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Abstract

This research investigates the symbiotic relationship between composition and improvisation and the notion of improvisation itself. With a specific interest in developing, extending and experimenting with the relationship of improvisation within predetermined structures, the creative work component of this research involved composing six new works with varying approaches for The Andrea Keller Quartet and guest improvisers, for performance on a National Australian tour. This is documented in the CD recording *Galumphing Round the Nation - Collaborations Tour 2009*. The exegesis component is intended to run alongside the creative work and discusses the central issues surrounding improvisation in an ensemble context and the subject of composing for improvisers. Specifically, it questions the notion that when music emphasises a higher ratio of spontaneous to pre-determined elements, and is exposed to the many variables of a performance context, particularly through its incorporation of visitant improvisers, the resultant music should potentially be measurably altered with each performance. This practice-led research demonstrates the effect of concepts such as individuality, variability within context, and the interactive qualities of contemporary jazz ensemble music. Through the analysis and comparison of the treatment of the six pieces over thirteen performances with varying personnel, this exegesis proposes that, despite the expected potential for spontaneity in contemporary jazz music, the presence of established patterns, the desire for familiarity and the intuitive tendency towards accepted protocols ensure that the music which emerges is not as mutable as initially anticipated.
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Chapter I

The Research Topic

Introduction

One of the striking features of contemporary jazz is its focus on developing, extending and experimenting with the relationship between improvisation and predetermined structures. This exegesis explores the symbiotic relationship between composition and improvisation and the notion of improvisation itself. It analyses and compares the treatment of six pieces over thirteen performances with varying personnel, discusses the central issues surrounding improvisation in an ensemble context and addresses the subject of composing for improvisers. The process of subjecting an established ensemble and a set of repertoire to varying influences, namely additional members and the many variables of the live performance context, is examined. The effect of these variables upon the music is documented and presented in this exegesis and conclusions are drawn as to the impact of external influences within the framework of contemporary jazz ensemble music. This exegesis runs concurrent to the production of the creative work titled *Galumphing Round the Nation – Collaborations Tour 2009 (Collaborations Tour)* which is documented as two audio CD’s presented at the beginning of this document and through musical scores presented in Appendix A.

Composing and working within the framework of jazz provides a wide range of possibilities, from the almost entirely pre-structured and notated to the ‘free’ and many
degrees in between. The music I am drawn to investigate sits between the two extremes of ‘conservative’ 32 bar, head-solos-head form which dominated jazz for many decades (Dean 1992, 144) and the ‘radical’ music which emerged as ‘free jazz’ after 1960, comprising music without a pre-determined structure (Rzewski 1999). The music under discussion here experiments with varying ratios of pre-determined to spontaneous elements.

The creative work entailed composing six new works with varying approaches for The Andrea Keller Quartet (AKQ) and guest improvisers for performance on a National Australian tour. The aim of the creative project was to create original music for a long-standing ensemble, which is consequently highly stylised, that allows for the jazz concept of ‘sitting in’, meaning that improvisers who are not a part of the group can be invited to perform with the ensemble with nominal rehearsal. Each concert featured the AKQ performing the material with a special guest improviser.

In the six works I created, the ratio of improvised to notated elements was generally weighted in favour of improvisation. In four of the six works improvisation outweighed notation when the duration of each were calculated as a ratio of overall performance. In one of the remaining two pieces the balance was equal, and in the final piece the notated elements were slightly longer than those of the improvised. (For full details refer to Appendix B.) This attempt to delineate ratios is, of course, not entirely accurate. It is not as straightforward as saying $x$ minutes is composed and $y$ minutes is improvised. In the majority of instances in this music, the improvised sections occur over predetermined structures which sometimes include notated accompaniment lines, and in the composed
sections not every aspect is entirely notated, i.e. improvisation is always incorporated to some degree. In addition to this, the music is always entitled to be interpreted with varying amounts of freedom; the extent to which improvisational liberties can be taken is generally determined by the nature of the music itself.

This research has grown out of my belief that when music emphasises improvisation and thus embraces an ‘open to the moment’ spirit, it should be transformed with each new performance. At the beginning of the compositional process I had noted in my journal that I wanted to surrender control and be open to whatever the five of us created. I wrote, “At each concert and with each new player, the music should have the potential to be entirely different. We shouldn’t get used to ‘the way it goes’ - no ruts.” It is this notion that I am exploring through this creative work and the accompanying exegesis.

Central Research Question

The central research question of this exegesis is:

**To what extent and in which way(s) will the inclusion of visitant improvisers affect the AKQ’s interpretation of musical works and, in fact, the works themselves?**

I hypothesise that the introduction of a variable fifth member will have a measurable effect on the music. As Derek Bailey (1980, 66) suggests, “Music is, of its nature, not fixed and is always malleable, changeable”.
The AKQ’s approach celebrates individualism and the unique contribution of each musician. As such, I anticipate obvious variables within the performances with regard to mood, groove, feel, intensity, dynamic contrast, balance, textural density, timbral quality, tone colour, rhythmic complexity, interpretation, melodic phrasing, articulation, interaction, ‘language’, and approaches to improvisation. By the same token, I also recognise that there are limits to the variables within the constraints of the music – namely harmonic, structural and stylistic. However, I was intrigued to discover the extent to which deviations occurred within the constraints imposed on the music. I was testing the notion that contemporary music, which has a higher ratio of improvised to composed content, will alter significantly when subjected to the influence of an ‘intruder’ (the invited special guest) when given freedom to respond to the music in whichever way they see fit.

Texts on jazz improvisation are numerous (Berliner 1994; Borgo 2002; Hodson 2007; Mazzola & Cherlin 2009; Monson 1996), although predominantly focussing on either mainstream or ‘free’ jazz. A considerably smaller amount of the literature discusses the relationship between composed and improvised elements and the use of improvisation within predetermined structures in a contemporary jazz context, i.e. beyond the traditional song form. It is my intention that this research contributes knowledge to the area of composing for improvisers and makes more transparent the musical interrelations in a contemporary jazz ensemble. However, I must acknowledge that the scope of this research is limited to a discussion of concepts which have arisen directly from the production of the creative work in reference to the central research question and, as such,
many vital issues surrounding the performance of improvised music have undoubtedly been neglected.

It is beyond the scope of this exegesis to discuss the audience. Despite attempts within this research project to gather empirical evidence of audience responses, I was unable to gain substantial information in order to form reliable conclusions. Due to the “indivisible [and] interactive totality” of the relationship between musician/instrument/listener and environment (Nachmanovitch 1990, 143), it is vital to acknowledge the importance of the audience in this performance-based art. As Bailey (1980, 44) suggests, the audience, along with other intangible factors of performance, has a huge impact on a performance. However, this study will focus on the perspectives of my collaborators rather than those of the audience.

Overview of the Study

The AKQ is a well established musical ensemble with a focussed approach to performing improvisations within composed structures. In my own creative practice, my focus is on music that challenges the traditional use of improvisation within composed structures, music which incorporates improvisation on different levels (i.e. not always as the focal point) and music which searches for ‘the new’ through its combination of idiomatic and non-idiomatic devices.
The music created for this research was designed in such a way as to be complete when played by the AKQ alone but also includes an ‘optional fifth part’ to be played by a special guest improviser. The fifth part is highly improvised in comparison to what the quartet plays. The material was performed on the Collaborations Tour, which comprised thirteen concerts between February and September 2009 (for details see appendix D). Venues ranged from jazz clubs, small bars, pubs, and warehouse spaces, to the Sydney Opera House. Some rooms were large, others small, some acoustically pleasing and others not. Various venues had sound technicians and others were without. Sometimes the pianos and drum kits were high quality, but at other times, lower quality. In the absence of a piano, either a Rhodes or Nord Electro keyboard was used.

Each concert featured one of six special guest improvisers.

The special guests were:

Stephen Magnusson – guitar (three concerts)
Phil Slater – trumpet (three concerts)
Miroslav Bukovsky – trumpet (two concerts)
John Rodgers – violin (one concert)
Jamie Oehlers – tenor saxophone (two concerts)
Bernie McGann – alto saxophone (two concerts)

The guests were chosen due to their excellent reputations as improvisers and because they were local to the areas in which we were performing. All but one I knew personally. Two I had never previously performed with; two I had played with only once; and two I have quite long playing histories with (one spans over twenty-two years and the other
ten years). The guests represent various front line instruments, including guitar (which can belong to both the front line and the rhythm section), but the instrument they play was not critical in the decision to invite them to perform with the AKQ. Rather, it was the who that was crucial in the choosing. Each musician was chosen for their musical skills and their adaptive personalities. Each of the visitant musicians represents different generations and stylistic approaches (one is not from a jazz background and all have differing influences). These factors made the study intriguing and provided a broader palette from which to observe their effect on the music. Common to all, however, is a very high competence in improvisation and it is worth noting that all are composers in their own right.

A live recording was made of each performance and, additionally, the six works were recorded at the ABC studio, Melbourne, August 20 and 21, 2009. Both the live recordings and the studio recording were analysed in order to collate data and assess the types of deviations and the extent of the deviations that occurred between the performances of each work by the varying musicians on the different occasions.

Framework of the Inquiry

The main method of this research is practice-led (Barrett & Bolt 2007; Gray 1996; Haseman 2006) and includes creating new music and performing in live situations around Australia as outlined above. The overall framework is jazz performance. I have consulted many texts on improvisation and jazz (including the views of performers and
musicologists) in order to provide a foundation for the understanding of improvisation as it pertains to this exegesis, to introduce the issues inherent in the relationship between improvisation and composition, and to inform the commentary of my own creative practice. I have also undertaken extensive listening to recorded examples of contemporary improvising ensembles as a part of my research strategy.

In addition to composing, rehearsing and performing new musical works, the methods include conducting interviews with the musicians who participated in the project. A large portion of information is recorded in my reflective journal to highlight an experiential perspective. Documentation involves continually updating musical scores in the computer software for musical notation program, *Sibelius*, recording all rehearsals and live performances and a formal studio recording of the project. These have been reviewed and analysed as a means of developing the creative work and of evaluating the results.

Synopsis of Content

**Chapter II – Key Concepts Underlying the Research**

This chapter discusses the key terms, themes and concepts underlying this research and makes reference to relevant literature in the field. I provide definitions of significant terms such as jazz, improvisation and composition, and outline issues surrounding the relationship between the latter two. I also explore the notions of collaboration, “group flow”, and interaction.
Chapter III – Musical Context and Influences
This chapter defines the musical context in which this practice sits and outlines the key influences that have driven my creative practice. I explain the AKQ’s rationale and ideology.

Chapter IV – The Creative Work
In this chapter I outline the compositional and developmental processes undertaken in creating the creative work. I discuss the musical aims and methods and provide an analysis of the individual pieces. Through analysis, the achievements and problems arising from this process are highlighted, including issues and views surrounding the recording of improvised music.

Chapter V – Similarities and Differences Between the Performances
This chapter presents the data collated through listening and analysis of the recordings of the Collaborations Tour. I make comparisons of the major musical properties and examine the variables. I discuss the outcomes and their implications and draw preliminary conclusions.

Chapter VI – The Effects of Familiarity, ‘Mistakes’ and “Group Flow”
In this chapter I discuss the concept of familiarity and its relevance to the nature of improvisation as it emerged through this research. I consider the art of ‘mistakes’ and their value in improvised music, and assess the results of “group flow”.
Chapter VII – Conclusion

In this chapter I discuss the qualities that were used to gauge ‘success’, and provide a summary of the research, including a reflection on my creative practice.
Chapter II

Key Concepts Underlying the Research

Introduction

Contemporary jazz is largely structured using composed and improvised elements. As stated in Chapter I, this exegesis examines the relationship between improvised and composed elements in a contemporary jazz context. It is therefore necessary, for the purposes of this research, to define what is meant by the terms jazz, improvisation, and composition. In this chapter I discuss the key terms, themes, and concepts underlying this research. I begin to unpack the nature of improvising within composed forms and the process of composing for improvisers. Through an examination of existing literature I establish that structure underlies all improvisation and that all improvisation occurs in relation to known elements. I explore the notion of collaboration, discuss Sawyer’s concept of “group flow”, and outline the importance of interaction within collectively created music.

Defining Jazz, Improvisation and Composition

There are two ways to look at the word ‘jazz’… there’s a noun and there’s an adverb. The noun is a type of music which some people would argue is well-definable and probably ceased to develop in any kind of essential way after about 1970. It involves the concepts of swing and the blues in order to fall into that jazz category. And then there is a jazz way of doing things, jazz as a process. Which is the way it began, as a kind of syncretic organism which took elements of different
things and put them together, and constantly morphed into something else. (Paul Grabowsky in Zolin 2008, 57).

This definition of jazz provided by Australian pianist and composer Paul Grabowsky is echoed through the views of other respected contemporary improvisers (Bailey 1992; Milkowski 2005; Shorter in Downbeat 1993). In the context of this exegesis jazz is taken as a verb, meaning a musical process, which, through its incorporation of improvisation, promotes individual contribution, the creation of new music, and searches for intimate and honest personal expression at its core. It should be noted that while improvisation is vital to jazz, it appears in varying degrees and is certainly not exclusive to the jazz idiom. The two terms are connected yet distinct. Improvisation is a broader term used to describe an action or approach. Its use in conjunction with the term jazz helps to position the type of music deeper into a specific field. It should be noted, however, that the two terms are at times used interchangeably.

The following paragraphs present current theories and definitions on improvisation and composition. In the majority of texts that examine both, the relationship is often described as a “dichotomy” (Bailey 1992, 140; Dean 1992, 177) and the elements that differentiate or separate them are highlighted. While I acknowledge the disparate nature of the two approaches, this research is particularly concerned with how they interact. There appears to be little discussion in the available literature of their symbiotic nature.

Reflective of Grabowsky’s (Zolin 2008) views on jazz, is Iyer’s (2007, para. 13) assertion that improvisation “is not a kind of music, but a way of approaching musical
activity”. The concept of improvisation as an approach rather than a product-orientated music recurs with significant importance in other texts. For example, Borgo states that:

Improvisation emphasises process over product creativity, an engendered sense of freedom and discovery, the dialogical nature of real-time, the sensual aspects of performance over abstract intellectual concerns, and a participatory aesthetic over passive reception (2002, 184).

When improvisers discuss the act of improvising, they often speak of the inability to predict how a performance will unfold (Bailey 1980, 42). Issues of context can affect whether they will feel inspired and ‘free’ with their performance. Many extraneous factors such as the quality of the instruments, whether they are in tune, the acoustics of the space, the response of the audience, and other uncontrollable factors have an immeasurable effect on the performance of improvised music. It is impossible to fabricate the perfect environment and there is no formula for gauging the quality or ‘success’ of an improvisatory performance. According to Bailey (1980, 10 - 40), musicians report feelings such as “clarity of thinking”, “letting go”, confidence and attaining the “new” as being definitive of a successful performance.

Rzewski (1999) claims of improvisation that “anything can happen” (para. 31) and speaks of the “precarious” and “unpredictable” nature of improvisation as it reflects real life (para. 49). This concept of improvisation reflecting its context, and being largely a result of inherent variables, is perceived as intrinsic to discussions of improvisation (Bailey 1980, 44; Ball personal interview June 26, 2009; Berliner 1994, 449; Dean 1992, 200; Nachmanovitch 1990, 143; Reason 2004, 73; Slater personal interview July 31,
Although I fundamentally agree that “anything can happen”, this research has shown that within the framework of contemporary jazz ensemble performance, intuitive stylistic protocols emerge, forming constraints around the music, in a sense inhibiting the extent to which “anything can happen”.

It is interesting to observe that the notion of ‘free’ improvisation is often dismissed as unattainable due to the fact that all improvisation, no matter the idiom or non-idiom, relies on practiced and familiar structures to some degree and therefore there can be no such thing as entirely ‘free’ music (Bailey 1992; Blum 1998, 33; Iyer 2007; Magnusson personal interview July 8, 2009; Monson 1996, 185; Nettl 1998, 15; Rzewski 1999; Sawyer 2006). As Pressing (1984, 345) asserts, “No action can be completely free of the effects of previous training”.

Formal definitions of improvisation are abundant yet similar, fundamentally expressing that improvisation is “an individual or collective real-time process of taking decisions and actions that have immediate sonorous consequences” (Iyer 2007, para. 3). Or, as Dean (1992, 178) suggests, it is “the simultaneous conception and production of an artistic entity”. In contrast to this definition of improvisation, Dean (1992, 69) refers to composition as “slowly conceived music”. The luxury of time to perfect, sculpt, and reconsider events in a composed piece poses a great difference in approach to the spontaneous method of creation involved in an improvisation, whereby ‘mistakes’ and imperfections inevitably occur and must be dealt with in the moment, as there is no editing option. However, it is more than just a question of time. Iyer (2007), Bailey (1992) and Rzewski (1999) all agree that the differences between improvisation and
composition are far more intricate and complex than is expressed in the simplistic statement of ‘improvisation as instant composition’. The two approaches are seen as fundamentally different mental processes, namely of process orientated versus product orientated activity (Hamilton 2000). Of the contrasting disciplines, Gioia (in Hamilton 2000, para. 7) has chosen to describe composition as “the aesthetics of perfection”, as opposed to “the aesthetics of imperfection” in reference to improvisation.

The aesthetics of imperfection thus focuses on the moment or event of performance, while its rival emphasizes the timelessness of the work. [The dichotomy implies rival aesthetics such as] process and product, impermanence and permanence, spontaneity and deliberation (Hamilton 2000, para. 14).

Composing for Improvisers

The above discussion refers to composition and improvisation as separate disciplines. However, of the symbiotic relationship between the two, Berliner (1994, 383) accurately describes how “the spontaneous and arranged elements of jazz presentations continually cross-fertilise and revitalise one another”. The creative work which forms this research, being concerned with how the two interrelate in contemporary jazz ensemble music, makes it necessary to comment on the nature of the composed amidst this amalgamation. Pressing states that:
Central to improvisation is the notion of the ‘referent’. The referent is an underlying formal scheme or guiding image specific to a given piece, used by the improviser to facilitate the generation and editing of improvised behaviour (1984, 346).

He continues to articulate that there are many possibilities within the treatment of the referent and the improvisational approaches employed (1984, 348). Pressing (1998, 52) also observes that the significance of the referent is that it “provides material with emotional and structural foundations honed to engage the listener and performer and reinforce piece identity within and across different performances”.

Also termed a “point of departure” or “model” (Nettl 1998, 13), there are obviously many different types of referents, varying in instructional detail and complexity among other things. Of the role of the referent in improvised music, Reason points out:

While there are many improvised pieces that refer to scores, improvisers generally have plenty of room to add their own understanding of the score and what it may signify to them. The significance of the score in improvised music often serves more as a point of departure than as a set of fixed ideas to which one addresses rigidly. Hence, it is possible for two different improvisers to work with a specific “score” and produce significantly different outcomes (2004, 76).

Iyer (1997) describes the relationship between improvisation and composition as a “dialogue”. He explains his approach when composing for improvisers as a “structural architecture … it provides spaces and occasions for interactivity and real-time exploration, so that improvisation is always possible, even necessary” (1997, para. 14).
Collier (in Dean 1992, 165) points out that the central considerations when composing for improvisers are of the composer’s vision being fulfilled, along with the improvisers being given space to freely express themselves, and also the importance of leaving things open to the moment. Berliner contributes to the discussion by pointing out that:

Soloists agilely adapt their vocabulary to the precise features of compositions, at other times they transform the compositions’ features in order to suit their evolving melodic ideas (1994, 223).

This observation clearly emphasises the symbiotic relationship between the two.

Ratios of Spontaneous to Predetermined Material

The fact that improvisation and composition are often audibly indiscernible - a composed piece may resemble an improvisation (Davis 2004, 134) and vice versa - contributes to their symbiotic relationship. Leading authors generally agree that discerning the distinction between the two from an audience perspective is inconsequential. Rzewski (1999, para. 7) states that “whether a musician acts in accordance with some predetermined plan, changes the plan at every moment, or acts without any conscious plan whatsoever, has no effect at all on the degree of freedom or determination of the resultant music”. This is echoed in statements to similar effect by Bailey (1992, 140) and Hobsbawn (in Hamilton 2000). Hobsbawn (in Hamilton 2000, para. 44) adds that the significance of improvisation is that it “stands for the constant living re-creation of the music, the excitement and inspiration of the players which is communicated to us”.
It has been suggested that: 1) familiarity with the referent has a greater impact on freedom than, for example, the ratio of composed to improvised elements (Ball personal interview June 26, 2009; Pressing 1998, 52), and 2) a musical performance is affected more by the spirit of approach rather than by what proportion of the music is improvised versus predetermined (Bailey 1980, 16; Hamilton 2000). However, the subjective nature of this ratio is highlighted by Rzewski (1999, para. 26) when he claims: “Depending on one’s point of view, freedom or structure might be considered to be desirable or undesirable qualities…according to one’s beliefs about what makes music good or bad”. Of this issue, saxophonist Anthony Braxton states:

I’m not interested in only total improvisation because I don’t believe existential anarchy is the highest context…Structure is part of how evolution is arrived at (in Dean, 1992, 133).

I agree with Braxton that the presence of structure is intrinsic to the evolution of music. My creative practice is concerned with manipulating the delicate balance between prescribing a particular structure while simultaneously cultivating freedom and space for improvisation at any point. In order to make the performance of optimal enjoyment for me, there needs to be a balance between the improvised and composed elements (albeit unequal, with more emphasis on the improvised). This is a personal aesthetic and is not necessarily shared by the other musicians who participated in this project. The interviews with those musicians revealed that there is indeed no ‘perfect’ ratio but, rather, that each musician has their own preference regarding this balance.
Collaboration and “Group Flow”

It is important for this research to address the collaborative nature of improvisation as it occurs in the context of an ensemble. Jazz traditionally incorporates improvisation and is largely performed by ensembles of two or more musicians; as such, its intrinsic link to the concept of collaboration is evident. One can find many variants within collaborative forms. The type leading this creative practice has been inspired by a desire to employ aspects of ‘sitting in’ which has been a vital part of the sharing, communicative, and pedagogical methods of jazz music. The collaborative project underpinning this research is unique in that I am asking an outsider to join the AKQ briefly and respond to my original music in whichever way they see fit. I am inviting them to simultaneously share and contribute to our established collective language while also featuring them as ‘soloist’. Of collaboration, Nachmanovitch observes that:

In playing together there is real risk of cacophony, the antidote to which is discipline. But this need not be the discipline of ‘let’s agree on a structure in advance’. It is the discipline of mutual awareness, consideration, listening, willingness to be subtle (1990, 97).

This commitment to availing oneself to the moment, the music and others that Nachmanovitch astutely describes is the essence underlying the creation of contemporary jazz ensemble music. As Monson (1996, 177) states “most jazz performances involve a fundamental dependence on the cooperation of others”. Sawyer (2006, 153) observes that aside from improvisation and collaboration, a key characteristic of group creativity is “emergence”, referring to the collective phenomena
in which the whole is greater than the sum of the parts. I would argue that this can be
greatly influenced by the attitude of any one member. The ‘parts’ may only alter slightly
in response, but the phenomenon of the ‘whole’ is susceptible to a greater shift.

Sawyer’s (2006, 158) term “group flow” - an extension of Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi’s
concept of “flow” - describes the group’s performance when it is “at its peak” and refers
to the phenomena responsible for pushing the musicians to excel to new heights.
Sawyer (2006) reiterates the unpredictable nature of improvised performance expressed
earlier and agrees with Nachmanovitch’s (1990) claim by defining the requirements for
“group flow” as open communication and an aural awareness of the entire group sound,
while simultaneously contributing individually with conviction. Of the experience of
“group flow” Mazzola and Cherlin (2009, 36) write, “the ego falls away”, the
experience of time is transformed, there is an organic sense of growth and logic, and
“you’re using your skills to the utmost”. Additionally, my own experience of “group
flow” has demonstrated that a sense of effortless ease often accompanies these moments
of peak performance.

Integral to the attainment of “group flow” is interaction, along with connecting with the
ensemble and the audience, which many of the musicians participating in this project
articulated as essential ingredients in gauging the success of a performance. Words such
as “conversation” and “dialogue” are often used to describe the process of interplay
within the ensemble (Berliner 1994, 348; Hodson 2007, 137; Monson 1996, 29, 84).
Dean (1992, 77) suggests that “perhaps the most important feature of improvisation
lacking in compositions is the possibility for interaction at any chosen musical level between several musicians”.

Conclusion

The literature referred to in this chapter demonstrates that structure underlies all improvisation and that all improvisation occurs in relation to known elements. The degree and level of predetermined/practised music making may vary in relation to that which evolves spontaneously, but I have highlighted the inseparability of structure to improvisation. Leading improvising musicians define jazz as a process and improvisation as an approach and I have presented the contrasting aspects of approach towards composition and improvisation, also noting the symbiotic nature of their relationship. I have argued that the fundamental nature of improvisation is unpredictable but certainly not without preparation, and shown that improvisers tend to associate a higher degree of interaction and improvised spirit with the success of a performance. I have introduced the notion of “group flow” as a fundamental element of this ‘success’ and stressed the inextricable link between improvisation and environment. Chapter III discusses the musical context within which this research is situated.
Chapter III

Musical Context and Influences

Introduction

This chapter defines the musical context in which this research sits and outlines the key influences that have driven my creative practice. I detail the AKQ’s formation and provide insight into its approach, including the importance of individuality and intuition in the creation of contemporary jazz ensemble music.

Defining the Creative Practice

Of utmost importance in my own creative practice is the belief that individuality should be celebrated and given room to prosper in a symbiotic relationship within the idea of the ‘ensemble’. The conscious relinquishing of control and the need to leave space for my collaborators’ ‘voices’, thereby granting them a sense of ownership over the collective music we create, has been a central concern. It is undeniable, therefore, that the members of the AKQ themselves are key inspirations behind this music. Monson (1996, 64) explores the idea that jazz musicians adapt their playing to the various individuals who share in the musical creation. Of particular interest on the Collaborations Tour was how the individuals of the AKQ responded to each guest, how the AKQ as an ensemble responded to each guest, and how the guests responded to the AKQ. However, it is significant to note the intuitive level on which these responses occur (Pressing 1988, 147).
The Ensemble, Its Rationale and Values

The AKQ was formed in 1999 with Eugene Ball on trumpet, Ian Whitehurst on tenor saxophone, and me on piano. Initially a quintet with bass and drums, the ensemble became a bass-less quartet in 2003 when circumstances led the bassist to relocate. As a result of my belief that the personalities in the ensemble were more integral to the music than the instruments, I decided not to replace him. Drummer Joe Talia joined the ensemble in 2005.

The fact that the AKQ is a bass-less ensemble with the line up of trumpet, tenor saxophone, piano and drums is somewhat unusual but by no means unique in the world of improvised contemporary jazz. In the initial period as a ‘jazz’ quartet without bass, there were issues to contend with and a restructuring of our thought processes and perceived roles in the ensemble was required. Our approach is to think of the instruments equally in terms of their ability to contribute to the groove, rhythmic impetus, harmonic outlines, melodic outlines, accompaniment, dynamic contour, and formal structure; and that all should be given a similar level of freedom to improvise, interact and share the focus of the music.

Through three commercially released recordings made as a quartet, the 2007 European tour, the 2009 National Australian tour, and countless other performances, the music played by the quartet continues to evolve. Just as an individual’s style develops through
an accumulation of predilections, experiences and aesthetic choices (Pressing 1998, 54), so too does that of the group.

As a group develops rapport and players within a group become increasingly familiar with one another’s musical tendencies (i.e., personal style traits), a general style peculiar to the group will usually develop (Nunn in Borgo 2002, 174).

The AKQ has, similarly, created a highly personalised style and I agree with the participants in the project who unanimously claimed through personal interviews that the quintessence of the style or ‘sound’ of the AKQ remained true and developed throughout the process of the Collaborations Tour.

Inspirations and Aspirations

A bass-less contemporary jazz ensemble similarly concerned with playing referent-based music is The Julien Wilson Trio (JWT). Local to Melbourne, the trio features tenor saxophone, piano accordion, and guitar. They perform original music and that of contemporary musicians from around the world. The music they produce is melodically driven, their approach interactive, and their style rhythmically fluid and full of subtlety. Stephen Magnusson is both the guitarist in the JWT and a guest on the Collaborations Tour. The music of the JWT had a tremendous influence on The Incredible View (one of the pieces which forms part of the creative work), which was very much inspired by their live album Trio – Live (Wilson 2007).
In recent years the developments in my music have been driven by an ardent curiosity in
the music of the *Wayne Shorter Quartet (WSQ)*. The experience of seeing the *WSQ* play
live in Melbourne 2007 was life changing for me. The music sounded so improvised,
free, spontaneous and fresh, yet it was obviously founded on predetermined structures
(some melodies were very well known Shorter originals). The construction of the music
is something of a mystery to me. However, based on information gained from interviews,
I surmise that the music eventuated from an organic process rather than a verbally
specific or instructional one. It is evident that Shorter’s approach as leader does not
involve explicit instructions but, rather, a method of leading by example. Central to the
saxophonist’s approach is the need to self-sacrifice by “going overboard” (Shorter in
Koransky 2003). This is clear through the interviews with Shorter and his musicians and
is audible in his recordings. Often preferring to discuss broader life issues than music,
Shorter discloses little of his musical approaches through available interviews.
According to pianist Danilo Perez (*Profile* 2002), Shorter’s instructions to the group
were minimal, preferring to leave his musicians to make their own decisions. In fact,
prior to their first performance together, the quartet had no rehearsals (Gordon n.d.). In
developing the precarious musical balance between pre-determined structure and
spontaneity, Shorter’s focus has been on letting the music happen with as much freedom
as is needed to push it into new areas. It is Shorter’s approach to improvisation that has
inspired my current practice.

Shorter’s current quartet, formed in 2001 with Danilo Perez (piano), John Patitucci
(bass), and Brian Blade (drums), is known for its sophisticated approach to freedom
within structure and is said to have a “remarkable group-think and deconstructivist
aesthetic” (Milkowski 2005). The three CD releases by the WSQ are *Footprints Live* - recorded live July 2001 (Shorter 2002), *Alegria* - studio recording (Shorter 2003) and *Beyond the Sound Barrier* - recorded live November 2002-April 2004 (Shorter 2005). The repertoire on *Footprints Live* consists of older and more familiar Shorter originals (predominantly dating back to the 1960’s), whereas *Beyond the Sound Barrier (BSB)* explores newer repertoire including three pieces written specifically for the WSQ. The similarities between the approaches on these two albums are evident. The referents employed by the quartet appear similar to an elaborate map with clear signposts that are used as points of departure. There is immense freedom within the structures; although it appears more so on *BSB* than on *Footprints Live*. I would suggest that this is due to the fact that *Footprints Live* was recorded at the quartet’s inception and is therefore relatively less adventurous (it even seems to have more ‘solos’ whereas *BSB* blurs the lines between solo and accompaniment). The quartet is more familiar with the repertoire and each other by the *BSB* tour and hence is able to extend further into the unknown. This connection between familiarity and stretching oneself is central to this research and is explored further in Chapter VI.

Three of the ten tracks on *Alegria* feature the quartet alone and the connections to the approaches on *Footprints Live* and *BSB* are clear. *Alegria* is obviously more composed as it involves a large ensemble. Pressing (1984, 351) points out that in general, the larger the ensemble, the less improvisation and greater detail in the referent is required for “overall coherence”. The arrangements themselves are very elaborate, often employing through-composed forms and frequent mood and section changes, similar to those of *Footprints Live* and *BSB*. Improvisation occurs at many different levels, as feature, as
accompaniment, as decoration and as counter melody. The music fluctuates between brief moments of improvisation amidst the composed. It is the rapidity of these fluctuations and the brevity of these moments that I find most influential. Although the music on *Alegria* is comparatively more composed, it still manages to uphold the very spontaneous, fresh and exciting sound of the other two albums. This is most likely due to the spirited approach of the musicians, and the strength of their connection to the music and the moment. As argued in Chapter II, there is much evidence to support the notion that it is of little relevance whether something is improvised or rehearsed; that it is the way in which the music is delivered which is of greatest value to its sense of discovery and ‘newness’. The eternal search for ‘the new’ could simply be a case of “If not the rhythm or the notes at least the spirit of it should be new” (Paco Pena in Bailey 1980, 17).

I surmise that the foundation of the *WSQ*’s approach to improvisation is concerned with interaction, responsiveness, and a goal to create together. They treat improvisation within a jazz context in a fresh and progressive way. This music is not focussed on ‘solos’ as such. It is not about distinguishing a virtuosic soloist from the accompaniment; it is a collectively driven concept of an improvising ensemble, where all members are improvising simultaneously. This is not an entirely new approach. For one, Bill Evans’ vision for his trio was to head in the direction of simultaneous improvisation rather than individual solos. He felt each player should be able to respond to the music in whichever way they felt appropriate and not be restricted to purely an accompaniment role (Mazzola & Cherlin 2009, 15). This “flexible approach” of the ensemble conversing in
unrestrained dialogue (Hodson 2007, 119) can be heard in Evans’ recordings dating back to the late 1950’s/early 1960’s.

Miles Davis’ ‘second great quintet’ (of which Wayne Shorter was a member) is an ensemble also renowned for its flexible, intuitive, and dialogic treatment of referents. Like Shorter, Miles is known for his often cryptic and essentially non-verbal methods of ensemble leadership. Smith (1998) observes the intrinsic link between the leadership methods employed by Davis and the resultant music. Coolman (1997, 156) in his thesis on the music of the 60’s quintet concluded that they were able to balance freedom with structure through their high levels of adaptability, utilisation of subtle motivic cues, and acute responsiveness.

Although the WSQ’s approach to playing music is, in a way, reminiscent of that of the Miles Davis Quintet, I believe the WSQ have managed to stretch the boundaries of improvised-referent-based music even further. Hodson (2007, 110) explicitly depicts how the rhythm section of Miles’ 60’s quintet “‘Goes with the flow’ created by Shorter”. (Shorter in this instance was the soloist). I suggest that this flexibility of response within a dynamic balance of structure and freedom has been developed further by the WSQ. This is evidenced by the fact that there is much more simultaneous improvisation and less ‘solo’ based improvisation in the WSQ’s approach. All four members are audibly fluctuating between going with their own flow and that created collectively by the group.

Undeniably contributing to the unique sound of all the ensembles mentioned above is the synthesis of each performer’s individual personalities, each ensemble’s collective
approach to freedom within structure, and each player’s incredible musicianship and improvisational abilities, all integrating to create an inimitable and homogenous sound.

Elaborating on a comment made by free jazz musician Ornette Coleman, Mazzola and Cherlin state that:

[The] ‘impersonal’ concept of collectively creating an imaginative musical narrative challenges the emphasis that is usually put on the soloist: Free jazz bids farewell to the isolated heroic individual. Additionally, it suggests that musical freedom attends a higher, impersonal level, a kind of interdependent and coherent objective entity, a collective ideation that exhibits a high potential for creating sublime musical realities (2009, 45).

It seems the WSQ adopts this attributed ‘free jazz’ concept and masterfully applies it to referent-based material. The collective interpretation of the compositions by the ensemble are of equal importance to the compositions themselves, if not more so. This conforms to the jazz ethos whereby the composed is merely a vehicle to be used for improvisation. The ‘tune’ is common ground which musical strangers share and use as a point of departure. A significant occasion on the Collaborations Tour occurred when trumpeter Ball became ill and unable to perform. Two audience members, who are well acquainted with my music and the AKQ, commented that in his absence they heard the compositions more for the first time, rather than the band, and that the music sounded entirely different to them. This reiterates how integral each member is to the sound and identity of the AKQ.
Conclusion

In this chapter I have outlined the formation, musical approach, and style of the AKQ, particularly highlighting the importance of the individual and the role of intuition in this type of creative music. I attribute the most direct and conscious influences to the musicians in the AKQ themselves, the music of the Julien Wilson Trio and that of the Wayne Shorter Quartet. I have drawn particular focus to the improvisatory approach of the WSQ, which is identified as being a major instigator of developments within current jazz practice.

The observations listed in this chapter, in particular; the emphasis on organic processes; a conscious awareness of the effect of verbal and written instructions; leadership methods; preferring to allow the musicians to make their own instinctive decisions; the treatment of referents as a point of departure; going with the flow; blurring the lines between composition and improvisation; and placing utmost importance on interaction and collective creation, have influenced my goals and practices in the assemblage of the music for the Collaborations Tour.

Chapter IV will look at the musical works created for the Collaborations Tour and reveal the processes, strategies and challenges of the project.
Chapter IV
The Creative Work

Introduction

This chapter outlines the compositional and developmental processes undertaken in creating the musical works that form the creative, practice-based component of this research. It discusses the musical aims and methods, and provides an analysis of the individual pieces composed for and performed on the Collaborations Tour. I highlight the achievements and problems that arose out of this process and address issues and views surrounding the documentation and recording of improvised music.

Musical Considerations

In composing the material that forms the foundation of this research I was aiming to create pieces that were structured, yet had ample room for improvisation and fresh interpretations at each performance and with each new guest. Some of the forms were based on more conventional ‘micro’ jazz structures (head-solos-head), while others were through-composed and contained more elaborate structures. Some allowed for free improvisation while others required improvisation over set harmonic patterns.

Considerations while composing the pieces included experimenting with the use of improvisation within more complex compositional structures through a progressive approach to the form and space that improvisation takes, and awareness of freedom
versus constraint through experimentation with different ratios of composed to
improvised material. The need to nurture freedom was essential, but not as a result of
being vague or unclear. I aimed for flexibility in the music in order to allow the
ensemble freedom and was conscious of the musicians’ needs to be inspired to play over
the pieces and therefore endeavoured to leave enough space for them to express their
own voices.

An important consideration in the composition of the works was the complexity of the
quartet music as opposed to the ‘optional fifth part’. The reasons for approaching the
two with separate strategies were two-fold. Firstly, the logistics of rehearsing with the
guests while on the Collaborations Tour meant that rehearsal time was brief and
generally on the day of the performance. This had a direct effect on the nature of the
music created and, in fact, was one of the driving motives behind the project: to create a
repertoire for my existing band which could easily allow an ‘outsider’ to participate with
minimal rehearsal but to maximum musical effect. The ‘optional fifth part’ played by the
special guest was highly improvised in comparison to the ratio of notated elements
applied to the individual parts of the quartet. Secondly, the nature of the enquiry and the
‘role’ that I wanted the guests to occupy was founded on allowing an unrestricted
response to the music, anticipating that their effect would be greater on the AKQ and
hence the resultant music. Although I wanted the music to sound sophisticated, it was
not to be overly challenging so as to restrict improvisation.

General concepts contemplated during the compositional process included: that the
music have a strong sense of melodicism; employ varying timbral groupings within the
ensemble; and that every member of the ensemble be given a chance to feature.

Experimentations with textural and timbral concerns resulted in the tenor and trumpet often providing accompaniment to the solos/improvisations in either scripted or unscripted forms. In addition to this, of concern during the composition of these pieces was the concept of malleable time felt and adhered to collectively within an ensemble, hence three of the tunes feature and explore this concept to some degree.

The first factor I neglected to anticipate in my compositional process was the ability to write for the individual in this instance. The importance of writing for the individual as highlighted in the Ellington tradition (composing for who is playing rather than what instrument is playing) has been a guiding force in my compositions for improvisers, hence, negotiating a proportion of the music (one-fifth to be specific) through the compositional process which was to be played in turns by six different personalities and voices caused considerable difficulty in writing for the Collaborations Tour. I overcame this by focusing on a particular guest during the composition of each piece. This approach is partly responsible for the diversity of the repertoire, as are the inspirations from various genres clearly evident in the playing styles and tendencies of the invited guests. It was interesting to note, however, that even though I had nominated particular pieces of the repertoire as fitting certain guests ‘better’, there were often instances where the pieces that I had not thought would be as appropriate in terms of style or character for particular guests were in fact embraced and performed in a way that not only matched my preconceptions but at times far surpassed my expectations.
It is extremely difficult to write music that needs to fit the various criteria outlined above. As argued by Mazzola and Cherlin (2009, 123) “there is no product that is fabricated from given ingredients in accordance with an exact plan and deadline”. I may have set out with a goal for the music, but when it came time to write I just let the music come out in whichever way it unfolded. I tried not to question things when they were flowing; instead I just let them happen and documented them. My intention was to simply “reveal” the music as expressed by Nachmanovitch (1990, 31) in his analogy of Michelangelo uncovering the statues that were already present in the stone. This corresponds to the music that is already in the five of us and should be left to happen of its own accord. The result of this unhampered approach, however, is that the music does not always allow for what I had hoped and intended. Although the individuals are given freedom of interpretation, the pieces do not necessarily lend themselves towards genuine flexibility. I feel I imposed too much predetermined structure on the music because I wanted it to have a fail-safe cohesive quality which I thought it may not achieve if I had left the pieces more open, given that there was minimal rehearsal time with the guests and the fact that there was not always a shared playing history between the individuals in the AKQ and the guests. In this sense, the construction of the pieces was directly affected by the context in which they were to be performed, including the fact that the first full run for each new ensemble was premiered in front of an audience. Through the personal interviews conducted, some musicians said that in their own musical concept they prefer less or more constraint. However, it should be noted that they all expressed great satisfaction with the balance between structure and freedom that was provided through the pieces and felt the music’s construction to be extremely appropriate to the constraints of the performance situation.
All of the pieces evolved through a process of creative development and, in fact, some continued to evolve throughout the performance process as well. Initially rehearsals were conducted with the AKQ alone, where sketches of the works were presented, workshopped and recorded as an ongoing procedure. During this period the AKQ also had the opportunity to perform three times as a quartet, trialling the new pieces, which was extremely beneficial to the development of the repertoire (these too were recorded). The scores were continually updated and developed on Sibelius. Although I acknowledge that some elements of the musical notation of works for contemporary jazz ensemble can benefit from being “vague and open to manifold interpretations”, as suggested by Schutz (1964, 166), and “substantially indeterminate”, according to Pressing (1998, 58), in order to encourage freedom through interpretation, I was concerned to ensure that the information present on the charts was as clear and straightforward to read as possible. I managed to achieve this successfully for the majority of the music. There were only a few points where problems recurred throughout the performances perhaps due to ambiguities or slightly less clear instructions in the scores.

Rehearsals with the special guests were brief and, more often than not, just hours prior to the performance. As exhibited through the leadership styles and instructional methods employed by Wayne Shorter and Miles Davis, it became evident through this project that information communicated both verbally and through musical notation is vital to the performance. My creative practice has shown that the nature and amount of information which is communicated and shared within a contemporary jazz ensemble has great significance to the performance milieu, impacting upon the responses of the improvising
musicians which in turn affects the resultant music. During the performances of the Collaborations Tour, some instructions (often non-verbal but aural, visual and gestural) inspired common responses from the guest musicians while at other times the response was quite individual.

Appendix C contains a more detailed account of the formation and evolution of the above-mentioned pieces.

Compositional Methods, Intentions, Achievements and Challenges

In order to outline my compositional methods, intentions, and the achievements and challenges of the music, I have addressed the six pieces individually below. Although, as pointed out earlier, when it came time to compose, I tried to let the music come out with as little consciousness as possible, there are nonetheless strong concepts that underlie the music.

Appendix A contains the full scores and Appendix B displays a more detailed analysis of the individual pieces. The pieces were always performed in the order listed below.

My Old Friend

A tune with a straight feel (even subdivisions of quavers) played at a fairly bright tempo. It begins with a head followed by solos. The 20 bar harmonic form used for improvisation is worth noting because it is constructed entirely of slash chords built over
a predominantly ‘F’ pedal (a brief foray to an ‘Ab’ pedal occurs in bars 7-10). An unscripted breakdown between soloist and rhythm section followed by a solo cadenza divides the bulk of the tune from a rubato coda which allows the soloist to continue improvising over the trumpet and saxophone playing phrases from the original melody. This was one of the simplest tunes and was intended as a ‘warm up’ tune. Hence, it was always performed to open the set. The main challenges with this tune were achieving an organic sense of flow between the sections. The slash chord harmony proved to be less conventional and, therefore, somewhat of a challenge to improvise over.

For Bernie

The most straightforward of the pieces in terms of structure, it is one of the slower tunes and the only one in a swing feel. It begins with a 38 bar head. Solos are over a 28 bar form which is based on the harmonic structure of the head and then a reinstatement of the head with a 3 bar coda (consisting of 3 pause chords over which the soloist plays a cadenza) completes the tune. This song seemed to write itself and evolved in a very organic way. I wrote it for alto saxophonist Bernie McGann in response to my glee at his agreement to be part of the project. The melody works beautifully for the saxophone but sits in an awkward register on the trumpet.

It was particularly challenging to find new ways of playing this tune. Although the drum and piano accompaniment has the potential to evolve, it is fairly similar in treatment throughout the performances. I believe this was due to its strong stylistic ties to jazz (used here as noun). The harmonic content, melodic material and feel combine firmly to imply a specific musical language, more so than the other pieces in this repertoire. The
stylistic nature of the music in this instance became more inhibiting than it was encouraging of diverse interpretations.

*Galumphing Round the Nation*

This piece has many sections, utilising a number of different instrumental groupings. It begins with a free improvisation between trumpet and drums before the gradual entry of the ensemble one by one. The music is then stripped back to a duo between piano and guest, which grows to a trio with saxophone and then a gradual introduction of the rest of the band to conclude. It covers many tempos and moods and is, therefore, probably the piece with the broadest dynamic range. This was one of the most difficult pieces to bring together, perhaps because it contains so much information, including tempo, meter, textural, and timbral changes.

The rubato section in the middle, featuring the piano and guest, was a transcription of one of my improvisations. In performance I wanted this section to retain a strong improvisatory sense, which we managed to achieve more on some performances than others. This section proved to be difficult firstly because of its rubato nature (it seemed to work best when the piano led the way) and secondly because of its harmonic movement, which was awkward as a result of its movement in 10 bar cycles.

An instance of apparent telepathy or extra-sensory perception (ESP) occurred on *Galumphing Round the Nation* between Oehlers and Whitehurst. The two tenors were improvising together over the repetitive 10 bar sequence, which builds in tempo and intensity. At the climax of the dialogue, they simultaneously played a descending scalar
line in harmony. Beginning on the exact same beat, the moment lasts for three seconds and is almost precisely in rhythmic unison. A memorable moment; these occasions are discussed in Monson (1996, 142) and Berliner (1994, 390) as epitomising musical rapport and communication.

The Rain Outside

I wrote this piece with John Rodgers and Phil Slater in mind. It is a 73 bar through-composed form where the trumpet, tenor, and piano parts are entirely notated, including very specific dynamic markings. The drums and guest are required to improvise over this ‘accompaniment’. They may do this in harmony with the composed aspects or go against them entirely. It began as a random pitch piece with a set of rules governing note choice, but this proved to be too difficult and out of context with the rest of the repertoire, so pitches were assigned and the composition developed into its current form. The main challenge of this piece was playing the composed parts in sync with each other. There were many inaccuracies here, as the pulse often became very ambiguous due to the slow tempo and the fact that the drums were involved in complex textural interaction with the soloist. However, this was part of the allure of the piece and I don’t feel it detracted from its impact or effect. In the recording studio we experimented with playing along to a click track to overcome these inaccuracies but found it was too restrictive on the group’s flow of rhythmic intensity. This was abandoned in preference of the spirit we were able to achieve through our more organic method.
Overall, the performances of this piece were very powerful. One performance in particular became a personal highlight. The longest version (which lasted 7:50) included a 3-minute (predominantly solo) improvisation by violinist John Rodgers at the conclusion. In rehearsal I had merely mentioned that at the end of the composition the AKQ would finish but that he was welcome to continue improvising. I hadn’t anticipated that this would occur for as long as it did but it has become one of the more memorable moments of the project because Rodgers chose to dispose of the norm and, in a sense, break an unarticulated protocol. Instead, in the true spirit of improvisation, he was making a bold, personal and individualistic contribution to the music and to the AKQ, which is what I had hoped for at the outset.

*The Incredible View*

A head-solos-head form. This piece was strongly inspired by the music of the Julien Wilson Trio (Chapter III). My intention behind this tune was to create a through-composed melodic piece which had an underlying pulse but was essentially rubato throughout. The relationship of the groove between the accompaniment and melody was intended to be elastic and malleable. The subtle differences between the phrasing of the various melodies, as opposed to the accompaniment, proved to be extremely difficult to achieve and to some extent the problem was solved by aiming for a bubbling groove between piano and drums, with the horns laying back and stretching the phrasing on top. There are only a select number of performances where the music achieved the subtle balance of this interplay momentarily and found the ‘groove’. Part of the problem was the difficulty in finding a suitable tempo for this tune.
Another concern was that the form is fairly ambiguous and lacks clear signposts. It is very repetitive while moving through many different keys and the repetitions use minor variations which makes it tricky to negotiate and difficult to shape. Halfway through the Collaborations Tour the arrangement was altered slightly, having the drums lay out for the first section of the head, entering at different points to vary the texture. This had the desired effect and gave the head more shape.

This was the piece I felt least comfortable with. At each performance I was trying to change it to make it work ‘better’. Upon listening back to the thirteen concerts I hear that it was actually beautiful the first time …

*Small Comforts*

This piece is the most consistently loud and energetic of the repertoire. I intended to create a broad spectrum of dynamics and emotions within the set and *Small Comforts* is definitely at the top end of this spectrum. It utilises a through-composed form. It is essentially in two main sections, both allowing for different soloists. Shared melodic material bookends both sections but the harmonic progressions are entirely different. The guests’ solo section is a concert ‘A’ groove for an indeterminate length. At the piano’s whim a 4 bar fixed progression is inserted and then there is a return to the open ‘A’ groove. This cycle repeats.

Ball and Whitehurst instigated ad lib horn lines at their discretion under the soloist. The sentiment behind this instruction was taken from the old jazz ‘riff’ lines that horn sections would improvise in order to create layers in the music and to spur the soloist on
to new heights. These were instigated by Ball and generally 2-3 riffs were played, although sometimes less and sometimes more. A couple of occasions were devoid of these backings. This absence occurred in the first instance under the violin, when balance was an issue and secondly when Ball was unable to perform due to illness. These riffs were often very much inspired by motifs or gestures played by the soloist. In one of the later performances phrases from the composed melody were used as ‘riffs’ under the soloist.

Recording the Creative Work

As the audio quality of the live recordings proved to be quite disappointing, a studio recording was made over two days in August 2009 at the ABC, Melbourne. Each guest recorded two tunes, resulting in two versions of each tune - twelve tracks in total. The majority of the pieces were recorded in one or two takes and a minimal amount of editing occurred.

The studio recording is a polished record and practical summary of the Collaborations Tour for the purposes of this exegesis and documents the interactions of some of Australia’s best improvisers. The approach to performance in the studio environment was in some areas far more prescribed and thus very different to the live performance setting. Despite the distinction in approach and intention, the studio recording undoubtedly benefited from its live predecessors. The studio recording occurred after
twelve of the thirteen concerts had been completed and analysed. This process inevitably informed the decisions made for the studio.

The choice of repertoire for each guest was based on the contributions I enjoyed most from the performances. In some instances, this entailed maintaining my original strategy of pairing performers with the pieces I had composed for them but in others, the pairing was unanticipated prior to the live performances.

The concepts seemed to have achieved a higher degree of clarity upon entering the studio and although variations occur from take to take in order to maintain freshness and to aid in the search and creation of magical moments, common trends can be traced between the approaches on both the live performances and the studio recording.

Lengths of solos, who would feature on each tune, and placement and frequency of horn backings were far more prescribed in the studio than in the live setting. I had made some of these decisions prior to the recording, while others were decided collectively in the studio. Despite the higher ratio of prescribed elements, the music is not reflective of this and is, in fact, riskier than some of the live performances. This is perhaps due to the specific focus one can achieve in a studio setting; the level of familiarity achieved at this point in the project; the fact that one is playing great instruments; the sound of the ensemble and ability to hear everything is optimal; and the ‘vibe’ is not being altered by a live audience. When gauging the quality of the studio recording I looked for an honest depiction of the ensemble and the music – one that represented the true colours of the project – this included mistakes and magic.
Upon listening to the live recordings and, in a sense, becoming an audience member, I found (not uncommonly) that my memories of the performance experience did not necessarily match my perception upon listening back. Gigs that had negative associations often sounded very strong and those that I held fond memories for were not necessarily audibly better. When critiquing the performances, it also became evident that even my mood while listening back affected my perception of what was occurring. The subjective nature of this investigation is again reiterated here. One must question how a complete impression can be achieved if perception can be considered inaccurate or incomplete. To add even more ambiguity to the situation, Cardew points out that:

Documents such as tape recordings of improvisation are essentially empty, as they preserve chiefly the form that something took and give at best an indistinct hint as to the feeling and cannot convey any sense of time and place (1971, xvii).

If we embrace the widely accepted notion that improvisation is enormously affected by its ‘natural context’ (Berliner 1994, 449; Cardew 1971, xviii; Smith 1973), then we must concur with Cardew and conclude that the documentation presents an incomplete picture of the events that took place.

Cardew (1971, xx) states that “this music…depends to some extent on public response. For this reason too it cannot happen fully in a recording studio”. I would argue that one’s intention is different when entering the studio because one intends the performance to be immortalised, as opposed to a live performance where the music is created with input from the audience and is intended to be a shared but transient moment. Due to the
relative simplicity of the equation in the studio (the environment can be controlled to some degree) I believe this to be a more complete depiction of the musical event than the live recording because the sense of place and ‘vibe’ is not as richly complex or manifold.

David Borgo (2002, 178) groups the views of various artists and authors on recording into two main points “(1) an audio recording, no matter its fidelity, necessarily reproduces only a limited spectrum of the performance experience and (2) the act of listening to improvised music away from its initial performance context and on several occasions forever alters its meaning and impact”. Both of these points have proven to be true in my experience, as has Borgo’s (2002, 179) acknowledgement that recording is seen by musicians as advantageous in that it provides a means of networking, documenting of musical progression, establishes tradition, and has enormous educational value.
Conclusion

Although I do not feel satisfied that the compositions were appropriately constructed to truly allow for the freedom I had hoped to achieve through interactions with the differing musicians on the Collaborations Tour, the opinions of the musicians differ to mine and I believe the resultant music was one approach to the situation and a successful solution to its particularities. The depiction of my approaches and intentions in composing the individual pieces given above is aimed at providing insight into the music and its performances pertaining to its discussion in Chapters V and VI. The notion of recording improvised music and the uncertainties surrounding perception and documentation have raised many questions as to the ability to objectively evaluate the performances of this creative work. As has already been stated in Chapter II, the subjective nature of the discussion is clearly apparent. My observations therefore, are based on a combination of my memory of events (at times enhanced by my journal) and those which became apparent upon listening to the live recordings.

Chapter V will present the data, results and observations that emerged from the Collaborations Tour.
Chapter V

Similarities and Differences Between the Performances

Introduction

In this chapter I evaluate the performances of the Collaborations Tour, articulating the extent to which the guests affected the musical works and identifying which musical elements displayed the largest variables. The mixed methods used to collate data in order to gain the following results from this research included listening to and analysing the live recordings of the thirteen concerts and the studio recording. I compared the major musical properties through aural evaluation. These comparisons are summarised here and are presented in further detail in Appendix B. Some elements of this aural evaluation were drawn from quantitative data. For these, I created graphs to show the variability in duration and tempo of the six works across the thirteen concerts. Areas requiring more subjective evaluation involved employing a set of criteria by which to judge the music. This entailed observing firstly the spirit or ‘vibe’ and the element of surprise and adventurous new directions, noting the accuracy, the presence of standout events, flow, and the degree of collective creation. Further quantitative analysis included running the audio files from the live concerts through the MIR Matlab toolbox. This program extracts musical features for analysis. I computed and compared the data for the entropy (randomness) of dynamics (changes in sound intensity) and the entropy of density (density of sound onset times) in each performance of each piece, across pieces
and performances. This chapter presents the data and results and discuss the outcomes and their implications.

I have divided the following discussion into groupings of interconnected musical elements in an attempt to aid the cohesion and formatting of my observations. Despite my intentions to keep the divisions distinct from each other in the following discussion of the similarities and differences as discerned through the performances, overlapping of musical elements has inevitably occurred between the categories.

1. Tempo and Duration:

Figure 1. Variability in tempo across the thirteen live performances.
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In most cases the variations occurred due to random reasons. Despite an absence of obvious patterns or correlations, it was evident that the tempo chosen for each piece was
partially responsible for achieving the groove and obviously had repercussions for the mood as well. There was only one drastic tempo variation, this occurred on *Galumphing Round the Nation* at the seventh performance and was the result of a conscious attempt to change the mood of the piece.

Figure 2. Variability in duration across the thirteen live performances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performances</th>
<th>Duration in Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The longer versions were due to longer solos or improvised sections, having more than one soloist and slower tempos. Although some aspects of the pieces were not prescribed, patterns can be observed. For example, the length of the drum introduction to *My Old Friend* was never formally set; nevertheless it was eight bars long for twelve out of thirteen performances. The length of un-prescribed cadenzas and outros was quite varied and, although they followed similar protocols, individualistic approaches can be observed. Although, the individualistic approaches related more specifically to whether
the ‘language’ employed was melodic and tonal, as opposed to gestural and abstract, or more concerned with texture and ambience as it occurred in some instances.

An obvious pattern emerged with some performers taking longer solos and others shorter. The lengths of solos for a certain player were fairly consistent through their repeat performances, and a ‘good night’ did not necessarily mean being more indulgent and playing longer, or being more succinct and playing shorter.

2. Groove and Feel:
Groove is considered to be an enormously significant factor in achieving a heightened performance state, according to many musicians and authors (Berliner 1994, 388; Monson 1996, 29). In order to define ‘groove’, the explanation offered by Monson states that:

   The notion of the groove supplies underlying solidity and cohesiveness to freely interacting, improvising musicians … Groove as a noun [refers to] rhythmic feels … Groove is also an aesthetic term, and in this capacity it is usually used as a verb (1996, 67).

Referring to groove as a noun in this instance, the six pieces had set grooves and feels, which the bands adhered to throughout the performances. The only departure from these norms occurred on The Incredible View in which (as detailed in Chapter IV) I was continually searching for a method of achieving my initial intentions in relation to groove and feel. Again, the correlation between tempo and groove/feel was emphasised.
In aesthetic terms, groove is more elusive and certainly difficult to discuss in words, however, there were moments when the ensemble managed to achieve this attribute, which should be added to the list of requirements or qualities of “group flow”.

As mentioned in Chapter IV, the concept of a collectively felt, malleable pulse is a tool I am drawn to explore within an ensemble setting. The Incredible View, Galumphing Round the Nation and The Rain Outside all utilise this idea. A delicate concept to realise, some performances delivered more successful accounts of this than others. There is no clearly evident factor responsible for this, although the choice of appropriate tempo and audibility amongst the musicians were pre-requisites, but by no means guarantees, of success.

3. Interpretation, Melodic Phrasing and Articulation:

The interpretation of the melody varied between soloists. Some were particularly free with the material, adding fills and taking liberties with the time and phrasing, while others were more literal with the information. At many points the guest was given the opportunity to ‘fill’ or improvise over a prescribed section. It was interesting to note those players that chose to either ‘sit out’ at these points or double the written parts, as they preferred to be part of the ‘horn section’ rather than being a continually featured soloist. Despite the fact that the guests understood the purpose, intent, and reasoning behind their parts/roles, in the personal interviews conducted many expressed the desire to be part of the band rather than a featured soloist.
Articulation and melodic phrasing varied between guests, as was to be expected. Just as no two people speak alike, so too, no two musicians sound alike. Subtle and intuitive responses can be heard from the AKQ with regard to these elements – either by reflecting back similar nuances, or by counteracting them.

4. ‘Language’ and Approaches to Improvisation:

The word ‘language’ is used here to encompass the meaningful choices made by individuals with regard to melodic tools, stylistic concepts, and genre referencing. The soloists’ concepts and language had obvious and audible variations and differences, which is to be expected, considering the individualism and unique “knowledge base” (Pressing 1998, 53) of each musician. Interestingly, the nature of the material to be improvised over often contained implications to which the soloists naturally conformed. For example, the open groove over a static ‘A’ fundamental in Small Comforts saw all the soloists devise individual approaches. However, they shared a similar connection in that they all had a very strong but singular concept, perhaps mirroring the simplicity and monothematic material comprising the accompaniment in this section. Bukovsky focussed on an exotic modal sound, Oehlers used a chromatic approach, Slater employed a textural/wall of sound approach, Rogers an atonal method, and Magnusson momentarily transformed into a rock ‘n roll guitarist. Integrated amongst these were strong rhythmic approaches and a focus on ‘sounds’. These varying methods altered the mood, intensity and dynamic contrast significantly. For Bernie, on the other hand, perhaps due to the jazz language which the piece itself employs and because of the jazz ‘study’ that formed part of the foundation for five of the six guests, tended to be
approached in a similar fashion, centring around melodic and ‘line’ driven improvisations.

The treatment of the rubato section in *Galumphing Round the Nation* (discussed in Chapter IV) was often quite different. Some approaches are very sparse and gentle while others are full of flourishes. Some soloists refer to the piano melody. Others play it verbatim while the piano improvises. In one version, no one played the written melody. It is interesting to note that this was one of the better concerts (based on the ‘vibe’ and conditions), implying that a more favourable performance context may presuppose a higher degree of improvisation. The effect of these differing approaches is that they simply take the music in a different direction momentarily and force the musicians to re-negotiate and re-evaluate their parts.

Although certain aspects of *The Rain Outside* were similar across all performances (for example, the four bar drum introduction uses sparse and soft cymbals in all but two versions), the improvisational approach and treatment by the guests was extremely varied. Naturally, some performances were more powerful than others. These versions tended to be constructed around the concept of opposing forces, where the soloist and drums worked together to create ideas and followed their own direction, often contradicting that of the composed piece. Again, the individualistic tendencies of the guests came to the fore. In their approaches to this piece, some closed their eyes and responded aurally, others played off the chord symbols and referred to composed fragments. Some chose to play melodically, others gesturally and/or texturally. Many instinctively employed principles of balance and chose to play predominantly in the gaps of the piece. One guest even chose not to improvise at all.
It is interesting to note the similarities between solos on the same piece by the same musician. Two such examples are the development of the piano solo on *The Incredible View* over the performances, and the development of the free improvisation between Ball and Talia which opens *Galumphing Round the Nation*. The latter often has a similar ‘vibe’, a focus on the impending melody, and particular ideas that recur throughout the performances. The former also generates a similar ‘vibe’ in the majority of performances but, in addition, one can hear the slow progression over the course of the tour from diatonicism to the incorporation of chromaticism (as demonstrated on the studio recording).

Favourite phrases, ideas, and concepts can be heard in many of the participants’ playing on repeat performances of the same songs. Hamilton (2000, para. 60) suggests that “the improviser’s successive performances of a song or number constitute a developing work, incrementally altered and never wholly spontaneous”. The results from my own observations support this statement. This notion is also explored in Martin (2002) and Berliner (1994) and includes specific melodic devices that are detected over different songs by a single soloist, forming part of their individual language or personal vocabulary. Hamilton comments on one musician’s attempt to avoid using phrases he had played before:

This aspiration is surely unattainable and fortunately so. An improviser’s individuality precisely resides in, among other things, their creative development of favourite stylistic or structural devices (2000, para. 68).
5. Dynamic Contrast, Intensity, Mood and Balance:

The dynamics of the pieces were typically built into the music and seemed to be consistent throughout. The peaks, in general, occurred during the solos. What did differ was the range between loud and soft (whether broad or limited) and the overall general dynamic of a player and how the AKQ responded to match this. In many cases, despite the variables in dynamics and intensity, the energy of the piece remained consistent. Some soloists are more dynamic than others. For example, Slater is a very dynamic player, often incorporating loud outbursts interspersed among quieter passages. Whereas, the nature of the violin in this context meant the dynamics were less contrasting in general. The AKQ played at a lower volume than usual, reflecting sensitivity to the situation, and instead, variety was achieved through a greater range in the textures employed. It is interesting to note that this sensitivity was sustained throughout the entire performance, not just when Rodgers was playing. For instance, the free introduction to *Galumphing Round the Nation*, which was extremely animated in other concerts, was soft and spacious in this instance.

The mood inherent in the pieces was transferred from guest to guest. It was not articulated verbally, it was an obvious and instinctive part of the music. As many of the guests noted in the personal interviews, one of the challenges for them was to identify the character of each piece and to play accordingly.

The quantitative results from the MIR Matlab Toolbox indicate that dynamics are extremely variable, particularly differing between pieces, and also across concerts. Both of these results were to be expected, the former due to the variety in repertoire and the
latter due to variables in acoustic spaces, instruments used, and individual dynamic levels of the guests. There is a strong, though not perfect, correlation between the entropy of sound onset density (timing) and that of the dynamics measure. This is due to the fact that the entropy of density was measured by detecting the onsets of sounds using an algorithm that measures peaks in the energy spectrum of the audio data, similar to that of measuring the entropy of dynamics. The fact that the correlation is not perfect, however, indicates that the two measures are not redundant but, rather, reflect different qualities of the performances. The graphs below show that the variability of dynamics is generally broader than the scope of density (indicated by the high levels versus low). Furthermore, the variability in entropy for density across concerts and pieces is greater than that of dynamics. These results demonstrate that performance parameters – especially sound density – vary not only between pieces, but also across repeat performances of the same set of pieces. This latter form of variability is most likely due to the influence of each individual guest on the overall group sound.
Figure 3. The relationship between dynamics and timing across twelve concerts.
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Figure 4. The relationship between dynamics and timing across pieces.

![Bar chart showing the relationship between dynamics and timing across pieces.]

(N.B. the thirteenth concert is not included in these graphs because the results were tabulated prior to the final performance and it was deemed that enough information had been gained from the MIR Toolbox program.)
6. Textural Variations and Rhythmic Complexity:

My Old Friend, For Bernie, The Incredible View and Small Comforts all incorporated horn backing lines under the guest soloist; the latter being improvised anew for each performance. The frequency (meaning the amount of choruses on which they occurred) and the intervals at which they occurred (whether consecutive or separated) were not pre-determined and hence variation occurred. The backings occurred in most of the performances, however, the few occasions where they did not occur, were due to a) an acoustic space which was difficult to negotiate and the backings would have made sound issues even more complex, and b) the soloist took a shorter amount of forms than anticipated.

On the whole, textural variations are slight, although aural evaluation of the recordings reveals that a distinct difference in the accompaniment provided by the drums and piano occurs under Rodgers’ violin. The textural fluctuations happen in a less sustained way. The rhythm section appears to create more air in the sound by using lighter articulation in order to lessen the density. Talia employs the use of less cymbals in favour of the toms and uses chop sticks (lighter sticks) as a method of ensuring that the violin is not drowned out. These textural and space adjustments are also especially noticeable on the Bukovsky gig (performance #6) in Llewellyn Hall due to the difficulty of the acoustic environment, which was designed for acoustic classical ensembles, not for the type of ensemble which has a drum kit and uses amplified instruments.

The other notable difference in accompaniment occurs when the guitar becomes part of the ensemble. On the whole, this does not affect the way the piano accompanies
throughout, but noteworthy effects include the piano being able to ‘fill’ more and not being confined to a rigid accompanimental role, which results in the piano often playing less. The other important effect of the guitar’s presence in the ensemble is on the piano solo in *The Incredible View*. Having the guitar provide the rhythmic, harmonic, and structural accompaniment means the piano is given freedom to employ double octave melodies or singular right hand lines with no accompanying left hand.

Rhythmic elements, including complexity, naturally varied to some extent, but there were no outstanding features to report here. However, on a personal note, I found it amusing to observe that on one of the more successful concerts (which pertinently had the best quality piano of the tour) I played my fastest line of all gigs. Not being a speedy piano player in general, this may be construed as evidence of how much context can affect performance.

7. Timbral Quality and Tone Colour:
Variations occurred in timbral quality and tone colour purely because of the changes in instrumentation with the introduction of each new guest. Additionally, subtle changes in timbre and tone colour also occurred because of the different ‘personality’ each new guest injected into the band. Monson (1996, 26) points out that “it is important to remember that there are always musical personalities interacting, not merely instruments or pitches or rhythms”. This is evident in the way Ball and Whitehurst played the horn lines under McGann’s interpretation of *For Bernie*. Their natural instinct is to mimic tone quality by using a gentler and more relaxed tone to match that of McGann’s. The difference between the *AKQ*’s musical response to, say, Oehlers as opposed to McGann
is marked and obvious in the way the ensemble matches the sound and the ‘vibe’ of each of these distinctive musicians and their instruments.

8. Interaction:

Interaction, or a sense of conversation, was identified as a key ingredient to a successful improvisatory performance in many of the interviews conducted. This is reflected in much of the literature on improvisation (Berliner 1994; Cooke & Horn 2002; Monson 1996; Sawyer 2006). The conversation occurs between soloist and rhythm section, and among members of the rhythm section. As Monson explains:

There is an inherent tension within the jazz ensemble between the individual and the group. On the one hand, the aesthetic of the music is centred on the inventiveness and uniqueness of individual solo expression; on the other, climactic moments of musical expression require the cohesiveness and participation of the entire ensemble. In an improvisational music, such as jazz, the interaction between group and individual greatly affects the ultimate composition and development of the music (1996, 66).

If we begin by looking at the accompaniment provided by the rhythm section (in this case drums and piano) it is clearly fixed in terms of form, harmonic structure, and feel. However, as Monson (1996, 82) states “there is a considerable degree of flexibility even in the relatively fixed instrumental roles of the jazz rhythm section”. Therefore, one must acknowledge that there is room within the accompaniment for evolution to some degree. The recordings of the performances, however, show that variation is subtle – a ‘way to play it’ has been settled on (which has been arrived at through non-verbal means). The formation of these ‘ways’ is grounded in intuitive stylistic choices made
collectively by the musicians. Berliner (1994, 383-384) claims that “as artists absorb and share initially improvised patterns, repeating them as components of increasingly consistent routines, the patterns shift subtly from the realm of improvised ideas to that of arranged or precomposed ideas”. This idea of consistency, therefore, was a leading theme audible not only through the development of solos over the span of the concerts, but through accompaniment patterns as well.

Variations in the accompaniment occur in the use of range (with reference to register on the piano and array of tone colours on the drums), dynamics and articulation (some feels are very broken and detached while others are a wall of sound), use of fills, textural variations, and harmonic passing chords and substitutions. The rhythm section is supporting in energy and mood and provides necessary balance as required by the music, rather than merely mirroring ideas. As Monson (1996, 152) argues, “the accompanists can choose to play in a concerted fashion with or in counterpoint to the soloist, or in a more conversational manner among themselves and the soloist”.

Berliner (1994, 405) outlines the problems often faced in collective improvisation from which I surmise that balance is an important device in interaction and responsiveness - a balance between following one’s own path versus complementing the surrounding occurrences, and fulfilling one’s role versus engaging in a conversation. “Within their heightened state of empathy, improvisers not only respond supportively to their cohorts, they also stimulate one another’s conception of new ideas that grow directly out of the group’s unique conversational interplay” (Berliner 1994, 390). The balance between predictability and unpredictability, or “expectation and deviation” as expressed by Dean
(1992, 201), is worth mentioning here. The need to have expectations met some of the time is important for cohesion but must be interspersed with ‘surprises’ in order to keep the music fresh and evolving. Flexibility in employing the above devices is essential to effective accompaniment.

An opportunity for Ball and Whitehurst to interact on an accompaniment level occurred under the guest’s solo on Small Comforts. As reported in Chapter IV, instructions were given to the trumpet and tenor to instigate ad lib horn lines at their discretion under the soloist. These ‘riffs’ took their inspiration from the soloist. Ball and Whitehurst would mimic gestures employed by the soloist, or conversely provide an antithesis.

The Rain Outside displayed great diversity in relation to the degree of interaction between drums and soloist. The extent of dialogue was dependent on the approach and inclination of both the guest and the drummer, Talia, and how they responded to each other. Talia said that the more effortless versions occurred when the strength of conviction from the guest was unmistakable and the improvisation was fearlessly taken in an entirely different direction to that of the accompaniment (personal interview July 14, 2009).

Schutz (1964, 176) states of “co performers” that “either has to foresee by listening to the Other, by pretensions and anticipations, any turn the Other’s interpretation may take and has to be prepared at any time to be leader or follower”. The give and take nature of interplay between the soloist and the rhythm section is fluid, the conception of ideas coming from all areas of the ensemble and intuitively feeding the music, growing and
forming it collectively. Berliner (1994, 349) explains that “every manoeuvre or response by an improviser leaves its momentary trace in the music. By journey’s end, the group has fashioned a composition anew, an original product of their interaction”.

My approach to detailing interaction has been to identify the recurring concepts, surmise a selection of approaches, and emphasise its importance to the creation of contemporary jazz ensemble music. There are many notable moments of interaction audible in the recordings from the Collaborations Tour. I have refrained from trying to textualise them through the use of transcription or a descriptive relaying of events, as I do not believe this will serve the purpose of enhancing the research presented here. I concur with Bailey’s (1980, 15) view that “for the musical theorist there seems to be no description or evaluation without technical analysis which in turn usually relies on transcription and dissection. For the description – or evaluation – of improvisation, formal technical analysis is useless”.

Conclusion

All the musical elements were altered to some extent; as was expected. However, the musical elements that displayed the largest variables were duration, melodic interpretation, improvisational language, dynamics, and density. In a sense the guest stimulated the musical environment purely because of their individuality and the fact that they were new to the equation.
All of the performances display strength and carry a great musical energy despite varying conditions. Any difficulties presented by venues, limited rehearsal time and other factors pertaining to the context were overcome. Only my memory and my journal remind me of the ‘vibe’ or atmosphere associated with each performance, as this is absent from the recorded documentation, however, I acknowledge the inextricability of these memories in analysing the data.

Evidence presented throughout this exegesis indicates that when different improvisers approach the same referent, the results have the potential to be markedly varied. In some ways I have found the differences to be less pronounced than anticipated. Although the pieces I composed for this project seemingly had the potential to be very different from performance to performance, they often are not. The slow development across the performances and the refinement of concepts are clearly audible. Much of the information is built into the music, often eliciting similar intuitive responses from different musicians. There are musical and, more specifically, jazz protocols, which ensure that events happen in a certain way. The structures of the music are confining to some degree, particularly when unfamiliar (as they were for each new guest). These findings have led me to reassess my belief that as improvisers we predominantly improvise, and to question how much is actually improvised.

In the next chapter I explore the notion that familiarity with the material is of more consequence to the idea of ‘freedom’ than the construction of the material itself.
Chapter VI

The Effects of Familiarity, ‘Mistakes’, and “Group Flow”

Introduction

In this chapter I explore noteworthy issues of performance that emerged from the Collaborations Tour and are seen to have a significant impact on the performance of improvised music. I discuss the concept of familiarity and its relevance to the nature of improvisation, consider the art of ‘mistakes’ and their value in improvised music, and report the results of “group flow” as evidenced through this creative project.

Familiarity Versus Unfamiliarity

The belief that all improvisation occurs within reference to familiar structures to some degree has already been established in this exegesis (Chapter II). The parameters of the concept of familiarity include: 1) the familiarity that the AKQ has established among its members; 2) the AKQ’s relative unfamiliarity with the playing styles of the guests; and 3) each musician’s level of familiarity with the referents which formed the repertoire. All three are extremely interrelated and, to some extent, inseparable when contemplating the performance of contemporary jazz ensemble music.

Observations of the music of the Collaborations Tour revealed that, despite its subjection to a gamut of imposed variables, ventures into new areas were less frequent
than expected and the ensemble continually reverted back to established ways of playing. Sawyer (2006, 154) claims that “group creativity isn’t all improvised anew in each performance”. This is partially due to the fact that the pieces have characters, which as an ensemble we instinctively try to match, but is also a result of our basic need for familiarity. Not only do we gravitate towards familiarity as a safe haven, but also it is essential in order to take the “leap” that is required for meaningful improvisation (Lacey, in Bailey 1980, 57). As a springboard for risk taking, familiarity can translate into using more of one’s instrumental register, pursuing ideas over formal constraints, greater dynamic intensity, and courageous interplay. These are just some examples that are audible in the recordings of the Collaborations Tour. Wavering between the familiar and the unfamiliar is a widely acknowledged facet of improvisation (Bailey 1980, 54; Berliner 1994, 216-217).

Aside from providing the path from which to deviate, familiarity enables one to listen more understandingly and, therefore, efficiently to everything that is going on within the ensemble and to react with confidence. Awareness and listening are at optimum levels and form the pre-requisites for group interaction. As Monson (1996, 83) observes “the player must be so thoroughly familiar with the basic framework of the tune that he or she can attend to what everyone else in the band is doing”. Pressing elaborates:

The information content of the referent and the performers’ depth of familiarity with it [have the effect of] free[ing] up more processing resources for perception, control, and interplayer interaction, increasing the chances of reaching a higher artistic level (1998, 52).
The musicians involved in this project articulated the need for familiarity and preparation in the interviews conducted. Although the degrees of preparation varied, the importance the musicians placed on being clear about the music and their part in it was apparent through their rehearsal techniques. Of the various levels of preparation, one guest was so particular as to inquire about which mode/scale I was hearing over a certain chord – not because he intended to play the music that literally, but so that he could understand the implications of my intentions. Yet another chose to approach the performance situation with as little preparation as possible, preferring to arrive at the music with fresh ears and responses. Both approaches produced strong results, the methods chosen being, obviously, very personal and individualistic.

It takes time to become familiar with material (undoubtedly this varies from musician to musician). It also takes time to establish one’s place in an ensemble. This was not afforded in the rehearsal time allotted with the guests, however, the transition from unfamiliar to familiar became evident firstly among the AKQ’s performance over the thirteen concerts and, secondly, over the subsequent performances by each guest. The development and impact of this familiarity culminated in the studio recording. The result is a document which displays that the musicians are clearly familiar and comfortable with the material. With consideration of the entire recorded output of the project, it is obvious that the studio recording elicited greater risk taking and a fresher approach to the pieces. New things were still being discovered in the music and the increased sense of freedom and interaction which occurred in the studio environment reinforces Monson and Pressing’s previous statements. With the level of familiarity that the musicians had achieved with the music and each other by this point; with the luxury of knowing that,
although there is a limit to time, energy and resources, one has the chance to do multiple
takes of the same song; with the absence of a live audience; and in the presence of a
more controllable environment, the ensembles were able to ascend to new heights.

‘Mistakes’ and Their Consequences

The presence of ‘mistakes’ is integral to Gioia’s (2000) “aesthetics of imperfection”, and
any discussion on the nature of improvisation. The occurrence of ‘mistakes’ is inevitable
in spontaneously created/performed music. As Dean (1992, 178) observes “there is no
possibility of removing an element once produced…Rectification has to be retrospective
and cannot be erasive”. Monson (1996, 154) articulates that “‘mistakes’ in jazz
improvisation not infrequently have as their consequence extraordinarily positive,
spontaneous musical events”. Experience has taught me that ‘mistakes’ and
unintentional events are often responsible for the formation of new directions and should
be embraced as being on the threshold of potential. Ralph Peterson (quoted in Monson
1996, 176) explains that ‘mistakes’ “are the most musical moments, because the desire
to compensate for the … mistake … often leads to a special moment in music where
everybody begins to come to the support”. The desire to transform the incident into a
meaningful event is paramount.

Significantly, the nature of a ‘mistake’ changes from the transient space it occupies in
live performance, to the immortal one it inhabits in recording. As Berliner (1994, 474)
suggests “mistakes that passed unnoticed in the heat of live performances can detract
from the music when subjected to repeated hearings”. This perhaps explains why memories of performance often fail to correlate with perceptions of the documentation of performance.

The essence of Gioia’s (2000) “aesthetics of imperfection” is echoed by Monson (1996, 176), who points out that ‘mistakes’ are a by-product of the interactive and risk taking nature of collaborative music. She discusses ways in which ensembles “collectively remedy confusions in performance” (1996, 154). The type of solution is largely dependent on the nature of the ‘mistake’, and it is of no relevance who does the remedying; decisions are made for the best outcome of the music. Berliner observes that:

Within the normal compass of their activities, improvisers must respond creatively to surprises that constantly arise during performances. Unexpected turns of events occur everywhere…Ultimately, the flexibility with which musicians treat repertory and musical arrangements, whether subtly ornamenting or substantially altering their features, enhances the improvisatory spirit of performances (1994, 374).

There are wonderful examples of transforming ‘mistakes’ into aesthetic virtues in the performances of the Collaborations Tour. One such example is Ball’s playing of an accompaniment line on The Incredible View. He enters with a pre-determined phrase in an incorrect bar, and upon realising, instantly begins to improvise with the line until Whitehurst subtly cues him into the correct entry point with the deliberation of his own playing. Having played together as teenagers and nurturing a deep friendship, the musical rapport between Ball and Whitehurst is extraordinary. Over the decade that I have played with them in this ensemble they have frequently amazed me with their
apparent telepathy by playing identical ‘mistakes’ simultaneously, a quality I cherish for its testament to the empathy and trust inherent in profound musical creation.

When unexpected musical events occurred in the performances of the Collaborations Tour, I found that the individuals in the ensemble would intuitively reconsider their parts and roles and adjust the music accordingly. For example, when one guest chose to play relatively conservatively on the improvised section of Galumphing Round the Nation, Whitehurst rose to new heights and dominated the music’s focus. Often the unexpected becomes the key to the differences. The exciting moments are formed when the music is on the edge and one is witnessing the true spirit of improvisation. ‘Mistakes’ therefore, can be seen to form the crux of the “aesthetics of imperfection” and embody the essence of improvisation.

The Results of “Group Flow”

To elaborate on Sawyer’s (2006) concept of “group flow” (Chapter II), the results of this creative project have disclosed that at the times when the ensemble attained this collective state, the audible qualities in the music can be described as having a sense of motion and direction, organic growth or natural flow, and a flexibility in its dedication to the moment. The music appears to be created in an effortless fashion and the boundaries are extended as the group strives to discover new areas together. Yet, there is a quality of control and anticipation. A sense of ensemble cohesion and of creating something together through conversation, dialogue and interaction is present. The journey is
adventurous and playful, the music more dynamic (i.e. has a bigger range), and we manage to find the ‘groove’.

It is important to keep the frequency and duration of moments of “group flow” in perspective. In the words of musician Don Pate (quoted in Berliner 1994, 387), “I’m looking for those few minutes of magic. There is no constant magic”. Moments of ‘magic’ are not necessarily lacking on those performances with less positive associations but they tend to occur with higher frequency on those that are connected to greater feelings of success. A finding of personal significance was that the positive performance experiences were not devoid of messy moments and inaccuracies, but that the ‘vibe’ and enjoyment of the journey far outweighed them and so failed to dampen the spirit and memory of the overall experience. Conversely, the performances that have negative associations in my memory do not necessarily consist of more ‘mistakes’ (in fact, I have found that the perceived outcome of a concert is not affected by the number of ‘mistakes’ or messy sections). Rather, they are afflicted by less group interaction and an absence of engaging in deep communication and conversation with one another.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have detailed the importance and relevance of familiarity to improvised performance and its effect of enhancing broader perception of a musical situation, as well as its contribution to risk taking and a sense of freedom. I have argued that the notion of ‘mistakes’ and their role in the ‘imperfect’ art of improvisation indeed
facilitates invention, and the production of unexpected events, which, in itself is a means of creating excitement, newness, and a higher focus of ensemble attentiveness and improvisatory spirit. I have detailed the effects of “group flow” as is audible in the recorded documentation of this creative project, and conclude that a ‘better’ gig (one with more positive associations) entails frequent occurrences of moments of “group flow”.
Chapter VII

Conclusion

Gauging Musical Success

The qualities which were articulated by the musicians through the personal interviews as methods of gauging success in a musical context included high levels of interaction, a sense of connection within the ensemble and to the audience, a feeling of freedom, enjoyment, attainment of the ‘new’, and the overcoming of challenges.

Each concert managed to capture an essence of depth, connection and memorable moments to some degree. The significance of the different personalities to the music and the performance experience was clearly apparent. I am extremely grateful for the participation of John Rodgers, Bernie McGann, Phil Slater, Miroslav Bukovsky, Stephen Magnusson, and Jamie Oehlers, and deeply value their contribution to the music. I hold each guest’s performance to be of equal value (this study being concerned with noting the differences inherent in individualistic contributions and their effect, not valuing one contribution over another). Nevertheless, there are three concerts that stand out in my memory; the warehouse gig in Sydney with Phil Slater, the Canberra concert with Miroslav Bukovsky, and the Perth Jazz Society gig with Jamie Oehlers. They do so because they share the following elements:

1. The tone and timbre the ensemble was able to produce due to the quality of instruments and the acoustics was aesthetically pleasing (this does not mean it
was at an optimum level, but was pleasurable enough to inspire improvisation and to initiate the desire to play with sound.)

2. The audience was responsive, supportive, encouraging and appreciative.

3. There was a heightened sense of cohesion amongst the ensemble – a mutual and somewhat contagious energy or ‘vibe’ which seemingly transmitted a warrant for risk taking.

All the musicians interviewed felt the project worked and was a great success from a musical perspective. They expressed that the combination of freedom and instruction was in perfect balance for the achievement of creating a meaningful musical experience with the resources allowed.

Summary

I surmise that the inclusion of visitant improvisers affected the AKQ’s interpretation of musical works to a noticeable degree but in a more subtle way than I had envisaged or hoped for as expressed through my journal statement quoted in the introduction to this exegesis. All of the musical elements were intuitively altered through the process of subjecting a set of repertoire, containing a high ratio of improvisation, to varying personnel and contexts. Despite this however, the music did settle into established patterns and similar approaches across the performances of the Collaborations Tour.
The alterations in the interpretation of the pieces that were discovered were found to be
influenced by the following facts:

- Individuality as a central concern to improvisation equated to the guests affecting
  the music simply because they were new to the equation and each brought with
  them a different musical history and set of aesthetics.

- The connection between improvisation and practised/familiar structures (whether
  in reference to individual trends or those of the group as they emerged through
  repeat performances), makes the moments where “anything can happen” a rarity
  rather than the norm.

- Familiarity with the music itself and amongst the musicians of the ensemble
  affected levels of freedom and risk taking.

- Interaction as a major component of group improvisation meant that the
  interrelationships between the various individuals doubtlessly produced differing
  results.

- Improvisation as inextricably linked to its context is, by definition, unpredictable
  and unable to be fabricated. The effect of the contextual variables on the music
  cannot be denied. Although, perhaps due to a sense of professionalism, the
  variability is not acutely pronounced.

Due to the nature of improvisation and interacting with different individuals, it seems
obvious that the music would differ, and although the differences of interpretation can
be audibly perceived, due to the restrictions of improvisation and the music itself,
including style, habits (those of the individual and those established by the group), and
accepted protocols, the pieces themselves were not as significantly altered or reinvented as initially anticipated.

I have concluded that the reasons for this can be found in a) the compositions themselves, b) the approach instigated by myself as leader of the project, and c) the level of familiarity with the pieces and with the musicians in the ensemble. The compositions were restrictive in that the structures were concretely established, and as the leader I did not set up a precedent to freely experiment with tempos and feels, or instigate abandoning the predetermined structure in favour of the moment. As familiarity increased through repeat performances, however, higher levels of risk taking are evident. The symbiotic nature of improvised to composed elements ensured that the pieces inspired certain ways of playing by the guests. Conversely, the improvisatory idiosyncrasies of each guest affected the way the AKQ interpreted the music. Generally speaking, however, I feel that the compositions were more restrictive than the guests were liberating. Perhaps if the Collaborations Tour had involved a higher concentration of performances, the results would differ in this respect.

Reflection

The process of undertaking this research has deepened my understanding of improvisation and its role in the intricate and often intuitive workings of a contemporary jazz ensemble. Importantly, it has led me to question and reassess some of my own beliefs and assumptions about the creation of referent-based improvised music. Particularly, in recognising that habits personify the individual, as do collectively
formed ones distinguish an ensemble, I now view my original intention of the music being “entirely different” at each performance as being somewhat unrealistic.

This new awareness has brought to the fore my need to re-address how I choose to lead my ensemble, and what information and in what manner I present this to the musicians performing my music. This research has further illuminated for me that there is still much exploration to be done into methods of creating a nourishing environment in which improvising musicians can converse in musical dialogue. In my aim for a freer and more open compositional approach, I believe it is essential to continue experimenting with different structural considerations, but mainly to set a standard of “going with the flow”, creating an expectation to follow the soloist or the moment rather than the pre-structured elements of the composition, and to lead by example in this regard. Perhaps a more realistic view of the notion that “anything can happen” in improvisation is for the expectation to simply be that substantial moments of surprise may happen but they will be rare occurrences rather than the norm.

The “group-think and deconstructivist aesthetic” for which the Wayne Shorter Quartet is renowned, and the concept of simultaneous ‘solos’ which they explore, making the distinctions between accompaniment and solo decidedly ambiguous, are a continuing inspiration for me. As are the improvisational and leadership approaches of both Wayne Shorter and Miles Davis, who have compounded my belief that ‘less is more’ when posing instructions to improvisers and that the power of leading by example cannot be underestimated. In my bid to create referents that invite individualistic approaches by the performing musicians, I find particular inspiration in the following statement by
Miles Davis, where he claims that “what I wanted would come out of a process and not some prearranged stuff” (quoted in Smith 1998, 262). I am extremely indebted to my long-term colleagues Eugene Ball, Ian Whitehurst and Joe Talia, for their courageous approach to playing my music and their enthusiasm for the process we undertake in its creation. I feel very fortunate for their continued commitment to discovering the possibilities within the AKQ.

In comparing the six pieces of the Collaborations Tour to my previous and post work, it is interesting to note that the compositions under discussion in this exegesis are, on the whole, undoubtedly more conservative, prescriptive, and structured. As I observed in Chapter IV, my desire to impose a fail-safe cohesive quality on the music, given the circumstances under which it was to be performed, resulted in me over-composing the works in a sense. This is evidence of my underlying need to control the performance situation as a way of ensuring musical success. The production of this creative work forms part of an ongoing lesson for me in surrendering control and embracing the unknown.

Despite my own misgivings about the music I composed for this creative project, I recognise that the pieces were befitting the circumstances, and that I succeeded in creating an environment whereby the AKQ was able to create enjoyable and meaningful music within a contemporary original jazz context, inviting some of the highest regarded improvisers in Australia to ‘sit in’ with us, to the fundamental satisfaction of all. In this sense I see the Collaborations Tour as a resounding success.
Appendix A

Musical Scores

My Old Friend

For Bernie

Galumphing Round the Nation

The Rain Outside

The Incredible View

Small Comforts

All compositions by Andrea Keller (Meagher)

Arranged for the Andrea Keller Quartet with special guest
My Old Friend

Concert Score
Andrea Keller

\[ q=138 \]

\( \text{ten. sax} \)

\( \text{trp} \)

\[ q=138 \]

\( \text{piano} \)

drums - set up straight groove
tacet first time. Comp - Melody as cue only

\( \text{guest} \)
(tacet)
backings on cue

22

B♭/F A/F × G/F F♯7/F ×

take last solo

28

Ab Maj♯5 × × × Fsus ×

34

Gm/F C/F Gm/F C/F ×

Gm/F C/F Gm/F C/F ×
39

open

Breakdown/Cadenza

cue breakdown

solo cadenza

43

RUBATO

continue improvising

(trp & tnr phrases)
Fm6  F#7  G7#9  Abm(maj7)  Am11  Aø

D7b9  G6  Abm  D#7#11
rit.

37

D7#11

C#7sus

C#7b9

rit.

D7#11

C#7sus

C#7b9

Backings on cue

Solo

43

F#m6

Em7

EMaj

F#m6

Em7

EMaj
after last solo DC al Coda

(Cue chords)
Galumphing Round the Nation

Concert Score

Andrea Keller

Tenor Saxophone

Trumpet in B♭

free improv between drums & trumpet

Piano

piano tacet 1st time. Comp - melody as cue only

Guest

improvise on sign

---

Ten. Sax.

Tpt.

Pno.

Guest

FMaj7  F♯sus4  G
8

Ten. Sax.

94

Tpt.

Pno.

G♭\text{G} \quad A^6 \quad B/D^♯ \quad A/C^♯

12

Ten. Sax.

Tpt.

piano enter

Pno.

Guest

Bm \quad B♭ \quad E♭\text{Maj} \quad Am \quad A♭ \quad D♭\text{Maj}
Rubato

Ten. Sax.

Tpt.

Pno.

Guest

improvise freely

Rubato

Ten. Sax.

Tpt.

Pno.

Guest

improvise freely
70

Ten. Sax.

Tpt.

Pno.

Guest

DbMaj  Gm  F#Maj  F#Maj+

DbMaj  Gm  F#Maj  F#Maj+

(continue improvising)

74

Ten. Sax.

Tpt.

Pno.

Guest

Bm  Bb  EbMaj  Am

(continues)

Bm  Bb  EbMaj  Am

bring in time gradually

Bm  Bb  EbMaj  Am

(continue improvising)

Bm  Bb  EbMaj  Am

(continue)

Bm  Bb  EbMaj  Am

(improvise with guest & then play melody as cue to $)

Bm  Bb  EbMaj  Am

Bm  Bb  EbMaj  Am

(continue)

Bm  Bb  EbMaj  Am

(improvise with tenor & then play melody as cue to $)
78  AbMaj  DbMaj  Gm  F#Maj
Ten. Sax.

Tpt.

Pno.

Guest

82  F#Maj+  F#Maj#11  open

DS+2. al FINE

Ten. Sax.

Tpt.

Pno.

Guest

DS+2. al FINE
open
improvise freely with drums

play time and improvise/interact with soloist

Copyright 2009
70
improvise to end

110
improvise to end
To Coda

13

To Coda

Fill

17
35

41

backings on cue

Solo
A¨sus
GØ
F#Maj#11
F#Maj#11
B¨m
F#Maj#11
A¨sus
GØ
F#Maj#11
F#Maj#11
B¨m
5
18

23

dr set up
groove

26

31
(horns ad lib backings under guest’s solo)
open

solo
35

G E

G E

G E

G E

G E

C C

On Cue

B♭/A A

C

B♭/A A

(improvise- melody as cue only)
(end improvising)
Eugene's Solo

%62

\[ D \]

\[ D^b \quad B \quad A_{b7} \]

\[ D \]

\[ D^b \quad B \quad A_{b7} \]

\[ dr & pno similie... \]

%66

\[ D \]

\[ D^b \quad B \quad A_{b7} \]

\[ \]

%70

\[ D \]

\[ D \quad A \quad B \quad D \quad A \quad B \]

\[ D \]

\[ D \quad A \quad B \quad D \quad A \quad B \]

%74

\[ D \]

\[ D / C^b \quad C^6 \]

\[ D \]

\[ D / C^b \quad C^6 \]

%78

\[ D^b \quad B \quad A_{b7} \]

\[ D^b \quad B \quad A_{b7} \]
E

102

E

B♭

D/F♯

G

comp freely - melody as cue only

E

106

E7sus9

D/F♯

G
Half Time (\(j=\frac{3}{4}\))

114

A/E  Bo/F  DMaj7/F#  G  G  E/B
Appendix B

Analysis of the Pieces and their Performances

My Old Friend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dr Intro</th>
<th>Head 1</th>
<th>Head 2</th>
<th>Solo 1</th>
<th>Solo 2 (opt)</th>
<th>Breakdown</th>
<th>Cadenza</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Melodic content</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trp &amp; tnr 2-part melody</td>
<td>Trp &amp; tnr 2-part melody</td>
<td>Not prescribed</td>
<td>Not prescribed</td>
<td>Not prescribed</td>
<td>Not prescribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Harmonic Content</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>F Pedal</td>
<td>F Pedal</td>
<td>F Pedal</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accomp-paniment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drums</td>
<td>Piano &amp; Drums</td>
<td>Piano &amp; Drums</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>2-part horn figures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length</strong></td>
<td>8 Bars</td>
<td>20 Bars</td>
<td>20 Bars</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>Open/Free time</td>
<td>Rubato</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Duration:** 6:00 – 9:10. Depending on whether there was one soloist or two.

**Tempo:** Variations range from crotchet = 148 - 168 but the majority were steady between 152 – 160.

**Form/Structure:** This is prescribed and includes head, solos, breakdown and cadenza.

Although the length of the drum intro was not prescribed, it was 8 bars long for twelve out of thirteen performances.

‘Optional fifth part’: There are no written melodies, the soloist is just required to improvise throughout.

**Melodies and Backings:** These are prescribed. Backings occurred on ten of the thirteen performances, anywhere from one to three times, sometimes in succession, sometimes not. The three performances where they did not occur were either in a difficult acoustic space where the backings would have made sound issues even more complex, or when
the soloist only took three forms (a lot shorter than anticipated).

**Solos:** are improvised (including length). The length ranges from three choruses to eight with most around five - seven. The solo form is the same as that of the head.

**Breakdown:** The length ranged from 13secs to 1:50. The details of this section were unspecified, but the majority of approaches were to stay with the final tonality of the form. Less common was to use the ideas present in the form loosely and also to play freely with no reference to the previous harmonic content.

**Cadenza/Outro:** The solo cadenza linking the breakdown to the outro was optional. Solo cadenzas occurred in half the performances and the length varied. The outro is based around phrases of the initial melody played rubato by trumpet and tenor saxophone, over which the guest continues to improvise. This section has room for variation, particularly in the length and the intervals at which the horn lines occur. Length ranges from 54secs to 2:10. In half the performances the breaks between the horn phrases of the outro were quite big, leaving room for the soloist to treat this section as a real cadenza. In the other half they occurred in quick succession.

**Dynamics:** The energy of the piece is quite consistent throughout the performances but there are differences in dynamic range. Some guests use the full range of dynamics in their playing, from very soft to very loud. Others are loud to even louder and some are quite consistent at a medium volume with wavy peaks and troughs.

**Minutes of composed-improvised:** Taken from performance #11.

(Note: this version includes 2 soloists which is indicative of half the versions.)

1:14 minutes - composed (head)

6:20 minutes - improvised (solos over form)

1:02 minutes - both (this involves a cadenza over written lines)
This occurs chronologically as stated.

Total duration: 8:35

**For Bernie**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Head</th>
<th>Solo1</th>
<th>Solo2</th>
<th>Head</th>
<th>Coda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Melodic Content</strong></td>
<td>Prescribed</td>
<td>Indeterminate. Guest</td>
<td>Indeterminate. Either trumpet or tenor</td>
<td>Prescribed</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Harmonic Content</strong></td>
<td>f# minor predominantly</td>
<td>f# minor predominantly</td>
<td>f# minor predominantly</td>
<td>f# minor predominantly</td>
<td>3 chords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accompaniment</strong></td>
<td>Pno &amp; dr with horn backings</td>
<td>Pno &amp; dr with optional horn backings</td>
<td>Pno &amp; dr with optional horn backings</td>
<td>Pno &amp; dr with horn backings</td>
<td>Pno &amp; dr with horn backings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length</strong></td>
<td>38 Bars</td>
<td>Generally 56 Bars (2x28)</td>
<td>Generally 56 Bars (2x28)</td>
<td>36 Bars</td>
<td>3 Bars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Duration:** 6:40 – 11. Depending on whether there was one soloist or two.

**Tempo:** Variations range from crotchet = 69 – 84 with most at the 76 – 80 mark.

**Form/Structure:** This is very much prescribed. The head is divided into four sections.


‘Optional fifth part’: The head is played by the guest. Trumpet and tenor play accompaniment lines.

**Melodies and Backings:** These are prescribed. The horn lines always occur on the second chorus of the guest’s solo, except for the Canberra concert, where they do not occur at all (this was a difficult acoustic space), and when one guest takes three forms, the horns re-enter again halfway through the third form.

**Solos:** These are improvised. The form employs fairly functional harmony. All solos go for two choruses except one instance which goes for three and one which goes only for
one. The solo form varies slightly from the head – it is 28 bars long and divided into A: 16 bars & B: 12 bars.

**Cadenza/Outro:** This occurs over three pause chords which the guest improvises over. There is room for variation here; however, all have similar approaches. Length ranges from 26-53secs.

**Dynamics:** The song has inbuilt dynamics to a certain degree. Again, some guests are more dynamic than others and other factors of context can affect this, such as, acoustics of the space, sound on stage etc.

**Minutes of composed-improvised:** Taken from performance #4

3:55 minutes - composed (head)

5:28 minutes - improvised (solos)

0:27 minutes - both (this involves a cadenza over written lines)

Distributed as follows:

2:07 minutes - composed

5:28 minutes - improvised

1:48 minutes - composed

0:27 minutes - both

Total duration: 9:50
## Galumphing Round the Nation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Melodic Content</th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Head</th>
<th>Duo</th>
<th>Head</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free improvisation between trumpet &amp; drums. To be at the tempo of the piece.</td>
<td>Two horns taking turns at playing melody/accompaniment</td>
<td>A counter melody to the improvisation is notated</td>
<td>Two horns &amp; optional soloist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Harmonic Content</th>
<th>Open</th>
<th>Shifting</th>
<th>Shifting</th>
<th>Shifting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accompaniment</th>
<th>Piano &amp; Drums</th>
<th>Piano, Rubato</th>
<th>Piano &amp; Drums</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Indeterminate</th>
<th>76 Bars</th>
<th>Open</th>
<th>56 Bars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Duration: 7:00-9:19. Depending on the length of the introduction and the tempo.

### Tempo: Minim = 108 - 152. Initially most were up at the 152 mark. The seventh performance was at 108 and was a conscious decision to try it a lot slower, the subsequent versions ranged between 112 – 132. Because of the ritardandos, the rubato section, and the gradual reintroduction of time into the head out, the tempo fluctuates a lot in this piece. The vast majority of the time the head out is not at the same tempo as the piece began.

### Form/Structure: This is prescribed.

The head in can be broken into the following sections. A1: 10 bars – B1: 10 bars – A2: 10 bars – B2: 15 bars – C: 5 bars – B3: 26 bars.

The D section is an open, rubato duo between piano and guest. The form is prescribed except for the last 10 bars of the section which has an open repeat (Whitehurst joins the guest improvising in this section). A guide of the piano part is notated and chord symbols are provided. Both are given to the guest who is instructed to improvise over the top – A: 10 bars – B2: 15 bars – C: 5 bars – B3: 26 bars.

The guest is given the option to continue improvising over the head out which is similar to that of the head in, minus A1 & B1.
**Melodies:** These are prescribed. There are no backings as such.

**Solos:** These are built into the through-composed form as improvised sections of indeterminate length.

1) **Introduction:** Free improvisation between trumpet and drums ranges from 1:33 – 3:15.
These generally have a similar approach, there is interaction between the two players and reference is made to the impending melody. Some improvisations are gentler and more spacious while others are quite intense and energetic.

2) **Rubato section between piano and guest:** has room for variation. All are of a similar length. Some guests refer to the piano melody. Others play it verbatim while the piano improvises. Some are very sparse and gentle, others full of flourishes. In one version no one plays the written melody.

**Head Out:** There is room for variation in that there are instructions to the guest to ‘fill’ or continue to improvise. In half the performances, the guests take up the invitation to improvise over the head, in the other half – they prefer to play the melody and act as a part of the horn section.

**Dynamics:** An energetic piece overall. The sections have distinct moods which dictate dynamics to some extent. There are tamer performances and more contrasting ones.

**Minutes of composed-improvised:** Taken from performance #8.

6:03 minutes - improvised (3:06 of that is free, the remainder is over a set harmonic structure)

2:26 minutes - composed

Distributed as follows:

3:06 minutes - improvised (free)

1:19 minutes - composed
2:57 minutes - improvised
1:07 minutes - composed
Total duration: 8:29

**The Rain Outside**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Drum introduction</th>
<th>Piece</th>
<th>Outro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melodic Content</td>
<td></td>
<td>Guest improvises with drums</td>
<td>Guest improvises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonic Content</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shifting</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompaniment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Piano, trumpet &amp; tenor largely homophonic</td>
<td>Not prescribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>4 Bars</td>
<td>69 Bars (40, 29)</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Duration**: 4:40 – 7:50. The vast majority are between 4:40 – 5:45. The performance which lasted 6:15 was the slowest at crotchet = 46 and the longest performance which lasted 7:50 included a three minute improvisation by violinist John Rodgers at the end.

**Tempo**: Variations range from crotchet = 46 – 63. The tempos are quite evenly scattered within this range.

**Form/Structure**: This is very much prescribed.

‘**Optional fifth part**’: The guest is given the written score with approximated chord symbols included, and instructed to improvise freely, interacting with the drums.

**Melodies and backings**: Piano, trumpet and saxophone parts are notated for the entire piece. Drums are instructed to provide time and improvise/interact with the soloist.

**Ending**: This has room for variation. After the final chord of the piece is held, guests and drums are given permission to continue to play. Most endings range between 13-23secs and have piano, trumpet & tenor holding a long note while the drums and soloist play some sort of repetitive figure. The seventh performance has an ending that goes for
over three minutes and involves a free improvisation between the guest and the drums to end.

**Dynamics:** These are prescribed very specifically, however, in some performances the dynamics are more pronounced. Often the drums & soloist follow the dynamics of their own direction, rather than those played by the three notated parts. Sometimes the dynamics are at their extremes, and at other times, their use is very soft and subtle.

**Minutes of composed-improvised:**

The average length of this piece is approximately 5 minutes, and the treatment is simultaneously improvised and composed.

---

**The Incredible View**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Piano Introduction</th>
<th>Head</th>
<th>Solo 1</th>
<th>Solo 2</th>
<th>Head</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melodic Content</td>
<td></td>
<td>Melody is shared among the 3 horns</td>
<td>Not prescribed. Guest</td>
<td>Not prescribed. Piano</td>
<td>Melody is shared among the 3 horns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonic Content</td>
<td>F#sus</td>
<td>Shifting</td>
<td>Shifting</td>
<td>Shifting</td>
<td>Shifting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompaniment</td>
<td>Piano &amp; drums</td>
<td>Piano &amp; drums with optional horn backings</td>
<td>Piano &amp; drums with optional horn backings</td>
<td>Piano &amp; drums</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>8 Bars</td>
<td>40 Bars</td>
<td>34 or 68 Bars</td>
<td>34 or 68 Bars</td>
<td>32 Bars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Duration:** 7:30 - 12:20. Dependent on how many forms the two soloists take. These tended to be a minimum of one or a maximum of two each.

**Tempo:** This varied between crotchet = 63 - 80, but mainly was at 72.

**Form/Structure:** This is prescribed.

The head in is 40 bars long and is divided into three sections which are all very closely related. A: 12 bars – B: 14 bars – C: 14 bars.
‘Optional fifth part’: When not playing the melody, the guest is given chord symbols in order to fill and improvise at specific instances. Not everyone takes up the invitation to improvise here, although two-thirds do.

**Melodies and Backings:** These are prescribed. The horn lines are played at the discretion of Ball and Whitehurst, either in the first or second chorus, or just for half a chorus.

**Solos:** These are improvised and the length is not prescribed. The solo form is almost identical to that of the head, except the final 6 bars of the form are left off. A: 12 bars - B: 14 bars – C: 8 bars.

The guest takes the first solo and the piano takes the second. Early on in the tour we experimented with collective versions of the solo(s) but this proved to be unsuccessful.

**Head Out:** This is an abridged version of the head in. A: 12 bars – B: first 10 bars – C: last 10 bars.

**Ending:** This is not set in concrete - whether to rit or vamp and fade - but all are fairly similar, with a slight rit and a pause/linger on the last chord.

**Dynamics:** These are built into the piece. All versions have lots of waves.

**Minutes of composed-improvised:** Taken from performance #7.

4:24 minutes - composed (heads)

3:41 minutes - improvised (solos)

Distributed as follows:

2:28 minutes - composed

3:41 minutes - improvised

1:56 minutes - composed

Total duration: 8:05
### Small Comforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Melodic Content</th>
<th>Horn Introduction</th>
<th>Solo 1</th>
<th>Head 1</th>
<th>Solo 2</th>
<th>Head 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-part melody. Rubato</td>
<td>Not prescribed. Guest</td>
<td>Prescribed 2-part melody with guest improvising</td>
<td>Not prescribed. Trumpet</td>
<td>Prescribed 2-part melody with guest doubling melody</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonic Content</td>
<td>A Major</td>
<td>A Major</td>
<td>Db Major</td>
<td>A Major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompaniment</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Piano &amp; Drums with ad lib horn lines</td>
<td>Piano &amp; Drums</td>
<td>Piano &amp; Drums</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>30 Bars</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>23 Bars</td>
<td>52 Bars</td>
<td>27 Bars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Duration:** 6:05 - 7:40. Variation occurred in the length of Solo 1. The introduction, although rubato, goes for between 1:22 – 1:34.

**Tempo:** Variations range from crotchet = 168 - 184. One-third is at 168, one-third at 176 and one-third at 184.

**Form/Structure:** This is through-composed and prescribed. The introduction and both heads are based on closely linked melodic material.

‘Optional fifth part’: The guest is mainly asked to improvise, except when doubling the melody on the head out.

**Melodies and Backings:** Melodies are prescribed but backings provided by trumpet and tenor are improvised and instigated by Ball. They generally played between two - three riffs under the guest, (although sometimes one and on one occasion four). On a couple of occasions they didn’t play any. This was under the violin when balance was an issue, and when Ball was unable to perform.

**Solos:** These are improvised. The length of the first solo ranges from 1:52 - 3:46. The form consists of a concert ‘A’ groove for indeterminate length. Then at piano’s whim, a
4 bar fixed progression is inserted before a return to the concert ‘A’ groove for indeterminate length. This cycle repeats.

The second solo is of fixed length and utilises a different harmonic progression and key to the previous.

**Dynamics:** Apart from the introduction, this is a loud piece in general, with the volume varying across the performances.

**Minutes of composed-improvised:** Taken from performance #10.

3:10 minutes - composed in total

4:04 minutes - improvised in total

Distributed as follows:

1:35 minutes - composed

2:55 minutes - improvised

0:30 minutes - composed

1:09 minutes - improvised

1:05 minutes - composed

Total duration: 7:14
Appendix C

Formation and Evolution of the Repertoire

The order in which the pieces were composed was:

*My Old Friend*
*For Bernie* (for Bernie McGann)
*Small Comforts*
*The Incredible View* (for Stephen Magnusson)
*The Rain Outside* (for John Rodgers and Phil Slater)
*Galumphing Round the Nation*

Details of the evolution of the pieces are as follows:

*My Old Friend* had two drafts before settling on the final version. The first had the coda as the introduction; had the guest playing the melody and had no specific chords notated for the head or the solo section, just indicated an F pedal to an Ab pedal and then back again to F. The second draft is almost identical to the final draft except for some refinements of notation and instructions. It is minus the horn backings under the guest’s solo.

*For Bernie* also had two drafts before settling on the current version. There were minimal alterations between them.
The first draft had no coda and extra accompaniment notes in the tenor part.

The second draft is complete except for the horn backings under the guest’s solo. As the performances progressed, the treatment of the ritardando at the end of the first head and the pauses in the cadenza/coda were fine tuned to make it more practical.

*Galumphing Round the Nation* had three drafts before the final. Initially it was titled *Not me, Nor I.*

The first draft had no indications for the guest, aside from the main melody written as a cue. It also did not include a free introduction or chord symbols and the form was incomplete. There was no rubato section or open blowing section in the middle. The piano part had not been decided upon either.

The second draft saw the inclusion of the free improvisation between Ball and Talia, chord symbols, indications when the piano should play and not, the form was now complete with rubato section etc, still there was no part for the guest.

The third draft involved simply fine tuning some registers for the horns; the name was changed to *Galumphing Round the Nation.* There was still no part for the guest; this only appeared in the final draft.

*The Rain Outside* began as a random pitch piece.

In the first draft I had assigned many ‘rules’ to abide by. These included that if the combination of notes struck by the ensemble was ‘consonant’, these notes must be repeated for the next chord. This must then be followed by a large interval. If the chord struck was ‘dissonant’, the next move must either be up or down by a semitone. It was always envisaged that the guest would play freely over the top.
In the second draft I assigned pitches and parts to the original rhythm and lengthened the form. This draft used the random pitch piece as its introduction.

The third draft is very close to the final version but without the dynamics, chord symbols and the inclusion of the 4 bar drum introduction.

_The Incredible View_ had three drafts.

The first draft simply entailed the head. There was no solo form and the harmony parts were incomplete at this stage.

The second draft was more complete but incorporated a full head out and over utilised the tenor.

The third draft was a further tuning of the second, with more space in the horns and a shorter head out. The piano introduction became part of the form as the tour progressed. (I had actually done another version post the final draft, but we never played it and I just came to terms with the arrangement we had).

_Small Comforts_ only had two drafts before the final.

The first draft included an open section which instructed the piano and drums to develop an improvisation through using rhythm and space. The second section was not present in this version. The guest was given chord symbols from start to finish, implying that they could play whatever they felt, whenever they liked. I had written a rhythmic figure for the backing figures with a note to use random pitches.

The form was complete by the second draft but the guest’s part needed fine tuning as did some registers, repeats and doubling of parts and tacets. The guest was also being asked to improvise over the 2 horn introduction. This was omitted in the final version.
It is worth noting that aside from *Galumphing Round the Nation* and *The Rain Outside*, the tempo indications on the charts are very different to the tempos we performed the tunes at.

The differences between the quartet versions versus those with the ‘optional fifth part’

Early on in the creative development sessions it was decided that the best way to tackle the ‘optional fifth part’ was to write two versions of each piece – a quartet version and a quintet one. Some pieces display more variation between the two versions than others. Below is a description of the differences.

*My Old Friend* has little difference, as the guest is only required to improvise. In the quartet version the piano plays the cadenza and improvises on the outro.

*For Bernie* has the guest playing the entire head and the trumpet and tenor playing accompaniment lines. In the quartet version the tenor plays the melody for the first section of the head while the trumpet plays backing figures, then the trumpet plays the melody for the rest (including the cadenza) while the tenor plays the accompaniment lines.

*Galumphing Round the Nation*. The guest doubles the melody in certain parts, fills over other parts and takes the duo solo with piano, which builds into a trading section with
Whitehurst. The guest is invited to improvise over the head out. In the quartet version, Whitehurst plays the duo with piano and there is no trading. For the remainder of the arrangement, the trumpet and tenor play their written parts as usual.

*The Rain Outside* has little difference between the two versions. The guest improvises with the drums while the horns and piano play a written part. In the quartet version, only the drums improvise over the written part played by the horns and piano.

*The Incredible View* sees the melody being shared among the guest and the trumpet and tenor, with the majority of the phrases being relegated to the guest. The tenor and trumpet play accompaniment lines and the guest is at times instructed to fill. In the quartet version the melody and accompaniment lines are shared between the trumpet and tenor. There are no instructions to fill.

*Small Comforts* has the guest improvising over the first solo section and then continuing to improvise over the two horn melody which follows this. The guest then doubles the tenor melody in the climactic section towards the end. They are also provided with chord symbols, offering the option to embellish. The only difference in the quartet version is that Whitehurst takes the first solo.
Appendix D

Collaborations Tour Details

1. Monday 23\textsuperscript{rd} February 2009 @ Lebowski’s 303 Melbourne
   Guest - Stephen Magnusson (guitar).
   Venue - Small intimate bar with Nord electro keyboard.

2. Sunday 8\textsuperscript{th} March 2009 @ Bennetts Lane Jazz Club Melbourne
   Guest - Stephen Magnusson (guitar).
   Venue - Medium sized jazz club with baby grand piano.

3. Tuesday 10\textsuperscript{th} March 2009 @ The Excelsior Hotel Jazzgroove Sydney
   Guest - Phil Slater (trumpet).
   Venue - Small pub band room with Rhodes keyboard.

4. Wednesday 11\textsuperscript{th} March 2009 @ 505 Sydney
   Guest - Phil Slater (trumpet).
   Venue - Intimate warehouse space with grand piano.

5. Thursday 12\textsuperscript{th} March 2009 @ Wollongong Conservatorium
   Guest - Phil Slater (trumpet).
   Venue - Medium sized room with grand piano.
6. Friday 13\textsuperscript{th} March 2009 @ \textit{Llewellyn Hall ANU} Canberra
   
   Guest - Miroslav Bukovsky (trumpet).
   
   Venue - Large Concert Hall with grand piano.

7. Sunday 5\textsuperscript{th} April 2009 @ \textit{Brisbane Jazz Club}
   
   Guest - John Rodgers (violin).
   
   Venue - Medium sized room with grand piano.

8. Monday 27\textsuperscript{th} April 2009 @ \textit{Perth Jazz Society}
   
   Guest - Jamie Oehlers (tenor saxophone).
   
   Venue - Large room with grand piano.

9. Saturday 2\textsuperscript{nd} May @ \textit{Uptown Jazz Café} Melbourne
   
   Guest - Bernie McGann (alto saxophone).
   
   Venue - Medium sized room with Nord Electro keyboard.

10. Saturday 23\textsuperscript{rd} May @ \textit{Uptown Jazz Café} Melbourne
    
    Guest - Miroslav Bukovsky (trumpet).
    
    Venue - Medium sized room with Nord Electro keyboard.

11. Friday 3\textsuperscript{rd} July @ \textit{Uptown Jazz Café} Melbourne
    
    Guest - Jamie Oehlers (tenor saxophone).
    
    Venue - Medium sized room with Nord Electro keyboard.
12. Friday 10\textsuperscript{th} July @ \textit{Uptown Jazz Café} Melbourne

   Guest - Stephen Magnusson (guitar).

   Venue - Medium sized room with Nord Electro keyboard.

13. Friday 11\textsuperscript{th} September @ \textit{Sydney Opera House Studio}

   Guest - Bernie McGann (alto saxophone).

   Venue - Large space with grand piano.

Prior to the first two concerts of the \textit{Collaborations Tour}, the \textit{AKQ} went through an intensive creative development period with the six sketches. This included five rehearsals and three gigs as a quartet and then an additional two rehearsals which involved the first guest, Stephen Magnusson.

The dates of these were:

10\textsuperscript{th} January 2009 – Quartet rehearsal

16\textsuperscript{th} January 2009 – Quartet rehearsal

16\textsuperscript{th} January 2009 - gig @ Uptown Jazz Café, Melbourne

19\textsuperscript{th} January 2009 – Quartet rehearsal

23\textsuperscript{rd} January 2009 – Quartet rehearsal

23\textsuperscript{rd} January 2009 - gig @ Uptown Jazz Café, Melbourne

30\textsuperscript{th} January 2009 - gig @ Uptown Jazz Café, Melbourne

31\textsuperscript{st} January 2009 – Rehearsal with Stephen Magnusson

7\textsuperscript{th} February 2009 – Rehearsal with Stephen Magnusson

19\textsuperscript{th} February 2009 – Quartet rehearsal
Concerts three through thirteen were each preceded by a brief rehearsal with the guest artist. In preparation for this, the guests were sent the charts and a recording of the music as played by the AKQ at the early Uptown gigs.

Each of the performances (with the exception of the The Excelsior Hotel Jazzgroove gig) opened with a set of older material from the AKQ without the special guest.
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