

Issues with Music and Sciences

Final Writing Assignment

David John Baker, Ph.D.

Winter, 2020

E-mail: davidjohnbaker1@gmail.com
Office Hours: Friday 13:00-14:00 UTC
Language: English

Web: [issues_with_music_and_sciences](#)
Class Hours: Tuesday 16:00-18:00
Class Room: Zoom

Overview

Over the course of the last term, we have been surveying and critiquing the problems, solutions, and difficulties that arise when questions about music are investigated with scientific methods. We have seen a diverse array of topics ranging from the philosophy of science, to the perception of music, and we will still cover topics ranging from music and emotion to more applied topics such as music and artificial intelligence.

For your final, you will critique a paper of your choosing that demonstrates your ability to critically assess the problems, solutions, and difficulties associated with answering questions about music with scientific methods.

The goal of this final assignment is give you the time, support, and structure needed to articulate your own views and opinions on a small piece of the music science literature. After completing the assignment you will:

1. have a document that serves as proof of your learning and growth as a critical thinker and
2. feel comfortable talking about your topic of choosing with an expert in the field you are critiquing.

You will be assessed using the attached **rubric**. I have additionally provided a template you can follow to help structure your ideas as well as an example outline that you should feel free to use. Scientific writing can be largely formulaic and there is nothing wrong with borrowing the general structure of text that you find clear to read. That said, borrowing the content and structure of another and passing it off as your own without reference is plagiarism.

Structure

In order to take the stress off of organizing the paper so you can focus your attention on the content, below I provide a general outline for the paper and several motivating questions you can use to help guide your paper. An example is also provided for your benefit.

1. Select broad empirical area of interest

- music and ... emotions, neuroscience, memory, artificial intelligence, cognitive abilities

2. Browse papers by journals withing the field in order to select paper a that you find meaningful

- Browse by journal
 - *Psychology of Music*
 - *Music Perception*
 - *Journal of New Music Research*
 - *Music and Science*
 - *Empirical Musicology Review*
 - *Proceedings of International Society of Music Information Retrieval*
 - *Journal of Research in Music Education*
 - *Musicae Scientae*
 - *Psychomusicology: Music, Mind, and Brain*
- You can also select a paper outside of these journals, as long as the topic is relevant
 - Novelty journals: *Nature, Science*
 - Music Theory related: *Music Theory Online, Journal of Music Theory*
 - Psychology: *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*
- You are also allowed to choose a pre-print
 - Author must have published in the first list
 - Must be cleared with instructor

3. After reading paper, write thesis statement to guide paper. Email instructor to get approved, guidance.

- *In this paper, I argue ...*

4. Write term paper in style of open peer commentary, arguing your thesis point in order to demonstrate your critical thinking ability

- Paper should conform to APA6 or APA7 formatting
- *Highly encouraged write in using template*
 - ex. <https://www.overleaf.com/latex/templates/tagged/apa>
 - Google Docs
- Organize paper using guiding questions, see example

Example

Imagine that you are writing a longer open peer commentary responding to an article of your choosing in the style of *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* or *Empirical Musicology Review*. Revisit the article from the *Music and Emotion* lecture for review. In your response, you need to demonstrate that you:

- Understand what the authors are communicating
- Critically assess at least one aspect of their work

Rubric

You will be graded using the attached rubric. Please use this rubric as you write to ensure that you are meeting the requirements to demonstrate your understanding.

In the rubric, **the writer** is you, the student. **The authors** refer to the authors of the paper you are critiquing.

Dimension	Sophisticated (5 points)	Competent (3 points)	Needs Work (1 point)
Introduction	The topic's context and rationale are introduced in way that demonstrates the writer has engaged with literature relevant to the article. The writer clearly identifies the authors' goals and motivations behind the work.	The topic is introduced by the writer similarly to how the authors of the paper introduce the topic. Minimal examples are given beyond the paper itself in demonstrating why the work was done.	The topic is introduced by the author in a way that does not engage with anything beyond the paper itself. The readers is left wondering why either the writer or the author are interested in the issue at hand.
Methods	The writer not only demonstrates they understand why the authors made the decisions they did, but also situate each choice of the author using terminology from the Issues in Music Science glossary and make clear connections between the terms and the author's choices.	The writer provides a summary of the methods and logic used in the paper, mentions terms discussed in class, but does so only to use terms/concepts and does not engage as to why they matter.	The writer fails to adequately demonstrate they understand what the authors describe in their paper. The writer fails to engage with the terms and concepts from the Issues with Music and Sciences glossary.
Critique	The writer provides insights about the authors' inferences that can clearly point to both a choice of the authors and external reasoning to back up their critique. Clear references are made to references beyond the paper at hand.	The writer provides valid critiques of the paper at hand, but does so via their own opinion and authority. The writer does not engage with other literature to support their claims.	The author fails to make any insights about the authors' assertions. Only a summary of what was done is provided.
Assertions	The writer puts forwards clear, reasonable actions the authors could have considered in completing their own work. This could range from noting problems with experimental design and stimulus all the way to fundamental assumptions about the theory and hypothesis they are testing.	The writer suggests changes that the authors could have considered, but could also be suggested to any other research paper. For example, increasing sample size, getting a more representative population, or running more experiments.	The writer does not make any clear suggestions about how the authors could change their work going forward.
Formatting	The writer adheres to APA7 or APA6 formatting through both parenthetical in-text citations and correct referencing.	The writer formats the paper to APA standards but some references do not appear in the bibliography that are cited in the text. s	The writer fails to use a referencing system.