functions of collaboration because faculty participants spoke directly to these goals in survey responses, which contrast directly to the other categories of collaboration that were derived from actions that took place in the classrooms and learning environments. Essentially, a representation of
what kind of environment the faculty wanted versus the actual classrooms and learning environments. For example, in music to “contribute to the dialogue” and in First Year Composition, “to provide a community that supports and pushes the writer to succeed.”

**Collaborative Language**: represents words or phrases that outwardly represented the desire for collaboration or collaborative situations within the observed classrooms and learning spaces, and survey responses. This category overlapped closely with Group Role/Responsibility and Relationship of Instructors to Students, and largely contained second person references such as variations of “we.” However, in the context of the situations in which they were uttered, the uses of “we” categorized under Collaborative Language most often occurred when instructor or student participants wanted to convey a feeling of togetherness, community, or collaboration, but ultimately only relayed a message of “I want” or “I will.” This happened more frequently in First Year Composition data than in the Jazz data. For example, please consider this exchange from First Year Composition regarding an essay due date: Speaker 1: “A week. We can do it! We can do it! It’s going to be fine! So that’s the 21st, right?” Speaker 2: “Why don’t we make it next Wednesday?” Speaker 1: “I can’t do it; I’m not gonna do it. I’m gonna keep it—we’re going to keep [the due date] as it is.” (My emphasis)

**Purpose of Collaboration**: the category from which Collaboration as Demonstration, Collaboration as Assessment Tool and Collaboration as Knowledge Making were derived, but was occasionally applied on its own to individual situations or phrases within the data set if they very clearly demonstrated how or why participants acted collaboratively. For example: “creating
a solid community of writers,” “peer review,” “communication,” “contribute to the dialogue,” “reach an agreement,” and “work on their collective sound.”

Ownership: represents examples of ownership or individuality in the data sets. This code sometimes overlapped with Individual Role/Responsibility, and speaks to an important consideration of the collaborative experience: what is the role of individual ownership within the collaborative effort or experience? Examples include: “The quote is them talking, but then in the quote, they quote—they put something in quotes. I remember you said not to do that, but it’s like, it’s not my writing, it’s theirs.”; “What I’m saying is I’m just copying his, so I can’t change that.”; “contribute to the dialogue”; “to make it their own”; and “you’re going to develop your own style, so no one can tell you that vibrato is right or wrong.”

Relationship of Instructors to Students: represents a broad category that applied to situations, actions, and phrases that illustrated or defined the ways in which instructors and students interacted and/or the positions of authority and respect. For example: “I want,” “think about this,” “look at this,” “you following me?”, “He tells me how to fix my paper and what to add to make it better.”; “we talked about,” “ask me questions,” “Let’s listen to how I do it.”; “We have a rough draft and a final draft, loves.” “We can do it!” “So most teachers are like ‘write the paper.’ What I’m telling you to do is I want you to slow down and think about how you’re using your sources and why you’re using your sources.” “Well, you know—I wouldn’t be afraid—another thing you need to be able to do is like to admit ‘Well, you know, I screwed up.’ I think that’s really important to do. To try to pretend that you’ve got it all together is ridiculous. I think if that happens again, say, you know, ‘I did this, but let’s actually go back and do this.’ I think
that’s cool, and I think students respect that.”

**Resistance to the Existing Performance or Pedagogical Model:** this category represented actions, phrases, or contexts that resisted the extant (or expected) model of pedagogy or performance (as in the case of a very specific First Year Composition model or Jazz performance model), and sometimes overlapped with Relationship of Instructors to Students. For example, “So I want you to try and think more finesse. I know it’s Jazz, but I still want you to be graceful.” “The main difference[s] are the grade aspect and the contrived audience[s] that writing prompts force upon students.” “having time to really discuss topics as opposed to teach[ing] a formula pushed by the program/department.”

**Group Role/Responsibility:** a category that represents, according to the data, expectations, definitions, and actions of what a group’s role is in the writing or music performance process, classroom, or learning environment. For example: “peer review,” “creating a solid community of writers,” “large and small group performance,” “communication,” “I want you to ask me questions, because I want all of us to be on the same page.” “Conducting research before or during the writing process,” “[conveying] technical ability,” and “[conveying] emotion.”

**Improvisation:** Within the data sets, Improvisation functions as the spontaneous generation of ideas or activities and often overlaps with Relationship of Instructors to Students, Collaboration as Demonstration, and Interaction. For example:

Speaker 1: “Somebody give me a topic.

Speaker 2: “. . . Professional athletes are overpaid . . .”
Additionally, “[requires] communication,” and “specific time on the platform with which to contribute.”

**Individual Role/Responsibility:** within this data set, a category that represents expectations, definitions, and actions of what an individual’s role is in the writing or music performance process, classroom, or learning environment. For example, “In Jazz, a musician must know his or her individual part, and also know how that part relates to other parts in the music. He or she must be able to listen.” “to act as a team member,” “The individual writer’s responsibility in the writing process is to produce academic writing and complete [the] revising process to achieve the essay requirements.” “You can tell me what it is you’ve learned—what it is you’ve discovered through your sources.” “To brainstorm and have ownership of his/her critical thoughts and analysis” “communication” “writing for something beyond a grade”

**Interaction:** Within the context of these data sets, Interaction represented moments, words, phrases, or specific actions involving individuals speaking to one another, or otherwise interacting physically. This category often overlapped with Improvisation, Listening, Relationship of Instructors to Students, Collaboration (and all of its subcategories), and the categories related to Assessment. For example, “*saxophones playing together*” Speaker 1: “So it could be a good idea to go against what you believe and then you can actually learn something new so you have more to write about?”

Speaker 2: “It’s possible man. . . .”

Speaker 1: “Because my opinion is all based on stuff I already know”

Speaker 2: “Right. It’s a good point. But it’s also like what [Participant’s name] [is] saying too is
that’s a way to explore counter argument and rebuttal, right?”

—And (from a Jazz context)—

“*recording playing*

*saxophone playing*

Speaker 1: UGH!

Speaker 2: *singing the melody concurrently with Speaker 1’s saxophone playing* [rhythmic speech] buh do buh

Speaker 2: *concurrently with Speaker 1’s saxophone playing one note* buht. Two. Here we go.

Speaker 1: Shoot.

Speaker 2: *with recording playing in the background, singing the melody together with Speaker 1* [rhythmic speech] buht do duht

*saxophone playing alone*”

**Listening**: In the context of this data set, listening was not *initially* defined rhetorically.

Listening therefore represents the physical acts of hearing and comprehending, as well as actions or contexts that require listening within the data sets. For example, “communication” requires listening, as does “large and small group performance,” and having “specific time on the platform with which to contribute.” Listening as a physical process and as a rhetorical construct overlaps with nearly all of the groups within the code book, but listening as a rhetorical construct (especially according to Ratcliffe) specifically overlaps with every category within the Collaboration and General Codes groups.

**General Music Vocabulary**: represents terms specific to music that appeared in the data. Some
of which were also used in writing contexts, which is described later in this chapter. For example: “etude,” “F sharp,” “piano,” “B flat,” “chorus,” “rhythm,” “articulation,” “audience.”

**Jazz Performance/Jazz Studies Jargon**: is a sub-category of General Music Vocabulary that includes terms, actions, or contexts specific to the observed Jazz Performance/Jazz Studies program, some of which overlapped with First Year Composition Jargon and General Writing Vocabulary. For example: “blowing through it,” “quoted,” “Jazz improvisation,” “take it from the top.”

**Music Performance Process**: represents terms, actions, or contexts that, within the data sets, represented elements of the music performance process or the music performance process itself. For example: “quote,” “know the music,” “be able to play as a group,” “interaction,” “improvisation.”

**Purpose of Jazz Performance**: sometimes overlapped with Music Performance Process and General Writing Vocabulary—the terms, qualities, or actions that represented purposes of performing Jazz. For example: “provide entertainment,” “to understand the music,” “interaction,” “[to] contribute to the dialogue,” “[to have] specific time on the platform with which to contribute,” “to get across their point to the audience,” “technical ability,” “emotion.”

In the process of generating the aforementioned definitions and examples, I began to recognize two standout categories: Assessment and Collaboration, that represented actions or knowledge common to each classroom and/or learning space that I observed. These two
categories accounted for a total of 161 and 271 code references respectively, with one overlapping category—Collaboration as Assessment Tool—containing 23 references. Additionally, two other groups emerged as discipline-specific concepts in First Year Composition or Music that sometimes, but not frequently, translated to classrooms and learning environments of the opposite discipline. Finally, the “general” category contained actions, terms, and relationships that occurred frequently within (and between) both of the studied disciplines’ classrooms and learning spaces, but did not fit cleanly into a specific label. As the analysis became tighter, I was able to determine that, based on frequency and context, Assessment and Collaboration were the two concepts that most strongly influenced the narratives that were forming in each faculty participant’s learning space during the course of the observations.

I would like to focus attention on the codes represented above because, as I began to discuss earlier, they are not merely labels; they represent relationships, actions, and responsibilities within the classrooms and learning environments that I observed. The groups into which I organized the individual codes represent academic contexts (as in the case of First Year Composition/Writing, and Music), significant contributing factors to the narratives at work in each classroom (as in the case of Collaboration, and Assessment), and generic concepts that appeared multiple times and in multiple contexts within the classroom recordings, visual field observations, and survey responses. For example, assessment was not originally a group by itself; however, in the process of listening to and analyzing the classroom moments that I had recorded, many of the discussions in each class session related directly or indirectly to assessment. The same process of careful analysis produced the Collaboration group as well.

These observations regarding assessment and collaboration, supported by survey responses in which students and faculty related their understandings of writing or of Jazz to
specific assignments given by the instructor, indicated that assessment and collaboration (or the desire for collaboration) were significant elements of the narrative at work in each classroom during the period of observation. This is not surprising given the fact that these instances of learning were taking place within the academy. It follows that students (and sometimes instructors) were gauging and defining success based on the assessment of specific assignments or of their overall end of term assessment, as well as viewing collaboration, collaborative language, or merely the desire for collaboration as means of maintaining student morale, assessment, and creating a classroom community. From the data at hand, it appears as though the actions and statements associated with the First Year Composition, Music, and General groups ultimately served to contextualize the faculty and student participants’ expectations of what collaboration and assessment should be and how those concepts should function within classrooms and learning environments within the academy, as reflected in the following narratives that emerged from the observed class meetings.

Emerging Narratives

Narrative 1: First Year Composition Experience

According to the data, First Year Composition students within the context of the observed class meetings (including lesson content, assignments, and timing within the academic calendar) were expected to know how to assess one another, how to self-assess, and were also expected to understand and to execute the conventions of argument. Both First Year Composition faculty participants made use of demonstration through the use of visually based electronic media during the course of my observations, and consequently, the First Year Composition students were also expected to correctly search out and evaluate information in support of their claims using
electronic media, as well as access and make use of the electronic class space (e.g. BlackBoard) for viewing grades, course documents (e.g. the syllabus and assignment sheets), communicating on the discussion board, and viewing examples of writing. Collaboration was also a component of the classroom activities during my observations, although both faculty participants approached it differently. For example, one faculty participant’s class participated in an electronic collaborative brainstorming and writing activity through the Blackboard discussion board feature, while the second First Year Composition faculty participant’s students engaged in face to face peer review and brainstorming sessions with partners or groups (in the case of the face to face collaborative sessions, sometimes groups were put together by the instructor on an impromptu basis, and sometimes the instructor allowed the students to choose their own partners.) Students in these classes during the course of the observations were largely concerned about their recent essay grades, their mid-term course grades, how to complete their writing assignments to their instructors’ liking, and how to manage their writing time effectively, with many concerns voiced regarding balancing the time needed for research and the time needed for writing.

Narrative 2: Jazz Pedagogy Experience

During the course of my observations, the undergraduate and graduate students were expected to have a functional knowledge of Jazz fundamentals—the Jazz vocabulary, Jazz (music) theory, and some Jazz history. Much like the First Year Composition context, Jazz pedagogy students, whether they were undergraduates or graduate students, were expected to know how to assess one another, how to self-assess, to think critically, and to apply the aforementioned theoretical and historical concepts to hypothetical teaching situations. For example, the graduate Jazz pedagogy students engaged in teaching demonstrations during the
course of my observation—a full immersion in the practice of interacting, assessing, and demonstrating, while the undergraduate students interacted with the faculty participant in brief “what if” scenarios where the students were asked to essentially perform an on-the-spot analysis of a hypothetical teaching situation and respond with an appropriate technique. In one instance, the faculty participant asked the students, all of whom were vocal specialists, to determine how they would approach presenting the concept of improvisation to instrumental specialists, therefore asking them to “think like an instrumentalist instead of a vocalist,” and approach a standard Jazz technique from a perspective outside of their specialty. Interestingly, while the Jazz Performance/Jazz Studies students were expected to think outside of the box, per se, participation in many of the discussions and activities assumed proficiency with certain skills that were not outwardly required for admission to the course. For example, while piano proficiency (e.g. having the ability to play scales, chords, and occasionally to accompany one’s self or to arrange a piece of music) is not listed in the university’s catalogue as a pre- or co-requisite for enrollment in the observed Jazz courses, it remains a skill that is often assumed, and therefore students who are not yet proficient find themselves in a disadvantaged position. This position mirrors that of First Year Composition students who were not always proficient with the technologies used in the observed writing classrooms. Additionally, because of this university’s policy to screen incoming First Year Composition students through an initial writing assessment process, the First Year Composition instructors assumed that students were entering their courses with an expected level of writing proficiency.

The narratives above represent the foundational values, and the means to participation/expected knowledge inherent to the First Year Composition and Jazz Performance/Jazz Studies classrooms and learning environments during the specific period of
observation—broadly summarized, the value of both individual and collaborative activity, and the ability to navigate disciplinary knowledge and discipline-specific language or activity, even if those disciplinary functions are not part of the students’ initial knowledge-base. These values and expectations provide a localized understanding of how the expectations of faculty and students translate (or do not translate) into actual application, and, importantly, how the expected knowledge inherent to the specific lessons and activities that students and faculty worked through during the observation period shaped the transferability of that knowledge into other contexts—other disciplines, or situations outside of the academy. These aforementioned elements provide a foundation for the next chapter where I contextualize the concepts of collaboration and assessment in the observed classrooms and learning environment through Paul Prior’s concept of literate activity, toward an understanding of how the observed examples of expected knowledge and literacies construct the literate activity that has the potential to open transdisciplinary perspectives across academic disciplinary boundaries in programs that are not specifically connected to Writing Across the Curriculum/Writing in the Disciplines/Interdisciplinary Studies formats.
“As Bruno Latour has argued, disciplines by their nature are time-bound, collaborative, and a function of the cultures in which they develop. As he notes in *Science in Action*, “an isolated specialist is a contradiction in terms. Either you are isolated and very quickly stop being a specialist, or you remain a specialist but this means you are not isolated” (152). On the other hand, despite the fact that disciplines are a product of—or at least are imbricated in—the cultures in which they develop, they still resist the possibilities of collaboration across disciplines. That is, insofar as knowledge is discipline specific, interdisciplinarity is highly problematic; knowledge in one discipline does not necessarily—and, in fact, cannot—constitute knowledge in a different discipline.”

— Ronald Schleifer

As Ronald Schleifer indicates above, the enculturation inherent to disciplinary knowledge and disciplinary participation complicates approaches to interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary collaboration. Similarly, Jean-Francois Lyotard’s discussion of master narratives (see chapter two) frames this project’s treatment of disciplinary participation (and consequently, collaboration and transdisciplinarity) by framing a potential boundary between disciplines—the expected knowledge that participants in a particular discipline’s discourse must have and must be able to navigate in order to participate. From an opposing but complementary perspective, Paul Prior synthesizes the scholarship that informs sociohistoric perspectives of learning, disciplinarity, and participation, that, in the context of this project, highlight important oppositions to the view of...
disciplines as fixed, closed “territories.” Prior specifically cites Minick, Stone, and Forman (Contexts for learning: Sociocultural dynamics in children’s development, 1993): “Sociohistoric theories point toward an image of disciplines as open networks, forged through relational activity that intermingles personal, interpersonal, institutional, and sociocultural histories” (Minick, Stone, and Forman in Prior 25). Therefore, in the context of this project’s approach to collaboration through the examination of activities, processes, and conversations—situated literacies—in specific First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies classrooms and learning environments, Prior’s contribution to the discourse surrounding disciplinarity and literacy—literate activity—provides, in conjunction with the understanding that disciplinary participation within the academy requires the navigation of expected knowledge, a frame for the data collected in this study’s research sites.

Literate activity encompasses (and accounts for) the function of many elements of social, individual, and textual interaction within writing environments. Prior discusses, within the notion that, “‘writing’ is too partial, too contextually thin, a unit of analysis,” his rationale for literate activity, defining this concept broadly: “This notion of writing as situated, mediated, dispersed is the basis for what I am calling literate activity. Literate activity, in this sense, is not located in acts of reading and writing, but as cultural forms of life saturated with textuality, that is strongly motivated and mediated by texts” (Prior xi, 138). Prior’s concept of literate activity posits that texts and textuality (which are inclusive of both individual and social factors) mediate interaction, and therefore literate activity accounts for a more transparent view of writing and writing environments—a view that writing is inclusive of activity but neither defined by it nor limited to it. Furthermore, in the context of this study, textuality is understood as a concept that, as much as it encompasses visual modalities of reading and writing, also encompasses the aural
“texts” of Jazz improvisations and rhetorically situated aurality that mediates the interaction necessary to produce those aural texts.

From a disciplinary perspective, literate activity takes into account the disciplinary elements—the texts, participants, communication, and disciplinary culture—that encompass the discourse community, and allows for difference within these elements. Therefore, it is possible to read Prior’s contention from the perspective that literate activity, although “not located in acts of reading and writing,” still encompasses and is mediated by localized factors, specifically, language, individual and social roles or responsibilities, and disciplinary knowledge—elements that, arguably, make the relationships inherent to literate activity possible (Prior 138). These aforementioned localized factors may serve to separate or to connect disciplinary cultures, expected knowledge, and acts. Narrowing the lens further, the localized, mediating factors of language, individual and social roles and responsibilities, and disciplinary knowledge are further acted upon by situated literacies: the specific activities that students and instructors performed repeatedly in the observed classrooms and learning environments that both use and build upon language, individual roles and responsibilities, and disciplinary knowledge.

The significance of these situated literacies within the classrooms and learning environments of the two observed disciplines lies in how they build upon the mediating factors of literate activity: language, individual versus social roles and responsibilities, and disciplinary knowledge. By tracing the connective features of the situated literacies within First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies classrooms and learning environments as they build into larger contexts, this project can draw localized conclusions about how everyday literacies point, in an introductory sense, to viable means of transdisciplinary collaboration in the research sites. Within this context, I will attend to this project’s research questions when
presenting the significance of how each of the observed classroom and/or learning environment’s situated literacies build rhetorically into the collaborative functions of language, individual versus social roles and responsibilities, and disciplinary knowledge, within the categories of Collaboration and Assessment in the data.

- What is the relationship of language to collaboration in collegiate learning spaces involving writing or Jazz performance?
- How might collaboration connect writing and Jazz “through means other than language?”
- What is the nature of social ethos and individual ethos in writing and Jazz learning situations, and how do these positions assist or resist collaboration and the collaborative process?

In order to facilitate these discussions, it is necessary to trace the relationships from situated literacies through literate activity, beginning by determining two things: 1) What each classroom and learning environment’s situated literacies were (through a review of the field observation notes and transcripts) and 2) How those situated literacies relate to language, individual versus social roles and responsibilities, and disciplinary knowledge. Last, it will be necessary carry the aforementioned analysis forward, toward an understanding of how these elements relate to collaboration and assessment—the most frequently occurring code references in the data. The aforementioned discussions will thus facilitate an examination of the research questions in light of the data and the project’s foundation in literate activity.

The specific situated literacies within each discipline’s observed classrooms and learning environments were identified by searching the visual observation notes for specific activities such as writing, requests by instructors for students to read specific sources (both during and
outside of class), or to listen analytically to musical examples or written texts read aloud, as well as reviewing the transcribed conversations that took place in each classroom and learning environment, and creating lists of frequent or repeated activities. Examples of the exact requests and activities included the following: From First Year Composition faculty participant Amanda’s class, “Ideally, you are all going to read your sources—right, gonna read and annotate the sources like we’ve been talking about all semester long when we’re using sources—and you’re going to figure out some things about your topic;” from First Year Composition faculty participant “Robert’s” class, “OK, so what we might do - I'll have you read through your essays and leave marks on them first. . . . You have some questions on the paper itself, please go ahead and comment or raise the question;” and from Jazz faculty participant Chris’s classroom, “So the chord progression makes sense. . . .” (concurrently with playing the particular progression on the piano). The narrowed list of situated literacies presented in the chart below therefore represents activities that instructors and students repeated multiple times within the single week of observation data that is the basis for chapters three and four of this project. Therefore, in the observed First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies classrooms and learning environments, the situated literacies included the following:

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST YEAR COMPOSITION</th>
<th>JAZZ PERFORMANCE/JAZZ STUDIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion/Demonstration</td>
<td>Discussion/Demonstration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (speech, textual [visual],)</td>
<td>Interaction (speech, textual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>electronic)</td>
<td>[musical/aural], electronic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research (assignment based, non-empirical)</td>
<td>Listening (as a means of analysis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Playing an instrument or singing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table above indicates, many situated literacies within the observed classrooms and learning environments matched, even though they were carried out in very different disciplinary settings. Examples include writing, reading, discussion/demonstration, and interaction, with the exception that some of the forms of interaction were based in discipline-specific functions (visual interaction in the writing based courses, and musical/aural interaction [e.g., singing and/or playing instruments together]). Furthermore, members of the Jazz performance/Jazz studies classrooms and learning environments were expected to be proficient in an additional literacy—the ability to play an instrument or to sing at a level appropriate for collegiate study—the specifics of which were not expected of members of the observed First Year Composition classrooms. Thus, the music students needed to be literate in the traditional linguistic media of the academy (e.g., reading, writing), but additionally in musical or sonic media.

Although the category “listening” also appeared to differ between the First Year Composition and Jazz contexts, the difference lies in the function of analysis. For the observed First Year Composition students, the rhetorical concept of analysis was facilitated through reading, and executed through writing and/or discussion (as in the case of the specific “source analysis” assignment discussed in faculty participant Amanda’s First Year Composition classroom on March 14, 2011), while the primary facilitator of analysis in the Jazz
performance/Jazz studies classrooms and learning environments was listening (as in the case of faculty participant Chris’s use of piano demonstration to assist his students in analyzing Jazz chord progressions on March 15, 2011). Therefore, during the course of the observations, First Year Composition students were reading (e.g., sources they located via research) for the purpose of obtaining information, and reading for the purpose of analyzing that information, whereas the Jazz performance/Jazz studies students were reading for the purpose of obtaining information (e.g., chord progressions and other “class notes” written on the chalkboard or on musical charts), listening for the purpose of obtaining information (e.g., listening to musical examples to determine what chord progression comprised a particular song), and then listening for the purpose of analysis (e.g., determining how a soloist then worked with the aforementioned chord progression). The reasons for reading and listening were largely the same in both disciplinary environments—to obtain information and to analyze that information—but the sources of the information and the end products produced by the students were often articulated through different media: visual versus aural.

However, recalling the earlier discussion of literate activity within this study, on a rhetorical level, the aural functions of the First Year Composition and Jazz classrooms and learning environments are still located within the bounds of textuality. The same discussion of media applies to the shared situated literacy of interaction. The observed students in both disciplines interacted through largely the same media: vocal discussions or singing, written word (electronically composed and handwritten), and listening to musical performances or to spoken essay examples for the purpose of assessment or analysis, with the exception of, again, the difference between a textual focus and a musical/aural focus; yet, the reasons for interaction—making music, assessment (peer review), collaborative brainstorming, largely remained the
same. On the opposite end of the spectrum, research and playing an instrument or singing were situated literacies that, at least in the observed classrooms and learning environments, were very discipline specific, without direct transfer between the two disciplinary contexts.

This convergence of the territorial master narrative (or from a complementary perspective, monologic rhetoric located in the structure of classroom authority)—the expected knowledge required for full participation and the negotiation of instructor/expert to student/recipient relationships—and the sociohistoric “open network” provided by bridging situated literacies and literate activity highlights a particular challenge to transdisciplinary collaboration in the research sites. The significance, then, of identifying these situated literacies in the observed First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz Studies classrooms and learning environments lies in the fact that each of the situated literacies listed in the chart above seem to build and to bind the larger concepts of language, individual versus social roles and responsibilities, and disciplinary knowledge when collaboration is the goal. Furthermore, collaborators must balance each of the concepts (language, individual versus social roles/responsibilities, and disciplinary knowledge) in order to achieve successful collaborative efforts in their specific locations, let alone in a transdisciplinary context—a challenge when we examine the theory behind language, relationships, and disciplinary knowledge.

For example, the situated literacies of reading, writing, discussion/demonstration, and interaction are dependent upon language(s), and if we consider Bakhtin further, the heteroglossic nature of language(s) prevents neatly dividing individual and social roles and responsibilities in the observed classrooms and learning environments. (Klancher in Donahue and Quandahl, Volosinov, and Titunik in Volosonov) Ronald Schleifer addresses the foundation for this convergence of language and actors, presenting language—the “complicated relationship
between syntax and semantics”—as a mediator of collaborative roles in the sciences and humanities (Schleifer 438). He continues:

Here’s how Thomas Kuhn puts it:

Proponents of different theories are . . . like native speakers of different languages. Communication between them goes on by translation, and it raises all translation’s familiar difficulties. The analogy is, of course, incomplete, for the vocabulary of the two theories may be identical. . . . [S]ome words in the basic as well as the theoretical vocabularies of the two theories—words like “star” and “planet,” “mixture” and “compound,” or “force” and “matter”—do function differently. Those differences are unexpected and will be discovered and localized, if at all, only by repeated experience of communication breakdown.

Kuhn is describing the problem of interdisciplinarity Davidson mentions: the ways that the “function” of disciplinary knowledge-tokens spoil in translation. If Davidson is describing the “identical” object of study for different disciplines, Kuhn is describing the problematic nature of such “identity” within the temporal development of the “same” discipline. (Schleifer 444)

The discussion of translation that Schleifer highlights is an important concept regarding the relationship of language and individual and social roles/responsibilities to collaboration, especially in the context of transdisciplinarity. If participants receive the disciplinary features of Jazz and First Year Composition as translations of the original “language,” this situation naturally begs the question of whether language (paired with the roles and responsibilities of participants from both individual and social perspectives) assists or resists transdisciplinarity and collaboration. Again, Ronald Schleifer answers this concern, citing Robert Markley:
The combination of semantics and syntax in our discipline [Rhetoric and Composition]—their opposition and conjunction—helps us to see this problem in ways that are more difficult to obtain in other disciplines. It allows us to see polysemy and multiplicities of meaning—what linguists studying both semantics and syntax call “levels” of signification. Thus, if the semiotics of meaning and the “discipline” of value are what we can teach, they also allow us to see what we can learn from the nomological sciences. In this regard, Markley’s argument that science in higher education is more closely linked than the humanities to the money system of our culture suggests that the disciplinary practices of the sciences offer the humanities ways to reimagine the subject of disciplinary knowledge, a subject that can be conceived as collective rather than individual and as multi-modal in its articulations” (Schleifer 444).

The “multiplicities of meaning” cited above relate to the use of metaphor as a means of translating knowledge or meaning back and forth over disciplinary contexts. Metaphors represent vehicles for the abstraction of meaning, and therefore, semantically, provide gray area where knowledge or meaning can be molded into new contexts—meanings that, as in the nomological sciences that Schleifer and Markley reference, are often taken as truth or are easily rationalized as an alternate or abstract lens through which to view the original knowledge. This is evident in the use of tropes: Aurality, Interaction, Improvisation, and Voice, in the case of this study, which become contingent on the discipline-specific meanings applied to them by individuals.

For example, consider Michael Jarrett’s (Drifting on a Read: Jazz as a Model for Writing) presentation of “Jazz tropes” as a foundation for his synthesis of literary theory with the Jazz tradition, and Cynthia Selfe’s recontextualization of aurality as a trope for listening from chapter one. According to the data collected for this study, the aforementioned tropes, which at
first seemed the most likely concepts to transcend closed disciplinary function, continue to function as abstract representations of disciplinary knowledge—an excellent basis for generating theory—but do not connect well to practical application, a necessary consideration when dealing with a functional subject such as collaboration. The concrete connections between disciplinary concepts in the observed First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies occurred in the less abstract concepts—the situated literacies—gleaned from conversations and activities within First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies classrooms and learning spaces themselves. This finding is supported by Schleifer and Markley above, in the aspect that unlike the sciences’ disciplinary knowledge—meaning that is syntactically fixed and more friendly to consensus—tropes break down in social epistemic situations, because the level of abstraction involved in assigning meaning to the trope resists the consensus necessary for agreement on a fixed meaning or function; however, if given time, tropes (as a linguistic medium for collaboration) have the potential to produce far richer meaning than knowledge based in collaboration via situated literacies, because the level of abstraction involved permits the flexibility for the various influences and experiences inherent to social epistemic situations (situations such as long(er) term collaborative scholarship in the form of recurring partnerships as in the case of Lisa Ede and Andrea Lunsford or at the local level, an undergraduate collaborative research and writing initiative intended to span a semester or academic year) to develop.

In a more localized context, some of the data collected for this study illustrated what Schleifer would refer to as syntactically based connections of language between the observed First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies classrooms and learning environments. Specifically, the connected (overlapping) terms became evident because the
connection was more than in name only: the overlapping terms functioned, and were also defined in the same way, in both disciplinary contexts. For example, the terms “quote,” and “audience” were frequently used in the classroom conversations recorded in both First Year Composition and Jazz classrooms, and the terms were defined (and functioned) in both locations. For example, (and I paraphrase here) “quote” refers to the use of one author’s (or musician’s) exact words or musical idea in support of one’s own idea, and “audience” refers to the target group for whom a writer or musician focuses his or her creative efforts in an attempt to convey meaning or knowledge.

In the context of this study, the most important features of these functional syntactic connections are the ways in which syntactic meaning (here, direct translation of terms or activities) and semantic meaning (tropes or other abstracted, metaphorically based references) assist or resist collaboration, and specifically, transdisciplinary collaboration. Because both syntactic and semantic meanings were located in the observed First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies disciplinary environments, we can consider two lines of thought: first, that the syntactic crossovers—the situated literacies—while very clearly in the minority, were the most promising means toward a transdisciplinary means of collaboration because they offer fixed meanings from which mutual understanding is possible; however, it can also be argued that abstract, metaphorically based references are ideal foundations for collaborative efforts because their flexibility—their semantic value—allows for deliberation and ultimately, more rich knowledge as a product of the collaborative effort. The question becomes one of expedience: syntactic, immediate transfer of fixed meanings, or a semantic, metaphorically based evolving meaning.

When framed as a mediator of literate activity in this study, language (both syntactic and
semantic) most closely functions within the following code categories¹ applied to the elements of data: blatant criticism (intentional, pointed, sometimes sarcastically conveyed), softened criticism, comments or words related to assessment, general writing vocabulary, specific First Year Composition program jargon, improvisation, interaction, listening, general music vocabulary, and Jazz Performance/Jazz Studies jargon. These code categories represent: 1) functional uses of language (e.g., comments or words related to assessment, general writing and music vocabularies, and discipline-specific and program or department-specific jargon from First Year Composition and Jazz ), and 2) phenomenologically and rhetorically situated acts that involve the use of or analysis of language (e.g., criticism, listening, interaction, improvisation), which, in conjunction with one another, form the situated literacies of reading, writing, discussion/demonstration, and interaction in the observed classrooms and learning environments.³

The code categories mentioned above (representing both functional and phenomenological or rhetorical instances of language) indicate that language functions first as a potential facilitator or mediator of collaboration in each of the observed classrooms and learning environments through common vocabularies and activities, or situated literacies. Here, ‘common’ refers to knowledge, activities, or language that are expected or assumed by faculty and/or students based on the master narratives in the process of being created within each of the four observed classrooms and learning spaces during the observation period. These common facilitators of collaboration are further mediated through the means of transmission: verbal language, textual products, and electronic (both visual and aural) communication via computers, projectors, and online spaces such as BlackBoard course shells and websites. It is these situated literacies (and all of their forms) to which members of each discipline either attached fixed
syntactic meanings or flexible, semantic meanings, therefore providing the potential for transfer, translation, or negotiation of knowledge between the separate disciplinary contexts.

Conversely, when examining whether collaboration might connect writing and Jazz through non-linguistic means, it is necessary to attend to three important considerations: first, whether references to or instances of “collaboration” in the data set, including the foundation of collaboration—the situated literacies—refer to a process (process of collaboration or collaborative process—the former indicating a practical function, and the latter indicating a rhetorical concept) or product (e.g., collaborative, collective), second, how the integration of individual and social epistemic roles in literate activity, as discussed by Prior, compares to the observed references to individual and social roles/responsibilities in the First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies classrooms and learning environments, and third, whether, (and if so, how) instances of specific disciplinary knowledge in the data set (e.g., terms, actions/activities, experiences) assist or resist collaboration through non-linguistic means—essentially highlighting how disciplinary boundaries in general may affect collaboration in the research sites. When considering collaboration through the lenses of both process and product, I am inclined to ask, can a heuristic be created for collaboration?

Thom Reilly, associate professor of the University of Nevada Las Vegas School of Social Work, provides this project with a definition of collaboration through the lens of business and social services, as well as specific models—heuristics, per se—that illustrate the specific relationships and responsibilities inherent to what Reilly describes as the process of collaboration. He illustrates a series of steps that individuals in collaborative situations can take to ensure a successful end product, and, as he describes in a discussion of the purposes of collaboration, reach a consensus. Reilly summarizes:
Research on collaborations have suggested that there must be several essential components for the internal operation of a collaborative including: (1) a central purpose that incorporates good timing, a shared vision and a critical need for action; (2) membership that is broad based, able to compromise and effectively represents the respective constituents or affected interests; (3) a structure that has clearly established roles, agreed upon ground rules, open and frequent communication and access to credible information that supports problem-solving; (4) a process that is open, has the buy-in of people in power to support outcomes, allows for interim success, and is able to effectively monitor the group’s progress; and (5) resources that include sufficient funds, entrepreneurial leadership and a skilled facilitator that can effectively guide the group to consensus-based decision-making. (56)

Here, Reilly offers a view of collaboration from the stance of a social researcher as a practical application, and one that is product-focused (therefore directly contrasting Ronald Schleifer’s aforementioned process-focused discussion of collaboration and transdisciplinarity between the sciences and the humanities). This attention to the end product mirrors the situations that collaborators in First Year Composition and Jazz situations—in the case of the observed students: peer review partners, collaborative brainstormers, and participants in “combo” performances) sometimes encounter. However, in the case of practical collaborative efforts, First Year Composition collaborative situations often fall under the product focus, as in collaboration for the purpose of peer review where the goal is the assessment of a product. Conversely, the Jazz students and educators who participated in the study placed more focus on the act of performing—the act of collaborating—rather than on judging the final product (performance). Also key to the inclusion of Reilly’s discussion is its tie to assessment. If, as Reilly offers,
collaboration functions in service of consensus, then assessment naturally becomes the mediating factor in that relationship, as it becomes the means of measuring right or wrong, agreement or disagreement, success or failure—the key elements of determining whether consensus can be reached. Similarly, from the position of this study, consensus played a role in collaborations such as peer review (product focused). However, in the cases where a generative process of brainstorming collaboratively (in First Year Composition) or analyzing a Jazz standard, the collaborative effort was more focused on the process rather than the product—the epistemology and the invention over the “paper” or the “song” itself.

From a broader perspective, we can understand implications for a product/process dichotomy in collaboration through the roles of process, product, and assessment in the observed First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies classrooms and learning environments. The observed Jazz students and faculty were quite familiar with the idea that the song—the product—is rarely played the same way twice, leaving the primary focus of assessment and revision on the process of performing the song. This notion is present in Jazz textbooks and literature, in addition to being articulated in the classroom observation and survey data. For example, data organized under the code category “collaboration as assessment tool” provides an excellent indicator of the function of process in the observed First Year Composition and Jazz environments; for example, from faculty participant David's learning environment:

Speaker 1: “Play it with me—one, two, three, four”
*Saxophones playing together*

Speaker 1: “Right, so did you breathe?”

Speaker 2: “Yeah…”

Speaker 1: “All right.” “One, two, three, four…”
*Saxophones playing together*

Here, the two students demonstrated the ideal way to perform a specific etude and assessed performance proficiency by playing the etude collaboratively. Similarly, collaborative assessment efforts took place in the form of peer review activities in the observed First Year Composition classrooms; for example, from faculty participant “Robert’s” classroom:

Speaker 1: “While the people are looking through, can somebody who has the works cited page please come up? Who has the works cited page with even no correction on it or you recognize what the correction should be? Can you bring that up. Also you get tons of points if you bring one up that you don't know what you were corrected on and put that up.” . . .

Speaker 3: “One that's correct you said?”

Speaker 1: “Or one that you'd like to get some help from other people on.”

Despite the presence of process-focused activities, however, many of the comments and discussions (student to student, and student to instructor) in the observed First Year Composition courses still revolved around the assessment of the final draft of students’ essays (e.g., “So did I fail this paper?”; “Just give me the grade.”; “Your final grade is made up of essay 1, essay 2, the proposal, the source analysis, and the research paper.”), indicating that even though the instructors highlighted the process of writing by requiring multiple drafts of essays and by facilitating both individual and collaborative pre-writing activities, the individually produced, high-stakes “final draft” product assessment clearly outweighed the value of individual and collaborative process-focused activities—an assessment practice that may need attention or alteration for transdisciplinarity and collaboration to be successful in the observed classrooms and learning environments.

It is important to recall that the observed First Year Composition instructors were
working within a program of standardized curriculum and community-based assessment, and therefore could not make large alterations to their courses’ assessment practices. However, when responding to the faculty survey question that asked: “If you were tasked with designing a collegiate or professional writing course or learning situation, what are the most important elements, techniques, or lessons that you would include?”, one First Year Composition instructor answered: “Having a real audience, creating a solid community of writers where peer review isn't seen as busy work, writing for something beyond a grade (for me, that would be having a service learning class), and having time to really discuss topics as opposed to teach[ing] a formula pushed by the program/department.” Essentially, assessment drives the focus on product in the observed First Year Composition courses, but it does not account for all of the features of the process/product dichotomy between Jazz and First Year Composition learning environments.

A suggestion for mediating difference between process-based Jazz initiatives and product-based writing initiatives, then, is to consider collaboration through the lens of performance, or a performative act, because performative collaboration depends upon and balances both process and product, and assists in blurring the product/process dichotomy. For example, Jazz itself is both created by and is a creator of performative acts—collaborative acts that weave an immediate and original context that both is performed physically (phenomenologically) and performs rhetorically by delivering musically based perlocution. Both of these actions are carried out by actors who must collaborate in an immediate and methodical-yet-improvised manner in order to create the product that is new knowledge—new music. This serves, in turn, as an excellent model for discussing a process of collaboration in the writing classroom—writing as a means to and result of collaboration that is performed in the classical sense of delivery and is performative in the sense that, “It produces or transforms a situation, it
effects,” which gives an appropriate ‘nod’ to the positive understanding of academic writing as a rhetorical, performed and performative, and a creative act (Derrida 13). Addressing collaboration-as-performance, we can see that delivery is a critical component in the act of collaboration and its products that connects writing and Jazz contexts; ideally, in both of these disciplinary contexts, collaborators arrange and deliver a unified argument from a united effort, necessarily considering the audience in the course of arrangement and delivery. Collaborators must understand that theoretically, two audiences are at hand: the recipient(s) of the end product, and the collaborative process participants themselves. Thus, multiple arguments are contained within a collaborative effort, one of which will be performed for the end recipient, and many that are performed for the collaborators, by the collaborators. Because the united collaborative effort encompasses multiple arguments—multiple contributions—the act of collaboration is then performative, as it transforms both the language of the collaborators (in the sense that products of blending individual collaborator’s voices and knowledge range from brainstorming to unified arguments) and the collaborators themselves (a blending of individual and social roles and responsibilities).

Rhetorically, this discussion additionally approaches how each individual functions within the dynamic or dialogue—does the individual have the power or capacity to open, alter, or otherwise change the dynamic, or does that power, per se, fall to the group or the collaborative effort. Contained within this question is also the sub-question of who contributes to the establishment and maintenance of a collaborative relationship—the individual or the group? (e.g., does collaboration happen because each individual decides to participate and uphold the collaborative effort, or is it the group dynamic that changes the ethos, changes the climate, and therefore creates a potentially collaborative space?) If the latter is the case, then I naturally have
to question, what element or elements of this group ethos are different from the multiple individual perspectives and/or influences? What changes when multiple individuals become a group, and especially, collaborators? Examination of these questions begins with a consideration of the collaborative environment—the rhetorical and the physical environment—as collaboration in writing and Jazz (both inside and outside of the academy) carry similar gendered, political, and cultural motives that ultimately determine how the collaborative relationships function. For example, does a hierarchy exist in Jazz “combo” performances—do certain performers take a lead role outside of solo improvisational moments—and what effect does assigned collaboration as in the case of the observed First Year Composition peer review efforts have on the group ethos?

Regarding the numerous responsibilities of performance in the classroom and to collaboration, Keith Dorwick, Bob Mayberry, Paul M. Puccio, and Joonna Smitherman Trapp (Remembering the Ghosts of Collaboration) note:

Teachers and scholars in the field of composition and rhetoric have a vast body of work that tells us that part of our job is to move our students to be performers of the rhetorics they learn. Among others Kathleen Welch, in particular, talks about ‘critical performance’ and ‘production.’ She says, ‘In the functions of memory and delivery reside many issues of culture, ideology, society, and the construction of public and private lives’. Jenn Fishman et al. further argue that interrogating the intersection of writing/rhetoric and performance will advance our disciplinary understanding and development: a ‘focus on performance locates textual exchange in specific sites; it makes delivery interactive; and it turns the idea of audience into something concrete and participatory’ (1).
The understanding of the audience as ‘participatory’ and of the collaborators as performers, initiating ‘interactive’ delivery is precisely what connects collaboration in writing and Jazz, inside and outside of the academy. Consequently, the manner in which we connect this understanding of collaboration-as-performance to the literate activity inherent to both academic disciplines and individual classrooms and learning spaces requires a more focused question: What outcomes of the individual or the collaborative/group epistemological process do students and faculty members within the observed classrooms and learning environments value? According to the survey response data, participants mentioned, “contributing to the dialogue,” “creating a solid community of writers, “writing for something beyond a grade,” “to work together and compromise” as ideal elements or outcomes of a course, or the specific roles of individuals or groups in the acts of writing or performing music.

This more refined focus on values addressed not only the role that the individual and the group plays (or played) within collaborative or social interactions within First Year Composition and Jazz Performance/Jazz Studies classrooms and learning environments, but most importantly, it addressed the climate (rhetorical and social) surrounding the individual and the group in these environments, for example, what it means to be an individual faculty or student participant and what is expected of individual participants in these situations, and the same takes place for the group or social role. These considerations facilitate a return to Prior; an important consideration within the complex concept of literate activity is Karen LeFevre’s discussion of invention as a social construct. Her focus on a global concept of invention, which Prior describes as, “a diffuse social process of meaning making rather than [a] bounded focal activity linked directly to transcription of a particular text [that] . . . bears obvious relations to the earlier discussion of writing as dispersed in literate activity” (Prior 154). Specifically, Prior highlights three
‘categories of participation’ from LeFevre’s discussion of invention in which she provides a hierarchy of interaction—levels of social interaction that facilitate invention. (Prior 155) Of these three categories, ‘inventing by interaction’ most frequently occurred in the observed First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies classrooms and learning environments. In these situations, students and instructors most frequently interacted collaboratively in the act of providing assistance or peer review, as in the case of these transcribed conversations and comments from faculty participant ‘David’s learning environment:

“Student(female): Yes. I think he has finesse, but I’m talking about a different type of graceful—like a plie, like, Jim is a plie, and Cannonball is more like a step—you know, I don’t know… *(concurrently, David: yeah.) Like, his playing is a lot more smooth and I would say legato, maybe—I don’t know if that’s the right term to say, but… *(Concurrently, David: uh huh. Yeah.)*

Student(male): I would say the way she… I remember that… *(concurrently:

Student(female): She was harsh.) Yeah! I agree. *(concurrently, student(female): She understood, too, because at one point she said to me “Oh, I see it’s a lot smoother or graceful.” She said something like that; I can’t remember exactly what she said though…

David: Okay. Um. I thought I saw some of you guys taking notes—maybe you were just writing your grocery lists, but uh, any comments from you guys?

Student(male): Uh, I guess the only thing would be like if you’re going to do an etude like this, like I was getting that the etude had a specific historical context, like it was All of Me, like it was the Basie version of All of Me, and when Jim was playing, he was playing in that style, like he was playing with vibrato like a lead alto player would,

*(concurrently, David: yeah, good!) and he was leaning back in a certain way, so I think
it would be important to mention that specific context, and maybe hipper to the recording, like the original All of Me recording.”

However, LeFevre’s second category, ‘joint invention,’ that involves multiple authorship was also noted in the course of the approximately month-long observation timetable in the First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies locations. The following transcribed example from First Year Composition took place on February 28, 2011, (outside of the March 14-18, 2011 data that is the basis for identifying situated literacies in the observed sites) but is relevant in this context because they illustrate joint invention in First Year Composition and Jazz contexts exactly.

“Amanda: Okay, so let’s go to the discussion board. . . . So first thing I want you to do—I want you to come up with a list of your five favorite things. . . . What I’d like us all to do—I’d like us to go to [student’s name] list. [Student’s name], do you mind? [Student]: No . . .

Amanda: . . . Let’s look at [student’s name] list. Okay, so [student’s name] you put down my cell phone, music, concerts, and the beach. Those are some good favorite things, right, a few of your favorite things. Okay, so now let’s take these ideas and let’s see if we can get anywhere with them in terms of the research paper. Because here’s what we’ve got to remember—it has to be argumentative; that’s one part of this, and it also has to be 6-8 pages long, so you gotta be able to sustain an argument. Some of our favorite things won’t take us that far. Some of them can—it’s all a matter of how we can break them down, so let’s take a look at [student’s name] list here. So we can figure—we can apply her list to ours and we can help break it down. So I’m just going to open up an empty Word document here right now, and we’re just going to put this in there. Put
As this exercise progressed, the students were instructed to compose a collaborative document through BlackBoard and Microsoft Word that assisted in brainstorming arguments for their research essays. LeFevre thus presents us with specific rhetorical conditions for participation, which assist in illustrating how the relationship of practical (and localized) situated literacies and the individual and social collaborative roles in the observed classrooms are represented in the concept of collaboration-as-performance. Additionally, this focus on values illustrates where and how disciplinary knowledge (often located within situated literacies and, it follows, literate activity) affects the rhetorical motives for and practical execution of collaboration.

Within this context, it is important to recall how the performance of Jazz (within the bounds of a small combo performance) is a rhetorical act—a dance among communicators in which they generate new knowledge—new music, individually and socially through immediate invention (executed through improvisation), interaction, aurality, and voice. This act, this rhetorical function, presents an argument or a demonstration of codified interpersonal relationships that operate within a framework outlined in the music theory—the vocabulary—yet carried out in a manner that is largely improvised, generative, and epistemological. The result of this demonstration is a performance that speaks to how the group of musicians—the collaborative effort described by Reilly—interpret and subsequently re-inscribe, re-interpret, or simply add to the extant cultural narratives attached to the pieces they perform collaboratively—through collaboration as a practical process and rhetorical performance. Please consider this practical illustration of the aforementioned concepts: each Jazz soloist or collaborative (combo) that plays the standard “How High the Moon” subsequently adds its own personal and cultural ‘touches’ to the piece through style, interpretation, and execution, much like a writer will bring
his or her values and culture to an individual or collaborative writing effort. The topic or “standard” is therefore subject to the narratives carried by its performers (language, individual and social ethos, and disciplinary knowledge) and the “tools” with which they execute it (situated literacies). Looking back to Ronald Schleifer’s statement quoted at the beginning of this chapter “…knowledge in one discipline does not necessarily—and, in fact cannot—constitute knowledge in a different discipline” through the lens of literate activity and the specific situated literacies at work in the observed First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies classrooms and learning environments, I must disagree to a point. (Schleifer 439) While specific disciplinary knowledge—here, we might consider elements of music theory such as chord progressions, and aspects of English grammar such as the specific uses for semicolons—may not easily transfer into other disciplines’ contexts in meaningful ways, framing knowledge (even disciplinary knowledge) within the bounds of literate activity—a representation of all that comprises “cultural forms of life saturated with textuality,” and the specific situated literacies such as reading, listening, writing, discussion/demonstration, interaction, research, and playing an instrument or singing that represent observed, practical vehicles for making and communicating knowledge in the participants’ classrooms and learning environments, provides a means toward transdisciplinarity and meaningful epistemological efforts.

Within the scope of literate activity, this focus on the social epistemic environment and collaboration-as-performance speaks to a generalizable understanding of the climate surrounding the roles of the individual and the group in the collaborative setting or collaborative process that, when combined with an understanding of the specific situated literacies through which students and instructors of both First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies create and articulate knowledge, points to a direct means for creating specific transdisciplinary
collaborative opportunities between students within the academy. Taking this practical approach, chapter five will carry this discussion of the social epistemic environment and the concept of collaboration-as-performance into an analysis of how this rhetorical understanding of collaboration and the means by which it connects the seemingly disparate disciplines of Jazz and First Year Composition might function within organized Writing Across the Curriculum/Writing in the Disciplines and Interdisciplinary Studies programs through a “re-harmonization” of the progymnasmata, and additionally, how the concept can facilitate transdisciplinary collaborative efforts in academic environments that do not engage in WAC/WID or “Interdisciplinary Studies” frameworks. Last, chapter five will present in detail the future directions for the research study that became the foundation of this dissertation project.


2 These categories appear in the full code book in chapter three.

3 Please recall that specific descriptions of the codes and their functions within the observed environments can be found in chapter three.
CHAPTER FIVE: RETRO CAN BE “COOL, TOO:” TRANSDISCIPLINARITY IN ACTION

“Writing may be a little retro, but that’s cool, too. That’s why people still wear bell-bottom jeans. You can always squeeze something out of the past and make it become new.”

—Paul “DJ Spooky That Subliminal Kid” D. Miller

Writing as a technology might be “retro” in light of our digitally networked culture, but our purposes for writing—knowledge making, argument, performance, conveying emotion—and the means through which we execute them are refreshed every time a scholar-performer asks a simple question: “How can we do this differently?” It’s not that writing needs to change or that our motives for it need to change; it’s that we should want them to change—we should want to re-harmonize the sound, to remix the theory and the pedagogy until we think about our disciplines and their products in different ways, because that’s what we love. That’s what we do. This is more than pulling bell bottoms out of the attic and re-naming them flares.

Writing and composition become new because we riff off of one another—in this case, Jazz metaphors to literate activity, to situated literacies and collaboration in the hopes of benefiting real scholarship, real people, real compositions. Real, tangible change. We may also think of collaboration as a product of those successful transgressions—those moves toward change. To this end, the concepts of transdisciplinarity and collaboration, both in the context of research and the instruction of collaborative writing, function as important gateways within our current approaches to teaching and researching within the field of Rhetoric and Composition, especially as we search for new pathways into research and pedagogy influenced and facilitated by other disciplines. This is precisely why in the midst of the larger call for border crossing,
collaboration and interdisciplinary studies (illustrated by the proliferation of WAC, WiD, and Interdisciplinary undergraduate programs, and most recently in the CCCC 2013 focus on writing and public works—intersections between academic writing and the public sphere, and a renewed focus on developmental writing) that this project answers, I would like to stress the need for disciplinarity—the need for fixed communities with boundaries (albeit boundaries that are most often friendly).

Disciplines shape our scholarly, professional, and personal identities: I am a writer, I am a musician, I am a Jazz musician, I am a rhetorician, I specialize in First-Year Composition. (Say that three times fast.) And while these features of our individual identities could easily serve to segregate us (I do this, therefore I don’t do that), in the context of collaborative composition efforts—collaborative knowledge making—it is precisely these disciplined features of our identities that provide an initial framework for the effort. Without specialties and disciplinarity, the problem of where to start and who can contribute specific elements—specific knowledge—to the composition process, has the potential to halt the endeavor before it begins. Collaboration and collaborative composition, whether within or outside of the academy, require disciplinarity and anti-disciplinarity, and all of the trans, inter, and multi-disciplinarities in between, in the aspect that collaborators need to be confident in and reflective of their own roles, language, and disciplinary knowledge—their own literate activity in relation to that of their disciplines and others—in order to contribute those facilities to a collaborative initiative and ultimately, to think beyond them as the collaborative performance moves forward. The point is that we have to first be disciplined in order to be anti-, trans-, inter-, and/or multidisciplinary. (Kristensen and Claycomb 2-3) Where we simply cannot get hung up is, through disciplinarity, who should contribute—who has the authority, or whose contributions are valid—in the collaborative effort.
Foucault illustrates in *Discipline and Punish* the habituation, the discipline of individuals through various systems of organization—time, space, force—all predicated upon adherence to the established hierarchy, upon obedience to a central authority. (Foucault 135-69, Kristensen and Claycomb 2-3) This understanding of discipline toward the goal of standardizing, “normalizing,” and containing the individual is one that understandably influenced contemporary anti-disciplinary sentiments. However, habituation—through routines, enculturation, and acculturation—serves a positive, yet complicated purpose in contemporary approaches to collaborative composition, especially in the case of transdisciplinary collaboration at the undergraduate level.

Kristensen, Claycomb, and numerous other Rhetoric and Composition, and Cultural Studies scholars argue that disciplinary enculturation most frequently (and most completely) occurs at the graduate level, and that depending on the course of study within the particular academic environment, First Year Composition students have significant potential to enter, navigate, and to benefit from transdisciplinary environments or activities prior to becoming fully involved in a particular discipline’s culture—a position that Kristensen and Claycomb describe as “pre-disciplinary.” (2-3) This discussion applies directly to the situated literacies and transdisciplinary collaboration initiatives addressed in this project because it asks of the project: are the “target” students in disciplinary limbo, theoretically non-encultured, and dare I say it, undisciplined, or does disciplinarity reside in the literacies that students and faculty members use on a regular basis in the act of making and transmitting knowledge. I would argue, based on this study’s illustration of literate activity mediated by language, individual and social roles and responsibilities, disciplinary knowledge, and finally tangible situated literacies, that the latter is true, at least of the observed classrooms and learning environments within the particular
Disciplinarity, according to this study, lies in both the specific means by which individuals or collaborative groups produce and articulate knowledge, and in the established disciplinary boundaries and scholarship inherent to, specifically here, Jazz/Music and First Year Composition/English. Specifically addressing the study’s research questions in this context, language mediates collaboration in the observed classrooms and learning environments at the level of shared situated literacies such as reading, writing, and discussion/demonstration, and in a broader context through interaction, invention, and imitation. However, collaboration is not dependent entirely upon shared language—shared situated literacies, when framed within the concept of collaboration-as-performance and situated in a focus on the collaborative process rather than a collaborative product—in both execution and assessment. Finally, disciplinarity is contained within the act of balancing academic habituation (in the form of analysis, research, and listening in the observed classrooms and learning environments) with personal experience.

Understanding the transdisciplinary positioning of this project and its effect on the practical applications for, and future directions of this line of inquiry, I would like to address some of the discourse surrounding disciplinary programs in the academy from the position of Rhetoric and Composition, because in order to play it, you’ve got to get yourself into the tune—you have to feel where it comes from. Studies produced and/or edited by the following authors provided a useful picture of how writers and writing instructors have navigated disciplinarity in the context of writing instruction: Young and Fulwiler (Writing Across the Disciplines), Rebecca Nowacek (Agents of Integration), Paul Prior (Writing/Disciplinarity), Thaiss and Myers Zawacki (Engaged Writers, Dynamic Disciplines), Dean and O’Neill (Writing in the Disciplines), and Kristensen and Claycomb (Writing against the Curriculum). Ultimately, reviewing the
aforementioned studies both produced and referenced by the authors above highlighted three significant concerns surrounding writing instruction in the United States and abroad that relate directly to this project’s goals:

1) The issue of writing instructors’ (experienced writers) inability to pass on the tacit processes of, or knowledge regarding writing that we have gained (and possibly take for granted) through many years of practice. Essentially, we have difficulty in articulating exactly how we do what we do, when engaging in the (our) process(es) of writing.

2) The issue of authority and expertise in and between disciplines:

This expert/non-expert dichotomy sometimes precludes us from having to think about the first issue presented here—whether we are actually presenting all of our writing expertise, because in the act of accepting us as writing authorities (in the sense of authorities on writing and writing assessors), our students sometimes accept the knowledge we present without question. Additionally, this issue of expertise revolves largely around Writing in the Disciplines initiatives, because a goal of this particular program design places the responsibility of writing mentoring within individual academic disciplines, where students work with disciplinary experts, on disciplinary subject matter, rather than with professional writing instructor-scholars. For example, Bhagat and O’Neill argue that, ‘elitist approaches to ‘acculturation’ into disciplinary academic writing are no longer tenable; and teaching generic—and decontextualised—‘study skills’ en masse is inappropriate and insufficient. Rather, [they] insist . . . that it is the disciplinary/subject specialist who is responsible for enabling students to understand and deploy disciplinary knowledge through a praxis that takes responsibility for and embraces writing as much as it does designing, making, and producing” (Dean and O’Neill 176). Bhagat and O’Neill
clearly articulate a central problem in disciplinarity, writing instruction, and collaboration: the lack of a tenable middle ground between elitist specialized knowledge and overly generalized First Year Composition curricula, which is also a particular problem for curriculum designers attempting to choose between a WAC framework where writing specialists are responsible for writing instruction but are not always experts in all of the disciplinary subject matter covered in the course, or a WiD initiative that carries with it the issues described above by Bhagat and O’Neill. Naturally, WAC and WiD programs are not the only available choices, but the contributors to Dean and O’Neill’s edition clearly illustrate that WAC and WiD programs, and some of their offshoots, are widely incorporated in American, British, and Australian systems of higher education, and provide tested alternatives to general First Year Composition programs.

3) Presenting course material and writing projects that students find relevant and interesting:
A major criticism of generalized First Year Composition courses and in some cases, Writing Across the Curriculum initiatives, presents the issue of writing course subject matter failing to be relevant to students’ interests. For example, the students observed in the Midwestern university First Year Composition classrooms at the heart of this study hailed from multiple major fields of study, and also included undecided majors\(^1\); therefore it was potentially difficult for instructors of these general First Year Composition courses to provide material and discussions that were relevant to all of the possible academic majors represented in their classrooms. A positive attribute of this academic diversity, however, both in the observed classrooms and learning environments and in the more general context of First Year Composition instruction, is that students can use their disciplinary expertise in collaborative initiatives within the classroom where familiarity and even unfamiliarity with the current subject material can be productive. For
example, in a WAC based writing classroom, political science majors could collaborate with students of other majors in political science related units to facilitate diverse arguments on the subject matter. Similarly, the same political science majors could collaborate with the instructor in the development of a writing assignment for a sociopolitical writing unit, thus combining their disciplinary expertise with that of the writing instructor.

These cases, naturally, would not be perfect—we question how much “disciplinary expertise” first or second year disciplinary students have in their major fields of study, but it’s a start. The important consideration, here, is that maintaining disciplinary content as the foundation of collaborative efforts can be just as problematic as generalized First Year Composition on one end of the spectrum and WiD initiatives on the other, because of the inherent expert/non-expert dichotomy and the problem of relevance. This is where a focus on literate activity and specifically, the situated literacies that individual students use regularly in the course of navigating their work, can mediate the First Year Composition/ WAC and WiD dichotomy by focusing on functional literacies in action rather than entirely on disciplinary content. Collaborative composition is action-based; therefore focusing on active situated literacies rather than content—discussing how individuals use writing, reading, listening, and demonstration in their disciplines—opens the door for better communication between collaborators by promoting an awareness of process and performance.

Having identified potential means to transdisciplinary collaboration (and in this case, disciplinarity) in the form of situated literacies in the observed First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies classrooms and learning environments through data analysis and framing the results within Paul Prior’s concept of literate activity, I would like to conclude this dissertation project by offering a future line of inquiry and pedagogical goals. First, I would like
to focus energy on including locating instruction of and opportunities for transdisciplinary collaboration in the research sites at the specific Midwestern university in which the study took place, and then more broadly to undergraduate learning environments including traditional Writing Across the Curriculum, Writing in the Disciplines, and Interdisciplinary studies programs. These pedagogical considerations are based on the potential of situated literacies as vehicles of transdisciplinary collaboration, and will take into consideration the three concerns with general First Year Composition and WAC and WiD initiatives articulated earlier in this chapter.

Although writing (here, textual, transcription…) and written products have long been the focus of First Year Composition programs, given the well-established technological foundation within the contemporary academy and more locally, the field of Rhetoric and Composition’s commitment to multimodality, transdisciplinary collaborative efforts and transdisciplinary composition programs need not maintain writing as the locus of composition, as many have argued. Rather, I would like to offer a move back—a re-examination and a re-mixing of the classical modalities of Invention and Delivery, and of the progymnasmata, toward locating argument and performance as the central features of the collaborative initiative, supported by multimodal and computer mediated means of delivery. This focus on argument and performance accommodates the creative, rhetorical, performing and performative goals of collaboration, in addition to, on a local level, accommodating the situated literacies inherent to the observed First Year Composition and Jazz classrooms and learning environments. Let’s start with a vamp.²

Habituation—the concept behind Roman writing instruction—plays a key role in current methods of Jazz performance and instruction as it also continues to influence writing instruction in the academy. Necessary for the context of this project, however, is the question of how
instances of habituation both in current Jazz and writing instruction, might improve collaborative composition efforts, especially in the transdisciplinary sense. Currently, habituation appears in wider conversations about composition and Jazz, especially in the community based Jazz instruction described by Paul Berliner. Jazz wasn’t learned in classrooms or in recording studios; it was learned in hotel room jam sessions, in one-on-one conversations, and by going out and listening to other players before going home and shedding what you heard. In contemporary academic situations facilitated by the wealth of recorded Jazz, transcription (here, related to mimesis and transliteration) is a popular means of learning by listening—one that is more accurate than trying to remember and re-create what you heard live. Transcribing a recording gives the musician the liberty to back up and listen again, but an equally valid argument insists that imitating the live performance by memory required (or requires—some still do it that way) and eventually facilitates a far sharper memory. (Berliner) This combination of listening and playing (or from the writing perspective, listening and writing) makes use of mimesis, memory and delivery toward the ultimate goal of facility—of habit; constructing a toolbox of vocabulary that a writer or musician can draw from without hesitation, immediately and accurately.

Consequently, habituation of this type occurred in the observed First Year Composition classrooms through the assignment of multiple drafts of the same project, and especially through the design of the argumentative assignments—thesis based approaches. For example, the larger composition program housing the individually observed First Year Composition course sections maintains a fairly standardized set of writing assignments based in specific types of arguments. The structure of these assignments therefore guides students to write arguments within specific designs, therefore habituating them in the act of writing specific types of arguments. This fairly standardized approach benefits potential collaborative composition efforts between the observed
First Year Composition and Jazz students by providing a stable knowledge base grounded in a university course requirement, meaning even the observed Jazz students, depending on their individual progression through the university’s core general education courses, could have already taken part in the First Year Composition program and therefore have facility with the argumentative framework—shared knowledge with current observed First Year Composition students that builds upon the situated literacies present in each of the classrooms and learning environments. Habituation—vamping, transcribing, drafting—is therefore a key first step in getting ideas on paper or getting a sound out, and given the complex nature of a collaborative effort—negotiating individual and social roles, multiple voices and experiences, multiple goals—the ability for each writer or player to draw quickly and accurately from a comfortable knowledge base is absolutely necessary. However, promoting habituation as a contemporary foundation of collaborative efforts requires a deeper look into negotiating individual and social perspectives.

The Roman (and sometimes current) facilitation of habituation focused largely on the individual writer, writing in an individual setting, and this is where Jazz performance concepts—largely dependent upon collaboration—potentially assist collaborative composition through habituation and performance: the means by which individual musicians habituate themselves by acquiring and using tools such as vocabulary (in this sense, specific musical concepts that function much like words and phrases in language), arrangement, and delivery before applying them in a collaborative setting by listening and responding to the statements (or musical phrases) of their fellow collaborators. In this context, although writing remained a central medium in the Roman system, contemporary understandings of writing as multimodal and tied into visual and aural media allow for the more seamless blending of habituation in Jazz and writing.
circumstances. Consequently, elements of the Roman system described by James Murphy that appear specifically in Jazz performance include the *precept*: Invention, Arrangement, Style, Memory, and Delivery; and *imitation*, with a specific (and contemporary) emphasis on reading aloud (“sight reading” in musical terms), transliteration (comparable with *transcription* in music, where one listens to a musical idea and first determines exactly what notes and rhythms comprise the original before learning to play it exactly on one’s own instrument, which may be different from the original instrumentation), and recitation and correction of a paraphrase or transliteration. Finally, of the progymnasmata, the most relevant exercises to contemporary Jazz instruction include retelling a fable, retelling an episode, amplification, comparison, impersonation, description, and thesis, or argument. (Here, thesis operates in Jazz on theoretical rather than entirely practical terms, but remains an important element in the habituation of Jazz musicians. For example, a Jazz musician theoretically makes an argument for a specific, personal arrangement of a Jazz standard through the processes of transliteration and finally performance of the new arrangement.) Most importantly, the situated literacies observed in the First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies classrooms and learning environments are what will immediately connect the re-mixed aspects of Roman writing instruction to collaboration, transdisciplinary collaboration, and the observed classrooms and learning environments. Therefore, in order to model the relationships of literate activity, language, individual and social ethos, disciplinary knowledge, and situated literacies that this project identified, I would like to turn to the progymnasmata as a pedagogical foundation.

Progymnasmata Re-harmonized: Facilitating collaboration in and between the observed First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies environments.
As discussed in chapter four, the overlapping or shared situated literacies between the observed First Year Composition and Jazz environments included reading, writing, discussion/demonstration, and interaction. Because these literacies are common—expected knowledge or activities—in the observed classrooms and learning environments, they represent practical (e.g. non-metaphorical) means to knowledge making and knowledge sharing within and between the observed environments. However, finding means to collaboration is not enough; First Year Composition and Jazz instructors and students need reasons for engaging in transdisciplinary collaboration: the “why” and “how.” Considering this goal within the scope of the research site(s), I would like first to construct the framework for specific transdisciplinary collaborative exercises that bring together the aforementioned shared situated literacies, in addition to research, listening, and improvisation, toward the goal of successful collaboration (and collaborative end-products) between Jazz and First Year Composition students.

Beginning with a seminar (as that is the format best represented by the scope of the data) facilitated by First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies faculty and students who volunteer to take a lead role, this effort will focus on the situated literacies of writing, reading, interaction, and demonstration, actively engaging collaborators (students and faculty) in discussions of how the situated literacies present opportunities for creating and presenting knowledge within and between First Year Composition and Jazz contexts. Because we know that the situated literacies build into the larger literate activity including language, individual and social ethos, and disciplinary knowledge, these factors serve as organizational frames for discussions about the situated literacies within the workshop.

As I discussed earlier, Jazz instruction, both past and present, academic and community based, often makes use of the Roman concepts of precept and imitation. These facilities assist in
developing the vocabularies that Jazz performers draw from during the course of their performances—both in moments of improvisation and performance of established “heads” or melodies. While the rhetorical elements contained within precept and the exercises within imitation provide excellent general spaces for student development of writing and performance within and between First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies, the narrowed, more focused exercises of the progymnasmata, aimed immediately at the development of writing and rhetorical skills, provide this project with a means of connecting writers and Jazz performers at the Midwestern university research site with specific activities that encourage a blending of their respective writing and musical skills, under the umbrella of collaboration as a means of performance.

Sharon Crowley and Debra Hawhee provide a concise description of the progymnasmata’s contribution to current pedagogy, which I quote from an earlier seminar paper of mine: Specifically, “the progymnasmata brought to the students’ attention patterns in language;” these patterns, articulated through the aforementioned concepts, translate forward into a contemporary understanding of the patterns of rhythm in both music and sentence structure. (Crowley and Hawhee 28) Again, exercises within the progymnasmata serve as an excellent framework for creating contemporary performance exercises because both disciplines—First Year Composition and Jazz—share classical rhetoric as a foundation of their respective disciplines. Specifically, then, I propose remixing—re-harmonizing—six relevant progymnasmata exercises of the twelve described by James Murphy in the second edition of *A Short History of Writing Instruction*, framed within the corresponding elements of precept and imitation, as a means of facilitating collaborative composition between First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies students at the Midwestern university research site. These
specific exercise models contained within the Writing/Jazz seminar provide frameworks for composition activities that facilitators can re-work to meet the needs of participants.

“Tales” or “Retelling an episode from a poet or historian”

Composition projects from this category habituate the First Year Composition and Jazz students through reading and re-reading (and/or listening to) key works from selected genres and subject areas noted for their historical value, which have been selected from a list compiled in advance by participating faculty members from First Year Composition and Jazz who are experienced in the important works of their fields. Next, students will come together in interactive, collaborative groups or pairs (that must include equal membership of First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies students) to analyze and discuss the reading and listening examples, identifying aspects of the examples that members of the collaborative effort would like to incorporate into the final composition. Last, collaborators will compose a multimodal project that casts the original reading and/or listening examples in a new light—whether that includes performing a dramatic scene, an oratory based on an article or short story or performing a Jazz standard, or, entirely rewrites an existing dramatic scene, article, short story, or Jazz standard toward the goal of re-shaping it to fit the experiences of the student composers or a contemporary cultural perspective. Collaborators should perform their compositions through non-traditional, non-familiar means, meaning that where First Year Composition students might be accustomed to producing typed or handwritten, two-dimensional compositions and Jazz performance students might be accustomed to performing their compositions through musical instruments or voices, collaborators will need to incorporate multiple elements in the production of their compositions—aural (recorded or live), visual (including video or graphic art), speech (recorded
or live), and textual modes.

“Proverb” or “Amplification of an aphorism or proverb”

Rather than focusing on a classical aphorism or proverb, a transdisciplinary revision of this exercise featuring writing and Jazz will have collaborative groups comprised of both First Year Composition and Jazz students research target Jazz standards, articles, works of visual art, short stories, or examples of personal writing such as blogs or autobiographies. Having amassed sufficient background on their target work to feel comfortable with its significance and rhetorical purpose, the collaborators should select a theme, statement, or general sentiment from their target piece and amplify it by composing a response (praise, opposition, or contrafact [in Jazz, composing a new melody over an existing standard’s chord progression and form]). Multimodal compositions are optional for exercises of this type, but the final products’ media should be representative of the collaborators’ voices. Exercises involving amplification situate easily within both writing and Jazz contexts, as collaborators—performers—rely on their vocabularies (not just words, but “a range of artistic or stylistic forms, techniques, or movements”), invention, interaction, and larger literate activity (including disciplinary knowledge)—elements discussed in previous chapters as key elements of both argument and Jazz performance.

“Description” and “Comparison”

Exercises based in description and comparison begin with students working independently; the participants should reflect individually on what writing or music means to them—why they write or perform music, what they are passionate about, what aspects of those chosen (or assigned) routes are difficult—and write a vivid description of their experience with writing or music.
Participants will then collaborate with one or more individuals from the opposite academic discipline, share their individual descriptions, and then collaboratively write a comparison of the collaborators’ experiences between the two disciplines, therefore identifying points of intersection between their personal and disciplinary experiences.

“Impersonation”

Exercises based in impersonation require individual work, as these activities prepare the participants for collaborative work by creating an awareness of the writer’s or Jazz musician’s individual process of composition, working from the concept that impersonating a respected writer or performer’s style, tone, and technique can add to the participant’s vocabulary through an analysis of “expert” writing or performance. For Jazz students, these exercises entail transcribing a Jazz standard, playing it exactly as the original artist did, down to the smallest articulation, which requires proficiency in the situated literacies of listening and writing (including musical notation). Similarly, First Year Composition students should select a portion of a written work (poem, short story, article, etc.) and write their own theme, imitating the original author’s style, vocabulary, and tone to the smallest articulation, therefore requiring proficiency in the situated literacies of reading and writing. Should First Year Composition students wish to “listen” to the sentence structure they are imitating, sentences can be coded for rhythm—a technique that I first introduced in a seminar paper titled “The Rhetoric of Rhythm: Imitation and Progymnasmata from Conservatory to Classroom.” “The method has two rules: 1) each word receives one clap (not each syllable, but each word as a whole unit) and 2) each piece of punctuation within the sentence . . . receives one foot stomp.” . . . Next, “label each word with a vertical line ( | ) and each punctuation mark with a dot.” Finally, “clap the vertical
lines and stomp the dots.” (Petrosino) The result of coding sentences in this manner is a rhythmic representation of the sentence structure that writers can hear and feel—better connecting them to the experience that Jazz musician have when listening to learn.

“Thesis”

Thesis represents the culminating projects of the seminar—multimodally composed, collaborative arguments that may be performed or presented in any number or combination of media from text to music. These arguments combine the situated literacies with the larger literate activity that took place in the observed First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies classrooms and learning environments. Collaborators should make use of computer technology when composing these larger projects in order to take full advantage of combining digital video, graphic, textual, and audio media with acoustic media such as musical instruments or voices.

In light of the composition frameworks above, I would like to attend to some additional logistics of, and particular challenges to, transdisciplinary collaboration in this localized context. First, the First Year Composition program from which I observed individual classes is built upon a standardized curriculum with program-wide, community based end-of-term portfolio assessment. Full-time instructors (like my study participants) and graduate assistants alike must teach from the same syllabus templates, and have a small selection of approved textbooks, handbooks, and other approved materials from which to instruct their courses. This standardized environment is beneficial to setting up discipline-specific collaborative efforts because instructors’ courses will largely cover the same material at approximately the same time in the semester, and may also be beneficial in setting up transdisciplinary collaborative efforts because
of the previously mentioned predictability with course content, assignments, and timing. In the case of transdisciplinary collaboration in this localized context, logistically, one half of the equation, per se, would be predictable.

However, given the prior discussion of the means by which habituation and elements of the Roman system appear in Jazz performance and instruction, it is crucial to recall James Murphy’s reminder that, “Perhaps the most important aspect of these methods is their coordination into a single instructional program. Each is important for itself, but takes greater importance from its place within the whole” (Murphy 78). Although the Roman system of writing instruction and the art of Jazz performance are historically most valuable as a whole, and it is therefore important that we appreciate them holistically, we must also not be afraid, within the bounds of contemporary praxis, to separate or to place particular emphasis on specific features or exercises within both systems as a means of enhancing collaborative, transdisciplinary composition.

In the larger context of Composition, this study’s finding that theorizing transdisciplinary collaboration through performance and literate activity affects writing instruction positively by locating disciplinarity within the situated literacies at work in specific classrooms and learning environments. This flexible understanding of disciplinarity, in turn, provides an alternative to the renewed focus on undergraduate writing instruction as writing mentoring within various academic disciplines (as in the case of certain understandings of WiD programs, and in the current academic climate where some institutions have, in lieu of employing Composition faculty, transitioned to writing tutoring or mentoring programs), while maintaining a recommendation that writing experts collaborate with other (academic) disciplinary experts when determining how writing and writing instruction can benefit each academic discipline’s goals.
This study’s focus on delivery as a vehicle of written and multimodal composition—placing the priority on delivering an argument as opposed to prioritizing the product in the case of assessments—as well as its understanding of disciplinarity and situated literacies, sheds light on the initial research questions by determining the relationship of disciplinarity to localized situated literacies, especially in the case of collaboration and collaborative writing. For example, locating disciplinarity within situated literacies in the case of undergraduate writing instruction (and especially collaborative writing instruction in every sense of the phrase) in addition to understanding the collaborators as performers who initiate interactive delivery to ‘participatory’ audiences provides a writing climate that is better prepares undergraduate writers for the (often collaborative) multimodal and multimedia writing they will encounter in contemporary academic and non-academic writing roles. Therefore, students and instructors can understand their academic disciplinary ties—in the case of this study, English/First Year Composition and Jazz—as productive features of their identities and voices, while simultaneously looking beyond those borders as they collaborate, using the situated literacies identified in their specific classrooms and learning environments as a means toward transdisciplinary collaboration.

Returning briefly to methodology in light of the pedagogical models this project recommends, it is important to note that Feminism’s positionality complicated the collaborative pedagogical models that came from this project in the sense that, in the case of collaborative work, the issues of power structures, representation (underrepresentation), and silenced voices remain. While this study’s recommendation that transdisciplinary collaborative initiatives within the academy use situated literacies identified in the specific classrooms and learning environments as both points of intersection for modes of composition and foundations for locating disciplinarity, as well as the recommendation for articulating the collaborative work
through a focus on delivery, these conclusions cannot directly eliminate the possibility for power struggles within the collaborative group or the silencing of voices during the collaborative process or in the end-product(s) itself.

Future Directions

From the perspective of a writing instructor, musician, writer, and rising researcher, moving this project forward brought both joy and heartache, fascination and frustration, and because I do love this project, there are several avenues I would take in extending and improving this research model, some in the near future, and some in the slightly more distant future. As an immediate continuation of the project and a means of reciprocation, I would like to invite the four faculty participants to come together as a group to talk about the situated literacies identified in their classrooms and learning environments, and to reflect on, from their point of view, how this project could move forward. I would like to offer them the seminar framework and related activities created with their students and their learning environments in mind for individual use within their separate spaces, and to offer a collaborative effort between the five of us aimed at first revising and extending those activities.

A later extension of this project presents some practical overhauls to the research design described below. These modifications provide the best means for expanding the project beyond the limitations of what a solo researcher can accomplish. First, I would like to extend the reach of the situated literacies by investigating more deeply (and broadly) the range of literacies used in Jazz performance. This would include structured observations of jazz performances within the current research site to add to the list of situated literacies already taken from jazz pedagogy classrooms. Not only will this additional look at situated literacies in performance situations create a more complete picture of the means to jazz performance; it will provide a point of
comparison between what students are taught to teach others about jazz performance and what is actually being carried forward into situations of praxis. I would like to extend the study of Jazz performance and jazz studies classrooms and learning spaces by assembling a research team whose members are committed to collaboration and share an interest in intersections between aural and textually based arts and the disciplines derived from them, for the purpose of executing a more purely grounded theory approach to analyzing data from the present study, as a means of testing the reliability of the situated literacies that I have identified and, I hope, identifying more points of intersection. In doing so, I would like to collect more data from the current research site(s), which would first include a much broader data collection initiative in the form of a semester-wide observation timetable, more faculty participants from both First Year Composition and Jazz (and subsequently their students in the course of classroom and learning environment observations), and revised survey data collection procedures that include questions created by a collaborative research team effort.

Turning to technology, I would employ video data collection rather than audio alone in the classrooms and other learning environments, as I have learned from the experience of the current iteration of this research project that while audio recordings coupled with field observation notes provided an adequate picture for a solo researcher, (and most importantly—a researcher who was both experienced in the subject matter and communities of both disciplines and, although I put this rather plainly, her own audience for her observation notes) greater reliability could be achieved through a less writer (or single researcher) focused approach to recording data. In a group research situation, observation notes—a writer-centered, individual medium—would not necessarily provide the same raw, unfiltered information that video would, and the potential for multiple researchers viewing and analyzing simultaneous visual and audio
cues—producing a wealth of potential code categories as a result of the multiple-researcher perspective—is a truly exciting endeavor. Therefore a renewed data collection and analysis effort within the current research site at the same Midwestern university would include: 1) assembling a team of researchers; 2) replacing audio recording and field observation notes with video and informal notation of observations and questions from individual research team members in the classroom and learning environment observations that would serve as talking points during group data analysis sessions; 3) extending the observation timetable to the duration of an entire semester; 4) extending the number of faculty participants (and therefore the number of student participants and observed classrooms and learning environments as well) at the current Midwestern university research site through a more extensive recruiting initiative; 5) creating new, collaboratively composed surveys. Each of these improvements is the result of the experiences and the knowledge that I gained through this study of collaboration, transdisciplinarity, and language. Most importantly, while I have centered this inquiry on the concept of transdisciplinary collaboration between First Year Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies students within the academy, future inquiries of this design that involve disciplinarity and discipline, literate activity, and collaborative knowledge making would flourish in writing centers, (musical) jam sessions, and community centers, as each of these locations (and situations alike) foster growth through collaboration and community.

The prevailing argument of this dissertation project contends that many of the previous ways of understanding disciplinary knowledge outside of discipline-specific contexts—most frequently metaphors and tropes—are useful when working within abstract, theorized concepts, but do not fare well when a practical application such as collaboration (and specifically transdisciplinary collaboration) is the goal. Rather, in the case of transdisciplinary collaboration
between the specific observed classrooms and learning environments, the *situated literacies*
identified within each classroom or learning environment are useful foundations for
understanding how knowledge is produced or transferred in those environments and therefore
function, in practical terms, as points of engagement around which instructors and students can
design discipline-specific or in the case of overlapping or shared situated literacies,
transdisciplinary collaborative activities. This argument was articulated through a synthesis of
literature from the disciplines of Rhetoric and Composition and Music that focused on the tropes
aurality, interaction, improvisation, and voice within the context of connecting writing and Jazz,
potentially through collaboration and community in chapter one, which became the basis for the
empirical study that investigated the ways in which writers and musicians in specific First Year
Composition and Jazz performance/Jazz studies classrooms created and shared knowledge.
Chapter two frames the aforementioned empirical study within the concept of *master narratives*
before presenting the project’s foundation in teacher research, feminist inquiry, and grounded
theory and illustrating the research site(s) and participants. Subsequently, chapters three and four
attended to the collection and analysis of the data, ultimately moving the focus from
metaphorical understandings of aurality, improvisation, interaction, and voice as general means
of connecting writing and Jazz to specific means of facilitating discipline-specific and
transdisciplinary collaboration within and between the observed classrooms and learning
environments by situating the data in Paul Prior’s concept of literate activity and identifying
situated literacies as practical means to discipline-specific and transdisciplinary collaboration. In
the end, I am hopeful that on a local level, this research endeavor provides instructors and
students viable means toward creating and performing with one another across and within
disciplinary spaces. In the larger disciplinary perspective of Rhetoric and Composition, I hope
this inquiry encourages rising researchers to experiment with methodologies and mixed methods, with the “outside” influences past and present that brought them to the scholarship they currently pursue, while fostering in our larger disciplinary audience a renewed interest in “squeez[ing] something out of the past and making it become new”—a renewed look at discipline and disciplinarity through the lenses of creativity, performance, and collaboration that speaks to rhetoricians and musicologists alike. Roland Barthes claimed that, “the amateur, a role defined much more by a style than by a technical imperfection, is no longer anywhere to be found”—a sentiment that I have kept in mind throughout the process of this inquiry, and the process of becoming a composition professional. (Barthes 150) When I walk into my classrooms I often encounter amateurs, those individuals who desire to write, desire to learn, desire to make something new. I want to begin and end my professional career as an amateur.

1 While this information was not requested as part of formal survey questions, it did appear informally in the recorded class sessions as students often discussed their majors with one another and with the instructor in the classrooms during the observation period.

2 A vamp (in Jazz and popular music) is “a short, simple introductory passage, usually repeated multiple times until otherwise instructed.” New American Heritage Dictionary

3 Selections are not limited to the “genres” or “subject areas” of English, Literature or Music, taking into consideration Thaiss and Zawacki’s understanding of discipline as, “much more fluid and elusive than the programmatic names suggest” (13).
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Appendix A: Data Report by Code Group

The source files used by this study are:
/Users/kristapetrosino/Desktop/Dissertation/Dissertation Study/SURVEY RESULTS/ALLFacSurvResults.jpg
/Users/kristapetrosino/Desktop/Dissertation/SURVEY RESULTS/ALLFacSurvResults.txt
/Users/kristapetrosino/Desktop/Dissertation/Observation Sound Files/BuzzelliMar15.mp3
/Users/kristapetrosino/Desktop/CBMarch22.doc.rtf
/Users/kristapetrosino/Desktop/Dissertation/SURVEY RESULTS/GSWFacSurvResults.txt
/Users/kristapetrosino/Desktop/Dissertation/SURVEY RESULTS/GSWStuSurvResults.txt
/Users/kristapetrosino/Desktop/Dissertation/SURVEY RESULTS/MUSFacSurvResults.txt
/Users/kristapetrosino/Desktop/Dissertation/SURVEY RESULTS/MUSStuSurvResults.txt

________________________ (End source list)

~Case Code Frequency Type Reference Source
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data comments or words related to assessment 58
   TEXT 167,191 AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

So did I fail this paper?

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data comments or words related to assessment 58
   TEXT 573,597 AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

So just give me the grade

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data comments or words related to assessment 58
   TEXT 839,1222 AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

So remember, if you no pass this paper, you can revise, if you choose to revise, the highest grade you can get is a c, right? So if you want an a or a b on a paper, you do it out of the gate, you don't do that on a revision. You following me? If you got an a b or c, that's the grade you
must live with. So if you're not happy, then that's just motivation for you to do better, right?

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data comments or words related to assessment 58
TEXT 1363,1441 AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

So you all have mid-term grades. Did you all see that you have mid-term grades?

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data comments or words related to assessment 58
TEXT 1544,2013 AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

this is how I do mid-term grades, right? I look at your two essay grades and I look at your attendance. If I feel like you could be on the path to a c, I say you're on the path to a c, for the most part. If I said there was something wrong, like where you got a D, then that means there are attendance problems and some major essay writing problems that we need to talk about to get you on the right track. The only people who got As and Bs were people who got As and Bs

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data comments or words related to assessment 58
TEXT 2089,2137 AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

Where is our grade posted at? Just on my grades?

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data comments or words related to assessment 58
TEXT 2206,2251 AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

Is it like an actual grade or just the points?

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data comments or words related to assessment 58
TEXT 2259,2305 AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

I think it's a "grade-grade"—a letter grade.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data comments or words related to assessment 58
TEXT 2364,2446 AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:
Okay, to understand the points again for this class, let's just review this quickly

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  comments or words related to assessment  58
TEXT  2383,2566  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

the points again for this class, let's just review this quickly, right? Your final grade is made up of the essay 1, essay 2, the proposal, the source analysis, and the research paper.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  comments or words related to assessment  58
TEXT  2575,2633  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

Those five essays determine your final grade in this class.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  comments or words related to assessment  58
TEXT  2681,2821  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

So point wise, whatever you get translates into a letter grade, which is what you will get on your final transcript. It will affect your GPA.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  comments or words related to assessment  58
TEXT  2856,3213  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

Remember that I'm giving you guys those participation points. Those are only for you to keep track of your absences and also for you to keep track of can you get the extra point in the end, right? So remember you need to fulfill all of those points; you have to have all perfect participation points in order to get one point at the end for your final grade.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  comments or words related to assessment  58
TEXT  3237,3446  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

So if you're in between an A and a B, by one point, the only way you can get that point is if you do all, everything I want you to do; you come to class, you participate, you have all your participation points.
So 3 absences we all know we're done

You don't turn in a paper, you're done.

So maybe right now, you might be feeling disappointed with yourself or you might feel like you need to work harder. That's good.

The next papers are the most important papers. Those are the ones I want you to work hard on anyways.

So if you're not happy, do something about it. If you don't want to do anything about it, then you just live with those consequences.

So that would mean that we meet up again in the fall, right? And we do this all over again in
Yeah, in the fall

if you choose to revise, the highest grade you can get is a c, right? So if you want an a or a b on a paper, you do it out of the gate, you don't do that on a revision. You following me? If you got an a b or c, that's the grade you must live with.

sight reading

sight reading

sight reading

sight reading
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data comments or words related to assessment 58
TEXT 35831,35843 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

sight reading

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data comments or words related to assessment 58
TEXT 1907,1925 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

Good sight reading!

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data comments or words related to assessment 58
TEXT 1963,2322 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

You spiraled through and you got through it, and most of it was good. There were some funky rhythms, some articulation things, but you did it with good tone throughout the whole thing, even when you knew there were, like right there 25, 26, 27 you know, but still, you maintained good tone and to me that's really important, especially when you're sight reading.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data comments or words related to assessment 58
TEXT 2819,2921 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

All right so you tried you tried something different, so that was cool, so let's listen to how I do it.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data comments or words related to assessment 58
TEXT 3405,3470 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

okay, now don't be so dramatic with ending the A with your tongue.
Okay, so you got piano towards the end and you realized that was piano. So I want you to try and think--think more finesse--I know it's Jazz, but I still want you to be graceful, especially if it's piano.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  comments or words related to assessment  58  
TEXT  4263,4321  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

So bring it down, and don't cut that F sharp off, you know.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  comments or words related to assessment  58  
TEXT  4529,4720  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

and don't back off on your sound, either. Just because I said piano and play less, don't back off on your sound. Still play with ferocity--I think that's the word. You know what I mean, right?

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  comments or words related to assessment  58  
TEXT  4805,4931  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

so, the F sharp-- want you to give it full value. You're still kind of cutting it off in my taste; so just listen for a second

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  comments or words related to assessment  58  
TEXT  32,186 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

Do you think you could still get like the almost passed or whatever? Like what if...? Teacher: Oh, the almost passed because we don't technically give Ds.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  comments or words related to assessment  58  
TEXT  218,830 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

So it means that you didn't make the C, but you got so close to it [coughs] that possibly changing something that's relatively simple may even elevate the grade above a C in just that, just that thing. For example, if somebody has not turned in their summaries. Obviously it's required that you do that, and so you can't pass without doing it. But everything else you did may
have been just fine.

Man 1: What's that LP [inaudible 00:59]?

Teacher: That was down the side. I mean the markers are very dry. That's a low pass in that particular area. And always I will make mention of that when I'm writing comments.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data comments or words related to assessment 58
TEXT 2257,2470 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

OK, so what we might do I'll have you read through your essays and leave marks on them first. And just as there good, you have some questions on the paper itself, please go ahead and comment or raise the question.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data comments or words related to assessment 58
TEXT 2492,2504 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

- grammar error

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data comments or words related to assessment 58
TEXT 1458,1463 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

- graded

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data comments or words related to assessment 58
Source Material:

- critique

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data comments or words related to assessment 58
TEXT 1057,1233 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

Do you want to try that Bflat one more time could you hear that at the beginning how it just wasn't spot on? This time try to attack that B flat, just, "baaañright on B flat.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data comments or words related to assessment 58
Student (female): Yeah, you could hear it at the beginning, right?
*(saxophone playing)*
Student (female): Try it one more time for me.
*(saxophone playing)*
Student (female): That was exactly it. So remember how that feels and do that every time, okay?

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  comments or words related to assessment  58
Source Material:

he tells me how to fix my paper and what to add to it to Apr 27, 2011 5:59 AM make it better

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  comments or words related to assessment  58
Source Material:

We would talk about what I needed to improve in my papers

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  comments or words related to assessment  58
Source Material:

A groups responsibility is during the peer evaluation stage for effective feedback Apr 30, 2011 9:54 AM and correcting glaring errors seen.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  comments or words related to assessment  58
Source Material:

clear and tactful Apr 25, 2011 6:14 PM matter.
I don't know, somebody give me a topic.

*(Inaudible student chatter)*

Student 20: Bacon
AMR: Bacon?
Student 20: Isn't that what he said?

AMR: Well I like bacon

Student 21 (Aaron): Professional athletes are overpaid (concurrent with Student 20 and AMR)

AMR: Professional athletes are overpaid, right? Aaron, what's theÉ
(concurrent) Student (Aaron): They are not.

AMR: Oh, They are not.
Student 22: Yes they are!
AMR: What's the argument that they are not overpaid? What's one of the reasons you're going to use to argue that they're not overpaid?

Aaron: Because they (inaudible)É

Student 20: No it's not.
AMR: Okay, well we could getÉ we could agree or disagree.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data comments or words related to assessment 58
TEXT 601,662 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

So how much did you practice?
Christine: I practiced one day.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data comments or words related to assessment 58
TEXT 20401,20445 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

Bix: Now we're going to go to a play by play.
Bix: all right, Nicole start talking.
Student(female): Uh--well I mean it was kind of strange, you know.
Bix: it's artificial. Yes.
Student(female): yeah. It was artificial, and I wouldn't teach an etude in a lesson, specifically probably. Yeah, if I was, I don't think I'm trying to figure out what I'm trying to say.

Bix: okay, while you're trying to figure it out, the reason I wanted to do this is I think this is going to be extremely practical. You know, she's more advanced than what I think you're going to be able to do, but again, let's say that you're dealing with a 15 year old or 16 year old, who really doesn't have any experience playing Jazz, how are you going to convey these things? Because you can't you need to have your jazz band getting ready for a concert or for whatever it is, and it's great, okay we're going to all to transcribe Bird, but you can't wait for them to get that together in order to, um, you know be able to play in the section. So how are you going to teach these concepts? That's why I think this is an important thing. I mean, this is kind of like having Christine in here to play is kind of like a puff ball, because you know she's going to take care of business, but um, anyhow, that is the reason why we're going to be doing this. Okay, so did you find out what you wanted to say?

Student(female): Ah, not exactly, but I did find a different thought. While she was playing, I kept thinking of different things to say, and uh, I mean, I saw things that she was automatically doing that if she was a 15 year old in high school who had never played Jazz before, you know like the caps, like the Ôduh do dut', you know those kinds of things she was doing automatically, I pointed a couple of them out to her and then holding the half note, which I consistently called the quarter note, over the eighth note rest, you know, those kinds of things

Bix: yeah

Student(female): I saw it as it was going by-- on paper as it was going by, and she was playing it right for the most part with the articulations and just the way she phrased things, but there were a couple of things that I mean, I wasn't comfortable addressing as far as like, her tone in a couple of spots not that I didn't feel comfortable with her, but more so like I didn't know what to say or how to sound intelligent about it. *(concurrently, Bix: Oh, okay.)*

Bix: ah. All right, all right. One thing I want to jump on, and I think this is very important too, is when you said that as things were going on, you kept having to regroup and do, and I think that's a huge part of teaching. It is a lot, and it is an art form in of itself, and I think if you're really rigid about "okay, this is what my students do, you know, in the fourth semester of undergrad, they need to be doing this," and it's not like that. People are different people learn
differently, people have different bents. People have different strengths. You know, some things for some students are going to be so easy; some students aren't going to get it. Um, and I'm not talking about this person is a stronger player than that one; I'm talking about this is why music is cool. We talked about the personality, and this is just one way that it manifests itself. So, I think one thing that really aids you as a teacher is your flexibility. Like, how much are you willing to give up your agenda like your last lesson before your recital we talked for like an hour and a half. Did you even get your horn out of the case? Like something like that. That's what needed to be done. So you need to be flexible like that, and also, uh, I can't remember what I was going to say. Anyhow, this is good now. So, let me ask you that-- took a bunch of notes, and I want you guys to chime in if anyone has something to say. Now, when you started, I thought the long tone thing was kind of contrived it seemed kind of schizophrenic.

Student(female): Yeah. I didn't really know if I should start with long tones or do like I was kind of confused about if I should just jump right into the etude

Bix: Right. And the thing is this is going to get easier as everyone does it. You know, by the time we get to Brian, he'll just be able to phone it in. Because, you know, we'll be dealing with everything. But yeah, I want you just to deal with what you're going to do. I mean obviously in a lesson, you're going to want someone to warm up, and I understand why you did it, but it was just like warm up, "yeewwAAAAHÓ, and you addressed a couple of things and then onto like, "bamÓÑon to what you really wanted to do.

Student(female): You're right it was absolutely contrived; I was just doing it because I wasn't sure if I, like I said.

Bix: Oh, yeah. Yeah. Schizophrenic is what I had written. Ah, now one thing, just going back to what you were doing you had her sight read an etude, but you didn't don't think you should have tried to make what you wanted clear. You know, there was no stated objective. You know, I wrote here, "what was she trying to do?Ó I mean, are we trying to play this perfectly, are we trying to want someone to warm up, and I understand why you did it, but it was just like warm up, "yeewwAAAAHÓ, and you addressed a couple of things and then onto like, "bamÓÑon to what you really wanted to do.

Student(female): I thought she did

Student(male): I totally did. *(concurrently, Student(male): yeah. Bix: Oh you did!) I counted off. I was like "how about right about here.Ó

Bix: Oh, okay. My bad. I don't know how I missed that. It's because my brain doesn't work is the tape recorder on? *(concurrently, laughter, and Student(female): I counted off every time for her. Um, okay. And then, "Any instruction?Ó I had written here, like I guess, was she supposed to go on, was the objective to like plow straight through, or were we going to stop and pick things apart? All right. I think the overall scope of it was cool, like how you started out let's say you did do long tones. You had her sight read it, you worked on some things,
then my notes are kind of schizophrenic here then you worked with some things with her

Student(female): Uh, *(concurrently, Bix: then you played together and broke them apart) yeah we kind of went section by section.

Bix: Then you had her did you have her play the whole thing by herself? *(concurrently, Student(female): ah) Without the rhythm section?

Student(female): I don't think I did not without the rhythm section. *(concurrently, Bix: Well that was good.)

Bix: Then we listened to it, then she played with the rhythm section.

Student(female): Yeah. I really wanted to have her to play with Jim Snidero

Bix: yeah.

Student(female): I just forgot--I realized as soon as I put the next track on without Jim Snidero I realized it *(concurrently, Bix: Okay) and I wasn't going to go back *(concurrently, Bix: okay) and do it, but I did want to do that.

Bix: Well, you know, and another thing wouldn't be afraid another thing you need to be able to do is like to admit "Well, you know, I screwed up. I think that's really important to do. Uh. You know like, to try to pretend like you've got it all together is ridiculous. I think if that happens again, say, you know, "I said this, but let's actually go back and do this. I mean, I think that's cool, and I think students respect that. One thing I remember we did a concert and this is kind of irrelevant, but None thing with David Baker and we did a concert with Slide Hampton in New York; we played at Symphony Space, and uh, we did something and David cued the backgrounds in too early and the trombone player was supposed to have four choruses and anyhow, the trombone solo kept on playing, whoever it was was doing it with Slide, and David was freaking out. He was doing like jumping jacks to try to get him to stop and then he went back and listened to the recording after the gig and realized it was his mistake, and you know, was humble enough to say "I apologize to the band, to this cat that was my fault. I remember as a 21 year old or whatever, that made a big impression on me to do that I think that you are encouraging trust when you are able to relate like that. Um some things like you really enforced the positive which is cool. Like your rapport with her was cool know each other but I imagine you're probably pretty nurturing with all of your students. Um, I'm guessing you hide your real self

Student(female) *chuckles

Bix: That was good, and I think that's important to do, to say "You know, I think that was cool but let's address this you know, because if you hear the negative all the time I don't like this, well I don't like this, another good thing that I have is there was one thing, like you took the germ of an idea I can't remember what it was because it was going by too fast, but you were like "every time this happens, I want you to do this. I think, especially for a younger student if they realize that okay, if they're looking okay, for a kid looking at two pages of Jim Snidero, I mean it's easy for us, as we look at it, but that's going to be kind of overwhelming, so
if you can kind of get the concept about, "look, this happens all the time, Ó you know, and so like if you've got "foo do dot, Ó you get that rhythm and that articulation going, and "look, it happens eight more times in this piece, Ó you know, that gives you a sense of relief, like you're closer. You're saying that you have these different sections put together, and that's important. Also, I think a good thing that you did Nyou gave her a chance to critique her own playing, Ó you know that's one of the things, you know, when we were at Notre Dame, and that's ÓI really dug that about Dana Hall. He made you guys like he didn't just tell you what was wrong or what was right; he made you articulate, Ó he made you remember what you did. And challenge you to "what happened here? Was that supposed to happen? Was that good; was that bad? Did you mean to do that? Ó And I think that's Ó you know that's more of an organic way of doing it rather than just rote or have a study plan like that's what's going to happen to just feed this information to you, you're going to regurgitate it, whereas it's kind of like a living thing. Uh Ó one thing you did when you asked about the rhythm, Ó you asked how she figured it out, and then you told her about writing the lines in Ó this works for me, Ó and I think that's Ó may have stated that in here or in your individual lessons, Ó you know, your gig as a teacher is to get the person to be able to teach themselves. You know, the sooner that you can render yourself worthless, the better it is. You know, when the student can honestly please themselves, and so, that was a good thing. Uh Ó now one thing, like the first time it happened I didn't think it was successful, but the second time it was. I can't remember the figure, but you guys were playing something back and forth, and you weren't diggin what she was doing, Ó

Student (female): Yeah, yeah I know what you're talking about

Bix: Okay Ó the thing that was confusing to me is that you didn't articulate what you were looking for, I don't think. I don't think she knew, Ó

Student (female): Like, audibly?

Bix: Yeah, like if you can do that without having to say it, cool, uh, but you know, if they don't have a clue what's going on, they're just spinning their wheels. Because then all of a sudden, it just stopped, and to my ears, nothing had changed. It wasn't like, "oh, that's it. Ó There wasn't like an "a-ha" moment. And then it happened again, and I can't remember what it was, but she tried it once or twice unsuccessfully, and then you told her, but I think it's important to be clear. I find for myself that I'll be having this running conversation or dialogue or whatever going on in my head, and I'll assume, Ó you know, I have to keep on catching myself doing this, Ó I'll assume that you guys know what I'm thinking about for the past 45 seconds, and then when I get there, you guys don't know where that's coming from. So I think that's important to include, to maybe not take things for granted, especially when you're dealing with younger students. And then one thing, um, I think the scoop inflection thing was good, and then * (partially inaudible, [mumbled] comment). Ah, and then the one thing that was kind of cool when you talked about the aesthetic: you talked about graceful. All right, which is very cool, and you could go either way Ó I could play devil's advocate because I say, Ó this is a term I use, Ó you need more grace, more finesse, um Ó now do you quantify that? That's a tough one to do, but I think it's good,
because I definitely think it's a part of it, but just be mindful: are you able to really verbalize something that's pretty abstract. What is graceful? Is it like a Jazz plie?

Student(female): Do you want me to answer you or something?
Bix: Yeah. It's not solely rhetorical.

Student(female): I mean, when I listened to the recording last night, I would say that Jim was graceful *(concurrently, Bix: yeah.) I mean, I'm just comparing him to Canonball Adderly, because I know that's what she transcribes, and I would not consider him graceful in the sense of the way Jim is.
Bix: Really?

Student(female): Yes. I think he has finesse, but I'm talking about a different type of graceful like a plie, like, Jim is a plie, and Cannonball is more like a step you know, I don't know. *(concurrently, Bix: yeah.) Like, his playing is a lot more smooth and I would say legato, maybe don't know if that's the right term to say, but *(Concurrently, Bix: uh huh. Yeah.)

Student(male): I would say the way she -- I remember that. *(concurrently: Student(female): She was harsh.) Yeah! I agree. *(concurrently, student(female): She understood, too, because at one point she said to me "Oh, I see it's a lot smoother or graceful." She said something like that; I can't remember exactly what she said though.

Bix: Okay. Um. I thought I saw some of you guys taking notes maybe you were just writing your grocery lists, but uh, any comments from you guys?

Student(male): Uh, I guess the only thing would be like if you're going to do an etude like this, like I was getting that the etude had a specific historical context, like it was All of Me, like it was the Basie version of All of Me, and when Jim was playing, he was playing in that style, like he was playing with vibrato like a lead alto player would, *(concurrently, Bix: yeah, good!) and he was leaning back in a certain way, so I think it would be important to mention that specific context, and maybe hipper to the recording, like the original All of Me recording.

Bix: Yeah! Very good.

Student(male): I was wondering, if it wasn't being done for sight reading purposes, would it have been more or less beneficial to like, let her to listen to it first? And get what you're going for the vibe of the piece?

Bix: Well, you know, I could see that the other thing is that with this way, you know where you're starting and I'm not saying that's right, but that would be the reason I would do that, but then you know, if you can influence what they're going to do, *(concurrently, Student(male): Uh huh.) maybe that's a good thing. You know, I think you could go either way.

Student(male): Some of both.

Bix: yeah. Any comments from the Taiwanese delegation? *(some laughter/chuckles)

Where's 716? Crazy. Do you guys have any no? Okay. Very good.
Source Material:

I refer to the grading rubric's terms so that students can understand the Apr 18, 2011 5:57 AM components of writing and be able to practice them in their essays. The list: audience, organization, development, grammar, syntax, and MLA.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data comments or words related to assessment 58
TEXT 1559,1588 GSWFacSurvResults.txt

Source Material:

critical thoughts and analysis

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data comments or words related to assessment 58
TEXT 1811,1833 GSWFacSurvResults.txt

Source Material:

constructive feedback.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data comments or words related to assessment 58
TEXT 2220,2323 GSWFacSurvResults.txt

Source Material:

The main difference is the grade aspect and the contrived audience writing prompts force upon students.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data comments or words related to assessment 58
TEXT 2587,2597 GSWFacSurvResults.txt

Source Material:

peer review

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data comments or words related to assessment 58
TEXT 2645,2680 GSWFacSurvResults.txt

Source Material:

writing for something beyond a grade

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data comments or words related to assessment 58
TEXT 1167,1211 MUSFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

Communication Grace Emotion Technical ability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation Study: Faculty group data</td>
<td>Relationship of instructors to students</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>TEXT 3354,3359</td>
<td>AMRTransMar14.txt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data | Relationship of instructors to students | 130 | TEXT 3913,3918 | AMRTransMar14.txt |

Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data | Relationship of instructors to students | 130 | TEXT 4604,4609 | AMRTransMar14.txt |

Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data | Relationship of instructors to students | 130 | TEXT 5280,5285 | AMRTransMar14.txt |

Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data | Relationship of instructors to students | 130 | TEXT 5308,5313 | AMRTransMar14.txt |

Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data | Relationship of instructors to students | 130 | TEXT 5355,5360 | AMRTransMar14.txt |
Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  130
TEXT  10492,10497  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  130
TEXT  10831,10836  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  130
TEXT  10949,10954  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  130
TEXT  12518,12523  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  130
TEXT  12602,12607  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  130
TEXT  13876,13881  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

I want
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Material:</th>
<th>AMRTransMar14.txt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I want</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation Study: Faculty group data Relationship of instructors to students</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXT 14673,14678</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation Study: Faculty group data Relationship of instructors to students</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXT 15496,15501</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation Study: Faculty group data Relationship of instructors to students</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXT 15526,15531</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation Study: Faculty group data Relationship of instructors to students</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXT 15693,15698</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation Study: Faculty group data Relationship of instructors to students</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXT 15708,15713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation Study: Faculty group data Relationship of instructors to students</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXT 15984,15989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation Study: Faculty group data Relationship of instructors to students</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXT 16113,16118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  
TEXT 16354,16359  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  
TEXT 18393,18398  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  
TEXT 19453,19458  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  
TEXT 19602,19607  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  
TEXT 19743,19748  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  
TEXT 20359,20364  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  130
TEXT 22107,22112  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  130
TEXT 23742,23747  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  130
TEXT 19634,19640  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

I would

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  130
TEXT 20162,20168  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

I would

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  130
TEXT 3354,3359  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  130
TEXT 3913,3918  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  130
TEXT 4604,4609  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students 130
TEXT 5280,5285  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students 130
TEXT 5308,5313  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students 130
TEXT 5355,5360  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students 130
TEXT 10492,10497  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students 130
TEXT 10831,10836  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students 130
TEXT 10949,10954  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

I want
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data   Relationship of instructors to students   130
   TEXT 12518,12523   AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data   Relationship of instructors to students   130
   TEXT 12602,12607   AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data   Relationship of instructors to students   130
   TEXT 13876,13881   AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data   Relationship of instructors to students   130
   TEXT 14673,14678   AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data   Relationship of instructors to students   130
   TEXT 15496,15501   AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data   Relationship of instructors to students   130
   TEXT 15526,15531   AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data   Relationship of instructors to students   130
   TEXT 15693,15698   AMRTransMar14.txt
I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students

TEXT 15708,15713  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students

TEXT 15984,15989  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students

TEXT 16113,16118  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students

TEXT 16354,16359  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students

TEXT 18393,18398  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students

TEXT 19453,19458  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

I want
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  130
TEXT  19602,19607  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:
I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  130
TEXT  19743,19748  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:
I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  130
TEXT  20359,20364  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:
I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  130
TEXT  22107,22112  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:
I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  130
TEXT  23742,23747  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:
I want

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  130
TEXT  19634,19640  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:
I would

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  130
TEXT  20162,20168  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

I would

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students 130
  TEXT  20201,20207  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

I would

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students 130
  TEXT  1064,1079  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

You following me

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students 130
  TEXT  12289,12304  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

you following me

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students 130
  TEXT  15963,15978  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

You following me

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students 130
  TEXT  1004,1012  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

you do it

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students 130
  TEXT  1696,1700  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

I say
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students 130
TEXT 18758,18762  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

I say

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students 130
TEXT 3065,3076  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

you need to

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students 130
TEXT 3771,3782  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

you need to

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students 130
TEXT 4709,4719  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

you can ask

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students 130
TEXT 4907,4922  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

I will make sure

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students 130
TEXT 5294,5305  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

listen to me

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students 130
TEXT 5322,5337  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

ask me questions

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data   Relationship of instructors to students
TEXT 6630,6640   AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

you made me

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data   Relationship of instructors to students
TEXT 7936,7950   AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

we talked about

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data   Relationship of instructors to students
TEXT 16571,16578   AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

tell me

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data   Relationship of instructors to students
TEXT 17064,17071   AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

tell me

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data   Relationship of instructors to students
TEXT 10772,10783   AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

look at this

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data   Relationship of instructors to students
TEXT 14015,14026   AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

look at this
I wanted

Think about this

he tells me how to fix my paper and what to add to it to Apr 27, 2011 5:59 AM make it better

They talked about what to have in our papers and what was important

so let's listen to how I do it

in my taste
Source Material:

do you know how to figure out that rhythm? How do you figure out rhythms when\(^\text{Christine speaking concurrently, partially inaudible.}\)
Christine: Um, count it?
Student (female): Usually, I stick in some lines if its everyone has their own different ways\(^\text{Christine: * (speaking rhythmically) but duh dut, duh dut, bu duhdeuh.}\)
Student (female): If you stick in the line *(speaking rhythmically) duh dut, bu dudaduh.) See?

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  130
TEXT  7501,7545  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

So, I just wanted to make you aware of that.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  130
TEXT  1586,1745  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

All right, so I'm just going to let you go right through this, all right? Uh, right about there\(^\text{just sight read through the whole thing, and then we'll go back.}\)

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  130
TEXT  2961,3091  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

I didn't exactly take a breath. I didn't take a breath at all; I played through it. Did you want me to do it one more time for you?

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  130
TEXT  5154,5278  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

Do you know what you did? Do you know what I'm going to say?
Christine: Uhhh\(^\text{this one?}\)
Student (female): yeah. The C sharp.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  130
TEXT  5752,5798  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

Are you looking for the assignment sheet, baby?

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students

TEXT  5891,5931  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

Here. I'll put you in babe, don't worry.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students

TEXT  6106,6712  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

AMR: A week. We can do it! We can do it! It's going to be fine! So that's the 21st, right?

Student 15: Miss Amanda, you're killing us.

AMR: I know, I'm killing myself; it's ridiculous. It's going to pay off in the end, I promise.

Student 15: Why don't we make it next Wednesday?

Student 16: I think that sounds good too, yeah.

AMR: I can't do it; I'm not gonna do it. I'm gonna keep it— we're going to keep it as it is.

Student 16: I almost got you though.
Student 15: I like it on Monday, though.

AMR: You did, you made me think about it. (Concurrent student chatter) And when's the final due?

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students

TEXT  6770,6816  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

we have a rough draft and a final draft loves,
Thank you (Dharmesha?). I appreciate it, love.

Did you like email it to yourself or brought with you? Remember this is what we talked about for homework? You guys are killing me today.

Killing me. Slow death. Okay, well we'll spend some time with that today, too.

Good, let's just play that game. Delightful.

somebody give me a topic.

*(Inaudible student chatter)*

Student 20: Bacon
AMR: Bacon?
Student 20: Isn't that what he said?

AMR: Well I like bacon
(Inaudible student name) please come sit down; please come to class on time.

Late student: sorry, I just woke up.

AMR: I know, just come to class. I don't want to talk about it.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students

Kara, what's up babe?

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students

It's possible man.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students

It's up to you. I'll leave it up to you.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students

Did you say it? What did you say baby?

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students

Ideally, just tell meñjust lie to me right now,
So most teachers are just like "write the paper." What I'm telling you to do is I want you to slow down and think about how you're using your sources and why you're using your sources.

saxophones playing together

saxophones playing together

saxophones playing together

saxophones playing together

saxophones playing together
Saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  TEXT 9789,9815  BIXTransMarch15.txt

Saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  TEXT 11181,11207  BIXTransMarch15.txt

Saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  TEXT 11248,11274  BIXTransMarch15.txt

Saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  TEXT 11315,11341  BIXTransMarch15.txt

Saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  TEXT 13052,13078  BIXTransMarch15.txt

Saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  TEXT 13198,13224  BIXTransMarch15.txt

Saxophones playing together

Saxophones playing together
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students 130
TEXT 14326,14352  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:
saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students 130
TEXT 14502,14528  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:
saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students 130
TEXT 14605,14631  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:
saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students 130
TEXT 14791,14817  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:
saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students 130
TEXT 14871,14897  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:
saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students 130
TEXT 15476,15502  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:
saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students 130
TEXT 20064,20218  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

Student(female): you know, you're going to develop your own taste and your own style, so no one can tell you that vibrato is right or wrong, but uh, yeah.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  130
TEXT 20799,36528  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

Bix: all right, Nicole start talking.
Student(female): Uh---well I mean it was kind of strange, you know
Bix: it's artificial. Yes.
Student(female): yeah. It was artificial, and I wouldn't teach an etude in a lesson, specifically probably. Yeah, if I was, I don't think I'm trying to figure out what I'm trying to say.
Bix: okay, while you're trying to figure it out, the reason I wanted to do this is I think this is going to be extremely practical. You know, she's more advanced than what I think you're going to be able to do, but again, let's say that you're dealing with a 15 year old or 16 year old, who really doesn't have any experience playing Jazz, how are you going to convey these things? Because you can't you need to have your jazz band getting ready for a concert or for whatever it is, and it's great, okay we're going to all to transcribe Bird, but you can't wait for them to get that together in order to, um, you know be able to play in the section. So how are you going to teach these concepts? That's why I think this is an important thing. I mean, this is kind of like having Christine in here to play is kind of like a puff ball, because you know she's going to take care of business, but um, anyhow, that is the reason why we're going to be doing this. Okay, so did you find out what you wanted to say?
Student(female): Ah, not exactly, but I did find a different thought. While she was playing, I kept thinking of different things to say, and uh, I mean, I saw things that she was automatically doing that if she was a 15 year old in high school who had never played Jazz before, you know like the caps, like the Ôduh do dut', you know those kinds of things she was doing automatically, I pointed a couple of them out to her and then holding the half note, which I consistently called the quarter note, over the eighth note rest, you know, those kinds of things
Bix: yeah
Student(female): I saw it as it was going by-- on paper as it was going by, and she was playing it right for the most part with the articulations and just the way she phrased things, but there were a couple of things that I mean, I wasn't comfortable addressing as far as like, her tone in a couple of spots not that I didn't feel comfortable with her, but more so like I didn't know what to say or how to sound intelligent about it. *(concurrently, Bix: Oh, okay.)*
Bix: ah. All right, all right. One thing I want to jump on, and I think this is very important
too, is when you said that as things were going on, you kept having to regroup and do, and I think that's a huge part of teaching. It is a lot, and it is an art form in of itself, and I think if you're really rigid about "okay, this is what my students do, you know, in the fourth semester of undergrad, they need to be doing this," and it's not like that. People are different, people learn differently, people have different bents. People have different strengths. You know, some things for some students are going to be so easy; some students aren't going to get it. Um, and I'm not talking about this person is a stronger player than that one; I'm talking about this is why music is cool. We talked about the personality, and this is just one way that it manifests itself. So, I think one thing that really aids you as a teacher is your flexibility. Like, how much are you willing to give up your agenda—like your last lesson before your recital—talking for like an hour and a half. Did you even get your horn out of the case? Like something like that. That's what needed to be done. So you need to be flexible like that, and also, uh, I can't remember what I was going to say. Anyhow, this is good now. So, let me ask you that, I took a bunch of notes, and I want you guys to chime in if anyone has something to say. Now, when you started, I thought the long tone thing was kind of contrived, it seemed kind of schizophrenic.

Student(female): Yeah. I didn't really know if I should start with long tones or do like I was kind of confused about if I should just jump right into the etude.

Bix: Right. And the thing is this is going to get easier as everyone does it. You know, by the time we get to Brian, he'll just be able to phone it in. Because, you know, we'll be dealing with everything. But yeah, I want you just to deal with what you're going to do. I mean obviously in a lesson, you're going to want someone to warm up, and I understand why you did it, but it was just like warm up, "yeewwAAAHH", and you addressed a couple of things and then onto like, "bamÓNOon to what you really wanted to do.

Student(female): You're right; it was absolutely contrived; I was just doing it because I wasn't sure if I, like I said.

Bix: Oh, yeah. Yeah. Schizophrenic is what I had written. Ah, now, none one thing, just going back to what you were doing—you had her sight read an etude, but you didn't think you should have tried to make what you wanted clear. You know, there was no stated objective. You know, I wrote here, "what was she trying to do?" I mean, are we trying to play this perfectly, are we trying to make what you wanted clear. You know, I wrote here, "what was she trying to do?" I mean, are we trying to play this perfectly, are we trying to look at a piece of music like that and have a fair idea of what a tempo is supposed to be like, but with a student, you know, a younger one who has no experience, I think it's going to be important to give them a tempo.

Student(male): I thought she did

Student(female): I totally did. *(concurrently, Student(male): yeah. Bix: Oh you did!)* I counted off. I was like "how about right about here.Ó

Bix: Oh, okay. My bad. I don't know how I missed that. It's because my brain doesn't work is the tape recorder on? *(concurrently, laughter, and Student(female): I counted off every time
for her. Um, okay. And then, "Any instruction? Ó I had written here, like I guess, was she supposed to go on, was the objective to like plow straight through, or were we going to stop and pick things apart? All right. I think the overall scope of it was cool, like how you started out Ñ let's say you did do long tones. You had her sight read it, you worked on some things, then Ñ my notes are kind of schizophrenic here Ñ then you Ñ did you have her play the whole? Ñ then you worked with some things with her. Ó

Student (female): Uh, *(concurrently, Bix: then you played together and broke them apart) yeah we kind of went section by section.

Bix: Then you had her Ñ did you have her play the whole thing by herself? * (concurrently, Student (female): ah Ñ) Without the rhythm section?

Student (female): I don't think I did Ñ not without the rhythm section. *(concurrently, Bix: Well that was good.)

Bix: Then we listened to it, then she played with the rhythm section.

Student (female): Yeah. I really wanted to have her to play with Jim Snidero Ñ

Bix: yeah.

Student (female): I just forgot--I realized as soon as I put the next track on without Jim Snidero Ñ I realized it *(concurrently, Bix: Okay) and I wasn't going to go back *(concurrently, Bix: okay) and do it, but I did want to do that.

Bix: Well, you know, and another thing Ñ I wouldn't be afraid Ñ another thing you need to be able to do is like to admit "Well, you know, I screwed up. Ó I think that's really important to do. Uh. You know like, to try to pretend like you've got it all together is ridiculous. I think if that happens again, say, you know, "I said this, but let's actually go back and do this. Ô I mean, I think that's cool, and I think students respect that. One thing I remember Ñ we did a concert Ñ and this is kind of irrelevant, but Ñ none thing with David Baker and we did a concert with Slide Hampton in New York; we played at Symphony Space, and uh, we did something and David cued the backgrounds in too early Ñ and the trombone player was supposed to have four choruses Ñ and anyhow, the trombone solo kept on playing, whoever it was was doing it with Slide, and David was freaking out. He was doing like jumping jacks to try to get him to stop and then he went back and listened to the recording after the gig and realized it was his mistake, and you know, was humble enough to say "I apologize, that was my fault. Ô I remember as a 21 year old or whatever, that made a big impression on me Ñ to do that Ñ I think that you are encouraging trust when you are able to relate like that. Um Ñ some things like you really enforced the positive Ñ which is cool. Like your rapport with her was cool Ñ know you guys know each other Ñ but I imagine you're probably pretty nurturing with all of your students. Um, I'm guessing you hide your real self Ñ

Student (female) * chuckles

Bix: That was good, and I think that's important to do, to say "You know, I think that was cool but let's address this Ñ you know, because if you hear the negative all the time Ñ I don't like this, well I don't like this. ÑUm, another good thing that I have is there was one thing, like you
took the germ of an idea...I can't remember what it was because it was going by too fast, but you were like "every time this happens, I want you to do this." I think, especially for a younger student if they realize that okay, if they're looking...okay, for a kid looking at two pages of Jim Snidero, I mean it's easy for us, as we look at it, but that's going to be kind of overwhelming, so if you can kind of get the concept about, "look, this happens all the time." You know, and so like if you've got "foo do dot," you get that rhythm and that articulation going, and "look, it happens eight more times in this piece," you know, that gives you a sense of relief, like you're closer. You're saying that you have these different sections put together, and that's important. Also, I think a good thing that you did...you gave her a chance to critique her own playing...you know that's one of the things, you know, when we were at Notre Dame, and that's...you know, you made it more of an organic way of doing it rather than just rote or have a study plan like that's what's going to happen...just feed this information to you, you're going to regurgitate it, whereas it's kind of like a living thing. Uh...one thing you did when you asked about the rhythm...you asked how she figured it out, and then you told her about writing the lines in..."this works for me...I think that's...And I think that's...you know, your gig as a teacher is to get the person to be able to teach themselves. You know, the sooner that you can render yourself worthless, the better it is. You know, when the student can honestly please themselves, and so, that was a good thing.

Student(female): Yeah, yeah I know what you're talking about

Bix: Okay...the thing that was confusing to me is that you didn't articulate what you were looking for, I don't think. I don't think she knew...you know, if they don't have a clue what's going on, they're just spinning their wheels. Because then all of a sudden, it just stopped, and to my ears, nothing had changed. It wasn't like, "oh, that's it." There wasn't like an "a-ha." There wasn't like...And then it happened again, and I can't remember what it was, but she tried it once or twice unsuccessfully, and then you told her, but I think it's important to be clear. I find for myself that I'll be having this running conversation or dialogue or whatever going on in my head, and I'll assume...you know, I have to keep on catching myself doing this...I'll assume that you guys know what I'm thinking about for the past 45 seconds, and then when I get there, you guys don't know where that's coming from. So I think that's important to include, to maybe not take things for granted, especially when you're dealing with younger students. And then one thing, um, I think the scoop inflection thing was good, and then *(partially inaudible
[mumbled] comment). Ah, and then the one thing that was kind of cool when you talked about the aesthetic: you talked about graceful. All right, which is very cool, and you could go either way I could play devil's advocate because I say this is a term I use you need more grace, more finesse, um now do you quantify that? That's a tough one to do, but I think it's good, because I definitely think it's a part of it, but just be mindful: are you able to really verbalize something that's pretty abstract. What is graceful? Is it like a Jazz plie?

Student(female): Do you want me to answer you or something?

Bix: Yeah it's not solely rhetorical.

Student(female): I mean, when I listened to the recording last night, I would say that Jim was graceful *(concurrently, Bix: yeah.) I mean, I'm just comparing him to Cannonball Adderly, because I know that's what she transcribes, and I would not consider him graceful in the sense of the way Jim is.

Bix: Really?

Student(female): Yes. I think he has finesse, but I'm talking about a different type of graceful like a plie, like, Jim is a plie, and Cannonball is more like a step you know, I don't know *(concurrently, Bix: yeah.) Like, his playing is a lot more smooth and I would say legato, maybe don't know if that's the right term to say, but *(Concurrently, Bix: uh huh. Yeah.)

Student(male): I would say the way she I remember that *(concurrently: Student(female): She was harsh.) Yeah! I agree. *(concurrently, student(female): She understood, too, because at one point she said to me "Oh, I see it's a lot smoother or graceful. She said something like that; I can't remember exactly what she said though"

Bix: Okay. Um. I thought I saw some of you guys taking notes maybe you were just writing your grocery lists, but uh, any comments from you guys?

Student(male): Uh, I guess the only thing would be like if you're going to do an etude like this, like I was getting that the etude had a specific historical context, like it was All of Me, like it was the Basie version of All of Me, and when Jim was playing, he was playing in that style, like he was playing with vibrato like a lead alto player would, *(concurrently, Bix: yeah, good!) and he was leaning back in a certain way, so I think it would be important to mention that specific context, and maybe hipper to the recording, like the original All of me recording.

Bix: Yeah! Very good.

Student(male): I was wondering, if it wasn't being done for sight reading purposes, would it have been more or less beneficial to like, let her to listen to it first? And get what you're going for the vibe of the piece?

Bix: Well, you know, I could see that the other thing is that with this way, you know where you're starting and I'm not saying that's right, but that would be the reason I would do that, but then you know, if you can influence what they're going to do, *(concurrently, Student(male): Uh huh.) maybe that's a good thing. You know, I think you could go either way.

Student(male): Some of both.

Bix: yeah. Any comments from the Taiwanese delegation? *(some laughter/chuckles)

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  130
TEXT 1188,1349  GSWFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

I refer to the grading rubric's terms so that students can understand the Apr 18, 2011 5:57 AM components of writing and be able to practice them in their essays.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  130
TEXT 2220,2323  GSWFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

The main difference is the grade aspect and the contrived audience writing prompts force upon students.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  130
TEXT 2543,2579  GSWFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

creating a solid community of writers

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  130
TEXT 2739,2843  GSWFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

and having time to really discuss topics as opposed to teach a formula pushed by the program/department.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Relationship of instructors to students  130
TEXT 1894,2026  MUSFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

As a teacher I attempt to bring the universal aesthetic that exists outside of the Apr 15, 2011 7:48 AM university to the students.
private instrumental instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>355,362</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>AMRTransMar14.txt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source Material:

comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>406,414</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>AMRTransMar14.txt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source Material:

portfolio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>593,597</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>AMRTransMar14.txt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source Material:

grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1522,2015</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>AMRTransMar14.txt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source Material:

Here's how I do this; this is how I do mid-term grades, right? I look at your two essay grades and I look at your attendance. If I feel like you could be on the path to a c, I say you're on the path to a c, for the most part. If I said there was something wrong, like where you got a D, then that means there are attendance problems and some major essay writing problems that we need to talk about to get you on the right track. The only people who got As and Bs were people who got As and Bs,
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data tools of writing assessment 25 TEXT

Source Material:

"grade-grade"-- a letter grade

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data tools of writing assessment 25 TEXT

Source Material:

Your final grade is made up of the essay 1, essay 2, the proposal, the source analysis, and the research paper. Right? Those five essays determine your final grade in this class. Does this make sense everybody, so far right? So point wise, whatever you get translates into a letter grade, which is what you will get on your final transcript. It will affect your GPA. So we're so far, so good, right? Remember that I'm giving you guys those participation points. Those are only for you to keep track of your absences and also for you to keep track of can you get the extra point in the end, right? So remember you need to fulfill all of those points; you have to have all perfect participation points in order to get one point at the end for your final grade. Does this make sense? So if you're in between an A and a B, by one point, the only way you can get that point is if you do all, everything I want you to do; you come to class, you participate, you have all your participation points.

Source Material:

So 3 absences we all know we're done, is done. We're done, right? You don't turn in a paper, you're done.

Source Material:

I will read them. I will make sure the topic is going to work, the argument is going to work, right? As a way for all of us to be on the same page as you're being turned loose into the arena of academic writing, independent academic writing, I should say.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Material:</th>
<th>dissertation study</th>
<th>tools of writing assessment</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMRTransMar14.txt</td>
<td>assignment sheet</td>
<td>5717,5732</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMTransMar18.doc.rtf</td>
<td>almost passed</td>
<td>74,87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMTransMar18.doc.rtf</td>
<td>graded</td>
<td>136,148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMTransMar18.doc.rtf</td>
<td>critique</td>
<td>1458,1463</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMTransMar18.doc.rtf</td>
<td>critique</td>
<td>2492,2498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSWSuSurvResults.txt</td>
<td>grammar</td>
<td>2568,2582</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
peer evaluation

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data tools of writing assessment 25 TEXT

852,1141 AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

if you no pass this paper, you can revise, if you choose to revise, the highest grade you can get is a c, right? So if you want an a or a b on a paper, you do it out of the gate, you don't do that on a revision. You following me? If you got an a b or c, that's the grade you must live with.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data tools of writing assessment 25 TEXT

1203,1218 GSWFacSurvResults.txt

Source Material:

grading rubric's

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data tools of writing assessment 25 TEXT

1361,1422 GSWFacSurvResults.txt

Source Material:

audience, organization, development, grammar, syntax, and MLA.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data tools of writing assessment 25 TEXT

1559,1588 GSWFacSurvResults.txt

Source Material:

critical thoughts and analysis

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data tools of writing assessment 25 TEXT

1811,1833 GSWFacSurvResults.txt

Source Material:

constructive feedback.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data tools of writing assessment 25 TEXT

2587,2597 GSWFacSurvResults.txt

Source Material:
peer review

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data tools of writing assessment 25 TEXT
1195,1211 MUSFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

Technical ability

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data tools of writing assessment 25 TEXT
1385,1433 MUSFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

contribute to the Apr 15, 2011 7:48 AM dialogue.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data tools of writing assessment 25 TEXT
1637,1649 MUSFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

communication

___________________________________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data Collaboration 14 TEXT 3472,3492
BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

Let's try it together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data Collaboration 14 TEXT 2046,2149
LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

maybe we can work up in a dyad here and you and [in intelligible 02:45] can go over some things together.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data Collaboration 14 TEXT 2121,2158
MUSStuSurvResults.txt
Source Material:
Their role is to act as a team member.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data Collaboration 14 TEXT 2370,2480
MUSStuSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

A group's responsibility is to work on their collective sound and prepare for Apr 26, 2011 5:34 PM performances

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data Collaboration 14 TEXT 2676,2703
GSWStuSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

work together and compromise

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data Collaboration 14 TEXT 2318,2366
MUSStuSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

be able to play as a Apr 29, 2011 3:50 AM group.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data Collaboration 14 TEXT 2398,2430
MUSStuSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

to work on their collective sound

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data Collaboration 14 TEXT 9070,9750
AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

I don't know, somebody give me a topic.

*(Inaudible student chatter)*

Student 20: Bacon
AMR: Bacon?
Student 20: Isn't that what he said?
AMR: Well I like bacon

Student 21 (Aaron): Professional athletes are overpaid (concurrent with Student 20 and AMR)

AMR: Professional athletes are overpaid, right? Aaron, what's theÉ (concurrent) Student (Aaron): They are not.

AMR: Oh, They are not.
Student 22: Yes they are!
AMR: What's the argument that they are not overpaid? What's one of the reasons you're going to use to argue that they're not overpaid?

Aaron: Because they (inaudible)É

Student 20: No it's not.
AMR: Okay, well we could getÉ we could agree or disagree.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Collaboration 14  TEXT 17755,17895  
BIXTransMarch15.txt  
Source Material:

Student(female): *with recording playing in the background, singing melody with Christine joining in (so both singing together) buht do duht

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Collaboration 14  TEXT 1698,1833  
GSWFacSurvResults.txt  
Source Material:

To provide a community that supports and pushes the writer to succeed, which Apr 18, 2011 5:57 AM may be through constructive feedback.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Collaboration 14  TEXT 2543,2579  
GSWFacSurvResults.txt  
Source Material:

creating a solid community of writers
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Collaboration 14  TEXT 2587,2597
GSWFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

peer review

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Collaboration 14  TEXT 1637,1649
MUSFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

communication

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  Collaboration 14  TEXT 2348,2382
MUSFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

Large and small group performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>tools of music assessment</td>
<td>1057,1506</td>
<td>BIXTransMarch15.txt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source Material:

Do you want to try that B-flat one more time? Could you hear that at the beginning how it just wasn’t spot on? This time try to attack that B-flat, just, "baaa-Ñright on B-flat. *(saxophone playing)*

Student (female): Yeah, you could hear it at the beginning, right? *(saxophone playing)*

Student (female): Try it one more time for me. *(saxophone playing)*

Student (female): That was exactly it. So remember how that feels and do that every time, okay?

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  tools of music assessment 52  TEXT 1912,1924  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:
sight reading

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data tools of music assessment 52 TEXT
2309,2321 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

sight reading

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data tools of music assessment 52 TEXT
19438,19450 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

sight reading

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data tools of music assessment 52 TEXT
25905,25917 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

sight reading

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data tools of music assessment 52 TEXT
35831,35843 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

sight reading

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data tools of music assessment 52 TEXT
4805,4931 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

so, the F sharp I want you to give it full value. You're still kind of cutting it off in my taste; so just listen for a second

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data tools of music assessment 52 TEXT
1982,1989 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

critique
know his or her individual part

know how that Apr 26, 2011 5:34 PM part relates to other parts in the music

be able to listen

to know their music

be prepared

know the music
be able to play as a

prepare for performances.

know music

learn all of their music

shed

Play it with me

Do you know what you did? Do you know what I'm going to say?
Christine: Uhhh É this one?
Student (female): yeah. The C sharp.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data tools of music assessment 52 TEXT
3525,3551 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:
saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data tools of music assessment 52 TEXT
6530,6556 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:
saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data tools of music assessment 52 TEXT
6627,6653 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:
saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data tools of music assessment 52 TEXT
8871,8897 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:
saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data tools of music assessment 52 TEXT
9554,9580 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:
saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data tools of music assessment 52 TEXT
9692,9718 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:
saxophones playing together
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data tools of music assessment 52 TEXT
9789,9815 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data tools of music assessment 52 TEXT
11181,11207 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data tools of music assessment 52 TEXT
11248,11274 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data tools of music assessment 52 TEXT
11315,11341 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data tools of music assessment 52 TEXT
13052,13078 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data tools of music assessment 52 TEXT
13198,13224 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

Saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data tools of music assessment 52 TEXT
14326,14352 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:
Okay, why don't you go ahead and warm up, and give me a couple of long tones before you start playing.
This time try to attack that B flat, just, "baaaaÓÑright on B flat.
*(saxophone playing)
Student (female): Yeah, you could hear it at the beginning, right?
*(saxophone playing)
Student (female): Try it one more time for me.
*(saxophone playing)
Student (female): That was exactly it. So remember how that feels and do that every time, okay?
Christine: Okay.
Student(female): Ah, let's just start right into the etude. All right, so I'm just going to let you go right through this, all right? Uh, right about thereÑjust sight read through the whole thing, and then we'll go back. One, two, one two three four.  

All right. Cool. Good sight reading!
Christine: thanks
Student (female): You spiraled through and you got through it, and most of it was good. There were some funky rhythms, some articulation things, but you did it with good tone throughout the whole thing, even when you knew there were, like right thereÑ25,26,27Ñyou know, but still, you maintained good tone and to me that's really important, especially when you're sight reading. Uh, let's just take it from the top. Here, let me just hear you play from, uh, the intro to the first chorus. One, two, one two three four.

All right, so let's try that.
Source Material:

So how much did you practice?
Christine: I practiced one day.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data tools of music assessment 52 TEXT
20064,20218 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

Student(female): you know, you're going to develop your own taste and your own style, so no one can tell you that vibrato is right or wrong, but uh, yeah.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data tools of music assessment 52 TEXT
20401,20445 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

Bix: Now we're going to go to a play by play.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data tools of music assessment 52 TEXT
20799,36528 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

Bix: all right, Nicole—start talking.
Student(female): Uh—-well I mean it was kind of strange, you know
Bix: it's artificial. Yes.
Student(female): yeah. It was artificial, and I wouldn't teach an etude in a lesson, specifically—probably. Yeah, if I was, I don't think I'm trying to figure out what I'm trying to say.
Bix: okay, while you're trying to figure it out, the reason I wanted to do this is I think this is going to be extremely practical. You know, she's more advanced than what I think you're going to be able to do, but again, let's say that you're dealing with a 15 year old or 16 year old, who really doesn't have any experience playing Jazz, how are you going to convey these things? Because you can't— you need to have your jazz band getting ready for a concert or for whatever it is, and it's great, okay we're going to all to transcribe Bird, but you can't wait for them to get that together in order to, um, you know be able to play in the section. So how are you going to teach these concepts? That's why I think this is an important thing. I mean, this is kind of like—having Christine in here to play is kind of like a puff ball, because you know she's going to take care of business, but um, anyhow, that is the reason why we're going to be doing this. Okay, so did you find out what you wanted to say?
Student (female): Ah, not exactly, but I did find a different thought. While she was playing, I kept thinking of different things to say, and uh, I mean, I saw things that she was automatically doing that if she was a 15 year old in high school who had never played Jazz before, you know like the caps, like the Ôduh do dut', you know those kinds of things she was doing automatically, I pointed a couple of them out to her and then holding the half note, which I consistently called the quarter note, over the eighth note rest, you know, those kinds of things.

Bix: yeah

Student (female): I saw it as it was going by-- on paper as it was going by, and she was playing it right for the most part with the articulations and just the way she phrased things, but there were a couple of things that I mean, I wasn't comfortable addressing as far as like, her tone in a couple of spots not that I didn't feel comfortable with her, but more so like I didn't know what to say or how to sound intelligent about it. *(concurrently, Bix: Oh, okay.)*

Bix: ah. All right, all right. One thing I want to jump on, and I think this is very important too, is when you said that as things were going on, you kept having to regroup and do, and I think that's a huge part of teaching. It is a lot, and it is an art form in of itself, and I think if you're really rigid about "okay, this is what my students do, you know, in the fourth semester of undergrad, they need to be doing this," and it's not like that. People are different people learn differently, people have different bents. People have different strengths. You know, some things for some students are going to be so easy; some students aren't going to get it. Um, and I'm not talking about this person is a stronger player than that one; I'm talking about this is why music is cool. We talked about the personality, and this is just one way that it manifests itself. So, I think one thing that really aids you as a teacher is your flexibility. Like, how much are you willing to give up your agenda like your last lesson before your recital we talked for like an hour and a half. Did you even get your horn out of the case? Like something like that. That's what needed to be done. So you need to be flexible like that, and also, uh, I can't remember what I was going to say. Anyhow, this is good now. So, let me ask you that, I took a bunch of notes, and I want you guys to chime in if anyone has something to say. Now, when you started, I thought the long tone thing was kind of contrived it seemed kind of schizophrenic.

Student (female): Yeah. I didn't really know if I should start with long tones or do like I was kind of confused about if I should just jump right into the etude.

Bix: Right. And the thing is this is going to get easier as everyone does it. You know, by the time we get to Brian, he'll just be able to phone it in. Because, you know, we'll be dealing with everything. But yeah, I want you just to deal with what you're going to do. I mean obviously in a lesson, you're going to want someone to warm up, and I understand why you did it, but it was just like warm up, "yeewwAAAHHÓ, and you addressed a couple of things and then onto like, "bamÓnon to what you really wanted to do.

Student (female): You're right it was absolutely contrived; I was just doing it because I wasn't sure if I, like I said.

Bix: Oh, yeah. Yeah. Schizophrenic is what I had written. Ah, now none thing, just going
back to what you were doing. You had her sight read an etude, but you didn't think you should have tried to make what you wanted clear. You know, there was no stated objective. You know, I wrote here, "what was she trying to do?" Or I mean, are we trying to play this perfectly, are we trying to check you on your sight reading? Or, am I trying to get you to learn how to play figures? These are the main things I was thinking about. Um, and you know, just tying in with that, someone like her is going to look at a piece of music like that and have a fair idea of what a tempo is supposed to be like, but with a student, you know, a younger one who has no experience, I think it's going to be important to give them a tempo.

Student(male): I thought she did.

Student(female): I totally did. *(concurrently, Student(male): yeah. Bix: Oh you did!) I counted off. I was like "how about right about here."

Bix: Oh, okay. My bad. I don't know how I missed that. It's because my brain doesn't work. Is the tape recorder on? *(concurrently, laughter, and Student(female): I counted off every time for her. Um, okay. And then, "Any instruction?" I had written here, like I guess, was she supposed to go on, was the objective to like plow straight through, or were we going to stop and pick things apart? All right. I think the overall scope of it was cool, like how you started out. Let's say you did do long tones. You had her sight read it, you worked on some things, then my notes are kind of schizophrenic here. Then you did you have her play the whole? Then you worked with some things with her.

Student(female): Uh, *(concurrently, Bix: then you played together and broke them apart) yeah we kind of went section by section.

Bix: Then you had her did you have her play the whole thing by herself? *(concurrently, Student(female): ah. ) Without the rhythm section?

Student(female): I don't think I did not without the rhythm section. *(concurrently, Bix: Well that was good.)

Bix: Then we listened to it, then she played with the rhythm section.

Student(female): Yeah. I really wanted to have her to play with Jim Snidero.

Bix: yeah.

Student(female): I just forgot--I realized as soon as I put the next track on without Jim Snidero. I realized it *(concurrently, Bix: Okay) and I wasn't going to go back *(concurrently, Bix: okay) and do it, but I did want to do that.

Bix: Well, you know, and another thing wouldn't be afraid another thing you need to be able to do is like to admit "Well, you know, I screwed up. I think that's really important to do. Uh. You know like, to try to pretend like you've got it all together is ridiculous. I think that if that happens again, say, you know, "I said this, but let's actually go back and do this. I mean, I think that's cool, and I think students respect that. One thing I remember we did a concert and this is kind of irrelevant, but none thing with David Baker and we did a concert with Slide Hampton in New York; we played at Symphony Space, and uh, we did something and David cued the backgrounds in too early and the trombone player was supposed to have four
choruses and anyhow, the trombone solo kept on playing, whoever it was was doing it with Slide, and David was freaking out. He was doing like jumping jacks to try to get him to stop and then he went back and listened to the recording after the gig and realized it was his mistake, and you know, was humble enough to say "I apologize that was my fault. I remember as a 21 year old or whatever, that made a big impression on me to do that to the band, to this cat that was my fault. I think that you are encouraging trust when you are able to relate like that. Um some things like you really enforced the positive which is cool. Like your rapport with her was cool to know you guys know each other but I imagine you're probably pretty nurturing with all of your students. Um, I'm guessing you hide your real self

Student (female) *chuckles

Bix: That was good, and I think that's important to do, to say "You know, I think that was cool but let's address this you know, because if you hear the negative all the time I don't like this, well I don't like this, another good thing that I have is there was one thing, like you took the germ of an idea can't remember what it was because it was going by too fast, but you were like "every time this happens, I want you to do this. I think, especially for a younger student if they realize that okay, if they're looking okay, for a kid looking at two pages of Jim Snidero, I mean it's easy for us, as we look at it, but that's going to be kind of overwhelming, so if you can kind of get the concept about, "look, this happens all the time, you know, and so like if you've got "foo do dot, you get that rhythm and that articulation going, and "look, it happens eight more times in this piece, you know, that gives you a sense of relief, like you're closer. You're saying that you have these different sections put together, and that's important. Also, I think a good thing that you did you gave her a chance to critique her own playing you know that's one of the things, you know, when we were at Notre Dame, and that's I really dug that about Dana Hall. He made you guys like he didn't just tell you what was wrong or what was right; he made you articulate he made you remember what you did. And challenge you to "what happened here? Was that supposed to happen? Was that good; was that bad? Did you mean to do that? And I think that's you know that's more of an organic way of doing it rather than just rote or have a study plan like that's what's going to happen to just feed this information to you, you're going to regurgitate it, whereas it's kind of like a living thing. Uh one thing you did when you asked about the rhythm you asked how she figured it out, and then you told her about writing the lines in "this works for me and I think that's DI may have stated that in here or in your individual lessons you know, your gig as a teacher is to get the person to be able to teach themselves. You know, the sooner that you can render yourself worthless, the better it is. You know, when the student can honestly please themselves, and so, that was a good thing. Uh now one thing, like the first time it happened I didn't think it was successful, but the second time it was. I can't remember the figure, but you guys were playing something back and forth, and you weren't diggin what she was doing

Student (female): Yeah, yeah I know what you're talking about

Bix: Okay the thing that was confusing to me is that you didn't articulate what you were
looking for, I don't think. I don't think she knew.

Student(female): Like, audibly?

Bix: Yeah, like if you can do that without having to say it, cool, uh, but you know, if they don't have a clue what's going on, they're just spinning their wheels. Because then all of a sudden, it just stopped, and to my ears, nothing had changed. It wasn't like, "oh, that's it." There wasn't like an "a-ha!" moment. And then it happened again, and I can't remember what it was, but she tried it once or twice unsuccessfully, and then you told her, but I think it's important to be clear. I find for myself that I'll be having this running conversation or dialogue or whatever going on in my head, and I'll assume you know, I have to keep on catching myself doing this. I'll assume that you guys know what I'm thinking about for the past 45 seconds, and then when I get there, you guys don't know where that's coming from. So I think that's important to include, to maybe not take things for granted, especially when you're dealing with younger students. And then one thing, um, I think the scoop inflection thing was good, and then *(partially inaudible [mumbled] comment). Ah, and then the one thing that was kind of cool when you talked about the aesthetic: you talked about graceful. All right, which is very cool, and you could go either way. I could play devil's advocate because I say this is a term I use. You need more grace, more finesse, um. How do you quantify that? That's a tough one to do, but I think it's good, because I definitely think it's a part of it, but just be mindful: are you able to really verbalize something that's pretty abstract. What is graceful? Is it like a Jazz plie?

Student(female): Do you want me to answer you or something?

Bix: Yeah. It's not solely rhetorical.

Student(female): I mean, when I listened to the recording last night, I would say that Jim was graceful *(concurrently, Bix: yeah.) I mean, I'm just comparing him to Canonball Adderly, because I know that's what she transcribes, and I would not consider him graceful in the sense of the way Jim is.

Bix: Really?

Student(female): Yes. I think he has finesse, but I'm talking about a different type of graceful. Like a plie, like, Jim is a plie, and Cannonball is more like a step. You know, I don't know *(concurrently, Bix: yeah.) Like, his playing is a lot more smooth and I would say legato, maybe. Don't know if that's the right term to say, but *(Concurrently, Bix: uh huh. Yeah.)

Student(male): I would say the way she listened to the recording, it was All of Me, it was the Basie version of All of Me, and when Jim was playing, he was playing in that style,
like he was playing with vibrato like a lead alto player would, *(concurrently, Bix: yeah, good!)
and he was leaning back in a certain way, so I think it would be important to mention that
specific context, and maybe hipper to the recording, like the original All of me recording.
Bix: Yeah! Very good.
Student(male—not the same male): I was wondering, if it wasn't being done for sight reading
purposes, would it have been more or less beneficial to like, let her to listen to it first? And get
what you're going for the vibe of the piece?
Bix: Well, you know, I could see that the other thing is that with this way, you know where
you're starting and I'm not saying that's right, but that would be the reason I would do that, but
then you know, if you can influence what they're going to do, *(concurrently, Student(male): Uh
huh.) maybe that's a good thing. You know, I think you could go either way.
Student(male): Some of both.
Bix: yeah. Any comments from the Taiwanese delegation? *(some laughter/chuckles)
Where's 716? Crazy. Do you guys have any no? Okay. Very good.
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<td>write</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMRTransMar14.txt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dissertation Study: Faculty group data</strong></td>
<td>writing process</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>TEXT 17463,17467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMRTransMar14.txt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source Material:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>write</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMRTransMar14.txt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dissertation Study: Faculty group data</strong></td>
<td>writing process</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>TEXT 18407,18411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMRTransMar14.txt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source Material:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source Material:

write

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data writing process 90 TEXT 18535,18539
Source Material:

write

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data writing process 90 TEXT 19071,19075
Source Material:

write

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data writing process 90 TEXT 21646,21650
Source Material:

write

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data writing process 90 TEXT 22121,22125
Source Material:

write

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data writing process 90 TEXT 8600,8608
Source Material:

synthesis

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data writing process 90 TEXT 10061,10069
Source Material:

synthesis
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data writing process 90 TEXT 11302,11310

Source Material:

synthesis

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data writing process 90 TEXT 11336,11344

Source Material:

synthesis

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data writing process 90 TEXT 14810,14818

Source Material:

synthesis

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data writing process 90 TEXT 15299,15307

Source Material:

synthesis

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data writing process 90 TEXT 19430,19438

Source Material:

synthesis

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data writing process 90 TEXT 22007,22015

Source Material:

synthesis

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data writing process 90 TEXT 23593,23601

Source Material:
Source Material:

**synthesis**

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data writing process 90 TEXT 23642,23650

Source Material:

**write**

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data writing process 90 TEXT 860,864

Source Material:

**write**

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data writing process 90 TEXT 4387,4391

Source Material:

**write**

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data writing process 90 TEXT 5236,5240

Source Material:

**Write**

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data writing process 90 TEXT 8422,8426

Source Material:

**Write**
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data writing process 90 TEXT 9338,9342
LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

write

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data writing process 90 TEXT 27494,27498
LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

write

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data writing process 90 TEXT 1790,1794
GSWStuSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

write

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data writing process 90 TEXT 1879,1883
GSWStuSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

write

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data writing process 90 TEXT 2277,2281
GSWStuSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

write

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data writing process 90 TEXT 2321,2325
GSWStuSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

write

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data writing process 90 TEXT 1518,1527
GSWFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:
Source Material:

brainstorm

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data writing process 90 TEXT 2068,2100

Source Material:

how to approach writing something

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data writing process 90 TEXT 2128,2141

Source Material:

brainstorming

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data writing process 90 TEXT 2151,2218

Source Material:

conducting inquiry or research before or during the writing process.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data writing process 90 TEXT 1341,1394

Source Material:

specific time on the platform with which to contribute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation Study: Faculty group data</td>
<td>music performance process</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>913,1015</td>
<td>BIXTransMarch15.txt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source Material:

Okay, why don't you go ahead and warm up, and give me a couple of long tones before you start playing.
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  music performance process  56  TEXT
1912,1924  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

sight reading

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  music performance process  56  TEXT
2309,2321  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

sight reading

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  music performance process  56  TEXT
19438,19450  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

sight reading

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  music performance process  56  TEXT
25905,25917  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

sight reading

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  music performance process  56  TEXT
35831,35843  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

sight reading

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  music performance process  56  TEXT
2701,2719  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

blowing through it.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  music performance process  56  TEXT
2819,2921  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:
All right—so you tried—so that was cool, so let's listen to how I do it.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data music performance process 56 TEXT
2961,3043 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

I didn't exactly take a breath. I didn't take a breath at all; I played through it.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data music performance process 56 TEXT
3186,3251 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

so I kind of stopped the A with my tongue before I attacked the B.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data music performance process 56 TEXT
2339,2358 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

take it from the top.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data music performance process 56 TEXT
2701,2718 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

blowing through it.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data music performance process 56 TEXT
2530,2535 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

quoted.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data music performance process 56 TEXT
2530,2535 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

quoted.
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  music performance process  56  TEXT
5555,5560  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf

Source Material:
quoted

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  music performance process  56  TEXT
7474,7479  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf

Source Material:
quoted

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  music performance process  56  TEXT
14863,14868  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf

Source Material:
quoted

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  music performance process  56  TEXT
2530,2534  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf

Source Material:
quote

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  music performance process  56  TEXT
4371,4375  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf

Source Material:
quote

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  music performance process  56  TEXT
4504,4508  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf

Source Material:
quote

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  music performance process  56  TEXT
4544,4548  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Material:</th>
<th>quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>quote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to understand the music

be able to listen
to know their music

be prepared

know the music

be able to play as a group.

to work on their collective sound

prepare for performances.
Source Material:

know music

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  music performance process  56  TEXT
  2577,2600  MUSStuSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

learn all of their music

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  music performance process  56  TEXT
  2606,2609  MUSStuSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

shed

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  music performance process  56  TEXT
  1167,1179  MUSFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

Communication

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  music performance process  56  TEXT
  1181,1185  MUSFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

Grace

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  music performance process  56  TEXT
  1341,1394  MUSFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

specific time on the platform with which to contribute

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  music performance process  56  TEXT
  1385,1433  MUSFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

contribute to the Apr 15, 2011 7:48 AM dialogue.
Interaction

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  music performance process  56  TEXT
1621,1631  MUSFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

communication

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  music performance process  56  TEXT
1637,1649  MUSFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

Large and small group performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>265,269</td>
<td>general music vocabulary</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BIXTransMarch15.txt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>265,269</td>
<td>general music vocabulary</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BIXTransMarch15.txt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1579,1583</td>
<td>general music vocabulary</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BIXTransMarch15.txt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
etude

etude

etude

etude

etude

etude

etude
Source Material:

etude

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
36814,36818  BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:

etude

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
37122,37126  BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:

etude

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
37656,37660  BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:

etude

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
38060,38064  BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:

etude

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
1912,1924  BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:

sight reading

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
2309,2321  BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:

sight reading
Okay, so you got piano towards the end and you realized that was piano. So I want you to try and think more finesse. I know it's Jazz, but I still want you to be graceful, especially if it's piano.
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary 123  TEXT

Source Material:

full value

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary 123  TEXT

Source Material:

piano

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary 123  TEXT

Source Material:

piano

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary 123  TEXT

Source Material:

piano

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary 123  TEXT

Source Material:

piano

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary 123  TEXT

Source Material:

piano

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary 123  TEXT

Source Material:
C sharp

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data general music vocabulary 123 TEXT

Source Material:

C sharp

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data general music vocabulary 123 TEXT

Source Material:

C sharp

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data general music vocabulary 123 TEXT

Source Material:

C sharp

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data general music vocabulary 123 TEXT

Source Material:

B flat

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data general music vocabulary 123 TEXT

Source Material:

B flat

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data general music vocabulary 123 TEXT

Source Material:

intro
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
Source Material:

intro

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
Source Material:

intro

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
Source Material:

intro

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
Source Material:

introduction

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
Source Material:

introduction

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
Source Material:

introduction

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
Source Material:
introduction

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data general music vocabulary 123 TEXT
  2407,2411 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

intro

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data general music vocabulary 123 TEXT
  2426,2431 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

chorus

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data general music vocabulary 123 TEXT
  5651,5656 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

chorus

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data general music vocabulary 123 TEXT
  6490,6495 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

chorus

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data general music vocabulary 123 TEXT
  13262,13267 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

chorus

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data general music vocabulary 123 TEXT
  14042,14047 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

chorus
chorus

etude

etude

etude

etude

etude
etude

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
  25632,25636  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

etude

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
  35240,35244  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

etude

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
  35285,35289  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

etude

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
  36814,36818  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

etude

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
  37122,37126  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

etude

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
  37656,37660  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

etude
etude

warm up

warm up

long tones

long tones
long tones

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
   2055,2060  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

rhythm

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
   6281,6286  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

rhythm

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
   6374,6379  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

rhythm

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
   8614,8619  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

rhythm

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
   9441,9446  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

rhythm

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
   10661,10666  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

rhythm
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
Source Material:

rhythm

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
Source Material:

rhythm

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
Source Material:

rhythm

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
Source Material:

rhythm

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
Source Material:

rhythm

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
Source Material:
rhythm

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data general music vocabulary
14030,14035 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

rhythm

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data general music vocabulary
14144,14149 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

rhythm

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data general music vocabulary
15193,15198 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

rhythm

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data general music vocabulary
15858,15863 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

rhythm

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data general music vocabulary
17339,17344 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

rhythm

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data general music vocabulary
19598,19603 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
Source Material:

rhythm

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
Source Material:

rhythm

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
Source Material:

rhythm

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
Source Material:

rhythm

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
Source Material:

rhythm

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
Source Material:
articulation

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary 123  TEXT
7310,7321 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

articulation

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary 123  TEXT
22832,22843 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

articulation

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary 123  TEXT
30365,30376 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

articulation

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary 123  TEXT
984,987  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

tone

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary 123  TEXT
2115,2118  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

tone

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary 123  TEXT
2246,2249  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

tone
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
Source Material:
tone

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
Source Material:
tone

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
Source Material:
tone

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
Source Material:
eighth rest

eighth notes
eighth notes

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
5884,5895  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

eighth notes

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
6041,6052  BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

eighth notes

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
982,997  MUSStuSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

chorus and verse

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
1061,1075  MUSStuSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

form and timbre

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
1133,1145  MUSStuSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

verse, chorus

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general music vocabulary  123  TEXT
1467,1479  MUSStuSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

chord quality
know his or her individual part

know how that Apr 26, 2011 5:34 PM part relates to other parts in the music

be able to listen

Student(female): you know, you're going to develop your own taste and your own style, so no one can tell you that vibrato is right or wrong, but uh, yeah.

audience,

Technical ability
Source Material:

Interaction

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data general music vocabulary 123 TEXT 1637,1649 MUSFacSurvResults.txt

Source Material:

communication

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data general music vocabulary 123 TEXT 2223,2254 MUSFacSurvResults.txt

Source Material:

private instrumental instruction

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data general music vocabulary 123 TEXT 2348,2382 MUSFacSurvResults.txt

Source Material:

Large and small group performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source Material:

quoted

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data general writing vocabulary 232 TEXT 2530,2535 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf

Source Material:

quoted

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data general writing vocabulary 232 TEXT 5555,5560 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general writing vocabulary  232  TEXT
4636,4640  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

quote

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general writing vocabulary  232  TEXT
4675,4679  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

quote

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general writing vocabulary  232  TEXT
4687,4691  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

quote

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general writing vocabulary  232  TEXT
4716,4720  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

quote

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general writing vocabulary  232  TEXT
4839,4843  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

quote

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general writing vocabulary  232  TEXT
4949,4953  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

quote

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general writing vocabulary  232  TEXT
5356,5360  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
quote

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data general writing vocabulary

5371,5375 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf

Source Material:

quote

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data general writing vocabulary

5475,5479 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf

Source Material:

quote

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data general writing vocabulary

5490,5494 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf

Source Material:

quote

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data general writing vocabulary

5555,5559 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf

Source Material:

quote

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data general writing vocabulary

5578,5582 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf

Source Material:

quote

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data general writing vocabulary

5740,5744 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf

Source Material:

quote
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general writing vocabulary  232  TEXT
5798,5802  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:
quote

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general writing vocabulary  232  TEXT
5813,5817  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:
quote

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general writing vocabulary  232  TEXT
7474,7478  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:
quote

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general writing vocabulary  232  TEXT
14863,14867  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:
quote

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general writing vocabulary  232  TEXT
2492,2498  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:
grammar

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general writing vocabulary  232  TEXT
1604,1608  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:
essay

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general writing vocabulary  232  TEXT
1870,1874  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

essay

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general writing vocabulary 232  TEXT
2491,2495  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

essay

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general writing vocabulary 232  TEXT
2500,2504  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

essay

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general writing vocabulary 232  TEXT
2586,2590  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

essay

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general writing vocabulary 232  TEXT
4667,4671  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

essay

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general writing vocabulary 232  TEXT
5216,5220  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

essay

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  general writing vocabulary 232  TEXT
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Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
Source Material:

research

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
Source Material:

research

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
Source Material:
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:

Research

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:
research

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
Source Material:

research

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
Source Material:

research

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
Source Material:

research

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
Source Material:

research

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
Source Material:

research

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
Source Material:
research

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data 21233,21240 AMRTransMar14.txt terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:

research

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data 21396,21403 AMRTransMar14.txt terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:

research

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data 21470,21477 AMRTransMar14.txt terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:

research

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data 21656,21663 AMRTransMar14.txt terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:

research

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data 21732,21739 AMRTransMar14.txt terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:

research

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data 22181,22188 AMRTransMar14.txt terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:

research

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data 22396,22403 AMRTransMar14.txt terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:
Source Material:

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:
research

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
Source Material:

argument

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
Source Material:

argument

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
Source Material:

argument

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
Source Material:

argument

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
Source Material:

argument

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
Source Material:
argument

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing
Source Material:

argument

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing
Source Material:

argument

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing
Source Material:

argument

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing
Source Material:

argument

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing
Source Material:
argument

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
Source Material:

argument

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
Source Material:

argument

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
Source Material:

discovery

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
Source Material:

discovery

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
Source Material:
Source Material:

discovery

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:

discovery

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:

discovery

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:

discoveries

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:

discoveries

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:
discoveries

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
12589,12599 AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

discoveries

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
19659,19669 AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

discoveries

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
22819,22829 AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

discoveries

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
8603,8608 AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

thesis

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
10064,10069 AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

thesis

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
11305,11310 AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

thesis

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
thesis

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:

thesis

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:

thesis

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:

thesis

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:

thesis

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:

thesis

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:
thesis

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing

main point

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing

main point

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing

main point

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Material:</th>
<th>main point</th>
<th>Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing</th>
<th>329</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16986,16995</td>
<td></td>
<td>AMRTransMar14.txt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17307,17316</td>
<td></td>
<td>AMRTransMar14.txt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19774,19783</td>
<td></td>
<td>AMRTransMar14.txt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19951,19960</td>
<td></td>
<td>AMRTransMar14.txt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20022,20031</td>
<td></td>
<td>AMRTransMar14.txt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20297,20306</td>
<td></td>
<td>AMRTransMar14.txt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
main point

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
Source Material:

introduction

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
Source Material:

introduction

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
Source Material:

introduction

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
Source Material:

synthesis

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
synthesis

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:

synthesis

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:

synthesis

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:

synthesis

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:

synthesis

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:

synthesis

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:
synthesis

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
23593,23601 AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
23642,23650 AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
14456,14465 AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
17287,17296 AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
18701,18710 AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
17117,17126 AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

discovered

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
Source Material:

discovered

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing

Source Material:

proof

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing

Source Material:

counter argument

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing

Source Material:

counter argument

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing

Source Material:

counter argument

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing

Source Material:

counter argument

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing

Source Material:
counter argument

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
Source Material:

counter argument

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
Source Material:

counter argument

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
Source Material:

counter argument

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
Source Material:

sources

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
Source Material:

sources

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
Source Material:

sources

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
Source Material:
Source Material:
sources

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

11755,11761 AMRTransMar14.txt

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

12486,12492 AMRTransMar14.txt

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

12839,12845 AMRTransMar14.txt

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

12895,12901 AMRTransMar14.txt

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

12925,12931 AMRTransMar14.txt

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

13123,13129 AMRTransMar14.txt

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

13585,13591 AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:
sources

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

sources

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

sources

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

sources

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

sources

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

sources

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

sources

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
essay

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
2314,2319 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

essays

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
3320,3327 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

research

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
12836,12843 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

research

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
13185,13192 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

research

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
19961,19968 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

research

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
25193,25200 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

research

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
research

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:

argument

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:

argument

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:

argument

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:

sources

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:

sources

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:
Source Material:

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing

LMTransMar18.doc.rtf

Source Material:

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing

LMTransMar18.doc.rtf

Source Material:

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing

GSWStuSurvResults.txt

Source Material:

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing

GSWStuSurvResults.txt

Source Material:

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing

LMTransMar18.doc.rtf

Source Material:

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing

LMTransMar18.doc.rtf

Source Material:
quote

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing

Source Material:

quote

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing

Source Material:

quote

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing

Source Material:

quote

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing

Source Material:

quote

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing

Source Material:
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Source Material:
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
audience, organization, development, grammar, syntax, and MLA.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
1518,1527 GSWFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

brainstorm

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
1559,1588 GSWFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

critical thoughts and analysis

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
2058,2065 GSWFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

audience

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
2128,2141 GSWFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

brainstorming

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
2151,2218 GSWFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

carried out or research before or during the
writing process.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
2278,2285 GSWFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

audience
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
2287,2301 GSWFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

writing prompts

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
2587,2597 GSWFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

peer review

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
2714,2735 GSWFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

service learning class

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
1167,1179 MUSFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

Communication

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
1195,1211 MUSFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

Technical ability

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
1385,1433 MUSFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

contribute to the Apr 15, 2011 7:48 AM dialogue.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data terms specific to academic writing 329 TEXT
1637,1649 MUSFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:
communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as demonstration 25 TEXT
3472,3552 BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:

Let's try it together None, two, one two three four
*(saxophones playing together)*

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as demonstration 25 TEXT
6444,6654 BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:

So let's actually play that together the fist chorus, one, two, one two three four.
*(saxophones playing together)*
Student (female): let's do that one more time. One two three four
*(saxophones playing together)*

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as demonstration 25 TEXT
9517,9719 BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:

Play it with me None two three four
*(saxophones playing together)*
Student(female): Right so did you breathe?
Christine: Yeah 
Student(female): All right, one two three four
*(saxophones playing together)*

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as demonstration 25 TEXT
9738,9816 BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:

Right. Let's take it from E7. One two three four
*(saxophones playing together)*
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as demonstration

Source Material:

Student (female): Take it from here — one two three four
*(saxophones playing together)
Student (female): one two three four
*(saxophones playing together)
Student (female): one two three four
*(saxophones playing together)

Source Material:

I don't know, somebody give me a topic.

*(Inaudible student chatter)

Student 20: Bacon
AMR: Bacon?
Student 20: Isn't that what he said?

AMR: Well I like bacon

Student 21 (Aaron): Professional athletes are overpaid (concurrent with Student 20 and AMR)

AMR: Professional athletes are overpaid, right? Aaron, what's the — (concurrent) Student (Aaron): They are not.

AMR: Oh, They are not.
Student 22: Yes they are!
AMR: What's the argument that they are not overpaid? What's one of the reasons you're going to use to argue that they're not overpaid?

Aaron: Because they (inaudible)
Student 20: No it's not.
AMR: Okay, well we could get we could agree or disagree.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as demonstration 25 TEXT
Source Material:
saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as demonstration 25 TEXT
Source Material:
saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as demonstration 25 TEXT
Source Material:
saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as demonstration 25 TEXT
Source Material:
saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as demonstration 25 TEXT
Source Material:
saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as demonstration 25 TEXT
Source Material:
saxophones playing together
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as demonstration

Source Material:

saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as demonstration

Source Material:

saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as demonstration

Source Material:

saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as demonstration

Source Material:

saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as demonstration

Source Material:

saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as demonstration

Source Material:

Saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as demonstration

Source Material:
Source Material:
saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as demonstration 25 TEXT
14502,14528 BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:
saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as demonstration 25 TEXT
14605,14631 BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:
saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as demonstration 25 TEXT
14791,14817 BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:
saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as demonstration 25 TEXT
14871,14897 BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:
saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as demonstration 25 TEXT
15476,15502 BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:
saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as demonstration 25 TEXT
17755,17895 BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:
Student(female): *with recording playing in the background, singing melody with Christine
joining in (so both singing together) buht do duht

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as knowledge-making</td>
<td>2 TEXT</td>
<td>GSWFacSurvResults.txt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source Material:

To provide a community that supports and pushes the writer to succeed, which Apr 18, 2011 5:57 AM may be through constructive feedback.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as knowledge-making</td>
<td>2 TEXT</td>
<td>MUSFacSurvResults.txt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source Material:

contribute to the Apr 15, 2011 7:48 AM dialogue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration: unclear purpose</td>
<td>1 TEXT</td>
<td>LMTransMar18.doc.rtf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source Material:

or maybe we can work up in a dyad here and you and [unintelligible 02:45] can go over some things together.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation Study: Faculty group data ownership</td>
<td>9 TEXT</td>
<td>4632,4806</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source Material:

The quote is them talking, but then in the quote, they quote, they put something in quotes. I remember you said not to do that, but it's like, it's not my writing it's theirs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation Study: Faculty group data ownership</td>
<td>9 TEXT</td>
<td>5623,5690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What I'm saying is I'm just copying his so I can't just change that.

Well, yes you can because he didn't have quotes around his own statements. So that's why this is a quote within a quote.

to make it their own.

Do you know what you did? Do you know what I'm going to say?
Christine: Uhhh É this one?
Student (female): yeah. The C sharp.

Student(female): you know, you're going to develop your own taste and your own style, so no one can tell you that vibrato is right or wrong, but uh, yeah.
contribute to the Apr 15, 2011 7:48 AM dialogue.

private instrumental instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source Material:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MUSFacSurvResults.txt</td>
<td></td>
<td>purpose of jazz performance</td>
<td>13, TEXT 2486,2506</td>
<td>provide entertainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSWStuSurvResults.txt</td>
<td></td>
<td>purpose of jazz performance</td>
<td>13, TEXT 2783,2820</td>
<td>get across what they are trying to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSStuSurvResults.txt</td>
<td></td>
<td>purpose of jazz performance</td>
<td>13, TEXT 2138,2177</td>
<td>get across their point to their audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSStuSurvResults.txt</td>
<td></td>
<td>purpose of jazz performance</td>
<td>13, TEXT 1779,1802</td>
<td>to understand the music</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
know music

Communication

Emotion

Technical ability

specific time on the platform with which to contribute

contribute to the Apr 15, 2011 7:48 AM dialogue.
Interaction

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  purpose of jazz performance  13  TEXT
1637,1649  MUSFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

communication

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  purpose of jazz performance  13  TEXT
2348,2382  MUSFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

Large and small group performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>writing</td>
<td>2783,2820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GSWStuSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

get across what they are trying to say

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  purpose of writing  121  TEXT  1932,2042
GSWStuSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

produce Apr 30, 2011 9:54 AM academic writing and complete revising process to achieve the essay
requirements.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  purpose of writing  121  TEXT  2138,2177
GSWStuSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

get across their point to their audience

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  purpose of writing  121  TEXT  2338,2368
to make the best paper they can

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data purpose of writing 121 TEXT 2513,2520

Source Material:

proposal

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data purpose of writing 121 TEXT 4507,4514

Source Material:

proposal

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data purpose of writing 121 TEXT 4526,4533

Source Material:

proposal

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data purpose of writing 121 TEXT 4878,4885

Source Material:

proposal

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data purpose of writing 121 TEXT 7586,7593

Source Material:

proposal
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To brainstorm and have ownership of his/her critical thoughts and analysis.

provide a community that supports and pushes the writer
conducting inquiry or research before or during the writing process.
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contribute to the Apr 15, 2011 7:48 AM dialogue.
The musician's role is to understand the music and be able to add embellishments to make it their own.

2 In jazz, a musician must know his or her individual part, and also know how that part relates to other parts in the music. He or she must be able to listen.

3 to know their music, be prepared

4 Their role is to act as a team member.

The individual writer's responsibility in the writing process is to produce academic writing and complete revising process to achieve the essay requirements.

2 I NEED TIME TO DO THE ASSIGNMENT AND READ SOURCES.

3 Their role is to get across their point to their audience in a clear and tactful manner.

4 The bulk of the responsibility lies in the writer's hands.

5 The writer's role is to make the best paper they can including everything that is wanted in it.
I tell him that I worked really hard on my paper

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data individual role/responsibility 29 TEXT

895,1308 AMRTransMar14.txt
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if you choose to revise, the highest grade you can get is a c, right? So if you want an a or a b on a paper, you do it out of the gate, you don't do that on a revision. You following me? If you got an a b or c, that's the grade you must live with. So if you're not happy, then that's just motivation for you to do better, right? Does that make sense to everybody? This is a part of life; this is a part of growing.
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3053,3446 AMRTransMar14.txt
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So remember you need to fulfill all of those points; you have to have all perfect participation points in order to get one point at the end for your final grade. Does this make sense? So if you're in between an A and a B, by one point, the only way you can get that point is if you do all, everything I want you to do; you come to class, you participate, you have all your participation points.
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So maybe right now, you might be feeling disappointed with yourself or you might feel like you need to work harder. That's good. We have six weeks for you to do that. The next papers are the most important papers. Those are the ones I want you to work hard on anyways. Right? So if you're not happy, do something about it. If you don't want to do anything about it, then you just live with those consequences.
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Okay. Or whatever else you want to do. It's up to you. I'll leave it up to you.
As a way for all of us to be on the same page as you're being turned loose into the arena of academic writing, independent academic writing,

I want you to ask me questions, right, because I want all of us to be on the same page.

Okay, so remember what we're doing right now is we're breaking down this last essay into three parts, so that we can make it more manageable, and we can also spend more time researching and writing. That's the whole goal of this, right? So the proposal is the first piece of this. You've got your topic, you've got your argument, you know what you want to do. Right? That's the first piece. The second piece now is the research piece. So you all found 4 sources over spring break, did you not?

Okay, well we could getÉ we could agree or disagree. This is what happened, right, Aaron would find two sources deserved to get paid what they get paid because they earn itÑthey earn that money, right, because they're the best in their field. So in his source analysis, he would talk about those two sources and how they're proving his main point, and he'd have synthesis to show thatÑto demonstrate that. Does this make sense so far? So this seems out there, but what we're doing now is not like an argumentative paperÑwe're saving that for the research essay. Right now what we're doing is we're analyzing our sources and figuring out how we're going to work them into our research paper. Does this make sense? So most teachers are just like "write the paper.Ó What I'm telling you to do is I want you to slow down and think about how you're using your sources and why you're using your sources. That's this paper we're going to work on right now. That's the source analysis. Does anybody have any questions about this? So far so good? Okay. So here we go, right. Let's look at this. So it's going to be a 4 to 5 page essay. And I want
you to closely examine two or more sources that you're going to be using in your research essay. So that's why I wanted you all to find 4 articles, to make your life a little simpler right now. And then you're going to analyze these sources and talk about how they will fit into your research essay. That's what's happening. So this is more like an informative paper. For some of you this might be your dream come true you're like thank God. But we're still doing synthesis we're doing explanatory synthesis, and we'll talk about that later this week. All right? So there's a couple of different directions you can go on the source analysis. I'm talking about the part now where is says it can work both ways. Think about this be intelligent about this, right? Ideally, you are all going to read your sources right, gonna read and annotate the sources like we've been talking about all semester long when we're using sources and you're going to figure out some things about your topic. This may mean that you're going to make some discoveries like "Oh, I'd never thought of that! That would be a discovery, right? "I had never considered that as a probable cause or "I hadn't considered that as a reason for my argument in the paper. Research sometimes does that for us. We find things, you make discoveries, or we go to new places. That's awesome, right? If that happens to you, that's something that you would include in the source analysis. Are you following me? So a discovery you've made. I have an example it will all pan out. The other part is, a lot of people are like, "No, I went into this project knowing exactly the points, I found sources that prove exactly what I want to say, I haven't made any discoveries I don't want to make any discoveries, I want just to be straight forward, just like that. Right?

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data   individual role/responsibility  29   TEXT
12747,12978  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

you're going to have to say in the paper the source analysis paper my intention was to find sources to suit this main point, and I have found those sources, and this is what the sources say. This is how they connect to one another.
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I want you to articulate the thesis for your research paper so don't confuse these things. The thesis for your research paper is in your proposal. "I'm going to be arguing that professional athletes should be paid what they are paid. That's the thesis. You following me? So I want you to clearly state that thesis for the research essay, and also who the audience for the research essay is going to be. I want to know both of those things. You already did them in the proposal, so this is another opportunity to, you know, copy and paste as you want to call it, but of course you have
to change it. It can't be word for word. All right. Then, I want you to address what it is that you've learned through your research. So in other words, you're going to tell me, "I found sources that support this main point, or I made this discovery, right? You're going to tell me what it is you learned through the research process. This is essentially the thesis for the source analysis. What is it that you learned from your research?

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data individual role/responsibility 29 TEXT 17056,17148 AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

You can tell me what it is you've learned--what it is you've discovered through your sources.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data individual role/responsibility 29 TEXT 17339,18064 AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

So it could be a good idea to go against what you believe and then you can actually learn something new so you have more to write about.

AMR: It's possible man.

Shane: That's how I see it, because I know if I was to do this and I went and like "I believe this so this is what I'm doing" I'd learn nothing.

AMR: right.

Shane: Because my opinion is all based on stuff I already know

AMR: Right? I mean it's a good point. But it's also like what Shane's saying too is that's a way to explore counter argument and rebuttal, right? So a lot of you may not have a counter argument right now. Your research may lead you to a counter argument. That is what you can focus on in the source analysis. Does this make sense, everybody?

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data individual role/responsibility 29 TEXT 19587,20127 AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

So here's what I want you to think about doing. I would come up with two discoveries because this is going back to the length question that Kara just asked. I want you to come up with two main points for this paper. So that means that I'll be maybe you made a discovery about this one thing and then also you found sources that confirm your reasoning for one of your main points. Or you found sources that confirm your reasoning for your main point, "AÓÑand you found sources that confirm a counter argument and rebuttal. Does this make sense?
Source Material:

each person is going to be trying to implement concepts.

Student(female): you know, you're going to develop your own taste and your own style, so no one can tell you that vibrato is right or wrong, but uh, yeah.

To brainstorm and have ownership of his/her critical thoughts and analysis.

conducting inquiry or research before or during the writing process.

writing for something beyond a grade

Communication
Each individual has a specific time on the platform with which to contribute to the Apr 15, 2011 7:48 AM dialogue.

As a teacher I attempt to bring the universal aesthetic that exists outside of the Apr 15, 2011 7:48 AM university to the students.

private instrumental instruction
Large and small group performance.
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<tr>
<th>Case Code</th>
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<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Case Code: 2348,2382**  
MUSFacSurvResults.txt

Source Material:

In a jazz group, each member must know the music and be able to play as a group. A group's responsibility is to work on their collective sound and prepare for performances. A group's role is to provide entertainment, know music and be able to play as a group. The group's responsibility is to learn all of their music and shed. It's very little responsibility lies in the group's hands. I'm not really sure..

**Case Code: 2264,2631**  
MUSStuSurvResults.txt

Source Material:

A group's responsibility is during the peer evaluation stage for effective feedback and correcting glaring errors seen. A group's role is to get across what they are trying to say. Very little responsibility lies in the group's hands. I'm not really sure..
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GSWStuSurvResults.txt
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11695,11696  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  231  TEXT
11743,11744  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  231  TEXT
12112,12113  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

We
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  12153,12154  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:
we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  12182,12183  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:
we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  12426,12427  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:
we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  13565,13566  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:
We

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  13601,13602  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:
we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  13896,13897  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:
we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  13919,13920  AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility
13954,13955 AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility
14357,14358 AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility
14430,14431 AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility
14519,14520 AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility
14635,14636 AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility
15000,15001 AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data
group role/responsibility
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data
group role/responsibility
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data
group role/responsibility
Source Material:

We

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data
group role/responsibility
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data
group role/responsibility
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data
group role/responsibility
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data
group role/responsibility
Source Material:
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  231  TEXT
19444,19445  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  231  TEXT
20457,20458  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  231  TEXT
20469,20470  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  231  TEXT
21130,21131  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  231  TEXT
21706,21707  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  231  TEXT
21850,21851  AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

we
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  231  TEXT
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  231  TEXT
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  231  TEXT
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  231  TEXT
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  231  TEXT
Source Material:

We

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  231  TEXT
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  231  TEXT
Source Material:
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility 3778,3779 BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility 5740,5741 BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility 8304,8305 BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility 13563,13564 BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:

We

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility 15896,15897 BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility 16840,16841 BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:

we
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data

Source Material:

We

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data

Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data

Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data

Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data

Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data

Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data

Source Material:
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility 231 TEXT
BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:

We

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility 231 TEXT
BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility 231 TEXT
BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility 231 TEXT
BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility 231 TEXT
BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility 231 TEXT
BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility 231 TEXT
BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  231  TEXT
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  231  TEXT
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  231  TEXT
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  231  TEXT
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  231  TEXT
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  231  TEXT
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  231  TEXT
Source Material:

we
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231  TEXT
Source Material:

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231  TEXT
Source Material:

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231  TEXT
Source Material:

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231  TEXT
Source Material:

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231  TEXT
Source Material:

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231  TEXT
Source Material:
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility

Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility

Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility

Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility

Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility

Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility

Source Material:

we
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  3612,3613  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  3917,3918  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  4027,4028  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  4113,4114  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  4142,4143  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  4455,4456  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

We
We

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility 231 TEXT
5699,5700 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility 231 TEXT
5830,5831 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility 231 TEXT
6024,6025 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility 231 TEXT
6235,6236 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility 231 TEXT
6264,6265 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility 231 TEXT
6329,6330 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility 231 TEXT
6366,6367 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility

LMTransMar18.doc.rtf

Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility

LMTransMar18.doc.rtf

Source Material:

We

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility

LMTransMar18.doc.rtf

Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility

LMTransMar18.doc.rtf

Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility

LMTransMar18.doc.rtf

Source Material:

We

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility

LMTransMar18.doc.rtf

Source Material:

we
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility
10183,10184 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility
10656,10657 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility
10847,10848 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility
10877,10878 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility
11056,11057 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility
11744,11745 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data group role/responsibility
11790,11791 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  231  TEXT
11793,11794  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  231  TEXT
11885,11886  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  231  TEXT
11924,11925  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  231  TEXT
11995,11996  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

We

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  231  TEXT
12027,12028  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

We

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  231  TEXT
12771,12772  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

we
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231 TEXT
13253,13254 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231 TEXT
13271,13272 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231 TEXT
13875,13876 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

We

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231 TEXT
14814,14815 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

We

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231 TEXT
15054,15055 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231 TEXT
15789,15790 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

We

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231 TEXT
16587,16588 LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility
16617,16618  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility
16853,16854  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility
17279,17280  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility
17367,17368  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility
17642,17643  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

We

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility
18173,18174  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

we
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231  TEXT
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231  TEXT
Source Material:

We

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231  TEXT
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231  TEXT
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231  TEXT
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231  TEXT
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231  TEXT
Source Material:

we
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231 TEXT

Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231 TEXT

Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231 TEXT

Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231 TEXT

Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231 TEXT

Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231 TEXT

Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231 TEXT

Source Material:
Source Material:

we

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231  TEXT
29044,29045  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf

Source Material:

We

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231  TEXT
1156,1160  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf

Source Material:

we're

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231  TEXT
19996,20000  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf

Source Material:

we're

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231  TEXT
22362,22366  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf

Source Material:

we're

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231  TEXT
2968,2972  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf

Source Material:

we'll

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231  TEXT
11995,11999  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf
Source Material:

We'll

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  231  TEXT
22375,22379  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf

Source Material:

we'll

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  231  TEXT
23336,23340  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf

Source Material:

we'll

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  231  TEXT
26552,26556  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf

Source Material:

we'll

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  231  TEXT
28284,28290  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf

Source Material:

we will

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  231  TEXT
28308,28314  LMTransMar18.doc.rtf

Source Material:

We will

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility  231  TEXT
939,940  MUSStuSurvResults.txt

Source Material:

we
I want you to ask me questions, right, because I want all of us to be on the same page.

To provide a community that supports and pushes the writer to succeed, which Apr 18, 2011 5:57 AM may be through constructive feedback.

creating a solid community of writers
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231 TEXT

Source Material:

peer review

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231 TEXT

Source Material:

writing for something beyond a grade

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231 TEXT

Source Material:

Communication

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231 TEXT

Source Material:

Emotion

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231 TEXT

Source Material:

Technical ability

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  group role/responsibility 231 TEXT

Source Material:

The sum total of the individuals (cliche, but true) should be greater than the Apr 15, 2011 7:48 AM parts. Interaction and communication create a fabric that is the music.
Source Material:

Large and small group performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>GSWSStuSurvResults.txt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A group’s responsibility is during the peer evaluation stage for effective feedback Apr 30, 2011 9:54 AM and correcting glaring errors seen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>BIXTransMarch15.txt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source Material:

Play it with me—none two three four
*(saxophones playing together)*

Student(female): Right—so did you breathe?  
Christine: Yeah—

Student(female): All right, one two three four
*(saxophones playing together)*

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as assessment tool 23 TEXT

9738,9816 BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:

Right. Let’s take it from E7. One two three four
*(saxophones playing together)*

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as assessment tool 23 TEXT

3525,3551 BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:

saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as assessment tool 23 TEXT
saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as assessment tool

Source Material:

saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as assessment tool

Source Material:

saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as assessment tool

Source Material:

saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as assessment tool

Source Material:

saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as assessment tool

Source Material:
saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as assessment tool 23 TEXT
11248,11274 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as assessment tool 23 TEXT
11315,11341 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as assessment tool 23 TEXT
13052,13078 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

Saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as assessment tool 23 TEXT
13198,13224 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as assessment tool 23 TEXT
14326,14352 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:

saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as assessment tool 23 TEXT
14502,14528 BIXTransMarch15.txt
Source Material:
saxophones playing together

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data collaboration as assessment tool

To provide a community that supports and pushes the writer to succeed, which Apr 18, 2011 5:57 AM may be through constructive feedback.

peer review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 14605,14631 | BIXTransMarch15.txt |
| 14791,14817 | BIXTransMarch15.txt |
| 14871,14897 | BIXTransMarch15.txt |
| 15476,15502 | BIXTransMarch15.txt |
| 1698,1833 | GSWFacSurvResults.txt |

| 2587,2597 | GSWFacSurvResults.txt |

Source Material:
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  purpose of collaboration  12  TEXT

Source Material:

reach an agreement

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  purpose of collaboration  12  TEXT

Source Material:

get across what they are trying to say

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  purpose of collaboration  12  TEXT

Source Material:

be able to play as a Apr 29, 2011 3:50 AM group.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  purpose of collaboration  12  TEXT

Source Material:

to work on their collective sound

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  purpose of collaboration  12  TEXT

Source Material:

know music

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  purpose of collaboration  12  TEXT

Source Material:

learn all of their music

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  purpose of collaboration  12  TEXT

Source Material:
implement concepts.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  purpose of collaboration  12  TEXT
  1698,1833  GSWFacSurvResults.txt

Source Material:

To provide a community that supports and pushes the writer to succeed, which Apr 18, 2011 5:57 AM may be through constructive feedback.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  purpose of collaboration  12  TEXT
  2543,2579  GSWFacSurvResults.txt

Source Material:

creating a solid community of writers

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  purpose of collaboration  12  TEXT
  2587,2597  GSWFacSurvResults.txt

Source Material:

peer review

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  purpose of collaboration  12  TEXT
  1385,1433  MUSFacSurvResults.txt

Source Material:

contribute to the Apr 15, 2011 7:48 AM dialogue.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  purpose of collaboration  12  TEXT
  1637,1649  MUSFacSurvResults.txt

Source Material:

communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIXTransMarch15.txt</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>17755,17895</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source Material:

Student (female): *with recording playing in the background, singing melody with Christine joining in (so both singing together) but do duht

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data listening 5 TEXT 1167,1179
Source Material:

Communication

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data listening 5 TEXT 1341,1394
Source Material:

specific time on the platform with which to contribute

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data listening 5 TEXT 1385,1433
Source Material:

contribute to the Apr 15, 2011 7:48 AM dialogue.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data listening 5 TEXT 2348,2382
Source Material:

Large and small group performance.

Case    Code    Frequency    Type    Reference    Source
Dissertation Study: Faculty group data  improvisation 4 TEXT 9070,9752
AMRTransMar14.txt
Source Material:

I don't know, somebody give me a topic.

*(Inaudible student chatter)
Student 20: Bacon
AMR: Bacon?
Student 20: Isn't that what he said?

AMR: Well I like bacon

Student 21 (Aaron): Professional athletes are overpaid (concurrent with Student 20 and AMR)

AMR: Professional athletes are overpaid, right? Aaron, what's theÉ (concurrent) Student (Aaron): They are not.

AMR: Oh, They are not.
Student 22: Yes they are!
AMR: What's the argument that they are not overpaid? What's one of the reasons you're going to use to argue that they're not overpaid?

Aaron: Because they (inaudible)É

Student 20: No it's not.
AMR: Okay, well we could getÉ we could agree or disagree. T

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data improvisation 4  TEXT 1167,1179
MUSFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

Communication

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data improvisation 4  TEXT 1341,1394
MUSFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:

specific time on the platform with which to contribute

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data improvisation 4  TEXT 2326,2343
MUSFacSurvResults.txt
Source Material:
Jazz Improvisation

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data
androcentric language

Source Material:

don't back off on your sound. Still play with ferocity I think that's the word. You know what I mean, right?
Christine: okayÉ
Student(female): ferociousness

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Cases contained the code 'feminist language'!

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Cases contained the code 'silenced female'!

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Cases contained the code 'silenced male'!

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data
androcentric

Source Material:

don't back off on your sound. Still play with ferocity I think that's the word. You know what I mean, right?
Christine: okayÉ
Student(female): ferociousness

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Cases contained the code 'silenced male'!
No Cases contained the code 'female centered'!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Cases contained the code 'non-specific gender bias'!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation Study: Faculty group data resistance to existing performance or pedagogical model</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>4060,4321</td>
<td>BIXTransMarch15.txt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source Material:

Okay, so you got piano towards the end and you realized that was piano. So I want you to try and think more finesse I know it's Jazz, but I still want you to be graceful, especially if it's piano. So bring it down, and don't cut that F sharp off, you know.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data resistance to existing performance or pedagogical model | 5 | TEXT | 10412,10596 | AMRTransMar14.txt |

Source Material:

So most teachers are just like "write the paper." What I'm telling you to do is I want you to slow down and think about how you're using your sources and why you're using your sources.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data resistance to existing performance or pedagogical model | 5 | TEXT | 2220,2323 | GSWFacSurvResults.txt |

Source Material:

The main difference is the grade aspect and the contrived audience writing prompts force upon students.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data resistance to existing performance or pedagogical model | 5 | TEXT | 2519,2540 | GSWFacSurvResults.txt |

Source Material:

Having a real audience

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data resistance to existing performance or pedagogical model | 5 | TEXT | 2739,2843 | GSWFacSurvResults.txt |

Source Material:

and having time to really discuss
topics as opposed to teach a formula pushed by the program/department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation Study: Faculty group data</td>
<td>blatant criticism</td>
<td>10 TEXT 9282,9398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BIXTransMarch15.txt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Source Material:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All right, and you're really cutting that the dotted 16th right here at the beginning you're really cutting them off.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation Study: Faculty group data</td>
<td>blatant criticism</td>
<td>10 TEXT 8499,8694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BIXTransMarch15.txt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Source Material:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just talking about your air when you started the C to the C sharp there, when you hit the B it was just *(speaking rhythmically and vocalizing musically) buh buh BWAH!* it just came out of nowhere.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation Study: Faculty group data</td>
<td>blatant criticism</td>
<td>10 TEXT 7662,7681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BIXTransMarch15.txt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Source Material:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You're late, right?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation Study: Faculty group data</td>
<td>blatant criticism</td>
<td>10 TEXT 6762,6779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BIXTransMarch15.txt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Source Material:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

yeah. No vibrato,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation Study: Faculty group data</td>
<td>blatant criticism</td>
<td>10 TEXT 3411,3469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BIXTransMarch15.txt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Source Material:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now don't be so dramatic with ending the A with your tongue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation Study: Faculty group data</td>
<td>blatant criticism</td>
<td>10 TEXT 4612,4640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BIXTransMarch15.txt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
don't back off on your sound.

You guys are killing me today.

Killing me. Slow death. Okay, well we'll spend some time with that today, too. Okay. So we've got our sources that we should have found for our topic. Ideally, just tell me just lie to me right now, you found 4 sources for your topic.

Good, let's just play that game. Delightful. I know you do.

That was cool. Can you go back to the B7 right here? One two three four
*(saxophone playing)

Student (female): All right, and so exactly the same thing—right, carrying your breath over.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data softened criticism 16 TEXT 8300,8375
BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:

can we do that one more time? And think about keeping your, uh, your air in.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data softened criticism 16 TEXT 7995,8148
BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:

All right, so that, exactly the same as that, same kind of gesture, so I want you to think about carrying your breath over, and not breathing right there.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data softened criticism 16 TEXT 7822,8376
BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:

That was cool. I was ______ *(inaudible). Let's just do it from the same spot and keep going this time. One, two, one two three four.

*(saxophone playing)

Student (female): All right, so that, exactly the same as that, same kind of gesture, so I want you to think about carrying your breath over, and not breathing right there.

Christine: okay.

Student (female): All right. Let's just take it from right there. One, two, one two three four

*(saxophone playing)

Student (female): can we do that one more time? And think about keeping your, uh, your air in.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data softened criticism 16 TEXT 6805,7007
BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:

Maybe at one point someone will say to add some, or maybe you'll hear a recording— I'm not sure if Jim Snidero is doing vibrato on this recording that I have of him, but just be wary of too much vibrato.
Do you want to try that B-flat one more time? Could you hear that at the beginning how it just wasn't spot on?

Yeah, you could hear it at the beginning, right?
*(saxophone playing)*
Student (female): Try it one more time for me.

You spiraled through and you got through it, and most of it was good. There were some funky rhythms, some articulation things, but you did it with good tone throughout the whole thing, even when you knew there were, like right there you know, but still, you maintained good tone and to me that's really important, especially when you're sight reading.

So, this eighth rest right here I kind of want you to think don't think about taking a breath or even actually acknowledging it.

All right so you tried you tried something different, so that was cool,
Source Material:

Okay, so you got piano towards the end and you realized that was piano. So I want you to try and think think more finesse. I know it's Jazz, but I still want you to be graceful, especially if it's piano. So bring it down, and don't cut that F sharp off, you know.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data softened criticism 16 TEXT 4856,4902
BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:

You're still kind of cutting it off in my taste.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data softened criticism 16 TEXT 5154,5278
BIXTransMarch15.txt

Source Material:

Do you know what you did? Do you know what I'm going to say?
Christine: Uhhh this one?
Student (female): yeah. The C sharp.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data softened criticism 16 TEXT 3679,4260
AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

So maybe right now, you might be feeling disappointed with yourself or you might feel like you need to work harder. That's good. We have six weeks for you to do that. The next papers are the most important papers. Those are the ones I want you to work hard on anyways. Right? So if you're not happy, do something about it. If you don't want to do anything about it, then you just live with those consequences. Right? So that would mean that we meet up again in the fall, right? And we do this all over again in the fall, or you could do it with somebody else, I don't care, right?

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data softened criticism 16 TEXT 13341,13391
AMRTransMar14.txt

Source Material:

please come sit down; please come to class on time.

Dissertation Study: Faculty group data softened criticism 16 TEXT 3679,4088
So maybe right now, you might be feeling disappointed with yourself or you might feel like you need to work harder. That's good. We have six weeks for you to do that. The next papers are the most important papers. Those are the ones I want you to work hard on anyways. Right? So if you're not happy, do something about it. If you don't want to do anything about it, then you just live with those consequences.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Source Material:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>positive assessment that first appears negative</td>
<td>1 TEXT 7179,7465</td>
<td>BIXTransMarch15.txt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So, you did it, but I'm just going to reiterate what you did, because I don't know if you realize what you did. But, you see these articulations right here? The long short long? Do, da, dut.

Christine: mmmmm

Student(female): You automatically applied it to right here, which is perfect.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Source Material:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>collaborative language</td>
<td>218 TEXT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>750</td>
<td>751</td>
<td></td>
<td>AMRTransMar14.txt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I don't know, somebody give me a topic.

*(Inaudible student chatter)*

Student 20: Bacon
AMR: Bacon?
Student 20: Isn't that what he said?

AMR: Well I like bacon

Student 21 (Aaron): Professional athletes are overpaid (concurrent with Student 20 and AMR)

AMR: Professional athletes are overpaid, right? Aaron, what's theÉ (concurrent) Student (Aaron): They are not.

AMR: Oh, They are not.
Student 22: Yes they are!
AMR: What's the argument that they are not overpaid? What's one of the reasons you're going to use to argue that they're not overpaid?

Aaron: Because they (inaudible)É

Student 20: No it's not.
AMR: Okay, well we could getÉ we could agree or disagree. T
Source Material:

Kara, what's up babe?

Kara (Keira?) So, are we actually going to like synthesize the sources in this paper?

AMR: Yes

Kara: so then we're going to like do something like copy and paste this or something?

AMR: Yes! Yes.
Kara: okay
   AMR: And when we say copy and paste, I'm not saying I want you to take your source analysis and copy it and paste it into your research paper, because they're two different papers, but the synthesis is something that you can definitely copy and paste. (concurrent student chatter)

   Kara: Okay.
   AMR: You'll frame it differently because in the research essay, it's argument. What we're doing right now is more informative.
   Kara: Okay.
   AMR: Does that make sense?
   Kara: yeah.
   AMR: All right. So Kara's onto me; she knows what I'm thinking.

So it could be a good idea to go against what you believe and then you can actually learn something new so you have more to write about.

AMR: It's possible man.

Shane: That's how I see it, because I know if I was to do this and I went and like "I believe this so this is what I'm doing" I'd learn nothing.
AMR: right.
Shane: Because my opinion is all based on stuff I already know
AMR: Right? I mean it's a good point. But it's also like what Shane's saying too is that's a way to explore counter argument and rebuttal, right? So a lot of you may not have a counter argument right now. Your research may lead you to a counter argument. That is what you can focus on in the source analysis. Does this make sense, everybody?
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Material:</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>saxophones playing together</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14326,14352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Material:</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saxophones playing together</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14502,14528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Material:</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saxophones playing together</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14605,14631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Material:</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saxophones playing together</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14791,14817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Material:</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saxophones playing together</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14871,14897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Material:</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saxophones playing together</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15476,15502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Material:</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saxophones playing together</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11344,11488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Christine: *(speaking rhythmically) duh dut duh dut duh duhde dut
Student(female): duh dut bo do duh dut
Christine: duh dut duh dut bo duh de dut
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Student(female): TrackÉ waitÉ. 317, 318É So I'm going to put on the track where it doesn't play the sax partÑit's just the rhythm section. All right?
Christine: okay.
Student(female): And you're going to play through it. I don't know how this is going to work out. This should be it.

*(recording playing)
*(saxophone playing)
Christine: UGHÉ
Student(female): *(singing the melody concurrently with saxophone playing) buh do buh

Student(female): buht. Two. Here we go. *(concurrently with saxophone playing one note) Christine: Shoot.
Student(female): *with recording playing in the background, singing melody with Christine joining in (so both singing together) buht do duht
*(saxophone playing)
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Having a real audience
creating a solid community of writers

peer review

and having time to really discuss topics as opposed to teach a formula pushed by the program/department.

specific time on the platform with which to contribute

contribute to the Apr 15, 2011 7:48 AM dialogue.
Interaction
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Large and small group performance.
AMR GSW 1120  
March 14, 2011 (Monday)

*Inaudible student chatter

Student 1: “Man, dude.”

Student 2: “I already know, I already know, I already know”

Student 3: “So did I fail this paper?”

AMR: “Did you, (student’s name, rather inaudible) get the email?  
Student to AMR: I got the email, but I didn’t print mine out; I forgot to. But I read all the comments.  
AMR: when you start putting together the portfolio, then you’ll print it out

Student 4: So do you want to read it for me?

*Inaudible, then  Student 5: “Do you want me to read it for you? Sure”

Student 4: So just give me the grade

Student 6: making noise with voice, but not using words

You got my facial expression?

Student 7: Oh, (Keira?). It’s just a paper.

AMR: Keira said we need to talk about a couple of things, so let’s do that before we even start, right? So remember, if you no pass this paper, you can revise, if you choose to revise, the highest grade you can get is a c, right? So if you want an a or a b on a paper, you do it out of the gate, you don’t do that on a revision. You following me? If you got an a b or c, that’s the grade you must live with. So if you’re not happy, then that’s just motivation for you to do better, right? Does that make sense to everybody? This is a part of life; this is a part of growing. This is it, that’s how we’re going to think of that. So you all have mid-term grades. Did you all see that you have mid-term grades?

(While AMR is talking) Student 8: I see it; I have it up

Student 9: No

AMR: Here’s how I do this; this is how I do mid-term grades, right? I look at your two essay grades and I look at your attendance. If I feel like you could be on the path to a c, I say you’re on the path to a c, for the most part. If I said there was something wrong, like where you got a D, then that means there are attendance problems and some major essay writing problems that we need to talk about to get you on the right track. The only people
who got As and Bs were people who got As and Bs, you know what I’m saying? Does this makes sense everybody?

Student 10: Where is our grade posted at? Just on my grades?

AMR: I don’t know exactly where it is, Leah.

Student 10 (Leah): Is it like an actual grade or just the points?

AMR: I think it’s a “grade-grade”-- a letter grade.

Leah: Oh.

*Inaudible chatter during AMR speaking

AMR: Okay, to understand the points again for this class, let’s just review this quickly, right? Your final grade is made up of the essay 1, essay 2, the proposal, the source analysis, and the research paper. Right? Those five essays determine your final grade in this class. Does this make sense everybody, so far right? So point wise, whatever you get translates into a letter grade, which is what you will get on your final transcript. It will affect your GPA. So we’re so far, so good, right? Remember that I’m giving you guys those participation points. Those are only for you to keep track of your absences and also for you to keep track of can you get the extra point in the end, right? So remember you need to fulfill all of those points; you have to have all perfect participation points in order to get one point at the end for your final grade. Does this make sense? So if you’re in between an A and a B, by one point, the only way you can get that point is if you do all, everything I want you to do; you come to class, you participate, you have all your participation points. Does this make sense?

Student: yeah

AMR: So 3 absences we all know we’re done, is done. We’re done, right? You don’t turn in a paper, you’re done. Okay, is this a good review on this? Is this helpful to get our head straight? So maybe right now, you might be feeling disappointed with yourself or you might feel like you need to work harder. That’s good. We have six weeks for you to do that. The next papers are the most important papers. Those are the ones I want you to work hard on anyways. Right? So if you’re not happy, do something about it. If you don’t want to do anything about it, then you just live with those consequences. Right? So that would mean that we meet up again in the fall, right? And we do this all over again in the fall, or you could do it with somebody else, I don’t care, right?

Student 11: Yeah, in the fall

AMR: Okay. Or whatever else you want to do. It’s up to you. I’ll leave it up to you. Okay, any other questions about this stuff though? Have we got all this sorted out?
Student 12: No
AMR: Have I got everybody’s proposals? All the proposals should be here in this nice beautiful stack right now. That’s where I want them. Okay, so, if you do have questions about your MSE essay, right, the one I just passed back, you can ask at the end. All right? So right now what we need to do is start talking about the next part of this whole research process. So all of you who turned in your proposals, I will read them. I will make sure the topic is going to work, the argument is going to work, right? As a way for all of us to be on the same page as you’re being turned loose into the arena of academic writing, independent academic writing, I should say. So the next step is that we’re going to do a source analysis, and this essay is strange. I’m not going to lie to you; it’s strange. So I want you to listen to me; I want you to ask me questions, right, because I want all of us to be on the same page. All right, I can’t walk and talk today—it’s not been going well—so I’m just going to pass these out and then I’m gonna…

Student 13: I’ve been having trouble concentrating too.

AMR: I can talk, I just can’t walk and talk. It’s difficult some days.

*Inaudible, plus coughing.

AMR: All right, so we should all have the assignment sheet. (Inaudible name) Are you looking for the assignment sheet, baby? I’m not sure where it ended up.

Student 14: It’s right here on your desk.

AMR: Oh good. Here. I’ll put you in babe, don’t worry. Okay, so let’s just review this real quickly. What is the rough draft due date for the source analysis?

Student 15: A month

AMR: Next Monday, right?

Student 16: A week

AMR: A week. We can do it! We can do it! It’s going to be fine! So that’s the 21st, right?

Student 15: Miss Amanda, you’re killing us.

AMR: I know, I’m killing myself; it’s ridiculous. It’s going to pay off in the end, I promise.

Student 15: Why don’t we make it next Wednesday?

Student 16: I think that sounds good too, yeah.

AMR: I can’t do it; I’m not gonna do it. I’m gonna keep it—we’re going to keep it as it
Student 16: I almost got you though.
Student 15: I like it on Monday, though.

AMR: You did, you made me think about it. (Concurrent student chatter) And when’s the final due?

Student 17: Oh sweet, we have a rough draft

AMR: Yeah we have a rough draft and a final draft loves, right, right? Okay. The rough draft is due the 21st—that’s next Monday. When’s the final draft due?

Student 18: The 28th.

*(inaudible student chatter)*

AMR: Okay, where can we find when due dates are?

Student 19: The 30th
AMR: (inaudible name) Did you say it? What did you say baby? The 30th! Where did you look to find out?

*(inaudible student chatter)*

AMR: So that’s great. The due dates are on our research essay assignment sheet, and they’re also on the syllabus. Thank you (Dharmesha?). I appreciate it, love. Okay, so remember what we’re doing right now is we’re breaking down this last essay into three parts, so that we can make it more manageable, and we can also spend more time researching and writing. That’s the whole goal of this, right? So the proposal is the first piece of this. You’ve got your topic, you’ve got your argument, you know what you want to do. Right? That’s the first piece. The second piece now is the research piece. So you all found 4 sources over spring break, did you not?

Student 20: No

AMR: Did you like email it to yourself or brought with you? Remember this is what we talked about for homework? You guys are killing me today.

Student 20: I totally forgot.

AMR: Killing me. Slow death. Okay, well we’ll spend some time with that today, too. Okay. So we’ve got our sources that we should have found for our topic. Ideally, just tell me—just lie to me right now, you found 4 sources for your topic.

Student 21: I found 4 sources for my topic.
AMR: Good, let’s just play that game. Delightful. I know you do. Okay. So what I’m asking you to do in this next step of our research process is a source analysis. Essentially, what this essay is—it’s a multiple source essay, just like we just did, right? It’s going to have source synthesis in it. Only what we’re going to do is we’re going to use the sources that we’re finding for our research paper and we’re just going to let them guide where we’re going in terms of our argument. So in other words, maybe you found 4 sources—two of them support this main point; the other two support the counter argument and rebuttal. Does this make sense so far? Your source analysis would just talk about that: “I found these two sources that talk about how”… I don’t know, somebody give me a topic.

*(Inaudible student chatter)*

Student 20: Bacon
AMR: Bacon?
Student 20: Isn’t that what he said?

AMR: Well I like bacon

Student 21 (Aaron): Professional athletes are overpaid (concurrent with Student 20 and AMR)

AMR: Professional athletes are overpaid, right? Aaron, what’s the…
(concurrent) Student (Aaron): They are not.

AMR: Oh, They are not.
Student 22: Yes they are!
AMR: What’s the argument that they are not overpaid? What’s one of the reasons you’re going to use to argue that they’re not overpaid?

Aaron: Because they (inaudible)…

Student 20: No it’s not.
AMR: Okay, well we could get… we could agree or disagree. This is what happened, right, Aaron would find two sources deserved to get paid what they get paid because they earn it—they earn that money, right, because they’re the best in their field. So in his source analysis, he would talk about those two sources and how they’re proving his main point, and he’d have synthesis to show that—to demonstrate that. Does this make sense so far? So this seems out there, but what we’re doing now is not like an argumentative paper—we’re saving that for the research essay. Right now what we’re doing is we’re analyzing our sources and figuring out how we’re going to work them into our research paper. Does this make sense? So most teachers are just like “write the paper.” What I’m telling you to do is I want you to slow down and think about how you’re using your sources and why you’re using your sources. That’s this paper we’re going to work on right now. That’s the source analysis. Does anybody have any questions about this? So
far so good? Okay. So here we go, right. Let’s look at this. So it’s going to be a 4 to 5 page essay. And I want you to closely examine two or more sources that you’re going to be using in your research essay. So that’s why I wanted you all to find 4 articles, to make your life a little simpler right now. And then you’re going to analyze these sources and talk about how they will fit into your research essay. That’s what’s happening. So this is more like an informative paper. For some of you this might be your dream come true—you’re like thank God. But we’re still doing synthesis—we’re doing explanatory synthesis, and we’ll talk about that later this week. All right? So there’s a couple of different directions you can go on the source analysis. I’m talking about the part now where is says it can work both ways. Think about this—be intelligent about this, right? Ideally, you are all going to read your sources—right, gonna read and annotate the sources like we’ve been talking about all semester long when we’re using sources—and you’re going to figure out some things about your topic. This may mean that you’re going to make some discoveries like “Oh, I’d never thought of that!” That would be a discovery, right? “I had never considered that as a probable cause” or “I hadn’t considered that as a reason for my argument in the paper.” Research sometimes does that for us. We find things, you make discoveries, or we go to new places. That’s awesome, right? If that happens to you, that’s something that you would include in the source analysis. Are you following me? So a discovery you’ve made. I have an example—it will all pan out. The other part is, a lot of people are like, “No, I went into this project knowing exactly the points, I found sources that prove exactly what I want to say, I haven’t made any discoveries—I don’t want to make any discoveries, I want just to be straight forward, just like that. Right?

Student: I like that.

AMR: Like that? That’s totally fine, but the trick of it is you’re going to have to say in the paper—the source analysis paper—my intention was to find sources to suit this main point, and I have found those sources, and this is what the sources say. This is how they connect to one another. Has anybody here done an annotated bib or anything like that?

Student: Yeah, I did (concurrently with AMR)
AMR: or made like note cards about sources? (concurrent student chatter) You know what I’m saying?

Student 22: Yeah I’m familiar with… (inaudible) from my brother

AMR: Yeah. Some people—yeah. If you’ve done that before, cool (Inaudible student name) please come sit down; please come to class on time.

Late student: sorry, I just woke up.

AMR: I know, just come to class. I don’t want to talk about it. Um—the source analysis is very similar to the annotated bib. Right? We’re examining our sources and how we’re going to use them. So you’re either going to talk about a discovery you’ve made, or how your sources confirm your argument, which you (inaudible). It’s as simple as that. So far
so good? I'll be I’m saying things over and over again

Student (20?): Mm hmm.

AMR: But I want to make sure we all understand what we’re talking about. Okay, so here we’re going to have all of the same components, right? Let’s look at this—what’s it going to be in here—all the same components. So the first thing: you’re definitely going to have to have an introduction for this paper, and if you want to write this stuff down so you remember this or it would be helpful for you for references that would be fine. That might be good for you. Okay, so the first thing we’re going to have to do… Kara, what’s up babe?

Kara (Keira?): So, are we actually going to like synthesize the sources in this paper?

AMR: Yes

Kara: so then we’re going to like do something like copy and paste this or something?

AMR: Yes! Yes.
Kara: okay
AMR: And when we say copy and paste, I’m not saying I want you to take your source analysis and copy it and paste it into your research paper, because they’re two different papers, but the synthesis is something that you can definitely copy and paste. (concurrent student chatter)

Kara: Okay.
AMR: You’ll frame it differently because in the research essay, it’s argument. What we’re doing right now is more informative.
Kara: Okay.
AMR: Does that make sense?
Kara: yeah.
AMR: All right. So Kara’s onto me; she knows what I’m thinking. So what I’m thinking is, let’s make your research paper better and easier for you by examining these sources and getting two instances of synthesis down. Does that make sense everybody? So in other words I’m trying to help you even though it seems like a pain in the ass. Okay. All right, here we go. The introduction. So this is what I want the introduction to do—I want you to clearly state—it’s not going to be a direct thesis like we’ve been talking about. It’s going to be a little bit different—so listen carefully about what I want, right? I want you to articulate the thesis for your research paper so don’t confuse these things. The thesis for your research paper is in your proposal. “I’m going to be arguing that professional athletes should be paid what they are paid.” That’s the thesis. You following me? So I want you to clearly state that thesis for the research essay, and also who the audience for the research essay is going to be. I want to know both of those things. You already did them in the proposal, so this is another opportunity to, you know, copy and paste as you want to call it, but of course you have to change it. It can’t be word for word. All right. Then, I want you to address what it is that you’ve learned through your research. So in
other words, you’re going to tell me, “I found sources that support this main point, or I made this discovery, right? You’re going to tell me what it is you learned through the research process. This is essentially the thesis for the source analysis. What is it that you learned from your research?

(Inaudible student question)
AMR: Well then you found sources to support your main points, right?

(inaudible student response)
AMR: So then you would say, “I found”, you know, “as I went through my research I found these sources that support my main point.”

**BREIF RECORDING BREAK—battery change (17:49-ish)**

AMR: You can tell me what it is you’ve learned--what it is you’ve discovered through your sources. So this could be something that is completely new, or this could be “hey, I found proof for my reasons.” “I found two sources that I can synthesize for this main point.”

Student (Shane): So it could be a good idea to go against what you believe and then you can actually learn something new so you have more to write about.
AMR: It’s possible man.

Shane: That’s how I see it, because I know if I was to do this and I went and like “I believe this so this is what I’m doing” I’d learn nothing.
AMR: right.
Shane: Because my opinion is all based on stuff I already know
AMR: Right? I mean it’s a good point. But it’s also like what Shane’s saying too is that’s a way to explore counter argument and rebuttal, right? So a lot of you may not have a counter argument right now. Your research may lead you to a counter argument. That is what you can focus on in the source analysis. Does this make sense, everybody?

*(Inaudible student question)*

AMR: (inaudible answer) That’s just the introduction, right? So the thesis is going to clearly state whether you’ve made a discovery or found sources for your argument. That’s fine. Okay. The next part of this, and this is going to go back to our critique paper—you know how to do this, right? I want you to write a summary of the sources you are using in the source analysis. Let me clarify this—a lot of people are like “I’m going to write a summary for all the sources I’ve found for my research paper.” That’s not what I’m looking for. I’m looking for a summary of the sources you actually use and synthesize in this source analysis. Only those. And when I say a brief summary, what would be the longest I’d expect to see?

Students (concurrently): inaudible answers
AMR: right. 5 sentences is what I just said, or a paragraph.

Student (Kara): So, a paragraph per source?

AMR: Some people do it that way; they do little paragraphs for each. Some people only just write like a couple sentences for each and put them all together into one. There are options.

Student (Kara) (same female as previous question): How is that going to be four pages?

AMR: I’ll show you.

Student (not the same female as previous question): Don’t you worry. (laughter)

AMR: Okay, and here’s the deal, right, you have to have two instances of synthesis. Between—and I want two different sources so at least that means you’re going to have at least three sources for this paper. More would be better. So here’s what I want you to think about doing—I would come up with two discoveries because this is going back to the length question that Kara just asked. I want you to come up with two main points for this paper. So that means that’ll be maybe you made a discovery about this one thing and then also you found sources that confirm your reasoning for one of your main points. Or you found sources that confirm your reasoning for your main point, “A”—and you found sources that confirm a counter argument and rebuttal. Does this make sense?

Student (female) mm hmmm.

AMR: I would pick two different things—like I wouldn’t hinge your whole paper on like one like “Okay, I found two sources that support this main point.” Right? Because then you might come up short, and I want four full pages.

AMR: Carmen(?) are you confused?

Student: kind of

AMR: Kind of? It’s weird. When we look at the example, then let me know if you’re confused, okay?

Student (female): I have a question.

AMR: yes

Student: Is that the main point like the main points that are going to be in the research paper?

AMR: Yes! Yes!

Student: okay

AMR: Like “I found sources that support” like “people are obsessed with bacon because they need salt to survive.” I don’t know; I made that up.
Student (male): I love bacon.
AMR: Right. I do too.

AMR: You get what I’m saying? That would be one main point. Another main point would be what our counter argument came up with about bacon.
*Inaudible student question/statement

AMR: Yeah, right! Some people say that we shouldn’t eat so much bacon. It’s bad for you. That would be a counter argument I discovered in the research. And that’s my source analysis paper, right? So there’s no counter argument that you’re making; you’re talking about what you’re going to be doing in the research paper and how the sources you’re using are helping you form that research paper. Does this make sense? Carmen, if it helps you think of it like this—it’s a reflection on what, like, how your brain is working before you actually sit down and write the research paper. Right? So this is the snapshot between the proposal and the research paper. This is that jumbled, like, how can I figure this out so I can start making a main point. That’s what we’re doing right now. Does that make more sense?

Carmen (female): No
AMR: That’s okay. So then we have our main points. You have to have two instances of synthesis at least and then here’s the kicker—this is another thing that’s really important—it says I want you to write a conclusion that states the future direction of your research essay. So instead of us being like “Professors shouldn’t use facebook because it’s like dangerous and will ruin their professionalism—that whole audience appeal and call to action—we’re not doing that in this conclusion. In this conclusion, you’re telling me after conducting this research, I found sources that confirm my initial thesis, that support my initial main points, so my plan is to stay with everything I’ve already lined up that was in my proposal. You’re just telling me what’s going to happen in the future—how it’s going to work out for your research paper. What direction you hope it goes. Some of you might make discoveries in your research and you’re like “I’m not going to use that; I don’t want to get into that mess.” Sometimes it gets like that, right? So your conclusion would just say that, like “I found this main point, it could work, but I don’t think I’m going to go there.” “It seems too messy; I don’t want to do it.” You know what I mean? So the conclusion is like a reflection okay—now that you’re done with the research, are things changing for the research paper? Or not?

(**From outside the classroom, random ‘chicken noise’ made by a student. **)  
Laughter

AMR: That was nice. That kind of scared me too. (concurrent with random laughter and chatter in the classroom). Okay, so as I said earlier, you have to keep in mind that this paper is important because the synthesis that’s going to happen in it should be synthesis that you can use in your research paper. So we’re working towards the research paper, and I want you to approach this paper like…
Buzz: Okay, all right, here we go. You were supposed to choose the best answer; that’s because sometimes more than one answer could, you know, arguably be correct. But only one can be the best answer. And all of these multiple choice were taken verbatim off of your handouts, you know, copy and paste. So, uh, let’s just go quickly through them. Do you want to see one, Krista?

Me: Sure, thanks.

Buzz: Here, you don’t know him.

Me: Appreciate it

Buzz: Uh, well this is Krista—she’s visiting

Me: Hi, nice to meet everybody (concurrent) Students(females): Hi Krista! She’s pregnant! (Laughter)

Buzz: Yeah, we really have two visitors

Me: Yeah, technically two

Buzz: Okay, number one—high energy virtuosic solos, but incorporates simpler harmony, rhythm and melody than Bebop, so that would be

Student (male): Hard bop

Buzz: Hard bop, letter F. Typical front line—two cornets, could stop right there. Clarinet, trombone, later saxophone—that would be

Student(female): New Orleans

Students: New Orleans

Buzz: New Orleans, letter A. Incorporates atonality—could have stopped there—abandonment of traditional forms, collective improvisation, and unorthodox playing techniques—that would have to be

Student (female) Free jazz

Buzz: Free Jazz, letter H. I think almost everybody got that one. Repertoire included
original compositions frequently based on the chord changes to standards…
Student (female) Ohhh! (concurrently with Buzzelli’s previous statement)
Buzz: We talked about that, I played some on the piano, what is it?
Students: Bebop (with inaudible conversation)

Buzz: Bebop—letter C. Name literally means new beat—I think everybody got this one—E, bossa nova. Use of two-beat rhythm section—could have stopped there pretty much, well, not really—and collective improvisation on heads, uh those two things combined, the best answer would be New Orleans. Repertoire consists of compositions heavily influenced by blues, ragtime, marches, and spirituals… again, letter A. Typical rhythm section consisted of piano, bass drums, and rhythm guitar—the only era where rhythm guitar was really prevalent is like the swing era. So that’s letter B. Uh, repertoire incorporated pop songs of the day, tin pan alley, show tunes, great American songbook standard song forms, again, letter B. You know, that’s one that could arguably be several others, but Swing era would be the best answer for that. Typical rhythm section: banjo—could have stopped right there—tuba, and then later, guitar and bass, but that’s still letter A: New Orleans. Next page—incorporated extreme tempos: both fast or slow—that could be a lot of things—uh, very virtuosic and longer solos, angular and rhythmically unpredictable melodies, that’s a little tricky, but the best answer, again, is bebop: letter C. Incorporates rock rhythms, electronic instruments and effects, simple rock harmony—I think most everybody got that—letter G, fusion. Characteristics include moderate tempos, lyrical solos, very restrained and understated playing—I’m surprised that anybody got that wrong—but that’s letter D, Cool. First introduced early 20th century—first recordings 1917: New Orleans. Right. Letter A. Repertoire included standards, original compositions with European and classical influences: best answer—letter D, right off of your handouts. And finally, combines Jazz harmonies with Brazilian rhythms—I think everybody got that—Bossa Nova. Okay? Next section. The Blues: is always slow and sad? No. Is always sung? No. Is typically 12 bars long, yes. Usually incorporates sophisticated harmonies—no. So, really it can only be letter C. 18: The B section of an AABA tune is the…?
Students(male and female): Bridge
Buzz: The bridge. Letter D. The part of the song that’s played only once at the beginning or often not at all is called the…
Student(male): Verse
Buzz: The verse. We talked about some famous verses? Yeah we did.
Student(female): Someone to watch over the Rainbow
Buzz: Someone over the rainbow is a not-so-famous verse; there is a verse but nobody knows it. But one of the ones that everybody knows that I think we mentioned in here… *(sings) There’s a somebody I’m longing to see… what is that song?
Students (male and female): Someone to watch over… *(concurrently with student(female): me. Yes. *(some laughter) There’s a saying old, all in love are blind—Right, that’s the verse: usually sung, with that tune, but then you don’t ever come back to it. Uh, okay. An extension at the end of a song is the tag. Next page. The melody to a Jazz tune is sometimes referred to as—and only one of these really makes sense—letter A, yeah—it’s the only one. The part of the tune that is generally repeated many times and is used as the accompaniment
for improvised solos is the…
Student (female): Chorus
Buzz: Chorus. You’re doing your listening assignments and you’re seeing how many choruses of the tune they play, right? Okay. Name that artist—and we only covered 4 people, pretty much. Who’s most closely associated with Herbie Hancock?
Student (male): Miles
Buzz: That would have to be Miles Davis, pretty much. Which one of these artists is most closely associated with a recording of Hello Dolly?
Student (female): Louis Armstrong
Buzz: Louis Armstrong. Which of these artists is most closely associated with the Blue Devils and the Benny Moton orchestra?
Student (female): I think it was Basie
Buzz: Basie. Uh, Hot Five and Hot Seven?
Student (female): Armstrong
Buzz: Armstrong. Right off the handouts. Uh, Gill Evans was the arranger for…?
Student (female): Miles Davis
Buzz: Miles Davis. Freddy Green was the rhythm guitar player for…?
Student (female): Count Basie
Buzz: Count Basie. Uh, most closely associated with John Coltrane… to the best of my knowledge would be the only one of these people to actually play with John Coltrane…
Student (female): Miles Davis
Buzz: Miles Davis. Collaborated with Lester Young…. Basie. Lester Young was a Basie sideman—a member of the Count Basie orchestra for some years. Most influenced by Lester Young, then would be someone who came after Basie, so that would be Charlie Parker.
Student (male): okay.
Buzz: Um, most closely associated with Dizzy Gillespie, in that they lead a group together, and we watched a video on this and everything…
Student (male): Yardbird
Buzz: Charlie Parker, yeah. Which of the following played in Miles Davis’ second great quintet? Gill and Bill Evans who were real people: Gill Evans was a great arranger and Bill Evans was a pianist—both were associated with Miles Davis but were not members of the second great quintet. Bob Evans and Dale Evans—nobody went for that one: I was so disappointed…*laughter* Do you know who Dale Evans was?
Student(s)(male and female) No
Buzz: No? Roy Rogers’ wife
*laughter*
Buzz: Nobody guessed that. Coltrane and Red Garwin—that would be the first great quintet; Wayne Shorter and Herbie Hancock is correct, and then Chick Corea and Dave Holland—that would be Bitches Brew era. Speaking of Bitches Brew, the three milestone recordings: 1949 Birth of the Cool, 1959 Kind of Blue, and 1969 Bitches Brew. Now most of you did well with the blues; what I was really looking for, if you mentioned it was 12 bars long, that was good, the main thing being you have a line of lyric, it repeats, it rhymes, then you could have either quoted one or made one up—most people got that. All right. Questions?
Buzz: (to me) How’d you do? I should have made you keep score.
Me: I think I could have passed.
Buzz: All right. Let’s have them back.

*Student chatter*
Buzz: You’ll have another written exam during your final exam time along with your listening exam, which is during your final exam time. I guess the written could be over… yeah?
Student (female) *Inaudible question
Buzz: It’s worth 10
Student (male) *inaudible comment
Buzz: *inaudible comment… I wouldn’t worry about it.
Student (female) I know.
Buzz: So your final could probably, actually, still bring back some of this material. I might want to… I might want to ask similar questions, because these weren’t that great. And then of course anything else we cover between now and then, but we’re going to take a different turn here. I would like to do more of the artists and that kind of thing, but I’m not sure how much time we’re going to have for it because we’re going to get into more performance oriented stuff, very soon. You’re also going to have one last theory type quiz—I want to get that out of the way, so we’re going to cover that material today, as well. All right. Look familiar? Okay, you’ve probably seen something like this at some time in your life. And what is that?
Student(male): Diatonic chords—it’s a scale
Buzz: well, it’s more than just a scale now
Student (male) chords
Buzz: diatonic, what kind of chords?
Student(male): triad
Buzz: triads in the key of C, okay. Is this new to anybody? Just going to take this one step farther, and now we have diatonic seventh chords.
**Plays chords on the piano**
Buzz: Ah, let’s look at these, and you know that’s a one chord, two chord, three chord, so on. So in a major key, what quality is the one chord?
Student (male): it’s a seventh chord
Buzz: Major seventh—it’s a c major seventh. What’s the two chord?
Student (male) minor seventh
Buzz: minor seventh. So, that’s a d minor seventh. Three chord?
Student (male): minor seventh
Buzz: minor seven. Four chord?
Student (male): Major seven
 Buzz: Major seven. Five?
Student (male): Dominant
Student(2)(male): major
Buzz: Dominant 7, so we call that G7.
Student(female)*concurrently with Buzz: G7
Buzz: Six?
Student (male): minor seventh
Buzz: a minor seven
Buzz: Seven?
Student(male): half diminished
Student(male)(2): diminished
Buzz: whoever said half diminished is correct. So it’s b half diminished or b minor seven flat five, and then we’re back. So there’s our diatonic seventh chords in the key of C.
And if you were to do that in any other key, the letter names would be different but all the chord qualities would be exactly the same. That’s just how it comes out in the major key. How is this useful to a Jazz musician? Let’s—I know you’re all vocalists—they’re all vocalists, by the way—
Me: Thank you, that’s good to know.
Buzz: Well let’s kind of think instrumentally for a minute here. Say you’re improvising a solo on your instrument, or it could be vocal, how would this be useful to know how all of the scale degrees function?
Student(female): if you know the changes, if you’re improvising over the chords, you can outline the chords that are being played vocally, as an improvised solo.
Buzz: you can outline chords, but how does knowing what key the chord comes from help you do that?
Student(male): If you know you’re going to a 4 chord, and say you’re going to be singing the third of that chord, you know you’ll want to be singing a major third instead of a minor third, or you’ll goof up the whole chord quality.
Buzz: sort of—ah, Gordy:
Gordy: You’ll know if you want to stay in the key which notes to sing, or if you want to go out of the key, or add a note to the chord or something, you’ll know that too.
Buzz: That’s the closest. I mean the reason I said “sort of” to yours is because just because you’re in the key of C doesn’t mean that’s the only chords you can have, especially in Jazz where we go into different keys and borrow chords from other keys and whatever. So, you can’t really predict what kind of chord you’re going to have. You can to the extent that these will be the most common, and that is good to know for instance, say you’re transcribing the tune, and when I say transcribing I mean you have a recording and you’re trying to figure out the chords changes. And you hear what the base note is. You’re in the key of C and you hear an F. Your first guess should be that’s an F major seven. Now it might not be. It could be an F7, it could be an f minor seven, it could be anything that has an F in the bass, but the most likely is an F major seven. So what you said is kind of useful doing that. What Gordy said is kind of like if you have a chord progression, you can look at it and determine what key it’s in, which might not always be obvious. For instance, let’s say we have a chord progression that goes C minor 7, F minor7, Bflat minor 7, Eflat7 and you’re looking for a scale to play or sing that fits all of those chords, if there is one. How do you determine that?
Student(female): You see that the Eflat7 is the dominant, so that’s probably the 5th.

Buzz: That’s the shortcut, yeah, good. No. That’s the best answer, so let’s do it that way. The only place we have a dominant 7 is on five. In a major key, that’s the only place that chord occurs. So, we have to count backwards from five. If Eflat is five, what’s one?
Student(male): Aflat
Buzz: Aflat. So this chord, assuming we’re sticking with major scales, is the five chord in A Flat. Now, how do we know if the others are in A flat? Now let’s do it the hard way.
You took the shortcut, but that’s good. That’s smart. Let’s take a look at the first chord first, which would be the logical thing but not the quickest thing. So we have a minor seven, which could be any one of three things, what?
Students(male and female): Two, three, or six
Buzz: Two, three, or six. If C is two, what key are we in?
Student(female): B flat
Buzz: B flat. So we might be in B Flat and this might be a 2 chord, but we don’t know yet. Could also be a three chord, in which case if C is three, we’d be in…
Student(male) A flat
Buzz: A flat, but this could be a six chord and now we’d have to be in…
Student(male): E flat
Buzz: E flat. At this point, we don’t know. So let’s look at the next chord. Again it’s minor seven, so again it could be two, three or six.

BIX Transcription of audio file March 15, 2011.

BIX: …so much for doing this, and uh, you know just, you don’t have to play dumb or anything. Just, you know, you don’t have to be a beginner. Just be who you are and, actually, we’ll be working out of the Snidely etude book. And, uh, so each person is going to be trying to implement concepts. We’ll talk about that. So anyhow, this is going to be a half hour right now and then we’re going to discuss it afterward.

Student (female) so this is like, the lesson starting now? So, Christine, how was your break?
Christine: Great!
Student (female): So how much did you practice?
Christine: I practiced one day.
Student(female): Better than no days.
Christine: yeah.

Bix: I get a feel—this feels more as a continuation of the rec tec project.
Christine: a what?
Student (female): That just went over my head. (*concurrent whispered conversation, inaudible). Okay, why don’t you go ahead and warm up, and give me a couple of long tones before you start playing.

*(saxophone playing)
Student (female): Do you want to try that Bflat one more time—could you hear that at the beginning how it just wasn’t spot on? This time try to attack that B flat, just, “baaa”—right on B flat.
*(saxophone playing)
Student (female): Yeah, you could hear it at the beginning, right?
*(saxophone playing)
Student (female): Try it one more time for me.
*(saxophone playing)*
Student (female): That was exactly it. So remember how that feels and do that every time, okay?
Christine: Okay.
Student(female): Ah, let’s just start right into the etude. All right, so I’m just going to let you go right through this, all right? Uh, right about there—just sight read through the whole thing, and then we’ll go back. One, two, one two three four.

*(saxophone playing)*
Christine: Umm….
Student(female): Just keep going.
*(saxophone playing)*

Student(female): All right. Cool. Good sight reading!
Christine: thanks
Student (female): You spiraled through and you got through it, and most of it was good. There were some funky rhythms, some articulation things, but you did it with good tone throughout the whole thing, even when you knew there were, like right there—25,26,27—you know, but still, you maintained good tone and to me that’s really important, especially when you’re sight reading. Uh, let’s just take it from the top. Here, let me just hear you play from, uh, the intro to the first chorus. One, two, one two three four.
*(saxophone playing)*
Student (female): So, this eighth rest right here—I kind of want you to think—don’t think about taking a breath or even actually acknowledging it.
Christine: okay.
Student(female): I kind of want you to think about blowing through it. All right, so let’s try that. One, two, one two three four.
*(saxophone playing)*
Student(female): All right—so you tried—you tried something different, so that was cool, so let’s listen to how I do it…
*(saxophone playing)*
Student(female): I didn’t exactly take a breath. I didn’t take a breath at all; I played through it. Did you want me to do it one more time for you?
Christine: yeah.
Student (female): one two three four
*(saxophone playing)*
Student(female): so I kind of stopped the A with my tongue before I attacked the B
*(concurrently, Christine: okay)* Give that a shot?
Christine: okay
Student(female): One, two, one two three four.
*(saxophone playing)*
Student(female): okay, now don’t be so dramatic with ending the A with your tongue. Let’s try it together—one, two, one two three four
*(saxophones playing together)*
Student(female): by yourself—one, two, one two three four
*(saxophone playing)
Student (female): Yeah, that was it. So every time you have this kind of gesture anywhere, I want you to do the same exact thing—same concept as we did right there. Cool?
Christine: okay.
Student (female): Ah, let’s go ahead and start at five and finish it out. One, two, one two three four.
*(saxophone playing)
Student(female): Okay—let’s try that again. One, two, one two three four.
*(saxophone playing)
Student (female): Okay, so you got piano towards the end and you realized that was piano. So I want you to try and think—think more finesse—I know it’s Jazz, but I still want you to be graceful, especially if it’s piano. So bring it down, and don’t cut that F sharp off, you know…
Christine: this one?

Student (female): You’re kind of cut-- No, this one. So one, two, one two three four
*(saxophone playing)
Student (female): Okay, so C sharp with cap
Christine: Mhmmm
Student(female): and don’t back off on your sound, either. Just because I said piano and play less, don’t back off on your sound. Still play with ferocity—I think that’s the word. You know what I mean, right?
Christine: okay…
Student(female): ferociousness
Christine: yeah!
Student(female): so, the F sharp—I want you to give it full value. You’re still kind of cutting it off in my taste; so just listen for a second: one two three four
*(Saxophone playing)
Student(female): If I followed my own advice, I would have played piano, but I didn’t. So, let’s give it a shot—one, two, one two three four
*(saxophone playing)
Student (female): Do you know what you did? Do you know what I’m going to say?
Christine: Uhhh… this one?
Student (female): yeah. The C sharp.
Christine: okay.
Student(female): one, two, one two three four
*(saxophone playing, then other sax playing, then saxophone playing)
Student (female): Just do that.
*(saxophone playing)
Student (female): One more time.
*(saxophone playing)
*(other saxophone playing)
*(saxophones playing back and forth)
Student (female): yeah. That was it. Let’s, uh, go onto the first chorus. One, two, one two three four
*(saxophone playing)*

**Student (female):** all right. So we’ve got these eighth notes, right? It’s going to be very—if you’re not swingin’ it’s going to be very obvious, especially because it’s repeat eighth notes, so you know the, uh—I’m sure you take lessons, right? With a great teacher, and I’m sure he’s talked to you about the triplets on the—with the eighth notes. Have you done that?

**Christine:** A little bit

**Student (female):** So like, the way I think about it is I—by these—that gets the first two triplets, this gets the second one, so you always want to be thinking in your head (*spoken rhythmically*) trip-l-et, trip-l-et, trip-l-et, trip-l-et, trip-l-et, do.

**Christine:** *(spoken rhythmically)* dut, duh dut, do do be duh dut.

**Student (female):** yeah. So let’s actually play that together—the fist chorus, one, two, one two three four.

*(saxophones playing together)*

**Student (female):** let’s do that one more time. One two three four

*(saxophones playing together)*

**Student (female):** were you giving me a little vibrato, on that G sharp?

**Christine:** yeah.

**Student (female):** yeah. No vibrato, at least for right now. Maybe at one point someone will say to add some, or maybe you’ll hear a recording… I’m not sure if Jim Snidero is doing vibrato on this recording that I have of him, but just be wary of too much vibrato.

**Christine:** okay

**Student (female):** all right. Cool. Let me just hear you do that by yourself. One, two, one two three four.

*(saxophone playing)*

**Student (female):** right. So, you did it, but I’m just going to reiterate what you did, because I don’t know if you realize what you did. But, you see these articulations right here? The long short long? Do, da, dut.

**Christine:** mhm

**Student(female):** You automatically applied it to right here, which is perfect.

**Christine:** okay

**Student (female):** So, I just wanted to make you aware of that. Uh. Let’s go from right there. One, two, one two three four

*(saxophone playing)*

**Christine:** ugh.

**Student (female):** You’re late, right?

**Christine:** yeah.

**Student (female):** let’s take it from the same spot. One, two, one two three four.

*(saxophone playing)*

**Student (female):** That was cool. I was ______ *(inaudible)*. Let’s just do it from the same spot and keep going this time. One, two, one two three four.

*(saxophone playing)*

**Student(female):** All right, so that, exactly the same as that, same kind of gesture, so I want you to think about carrying your breath over, and not breathing right there.

**Christine:** okay.

**Student(female):** All right. Let’s just take it from right there. One, two, one two three four
*(saxophone playing)
Student (female): can we do that one more time? And think about keeping your, uh, your air in.
Christine: was that too connected? Or was that…
Student(female): No, that was cool.
Christine: okay.
Student(female): Just talking about your air—when you started the C to the C sharp there, when you hit the B it was just *(speaking rhythmically and vocalizing musically) buh BWAH!—it just came out of nowhere.
Christine: okay.
Student(female): One, two, one two three four
*(saxophone playing)
Christine: hmmm…
Student(female): let’s play it together. One, two, one two three four.
*(saxophones playing together)
Student(female): By yourself, one two three four
*(saxophone playing)
Student(female): cool. Keep going. One two three four.
*(saxophone playing)
Student(female): That was cool. Can you go back to the B7 right here? One two three four
*(saxophone playing)
Student(female): All right, and so exactly the same thing—right, carrying your breath over.
Christine: mmmm.
Student(female): All right, and you’re really cutting that—the dotted 16th right here at the beginning—you’re really cutting them off. Like, a little too short—like *(speaking rhythmically) duht duht, duht duht.
*(saxophone playing)
Student(female): Play it with me—one two three four
*(saxophones playing together)
Student(female): Right—so did you breathe?
Christine: Yeah…
Student(female): All right, one two three four
*(saxophones playing together)
Student(female): Right. Let’s take it from E7. One two three four
*(saxophones playing together)
Student(Female): All right, so… let me see here… yeah yeah. *(sung) long short long, duh duh… wait. *(Saxophone playing)
Student(female): sorry—that’s the way. I said it wrong.
*(saxophone playing)
Student(female): long, long short. You hear it?
Christine: yeah yeah
Student(female): All right, cool. I was thinking one thing and saying a different thing. All right. Take it from E7. One, two, one two three four.
*(saxophone playing)
Christine: *vocalization
Student(female): All right—don’t be afraid of that C sharp. It sounds like you really
backed off a little bit, and uh, E7. One, two, one two three four.
*(saxophone playing)
Student(female): yeah. That was cool. Take it from the same spot again—one, two, one
two three four
*(saxophone playing)
Student(female): All right, so you want to hear—do you know how to figure out that
rhythm? How do you figure out rhythms when… (Christine speaking concurrently—
partially inaudible).
Christine: Um, count it?
Student(female): Usually, I stick in some lines if its—everyone has their own different
ways—
Christine: *(speaking rhythmically) but duh dut, duh dut, bu duhdeuh.
Student(female): If you stick in the line *(speaking rhythmically) duh dut, bu dudaduh.)
See?
Christine: *(speaking rhythmically) duh dut, bu duh de ut
*(saxophone playing)
Student(female): Take it from here—one two three four
*(saxophones playing together)
Student(female): one two three four
*(saxophones playing together)
Student(female): one two three four
*(saxophones playing together)
Christine: *(speaking rhythmically) duh dut duh dut duh duhde dut
Student(female): duh dut bo do duh dut
Christine: duh dut duh dut bo duh de dut
Student(female): All right. Same spot, by yourself. One two three four
*(saxophone playing)
Christine: UGH!
Student(female): That’s okay. Do it again.
*(saxophone playing)
Student(female): take it back to the—right there.
*(saxophone playing)
Student(female): Yeah—that was it. Uh, let’s keep going. One two three four
*(saxophone playing)
Student(female): All right. Do I have to say it?
Christine: Ummm… rhythm?
Student(female): It was cool. It wasn’t like, bad or anything, it’s just you want to keep
everything uniform, so let’s take it back to the D major. One two three four.
*(saxophone playing)
Student(female): One two three four
*(saxophone playing)
Student(female): That’s cool.
Christine: okay.
Student(female): Take a second. One two three four
*(saxophone playing)
Student (female): You were anticipating it—
Christine: oh.
Student(female): A little too early. One, two, one two three four
*(saxophone playing)
Student(female): you were anticipating it a little too early. One, two, one two three four
*(saxophone playing)
Student(female): You’re thinking about it too much. Just take a second; don’t even think about it. Sometimes I just-- I think about something too much I’m just like *(vocalization) UUGH!—It’s like all the time, but…
Christine: It’s like always
Student (female): It’s like always I do that
Christine: UUGH! I noticed!
Student (male): UUGH!
Christine: I noticed that about you.
*(laughter in the classroom)*
Student(female): Let’s both play it together. Let’s do______ One, two, one two three four
*(saxophones playing together)*
Student(female): You have to hold on two beats
Christine: Okay.
Student(female): Quarter note! One two three four
*(saxophones playing together)*
Student(female): Cool. Let’s go to chorus two. One, two—actually, no, hold up—go back. Let me hear it by yourself.
Christine: okay________
Student(female): One, two, one two three four
*(saxophone playing)*
Student(female): Um—you have to land that right on beat four.
Christine: okay
Student(female): Okay. It was a little early. We’ve gotta nail beat four--*(speaking rhythmically) doo, dot. B major—one, two, one two three four
*(saxophone playing)*
Student(female): Keep going. One two three four
*(saxophone playing)*
Student(female): All right, so you don’t like quarter notes, do you? (*concurrently: Christine: not really) Right—the same as half notes (*Concurrently: Christine: It’s the same as that… buuuh buht ba do dat) Half notes. I’m calling it a quarter note, but it’s the same exact rhythm, so… chorus two—one two three four
*(saxophone playing)*
Student (female): all right—so let’s look at that rhythm. Right there… because you’re kind of thinking of something else. Let’s play it together right there.
Christine: Okay—from the G sharp?
Student (female): One two three four
*(saxophones playing together)*
Student(female): The G sharp half
Christine: Wait, where?
Student (female): The G sharp half
Christine: okay
Student(female): One two three four
*(saxophones playing together)
Christine: UGH.
Student(female): That’s okay. Okay. One two three four
*(saxophones playing together)
Student(female): Right—so it’s on beat—the and of one.
Christine: mmm
Student(female): Buht bu da dut. Let’s just take that measure. One two three four.
*(saxophones playing together)
Student(female): same thing. One two three four.
*(saxophones playing together)
Student(female): By yourself, from the G sharp. One, two, one two three four.
*(saxophone playing)
Christine: Ugh.
Student(female): One, two, two three four—
*(saxophone playing)
Student(female): All right, so, you’re putting a little too much inflection on it. You’re, you know, *(vocalizing rhythmically: reh reh neh) Think of it, you know, a little more graceful. You know, what would, uh, NOT Cannonball Adderly do it? Maybe like:
*(demonstrates on saxophone). Would you try that? One two three four.
*(saxophone playing)
Student(female): together, one two three four
*(saxophones playing together)
Student(female): keep going. One two three four
*(saxophone playing)
Student(female): All right, so let’s go back to here, carrying your breath over. Can you take it from the D major? One two three four.
*(saxophone playing)
Student(female): Make sure you’re not skipping that quarter note rest right there.
Christine: ahh…
Student(female): *(speaking rhythmically) boot, boop bat bah. Can we just take the pickup, G seven. One two three.
*(saxophone playing)
Christine: ahh…
Student(female): It’s cool, you’ve got forte—don’t back off your sound.
Christine: okay.
Student(female): one two three
*(saxophone playing)
Student(female): Cool. Is it okay if I let her listen to the recording?

Bix: Yeah, yeah.
Student(female): Okay. I’ve got Jim Snidero doing it on CD, so now that you’ve gone through it, I want you to listen to it.
*(recording playing) *(Concurrently: Christine): Yeah, that is smoother.

Student(female): All right. So, I see you marking scoops *(concurrently: Christine: yeah) all over the place. I want you to be really careful with that—you can try a couple—you can try putting them in, and I’ll listen to them, *(concurrently: Christine: okay) but I’m going to tell you what I honestly think of them—I’m going to tell you what they sound like. Because sometimes there’s a tendency to over scoop, like when we did the Basie thing last semester, I uh, --scoops are kind of a weird thing, being that a lot of musicians, they’re on one side or the other side *(concurrently: Christine: mhmmm, yeah.) We need to make sure that we do them with tender loving care. *(concurrently, Christine: mhmm.) Okay. So lets, uh, do you know what track it is? Wait, it’s probably in the book…
Bix: no
Student(female): Track… wait…. 317, 318… So I’m going to put on the track where it doesn’t play the sax part—it’s just the rhythm section. All right?
Christine: okay.
Student(female): And you’re going to play through it. I don’t know how this is going to work out. This should be it.
*(recording playing)
*(saxophone playing)
Christine: UGH…
Student(female): *(singing the melody concurrently with saxophone playing) buht do buht

Student(female): buht. Two. Here we go. *(concurrently with saxophone playing one note)
Christine: Shoot.
Student(female): *(with recording playing in the background, singing melody with Christine joining in (so both singing together) buht do duht
*(saxophone playing)

Student(female): Nice hits at the end—that was great. Good time.
Christine: cool
Student(female): so some of the scoops *(concurrently, Christine: yeah…) just don’t, yeah. I wasn’t caring for much of them them. You know what I mean—do you agree? Christine: yeah. I wasn’t too aware, like I was “maybe I’ll do that scoop, maybe I won’t”, you know, I wasn’t like “I’m gonna do that scoop”
Student(female): Well, I think, like that one, to the A, that one worked well. I thought that one was subtle enough—it didn’t distract me at the end—I thought that one was appropriate.
Christine: yeah.
Student(female): Like right here, I would fix that. Uh… all right cool. And you caught this—this is definitely short—you played it right. Duh do duht
Christine: yeah
Student(female): Yeah, you caught that; it was cool. How much time do I have?
Bix: I mean, you can keep going. I mean, you’ve pushed over a half hour, but…
Student(female): okay… well, I mean…
Bix: No, like finish your concept to the end, like whatever you wanted to convey…
Student(female): All right, well, great job, Christine. Um yeah, so I wanted to tell
*(concurrently, laughter, and Bix: In summary… )
Christine: Haha, good job student
Student(female): You’re good
Bix: Pat her on the head
Student(female): So these things make sure you work on it first, so if you’re going to do
an etude like this, I mean, you’re better off just going to the recording. Like even if
you’re going to transcribe this instead of reading the music, but it’s always good for sight
reading practice, you know, for you to be able to read, but if you can read throuh the
etude before you listen to it, don’t cheat yourself—figure out the rhythms on your own.
Uh, listen to it and then cop what they’re doing. Sometimes it’s not going to work out,
you know, the scoops, some of them didn’t work out, and he did use vibrato in a couple
of the notes, but you really don’t have to worry about that. I think it’s also, you know, if
it’s appropriate. You’re going to know when it’s appropriate and when it’s not
appropriate with practice, with performance, with performing, and just listening
Christine: mmmmm
Student(female): you know, you’re going to develop your own taste and your own style,
so no one can tell you that vibrato is right or wrong, but uh, yeah.
Christine: Sure!
Bix: thank you
Christine: yeah, cool. *clapping
Christine: Thank you

Bix: Now we’re going to go to a play by play. That’s good though. Not _______ but
good though.
Student(female): could I have a piece of paper from somebody, please?

Student(male): who’s on the rhythm section for that?
Bix: *naming names, partially inaudible
Student(male): it’s pretty swinging *(concurrently, Bix: swinging, yeah!)

Bix: Thank you!
Christine: See ya!
Bix: yeah, we’ll see ya.

Bix: all right, Nicole—start talking.
Student(female): Uh---well I mean it was kind of strange, you know…
Bix: it’s artificial. Yes.
Student(female): yeah. It was artificial, and I wouldn’t teach an etude in a lesson,
specifically—probably. Yeah, if I was, I don’t think… I’m trying to figure out what I’m
trying to say.
Bix: okay, while you’re trying to figure it out, the reason I wanted to do this is I think this is going to be extremely practical. You know, she’s more advanced than what I think you’re going to be able to do, but again, let’s say that you’re dealing with a 15 year old or 16 year old, who really doesn’t have any experience playing Jazz, how are you going to convey these things? Because you can’t—you need to have your jazz band getting ready for a concert or for whatever it is, and it’s great, okay we’re going to all to transcribe Bird, but you can’t wait for them to get that together in order to, um, you know be able to play in the section. So how are you going to teach these concepts? That’s why I think this is an important thing. I mean, this is kind of like—having Christine in here to play is kind of like a puff ball, because you know she’s going to take care of business, but um, anyhow, that is the reason why we’re going to be doing this. Okay, so did you find out what you wanted to say?

Student(female): Ah, not exactly, but I did find a different thought. While she was playing, I kept thinking of different things to say, and uh, I mean, I saw things that she was automatically doing that if she was a 15 year old in high school who had never played Jazz before, you know like the caps, like the ‘duh do dut’, you know those kinds of things she was doing automatically, I pointed a couple of them out to her and then holding the half note, which I consistently called the quarter note, over the eighth note rest, you know, those kinds of things…

Bix: yeah

Student(female): I saw it as it was going by-- on paper as it was going by, and she was playing it right for the most part with the articulations and just the way she phrased things, but there were a couple of things that I mean, I wasn’t comfortable addressing as far as like, her tone in a couple of spots—not that I didn’t feel comfortable with her, but more so like I didn’t know what to say or how to sound intelligent about it.

*(concurrently, Bix: Oh, okay.)*

Bix: ah. All right, all right. One thing I want to jump on, and I think this is very important too, is when you said that as things were going on, you kept having to regroup and do, and I think that’s a huge part of teaching. It is a lot, and it is an art form in of itself, and I think if you’re really rigid about “okay, this is what my students do, you know, in the fourth semester of undergrad, they need to be doing this,” and it’s not like that. People are different—people learn differently, people have different bents. People have different strengths. You know, some things for some students are going to be so easy; some students aren’t going to get it. Um, and I’m not talking about this person is a stronger player than that one; I’m talking about this is why music is cool. We talked about the personality, and this is just one way that it manifests itself. So, I think one thing that really aids you as a teacher is your flexibility. Like, how much are you willing to give up your agenda—like your last lesson before your recital—we talked for like an hour and a half. Did you even get your horn out of the case? Like something like that. That’s what needed to be done. So you need to be flexible like that, and also, uh, I can’t remember what I was going to say. Anyhow, this is good now. So, let me ask you that—I took a bunch of notes, and I want you guys to chime in if anyone has something to say. Now, when you started, I thought the long tone thing was kind of contrived—it seemed kind of schizophrenic.

Student(female): Yeah. I didn’t really know if I should start with long tones or do like—I was kind of confused about if I should just jump right into the etude…
Bix: Right. And the thing is this is going to get easier as everyone does it. You know, by the time we get to Brian, he’ll just be able to phone it in. Because, you know, we’ll be dealing with everything. But yeah, I want you just to deal with what you’re going to do. I mean obviously in a lesson, you’re going to want someone to warm up, and I understand why you did it, but it was just like warm up, “yeeewAAAHH”, and you addressed a couple of things and then onto like, “bam”—on to what you really wanted to do.

Student(female): You’re right—it was absolutely contrived; I was just doing it because I wasn’t sure if I, like I said.

Bix: Oh, yeah. Yeah. Schizophrenic is what I had written. Ah, now—one thing, just going back to what you were doing—you had her sight read an etude, but you didn’t—I don’t think—you should have tried to make what you wanted clear. You know, there was no stated objective. You know, I wrote here, “what was she trying to do?” I mean, are we trying to play this perfectly, are we trying to—am I checking you on your sight reading? Or, am I trying to get you to learn how to play figures? These are the main things I was thinking about. Um… uh… And you know, just tying in with that—one person like her is going to look at a piece of music like that and have a fair idea of what a tempo is supposed to be like, but with a student, you know, a younger one who has no experience, I think it’s going to be important to give them a tempo…

Student(male): I thought she did…

Student(female): I totally did. *(concurrently, Student(male): yeah. Bix: Oh you did!) I counted off. I was like “how about right about here.”

Bix: Oh, okay. My bad. I don’t know how I missed that. It’s because my brain doesn’t work… is the tape recorder on? *(concurrently, laughter, and Student(female): I counted off every time for her. Um, okay. And then, “Any instruction?” I had written here, like I guess, was she supposed to go on, was the objective to like plow straight through, or were we going to stop and pick things apart? All right. I think the overall scope of it was cool, like how you started out—let’s say you did do long tones. You had her sight read it, you worked on some things, then—my notes are kind of schizophrenic here—then you—did you have her play the whole?—then you worked with some things with her…

Student(female): Uh, *(concurrently, Bix: then you played together and broke them apart) yeah we kind of went section by section.

Bix: Then you had her—did you have her play the whole thing by herself? *(concurrently, Student(female): ah…) Without the rhythm section?

Student(female): I don’t think I did—not without the rhythm section. *(concurrently, Bix: Well that was good.)

Bix: Then we listened to it, then she played with the rhythm section.

Student(female): Yeah. I really wanted to have her to play with Jim Snidero…

Bix: yeah.

Student(female): I just forgot— I realized as soon as I put the next track on without Jim Snidero—I realized it *(concurrently, Bix: Okay) and I wasn’t going to go back *(concurrently, Bix: okay) and do it, but I did want to do that.

Bix: Well, you know, and another thing—I wouldn’t be afraid—another thing you need to be able to do is like to admit “Well, you know, I screwed up.” I think that’s really important to do. Uh. You know like, to try to pretend like you’ve got it all together is ridiculous. I think if that happens again, say, you know, “I said this, but let’s actually go back and do this.” I mean, I think that’s cool, and I think students respect that. One thing
I remember—we did a concert—and this is kind of irrelevant, but—one thing with David Baker and we did a concert with Slide Hampton in New York; we played at Symphony Space, and uh, we did something and David cued the backgrounds in too early— and the trombone player was supposed to have four choruses—and anyhow, the trombone solo kept on playing, whoever it was was doing it with Slide, and David was freaking out. He was doing like jumping jacks to try to get him to stop and then he went back and listened to the recording after the gig and realized it was his mistake, and you know, was humble enough to say “I apologize—that was”—to the band, to this cat—“that was my fault.” I remember as a 21 year old or whatever, that made a big impression on me—to do that—I think that you are encouraging trust when you are able to relate like that. Um—some things like you really enforced the positive—which is cool. Like your rapport with her was cool—I know you guys know each other—but I imagine you’re probably pretty nurturing with all of your students. Um, I’m guessing you hide your real self… Student(female) *chuckles

Bix: That was good, and I think that’s important to do, to say “You know, I think that was cool but let’s address this… you know, because if you hear the negative all the time—I don’t like this, well I don’t like this—Um, another good thing that I have is there was one thing, like you took the germ of an idea—I can’t remember what it was because it was going by too fast, but you were like “every time this happens, I want you to do this.” I think, especially for a younger student if they realize that okay, if they’re looking… okay, for a kid looking at two pages of Jim Snidero, I mean it’s easy for us, as we look at it, but that’s going to be kind of overwhelming, so if you can kind of get the concept about, “look, this happens all the time,” you know, and so like if you’ve got “foo do dot,” you get that rhythm and that articulation going, and “look, it happens eight more times in this piece,” you know, that gives you a sense of relief, like you’re closer. You’re saying that you have these different sections put together, and that’s important. Also, I think a good thing that you did—you gave her a chance to critique her own playing—you know that’s one of the things, you know, when we were at Notre Dame, and that’s—I really dug that about Dana Hall. He made you guys like—he didn’t just tell you what was wrong or what was right; he made you articulate—he made you remember what you did. And challenge you to “what happened here? Was that supposed to happen? Was that good; was that bad? Did you mean to do that?” And I think that’s—you know that’s more of an organic way of doing it rather than just rote or have a study plan like that’s what’s going to happen—to just feed this information to you, you’re going to regurgitate it, whereas it’s kind of like a living thing. Uh… one thing you did when you asked about the rhythm—you asked how she figured it out, and then you told her about writing the lines in—“this works for me…”—and I think that’s—I may have stated that in here or in your individual lessons—you know, your gig as a teacher is to get the person to be able to teach themselves. You know, the sooner that you can render yourself worthless, the better it is. You know, when the student can honestly please themselves, and so, that was a good thing. Uh—now one thing, like the first time it happened I didn’t think it was successful, but the second time it was. I can’t remember the figure, but you guys were playing something back and forth, and you weren’t diggin what she was doing… Student(female): Yeah, yeah I know what you’re talking about

Bix: Okay—the thing that was confusing to me is that you didn’t articulate what you were looking for, I don’t think. I don’t think she knew…
Student(female): Like, audibly?
Bix: Yeah, like if you can do that without having to say it, cool, uh, but you know, if they don’t have a clue what’s going on, they’re just spinning their wheels. Because then all of a sudden, it just stopped, and to my ears, nothing had changed. It wasn’t like, “oh, that’s it.” There wasn’t like an “a-ha” moment. And then it happened again, and I can’t remember what it was, but she tried it once or twice unsuccessfully, and then you told her, but I think it’s important to be clear. I find for myself that I’ll be having this running conversation or dialogue or whatever going on in my head, and I’ll assume—you know, I have to keep on catching myself doing this—I’ll assume that you guys know what I’m thinking about for the past 45 seconds, and then when I get there, you guys don’t know where that’s coming from. So I think that’s important to include, to maybe not take things for granted, especially when you’re dealing with younger students. And then one thing, um, I think the scoop inflection thing was good, and then *(partially inaudible [mumbled] comment). Ah, and then the one thing that was kind of cool—when you talked about the aesthetic: you talked about graceful. All right, which is very cool, and you could go either way—I could play devil’s advocate because I say—this is a term I use—you need more grace, more finesse, um… now do you quantify that? That’s a tough one to do, but I think it’s good, because I definitely think it’s a part of it, but just be mindful: are you able to really verbalize something that’s pretty abstract. What is graceful? Is it like a Jazz plie?
Student(female): Do you want me to answer you or something?
Bix: Yeah—it’s not solely rhetorical.
Student(female): I mean, when I listened to the recording last night, I would say that Jim was graceful *(concurrently, Bix: yeah.) I mean, I’m just comparing him to Canonball Adderly, because I know that’s what she transcribes, and I would not consider him graceful in the sense of the way Jim is.
Bix: Really?
Student(female): Yes. I think he has finesse, but I’m talking about a different type of graceful—like a plie, like, Jim is a plie, and Cannonball is more like a step—you know, I don’t know… *(concurrently, Bix: yeah.) Like, his playing is a lot more smooth and I would say legato, maybe—I don’t know if that’s the right term to say, but… *(Concurrently, Bix: uh huh. Yeah.)
Student(male): I would say the way she… I remember that… *(concurrently: Student(female): She was harsh.) Yeah! I agree. *(concurrently, student(female): She understood, too, because at one point she said to me “Oh, I see it’s a lot smoother or graceful.” She said something like that; I can’t remember exactly what she said though… Bix: Okay. Um. I thought I saw some of you guys taking notes—maybe you were just writing your grocery lists, but uh, any comments from you guys?
Student(male): Uh, I guess the only thing would be like if you’re going to do an etude like this, like I was getting that the etude had a specific historical context, like it was All of Me, like it was the Basie version of All of Me, and when Jim was playing, he was playing in that style, like he was playing with vibrato like a lead alto player would, *(concurrently, Bix: yeah, good!) and he was leaning back in a certain way, so I think it would be important to mention that specific context, and maybe hipper to the recording, like the original All of me recording.
Bix: Yeah! Very good.
Student(male—not the same male): I was wondering, if it wasn’t being done for sight
reading purposes, would it have been more or less beneficial to like, let her to listen to it first? And get what you’re going for—the vibe of the piece?
Bix: Well, you know, I could see that—the other thing is that with this way, you know where you’re starting—and I’m not saying that’s right, but that would be the reason I would do that, but then you know, if you can influence what they’re going to do,
*(concurrently, Student(male): Uh huh.) maybe that’s a good thing. You know, I think you could go either way.
Student(male): Some of both.
Bix: yeah. Any comments from the Taiwanese delegation? *(some laughter/chuckles)
Student(male): Yes.
Bix: I will give you said CD and book. Um, Keith, I’m wondering, would you prefer to work with a guitarist?
Student(male): Maybe… yeah, maybe. You would definitely approach it differently. Or are you thinking you would want me to do an etude with a saxophone player?
Bix: Well, we could but, I think that puts you at a disadvantage. I think that’s something you should be able to do, definitely, *(concurrently, Student(male): right…) but I think that since—you don’t know how it works, that you may be at a— You know, we could do the same etude… *(concurrently, student(male): m hmm.) Um—oh, was there a concert part in there? Maybe I will have to—I might have to Finale this bad boy.
Student(male—different male): I might have it.
Bix: Oh really!
Student(male): on my computer… I’ll check
Bix: Okay! Yeah. Um, but yeah, I think, do you like want to get one of your students that you’re already teaching, but with, like, new material? I mean you’ll have a chance to look at the material, but it will be new to him.
Student(male): Right. So you’re thinking one of those etudes?
Bix: Yeah. Just for these concepts, yeah.
Student(male): Okay.
Bix: If you want to get—Christine is available for every lesson, but if you want a guitarist… *(concurrently, student(male) okay.) That’s up to you.
Student(male): Okay. And I’ll be a week from today…
Bix: Yeah.
Student(male): Let me think about it. I don’t know if there is anything we could do that would be different from those etudes that would be beneficial for class purposes?...
Bix: It’s up to you. If you have something, cool.
Student(male): Okay.

Bix: All right. Well, cool. Cool. I thought it was great.
Student(female): Thank you.

CLASS ENDED—RECORDING STOPPED.
Woman 1: Do you think you could still get like the almost passed or whatever? Like what if...?

Teacher: Oh, the almost passed because we don't technically give Ds.

Woman 1: Oh, OK. OK.

Teacher: So it means that you didn't make the C, but you got so close to it [coughs] that possibly changing something that's relatively simple may even elevate the grade above a C in just that, just that thing. For example, if somebody has not turned in their summaries. Obviously it's required that you do that, and so you can't pass without doing it. But everything else you did may have been just fine.

Man 1: What's that LP [inaudible 00:59]?

Teacher: That was down the side. I mean the markers are very dry. That's a low pass in that particular area. And always I will make mention of that when I'm writing comments. Yeah. So did you bring your writer's resource?

Woman 1: I may have.

Woman 1: I don't think it very, been [unintelligible 01:24]. Did we [unintelligible 01:24] grade? I don't remember.

Teacher: Yeah.

Woman 1: Did you hand it back already, because I think I might have, like the [unintelligible 01:45].

Teacher: If you, if we're looking at it...

Woman 1: Because I turned it in early.

Teacher: Yeah, yeah, I may have to send you it back.

Woman 1: Yeah.

Teacher: Because...

Woman 1: Is there any way I could email it to you in case you wanted to use it for...

Teacher: Well I don't have it marked in on this. I mean, were you graded on that?

Woman 1: Yeah.

Teacher: So you turned yours in early?
Woman 1: Yeah, so maybe that's why I [unintelligible 02:04].

Teacher: Yeah, yeah. So I was looking through all the other papers and just I didn't see it. It's so unusual to get one early, that I sometimes get [unintelligible 02:20]. Yeah, that's true. I do [unintelligible 02:21] there's that.

Woman 1: Do you want me to just like bring it back in?

Teacher: That would be a help.

Woman 1: OK, I can do that.

Teacher: That'd be a help. Do you have your critique paper with you or...? Well [unintelligible 02:43], or maybe we can work up in a dyad here and you and [unintelligible 02:45] can go over some things together. Let's see your - you do have your [unintelligible 02:54] books?

Woman 1: No I [inaudible 02:57].

Teacher: OK, so what we might do - I'll have you read through your essays and leave marks on them first. And just as there good, you have some questions on the paper itself, please go ahead and comment or raise the question.

Man 1: If there's a grammar error inside the book that we quoted straight from, how do we do that?

Teacher: You need to look. Check the original. That's why I want the copies of the sources. Generally I will look at those copies and see whether or not it's your fault or theirs. You don't want to claim that your source is errant when it's actually you.

Woman 1: Do they have to be in alphabetical order?

Teacher: Mm-hm. What happens with works cited pages? In fact in about five to eight minutes we'll go over this work cited pages and see... It's Katie and Christian and Bree, you don't have your AWR books; I'll have to loan you them because I want us to get these work cited pages right. You turn in the items early, and you go [coughing] papers you're supposed to use exactly on these early papers. It's going to get more complicated than your research papers, because for these papers you'll have a variety of different sources that you're using and I can't be with you every step of the way.

So if I direct you to use, in this case, AWR, Chapter 27, numbers six through three; you've got to be able to talk about it before the papers were due. You've got to be able to follow those directions and, by association, looking at the example and including the information that's requires.

Again, what's a possible reason that you may plug in to something online that says, "Click this tab to put your work cited entries in the order"? Remember we mentioned this the other day?
Man 1: Is it algebraic?

Teacher: Algebraic, right. A lot of these pages that were set up haven't been corrected. Especially if they are associated with these that were written, as our reviews were, I think, five or six years ago. I think a couple of you had some that you smartly found in other sources that came out 2006, 2007. Yeah, Bree?

Woman 1: When you're – in one of these you're saying that it's wrong, but it's a quote, I didn't write it.

Teacher: What am I saying that it's wrong about?

Woman 1: Well parentheses that they have inside their own quotes, but it's like I just copied the quote.

Teacher: Can you explain that with a little more detail?

Woman 1: It says like...The quote is them talking, but then in the quote, they quote, they put something in quotes. I remember you said not to do that, but it's like, it's not my writing it's theirs.

Teacher: They put something in quotes? Probably, now did you look? Is there a number associated with that?

Woman 1: You just crossed out the quotes.

Teacher: Because more than likely, what you're describing, and I can't remember on your paper, but show me your work.

Woman 1: This one. Where it said, "That's what Heath did." I didn't do that.

Teacher: Right. But what you have there, that number is 61F. He looked that up in a writer's resource that'll tell you this is quotation marks with other marks of punctuation. So how would you indicate a quote within a quote?

Woman 1: But what I'm saying is he wrote that.

Man 1: Wait, wait, wait. How would you indicate a quote within a quote?

Woman 2: Quotation marks.

Man 1: With what? If you have a quoted phrase within a quote, it's single quotation marks.

Woman 1: What I'm saying is I'm just copying his so I can't just change that.

Man 1: Well, yes you can because he didn't have quotes around his own statements. So that's why this is a quote within a quote. OK? If it were British, it would be the opposite way but you don't really have to know that.
Woman 3: [unintelligible 08:29]

Man 1: Yours is more of a 66 because you put in quotation marks a book. How do we indicate books?

Woman 3: But that's how he had it so how would I do it?

Man 1: But he's doing that because it's a stylistic format of the "New York Times." It directly contradicts MLA style for us. So how do we indicate the excerpt that we had, "The World Is Flat". The excerpt. Quotations. And how do we indicate the book? Italicized. So we have to make those distinctions. Similarly, it is notable at this time that some of you would actually have the italics and quotations correct in your works cited but then you would flip those around. Sometimes you would italicize the titles inside quotation marks even. Consistency is what demonstrates your knowledge of the MLA formatting that you're supposed to learn this semester. Derek, you have another question?

Derek: I was going to ask why there was just two dashes. I don't understand.

Man 1: How do you make a dash? In their case.

Derek: A line?

Man 1: Not quite. A dash is a punctuation mark. So you hit it twice. If you have a hyphen that counts as a spelling. Generally what I would mark on your papers is that you need to use a 62B, a dash, which is hitting it twice, rather than a hyphen which is actually a 67 which is a spelling thing. I don't know if those things will ever change.

Derek: I think I just assumed since it was off the Internet it was just like a...

Man 1: Yeah, but you still do just one though.

Woman 3: So you put the single quotation around the thing that the author quoted?

Man 1: Yes. And the British do that the other way around. That's one way you can tell if something's posted in Australia, New Zealand, United Kingdom, Canada. So if you're looking for a place of publication sometimes, which is not so pertinent to online stuff, but if you're looking for a place of publication where you have different locations on the title page in the book then that's one way of telling which one it'll be. Another media question. Go ahead and take a few minutes to read through and look through the marks on the paper.

[silence]

Man 1: While the people are looking through, can somebody who has the works cited page please come up? Who has the works cited page with even no correction on it or you recognize what the correction should be? Can you bring that up. Also you get tons of points if you bring one up that you don't know what you were corrected on and put that up.
Woman 4: Like rip it off?

Man 1: No.

Woman 5: Write it on the board?

Man 1: Write on the board.

Woman 4: The whole works cited page?

Man 1: No, no. Just one of the entries.

Woman 5: Just put one of them up there?

Man 1: Alana's taunting me. So if I wanted to come up I just...

Man 3: One that's correct you said?

Man 1: Or one that you'd like to get some help from other people on.

Man 3: I have one that's super wrong.

Teacher: Oh. Well. There you go. I'll give you the green marker.

Woman 1: [unintelligible 14:51]

Teacher: Doesn't matter. She was asking about the fact that her one that she was going to put on there was the last one on her works cited page and it starts with a V.

Woman 2: I have one.

Teacher: You have one? Actually, we have another marker here. Do be sure to put these up with the proper margin and hanging indent.

Woman 3: Who's is this?

Man 3: That's me. Mine. But it doesn't have activities.

Teacher: While they're doing that, what's a writer's resource number that you see on your paper that you might have a question about, especially if you don't have your book with you? I didn't give you one?

Woman 4: Yeah.

Teacher: But you understood them?

Woman 4: I dismissed it as not having any idea what it means and I have no idea how to find out what it means. Now would probably be the appropriate time to ask. 66 because numbers mean nothing to me. How would they be defined or something?

Teacher: Remember the stamp for chapter so 66 would be italics. Notice that it'll say
includes underlining but you'll remember what we said about underlining on anything with print. We just don't want to use underlining. So "New York Times" is obviously a newspaper, right? So it's a title. Technology, society. I don't know if that's the website. I have not checked to see.

**Woman 4:** That's a website.

**Teacher:** Then January magazine which the same thing.

**Woman 4:** There was no date for that though.

**Teacher:** Which one?

**Woman 4:** This one.

**Woman 5:** Yeah, there wasn't one. I just put May 2009.

**Teacher:** Technology and society? Why'd you do that?

**Woman 5:** Oh, never mind. Is she talking about something different?

**Woman 4:** I'm talking about the McAllen.

**Woman 5:** Oh, never mind.

**Woman 4:** There was no date.

**Teacher:** Which creates a problem, doesn't it? Because ideally we have to be able to find all the publishing information so if they are not including publishing information that says something about their [unintelligible 18:13] .

**Woman 4:** Yeah but there were like two reviews for Gladwell. I had to use what I could find. That wasn't a blog. It didn't really have a huge variety of things with dates and all the ideal information.

**Teacher:** Who else worked on Gladwell?

**Woman 5:** I did.

**Woman 6:** I did.

**Teacher:** How many did you end up with?

**Woman 6:** How many sources? Four.

**Woman 7:** Google hates me.

**Teacher:** Not really. It's just that the Technology and Society is still an interesting source, but you really have to perhaps remember what I said. Try to go to a home page. So that might be what the issue is there.
Woman 8: [unintelligible 19:07]

Teacher: Yeah, remember what I said about about.com? Yet, the about.com should have a date on it. It'll be up probably depending on when it was written up in the left hand section somewhere.

Woman 8: [unintelligible 19:34]

Teacher: [unintelligible 19:37] newyorktimes.com and [unintelligible 19:39] plus we didn't really look at that plus this then, we went over this in class, explains this is now an invested company. Chicagotribunal.com is a website that stands in just like if it were a newspaper. OK. So who's got which ones? Who's green? All right. We'll start. Super wrong. Cool. We can make a movie out of this. How many people actually used Gonzales? I thought he was to be maybe the most intriguing. I don't know if you actually read his background but he is a professor at a university.

He has obviously different political viewpoints about things doesn't it?

Man 1: He disagrees with Friedman a lot.

Teacher: He's the one person who came down on Friedman in almost every aspect.

Man 1: [unintelligible 26:43]

Teacher: It's actually one of those that if you didn't come across it you may not think any of the thoughts that he brought up. Again, what I want to make a point about on this is that in our experience with looking up what other people have to say about an article, in our case a book, an article from which we read, it's the way you advance in knowledge and it's what all research is. You may think that you've got everything wrapped up and all packaged and then you come across one more either inspirational or one more argument. It can be an inspirational argument or it can be a depressing argument for you because it reveals things that you just hadn't thought about.

That's what the critical thinking aspect of doing research writing involves. Some days not so happy, some other days, well, OK.

So, OK, we've got Robert J. Gonzalez of "Falling Flat"?

Man 1: That's his title.

Teacher: Yeah, that's the title. What is he doing with that title though?

Man 1: Making fun of his book.

Teacher: Literally. Making fun of it. It's a sort of a pun. Instead of "The World is Flat", his viewpoints on that is "Falling Flat". It's of course, Friedman. And so, that's the title of the essay. It's in quotation marks why? Why wouldn't it be in italics?

Woman 1: Because it's the article [unintelligible 23:29]. It's not a book.
Teacher: I hear, "BBB" [saying he cannot understand her] . Go ahead and say it.

Woman 1: Well, I said it's not a book.

Teacher: OK, it's not long enough to have that kind of authority or that kind of link, as being defined as needing to be italicized. It's something that could be enclosed in something that could be italicized. In fact that's the case here, because it appears where? At www...

Man 1: San Francisco.

Teacher: .sanfrancisco.com, which is actually the online version of what you'd have if you had the actual newspaper in your hands. Now remember when I said that. I don't particularly care for how they have come up with this model myself, nonetheless still have to teach it as such. Because San Francisco Chronicle is identified as a company then, but there's no real way for you to know that's why they're doing this. So it has to be explained every single time, to everybody. Whereas it looks like the paper's title, which it is, but it's included as a corporate title. So it does not get italicized.

Woman 1: Well, I have a question. Because in mine – when I quoted it – I italicized it.

Teacher: Did you use [coughing] [inaudible 25:06] ?

Woman 1: Just the article title.

Teacher: Yeah, it's technically, but AWR63 says is that you have to have that website in there first, and you left that out.

Woman 1: But you didn't count me wrong.

Teacher: No, but I said, "Take a look. See AWR, number 27."

Woman 1: Oh, I thought that was for that.

Teacher: Yeah, that's for all of them.

Woman 1: OK.

Teacher: OK. I see one little thing, it's not super wrong, but it's...

Man 1: Oh it gets worse, the 66.

Teacher: What's the first...?

Woman 1: [inaudible 25:51]

Teacher: Oh, OK, never mind.

Man 1: Yeah.
**Teacher:** This is actually going that way. Yeah.

**Woman 1:** I shouldn't have wrote it.

**Teacher:** No, there should just be a space here. Be sure that you don't think that this is in quotation marks – anybody looking at this to change their model.

**Man 1:** I didn't [unintelligible 26:05] .

**Woman 1:** Well isn't "The World's Flat" supposed to be like italicized instead of in quotation marks?

**Teacher:** Yes, yeah, yeah. I haven't got there yet.

**Woman 1:** Oh, I'm sorry.

**Teacher:** But – jump right to it. So this would be italicized, and I think – I can't remember when you guys did these for the critique, some of you, or a couple of you actually, somehow wrote in italics.

**Woman 1:** Yeah.

**Teacher:** I don't expect [unintelligible 26:42] to be able to do that on the board. It's his first time maybe. "The World is Flat" – and they put the comma here – by Thomas Freedman. Put that as – what's missing next?

**Woman 1:** After San Francisco Chronicle there's another comma.

**Teacher:** Let's go back up to the first line. What's...?

**Man 1:** Period.

**Teacher:** Yeah.

**Woman 1:** No.

**Man 1:** I got it here.

**Teacher:** And then we have more information then we want right here, right? And I don't know what happened there.

**Man 1:** I don't have all these books yet.

**Teacher:** Mm-hm.

**Man 1:** So...?

**Teacher:** You kind of winged it?

**Man 1:** Kind of.
Teacher: And actually, what's the first, what should we just cross out? Which would make it—or erased—which would make it easiest?

Woman 1: Is it the one through three? [muffled voices of several students]

Woman 1: Oh yeah.

Teacher: And what else? Just keep going?

Woman 1: Yeah.

Teacher: And then of course, this would head back that way. This would be in italics, right? This won't be. And this is one way that MLA has changed a bit. But again, if you had a title like this in a web entry, that would have used to indicate the actual title of the newspaper itself. However, they would have something like "New York Times Corporation" or something like that. So it would indicate the corporation instead of the newspaper. Now they've just done away with that. As he got it right now, there's one question he's already learned. What's missing? Well, it's not what's missing.

Woman 1: The dash?

Teacher: You're looking in the right place, except that's actually a hyphen.

Woman 1: Oh.

Teacher: You go back over earlier, punctuation thing. You're looking right here, right?

Woman 1: Yeah.

Teacher: So what's he saying here? What's this date called? The date of...?

Woman 1: [unintelligible 29:42]

Woman 1: Oh, yeah the date you...

Teacher: Yeah, it can. I've heard different phrases. The date of access.

Woman 1: Yeah.

Teacher: Which means that—what?

Woman 1: The date you viewed it?

Teacher: It's the date you viewed it.

Man 1: What if you don't remember the exact date?

Teacher: Yeah. Well, that's what I thought you were going to...

Woman 1: Take a guess.
Woman 1: Yeah.

Woman 1: Just take a guess.

Man 1: I viewed it like four times – in the middle of February, then in March, I was reading that.

Woman 1: Take a little guess.

Teacher: And you know what? I like that, but...

Woman 1: Just take a random guess.

Woman 1: Just make it up.

Man 1: Should I just make up a date?

Woman 1: Yeah, just put something.

Man 1: I feel like that's cheating. I just like the way I did it.

Teacher: See that's what I thought – you were being honest.

Woman 1: Yeah.

Teacher: And we can think, for example when Kris is working on her dissertation, she's going to be looking at stuff...

Woman 1: Oh, [unintelligible 30:35] [laughter]

Teacher: ...over the years.

Woman 1: I didn't even know that she was doing [unintelligible 30:44] . [laughter]

Teacher: But she can't just put February through September. And then she'd have to put in like what months she didn't actually look at it, if she's trying to be as honest as you are. So really what you want is the first time you looked it up.

Man 1: So I just need one date?

Teacher: Yeah.

Man 1: All right.

Woman 1: Just pick a random date.

Teacher: You want to pick a random date right now, we'd... It was February.

Woman 1: February 28th.

Woman 1: Mm–hm.
Man 1: OK. Very good.

Teacher: Scott, we've got your period at the end. So this is the date of publication, and this is the date of access. So believe it or not, they've simplified this tremendously from what you used to have to do. But it is important to get this stuff done right now, and if you don't have the book go ahead and borrow one. Because as I've said, we've got the research paper coming up. And then we're going to be--and you may have some of these, you may have books, you may have--well you will have journal publications, you may have newspapers. And they all have to be itemized consistently according to standards.

Can we jump over now to the middle one? I hadn't thought to go this long on this, but it's fine. Can you go ahead and read that? Oh is that [unintelligible 32:44] ? OK.

Woman 1: You want me to read it out loud?

Teacher: Yeah.

Woman 1: Bridgeman, J.M., Self medicating.

Teacher: Can I ask a question right here? Because some other people will ruin into this, and you probably will, too. What happens if you have two or three authors there? Do you keep reversing the names?

Woman 1: No, only the first one alphabetically.

Teacher: Exactly right. And that's the only place, anywhere in a works cited entry, where that's reversed. And it's strictly for alphabetizing according to last name, which means that your works cited page should be alphabetized according to last name. Not just when you thought to put it down.

Man 1: So if you've got more than one author, you put, like if you had somebody that had a last name that starts with a G or something like that, they're going to go after it?

Teacher: Interesting question, Brad. Maybe you go by whatever author's name is first. So J.M. Bridgeman and Bradley McBride.

Woman 1: And if you were citing them, you'd only cite Bridgeman?

Woman 1: No.

Teacher: It depends on how you're doing that. If you were saying, for example Bridgeman and McBride, for two people you probably will have to give both – the first time.

Woman 1: In parentheses?

Teacher: Yeah.
Woman 1: OK.

Teacher: But once you get four or more, and again some of you are going to be looking at journals where you'll have multiple people authoring the publications. And you may have as many as six or seven names. In that case, you'd simply do "et al". Did you learn what that means?

Woman 1: And...

Teacher: And?

Woman 1: And company, just like that et al. I used to know.

Teacher: Yeah. And then the colloquial way, of saying the Latin would be "among others" or "and others". The reason this is punctuated with a period is actually that's et al again.

Woman 1: So would you just mention the first one, or would you mention the two and then put that?

Teacher: In the sort of [unintelligible 35:15] then of [unintelligible 35:15] of what we're doing, we'll go ahead and put that, if you've got four or more. Yeah.

Woman 1: OK.

Teacher: Yeah. Let me erase this before we keep going. All right, so - and this title - I think I've asked a couple of you who used this...

Woman 1: It wasn't really random.

Teacher: What does this title actually mean? I mean for some that talked, for example "Falling Flat" - we can get that. That's an - there's a metaphor involved in it, but there's also a kind of sarcasm that's implied as well. But "Self Medicating", did those of you who used that one, quite understand what he was talking about?

Woman 1: I don't know where he got the title from.

Teacher: Maybe he was self medicating, huh? I think, but I don't know myself, but I think that he's referring to this notion that we have to analyze things in such a way that we can come to proper conclusions about how to address those issues. But that is so abstruse, so off, that I wouldn't ever tell Alex Trebek that's my guess. So we'll leave that out. "Self Meditating" but you've got that in quotation marks, probably, right? And "Review of the Tipping Point: How Little Things Make a Big Difference" and this would be italics.

Woman 1: I tried with that.

Teacher: OK, it looks close enough. "January Magazine" - it also, that really looks... I wouldn't even put that up there because that's obviously italics.
Woman 1: [inaudible 37:22]? 

Teacher: Hmmm? Oh, oh, yeah, thank you. I got so excited about the italics. What has to go here by...? 

Woman 1: Malcolm Gladwell. 

Teacher: Yeah, by Malcolm Gladwell. And again if you looked at the picture of Malcolm Blackwell, did you think that the name fit the person? 

Woman 1: No. 

Teacher: I did. OK, well I guess I... 

Woman 1: Yeah. 

Teacher: It's OK. Januarmagazine.com January Magazine is corporate owned I guess. May 2000? And that's all the date they gave? 

Woman 1: Yeah. 

Woman 1: They didn't give a [inaudible 38:07]. 

Woman 1: Yeah, that's what I was telling you. That's what I thought you were going to comment on last time. 

Teacher: Yeah. Again, some of these things will be clues that maybe there are more authoritative things out there, but at least this date is included because it's probably - even though it's named January magazine - it's the May edition of it, right? So you have web and the 15, February 2011. So that's the only thing that you left out on it. 

Woman 1: OK. 

Teacher: And then all of your sources should be done this way, right? 

Woman 1: Mm-hm. 

Teacher: So you can't do one source that's an online web review the correct way, and then do some other ways for the others, and still have a correct works cited page. That's why I really want you to do, when you start looking stuff up, I want you to go ahead, try to get them accurate. So that when you turn them in on a the work cited page, for example when you do the research paper - be able to turn that work cited page in before you turn in the research paper. And you will have me to look over it and catch it beforehand. 

And then - who did this one? OK. You want to read it? 

Woman 1: Hawthorne, Christopher, The Massive Outbreak of an Idea, Revision of "The Tipping Point"...
Teacher: Oop.

Woman 1: Oh, sorry.

Teacher: Is that what it says?

Woman 1: Revision?

Woman 1: Review...

Teacher: Yeah.


Teacher: OK. And when you look at the example in your logger's resource of one of the examples – I can't remember if it's actually, I think it's actually just the hard text version – they use the San Francisco Chronicle as an example.

Man 1: You don't use the www?

Teacher: Hmmm?

Man 1: You don't use the www option?

Teacher: It's really whatever shows up. Now we can say that maybe the www didn't show up on this one.

Man 1: It didn't show.

Teacher: In other words, sometimes sfk. I don't know I'd have to look at that, will show up as www.sfk.com, other times it will not.

Man 1: It's like [inaudible 40:51].

Teacher: Yeah.

Woman 1: Because most of the time you don't need www. anymore.

Man 1: You don't even need to, yeah.

Teacher: Right, right. So we'll put particularities there. But once you have these things right -- remember what I said about this -- the work cited page is a mechanical thing. That's why I want you to get it right in the summaries, because if you're paying close enough attention, if you're not on Facebook while you're doing it at the same time, if you're paying close enough attention you will find that you just learn it kind of automatically. But you don't have to know it, you simply have to be able to look up for a model. It's like driving through a McDonalds and you get the wrong thing. Do you want to keep it?
Woman 1: No.

Man 1: Trade it.

Teacher: No? If you drive through again and they give you something else and it's still the wrong thing, would you keep that? No. By that time you want to drive through and show them a picture of what you want, right? And if you're showing them the picture, you're assuming that they can get it. It's the same thing with the writer's resource. If there is the number 63, and you're looking at it and following it, the assumption is you can get it. So it's following a model. And it's just looking at it. It's not like that time when you were a little kid and somebody, your father or somebody, said, "Here throw a baseball." And the way you threw it didn't look like the way it was supposed to be done. I did that when I was trying to be a left hander. It didn't work.

OK. Well we were having conferences and evidently I took out the... Let's see if I put them over here. We have a new syllabus for the rest of the semester, and, actually it looks like I took them out when somebody came in, so it's up in the office. I'll just email that to you. OK?

Man 1: The what?

Teacher: The new syllabus. But next Wednesday we will not have class. We will be using those hours in the morning for conferences. I want to be able to get them. I want to get your summaries from you before you go. I want these revisions to come in a week from today. I've written on the syllabus that they need to come in when you come in for a conference. I want you to bring them when you come in for a conference. So if you have any questions, we can go over them then. OK? All right. So if I could get those summaries. Did you check you're...?

Woman 1: Yeah, but I don't have [inaudible 44:08] . I just have [inaudible 44:08].

Teacher: And what is this here?

Woman 1: Those are the [unintelligible 44:23] .

Teacher: Yeah you're supposed to turn in [unintelligible 44:25] summaries in. Really by Monday we need to have the full report. You've got to get rolling on it.

Man 1: We leave the revisions here today?

Teacher: Yeah, if anybody else has, I said I'd be willing to take those other revisions and...

Man 1: [muffled speaking]

Transcription by CastingWords
HUMAN SUBJECTS REVIEW BOARD
Application for Approval of Research Involving Human Subjects – As of June 2010
(The most current version of this application is available online at www.bgsu.edu/offices/orc/hsrb.)

Please answer all applicable questions and provide the material identified.
Please complete electronically.

• Applications judged to be illegible, incomplete, or vague will be returned to the Principal Investigator (PI) for revision.
• All boxes are expandable so be sure to include complete information, attaching continuation sheets as necessary.
• Submit the original, signed, hard copy application and necessary supporting documentation to the Human Subjects Review Board (HSRB), 309A University Hall.
• SUBMISSION LEAD TIMES – For Full Board projects – submit at least 2 months before your planned start of recruiting and data collection. For Expedited Review projects – submit at least 2 weeks before your planned start of recruiting and data collection.
• For projects reviewed via the expedited review process - You should receive notification of the results of the initial review of this application 5 – 7 business days (7 – 9 during the summer and breaks) from the date of receipt of the application by the Office of Research Compliance.
• IMPORTANT NOTE: This application will not be reviewed unless Human Subjects training has been completed by the PI (and the Advisor, if the PI is a student) – see the HSRB web page for scheduled training dates.

Ia. General Information:
Name of applicant (Principal Investigator): Krista L. Petrosino
The Principal Investigator is (check one):
☐ Faculty ☐ BGSU Staff ☐ Undergraduate Student ☑ Graduate Student
☐ Off-campus applicant (check this box if you are not affiliated with BGSU but propose to conduct research involving BGSU Faculty, Staff, or Students)
Department or Division: English: Rhetoric and Writing
Campus Phone: 419-372-0269
E-mail: klpetro@bgsu.edu
Fax:
Have You Completed BGSU Human Subjects Training?
☑ Yes (Office of Research Compliance will confirm training date)
☐ No (Please see IMPORTANT NOTE above)
The HSRB will send all correspondence to your departmental address unless otherwise indicated below:

Title of the Proposed Research Project:
A Review of the Use of Metaphor and Shared Terminology in Bowling Green State University General Studies Writing and Jazz Performance Classrooms: Survey and Observation

Names of Other Students or Staff Associated with the Project (Student PIs note – Do not include your advisor for this research project here):

Have you requested, or do you plan to request, external support for this project?
If yes, external Funding Agency or Source:

(Note: If the funding source requires certification of IRB approval or if federal funding is requested, this application will go to the full Board for review – in that case please submit the original plus 13 copies of the application and supporting materials.)

IIb. If you are a BGSU student, please provide the following information:

This research is for: ☐ Thesis ✓ Dissertation ☐ Class Project ☐ Other

(Note: If the class project box is checked and the PI is a student no continuing review form will be sent. The P.I. will receive an expiration notice at the end of the approval period. The Office of Research Compliance must be notified in writing, before the end of the approval period, of intent to continue the project.)

Advisor's Name (This is the advisor for this research project):  Dr. Lee Nickoson

Department or Division:  English: Rhetoric and Writing  Phone:  419-372-7556  Fax:  E-mail:

Has Advisor Completed BGSU Human Subjects Training?

☒ Yes (Office of Research Compliance will confirm training date)
☐ No (Please see IMPORTANT NOTE, page 1)

II. Information on Projects Using Pre-existing Data

(Skip to Section III if this project does NOT use pre-existing data. Pre-existing data includes retrospective medical chart reviews, public data sets, etc. Sometimes it is referred to as secondary data or archival data.) Some projects involving the use of pre-existing data may not require review by the HSRB. However – it is the HSRB’s responsibility to make that determination – not the researcher’s.

NOTE: If you are obtaining medically-related information from a “Covered Entity” (a health plan, health care clearinghouse or a health care provider who bills health insurers – e.g., hospitals, doctor’s offices, dentists, the BGSU Student Health Service, the BGSU Speech and Hearing Clinic, the BGSU Psychological Services Center), the HIPAA Privacy Rule may apply.

a. Name(s) of existing data set(s) [Include any ancillary data sets you might be linking the main data set(s) to]:

b. Source(s) of existing data set(s):


c. Please provide a brief description of the content of the data set(s):


d. When you obtain the data, will the individual records be anonymous or will they have identifiers/codes attached?

☐ Anonymous (i.e., no identifiers or codes attached to any records in any of the listed data sets)
If your project also involves direct data collection, please go to section III and complete the rest of the application. Otherwise, please go to and complete sections VII.a, VII.b, and IX.

☐ Identifiers/codes attached (examples would include, but not be limited to, record numbers, subject numbers, case numbers, etc.)

d.1 If the records have identifiers or codes attached, can you readily ascertain the identity of individuals to whom the data pertain (e.g., through use of a key that links identifiers with identities; linking to other files that allow individual identities to be discerned)?

☐ Yes, I can ascertain the identity of the individuals.

Please explain in the box below how you will protect the confidentiality of subjects. The Human Subjects Review Board is concerned about 2 dimensions of confidentiality: (1) that the researcher has legitimate access to the records, i.e., the records are not protected by any special confidentiality conditions, and (2) that the researcher will not reveal individual identities unless permission has been granted to do so.

Please continue with section II.e

☐ No, I cannot readily ascertain the identity of the individuals.

Please describe in the box below, the provisions in place that will not allow you to ascertain identities (e.g., key to decipher the code/identifier has been destroyed, agreement between researcher and key holder prohibiting the release of the key).

If your project also involves direct data collection, please go to section III and complete the rest of the application. Otherwise, please go to and complete sections VII.a, VII.b, and IX.

e. Are the data from a public data set? (A public data set is data available to any member of the public through a library, public archive or the Freedom of Information Act. Data obtained from private companies, hospital records, agency membership lists or similar sources are not usually public data)

☐ Yes

Are you requesting permission to conduct multiple research projects with these data?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If your project also involves direct data collection, please go to section III and complete the rest of the application. Otherwise, please go to and complete sections VII.a, VII.b and IX.

☐ No (if no, please answer the following questions)

f. If you are obtaining access to non-public information, please explain in the box below how you will obtain access to the information (e.g., permission from the CEO, permission from the Board of Education). Note: a condition for approval will be written documentation of this permission – this can be hard copy or an email from the relevant authority.
g. Before the data were collected, did respondents give their permission for the information to be used for research purposes?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

h. Are you recording the data in a manner that will allow you to identify subjects, either directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

i. If your project also involves direct data collection, please continue completing the rest of the application. Otherwise, please go to and complete sections IV (as appropriate), VII.a, VII.b, and IX.

III. **General Project Characteristics:** Does the research involve any of the following? (If the response to any of the following is “yes,” provide a justification and/or rationale in the box provided below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a. Deception of subjects
  (if “yes,” please submit the original plus 13 copies of this application and supporting materials).
- b. Shock or other forms of punishment
  (if “yes,” please submit the original plus 13 copies of this application and supporting materials).
- c. Sexually explicit materials or questions
- d. Handling of money or other valuable commodities
- e. Extraction of blood or other bodily fluids
- f. Questions about drug and/or alcohol use
- g. Questions about sexual orientation, sexual experience, or sexual abuse
- h. Purposeful creation of anxiety
- i. Any procedure that might be viewed as an invasion of privacy
- j. Physical exercise or stress
- k. Administration of substances (food, drugs, etc.) to subjects
- l. Any procedure that might place subjects at risk (e.g., disclosure of criminal activity).
- m. Systematic selection or exclusion of any group. This includes the selection or exclusion of any group based on age, gender, race, ethnicity, etc.

Graduate Assistants teaching courses in the BGSU General Studies Writing Program have been excluded from this study, as are Graduate Assistants who teach Music courses. I wish to focus on Full-Time faculty members. Additionally, students who are under 18 years of age are also specifically excluded.

IV. **HIPAA:** If you answer “Yes” to any of the following questions, your project is subject to HIPAA and you must complete the HIPAA Supplement (available online at www.bgsu.edu/offices/orc/hsrb) and attach it to the application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a. Will health information (information relating to the past, present, or future physical or mental health or condition of an individual) be obtained from a covered entity (a health plan, health care clearinghouse or a health care provider who bills health insurers – e.g., hospitals, doctor’s offices, dentists, the BGSU Student Health Service, the BGSU Speech and Hearing Clinic, the BGSU Psychological Services Center)?
- b. Will the study involve the provision of health care in a covered entity?
  Yes  No
b.2 (Complete this only if you answered “Yes” to IV.b – otherwise, skip this item).
If the study involves the provision of health care, will a health insurer or billing agency be contacted for billing or eligibility?

V. Subject Information: (If the response to any of the following is "yes," the researcher should be sure to address any special needs of the potential subjects in the informed consent process. For example, if subjects are over the age of 65, then it may be appropriate to use a larger font in all correspondence with subjects to ensure readability.)

Yes  No  Does the research involve subjects from any of the following categories?

☐  ☒  a. Under 18 years of age included in the target population
   (If "yes" signed, active parental consent is required for those individuals who are under 18 unless a waiver is granted by the HSRB. If you are requesting a waiver of parental consent, please submit the original plus 13 copies of this application and supporting materials.)

☐  ☒  b. Over 65 years of age as the target population

☐  ☒  c. Persons with a physical or mental disability as the target population
   (If "yes" please submit the original plus 13 copies of this application and supporting materials).

☐  ☒  d. Economically or educationally disadvantaged as the target population.

☐  ☒  e. Unable to provide their own legal informed consent
   (If "yes" and the subjects are not children, please submit the original plus 13 copies of this application and supporting materials).

☐  ☒  f. Pregnant females as the target population
   (If "yes" please submit the original plus 13 copies of this application and supporting materials).

☐  ☒  g. Victims of crimes or other traumatic experiences as the target population

☐  ☒  h. Individuals in institutions (e.g., prisons, nursing homes, halfway houses)
   (If "yes" please submit the original plus 13 copies of this application and supporting materials).

VI. Risks and Benefits: (Note: the HSRB retains final authority for determining risk status of a project)

Yes  No  Please answer the following questions about the research.

☐  ☒  a. In your opinion, does the research involve more than minimal risk to subjects?
   ("Minimal risk" means that "the risks of harm anticipated in the proposed research are not greater, considering probability and magnitude, than those ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests.") If the answer is "yes," explain in the box below and provide an explanation of the benefits of the research to the subjects and to society.)

☐  ☒  b. Are any emergencies or adverse reactions (physical, psychological, social, legal, or emotional) probable as a result of the research? (If "yes," then explain the measures to be taken in case of emergency in the box below.)

☐  ☒  c. Will participation in this research result in any appreciable negative change in the subject’s emotional state? (If "yes," explain the nature of the change and the process for assisting subjects in the box provided.)
VII.  Project Description:  (Please provide as much information as you feel will adequately answer the following questions. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

a. What are you going to study? What is (are) the research question(s) to be answered / hypotheses to be tested?

   I am gathering data on the use of metaphor in writing instruction here at Bowling Green State University. Research questions include: 1) Do full time General Studies Writing instructors use metaphor when discussing writing, the writing process, or the teaching of writing? 2) Do full time Jazz studies/Jazz performance faculty members use metaphor when discussing music, music performance, or the teaching of music performance? 3) Do students of General Studies Writing use metaphor when discussing writing, the writing process, or the teaching of writing? 4) Do students of Jazz performance or Jazz studies use metaphor when discussing music, music performance, or the teaching of music performance? 5) What kinds of metaphors are used to refer to or to explain writing, the writing process, or the teaching of writing? 6) What kinds of metaphors are used to refer to or to explain music, music performance, or the teaching of music? 7) Do students in General Studies Writing courses respond favorably to uses of metaphor if they exist? 8) Do students in Jazz performance or Jazz studies respond favorably to uses of metaphor if they exist? 9) Is specific terminology shared by the fields of Music and First Year Composition?

b. Discuss the benefit(s) of this study. Why is this study important? (provide scholarly support)

   The potential benefits of this study include an understanding of whether the use of metaphor in writing instruction and in music instruction (as discussed in literature from both disciplines) occurs at the classroom level in Bowling Green State University’s Jazz performance/Jazz studies classrooms and General Studies Writing classrooms. The information learned will benefit future students, first-year writing instructors, Writing Program Administrators, and potentially Jazz performance instructors as well.

   The importance of this study is evidenced by the extensive discussions of writing and of music in metaphorical terms within both Rhetoric and Composition and Music literature. Specifically, metaphors such as "jazz," "voice," and "aurality" have entered discussions about writing and the teaching of writing within the field of Rhetoric and Composition, but in alternate contexts from their original uses in the music discipline. For example, Lyn Bloom, within a chapter of her book Composition as a Creative Art, discusses the notion of teaching writing as "jazz." She describes characteristics of jazz music and relates them to ideal qualities of academic essays, and continues her discussion using jazz as a specific metaphor for writing. Furthermore, Kathleen Blake Yancey discusses the complicated metaphor of voice in writing scholarship; she notes, "One of the more frequent metaphors employed in rhetoric and composition is voice. [...] Voice, then, can and does have several competing references, not all of them necessarily compatible with each other" (Yancey vii). This incompatibility identified by Yancey and illustrated by Bloom poses a problem; if the same metaphor is used differently by different instructors (even within the same discipline), students are placed in the position of trying to contextualize a metaphor in order to gain a full understanding of the concept to which the metaphor was applied. The process becomes more challenging when concepts or terms from one discipline are used metaphorically (sometimes with entirely different meanings attached) in another discipline, as in the term "aurality," which is frequently used in discussions of music but has recently made its way into the field of rhetoric and composition, but with alternate meanings. Consequently, the concept of metaphor has moved so deeply into music literature, that "Cognitive theories of metaphor entered musicology about ten years ago and quickly came to be appreciated for their rich interdisciplinary potential" (Spitzer [Metaphor and Musical Thought] 3). Given the complex and
interdisciplinary nature of metaphor within the academy, it is important to determine whether these metaphors so frequently discussed in disciplinary literature are actually being employed by instructors in the classroom.

This small study, then, will indicate whether these and other metaphors are currently in use in both the Bowling Green State University General Studies Writing classrooms and in Jazz performance/Jazz studies classrooms at Bowling Green State University. By testing whether metaphors are in use within writing and jazz instruction at this university, the data will allow me to address both more literal means of combining aspects of the two disciplines' pedagogies and the impact of such use of metaphors as "jazz" and "aurality" as maintained in theoretical discussions within the field of Rhetoric and Writing. Additionally, the diverse state of "Writing Across the Curriculum" course designs would benefit from the stability afforded by this dissertation's (of which this study is a part) aim to provide a stable, non-metaphorical means of using beneficial aspects of Jazz performance pedagogy in the writing classroom.

c. Are there any risks associated with this study? If so, explain how you will minimize the risks to subjects.

There are no foreseeable risks associated with this study; students and faculty members who participate will do so on a strictly volunteer basis, and their participation (or lack of) will have no impact on grades, evaluations, class standing, or their relationship to Bowling Green State University. Additionally, instructors and students who are observed and surveyed will not be critiqued in any part of the dissertation text and their survey answers or observed communications will remain confidential unless they are specifically informed of any intent on my part to quote them in the dissertation itself.

d. Who will be your subjects?

Subjects for this study include four full time General Studies Writing instructors (here at Bowling Green State University), four full time Jazz Performance/Jazz Studies faculty members from the Bowling Green State University Music department, and students in one section of one course from each of the faculty focus group members. To clarify, the eight faculty focus group members whose classes I will observe will be the only faculty members recruited for survey, and only the students within the selected section of each faculty member's course will be recruited for survey participation.

e. Approximately how many subjects do you plan to enroll? Please provide a realistic estimate. (Recruiting is not enrollment – you will likely recruit more individuals than will be enrolled in the project. Also, don’t forget to factor in the possibility of withdrawals, which may require enrolling of additional subjects in order to achieve your desired sample size. If, during the course of the project, you need to increase the number of subjects to be enrolled, you should request Board approval for the increase – in many cases the Office of Research Compliance can handle this administratively.)

I expect to enroll eight full time faculty members (four from General Studies Writing and four from Jazz Studies/Jazz Performance) for surveys and observation, and approximately 60 to 70 of their students for surveys. This estimate is based on recruiting an average of 25 students per each of the four General Studies Writing course sections (assuming that roughly half of the students will enroll from each section) and recruiting all of the current Jazz Performance/Jazz Studies majors (undergraduate and graduate), with the expectation that approximately half of them will enroll in the study.
f. How will you recruit your subjects? Please describe the method(s) you will use to recruit (examples include via telephone, mailings, sign-up sheets, etc.). Please include recruitment letters, scripts, sign-up sheets as appropriate with the application.

I plan on recruiting the faculty focus group by individual, face to face meetings, and the students will be recruited for survey by distributing individual informed consent letters with attached consent form in the specific class sections that I plan to observe and survey. These letters describe the focus, aims, and methods associated with the study. By distributing the materials in person, I will be immediately available to answer questions or concerns about participating in the study, and I will make my Bowling Green State University email address and office phone number available for potential subjects who wish to ask questions or raise concerns in a less public forum. Prior to introducing each class section to the survey, I will obtain the number of students enrolled from the instructor and provide each student with an informed consent letter. Students who return the completed form to my East Hall mailbox will then be emailed the link to the survey using the email address they provide on their information/signup form.

g. Describe the process you will use to seek informed consent from the subjects (example – provide information sheet to potential participants, allow them to read over the information, ask them if they have any questions, answer questions to their satisfaction, then request them to sign the consent form). If you are using an information sheet please include that with the application. (See www.bgsu.edu/downloads/gradcol/file44764.doc for relevant elements of consent, sample wording, and a suggested outline of a consent form.)

In addition to informing students that providing their names, signatures, and email addresses on the individual consent forms indicates consent to participate in the study, I will be including with the student survey a full disclosure of the survey's purpose and aims, and a statement of consent explicitly stating that participation in the survey (via an online survey engine such as zoomerang) indicates consent to participate in the study, and that participation also indicates that each enrolled participant has been informed of all aspects of the study and is participating with full disclosure. Faculty members will sign a consent form that discloses procedures, expectations, and design of the classroom observations. Faculty surveys will maintain the same disclosure and consent statement as the aforementioned student survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>g.1. Are you seeking consent/assent from all relevant parties? (If &quot;No&quot;, explain why not in the box provided below)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>❓</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>g.2. Are you having your participants physically sign hard copies of consent/assent form(s)? (If &quot;No,&quot; you are requesting a waiver of written consent. Provide justification in the box below.) [For more information relative to requesting and justifying a waiver of written consent see HSRB Policy and Procedure Statement “Waiver of Written Consent – Request and Review” at <a href="http://www.bgsu.edu/offices/orc/hsrb/page44847.html">www.bgsu.edu/offices/orc/hsrb/page44847.html</a>]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>❓</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants whose extent of participation remains limited to the student survey will provide names, email addresses, and signatures on an informed consent document in addition to providing consent by participating in the survey itself. The
eight faculty members whose classes I am observing will be asked to sign specific consent forms that grant explicit permission to observe their classes in addition to consenting to enroll in the study by participating in the faculty surveys. Hence, faculty participants will consent to both the observations and the surveys separately. Students will also provide consent twice: once by signing and informed consent document, and by participating in the survey itself, as will be clear on the survey introduction and disclosure itself.

h. If deception or emotional or physical stress is involved, subjects must be debriefed about the purposes, consequences, and benefits of the research and given information on procedures they can follow or resources that are available to them to help them handle the stress. Please attach a copy of all debriefing materials, if applicable.

Debriefing form attached:  
☐ Yes  ☒ No

i. Explain in the box below the procedures you will follow to protect the confidentiality of your subjects. Include considerations associated with data and/or consent form collection and storage, and dissemination of results. Explain whether or not the study is anonymous.  
(Note: It is not always necessary to protect the confidentiality of your subjects, but they must be informed if you plan to quote them directly or reveal their identities in any way.)

Consent forms, field notes, recordings, survey results, and all other study related materials will be kept in a locked filing cabinet in my residence off campus. Summaries of the data collected should suffice for supporting evidence within this dissertation project; thus, I do not plan on quoting specific survey answers, faculty comments from observations, or comments made by students and faculty members in the observed class sections unless the parties involved are fully informed that I will need to do so.

j. Describe what subjects will be asked to do or have done to them from the time they are first contacted about the study until their participation in the study ends. Note – a summary of this information should be included in information provided to the subjects as part of the consent process.

Student subjects will need only sign the informed consent document and answer the online survey questions. Follow up is not required. Faculty members need only participate by allowing me to observe a section of their classes, (on a schedule to be determined by said faculty members during the Spring semester of 2010) and by providing answers on two short surveys. Follow up (if needed ) will take place in short meetings (not formal interviews), will only address unclear data, and will only take place with faculty consent and on said faculty members' schedules. Participation in follow up activities is not required for participation in the study.

VIII. Supplemental Materials:

Attach a copy of the following:
1. All materials (including scripts, advertisements, etc.) that will be used to recruit subjects.
2. The consent/assent form(s) or script(s), if applicable (see the Informed Consent Checklist, which can be found at www.bgsu.edu/offices/orc/hsrb, for guidance in developing consent documents).
3. Survey instrument(s), interview questions, observation protocols, etc.
4. If your project is subject to HIPAA, the HIPAA Supplement.

NOTE: You should receive notification of the results of the initial review of the application within 5 to 7 business days (7 to 9 during the summer and breaks) of the date of submission of the application to the Office of Research Compliance.

IX. Assurance by Principal Investigator (PI) and Advisor (if applicable):
By signing below as the Principal Investigator, I:
1. Certify that the information provided in this application is accurate and complete.
2. Acknowledge ultimate responsibility for the protection of the rights and welfare of human subjects and adherence to any study-specific requirements imposed by the HSRB.
3. Will comply with all HSRB and BGSU policies and procedures, as well as with all applicable Federal, State and local laws and regulations regarding the protection of human subjects in research.
4. Also agree to the following:
   • I accept responsibility for the scientific and ethical conduct of this research study
   • I will obtain HSRB approval before amending or altering the research protocol or implementing changes in the approved consent documents or recruitment procedures
   • I will immediately report to the HSRB any serious adverse events and/or unanticipated effects on subjects which may occur as a result of this study
   • I will train study personnel in the proper conduct of human subjects research
   • I will retain signed consent forms for at least 3 years following completion of the study

Signature ________________________________________________ Date____________________

Required for student applicants:

By signing below as Project Advisor, I certify that:
1. I have reviewed the information provided in this student’s HSRB application and approve of the procedures (including subject recruiting, obtaining informed consent, provisions for protection of confidentiality, and data collection) described therein.
2. I will facilitate my student’s compliance with all HSRB and BGSU policies and procedures, as well as with all applicable Federal, State and local laws and regulations regarding the protection of human subjects in research.

Advisor Signature ___________________________________________ Date____________________

Submit the application to the Human Subjects Review Board, 309A University Hall.
Steps in the Process of Review by the HSRB

1. A completed Application for Review (the original) should be submitted to the 309A University Hall (When necessary, a letter to a prospective funding agency will be issued stating that the proposed research protocol is under review and that the HSRB will make a decision within 60 days.)

2. The Chair assigns the application to two reviewers. The reviewers may either make a recommendation regarding approval or call for review by the full HSRB at a regularly convened meeting.

3. If the reviewers decide that the research project is exempt or expedited and is eligible for expedited review and the Chair concurs, then approval can be granted either with or without conditions. If there are conditions, they will be specified in a letter to the Principal Investigator and must be addressed before the project can be fully approved and subject recruitment and data collection may begin. Research projects deemed expedited will be reviewed within 5-7 business days of submission.

4. If the reviewers or the Chair decide that the project should receive full Board review, the Chair places the application on the agenda of the next regular meeting of the HSRB. The Board may approve the application as submitted, approve it with conditions, disapprove it or defer a decision if sufficient information is not provided by the investigator. The action of the committee will be reported in writing to the investigator. Any conditions must be addressed before the project can be fully approved and subject recruitment and data collection may begin. The HSRB meets the first Wednesday of each month.

5. Either the Board or the investigator can request that the investigator be present at the part of the meeting of the HSRB when a specific project is being considered.

6. If required, a letter describing the decision of the HSRB will be addressed to the funding agency. Normally, this letter will be forwarded to the agency by the investigator.
INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS

All research involving human subjects must receive review and approval from the Human Subject Review Board (HSRB) prior to collecting data in accordance with Federal Regulations and University Policy. THERE ARE NO EXCEPTIONS. Failure to receive prior review can result in disciplinary action by the University and/or legal actions against the faculty members, student assistants, staff members, and the University; suspension or termination of a research project; and, in the case of graduate students, potential delays of graduation.

The legal authority for the Human Subjects Review Board (HSRB) comes from the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects (described in 45 CFR Part 46). In addition, Bowling Green State University has on file with the Public Health Service a statement of assurance committing the University to compliance with Federal Policy. No research involving humans may be undertaken without prior review and approval by the HSRB.

When in doubt about whether HSRB review is necessary or not, the appropriate course of action is to seek review. The role of the HSRB is to ensure compliance with federal regulations of research projects for faculty, staff, and student researchers, as well as to protect the rights of human subjects. The Office of Research Compliance (372-7716 or hsrb@bgnet.bgsu.edu) can assist researchers in making decisions about all aspects of the research process.

Any research project involving human subjects that is conducted by BGSU faculty, staff, or students must be reviewed. Research using BGSU faculty, staff, or students as research subjects must also be reviewed. Even if the researcher is from another institution, the Human Subjects Review Board has the authority to require review of a project if it involves the recruitment of BGSU faculty, staff, or students as subjects.

Class projects
Data to be collected in a classroom must be reviewed if it is part of a research project (as opposed to teaching). Also, class projects conducted by students must be reviewed if they:

- Would identify the interviewee or respondent either by name or by the responses to specific questions and/or recorded behaviors.
- Systematically select subjects from a potentially vulnerable or sensitive group (e.g., prisoners, pregnant women, children who are gifted and talented, alcoholics, sexual minorities, people with disabilities, people with cognitive impairment, people unable to give informed consent).
- Systematically collect private or protected information about individuals (e.g., school records, medical records, criminal records, membership or participation in self-help organizations).
- Propose to investigate opinions, behaviors, and/or experiences regarding sensitive topic areas (e.g., sexually explicit materials or questions, questions about drug use, questions about sexual orientation or sexual experience, illegal activities, purposeful creation of anxiety).
- Ask participants to engage in behavior that carries greater than minimal risk (see section V of the application above for a definition of minimal risk).
- Have the potential to become a thesis or dissertation project.
- Have a reasonable expectation of being externally funded (regardless of the source), published and/or presented outside the course for which the project was originally conducted.

Any research project using vulnerable individuals as subjects requires extensive review (usually by the full HSRB). Vulnerable individuals include:

- Children involved in certain types of research
- Individuals in institutions (e.g., prisons, nursing homes, halfway houses)
- Physically or mentally impaired individuals
- Economically or educationally disadvantaged individuals; or
- Anyone unable to provide their own informed consent

If using members of vulnerable groups, the HSRB recommends you submit your application at least 2 months prior to the desired project start date.

Any research project must have extensive review if it involves socially controversial stimuli or potentially questionable procedures or materials such as (but not restricted to) the following:

- Shock or other forms of punishment
- Sexually explicit materials or questions
• Handling of money or other valuable commodities
• Extraction of blood or other bodily fluids
• Questions about drug use
• Administration of substances to subjects
• Questions about sexual orientation or sexual experience
• Purposeful creation of anxiety, or
• Any procedure which might be considered an invasion of privacy

If you are doing research for a thesis or dissertation and human subjects are involved, it must be reviewed. You must be sure to list the faculty advisor on the form and have them sign the application.

LEGAL REQUIREMENTS AND DEFINITIONS FOR RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS

These following definitions are taken from the Federal Policy for Protection of Human Subjects (45 CFR Part 46)

"Research means a systematic investigation, including research development, testing, and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge."

"Human subject means a living individual about whom an investigator (whether professional or student) conducting research obtains (1) data through intervention or interaction with the individual, or (2) identifiable private information."

"Intervention includes both physical procedures by which data are gathered and manipulations of the subject or the subject's environment that are performed for research purposes."

"Interactions includes communication or interpersonal contact between investigator and subject."

"Private information includes information about behavior that occurs in a context in which an individual can reasonably expect that no observation or recording is taking place, ... and which the individual can reasonably expect will not be made public."

"HSRB approval means the determination of the HSRB that the research has been reviewed and may be conducted at an institution within the constraints set forth by ... institutional and federal requirements....An IRB shall have the authority to suspend ... research that is not being conducted in accordance with the IRB's requirements."

"No investigator may involve a human being as a subject in research unless the investigator has obtained the legally effective informed consent of the subject or the subject's legally authorized representative."

"An IRB shall require documentation of informed consent.... Informed consent will be sought from each prospective subject or the subject's legally authorized representative. Informed consent will be appropriately documented...by the use of a written form approved by the IRB."

"When some or all of the subjects are likely to be vulnerable..., such as children,... or economically or educationally disadvantaged persons, additional safeguards (should) be included...to protect the rights and welfare of these subjects."

Confidentiality means that the name or other identifying characteristics of the individual providing information to the researcher is known to the researcher but will not be revealed and will remain secret.

Anonymous means that the name or other identifying characteristics of participants will not be disclosed to the researcher.
I. General Information: (Note – boxes are expandable)

Name of Applicant (Principal Investigator): Krista L. Petrosino

HSRB Project Number: H11D057GE7

Department or Division: English: Rhetoric and Writing

Advisor: Dr. Lee Nickoson

E-Mail Address: klpetro@bgsu.edu

Campus Phone: 2-0269

Fax:

The HSRB will send all correspondence to your departmental address unless otherwise indicated below:

Summary Description of Approved Project:

The approved project studies the use of metaphor and other instances of figurative language in Bowling Green State University General Studies Writing and Jazz Performance/Jazz Studies classrooms through observation and survey. Prospective participants include four General Studies Writing full-time faculty members and the students of one class section from each of the four GSW instructors, and four full-time Jazz Performance/Jazz Studies faculty members and their students from one class section each. Thus, the prospective participant count equals eight full-time faculty members and approximately 70 to 80 students. Participating faculty members will have their classrooms observed in addition to completing two online surveys; participating students will complete one online survey. All parties must complete the approved informed consent documents prior to participating in the project.

II. Requested Modifications/Addenda:

a. Describe each proposed modification/addendum

The modifications include a revised title: "A Review of Communication and Shared Terminology in Bowling Green State University General Studies Writing and Jazz Performance Classrooms: Survey and Observation" and revised survey questions. I have revised the language in both the instructor and student surveys to remedy "leading" questions by removing direct references to metaphor and other references to figurative language specifically. The intended result of these modifications is an approach that will render more varied and organic data. The approved informed consent language and directions for the surveys remains unchanged.

b. Discuss any changes in risk(s) and/or benefit(s) related to the proposed modifications/addenda

As in the approved project, there are no risks to participants. Benefits of the revisions include a more organic data set from the improved survey language.

III. Related Materials

Submit a hard copy of this form and any related materials that have been modified (e.g. consent form(s), survey(s), script(s), etc.) to the Office of Research Compliance, 309A University Hall.

Notes: To facilitate the review process, please highlight the changes that have been made to any modified materials submitted in association with the request. Do not highlight revised consent documents.
IV. Signatures

PI Signature ________________________________ Date ______________

Required for student applicants

Advisor’s Signature __________________________ Date ______________
Informed Consent for Students

*If you are under 18 years of age, please do not continue with this consent form. Thank you for your time!

Introduction:

My name is Krista Petrosino, and I am a PhD student at Bowling Green State University in the English department. This semester I am conducting a research project that examines the use of metaphor in teaching both First Year Composition and Jazz performance. Within this study, I also hope to stabilize some specific terminology between the disciplines of English and Music. This research project will gather data for my dissertation, and I am interested in working with you as a student of first year writing who is taking a course from a member of this study's focus group.

Purpose:

The purpose of my research and of this study is to identify instances of the use of metaphor in writing and music instruction, and within that context, to determine practical, non-metaphorical means by which elements of Jazz performance pedagogy might assist first year writing instruction.

Procedure:

This study will take place during the spring semester, 2011 (approximately between February and March). I hope to form a focus group of four full-time first year writing faculty members and four full-time Jazz performance faculty members, each of whom I will survey. Additionally, I hope to observe one section of one course that each of the focus group members instructs, in order to study the communication within groups learning first year writing and groups learning Jazz performance.

Faculty Members:
Faculty members will be asked to complete two short online surveys, one that addresses the use of metaphor in discussions of writing and one that elicits definitions of specific terminology. These surveys should take no more than 15 to 20 minutes each to complete. Additionally, observations of select class sessions of each of the eight members of the focus group will serve to gather data relating to group learning situations for comparison with the survey responses. These observations will take place during the time frame of the study, but on the individual instructors' schedules and at their discretion within the study's time frame. Formal follow up will not be necessary with the exception addressing unclear responses or observations. Should clarification be required, communication can take place via email or in a short face to face meeting.
Students of the Focus Group Members:

Students registered in one section of each of the eight faculty members’ courses will be asked to complete one online survey regarding their use of, and response to the use of metaphor in the classroom. This survey will take no more than 15 to 20 minutes to complete, and is completely voluntary. Students will consent to this survey individually, both by providing a name and email address on an informational sign up sheet, and then by completing the online survey itself.

Voluntary nature:

Your participation is completely voluntary. You are free to withdraw at any time. You may decide to skip questions (or not do a particular task) or discontinue participation at any time without penalty. Deciding to participate or not will not affect your (grades/class standing) or your relationship with (Bowling Green State University, your teacher, your school, your job...any institution involved in the research).

Confidentiality Protection:

Although absolute confidentiality cannot be guaranteed, confidentiality will be protected to the extent permitted by law. Sign up sheets (for students), faculty consent forms, field notes, recordings, and any printed survey responses will be kept indefinitely in a locked filing cabinet in my residence off campus. Only members of the research team will have access to the information you provide, and your identity will not be revealed in any published results unless you specifically request identification. To this end, summaries of the data collected should suffice for supporting evidence within this dissertation project; thus, I do not plan on quoting specific survey answers, faculty comments from observations, or comments made by students and faculty members in the observed class sections unless the parties involved are fully informed that I will need to do so. Because the surveys (faculty and student) will be distributed, I must inform you that (1) some employers may use tracking software so you may want to complete your survey on a personal computer, (2) do not leave survey open if using a public computer or a computer others may have access to, (3) clear your browser cache and page history after completing the survey.

Risks:

There are no potential risks for this study.

Benefits:

The possible benefits of this study include an understanding of whether the use of metaphor in writing instruction and in music instruction (as discussed in literature from both disciplines) occurs at the classroom level in Bowling Green State University’s Jazz performance/Jazz studies classrooms and General Studies Writing classrooms. While the information collected may not directly benefit you directly, the information learned will benefit future students, first-year writing instructors, Writing Program Administrators, and potentially Jazz performance instructors as well.

Contact information:

I can be contacted via email at klpetro@bgsu.edu or by phone at (419) 372-0269. My advisor for this dissertation project is Dr. Lee Nickolson, and she can be contacted by email at leenick@bgsu.edu, or by phone at (419) 372-7556. Please feel free to contact me at any time if you have questions or concerns about my research or your participation in the study. You may also contact the Chair, Human Subjects Review Board at 419-372-7716 or hsr@bgsu.edu, if you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this research. Thank you very much for your time and consideration!
I have been informed of the purposes, procedures, risks and benefits of this study. I have had the opportunity to have all my questions answered and I have been informed that my participation is completely voluntary. I agree to participate in this research.

Informed Consent for Students:

Signed (please sign and print your name)

______________________________

Date

______________________________

Email

______________________________

____ I am 18 years of age or older.

____ I agree to participate in the online survey for which I am providing my email address.
Krista L. Petrosino  
Graduate Assistant, Department of English  
Bowling Green State University  
Bowling Green, OH 43402  
klpetro@bgsu.edu  
(419) 372-0269

Informed Consent for Jazz Performance/Jazz Studies Instructors

Introduction:

My name is Krista Petrosino, and I am a PhD student at Bowling Green State University in the English department. This semester I am conducting a research project that examines the use of metaphor in teaching both First Year Composition and Jazz performance. Within this study, I also hope to stabilize some specific terminology between the disciplines of English and Music. This research project will gather data for my dissertation, and I am interested in working with you as a full-time instructor of Jazz performance and/or Jazz studies.

Purpose:

The purpose of my research and of this study is to identify instances of the use of metaphor in writing and music instruction, and within that context, to determine practical, non-metaphorical means by which elements of Jazz performance pedagogy might assist first year writing instruction.

Procedure:

This study will take place during the spring semester, 2011 (approximately between February and March). I hope to form a focus group of four full-time first year writing faculty members and four full-time Jazz performance faculty members, each of whom I will survey. Additionally, I hope to observe one section of one course that each of the focus group members instructs, in order to study the communication within groups learning first year writing and groups learning Jazz performance.

Faculty Members:

Faculty members will be asked to complete two short online surveys, one that addresses the use of metaphor in discussions of music and one that elicits definitions of specific terminology. These surveys should take no more than 15 to 20 minutes each to complete. Additionally, observations of select class sessions of each of the eight members of the focus group will serve to gather data relating to group learning situations for comparison with the survey responses. These observations will take place during the time frame of the study, but on the individual instructors’ schedules and at their discretion within the study’s time frame. Formal follow up will not be necessary with the exception addressing unclear responses or observations. Should clarification be required, communication can take place via email or in a short face to face meeting.
Students of the Focus Group Members:
Students registered in one section of each of the eight faculty members’ courses will be asked to complete one online survey regarding their use of, and response to the use of metaphor in the classroom. This survey will take no more than 15 to 20 minutes to complete, and is completely voluntary. Students will consent to this survey individually, both by providing a name and email address on an informational sign up sheet, and then by completing the online survey itself.

Voluntary nature:

Your participation is completely voluntary. You are free to withdraw at any time. You may decide to skip questions (or not do a particular task) or discontinue participation at any time without penalty. Deciding to participate or not will not affect your (grades/class standing) or your relationship with (Bowling Green State University, your teacher, your school, your job...any institution involved in the research).

Confidentiality Protection:

Although absolute confidentiality cannot be guaranteed, confidentiality will be protected to the extent permitted by law. Sign up sheets (for students), faculty consent forms, field notes, recordings, and any printed survey responses will be kept indefinitely in a locked filing cabinet in my residence off campus. Only members of the research team will have access to the information you provide, and your identity will not be revealed in any published results unless you specifically request identification. To this end, summaries of the data collected should suffice for supporting evidence within this dissertation project; thus, I do not plan on quoting specific survey answers, faculty comments from observations, or comments made by students and faculty members in the observed class sections unless the parties involved are fully informed that I will need to do so. Because the surveys (faculty and student) will be distributed, I must inform you that (1) some employers may use tracking software so you may want to complete your survey on a personal computer, (2) do not leave survey open if using a public computer or a computer others may have access to, (3) clear your browser cache and page history after completing the survey.

Risks:

There are no potential risks for this study.

Benefits:

The possible benefits of this study include an understanding of whether the use of metaphor in writing instruction and in music instruction (as discussed in literature from both disciplines) occurs at the classroom level in Bowling Green State University’s Jazz performance/Jazz studies classrooms and General Studies Writing classrooms. While the information collected may not directly benefit you directly, the information learned will benefit future students, first-year writing instructors, Writing Program Administrators, and potentially Jazz performance instructors as well.

Contact information:

I can be contacted via email at klpetro@bgsu.edu or by phone at (419) 372-0269. My advisor for this dissertation project is Dr. Lee Nickson, and she can be contacted by email at leneick@bgsu.edu, or by phone at (419) 372-7556. Please feel free to contact me at any time if you have questions or concerns about my research or your participation in the study. You may also contact the Chair, Human Subjects Review Board at 419-372-7716 or hsr@bgsu.edu, if you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this research. Thank you very much for your time and consideration!
I have been informed of the purposes, procedures, risks and benefits of this study. I have had the opportunity to have all my questions answered and I have been informed that my participation is completely voluntary. I agree to participate in this research.

Informed Consent for Instructor:

Signed

Date

___ I agree to be in the focus group and to complete the two online surveys.

___ I agree to have my classroom observed.
Krista L. Petrosino  
Graduate Assistant, Department of English  
Bowling Green State University  
Bowling Green, OH 43402  
kipetro@bgsu.edu  
(419) 372-0269

Informed Consent for General Studies Writing Instructors

Introduction:

My name is Krista Petrosino, and I am a PhD student at Bowling Green State University in the English department. This semester I am conducting a research project that examines the use of metaphor in teaching both First Year Composition and Jazz performance. Within this study, I also hope to stabilize some specific terminology between the disciplines of English and Music. This research project will gather data for my dissertation, and I am interested in working with you as a full-time instructor of first year writing.

Purpose:

The purpose of my research and of this study is to identify instances of the use of metaphor in writing and music instruction, and within that context, to determine practical, non-metaphorical means by which elements of Jazz performance pedagogy might assist first year writing instruction.

Procedure:

This study will take place during the spring semester, 2011 (approximately between February and March). I hope to form a focus group of four full-time first year writing faculty members and four full-time Jazz performance faculty members, each of whom I will survey. Additionally, I hope to observe one section of one course that each of the focus group members instructs, in order to study the communication within groups learning first year writing and groups learning Jazz performance.

Faculty Members:

Faculty members will be asked to complete two short online surveys, one that addresses the use of metaphor in discussions of writing and one that elicits definitions of specific terminology. These surveys should take no more than 15 to 20 minutes each to complete. Additionally, observations of select class sessions of each of the eight members of the focus group will serve to gather data relating to group learning situations for comparison with the survey responses. These observations will take place during the time frame of the study, but on the individual instructors’ schedules and at their discretion within the study’s time frame. Formal follow up will not be necessary with the exception addressing unclear responses or observations. Should clarification be required, communication can take place via email or in a short face to face meeting.
Students of the Focus Group Members:
Students registered in one section of each of the eight faculty members’ courses will be asked to complete one online survey regarding their use of, and response to the use of metaphor in the classroom. This survey will take no more than 15 to 20 minutes to complete, and is completely voluntary. Students will consent to this survey individually, both by providing a name and email address on an informational sign up sheet, and then by completing the online survey itself.

Voluntary nature:
Your participation is completely voluntary. You are free to withdraw at any time. You may decide to skip questions (or not do a particular task) or discontinue participation at any time without penalty. Deciding to participate or not will not affect your (grades/class standing) or your relationship with (Bowling Green State University, your teacher, your school, your job...any institution involved in the research).

Confidentiality Protection:
Although absolute confidentiality cannot be guaranteed, confidentiality will be protected to the extent permitted by law. Sign up sheets (for students), faculty consent forms, field notes, recordings, and any printed survey responses will be kept indefinitely in a locked filing cabinet in my residence off campus. Only members of the research team will have access to the information you provide, and your identity will not be revealed in any published results unless you specifically request identification. To this end, summaries of the data collected should suffice for supporting evidence within this dissertation project; thus, I do not plan on quoting specific survey answers, faculty comments from observations, or comments made by students and faculty members in the observed class sections unless the parties involved are fully informed that I will need to do so. Because the surveys (faculty and student) will be distributed, I must inform you that (1) some employers may use tracking software so you may want to complete your survey on a personal computer, (2) do not leave survey open if using a public computer or a computer others may have access to, (3) clear your browser cache and page history after completing the survey.

Risks:
There are no potential risks for this study.

Benefits:
The possible benefits of this study include an understanding of whether the use of metaphor in writing instruction and in music instruction (as discussed in literature from both disciplines) occurs at the classroom level in Bowling Green State University’s Jazz performance/Jazz studies classrooms and General Studies Writing classrooms. While the information collected may not directly benefit you directly, the information learned will benefit future students, first-year writing instructors, Writing Program Administrators, and potentially Jazz performance instructors as well.

Contact information:
I can be contacted via email at klpetro@bgsu.edu or by phone at (419) 372-0269. My advisor for this dissertation project is Dr. Lee Nickson, and she can be contacted by email at leecnick@bgsu.edu, or by phone at (419) 372-7556. Please feel free to contact me at any time if you have questions or concerns about my research or your participation in the study. You may also contact the Chair, Human Subjects Review Board at 419-372-7716 or hrsb@bgsu.edu, if you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this research. Thank you very much for your time and consideration!
I have been informed of the purposes, procedures, risks and benefits of this study. I have had the opportunity to have all my questions answered and I have been informed that my participation is completely voluntary. I agree to participate in this research.

Informed Consent for Instructor:

Signed

Date

___ I agree to be in the focus group and to complete the two online surveys.

___ I agree to have my classroom observed.