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Abstract

This thesis explores how a jazz composer can facilitate the exercise of improviser agency during the compositional process, and how a jazz composer can exercise agency during performance. Using the artistic practices of selected jazz composers and improvisers as models, a variety of techniques and approaches foreign to the ensemble’s previous performance practices were explored to musically cue changes while improvising on cyclical and modular forms. During the study’s three phases, twelve new works were developed using a cumulative and responsive compositional process, the final compositional product being the result of an iterative dialogue between the evolving compositional materials and the study participants’ reaction to them. The participants reflected on the performance outcomes during semi-structured interviews throughout the study. This allowed consideration of both composer and improviser perspectives on the opportunities offered by each composition to exercise different forms of agency.
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Chapter 1 - Introduction

People are both products and producers of their environment, and peoples’ capacity to influence events as they happen is called human agency (Bandura, 2000). This thesis explores the effect of several approaches to jazz composition on the ability of a composer and improvisers in a small jazz ensemble to exercise agency during the development and performance of new compositions. The study took place between April 2015 and October 2017, comprising three iterative phases each of which included the activities of planning, composition, rehearsal, observation, performance, interviewing and reflection.

The scope of inquiry was limited by using my longstanding quartet featuring Chris Poulsen (piano), Helen Russell (bass), Nathan Goldman (drums) and myself (tenor saxophone) as a case study. Previous experience writing for small and large ensembles informed my decision to compose for a small group for its malleability and minimal requirement for detailed arrangements. On a practical level, using fewer players simplified locating suitable improvisers willing to collaborate through compositional experimentation, and rendered a manageable number of interactive relationships to be observed during rehearsal and performance. On a socio-structural level, limiting the size of the ensemble was intended to create conditions conducive to efficient communication amongst the participants, and flexible experimentation with participants’ capability to exercise agency. This gave a clear starting point to investigate jazz composing that encouraged spontaneity, interaction, and improviser agency.

Improvisers’ capability of exercising agency was explored through creative collaboration (rehearsals and performances), and their perceived efficacy during this collaboration was surveyed using ethnographic techniques (interviews and participant observation). Various compositional strategies were employed to investigate composer agency during participants’ improvisations, requiring the participants to acquire, or refine, and apply idiosyncratic improvisational approaches necessary for each composition, with the objective of forming deeper connections between soloists and the material being used for improvisation.

The qualitative data from this process was then analysed, summarising the participants’ and my reflections on the composition, rehearsal and performance processes. The progressive findings of each phase guided the changes in approach employed in the subsequent phases. Music
scores of new compositions from this study and field recordings of their live performance during this study are attached as appendices that contextualise and illustrate aspects of the findings, but are not intended for assessment.

The following sections outline several research questions arising from my artistic practice as a composer, bandleader and improviser, followed by the rationale and methodology for the study, and a review of the literature relevant to the field. To conclude this chapter, I will outline some models for jazz composing and introduce the generous participants upon whom this study depended.

Research Questions

Guided by my experience as a composer and jazz musician, and following a review of both literature and key recordings which explore the relationship between jazz composition and improvisation, I arrived at my primary research question:

Can I develop a more improvisational approach to composition, and a more compositional approach to improvisation by exploring how composer and improvisers interdependently exercise agency?

To investigate this conceptual space, I also developed several more practically-oriented sub-questions:

1. How can a jazz composer exercise agency during others’ improvisations?
2. How can a jazz composer facilitate the exercise of improviser agency during the composition process?
3. How do changes to the distribution of agency affect performance outcomes?

Rationale

The initial impetus for this research project started building circa 2013 after reading Graham Collier’s The Jazz Composer (2009). Collier says “The role of the jazz composer is... to present something original and individual, but in doing so, he also needs to encourage improvisation by
using the skills of the musicians to enhance the given music” (2009, p.311). I had been writing and arranging jazz music for small and large ensembles consistently since commencing my undergraduate music studies in 2004, but after reading Collier’s book I began to re-evaluate my understanding of jazz composition. Up to this point, my jazz composition practice was mostly writing tunes (songs to be improvised on or with), and arranging them (deciding who does what and when), but that I had barely begun to scratch the surface of what Collier considers to be substantial jazz composing (development of material and the integration of written and improvised elements) (2009, p.8).

During 2013-14 I wrote and arranged tunes for my first album titled *Now and Then* (2015). For this recording, I notated detailed arrangements of the melodies and supplied individual parts for each player. For the recording session I also specified the order of solos, and on some pieces, the number of choruses for each soloist. *Now and Then* illustrates many jazz performance conventions established during the 1940s and 50s such as cyclical forms, theme-solos-theme structure (Berliner, 1994, p. 63), instrumentation of trumpet, saxophone, piano, bass and drums (with solos in that order), set instrumental roles (Collier, 2009, pp.55-56), and the use of consistent tempo (Bailey, 1992, p. 48). Bailey also notes that while there was experimentation during the intervening years, the 1940s and 50s conventions were readopted into contemporary performance practice during the 1980s. This format of jazz performance is focused primarily around the central open solo section, meaning that content, duration and structure of the majority of performances are determined collectively by the improvisers themselves. These conditions contribute to what Bob Brookmeyer calls, “an unavoidable surface sameness with the solos” (Brookmeyer, Truesdale, 2005).

Around this time, I began expanding my listening focus from the 1940s and 50s to also incorporate the 1960s. Dean (1992) explains that, from around 1960 onwards: “As [instrumental] roles were gradually expanded or undermined, so the complexity of actions coexisting within the performing group increased drastically” (p.5). I wished to absorb some of these new interactive and relational freedoms developed during the 1960s into the existing performance practices of my quartet, and to explore how they might be organised and implemented through jazz composing. This prompted my investigation into the distribution of agency between composer and improvisers during the process of composition, and during improvisers’ interpretation of the composition in performance.
The academic benefit of this research will be to provide a case study exploring the agentic transactions between jazz composer and improvisers expressed through the process of compositional development and performance. This will generate new embodied artistic knowledge in the research participants and produce new creative works that could themselves be treated as etudes for pedagogical purposes in the study of idiosyncratic approaches to improvisation.

Methodology

This study is situated in the field of artistic practice as research. Borgdorf (2007) says:

Art practice qualifies as research if its purpose is to expand our knowledge and understanding by conducting an original investigation in and through art objects and creative processes. Art research begins by addressing questions that are pertinent in the research context and in the art world. Researchers employ experimental and hermeneutic methods that reveal and articulate the tacit knowledge that is situated and embodied in specific artworks and artistic processes. Research processes and outcomes are documented and disseminated in an appropriate manner to the research community and the wider public. (p.14)

The starting point for selecting research methods was to consider Frayling’s (1993) three categories of research into, for and through art and design, and their subsequent adaptation by Borgdorf (2007) into research on, for and in the arts. Borgdorf introduces a further subdivision particular to research in the arts, which distinguishes between object (the work of art), process (the making of art) and context (the art world) (pp.6-7). All of Borgdorff’s modes of inquiry were evident in the course of my research.

Figure 1. Iterative phase structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>← Composition ← Rehearsal ← Performance ← Interviews ← Reflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Observation

This study was conducted in three phases, each entailing a cycle of planning, composition, rehearsal, observation, performance, interviews and reflection (see Figure 1). The research method that connects these activities together is action research, “based on the close
interaction between *practice, theory and change*” (Bresler, 1995, p.10). Davidson (2015) explains the relevance of action research to artistic practice as research:

Used in contexts where practitioners aim to improve or modify their practice, this method follows a cycle of research planning, acting, observing, and reflecting… The appeal of the approach is that it is focused on both understanding and improving one’s own practice. It offers a method of identifying artistic/creative processes that is flexible enough to suit every case and can be applied to an individual or a group. While the method comes from the same base as reflective enquiry through its use of inductive reasoning, it can also supplement reflections with real-time observation as well as recordings of creative processes, enabling interpretations based on patterns of action and the triangulation of several data sources. (p. 85-86)

The planning of each phase involved an ongoing investigation of the theory of jazz composing, often relying on first- and second-hand accounts of the motivations of significant jazz composers, which can be characterised as research on music. Examples of these jazz composers’ practical applications of their theoretical approaches were also investigated through the media of sound recordings and scores. These examples provided formal models to be tested in new compositions, constituting research for music, which Frayling (1993) describes as, “the gathering of research materials rather than research proper” (p.5). Stokes’s (2014) constraint-based model for the creative process was used to develop an experimental compositional approach that placed limits on a variety of musical parameters during improvisation to pursue novel performance outcomes. Stokes says: “Constraints are two-sided, paired tools that limit or preclude search for a solution path in specific parts of a problem space, and simultaneously promote or direct it to other parts” (p. 249).

The components of this study directly involving the artistic processes of composing and performing constitute research in music, and the majority of the following chapters will focus on describing the process of developing and performing of new compositions. Borgdorff (2007) says: “Art practice – both the art object and the creative process – embodies situated, tacit knowledge that can be revealed and articulated by means of experimentation and interpretation” (p.14). Field notes and journaling documented my observations during the research, and all group rehearsals and performances were audio recorded to allow for repeated observation. These recordings gave me access to data that may have escaped my perception while acting as a participant-observer in the artistic research process. In addition, I recorded semi-structured participant interviews to document my collaborators’ reflections throughout the study. Before the interviews, a recording of the preceding performance was made available to prompt reflection.
Including this qualitative data gave insights into improvisers’ perspectives on jazz composing and the compositional output of the study (see Figure 2).

**Figure 2. Table of artistic and research processes and products**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Profiling</th>
<th>Compositions</th>
<th>Rehearsals</th>
<th>Performances</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entre Nous La Mer, Bifurcation, 4ths, Kansas City Under Stars</td>
<td>R1.1, R1.2, R1.3a, R1.3b</td>
<td>P1 (Jazz Upstairs, 27/09/15)</td>
<td>IPC, IPH, IPN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>R2.1, R2.2a, R2.2b, R2.3</td>
<td>P2 (JMI Live, 19/11/15)</td>
<td>I1C, I1H, I1N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Become One, Soliloquy, Meters, 2+2</td>
<td>R3.1a, R3.1b, R3.2</td>
<td>P3.1 (Artsworx Theatre, 19/10/16)</td>
<td>I2C, I2H, I2N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Apparition, Stellar Surveillance, If I Should, Pas qu’un Blues</td>
<td>R3.3, R3.4a, R3.4b</td>
<td>P3.2 (Brisbane Jazz Club, 25/4/17)</td>
<td>I3C, I3H, I3N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Only Josh, Helen and Nathan were present for rehearsals marked with ‘a’
* Only Josh and Chris were present for rehearsals marked with ‘b’

After completing each iterative research phase, my observations and reflections, as well as those of my collaborators, were collated and analysed. The findings prompted conceptual, technical, theoretical and strategic changes to enhance the emergent, collaborative approach of the next phase. The ongoing findings from each phase are summarised at the end of chapters 2, 3 and 4.
Literature Review

Theorising Composition and Improvisation in Jazz Studies

Jazz first entered the academy through traditional musicological analysis of composition and improvisation. Ellington compositions were a major focus in the middle of last century, such in the work of Hodier (1993, pp.276-288), and Priestly and Cohen (1993, pp.185-204). Schuller also analysed the works of significant early jazz composers including Ellington and Jelly Roll Morton (1968), as well as Sonny Rollins’ motivic improvisational style on *Blue 7* (1958).

Discussion of jazz composition theory in literature such as Russo (1968), Miller (1996) and Pease (2003) focuses on elements of jazz style from various historical periods, form, orchestration, voicing and counterpoint. Collier (2009) provides an important departure from the dominant discourse on traditional arranging and composing technique, favouring a more philosophical discussion of the performative relationship between composer and improviser, and composition and improvisation. He provides numerous archetypal examples of these relationships from the jazz tradition and demonstrates how they have been absorbed into his own practice. Collier (1995) also suggests practical, sequential exercises using his own compositions for developing idiosyncratic improvisational approaches. These exercises are of a pedagogical nature, but were useful in considering how to incorporate new performance practices into my existing quartet during the composition and rehearsal process.

Hodier (1962), Budds (1990), Dean (1992) and Collier (2009) identify two divergent modes of thought in jazz music during the decade of the 1960s, essentially categorised as conservative and the progressive. These categories were not mutually exclusive and the arrival of new compositional and improvisational materials and approaches, each informing the other, led to an explosion of new formal possibilities and divergent styles. These two categories also provide a framework for identifying and investigating novel performance practices for my quartet in this study.

Interviews with jazz musicians have come to be seen as an important tool in interpreting jazz and what jazz musicians do in performance. Hentoff & Shapiro (1955) compiled a collection of oral histories as a collectively told linear narrative, and Taylor (1977) presents transcripts of
semi-structured interviews in full. These sources were useful in illustrating the type of data accessible through interviews.

Bailey (1992) discusses improvisational practice and learning in several different cultural improvising idioms. Originally published in 1980, frequent and long quotations from interviews are included in the text as qualitative data to give the improvisers a clearly present voice as part, or often as the main basis, of Bailey’s findings. This type of approach is indicative of the beginnings of a move towards artistic research practices that allowed the artists themselves to assign and articulate their own meaning to artistic practices and products. On the Edge (Bailey & Marre, 1992) was presented as four television episodes allowing for the inclusion of audio-visual recordings of improvisation, making it a far more complete medium to present Bailey’s research and giving the activity itself more presence in the findings.

Berliner’s (1994) Thinking in Jazz is somewhat of an encyclopedia for the ethnomusicologist in jazz studies. It systematically surveys the issues concerning improvisation in roughly the order they arise during a musician’s development, and frequent, succinct quotations of musicians’ insider perspectives add authenticity to Berliner’s assertions. Monson (1996) focuses more closely on interaction during improvisation, again using musician statements as a source of qualitative data for her findings. The quotations are noticeably longer than in Berliner’s work, giving the impression of a greater emphasis on the voices of study participants, although Berliner incorporates a larger number of corroborating or contrasting voices. Both Berliner and Monson position their qualitative interview data using excerpts of transcribed improvisations, references to recordings and historical/cultural context; and both found it necessary to become participant observers in their own studies, formally studying jazz improvisation on their chosen instruments, to better interpret the embodied knowledge of the improvisers that they were describing in their research.

**Theorising Agency**

In Bandura’s (2001) social cognitive theory, agency comprises four core features:

1. *Intentionality* is agents’ commitment to a future course of action. Both intended and unintended outcomes can be consequences of agentic acts.
2. *Forethought* is what motivates and guides agents' actions in the present in anticipation of future events.

3. *Self-reactiveness* allows agents to monitor their performance in comparison with set goals and standards. An agent's engagement with goals is affected by the goal's levels of specificity, challenge, and urgency.

4. *Self-reflectiveness* allows agents to assess the correctness of their predictions and choices in relation to the outcomes of their actions, others' personal beliefs the effects of their actions, and established knowledge.

Through the musical interactions in a jazz performance, improvisers are the products and producers of the social fabric of the ensemble and the performance environment. These interactions constitute agentic transactions. Bandura says: “…joint activities require commitment to a shared intention and coordination of interdependent plans of action. The challenge in collaborative activities is to meld diverse self-interests in the service of common goals and intentions collectively pursued in concert” (2001, p.7). Bandura also outlines three modes of agency: “Direct personal agency, proxy agency that relies on others to act on one’s behest to secure desired outcomes, and collective agency exercised through socially coordinative and interdependent effort” (2001, p.1).

These categories will be useful during this study for framing the fluid actions, and the web of influence between composer and improvisers. Bandura also discusses a growing body of research on social systems and group functioning that shows: “The higher the perceived collective efficacy, the higher the groups’ motivational investment in their undertakings, the stronger their staying power in the face of setbacks, and the greater their performance accomplishments” (2000, p.78).

The above literature provides context for how researchers in jazz studies have previously sought to understand the creative processes in composition and improvisation, and combined with social cognitive theory, which outlines a framework for understanding human agency, contains key concepts that will be investigated during this study.
Models of Jazz Composing

Understanding the motivations of jazz composers is vital in interpreting the process and objectives of jazz composing. Numerous compositional models exist that embrace improvised collaboration, each with different approaches to managing the distribution of agency between composer and improvisers, helping to shape and organise the performance of a composition. In this section I will outline some model approaches to jazz composing that have informed my compositional approach during this research.

Duke Ellington

Duke Ellington is widely regarded as the most significant jazz composer to date, chiefly for his ability to accommodate and showcase the individuality of his musicians. His long-time collaborator Billy Strayhorn observed:

Ellington plays the piano, but his real instrument is his band. Each member of his band is to him a distinctive tone colour and set of emotions, which he mixes with others equally distinctive to produce a third thing, which I like to call 'The Ellington Effect'. (cited in Hentoff & Shapiro, 1955, p.215)

Ellington orchestra members Clark Terry, Harry Carney and Lawrence Brown described Ellington as a “compiler”, alluding to his practice of collecting phrases heard during his players’ solos, warmups and collaborative offerings, and developing them into a compositions, fusing the stylistic palette of his orchestra’s repertoire with the personalities of the musicians that would perform it. Well-known themes such as ‘Sophisticated Lady’ (Ellington, Parish & Mills, 1933), ‘Do Nothing Till You Hear From Me’ (Ellington & Russell, 1943), ‘Mood Indigo’ (Ellington, Bigard & Mills, 1931) and ‘Caravan’ (Ellington, Tizol & Mills, 1937) were products of this process (Cohen, 2010, pp.150-151). Ellington noted that the exchange between improvisers and composer in his orchestra was reciprocal:

The music is mostly written down because it saves time. It’s written down if it’s only a basis for change… When we’re all working together a guy may have an idea and he plays it on his horn. Another guy may add to it and make something of it. Someone may play a riff and ask, ‘How do you like this?’ (cited in Rattenbury, 1990, p. 57)

Charles Mingus

Charles Mingus conceived his own unique means of engaging with the individual styles in his ensemble:
My present working methods use very little written material. I ‘write’ the compositions on mental score paper, then I lay out the composition part by part to the musicians… They are given different rows of notes to use against each chord but they choose their own chords except where a particular mood is indicated. In this way I can keep my own compositional flavour in the pieces and yet allow the individuals of their group lines and solos. (cited in Door-Dorynek, 1959)

Mingus’s trombonist from 1957-61 Jimmy Knepper describes how Mingus’s use of the piano to teach his players their parts contributed to the ‘unpolished’ sound of some ensemble passages:

He would sometimes fake the fast runs and aim for the high notes, and you’d try to figure out what he was playing in between. He didn’t want anybody to write out his parts. He wanted you to play like you just thought of it yourself, even if it wasn’t exactly what he wrote. (cited in Priestley, 1982, p.77)

Mingus sometimes incorporated sections of flexible lengths into his forms to create what he termed “extended form”. This elastic type of form can be heard on *Pithecanthropus Erectus* (Mingus, 1956) which features a form of ABAC where the A sections are 16 bars long, but where the B and C sections are 2 bar modal vamps “of indefinite length, variable according to both the inspiration of the soloist and the rhythm section’s decision to cue the next section” (Priestly, 1982, p.69).

**Eddie Sauter**

In a collaboration commissioned by tenor saxophonist Stan Getz, Eddie Sauter composed a suite of arranged environments for string orchestra and drums that Getz could improvise in, titled *Focus* (Sauter & Getz, 1961). Sauter explained:

I always left, in the back of my mind, a space for another part to be added. I didn’t know what was going to happen in that area. That was the hole I left for Stan … He fitted his part into the fabric and made a whole. He has an unusual sensitivity to musical form and expressiveness, and a remarkable agility of mind. He entered into each piece without forcing himself. He never imposes arbitrary things on his environment. And he never stops being himself. (cited in Cerruli, 1961)

Sauter emphasises the interdependent needs for composers’ knowledge of the improvisers involved in a collaboration, and improvisers’ understanding of a composition being interpreted.

**Gil Evans**

Around the same time, Gil Evans was reaching for formal spontaneity in his compositions. The arrangement of his composition ‘La Nevada’ (1959, 1961),
includes several orchestrated motifs and riffs that were cued in and out of Gil's piano, to guide the soloist in forging the musical drama. This kind of arrangement - requiring a sensitised participation from all the musicians and not just the soloist of the moment - would become increasingly common in Gil’s work. (Stein Crease, 2002, p.229)

‘Time of the Barracudas’ (1964) and ‘Zee Zee’ (1973) are further examples that employ this type of approach where compositions are minimal enough to be notated on a scrap of paper. Evans said of his later output:

I try to think of music in which everybody has some way of expressing himself. That’s why we play a lot of heads now. Sometimes something will come from that: everybody will start filling in around it and maybe veer off in some way - and all of a sudden I have an improvised arrangement. (cited in Collier, 2009, p.253)

Evans’ approach to organising his group’s performances from the 1970s onwards often experimented with spontaneously arranging named or numbered modular formal elements:

When he wanted to hear one of these sections, he would simply call it out. Often, these ensembles were sections taken from his earlier arrangements – the bridge from ‘Gone’ or ‘Summertime’, for example. They might be played as written, or they might contain newly written voicings or playing instructions. Either way, the players had to remain loose – but alert. (Hicock, 2002, pp.182-3)

**Ornette Coleman**

Ornette Coleman’s compositional approach with his quartet during the 1960’s turned conventional notions of solo form upside down - rather than a solo being a consequence of form, the form became a product of the act of improvisation (Wilson, 1999, p.37). Speaking of the performance of his compositions Coleman (1960) said:

Before we start out to play, we do not have any idea what the end result will be. Each player is free to contribute what he feels in the music at any given moment… I don’t tell the members of my group what to do. I want them to play what they hear in the piece for themselves. I let everyone express himself just as he wants to.

This approach to composition functioned outside of the bounds of predetermined phase-lengths and harmonic progressions, instead providing stimulus for improvisation through a theme’s pitch intervals and rhythm. Describing the connection between composition, improviser and interaction in Coleman’s group, his long-term bassist Charlie Haden said: “technically speaking, it was a constant modulation in the improvising that was taken from the direction of the composition, and from the direction inside the musician, and from listening to each other” (cited in Wilson, 1999, p38).
**Bob Brookmeyer**

Bob Brookmeyer worked with vastly different approaches to soloist freedom during his career. In the middle of both of his compositions ‘Ding Dong Ding’ (1980) and ‘First Love Song’ (1980) he gave pianist Jim McNeely unaccompanied cadenza sections of indeterminate length for free improvisation. Speaking of this experience, McNeely (2014) said:

> This was the first time that anybody had ever done this, for me at least. The band plays and plays and all of a sudden everyone stops and it's up to you to come up with a solo. And the first time we did ‘First Love Song’ he had a few chord changes written on the piano part and I said “do you want me to play those?” He said “no, no, just play whatever you want.”

Later on in his career, speaking of jazz composing, Brookmeyer said:

> You want to be, as a leader also, responsible to the soloist and talk to the soloist and help them fit into the piece and help them help the piece flow. That's their job. Remember that they are not there to play a solo, they are there to help the composition, and help the composition be part of the overall experience of the listener. (Brookmeyer, cited in Truesdale, 2005)

Brookmeyer (2005, 2006, 2012) emphasised that the main contribution that the jazz composer brings to a performance is planning and management of the overall musical environment and form through what is notated on the score and given in spoken directions. He saw jazz composition through the lens of different sorts of musical activity, relationships, structures and flow and used solos in his compositions to further his musical objectives, suggesting that placing certain limitations on a soloist may clarify the function of their solo in the overall structure of the composition, bringing the composer's objective into focus.

**Graham Collier**


> I wanted in those pieces... to reflect in a very broad way the fact that a jazz piece at its best changes from performance to performance... In... movable composed modules I thought there were effective ways of writing... Plus I firmly believe that if the piece is written to allow it, the composer/leader can be very creative with it in live performances; reacting in the same way as the improvisers to the situation. (cited in Dean, 1992, p.171)
Collier has also used what he calls “universal parts” (2009, pp.270-271) when working with large jazz ensembles. This brings the large ensembles performance practices closer to that of a small group playing from lead sheets or from memory, allowing more agency from the part of the performers in exactly what and how they play, and more freedom for the composer/leader to improvise with the form and arrangement during performance.

Collier (2009) identifies three intersecting types of improvisation, all necessary for a complete understanding of jazz performances: the solo, textural improvisation (interpretation of melody and accompaniment), and structural improvisation (length and order of solos) (p.46). He also outlines his concept of the three areas of jazz composition: space (improvisational, compositional, rhythmic, physical/aural), levels (supporting levels of common purpose, independent levels of divergent purpose), and jazz form (micro-level and macro-level structural improvising) (pp.265-309).

Steve Coleman

Steve Coleman’s music explores improvisers’ ability to organise and interpret structure in performance. Coleman (2011) said:

We try to actually construct new structures as we’re playing so we try to do spontaneous composing as a group, but in such a way that the audience really doesn’t know that it’s a spontaneous composition. And then a lot of times we’ll mix… different pieces of material together in different ways. Every concert we’ll do it different. We might be playing two or three things at once. We’re really into malleable structures. Taking structures and kind of bending them like moulding clay or something like that.

Coleman also takes the process “bending” existing structures one step further by sometimes actually teaching his band members their parts during a performance through dictation using a combination of his alto saxophone and his voice. This approach is clearly exemplified through the gradual layering of individual parts at Coleman’s direction on ‘Laid Back Schematics’ (Coleman, 1993).

Kneebody

The contemporary jazz quintet Kneebody have used a language of specific phrases, unique to their group, to allow any ensemble member to instigate changes in any music that they are performing using musical cues for acceleration, tempo changes, key changes or looping a section of form. Each band member has their own musical ‘name’ consisting of a different
number of notes derived from the first five notes of ‘Come Sunday’ (Ellington, 1945). This allows the band members to melodically communicate directions to one another by first playing a player’s, or multiple players’, musical ‘name’ and then employing specific cues to start or stop individual players playing, loop a cued phrase, or instantly change the combination of instruments playing together. Moody (2012) presents a useful in-context overview of most of these cues with annotated examples for Kneebody’s performance of ‘The Slip’ (Endsley, 2005). Discussing the cues, Kneebody’s keyboardist Adam Benjamin says: “They’re meant to blend into the rest of the music, so that it is not too apparent that we’re giving each other musical instructions” (cited in Rubin, M. & Devasthali, V., 2010).

New compositions by each member of Kneebody are taught to the others in the group without notating or distributing any form of musical score. Describing the process of collectively learning their music Benjamin says:

> At times, it feels like Kneebody is less of a band, and more of a class, where the thing we’re getting really good at is learning this complicated music by ear. And specifically, learning each other’s really complicated music by ear, where we understand each other’s compositional voices enough that we can adapt and learn new material more quickly than we would in other situations. (cited in Rubin, M. & Devasthali, V., 2010)

The above models of jazz composing provided specific strategies for practical experimentation and adaptation during the course of this study. In this study I adapted Ellington, Mingus, Sauter and Brookmeyer’s approaches to managing the interdependent relationship between composer and improvisers, and experimented with flexible ‘jazz forms’ by adapting the approaches of Mingus, Evans, Ornette Coleman, Collier, Steve Coleman and Kneebody.

The Participants

Due to the presence of improvised elements, jazz compositions can only be properly interpreted during performance, so this study is entirely dependent on the participants. The ensemble acting as the compositional workshop consists of pianist Chris Poulsen, bassist Helen Russell, drummer Nathan Goldman and myself playing saxophone. I have worked with these musicians in different groups and contexts for a number of years and we have previously recorded an album together under my leadership. Bandura (2001) says “Joint activities require commitment

---

1 I learned about this language of musical cues first-hand from the members of Kneebody at a Summer Intensive Workshop at SIM in Brooklyn, NY in 2009.
to a shared intention and coordination of interdependent plans of action. The challenge in collaborative activities is to meld diverse self-interests in the service of common goals and intentions collectively pursued in concert” (p.7). Each musician was invited to participate in this study because of their individual musicality and sensibilities, complementary musical styles, openness to collaboration, and their trust and friendship.

Before beginning the practical phases of the project, I used semi-structured interviews with each participant (approved by the Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee HQCM/11/14/HREC) to gather data on their influences, and experiences with ensemble playing, collaboration and notation. Asking these questions was also symbolic of my desire for deeper collaboration through better understanding the views and motivations of the participants. As Collier (2009) states, “it is the whole person who is involved in playing, not just the musician” (p.79).

There was general agreement that an aural familiarity with a composition and/or musical style is necessary to feel prepared to comfortably interpret music scores through improvisatory performance practices. Some means of developing this familiarity stated by the participants included listening to recordings, learning melody and bass by singing and/or using piano, ensemble rehearsal, and regular performances. The concept woven through much of the dialogue was the interconnectedness of melody, harmony and rhythm. Perhaps unsurprisingly, Helen and Chris went into greater detail discussing the harmonic aspect of music, and Nathan the rhythmic aspect, but all stressed the importance of adopting a melodic approach to making music. In discussing rhythm section relationships, Helen and Nathan focused on that between bass and drums, while Chris focused on the piano-drums relations.

Based on their experiences as ‘session players’ in various rhythm section combinations, each participant indicated an openness to negotiation with other improvisers’ musical approaches during performance and to compromise in search of the best possible musical outcomes. Berliner (1994) says “In meeting the multiple challenges of a shifting mix of groups, artists sharpen technical skills as they continuously assert and evaluate their musical ideas, ultimately defining and refining their personal improvisation concepts” (p.446).

Furthermore, all participants indicated a preference for playing through a musical challenge using trial and error to find an organic solution as opposed to discussing and prescribing a
solution or assigning musical roles. None of the participants identify as strong readers of highly-notated music and all expressed a preference for working with either no charts, chord charts or minimal traditional notation, creating an environment that allows them freedom to interpret and respond using their aural skills.

The importance placed on extended and repeated listening to jazz recordings in informing the participants’ musical aesthetic was abundantly clear. The first common thread in each participant’s listening was familiarity with recordings by Miles Davis and John Coltrane. Helen referred to their 50’s and 60’s recordings in general and Chris and Nathan referring to Miles Davis’ 60’s recordings as well as those of the 60’s John Coltrane Quartet. Previously unknown common interests were also discovered such as Helen and Nathan’s interest in the Police, and Chris and Helen’s interest in the Keith Jarrett Trio. In each case these groups of musicians were discussed from the perspective of individual rhythm section players’ contributions to the band’s sound. Monson (1996) says:

> Recordings heavily mediate the aural transmission of style in jazz. Jazz performances are not musical texts in and of themselves (in that they are negotiated between multiple improvising participants), but when such performances are recorded and disseminated through LPs, CDs, and cassettes, they become texts. (p.126)

**Summary**

Chapter 1 has introduced the context for my study, outlined the research questions, the research approach and the participants involved. The next three chapters detail the planning, composing, rehearsing, and performance outcomes observed during the course of this study. Chapter 2 gives an account of the musical and research activities undertaken during the Phase 1. Chapter 3 outlines the musical and research activities during Phase 2 using new compositional directions in response to the Phase 1’s findings. Chapter 4 outlines the adaptation of my compositional approach in Phase 3, prompted by the findings of Phases 1 and 2. Chapter 5 summarises the findings of Phases 1, 2 and 3, drawing conclusions about interactive compositional processes, and how performance outcomes were affected by the idiosyncratic improvisation approaches in the study’s compositions.
Chapter 2 - Phase 1

During the planning stage of Phase 1 of this project, I considered how experimentation with different musical parameters could affect composers’ and improvisers’ sense of agency during jazz during performance. I compiled a list of conceptual ideas for compositional exploration, many of which were inspired by recordings or attending live performances, or from reading about a significant recording in literature and listening to it to assess the textual analysis. Other ideas emerged from personal reflection, with recorded musical examples subsequently located during the course of the research.

Instead of introducing completed compositions to the players in rehearsals as I had done prior to this study, I decided to trial a novel, interactive compositional approach for some pieces in Phase 1. Using ideas from my planning notes, a sketch was developed for each composition to be rehearsed with the players. Guided by the participants’ comments from rehearsal discussions, as well as my own observations, more detail was then added to the compositions by the following rehearsal. In this way the compositions stayed flexible enough for experimentation during the course of their development and, as composer, I could be responsive to the players’ exercise of proxy agency in interpreting the concept used in each piece as I added to each composition.

I also felt the need to adapt the group’s rehearsal practices in order to be able to practice some of the idiosyncratic approaches to improvisation used in the compositions². The following section describes of the artistic and research activities around the development and performance of the Phase 1 compositions.

---

² From my long-term involvement with football (soccer) I was aware that modern training for conceptual aspects of the game focuses on using game-like situations to develop good decision making. This approach promotes improvisation through passing and player movement within the boundaries of exercises. In a possession drill, the team-in-possession of the ball will often commence with the advantage of extra players to promote success in the early stages of the exercise. Once the team-in-possession experiences success, more opposition players are added, the size of the playing area is reduced or the number of touches of the ball are limited, testing the team-in-possession’s decision making skills under increasing levels of stress. This system of slowly increasing the level of pressure ensures initial success, fostering conceptual understanding, but then shifts to preparing for high-intensity match situation. I see useful parallels here in the way musicians can learn new interactive approaches for idiosyncratic compositions.
Entre Nous la Mer

My goal with this piece was to use collective improvisation to focus on texture, relationships and interaction. The approach I wanted to adopt for 'Entre Nous la Mer' was inspired by a recording of Wayne Shorter's composition ‘Nefertiti’ (1968). Throughout the entire performance Miles Davis (trumpet) and Wayne Shorter (tenor saxophone) repeat the melody using an improvisational technique called “shadowing” (Collier, 2009, pp.276-277) allowing what would traditionally have been tight unison phrasing to go in and out of phase, an approach closely related to Mingus’ use of ‘unpolished’ ensemble passages. Meanwhile, Herbie Hancock (piano), Ron Carter (bass) and Tony Williams (drums) provide highly varied and active accompaniment, meaning that the traditional ensemble roles are essentially reversed. The horns are now providing the semi-improvised ‘groove’ of the tune that places the rhythm section players’ contribution in focus: the accompanists thus take the role of the soloist (Collier, 2009, p191-192).

In the first rehearsal of Phase 1 (R1.1) we listened to ‘Nefertiti’ to illustrate my desired approach and briefly discussed using the same conceptual basis for ‘Entre Nous la Mer’, except that repetitions of the melody could be shared amongst the participants, managed through the exercise of collective agency. The notation featured two presentations of the melody, one with passing chords, and the other with only one chord per bar (see Appendix B). The two sections were interchangeable and to be used as desired by each player. The 16 bar form and melody of ‘Entre Nous la Mer’ were very simple, so the performance objective hinged on the interactive relationships between the players during performance. Our first attempts were unfocused, with everyone finding it hard to limit themselves to working with the melody. It quickly became evident that my desire to let the players find their own way was creating an ambiguous situation, and that I would require a targeted rehearsal strategy to work towards the sort of ensemble approach I desired. We initially tried an exercise where only three people were permitted to play at any given moment. Afterwards, Nathan said: “Am I allowed to stop? I’m always scared to stop, I don’t know why” (R1.1). This suggested that he doesn’t often play in situations where this would be suitable, or perhaps that this sort of direction from a leader typically isn’t directed towards drummers.

In the second rehearsal of Phase 1 (R1.2) we commenced work on this piece with a duo exercise, rotating through all the possible duo combinations in the quartet with the objective of
exploring different instrumental combinations to vary the accompaniment. Each combination offered different interactive opportunities and everyone seemed to find this strategy an interesting change of pace. I also directly stated the importance of repeating the melody throughout the entire performance of this composition to give it a meditative quality, and the role of the accompaniment as the main focus of the performance rather than improvised solos. Helen said: “It’s tricky with that one because of the inversions that are built into it. When you take people out it’s tricky” (R1.2). There are many chord 3rds in the melody, so when Helen played the melody in the low register of the bass without chordal accompaniment from Chris, it did somewhat recontextualise the harmony. Chris said:

In some ways [voice-leading] is what holds it together because subconsciously you’re hearing those [resolutions]. Even if you're not playing it, once you start getting familiar with that shape, you start to hear that without playing it and that sort of forms the invisible skeleton around it. It almost makes me feel like trying to play in those negative spaces – counter-melody. (R1.2)

In the **Phase 1 performance (P1)** the participants demonstrated understanding of the overall performance objectives of this composition. In Helen’s Phase 1 Interview, she said:

I really like that idea of everyone working with melody. I haven’t really done it much. It is sort of tricky. I am all fine with very limited improvisation, constant reference to the melody, but then making some sort of journey happen. (IH1)

The participants continued experimentation with solo, duo and trio combinations by sometimes electing to tacet. Nathan said: “It’s still a bit tentative but it’s happening. The first time we played it everyone played the whole way through. So, we are learning. It is sort of just abandoning your fears and doing it” (IN1). Chris said:

I am familiar with that feeling in stuff we do with church. You do just melody, melody, melody, next verse… I felt like we all were all fairly open to responding to each other. I enjoyed the sit and listen aspect, having a real chance to appreciate what the others are doing. Just go “maybe I don’t need to add anything”. (IC1)

There were moments in P1 where the momentum of the piece was lost. My interest in further developing the approach used in ‘Nefertiti’ by exercising collective agency to manage melody and accompaniment may have been too much responsibility while still developing our ensemble concept for this approach. This could potentially have been minimised if I had taken personal responsibility for playing the melody throughout, reverting more closely to the ‘Nefertiti’ model at least as a temporary measure, allowing the other participants to purely focus on asserting collective agency in a more focused space in the composition through their accompaniment choices.
**Bifurcation**

The goal of this piece was to create an environment where improvisers could exercise personal agency to cue changes of tonality during the course of performance. John Coltrane’s composition ‘Spiritual’ (1962b) was used as stimulus for further development. The rubato melody of ‘Spiritual’ is 16 bars long, followed by a series of 2 bar modal vamps that structure the performance using contrasting modes. Coltrane’s tenor saxophone solo is based in the C Dorian mode, Dolphy’s bass clarinet solo in the C Mixolydian mode, and Tyner’s piano and Coltrane’s soprano saxophone solos returning to the C Dorian mode.

After listening to ‘Spiritual’ together in R1.1, we discussed the impact that this parallel modal shift has in developing a meaningful structure to this hypnotic, nearly 14 minute performance. The first sketch for ‘Bifurcation’ that I presented to the band was a simple chord chart in 4/4 without any melodic or rhythmic information (see Appendix C). We initially experimented with the rubato section at the start of the chart that alternates between an Eb or Eb minor chord and an Ab7 or Ab minor chord until the next section is cued. This concept facilitated proxy composer agency in this section by presenting the soloist with the opportunity of selecting the quality, duration and sequence of chords from my chosen palette. For our first attempt, I tried cueing chord changes by introducing melodic material that implied the desired quality of the next chord. It was collectively decided that it would be clearer to use Ab instead of Ab7 to make it more distinguishable from Ab minor for cueing purposes. Chris and Helen also took turns leading the group through this section as soloists. This was the first time we had tried improvising form together as a group, and one of the first occasions we had tried rubato improvising together, but the band’s reaction was quite positive. We then played through the 16 bar form once in tempo, with an improvised riff-based major melody followed by a parallel minor alteration of same melody, to demonstrate how the piece might work. Chris suggested that “It would be cool to have a melody that works over both tonalities so the rhythm section can choose the tonality during the melody” (R1.1). I was interested by this idea, but decided to continue with the soloist alone choosing when to change tonality. Next we attempted taking solos on the 16 bar form in tempo with soloists cueing the tonality during the V7 chord during the last 2 bars of the form, using melodic material from the Mixolydian mode for the major tonality and Altered scale or Phrygian Dominant-based material for the parallel minor. This section again explored the exercise of proxy composer agency, allowing each soloist to determine the form of their solo by having the opportunity to change the tonality of each 16 bar section of form. Helen noted
another example of use of parallel major and minor tonality in John Coltrane’s blues ‘Mr Syms’ (1962a) which has a 48 bar AABA form with 12 bar blues as the A section and a 12 bar parallel minor blues as the B section.

For R1.2, I changed the key and added a new section to transition from the rubato opening into the tempo of the repeating 16 bar form (see Appendix D). This new section featured a 2 bar syncopated melody alternating with 2 bar solo breaks featuring Helen, repeated until the 16 bar section was cued with 2 bars of walking bass. I also added major and minor melodies, with the tonality used to be decided and cued by Helen, and a coda using material from the opening section, this time in tempo. After rehearsing the individual sections, Helen said:

When the choruses go by faster you’re more likely to be free with the choices of [tonality]… If [the tempo is slow] you’re only going to do two choruses because they’re long… But if you know your solo is going to be at least 6 passes long… The faster the tune, the more likely you are to mess around with it more. (R1.2)

Chris strongly agreed, and I added that the maximum tempo would be determined by our ability to give clear melodic cues and to interpret them during the final 2 bars of each chorus. We also discussed how this composition’s malleable chord qualities and tonality would result in a very different structure each time it is performed.

In the Phase 1 interviews, the participants observed how ‘Bifurcation’s’ exercise of proxy composer agency assigned different responsibilities to each improviser. Helen said:

Normally for me it would be enough of a challenge to just be playing the breaks… but then the added responsibility of making the decision now of whether to play a minor key or a major key… That’s actually quite strangely taxing… It puts more responsibility on the bass player than you normally have… I’m a lot less used to being the instigator… as a bass player you’re much more often an accompanist than someone who’s making stuff happen. (IH1)

Chris said:

You don’t want to feel like a technical exercise. If you go to minor, you want to say minor things and it should relate to what you’ve said with the major things… Even in the intro section. As soon as you came in, I was like “what I played didn’t really relate to the tune that much.” I was kind of just playing over those chords… I think I would be a little more thoughtful about some of the melody in my intro. Not playing the melody but being a bit more aware of it. (IC1)

P1 was a successful performance of this piece with all improvisers engaging with the opportunity for more direct soloist agency in choosing the form of their solo while being
influenced by the exercise of proxy composer agency. This composition’s melodic and stylistic character is quite similar to that of the compositions on Now and Then (Hatcher, 2015) which may have bridged the gap between our previous repertoire and the new approaches being investigated in this piece.

4ths

The objective for this piece was to allow a soloist to improvise over a series of modal vamps, each played until the next was cued by the soloist. This concept was drawn from ‘Flamenco Sketches’ from Kind of Blue (Davis, 1959), a composition without a composed melody, featuring a form of indefinite length with a sequence of five modes, each to be improvised on until the next is cued by the soloist. I wanted to use this elastic approach to form in ‘4ths’, developing it further by composing specific melodic cues for each vamp. This would simultaneously exercise proxy composer agency by ensuring that my melodic cues would be integrated into the content of each solo, and facilitate the exercise of personal improviser agency to decide the formal proportions of their solo.

In R1.1 we listened to ‘Flamenco Sketches’ and discussed how to approach modal music, collectively conceding that we hadn’t done that much modal playing. In its initial form, the chart for ‘4ths’ that I supplied to the band consisted of two short melodic cues based on the interval of a perfect 4th to give them a distinctive sound in an attempt to make them readily identifiable to accompanists (see Appendix E). We familiarised ourselves with the cues by slowly practicing them in unison, and then tried improvising on the two modes and using the cues. Helen cited that Ornette Coleman’s music often uses melodies to cue the end of a solo or formal section. The notation in ‘4ths’ specified modes, not chords, during the vamps prompting Chris to ask, “So do you want me to be playing chords or not even chords as such? Playing notes together? Just counter-melodies or anything?” (R1.1). While not wanting to tell Chris exactly what or how to play, I had imagined that he would intuitively adopt an approach to modal piano accompaniment reminiscent of Herbie Hancock, McCoy Tyner or Bill Evans. My response was: “Playing the mode, but using the harmony from that mode” (R1.1). Using this sort of notation was evidently new to us and required more explanation. Next we discussed how to structure the form. Helen said:
You could do what the Indians do… one of those and then that, and then two of those and then that, and then three of those… I don’t really want to go there but it just reminded me of it because I’ve been thinking about [Indian music]. Especially the retrograde thing. (R1.1)

I was interested in process as formal development, saying: “I like the idea of a process that’s audible, like in the music of Terry Riley, Steve Reich with that minimalist thing - you can hear it grow and that’s the form” (R1.1).

For R1.2 I composed additional melodic cues and added more modes giving us five cues for five modes (see Appendix F). I also suggested that Helen might adopt more of a one-to-a-bar approach in her bassline to give the groove more of a ‘lilt’. I elaborated on my thoughts on process from the previous rehearsal, explaining that I wasn’t concerned if we didn’t all identify the cue and start playing it at the same time, as the process of cumulatively detecting and responding to the cue would create a really interesting effect. This was a more specific example of what I’d earlier described in R1.1 as a “process that’s audible” creating structure. Helen said: “What makes it harder is the pickups all being in different places. I know it would probably be duller if they weren’t” (R1.2). This factor in tandem with the cues’ angular melodies made them challenging to fluidly integrate into a solo whilst still unfamiliar. I also wrote an additional cue that would be played to begin and finish the piece.

In P1 we successfully negotiated our way twice through the form, aside from a few false starts by Chris and I trying to integrate the angular intervals and syncopated rhythms of the cues into solos with modal harmony. The challenge for accompanists was to identify the cues and then to engage with them in the middle of the phrase. Helen said:

> It just encourages people to listen harder to each other which has got to be a good thing and then it would just become easier the more we do it… A challenge for me is just to find a way to use a mode that doesn’t feel like running to run up and down a mode… I am so focussed on melody, and how melody interacts with chords. So when there is no melody, there’s only the [cues]… I would normally try and take some sort of material from the melody…It’s quite hard to hear sometimes when those cues start. And then if you don’t get it at the beginning, they’re hard to jump on in the middle. (IH1)

The challenge for soloists was deciding on the right moment to cue the next section, and to technically execute the cues clearly so that they can be identified by the accompanists. Chris said:

> You just feel like you are just playing over modes and it’s like avoiding playing bad notes… I want to take it to the point where I am really saying something within this
section then I’m going to know what is happening – this next section is coming then… I enjoyed listening back to that one. I felt it was drawing out a bit of some Herbie [Hancock] kind of sound. Reminds me a bit of the *Empyrean Isles* album… I think it’s got potential. In a general sense, some of my thoughts are “I hope they hear my cue now” or “I hope I am playing this cue right so that they can hear it”. (IC1)

Nathan said:

How to play with people that play modally is usually that the form gives me less choice as to what to do. I just signpost bits of the form that work, if I can remember where we are in the form! And how to actually drive the band and help the band out in modal style. What sort of comping ideas might work. (IN1)

I was personally challenged by improvising with a modal approach, indicating my frequent reliance on functional harmony in generating forward motion in my melodies. P1 demonstrated that the modal approach in ‘4ths’ didn’t target the participants’ musical strengths, but also that pushing improvisers out of their comfort zone can facilitate approaches to improvisation that would be otherwise unobtainable.

**Kansas City Under Stars**

The objective of this piece was to explore using rhythmic cues to facilitate personal soloist agency to spontaneously change the form and accompaniment. I drew inspiration from the phrase that Miles Davis sometimes played to his drummers to cue ‘trading fours’ as with ‘Dr. Jackle’ (McLean, 1958), or a drum solo as with ‘Walkin’” (Davis, 1966) and wanted to draw from Kneebody’s approach of soloists communicating to their accompanists how they would like to be accompanied.

‘Kansas City Under Stars’ was introduced to the group during R1.2 without a notated chart. I explained that we would use the 24 bar blues form of ‘Freddie Freeloader’ as recorded on *Kind of Blue* (Davis, 1959) and a rhythmic cue, set to pitches of the soloist’s choice, that could cue ‘stop time’ accompaniment for eight bars (see Appendix G). Here proxy composer agency was exercised by providing a cue for the soloist to coordinate the rhythm section towards a specific type of accompaniment that doesn’t often occur spontaneously. There were some initial clarifying questions about where in the form the cue could be used, but we managed to quickly begin practical work on the piece. I demonstrated by playing a solo using the cue rhythm at various points in the form to set up stop time from the rhythm section for eight bars, followed by Chris’s first attempt. We experienced immediate success, and using purely rhythmic cues
instead of melodic cues seemed to be less of a practical hurdle when trying to integrate them into solos. In order for the cue to be readily identifiable I had tried to select a rhythm that wouldn’t come up frequently in the participants’ improvisations, however Helen said she would probably use that rhythm. This was an important reminder that each participant has their own musical vocabulary and that finding a one-size-fits-all solution isn’t always possible.

For R1.3a I added a notated melody for the 24 bar form, developed by writing the rhythm first and then setting it to only four pitches, creating the impression of melody played by four differently pitched drums (see Appendix H). I also introduced a second rhythmic cue, again with pitches to be determined by the soloist, which would cue a metric modulation into a new eight bar section. This is another example of balancing promoting personal soloist agency while exercising proxy composer agency by providing the materials to be experimented with. I wanted this new 8 bar section to have an ‘afro 6/8 feel’ inspired by Philly Joe Jones’s drum groove on Sonny Rollins’s recording of ‘Asiatic Raes’ (Dorham, 1957) so I played an excerpt of this recording to demonstrate the feel and we looped the 6/8 section a few times together to practice this groove. We then tried playing through the form with me demonstrating the application of the new cue and practiced playing through the melody together in unison. I explained the arrangement that I had in mind with the first melody statement played by Nathan, then a second statement by Helen and I with accompaniment from Chris and Nathan, emphasising that everything about this piece was focused on rhythm. What had started as a very simple sketch was starting to feel complicated. Helen said: “Maybe this tune has got one too many variables? With the Ab7, which is something you’d be relying on, that other cue, and then this cue as well, it’s piling on” (R1.3a).

P1 was mostly successful, although we had some initial difficulties executing and responding to the cues during Chris’s solo. The issue of inaccurate cueing created a conundrum for accompanists in deciding whether to react or not. Discussing instances when the metric modulation cue was played inaccurately, Nathan said: “You kind of play through it ‘cause when you’re not sure yourself, you’re not sure that anyone else has got it. You think ‘he was trying to do it’ but getting the cue right also establishes the metric modulation” (IN1). The choice of the rhythm to cue the metric modulation was specifically designed to emulate the way a drummer ‘sets up’ feel change. In this sense, the soloist has to engage with the role the drummer usually occupies in this type of transition. Speaking of the experience of being an accompanist in this changed paradigm, Helen said:
When you are a little bit worried about what’s going to happen next it takes away your enjoyment of just being in the moment. That’s what jazz is about really… But not too much anxiety about what is going to happen next, what to listen for… My big fear was playing, either me doing it or someone else doing it, something unintentionally that sounds like a cue. (IH1)

This composition’s stated focus on rhythm did seem to stimulate particularly rhythmically oriented improvisations from the participants. Chris said:

It is great to just be told “this is really what I want to concentrate on, this rhythmic stuff”… Sometimes the idea of narrowing a thing really inspires more creativity. I like that a lot. Honestly having a super duper blank canvas you just don’t know where to go or you revert to things you already do. So I think having a clear concept is really helpful for that. (IC1)

Summary

Rehearsing the Phase 1 compositions was the first time that I had used practical exercises focused on enacting specific types of musical change when rehearsing with professional musicians. Chris said:

You’re not working through a chart so much as experimenting with ideas. It seems like a sporting team throwing the ball around. How would I react if you did this?… Sport can be very artistic in that sense, responding on the fly. I think the rehearsal is a kind of sort of like a training session… Until you have done the performance, you haven’t actually played the game. (IC1)

Even though the participants were all excellent listeners, we had to bring more individual and collective awareness to rehearsing and performing these compositions than we had with our previous repertoire. I was encouraged by signs of increased investment and a shared understanding of performance goals of each composition by the participants as we engaged with this process. Nathan said:

It’s a ‘choose your own adventure gig’ and everyone has an equal say in that. And it is good to have a band leader as well to call the shots and remind people what the bits are… both in performance and rehearsal… When there’s so many ideas floating around in your head it’s good to have someone to say “this is that”… The more you play, the more that each individual has a say in their role and that will be better for everyone. (IN1)

During rehearsals in Phase 1, there were often conversations between two or three members of the group lasting several minutes. While these conversations were beneficial for individuals’ conceptual understanding, I observed that they sometimes led to some frustration on the part of the group when some really wanted to get on with practical work on the music. I learned quickly
that I needed to balance time spent discussing and playing to accommodate individual preferences during ensemble rehearsals. It also became apparent that trying to explain a concept in too much detail could be counterproductive, and that playing an example with my saxophone, singing, or referencing existing recordings was an efficient way to translate concepts from abstraction into the musical context. The most engaging aspect of the rehearsals for the participants was practically working through interaction exercises focusing on particular musical parameters.

The breaking of playing habits and remaining ‘open’ to rapid, spontaneous change when soloists were asserting personal agency within the limits defined by the exercise of proxy composer agency were specific challenges posed by the music for this phase. Chris said:

>> The improvising is more alive. You have got to be thinking a bit more. I felt I have had to be more aware of what others are doing... I picture more of an undulating surface to stand on... So what someone is doing over there is really impacting on you a lot more. <<

(I1)

All participants indicated the need for more aural familiarity with the compositions to allow them to be more expressive within the changing improvisatory boundaries set by my exercise of proxy composer agency. Helen said: “I feel a bit constrained by listening out for what might happen instead of just being able to play” (I1H1). For the next phase I concluded that I would need to simplify my approach to notation and cues in an attempt to remove unnecessary barriers to expression.
Chapter 3 - Phase 2

The compositions from Phase 1 bridged the gap between a highly arranged approach to notation I had used with my quartet prior to this study, and a freer compositional conception facilitating personal improviser agency in making spontaneous changes to the form. The use of specific cues that enact change from predetermined options allowed for the simultaneous exercise of proxy composer agency. However, after P1, Helen said: “Maybe I should not have a chart? If I could memorise the hits and the cues and I wasn’t looking at it and I was just using my ears I guess I’d be happier” (IH1). During Phase 2, I reflected more deeply on Bill Evans’s (1959) comment about the music from Kind of Blue, where he said that “Miles Davis presents here frameworks which are exquisite in their simplicity and yet contain all that is necessary to stimulate performance with a sure reference to the primary conception.” I was interested in minimising notation in the compositions allowing the participants to ‘get the music off the page’, and in specifying only what would be sufficient to provide a starting point for improvised development by the participants.

The following sections of this chapter outline the compositional and improvisational issues as they arose for each of the compositions developed in Phase 2.

Become One

The goal of ‘Become One’ was to collectively improvise a unified melody and arrangement during the course of a performance. This audible development process would reflect the cumulative compositional process used during Phase 1, with the participants’ interdependent contributions towards the development of the melody during the performance shaping the exercise of collective agency to create a linear structure of gradual growth. The notation I provided was a circular piece of manuscript, suggesting a cycle without beginning or end, featuring a 6 bar harmonic progression without meter. I was interested in adapting and further developing the concept behind Phase 1’s ‘Entre Nous la Mer’ to facilitate collective improviser agency in creating the melody and proxy composer agency through structuring the collective improvisation. Rather than starting with a melody and having soloists contribute their variations, the development would come from the process of improvisers suggesting, listening, negotiating,
learning, and assembling the final melody, as it came into focus. This could be a short process, with a melody forged by one strong willed player and shaped by the commentary of accompanists; or much longer, with a gradual consensus being built through the exchange of phrase ideas between all members of the ensemble. Arrival at a stable, repeated melody would signal the end of the piece, and the melody could be different every time the piece was performed. This process is related to Steve Coleman’s dictation of layered parts for his ensemble in ‘Laid Back Schematics’ (Coleman, 1993) except the exercise of personal agency of the composer is replaced with the exercise of collective agency of all participants.

After explaining the piece’s objective in R 2.1 we played rubato through the cycle for roughly seven minutes (see Appendix I). With only a sequence of six chords the chart was quickly superfluous, giving an immediate feeling that we were playing music ‘by ear’, more akin to the preferences for performance practices expressed by the participants after Phase 1. Our first attempt failed to achieve any momentum towards a unified melody or arrangement so I asked the other participants how we could create a more linear performance with a sense of convergence in our ideas. All participants agreed that going into tempo would be helpful for interpreting each other’s melodies in relation to the changing harmony. The meter used would depend on the melodies being improvised and negotiated through the exercise of collective agency. The second attempt was more musically satisfying and we were clearly more comfortable playing and sustaining musical interest in tempo. This time it was easier to interpret each other’s ideas, starting to imitate, copy and transform some of each other’s phrases. However, we hadn’t established how to integrate new ideas with previous ones, still using too many throughout the performance to create a sense of convergence at the end of the piece. At this point I suggested that employing rhythmic ostinato, repeated intervals or motifs might be useful for developing and structuring melody ideas together. I also suggested setting up antiphony, or antecedent and consequent phrases played by different players might be useful to keep multiple ideas going at once while we worked out how to organise them.

In R2.3, Chris started playing ‘Become One’ in tempo by himself. Helen quickly joined in but I interjected to remind the others that we needn’t begin in tempo. My decision to deliver a rehearsal note in this way wasn’t an effective one as it gave the impression I was criticising the ideas of my collaborators. My intention wasn’t to tell the players exactly what to play, but rather to help them realise the opportunities that this piece offers. This sort of suggestion from me would likely have been better received before or after playing the piece, and using a positive
direction like “let’s try this” or illustrated by listening to a recording. Maintaining mutual trust and respect is vital when asking improvisers to take personal musical risks for the benefit of the ensemble.

In P2 there was counterpoint and imitation of each other’s ideas but we didn’t really achieve the performance objective of developing a linear structure towards a unified melody and arrangement. This may have been due to the deliberately ambiguous form. Chris said:

I really think the composition had a genuine strength about the circular-ness of it. It wasn’t just gimmicky... it was quite real. It had no defined spot where it starts… Maybe it was just a sense of that would be a good contrast next to a more black and white, “here’s the melody” sort of thing. (IC2)

This piece really required improvisers to think like composers, giving thought from the outset to micro and macro levels of structure, balancing the creation and interaction of musical gestures in the moment with the pacing of the development and variation of these ideas in overall structure of the performance. Nathan said:

Once you’re doing the six bars, and we tried working our way through that, then you go “What do we do now?” When you’ve got a 32 bar form, it gives you a bit more time to work your way through from one thing to the next. You know how to play through a bridge and build up to a bridge and to another thing… learning how to create sections when there’s a very small section of music that you’ve got, and then building that into more. Knowing when to do it as a band, like, when’s your peak going to be? How are you going to build to a point? What’s that going to be?... When are you going to get to a point and agree on it? (IN2)

My decision to leave some musical parameters open to interpretation initially allowed us to exercise collective agency to intuitively discover potential approaches to improvisation in this environment, but more direction could have clarified the performance goals for the participants. A future rehearsal strategy could involve exercises to practice this type of ‘linear development structure’ using a familiar piece from our repertoire. Improvisers could begin playing without referring to the melody and gradually evolving our collective improvisation into the target melody. I could also exercise additional proxy composer agency to clarify the performance objective by adding a target melody, bass ostinato and counter melody to the composition.

**Soliloquy**

This piece was inspired by a live performance (Hauptmann, 2015) featuring a trio with Ben Hauptmann (guitar), Jonathan Zwartz (bass) and Dave Sanders (drums). On several occasions
Zwartz and Sanders anticipated the end of Hauptmann’s phrases during his solo, all ceasing to play for several beats until Hauptman started his next phrase, resulting in surprising, momentary silences. Accompanists generally view ‘spaces’ in a soloist’s phrasing as opportunities to increase their rhythmic activity so by subverting this convention, the accompanists created impact by employing punctuating moments of silence juxtaposed with the high-intensity rhythmic activity of Hauptmann’s phrases. The objective of ‘Soliloquy’ was to adapt this effect into a device that could be cued during improvisations, reminiscent the ensemble direction cues used by Kneebody.

During Phase 1, I had observed that the rhythmic cues from ‘Kansas City Under Stars’ were more easily integrated into ongoing improvisation than with the intervallically-complex melodic cues of ‘4ths’, so I used a simple rhythm and a distinctive interval (the perfect octave) that would allow the soloist to cue accompanists to stop playing. To reduce the reliance on notation, the chosen form was a compilation of 8 bar chord progressions taken from standard tunes familiar to the players. These ‘standards’ were ‘Just Friends’ (Klenner & Lewis, 1931), ‘Whisper Not’ (Golson, 1959), In A Mellow Tone’ (Ellington & Gabler, 1940), ‘On the Sunny Side of the Street’ (McHugh & Fields, 1930). To make each 8 bar section immediately recognisable to the participants, each began on different functional chord from the tonality of the piece.

In R2.1 I explained the inspiration for ‘Soliloquy’ and presented the notation featuring a 32 bar harmonic progression and a cue (see Appendix J). Initially we played through it all together with me demonstrating how the soloist could apply the cue in different parts of the form while the rest of the participants practiced identifying and reacting to the cue, and different ways to recommence conventional rhythm section accompaniment. In my first attempts after using the cue, out of habit, I continued playing unaccompanied in tempo completely missing the focus on creating silence. Because I modelled this approach Chris and Helen adopted a similar approach when they tried using it in their solos. Maintaining the same tempo after using the cue also seemed to encourage the accompanists to re-enter the texture almost immediately. After discussing this point we made a second attempt, this time focusing on allowing some silence to punctuate a gap between the cue and the soloist’s next phrase. We also experimented with drastically changing the tempo and feel after the cue, using the moment of silence and rubato to transition the music from, for example, up-tempo swinging to a slow ballad. Using silence and rubato encouraged the accompanists to delay accompanists’ reflex response to begin playing again, allowing the soloist more time to employ a more cadenza-like approach.
In R2.2a, Helen suggested that the cue could also be applied to ‘trading fours’ where one or more players out of Chris, Helen and I would exchange (usually) 4 bar solos alternating with Nathan on drums. When trading in ‘Soliloquy’, the cue could signify the end of a trading phrase, creating an opportunity to vary the usually equal phrase lengths exchanged by soloists. Nathan’s unaccompanied drum phrases also allowed rubato or a change of tempo before setting the tempo for the subsequent soloist with the cue. We tried this out but had some difficulty determining exactly where in the form the subsequent soloist would begin playing from. I proposed that we continue from the same place that Nathan’s solo was cued. We worked on this for a while, with Nathan trading phrases of various lengths with Chris or myself. I proposed that Nathan could choose when to finish the piece by electing to rest rather than play when his phrase was cued during the trading section of the performance.

In R2.2b, this rehearsal’s reduced ‘duo format’ initially posed a challenge for Chris to react to the cue while accompanying my solo. Without Helen and Nathan present, Chris’ hands were playing rhythmically independently to create a multilayered accompaniment groove. This meant that he was focusing a lot on his harmonic function and coordinating the rhythmic relationship between his hands, sometimes using rhythmic patterns needing several bars to resolve, making them difficult to stop early in response to the cue. After some practice this became easier as Chris simplified the rhythms in his piano part, but it illustrated the importance of the soloist’s consideration of the activity in the accompaniment when deciding to apply the cue.

By R2.3 we were all becoming more comfortable with using the cue and identifying it when played by others. As confidence increased, more adventurous applications emerged. For example, after playing the cue Chris began suggesting ‘double time’ to start a new tempo, playing 16th notes but maintaining the same harmonic rhythm from prior to his cue. This required a fast assessment by Helen and Nathan to determine the feel and harmonic rhythm. Conversely, on hearing the cue played inaccurately, with the correct rhythm but not the interval of a perfect octave, accompanists reactions were varied, the most natural response being to continue playing until hearing the accurate cue expected, as with Phase 1’s ‘Kansas City Under Stars’.

In P2 we adopted contrasting approaches to using the cue. Chris’s approach was to instantly change tempo after the cue; mine was to allow some silence after the cue then use
approximately 30 seconds of rubato as a transitional device into a new tempo, creating enough space between tempos that it minimised any jarring effect; Helen and Nathan used a mixture of these two approaches. Nathan said:

That was a relief for us because we were thinking so hard throughout the whole gig… We cued the band into the next bit, where we just sort of played and then cued and then played. Some of the cues [were] a bit funny. That seemed to be a bit more breathing easy. (IN2)

The composition facilitated personal soloist agency over the tempo and momentum of their improvisational environment but, in hindsight, only using the cue to end each solo may have been enough. This would allow the next soloist to play a brief cadenza and then bring the band back in at a tempo of their choosing, or for a rubato duo to transition between the soloists. A further development for this piece may be composing a melody that concludes with the cue.

**Meters**

The objective of ‘Meters’ was to facilitate personal improviser agency to spontaneously change meter during the course of a performance. Monson (1996) analyses a bass solo by George Tucker that shifts six beats ‘out of sync’ with his accompanists pianist Jaki Byard and drummer Alan Dawson for several choruses before being resolved without it adversely impacting the performance (pp.152-171). Jazz improvisers frequently imply polymeter, so this sort of discrepancy where beats are added or lost sometimes occurs and requires negotiation between the performers to be rectified using collective agency. ‘Meters’ would deliberately introduce moments of tension created by a discrepancy in different player’s perception of the current meter, so the audible process of collectively realigning the meter becomes a point of focus. This concept is an adaptation of Gil Evans’s approach to cueing in riffs and motifs in ‘La Nevada’ (1959, 1961). However, in ‘Meters’ it would be the soloist, rather than composer, who could exercise personal agency in choosing when to make certain changes to spontaneously develop the form of the improvisational environment.

I introduced this piece to the players in R2.2a. No notation was supplied and the composed materials consisted only of some 1 bar claves in 3/4, 4/4 and 5/4 to be employed in a simple modal environment using Bb Dorian, minimising the impact of changing meters on the harmonic progression and form (see Appendix K). I exercised proxy composer agency by selecting the above compositional elements to be used, but left the compositional design sparse and
ambiguous to encourage personal agency from soloists and collective agency from the ensemble in shaping the structure of the performance. I demonstrated the claves to Helen and Nathan using my saxophone and voice, explaining that soloists could cue a change of meter by playing the clave of the desired new meter. There would be a momentary blurring of the meter as the existing meter and the cued meter went out of sync, but the changeover period would create audible tension to be released, and revealing the focus of the piece to the listener. I tried demonstrating as the first soloist and ran into immediate issues. Helen explained that the information that distinguished each clave was at the end of the cue giving accompanists very little time to respond. I suggested we try adding intervals to the claves to help distinguish one from the next, using a major or minor 3rd for 3/4, a perfect 4th for 4/4, and a perfect 5th for 5/4. This approach seemed to only complicate the cues so was also unsuccessful. Helen and Nathan both preferred the initial idea, however we tried using an alternate clave for 4/4 and 5/4 to give each clave a distinctive rhythm at its beginning (see Appendix L).

After discussing and playing ‘Meters’ together in R2.2b, Chris said: “It leaves more to the intuition and less to the intellect” (R2.2b). It was immediately clear from R 2.2a and R2.2b that the interaction in this piece taps more directly into our well-developed aural skills as jazz musicians without having to assimilate too much external information. This provided more evidence suggesting that a cue with a rhythmic basis was easier for the participants to integrate into a solo than a complex melodic cue such as with Phase 1’s ‘4ths’.

In R2.3 the participants’ initial feedback was that the alternate 4/4 and 5/4 claves were reversed when compared with how the participants might intuitively imagine or play them. Additionally, interpreting the claves as rhythmic cues posed a challenge as the participants were all used to the polyrhythmic approach employed by many jazz improvisers that doesn’t necessitate that accompanists depart from the prevailing meter to adapt to the soloist’s metric superimposition. I suggested a bass-specific approach that Helen might employ to disguise the momentary metric dissonance in transition would be to use to higher register to take the weight out of her notes until the new groove had settled. Chris emphasised the need for confidence when cueing changes of meter. I suggested that we could end the piece with an ensemble rhythmic unison using the clave of the meter we were already playing.
In P2 the constant potential of spontaneous meter changes in this piece seemed to instil some apprehension amongst the participants. However, we did achieve the piece’s performance objective focusing improvisation around the musical parameter of meter. Chris said:

I’m free to just jump in and out of all kinds of stuff, but to make it really effective I need to be pretty clear or forthright about “now I’m going here”, having that concept, and everyone knows this is on the cards, this could happen here. I did feel a bit of responsibility with some of those things to really overemphasise, and vice versa, I’m constantly looking out for “when are you going to change again?” (IC2)

Each soloist demonstrated conceptual understanding of the piece’s paradigm and exercised personal agency by changing the meter using the rhythmic cues, but soloists’ creativity, fluency and ability to maintain momentum during the course of solos were adversely impacted by the improvisational environment. Nathan said:

We were trying to explore the ideas and we couldn't figure out how to kind of conceptually succeed… One of those things where you know what it probably should be like, then you try, it doesn’t really work out, and you can't really find out the way to make it totally work. (IN2)

During P2 Helen cued a meter change during her solo that I completely missed because I was focusing on adding saxophone accompaniment. This served as a reminder that I need to be as comfortable identifying and interpreting the cue while improvising accompaniment as the rhythm section players. If this piece were to be further developed, adding a simple melody set to the claves could help give more unity to the composition, allowing the cues to facilitate additional proxy composer agency over melodic content of solos.

2+2

While rehearsing Phase 1’s ‘Entre Nous la Mer’ we had experimented with different combinations of duos and trios amongst the participants, but in P1 we hadn’t explored the possibilities of these ‘sub-ensembles’ as much as I’d hoped. In '2+2' the performance objective was to create musical situations where the whole rhythm section wouldn’t play through the entirety of performances. The compositional process for this piece involved developing four short melodic fragments, and then assembling and adapting them into a longer fifth section (see Appendix M). I forced myself to conduct this whole process over approximately one hour with minimal revision permitted once I’d committed an idea to paper. My objective with this rapid compositional process was to give this composition an improvised quality, even though this was the only Phase 2 composition that featured a melody. The first four fragments constituted a
modular form to be performed in any order by alternating duos, followed by the full ensemble playing the fifth section to conclude the piece. The order of sections for each performance would be chosen through collective agency exercised by each duo, and ensemble as a whole. Each section was intended to be performed as a short musical episode featuring improvised and interactive variations around the melody, and there would be no solos.

I introduced '2+2' during Rehearsals 2.2a and 2.2b. The full complement of participants wasn’t present at either of these rehearsals so all participants present played the whole time in order to familiarise ourselves with the modular elements of the compositions. The initial response of the players was positive, with the music being in such minimal, digestible fragments that we were able to immediately internalise and creatively engage with each short melodic fragment to structure a performance lasting a couple of minutes. Our improvisations were based around continuous repetition of the melody, with some variations, and a focus on interaction.

In R2.3 I specified that the duos would be Chris and Nathan, and Helen and I, so we played through '2+2' properly as an ensemble for the first time using duos for the first four sections. The improvisational constraints placed on the participants by the composition created the sort of opportunities for duo interaction I had hoped for in 'Entre Nous la Mer', making it unnecessary to give further direction at this stage.

In P2 we achieved the objective of using contrasting duos for most of the performance, managed through the exercise of proxy composer agency. The participants seemed to engage with the concept of improvising with the short melodic fragments to create some really interesting moments during P2. Chris said:

Chordally, [the fragments] are a bit more unpredictable… which I think was quite clever to be able to pull that off with just a repeated thing… Your harmony is just the melody, so it's got that empty thing happening. But the things that you're hinting at or referring to are a bit more outside or less diatonic… The ‘odd-timesy’ stuff just added an element. It just had this general ambiguity about it… which just kept it interesting. There's probably enough repetition to keep it hooked into something… For the listener, they would be… wondering where exactly it starts and finishes... And then just switching between the two combos. I think there was a lot interesting about that. (IC2)

Chris and Nathan’s duo improvisations were particularly musically effective. Chris had mentioned at the beginning of this study that he had previously practiced duos with a drummer, which influenced my pairing of Chris and Nathan in a duo. Nathan said:
That one surprised me, I think that was the most uncomfortable one for me on the gig, but it’s also the one I liked most listening back to. Discomfort doesn’t necessarily mean bad. It probably kept us on the ball. Comfort can mean complacency in playing rubbish and being completely oblivious to the fact that it’s terrible. That one was interesting. It had some dicey moments but I think that had the best moments of ensemble playing.

(IN2)

Like in Phase 1’s ‘Entre Nous la Mer’, the short fragments in ‘2+2’ allowed Helen to experiment with changing her ensemble role from primarily providing functional bass to operating as more of a second ‘front-line’ instrument. This opportunity wasn’t fully explored in P2 perhaps because I haven’t adequately explained the performance objectives or because Helen’s bass style favours the low and middle registers over the high register (thumb position), which impacts on which chord degrees will sound good on the bass in these registers.

For future performances, each duo could be shorter, focusing even more closely on improvising interactive accompaniments to the variations on the melodic fragments. Although the separate modular sections had a sense of melodic unity in P2, the episodic nature of the composition left the structure somewhat disjointed. Each fragment of this piece is self-sufficient as a vehicle to inspire improvisation, so it would be possible to use each of the first four sections as short interludes or transitions between longer unrelated pieces. It may then be very effective to conclude an entire performance with the fifth section performed as an ensemble. This sort of approach would constitute another level of proxy composer agency exercised over the course of a set.

**Summary**

In Phase 1 the pieces were composed responsively over a series of rehearsals, but in Phase 2 the materials in the compositions themselves didn’t significantly evolve from what was initially presented to the players. This shifted the focus of development to the individual and collective approaches to interpreting and improvising with the compositions’ concepts. We generally achieved the performance objectives of the pieces in P2 while working with flexible improvisational environments, with the participants being guided towards the specific opportunities of each composition through the exercise of minimal, targeted proxy composer agency. Nathan said:

There’s a lot of risk involved. As a composer, dealing with improvisers, I think that’s a really interesting concept, making a group language. It could completely change compared to what you thought it would be, but it has to do that to be interesting for
everyone. If it's exactly what you wanted it to be, it would be boring for you too...It's all
on us. That made it pretty hard, I think... And it changed the way everyone played,
instantly, compared to what we did in the first phase. (IN2)

Restricting how much I could arrange, notate or develop the material during Phase 2 kept the
compositions sparse and simple, encouraging the exercise of personal improviser agency to
transform and develop the composed material during performance. Helen said:

I remember thinking in [Phase 1] that there was maybe one or two too many concepts in
something, A) for us to get it performed in only a short amount of time and B), that one
concept was enough to take away and play with. So I think that's why the [Phase 2
compositions] were a bit more successful in that way because there was less worry
about getting it right. And a bit more freedom to just have a really simple idea that
pervades the piece. It's enough just to have some simple concept to hang a performance
on and that gives you more freedom and more confidence that the tune isn't going to go
wrong and you can still be just as effective without as many concepts. (IH2)

Only one Phase 2 composition had a melody resulting in more ambiguous structures compared
to head-solos-head performances, and subsequently P2 may have sounded less coherent
overall. Chris said:

I think it freed us up a bit to just feel it more than to be thinking. I think it nailed it actually,
in terms of just giving a lot more space to work with one concept and work together... I
feel like maybe [Phase 2] had less memorable-ness about it... I think that [Phase 1] had
more potential for memorable or distinctiveness about it. But we found it a little stifling
initially. (IC2)

The consensus amongst the participants was that we would prefer working with compositions
that could find a 'middle way' between the compositional organisation of Phase 1 and the
improvisational freedom of Phase 2. Chris said: “Some of those things could feel more effective
within the context of a stronger melody. I feel like that the concept alone might sometimes feel
more like an exercise rather than music” (IC2). I wanted the study’s compositions to create the
conditions for conceptual improvisation that engages with particular musical parameters. To
achieve this end in Phase 3, I would need to exercise more proxy composer agency than I had
in Phase 2. Providing more compositional guidance would likely achieve a better balance
between opportunities for spontaneity and stability for improvisers, allowing the participants to
more readily access their full range of improvised expression. Helen said:

Maybe if we'd done some of those ideas within the context of actual tunes that we
already knew, so there wasn’t a new composition and a new way of improvising at the
same time...that would just be one thing that might have eased us into it a little bit more.
(IH2)
Chapter 4 - Phase 3

In Phase 1, highly-notated scores and new conceptual approaches posed some challenges to creative expression and improvisational fluidity during P1. Phase 2’s compositions used minimal notation to remove this barrier to implementing new conceptual approaches in performance, but they had lacked overall shape and unity in performance due to the absence of recognisable melody statements combined with their generally very short forms.

I used the findings of Phases 1 and 2 to define my compositional objective of finding a ‘middle way’ for the Phase 3. I decided to readopt longer forms derived from ‘standards’ to allow us to ground our conceptual experimentation in structure, familiarity and musical honesty. This choice was influenced by reflecting on the significance of the Miles Davis Quintet’s heavy reliance on ‘standards’ for much of their live performance during the 1960s (Collier, 2009), transforming seemingly mundane improvisational environments into vehicles for imaginative metric, harmonic, textural and formal experimentation.

The following section provides a description of the creative process of developing the compositions in Phase 3.

Apparition

I had once attended a performance by the Ari Hoenig Quartet (Hoenig, 2009) where they played ‘Moanin’ (Timmons, 1958). Hoenig played the melody on the drums, however, the most engaging part of the performance was during solos where both soloists and accompanists created ambiguity through the exercise of collective agency by using highly chromatic harmony and a broken rhythmic feel during the A sections of the tune, except for beats 3 and 4 in the bar before the B section, where there are 2 accented quarter notes in the melody. This ensemble rhythm was restated at this point in the form throughout the entire performance of the tune as a rhythmic and harmonic anchor point to resolve the tension generated by their ‘open’ ensemble approach. The compositional objective with ‘Apparition’ was to promote improvisation in a broken feel using the above approach modelled by the Ari Hoenig Quartet employing key ensemble rhythms to periodically release tension during the performance. The compositional
approach used would be a loose adaptation of Eddie Sauter’s *Focus* (Sauter & Getz, 1961) model of composing arranged environments with improvisational space left for the soloist's contribution.

In R3.1a I described the above performance to Helen and Nathan, and we attempted to improvise on ‘Moanin’ with the broken feel and harmonically ‘open’ approach of the Ari Hoenig Quartet. Helen said: “I’ve probably done it more on straight 8th things, the Keith Jarrett Trio sort of approach, where it’s somehow easier to get it to meld together than in swing. Actually, probably a faster swing works better too” (R3.1a), citing *Sleeper* (Jarrett, 2012) featuring saxophonist Jan Garbarek as an example. Helen also noted the Brad Mehldau Trio as a good model of how to play a swinging broken feel and Nathan singled out their recording of ‘Monk’s Dream’ (Monk, 1998).

Helen suggested that the form of Steve Swallow’s 24 bar ‘Falling Grace’ (1966), divided into unusual phrase lengths of 14 and 10 bars, would support this sort of performance approach. Because of our lack of fluency in static modal harmony and ‘outside’ playing, we all expressed interest in trying this approach with a piece with more harmonic variation than ‘Moanin’. We chose ‘My Shining Hour’ (Arlen & Mercer, 1943), a standard well known to us, using an up-tempo swinging ‘broken’ feel, and our goal was to use a simple syncopated rhythm at the end of the B section to resolve tension we were creating with the open feel. Using a through-composed form helped us maintain momentum as we ‘floated’ through the harmony, and the faster tempo promoted a freer rhythmic approach. Helen said: “It’s definitely better with more changes. It gives you a lot more scope to make shapes” (R3.1a).

In R3.1b, I explained my interest in the approach modelled by the Ari Hoenig Quartet to Chris and suggested that we try the concept with a shorter form. Using the second half of ‘All the Things You Are’ (Kern & Hammerstein II, 1939), our goal was to build tension using a ‘broken’ fast swing feel through the sections of 8 and 12 bars with the goal of both playing a semibreve each time we arrived at bar 7 of the first section. Playing in a duo format with Chris was conducive to this sort of approach as it was easy to create rhythmic ambiguity using polyrhythms when playing without a bassist or drummer articulating the metric pulse and subdivision.
In R3.2 I introduced ‘Apparition’, based on the standard ‘You Stepped Out of a Dream’ (Brown & Kahn, 1940), using a score featuring some syncopated rhythms based on groupings of five eighth notes designed to destabilise the metric pulse (see Appendix N). We discussed using a ‘broken’ feel during solos and integrating the rhythms that accompanied the melody into the improvised accompaniment to solos. After playing though the melody several times to establish aural familiarity with the accompaniment rhythms in the context of the form, we all took solos with the goal of integrating the rhythms into our melodic ideas. As a front-line player, practicing accompanying others with the rhythm section using the rhythms helped me more intuitively improvise melodies that naturally incorporated the accompaniment rhythms. Chris asked for a rehearsal recording so we recorded one chorus without the melody, focussing just on the accompaniment rhythms. I looped this recording for use as a practice play-along and emailed it to the band to assist in the aural internalising process.

In P3.1 this composition had some rhythmic inaccuracies in the solo sections as soloists attempted to improvise phrases that accented accompaniment rhythms. The syncopated groupings of eighth notes combined with the broken feel clearly posed a challenge to our collective ensemble-playing skills, particularly evident during Helen’s bass where she, Chris and Nathan all seemed to hesitate on several occasions, getting metrically out of sync in the process. I could have helped here by playing the accompaniment rhythms with Chris and Nathan.

Reflecting on Helen’s prior comments about the usefulness of odd phrase-lengths for this piece’s approach, for R3.3 I deleted the final two bars of the form (see Appendix O). This added more momentum to the form and also meant that the final cadence led directly back to the start of the form or vamp section. To try a more flexible concept for the vamp section I decided to notate the chord symbol “C-ish”, a term derived from the trombone solo section in the score for Maria Schneider’s ‘Wrygly’ (1998, p.28), implying that we could play around any tonality or mode with C as its root. Chris and Helen liked the openness of this approach and I suggested that we could use it to transition between solos as well. Chris asked, “who owns the vamp? The soloist finishing up or the next one who’s starting up?” (R3.3). We discussed and agreed that this could be left open to interpretation with solos potentially dovetailing. I suggested that Helen could cue the end of the vamp by changing her bass note but Helen said: “You guys are going to be more in control of the dynamic of it and when is the right time to do it. If I did that I’d feel like I was stepping on your toes” (R3.3).
In R3.4a we played through the tune and clarified that the vamp would be used as the starting point for each solo. In the Rehearsal 3.4b, we worked on the technical aspects of ‘Apparition’, practicing the accompaniment rhythms together and then using them while improvising through the form. The musical conception of the composition was clear at this point, so we focused on deepening our aural familiarity with the composition.

In P3.2 ‘Apparition’’s improvisational environment focused our improvisation around the composition’s accompaniment rhythms facilitating the exercise of proxy composer agency over soloists’ phrasing. This is the sort of device Brookmeyer advised jazz composers to use when he said: “Keep your hand on the soloist” (Ratliff, 2006). The distinctive rhythmic accents that accompany the melody and solos are the unifying thread throughout the performance, giving the impression that these accompaniment rhythms actually become the melody. The absence of cues in this piece allowed us to improvise freely without needing to be prepared for a sudden change of form.

**Stellar Surveillance**

Not long before the commencement of this study, I attended a performance by the Jeff ‘Tain’ Watts Quartet (Watts, 2014) where one composition they played featured a pattern of metric modulations that progressively increased the tempo. The objective of ‘Stellar Surveillance’ was to exercise proxy composer agency to focus soloists’ improvisation towards metric modulations, facilitating the exercise of personal soloist agency in choosing how and when to change the ensemble’s momentum much like Kneebody’s tempo change cue. This spontaneous application of metric modulations is exemplified by the Miles Davis Quintet’s highly-interactive changes in metre and feel by soloists and accompanists during the 1960s, for example ‘Stella by Starlight’ (Young & Washington, 1965), particularly with Davis’s choice of subdivision and phrasing often being used to cue rapid changes of metre and feel. Other recorded examples of metric modulations are ‘Moanin’” (Mingus, 1960) where Charles Mingus (bass) and Dannie Richmond (drums) quickly shift the bass and drum accompaniment from 4/4 to a fast 6/8 at the start of Booker Ervin’s tenor saxophone solo, and ‘Blue In Green’ (Davis, 1959) where the harmonic rhythm doubles against a constant tempo at the start of each solo.
In R3.1a, without the aid of notation, I described how three metric modulations (2:3:4) would relate to harmonic rhythm but had difficulty making myself understood. After this frustrating start to work on this piece, I quickly notated the metric relationships to help the other participants visualise the relationships, but it still took some time to explain the notation (see Figure 3.). In hindsight, if I had demonstrated on my saxophone, the others would have immediately understood the relationships due to their excellent aural skills. Demonstrating as the first soloist on ‘I’ll remember April’ (de Paul, Johnston & Raye, 1941), I tried cueing the metric modulations by changing subdivision while improvising, moving the feel between a 2/4, 3/4 and 4/4. After attempting this approach during a bass solo, Helen said: “It’s a whole different mindset from (sic) me, ‘cause that’s the sort of thing I do all the time anyway but against the other things instead of everything changing with you” (R3.1a).

Figure 3. Rehearsal notation of metric modulations of 2:3:4

In R3.1b I demonstrated the metric modulations for Chris by counting a tempo, clapping on the first beat of each bar and singing the basic swing ride cymbal pattern while shifting from 2/4 to 3/4 to 4/4 to 3/4 and back to 2/4 (see Figure 4.). Next we tried improvising while actively implying these metric modulations on ‘There Is No Greater Love’ (Jones & Symes, 1936) and experienced immediate success. The absence of a steady statement of pulse by bass and drums was conducive to experimentation with rhythm and phrasing, allowing us to easily imagine and execute the metric modulations.
At R3.2 I presented the first notation of ‘Stellar Surveillance’ with a simple melody set to the 48 bar form of ‘The Night Has a Thousand Eyes’ (Brainin & Bernier, 1948) (see Appendix P). John Coltrane’s up-tempo recording (Brainin & Bernier, 1964) of this piece featured extensive use of pedal point, which I thought could be useful as a device to blur the transition between meters; however, Coltrane added four extra bars at the end of the form, which I decided not to use. We played once through the form in 4/4 but when I spontaneously attempted to cue the first metric modulation, the music fell apart. Chris suggested practicing the metric modulations at fixed intervals in the form so, with me leading as soloist, we started the first A section in 2/4, modulating to 3/4 for the second A section, and modulating a second time to the 4/4 tempo for the B section. This exercise was successful, so after repeating several choruses, we tried reversing the modulations. Executing the sequence of modulations in reverse was the more challenging of the two exercises, and shifting both ways between 3/4 and 4/4 were the most difficult modulations to execute. As a group we also discussed which tempo/meter to play the melody in, and whether it needed to always be played in the same meter. We agreed that the melody would always be played in the principle 4/4 tempo.

Performing during P3.1 Chris and I took solos on ‘Stellar Surveillance’ and managed to cue several metric modulations each. This was the first time we had used any metric modulations together in performance, and was a useful experience in observing how soloists could assert personal soloist agency over the momentum of solos using metric modulations, however the piece required introduction and ending sections to give it more shape.

Before rehearsing again in R3.3 I added a solo break 2 bars before the end of the 48 bar form to be played for the entire performance, similar to Coltrane’s recording of ‘The Night Has a Thousand Eyes’ (Brainin & Bernier, 1964) (see Appendix Q). This ensemble stop would provide a brief silence to facilitate the soloist cueing a metric modulation if desired. I also wanted to more directly engage Nathan with the piece’s improvisation concept, so I added vamps to begin and conclude the piece that gave Nathan space to take solos, with the rest of the band playing notated accompaniment. Structurally, Nathan’s introduction using the metric modulations would
foreshadow the underlying concept to be explored further later in performance of this piece. After we played through the new elements of the composition, Helen said: “The thing that’s hard for me is that you feel constrained from doing what you might normally do to play with the time… You feel you have to not do what might come more naturally” (R3.3). Soloists exercising proxy agency over the accompanists’ feel evidently had a large impact on how the accompanists needed to listen to the soloist.

Chris said: “to make it a bit more conceptual we could have the sense that it’s always floating… with the feeling that the listener is always questioning where it’s at” (R3.3). Sustaining a constant polymeter would be interesting but at that time, I was more interested in the soloist cuing the accompanists to ‘change gears’ together. Chris was engaging strongly with the metric modulations: sometimes as soon as a new meter settled he would quickly change it again to maintain creative tension. Helen said: “I still find it much easier to follow than lead… It’s fine not to have a bass solo. The essence of it is the listening and more can be done in [your] and [Chris’s] solos” (R3.3). This was a very relevant observation, as one of the most engaging aspects of this piece was hearing bass and drums modulating between meters while occupying traditional pulse-driven accompaniment roles.

In R3.4a we practiced cueing and executing the metric modulations, and experimented with trying to adapt the accompaniment rhythm in the vamp sections in response to Nathan’s metric modulations. Ultimately, we agreed it was a ‘tidier’ for Nathan to make the metric modulations against an unchanging accompaniment. In R3.4b we also focused on technical practice for the metric modulations like we had previously done in R3.2.

In P3.2 we achieved the performance objectives of focusing improvisers’ solos on exercising personal soloist agency to direct the accompanists through musically ‘changing gears’ using metric modulations. The practicality of cueing the metric modulations and reacting to cues was the main area of our ensemble playing that we developed in this piece. Further work combining technical and creative fluency would be required for the participants to feel completely comfortable executing and interpreting the cues. Nathan said:

We’d work on it, work on it, work on getting comfortable as with metric modulations and then putting it into a tune and then having to decide when it happens. It was hilarious. Any time anyone played any kind of triplet, we were like “is this it?” It could’ve been it. And you could’ve done it, too. (IN3)
To mitigate this potential for misinterpreting soloists’ phrases in future performances, I could limit cues for metric modulations to specific points in the form to give accompanists more clarity about when to anticipate cues. However, limiting the options for cue points would inhibit soloists’ improvisational exploration of the compositional materials, blocking potentially unforeseen performance outcomes. I would rather frame the moments of tension around missed cues or misinterpreted phrases as the emergent products of the improvised processes, acting as audible signifiers of the interaction taking place.

**If I Should**

The compositional objective of ‘If I Should’ was to continue the exploration of interactive duos from Phase 2’s ‘2+2’. The composition would be based around a duet improvisation between Helen and me, this time exercising proxy composer agency over the role of the bass as a catalyst for change in the approaches employed for piano and drums. At the outset, I didn’t have a clear idea of what role Chris and Nathan would have in this piece but I wanted all four players to be actively involved.

In R3.1a we tried a saxophone and bass duet on the harmonic progression from the standard ‘If I should lose you’ (Rainger & Robin, 1935) with Nathan accompanying. I suggested that we try having individual solos followed by a duet. Our first attempt started out quite conventionally in medium tempo with my saxophone solo accompanied by Helen’s walking bass line and Nathan playing time, followed by Helen’s bass solo accompanied by Nathan. At the end of the bass solo, Helen continued her melodic idea into the start of the duet section as I started adding short melodic interjections until we were in musical dialogue, alternately moving in and out of the foreground without a fixed pattern. The conversational texture that I was hoping for started to emerge, shifting from imitating or finishing each other’s short phrases into longer running motifs. This wasn’t discussed beforehand, but seemed like an obvious and useful device to encourage a compositional feel to the counterpoint. We tried the same conceptual approach to improvising on ‘Body and Soul’ (Green, Heyman, Sour & Eyton, 1930) at ballad tempo. Helen and I again made alternating contributions without a fixed pattern and the slower tempo made it easier to interpret each other’s phrases and respond with more interesting rhythmic and melodic choices, increasing the amount and changing the type of interaction.
In R3.2 we started by improvising a bass and saxophone duet in tempo on the form 'If I Should Lose You'. I proposed beginning with a broken feel, and we discussed how to add some structure to the duet. Helen said:

Those things always work better if they’re juxtaposed with something – with time… From an audience point of view, if you’re someone who doesn’t know what jazz is, then the establishment of a groove at some point means that what we’re doing, whether or not we’re playing the groove... it still exists. (R3.2)

We tried again, starting and finishing in the broken feel with a move to a steady slow swing feel in the middle of the duet, creating a more engaging overall structure to the concept. Afterwards, Chris said:

I felt a little bit unsure of what to do… because there’s a lot of strength in what [you and Helen] are doing already… My thinking was “am I keeping it really ‘compy’?” I didn’t feel like I needed to inject another counter-melody. I was trying to find gaps but not to respond as much as just ‘guidey’ stuff...It would be cool if there was another little conceptual thing we could add…Even if there was an intention of us building across a form at some point to something really loud. (R3.2)

I hadn’t yet figured out how I would exercise proxy composer agency to bring some organisation to the improvised duet and accompaniment in this piece. It was evident that, as a minimum, I would need to clarify Chris’s and Nathan’s roles in this piece by composing something for them to work with as accompanists.

In R3.3 I introduced the idea of using rubato in this composition as one of the ways we could exploit and structure the duet format. I referred to a video recording of ‘Autumn Leaves’ (Kosma & Mercer, 2014) by the Miles Davis Quintet where after the piano solo, Herbie Hancock and Tony Williams are tacet for Ron Carter’s bass solo. In the absence of a regular stated pulse, Carter plays rubato, completely changing the mood of the performance before Davis reintroduces the melody in tempo to end the piece. For the first time I presented a score for ‘If I Should’ with some harmonised melodic fragments to be played by Helen and me during the rubato sections (see Appendix R). These fragments provided structural target points to end our improvised phrases in lieu of providing a fully notated melody. Chris said: “I reckon those little phrases where you hook together really fills it” (R3.3). We discussed Nathan’s and Chris’s roles in this setting, and how to incorporate some composed accompaniment phrases into this piece. This would set up a team of two accompanists and a team of soloists, with interaction inside each team as the focus, but also having a secondary layer of interaction between teams. This is an example of Collier’s concept of “levels” (2009, pp.295-300), where several independent
relationships are set in motion simultaneously. I sang a suggested rhythm, and we discussed the Miles Davis Quintet’s recording of ‘Dr. Jackle’ (McLean, 1958) where Julian ‘Cannonball’ Adderley and John Coltrane trade choruses, and Red Garland and ‘Philly’ Joe Jones employ a simple riff that adds momentum towards the climax of the performance. We agreed on a symmetrical performance structure beginning with a rubato duet transitioning into tempo, a piano solo in the middle with traditional rhythm section roles, then back to the duet in tempo, and transitioning back to rubato to conclude.

For R3.4a I wanted to exercise some proxy composer agency over the accompaniment but to still accommodate improvisation by the accompanists. My solution was to add some rhythms to the score for use as ‘accompaniment vocabulary’ (see Appendix S). We rehearsed the accompaniment phrases in rhythmic unison through the form, initially playing 16 bars of each, then with me improvising a solo that used a mixture of these rhythms so that Nathan could practice hearing and responding to them. Nathan also started to cue the accompaniment rhythms while Helen and I improvised a duet. I tried to incorporate them into my phrases to work with Nathan in Chris’s absence.

In R3.4b I showed Chris the new score with accompaniment rhythms and received a positive reaction. Chris said: “It’s good isn’t it? I don’t even need to think about the [chords]. You just apply this [rhythm] to a [chord progression] you know” (R3.4b). This approach of applying rhythmic accompaniment vocabulary, independent from the form, simultaneously offered structure and flexibility. We rehearsed the rhythms much the same as I had done with Helen and Nathan. I suggested that both Chris and Nathan could try to cue the accompaniment rhythms at different times in the performance but this would need to be negotiated between them.

In P3.2 ‘If I Should’ was satisfying, but had different outcomes than expected primarily due to a spontaneous change to the planned structure. After two rubato choruses of saxophone and bass duet, Helen adopted the bass’s traditional role by playing a walking line to set up tempo, joined by Chris and Nathan playing conventional accompaniment roles. This necessitated changing my role to soloist, but I focused on interacting with the accompaniment rhythms as we had done when rehearsing this piece. As Chris and Nathan hadn’t managed to employ the accompaniment phrases until this point in the performance, this was our spontaneous solution. We then alternated between the rubato duet and the in tempo section once more before moving
on to Chris’s solo, where he used some of the accompaniment rhythms to interact with Nathan. These performance outcomes may not have eventuated without the opportunity to rehearse this piece with different combinations of study participants. Nathan said: “When does the duo thing cease? ...When you guys were playing it was fine... There was one point where I'm, ‘Just make some noise. That didn't feel right.’ I didn't do anything for about a minute one time” (IN3).

Exercising proxy composer agency to configure specific roles and relationships in the ensemble facilitated multi-layered collective agency that required all participants to consider very carefully what their function was in the music at any given time.

**Pas qu’un Blues**

This composition further explored the modular formal approach from Phase 1’s ‘Kansas City Under Stars’, this time with three sections instead of two, offering more possible outcomes for assembled formal combinations. The performance objective was for soloists to transition freely between sections, facilitating the exercise of personal improviser agency over the formal proportions of solos as they unfolded, a compositional approach adapted from Collier’s use of interchangeable formal modules.

'Pas qu'un Blues' was introduced during R 3.3 without notation. The compositional materials that I described to the participants were three modular sections: the 16 bar form of ‘St Thomas’ (Rollins, 1956), a 4 bar basic turnaround, and another 4 bar section modulating to the relative minor (see Appendix T). Soloists would have the opportunity to spontaneously assemble their solo structure using these modules in real time during performance. Initially, I chose to leave the cues as vague gestures to be interpreted by each soloist; however, they would always be executed in the last bar of each section. My first attempt at using these cues to direct the participants through the different sections quickly fell apart as my gestures weren’t clear enough. Helen said: “I don’t know why you would want to put that pressure on yourself. I don’t get it… You might want to play an ascending phrase and not change the form” (R3.3). The second attempt was more successful with the ensemble making it through six cues during my solo and then four cues during Chris’s. Although I had hoped the loose idea of a ‘gesture’ would pose the minimum possible barrier to integration into soloists’ melodies, it seemed that this approach was too vague for the accompanists to interpret. We discussed narrowing the parameters of the cues to using a motif or specific melodies, and decided to try using some simple melodic phrases as cues (see Figure 5.). I suggested the ascending phrase and Helen
suggested inverting the ascending phrase to use as the descending phrase. After our third attempt we all agreed that the set cues were easier to interpret and discussed the importance of making sure the accompanists could distinguish the cues from the rest of the soloist’s melodic lines.

Figure 5. Suggested phrases to be used as cues

In R3.4a I provided a score, now featuring a 12 bar blues as the primary formal section in place of the harmonic progression to ‘St Thomas’ (see Appendix U). The score also included a melody for the blues form and revised cues from R3.3. We agreed that the turnaround section could be cued to begin at bar 1, bar 9 or bar 11 of the blues form. The participants could imagine the mechanics of this flexible idea in terms of sound, but notating it in a way that reflected our understanding of it proved difficult. This instance illustrated how compositions communicated aurally can be more flexibly interpreted than when they are notated. We agreed that structuring solos with this modular form worked best primarily using the 12 bar blues form and using the 4 bar sections as secondary devices for contrast and building tension. In R3.4b we discussed the above approach to the modular form and played through the piece practicing executing and reacting to the cues. Chris said: “I think these are getting to the right space where we feel the right balance… It’s good inspiration” (3.4b).

In P3.2 ‘Pas qu’un Blues’ engaged improvisers and achieved its performance goals by facilitating personal soloist agency over the structuring of solo form. The paradigm of this composition established a highly interactive environment for improvisation and encouraged contrasting approaches to organising solo form by each soloist. The biggest challenge posed by facilitating personal soloist agency over managing a modular form is spontaneous development of satisfying solo structure. Helen said:

That was probably the one I was most comfortable with myself, at the time… I know that most people don’t pay as much attention to chord changes as I do, so is that interesting to a listener?... I don’t know if it’s making the music any more interesting on the outside. (IH3)
The cyclical forms featured in most jazz improvisation generally only require soloists to structure changes in intensity over their chosen number of repetitions of the form. A listener may not be able to detect the contrasting harmony in each section of ‘Pas qu’un Blues’, but the creative tension present when a soloist can rapidly change the form incontestably translates to very different and exciting performance outcomes, often unobtainable with cyclical form.

**Summary**

In Phase 3 I adapted forms from jazz standards already familiar to the participants. This approach facilitated an aurally-based relationship with the compositions and directed participants’ focus to the interactive aspects of the compositions’ performance. Nathan said:

> The third phase was the most comfortable ‘cause we had been doing it for a while… I also liked it when some of the ideas were really raw and maybe purer in terms of the concept, and just working on the concept. (IN3)

The participants also seemed to respond well to the balance of proxy composer agency exercised over soloists and the opportunity to exercise personal soloist agency over certain parameters of each composition in Phase 3. Chris said:

> Sometimes you do a gig, and you’re fitting into a mould - what someone wants you to do… There was a little aspect of that because we were trying something that I haven't necessarily tried but there was a sense of satisfaction in that there was freedom for me to be me, and working within that. (IC3)

The feeling amongst participants was that, of the three phases, the Phase 3 compositions struck the best balance between the familiarity of existing performance practices and the creative stimulus of new performance practices. Helen said: “The tunes we played at the last gig were less like the diagram tunes, and more like tunes with concepts. That changed from [phase] to [phase]” (IH3).

I returned to adding melodies to compositions in Phase 3, but to allow them to maintain a semi-improvised feeling I employed several different ‘incomplete’ approaches to notating melody. In ‘Apparition’ I used note heads without rhythmic values were used to specify pitches without rhythm, and in ‘If I Should’ I only provided sparsely placed melodic fragments were to be integrated into a duet improvisation. In ‘Stellar Surveillance’ I notated a simple melody only as a basis for paraphrasing and variation, akin to Miles Davis’ approach of “sketching the melody”
(Collier, p192). All of these approaches to notating and performing melody aim to establish a duality of structure and spontaneity that accommodates both composition and improvisation.

The repeated performance of ‘Apparition’ and ‘Stellar Surveillance’ fostered deeper familiarity with their forms, cues and conceptual approaches, allowing freer creative expression and interpretation than with one performance alone. Chris said:

> It definitely gives you a chance to go into it like you're feeling more than thinking… I think you could hear a bit more confidence and a flow… It felt like [we] had a bit more of an idea of the balance, or the shape of where things head, rather than just kind of surviving through the changes. (IC3)

Having two performances in this phase also gave me the opportunity to compositionally adjust ‘Apparition’ and ‘Stellar Surveillance’ after P3.1. ‘If I Should’ was developed incrementally over four Phase 3 rehearsals, and in P3.2 we spontaneously discovered an alternate way of structuring the composition to that which we had planned. All of these developments took time and willingness from both improvisers and composer to allow the composition to reveal itself through an exploratory and cumulative compositional process.
Chapter 5 - Conclusion

This research addresses the under-researched area of jazz composition concerning relationships of agency between improvisers and composer by exploring interactive compositional and improvisational processes. Using a quartet with consistent personnel, the goal was to simultaneously explore how exercising various modes of proxy composer agency could influence improvisers’ approaches to interpreting compositions, as well as how improvisers could exercise personal agency to, firstly, shape the nature of their improvisation environment during the compositional process, and secondly, to spontaneously organise flexible compositional materials to structure performances.

The established relationships between study participants were built on trust and shared understanding of musical syntax, relationships and roles, passion for acoustic jazz, and a willingness to develop a new ensemble approach over time. The participants’ respective experiences as session players working with numerous combinations of other musicians made them skilled at evaluating other players’ styles, influences, preferences and musical interests. The participants all possessed excellent aural skills and strong, personal, musical styles but they all expressed a willingness to compromise in finding solutions to musical problems.

In Chapters 2-4 I described the technical, theoretical, conceptual and relational observations made during this artistic practice research, with data drawn from the collaborative development, rehearsal and performance of new compositions, as well as reflexive journaling and participant interviews. In my findings, I focused on making global observations of the ensemble’s level of success in achieving pieces’ performance objectives, generally refraining from abstracting isolated moments of improvisation for detailed analysis.

This chapter summarises the findings of the three iterative phases of composition, rehearsal and performance to answer the research questions identified in Chapter 1. The main research question that has guided this research is:

Can I develop a more improvisational approach to composition, and a more compositional approach to improvisation by exploring how composer and improvisers interdependently exercise agency?
Reviewing the study results

My sub-research questions outlined in Chapter 1 provide a useful structure for summarising the interdependent findings of this study.

How can a jazz composer facilitate the exercise of improviser agency during the composition process?

During this study I employed a cumulative composition process, generally beginning the rehearsal of a piece with a conceptual sketch. The compositions evolved through experimentation and participant consultation allowing me as composer to responsively determine the broad conditions of the improvisational environments. Our experimentation was often structured using improvisation exercises placing a focus on each sketch’s specific opportunities for improvisers to exercise personal and collective agency. Helen said: “You actually were prepared with a realistic plan about how to get it to happen, which was good, otherwise nothing would have happened. And you were willing to take feedback” (IH3).

Whereas Ellington often transcribed and ‘compiled’ his side-men’s phrases for compositional material, my use of a conceptual sketch to set the agenda for each composition allowed observation and interpretation of the participants’ musical and verbal reactions, and subsequent additions or changes to compositions in response. Speaking of this process, Nathan said:

We had a role in providing almost real-time feedback when you had an idea that wasn't resolved… At other times we could say no, this didn’t work, but we just had to do it a few more times and we figure out actually how to play it. (IN3)

Jazz composing in this way constitutes a negotiation between composer and improvisers around a proposed performance objective where the materials and parameters for improvisation are gradually and collaboratively mediated through the evolving product of the composition. This interactive and emergent approach to composition mirrors the interdependent actions and responses during interactive improvisation in jazz performances. Chris said:

The way it worked, you were still very much like the conceptual leader of it all… So there's a sense in which I was playing within your rules or your world-scape that you've created. Then within that there's freedom to co-compose… There was a sense of interaction and push and pull, and of us exploring where this thing takes us. (IC3)
During rehearsals, listening to and discussing jazz recordings that illustrated relevant conceptual approaches had an important role in establishing a cohesive understanding amongst the participants of the musical relationships and modes of expression that I wished to explore. The participants’ suggestions for further relevant jazz recordings also stimulated discussions that provided insights into the participants’ musical histories, influences, interests, and priorities. Rehearsal conversations encouraged participant engagement with the concepts behind the new compositions and facilitated collective improviser agency during the compositional process.

Speaking of the reflective aspect of this study, Chris said:

> It makes you think about stuff a little bit more when you have to actually explain it in words, to formulate in your head what it is that you think about this or that and why... It makes me scratch my head sometimes, but then you come out at the end of it thinking, “Oh yeah, I guess that's what it is,” thinking about my own reasons for my responses in music, and even potentially a little bit clearer on what things I find natural or unnatural as a musician, and what challenges I like to try and jump on. (IC3)

Participants’ responses gathered during rehearsal conversations and participant interviews provided qualitative data that suggested which directions to pursue and how deeply the improvisers could be asked to delve into a concept before it became burdensome.

**How can a jazz composer exercise agency during others’ improvisations?**

There were several interdependent strata of agency relationships explored through the twelve new compositions produced during this study. These compositions fit into two broad categories: modular forms and cyclical forms which were roughly analogous with Collier’s (2009) concepts of “micro-level structural improvising” and “macro-level structural improvising” (pp. 301-305) (see Figure 6.). Musical cues for use by the soloist often had a prominent role in the mechanics of the compositions, allowing for spontaneous changes within each composition’s structural palette.
Listening to jazz recordings discussed in literature provided examples of musical techniques and devices used by jazz improvisers to spontaneously communicate with one another when improvising. Improvisers of relevance were identified from these recordings, prompting investigation into further recorded output by their connected cliques of musicians. The improvised relationships illustrated in these recordings provided stimulus for compositional exploration of a musical parameter, and the development of cues for creating spontaneous changes around this parameter. The compositions in this study presented improvisational environments often just beyond our collective comfort zone to introduce an element of creative tension in rehearsals and performance. This required more carefully coordinated collective agency and a more refined sort of active listening than what our ensemble had previously engaged in.

The cues used in this study were the tools for creating spontaneous change in the music. They required soloists to directly engage with the composition at key moments while improvising by using the cues to achieve certain predetermined outcomes. This approach posed a three-tiered challenge to the soloist: to clearly execute cues, to make musical decisions about when they were used, and how frequently they were used. At times, this required some exaggerated musical gestures from soloists while trust was being built through repeated success in cueing. Chris said "Some of the [cues] have had to be a little obvious for each other. The better we get, both at implementing and listening out for them... You can be a bit more subtle and nuanced with it" (IC3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Modular Forms</th>
<th>Cyclical Forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Bifurcation</td>
<td>Entre Nous La Mer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kansas City Under Stars</td>
<td>4ths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Meters</td>
<td>Become One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2+2</td>
<td>Soliloquy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Pas qu’un Blues</td>
<td>Apparition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stellar Surveillance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If I Should</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Keyboardist Adam Benjamin makes similar observations about the process of introducing new cues into Kneebody's group language:

> When we’re first getting a new cue together is when we tend to overuse it, because we’re still learning it in rehearsals, so when we go to perform we fall into a space where we’re doing it a lot because that’s all we’re hearing. (cited in Rubin, M. & Devasthali, V., 2010)

Beyond the technical execution of cues, their creative application during improvisation resulted in some unique, spontaneous and synchronised changes during performances that couldn’t have happened with this group of participants under conventional playing conditions. At other times cues became a barrier or distraction from a soloist’s stream of consciousness, suggesting that the participants had not yet attained their usual level of improvisational fluency in this paradigm. Nathan said:

> We could get pretty comfortable with the [cues] on their own and they were fun to workshop in the rehearsals we did. We were, "I've got this." Now put this into the tune. "Doh." That’s the thing that I think we still needed the most work on, just putting it all together. (IN3)

Once cues were executed by a soloist, they needed to be identified and appropriately interpreted by the accompanists through the exercise of collective agency. Speaking of this change in approach, Helen said:

> It was just nice to think about different parameters to play with as an improviser... We probably all learned about that thing of trying not to jam too many ideas into one thing... I’m a good listener, but when you’re listening for certain things that are just a little bit more exacting... I just thought it was fun to try some new ways of going about doing what we do. (IH3)

Before commencing this study, the participants were already experienced with intuitively considering a performance’s proportions by managing solo lengths and musical contrasts within cyclical forms. Compositional experimentation with modular forms during this study created opportunities for soloists to exercise personal agency through the composition to create spontaneous solo structures by improvising not just within a form, but the form itself using a variety of musical cues. This change in paradigm necessitated improvisers' consideration of the duration of each modular section to manage the formal proportions of each solo, and in relation to other solos, much like a composer. Thus the use of modular form facilitates ongoing collaboration between composer and soloist, allowing the composer to exercise proxy agency during performance affording the soloist the freedom to determine how the form of their solo would unfold. This interdependent transaction of agency established collective agency and a
social system of jazz composition dependent on the soloists’ and accompanists’ fluency in the altered paradigm for improvisation.

Conversely, cyclical forms derived from ‘standards’ provided familiar settings for the participants to engage with unfamiliar, idiosyncratic approaches to improvisation. To avoid reverting to ‘tune writing’ when working with cyclical forms, I chose a conceptual focus around certain musical parameters to exercise proxy composer agency during improvisers’ solos. Nathan said:

I’d prefer music that has boundaries because it sets a clear focus of what you’re trying to do... It’s like setting the criteria in the chart. This is what I have to achieve. These are the things that have to work... I think you can make better music with constraints and clear themes and clear ideas and clear markers that you have to get in there... The person listening to it becomes aware of that. (IN3)

**How do changes to the distribution of agency affect performance outcomes?**

Exploring the differing motivations between composer and improvisers required all participants to consider, perhaps more deeply than previously, how improvisers interact with a composition, and how to adapt existing improvisational skills and practices to work towards a unified concept for each piece. Encouraging the exercise of collective improviser agency during the cumulative composition process resulted in signs of heightened participant engagement with the compositions in performance. Nathan said:

Being involved in the way it was actually put together in some way, or at least working through the idea, made it more clear what was actually supposed to happen... By doing it in a slightly more collaborative and interesting way, you just get more invested in it. That makes you play differently. And listening to myself play in the recording I listened to today, I was, "Oh, wow. I was doing some different stuff". (IN3)

Workshopping the compositions revealed the direction each piece would take and what details needed to be added to the initial conceptual sketches. However, it was the performances, under the gaze of an audience, that were the true test of the viability of the compositional demands on the improvisers, and to observe if further changes would be required. Changes in compositional approach during the course of this study reflect my pursuit of a balance between the participants’ existing performance practices and novel approaches to interactive improvisation to create expressive performance outcomes. A compositional emphasis on personal improviser
agency highlighted the contrasting personalities and musical sensibilities amongst the participants. Helen said:

I'm more of a reactor than an initiator in general, in music, and I'm pretty sure I can probably say the same for (Nathan) too... I think we were both forced to take more initiative than we ordinarily would think about doing... It makes you think about how to do it, which is a good thing. (IH3)

A continuous compositional objective throughout this study was to achieve previously inaccessible performance outcomes for the ensemble while maintaining performer engagement. The participants more readily achieved the performance objectives of the compositions with cyclical forms, working more comfortably without the additional responsibility of managing formal elasticity; however, from the composer’s perspective, the modular forms facilitated more interesting results. This highlighted the contrasting motivations of composer and improvisers with regard to performance outcomes. Chris said:

We were trying something that I haven't necessarily tried but there was a sense of satisfaction in that there was freedom for me to be me, and working within that... The process you've taken has pushed and pulled a bit in certain ways. In some ways, times when it's felt more challenging but has had success, that's felt really satisfying. But then other times when it's felt easy and you can just rip through some of the sections has [also] felt satisfying. (IC3)

Learning and workshopping new ensemble playing approaches posed a challenge to our established levels of comfort in performance. The consensus amongst all participants was that the Phase 3 compositions struck the best balance between our established performance practices and those which were novel. Helen said:

My whole issue was... that I wasn't gonna spend the whole time worrying about missing a cue, or not being able to make a cue solidly enough... I don't really plan things I play very much, so it was good for me to have a really simple level set so that I could still just have fun, and not worry about what might happen and what might go wrong...That last lot of compositions was much more manageable. (IH3)

There is an interactive, idiosyncratic element in these compositions that can't be accounted for with technical command of one’s instrument or conventional notions of jazz musicianship. The participants, and potentially the audiences, may have at times felt that we were not delivering the same ‘quality’ of performance that we are accustomed to, but this was a necessary side-effect of the risk-taking involved in broadening our ensemble language. The performances didn't always showcase us playing at our best, potentially challenging our notion of ‘professionalism’, but they provided valuable documentation of emergent ensemble approaches for this group of participants. Nathan said:
Everyone was trying to explore at the same time. They were trying out things that they probably weren't comfortable with at the same time, which made me uncomfortable. You can hear when someone is uncomfortable playing… Sometimes when it’s a stronger idea people respond strongly if they understand it. If they don't understand it, they respond weakly or strongly [but] badly. (IN3)

The performance duration of most compositions was quite long and may have, at times, seemed indulgent to an audience. This was a consequence of the exploratory learning process that accompanied a change in paradigm. It may also suggest that soloists can naturally structure and sustain longer improvisations by engaging with the interactive opportunities offered by the compositions. Chris said:

The only way that you can practise or develop this thing is by having times of that... I think the better or more developed that thing becomes, the shorter all those sections are... It's kind of like learning a new language, or a new set of vocabulary… Then just pruning it back and using it more effectively… The more familiarity there is, the more streamlined it becomes. (IC3)

Pianist Fred Hersch says “After I've played a tune in public once or twice a way to do it usually comes to me, and then I’ll do it that way. The tune kind of arranges itself” (Berliner, 1994, p.90). Performing this study’s compositions clarified how to achieve their objectives for both composer and improvisers. The reflexive process that followed, particularly writing this thesis, resulted in fresh perspectives for better communicating these objectives to the players for future performances.

**Limitations and Further Research**

Research projects have to adhere to specific timelines, whereas artistic practice will often set its own pace. During this study, the participants’ regularly stated desire for familiarity with the compositions was frustrated by each piece’s continual evolution during each phase, with new changes and additions often made up until the performances. Furthermore, as the study proceeded, compositions had to be set aside as we began workshopping the next phase’s sketches, limiting the possibility of repeated performances in the short-term. Helen said:

The big overwhelming thing about it all is just the limited time. If you had a band with regular weekly rehearsals or something, for a year, then you'd get this little stuff happening really naturally. It was filled with pressure because we were trying to do a particular thing, for a particular gig, which we knew was gonna be recorded. If you had the leisure to make, with regular rehearsals and regular gigs as well, it would certainly be able to take it from there. (IH3)
This comment speaks to the need for an immersive style of learning for developing fluency with a new performance ‘language’ and managing an increasingly complex network of improvised relationships. Action research, as in this project, is quite demanding and time-consuming for participants, and the above type of immersion was not possible during this study due to the participants’ busy schedules.

An alternative model to address the above issue of time-constraints could be to limit the scope to between four and six compositions, all introduced at the outset of the project, to be observed through several iterative phases of composition, rehearsal and performance. This would generate a different type of data permitting deeper analysis of the impact of repeated performance on the evolution of compositional design and participant interpretation. In addition, using two groups of participants who are shown the same compositional sketches could provide interesting comparative data tracking the independent cumulative compositional process and improviser responses of each group.

A major challenge using the methodology of artistic practice as research is developing not just the musical technique, theory, craft and inspiration to undertake the artistic practice, but to then summon the intellect to interpret and articulate observations and reflections in the written component of the study. There was also an awareness, on the part of the participants, that this was a research project which may have influenced some of their musical responses. Nathan said: “If there’s any dissatisfaction with it it’s that we could’ve gone further… And it’s also a challenge, not just for you because you’re being assessed on it, but everyone can feel that” (I3N). Furthermore, varying degrees of interest in discussing music and modes of expression amongst the participants sometimes posed a challenge to gathering and interpreting data.

Additional guidelines provided to improvisers on the internal proportions of compositions may be useful in certain cases to help improvisers’ focus their creativity toward the intended performance outcomes. This could involve specifying the number of repetitions that a soloist will improvise in the case of cyclical forms, or specifying approximate time limits for solos in the case of modular forms. Furthermore, the number of soloists could be limited for particular compositions, or approximate time limits applied to a composition’s performance to allow more composer agency over the proportions of compositions in performance.
By chance, there were several rehearsals during this study which some participants could not attend (see Table 1). While this initially appeared to be a setback, these circumstances allowed me to work more closely with the personal approaches of the participants present on those occasions. This is a rehearsal technique worth further investigation in future research, and it would be interesting to record rehearsals where I am not present to observe how the participants interpret and negotiate new compositions on their own.

Audio-recordings of rehearsals could be made available to all participants, not just the researcher, as a tool for engaging with the concepts through their observation in musical context, but away from instruments, in addition to group and individual rehearsal. Aural transmission of compositions by the composer, a practice adopted by Mingus, Kneebody and Steve Coleman, among others, could also potentially replace notation when introducing music to the participants. This could take the form of participants transcribing elements of a composition as played by me during rehearsals or using pre-recorded audio made available before rehearsals. To this end, Chris said:

> Sometimes that approach, depending on what way you're creating concepts, will really drive more at the heart of getting to where you want it to go. It's funny, sometimes I think the reverse could be true, because you don't want to limit it to how you've been hearing it. (IC3)

This study required me to learn how to compositionally interact with the participants' individual improvisational styles, and also placed demands on the participants to learn novel approaches to structuring improvisation in an altered paradigm. For future research, this type of study could take a more interdisciplinary approach by more directly addressing social learning theory using Bandura's theory of social-cognitive development (Grusec, 1992), further exploring the social psychological dimensions of the relationship between composer and improviser.

### Summary

This research has documented the collaborative development and performance of new compositions specifically designed for interactive improvisation. This dissertation describes the decision-making process behind the cumulative compositional process used, the exploration of the distribution of agency in the relationship between composer and improvisers, and the performance outcomes from both the point of view of composer and improvisers.
The performance recordings provide a snapshot of each composition as a living organism in performance allowing others to interpret the study findings. Any performance, more so when it incorporates improvisation, is ephemeral, and a recording is documentation of only one possible performance. Collier (2009) puts it this way: “Jazz happens in real time, once” (p.30). New improvisational and compositional processes in my collaborators’ and my own creative practices constitute new knowledge situated in and expressed through the participants. Cobussen (2007) says: “The site of the performer, the site where the mind and the body meet in a non-pre-established hierarchy, gives access to knowledge that is impossible to achieve through more detached and exclusively mind work” (p. 27).

Undertaking this artistic practice as research provides useful data and a novel model for developing a more *improvisational approach to composition*, and a more *compositional approach to improvisation* by exploring how composer and improvisers interdependently exercise agency.
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**Music Scores**


Appendix A – Performance audio links

Performance P1 (Jazz Upstairs, 27/09/15)
Entre Nous La Mer - http://joshuahatchermusic.com/research/#entre-nous-la-mer
Bifurcation - http://joshuahatchermusic.com/research/#bifurcation
4ths - http://joshuahatchermusic.com/research/#4ths

Performance P2 (JMI Live, 19/11/15)
Become One - http://joshuahatchermusic.com/research/#become-one
Soliloquy - http://joshuahatchermusic.com/research/#soliloquy
Meters - http://joshuahatchermusic.com/research/#meters
2+2 - http://joshuahatchermusic.com/research/#2plus2

Performance P3.1 (Artsworx Theatre, 19/10/16)
Apparition - http://joshuahatchermusic.com/research/#apparition
Stellar Surveillance - http://joshuahatchermusic.com/research/#stellar-surveillance

Performance 3.2 (Brisbane Jazz Club, 25/4/17)
Apparition - http://joshuahatchermusic.com/research/#apparition2
If I Should - http://joshuahatchermusic.com/research/#if-i-should
Pas qu’un Blues - http://joshuahatchermusic.com/research/#pas-qu-un-blues
Appendix B – Score for ‘Entre Nous la Mer’
Appendix C – Sketch for ‘Bifurcation’
Appendix D – Score for ‘Bifurcation’

BIFURCATION

OPENING

VAMP/DRUM SOLO

ON CUE

JOSHUA HATCHER
Appendix E – Sketch for ‘4ths’

4THS

D Mixolydian

Until Cue

C Harmonic Minor

Until Cue
Appendix F – Score for ‘4ths’
Appendix G – Sketch for ‘Kansas City Under Stars’

KANSAS CITY UNDER STARS

JOSHUA HATCHER

CUE: STOPS FOR 8 BARS

\[\text{Music notation image}\]
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Appendix H – Score for ‘Kansas City Under Stars’

KANSAS CITY UNDER STARS

Stops for 8 bars

CUES

Interlude

MED SWING

FORM

Eb7

F7

Eb7

Ab7

Bb7

Eb7

Bb7

Eb7

(F7)

Afro "6/8" $\frac{6}{8}$

Ending (Repeat)

INTERLUDE (IX ONLY)

Eb7(95)  A7(99)  D7b7(95)  G7(99)

C7(95)  F7(99)  Bb
Appendix I – Score for ‘Become One’
Appendix J – Score for ‘Soliloquy’

**SOLILOQUY**

| C | Cm7 | F7 |
| G | Bbm7 | Eb7 |
| Am7 | G/F#7 | B7 | Em | Cm7/F#7 | F#7 |
| Bm | G#7 | C#7 | F#7 | Bm | Cm7 | Dm7 | E7 |
| A7 | D7 | G |
| Dm7 | G7 | C | C#9 |
| G | B7 | C | F#7 | B7 |
| Em7 | A7 | Am7 | D7 | Dm7 | G7 |
Appendix K – Sketch for ‘Meters’

METERS

CUES

Joshua Hatcher
Appendix L – Score for ‘Meters’

METERS

CUES

\[ \text{Joshua Hatcher} \]

\[ \text{Bbm7} \]

\[ \text{Eb7} \]

\[ \text{Bbm7} \]

\[ \text{Eb7} \]

\[ \text{Bbm7} \]

\[ \text{Eb7} \]

\[ \text{Bbm7} \]

\[ \text{Eb7} \]
Appendix M – Score for ‘2+2’
Appendix N – Score for ‘Apparition’ (P3.1)
Appendix O – Score for ‘Apparition’ (P3.2)

APPARITION

\[ \text{C} \text{\#} \text{\#} \]

\[ \text{Eb} \text{\#} \text{\#} \]

\[ \text{Gb} \text{\#} \text{\#} \]

\[ \text{D} \text{\#} \text{\#} \]

\[ \text{D} \text{\#} \text{\#} \]

\[ \text{G} \text{\#} \text{\#} \]

\[ \text{A} \text{\#} \text{\#} \]

\[ \text{F} \text{\#} \text{\#} \]

\[ \text{E} \text{\#} \text{\#} \]
Appendix P – Score for ‘Stellar Surveillance’ (P3.1)
Appendix Q – Score for ‘Stellar Surveillance’ (P3.2)

STELLAR SURVEILLANCE

INTRO

FORM

Josieja Hatcher
Appendix R – Sketch for ‘If I Should’
Appendix T – Sketch for ‘Pas qu’un Blues’

PAS QU’UN BLUES

CUES

SECTION A  Ascending melodic gesture
SECTION B  Descending melodic gesture
SECTION C  Repeated note

FORM

C  Em7  A7  Dm7  G7  C

C  Em7  A7  Dm7  G7  C

Em7(95)  A7(99)  Dm7(95)  G7(99)

C  C7/E  F  F#9  C/G  G7  C  G7

B  Em7  A7  Dm7  G7

C  Am  Bb7
Appendix U – Score for ‘Pas qu’un Blues’