

Jordan Wirfs-Brock  
Activity Log A  
September 28, 2020  
EDUC 8730

**Switched on Pop Live** - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NHmYzVZoxhg>

- *Starting at the very beginning, going until 30:00*
- *All time codes are the YouTube timestamp*
- *Did first 10 minutes at 1-minute intervals, then switched to 2-minute intervals to get more coarse activity logging -- I think I am writing down too much detail!*
- *Note that the show keeps going after I stopped -- I may want to come back and log until about 50 but with less granularity, mainly for purposes of identifying places I want to focus on. Although there are some fabulous moments here, I know there are some good ones in the 30:00 - 50:00 sections, too!*

Elapsed Time	Activity Summary	Notes/Interpretations
1:00	<p>We start out seeing a blank stage with two chairs set up, a table, two microphones, a computer, and a keyboard. The two hosts (Charlie and Nate) walk out on stage and take a seat.</p> <p>Nate says: Let's start with some music.</p> <p>A music clip starts playing. It's a classical music clip (harpsichord?). During this clip, Nate moves his hands along to the music in a conductor motion. Charlie looks over him and emulates the same movements. Then after a few seconds it transforms into Britney Spears' "Oops I Did it Again." The motions change into more of a "groovin" arm swing. Charlie mouths along visible with the lyrics. Nate does kind of an awkward knee cross. At the end of the clip, Nate sings along to "I'm not that innocent."</p>	<p><i>Interesting to note how the two play off of each other, looking over at what the other person is doing for cues and adapting their body language accordingly. It doesn't seem like they are actually looking at the audience that much.</i></p> <p><i>I also read awkwardness/nervousness, because I know that they generally do this kind of thing in a recording studio, not in front of a live audience. There's a little apprehension, how much gesturing should they do -- they are still adjusting and getting into the vibe of the performance.</i></p>
2:00	<p>Nate says stay tuned to find out what connects these songs. Then he does a short introduction, "This is Switched on Pop.</p>	<p>Interesting how Charlie is intentionally calling attention to the strangeness of the live performance situation and how it is</p>

	<p>[crowd cheers and claps] I'm musicologist Nate Sloan." "I'm songwriter Charlie Harding." Then Nate says hit the theme music, and Charlie pushes a key on the laptop to play the SoP theme song. They look at each other. Charlie takes a sip from his coffee cup, Nate grabs a can to open it. Charlie says, Whoo! It sounds different with the sub-woofer, not tiny laptop speakers.</p> <p>After the theme music ends, Charlie starts reading from a script, about how if we only listen to the lyrics of pop music, we miss a lot of layers.</p>	<p>different from recording a podcast.</p> <p>Still very little direct looking at the audience. They are both really focused on their scripts/outlines, which are on printed 8.5x11 notes.</p> <p>As Charlie begins his intro, it's very much reading -- it's not overly stilted, but you can tell he's reading the text verbatim and not improvising at this point.</p>
3:00	<p>Nate talks about how, over 5 years of doing the podcast, they kept having people for a text to understanding music, a guide to principles like timbre, rhythm, melody, etc. As he says each of these music terms, he moves his right arm in sync with each word. He says that they wrote a book [Charlie holds up the book in the air], and tonight they are bringing you the book.</p> <p>The view momentarily switches to a full-screen Switched on Pop logo.</p> <p>Charlie says, "So why are we really here?" Pause. Nate reflects back the question, looks at the script. And then says "Hit is DJ." Charlie pushes a key on his laptop, and "Oops I Did it Again" clip plays.</p>	<p>The gestural language Nate uses is really interesting. Even as he's talking he is trying to signpost with his body language.</p> <p>Again, I am still reading awkwardness here. They have back-and-forth banter that is scripted, and they haven't quite caught onto the rhythm yet.</p>
4:00	<p>This minute is almost entirely Nate talking monologue style. He explicitly names the song, Oops exclamation point [vertical movement with left hand] ellipses / dot dot dot [horizontal movement with hand] I did it again. He talks about how the song was received when it first came out. It was panned by critics. Throughout this section, he's not looking at his script much. He quotes one person as calling it "competent cheese" and remarks that would be a good name for a band. Charlie laughs and interjects briefly.</p> <p>Nate then looks at the script again to read another verbatim</p>	<p>Nate seems to be getting more comfortable. He's very good at sounding like he's off the cuff/paraphrasing or ad libbing. I actually can't tell if he is riffing on the script/outline, or if he's just very good at making it sound un-scripted. (To answer that question I'd need to get in touch with him...which I should probably try to do!)</p> <p>Charlie looks over at him, also is seeming more comfortable. His main way of reacting at this point is with his facial expressions, which might warrant more analysis -- is he a stand-in for the audience, how we should be reacting?</p>

	<p>quote about how Britney was styled as a doll to meet any fantasy. Then poses questions for the audience: What has changed in the past 20 years? What do we learn from this song?</p>	
5:00	<p>Nate asks, rhetorically, whether Britney is an innocent schoolgirl ingenue, or a sexualized grown woman. [Using facial expressions and gestures to emphasize that dichotomy.] Or, he says, to put it in the words of her song, is she still a girl, not yet a woman? Crowd chuckles, as does Nate.</p> <p>Nate says today we are going to explore this question/dichotomy not through her image, but through her music, her melodies and harmonies. We see Charlie react by nodding.</p> <p>Nate says this dichotomy plays out through her chord progressions, which alternate between minor -- he moves the script, puts his hands on the keyboard, plays three minor chords -- and major -- plays some more chords.</p> <p>Asks, "Is that loud enough?" There's a "whoooo!" from the crowd. Nate and Charlie laugh, Nate: "Nuff said."</p>	<p>Interesting juggling that Nate is doing here between the narrative and the live performance on the piano keys. I am fascinated by how he has to set the script aside and go back and forth. With the visual cues that are available in the live performance, I wonder if this makes the audience a bit more forgiving to pauses/any moments where it's not quite seamless (in contrast with the podcast, which has to be seamless).</p> <p>I'm getting a bit frustrated with the fact that I can't see Charlie's reactions when we do a close up or medium shot of Nate. (The zoom keeps switching.)</p>
6:00	<p>Nate says this chord progression, which alternates between major and minor [he moves his hand side to side] is a familiar one, and is actually drawn from classical music, going back to the court composer for Louis XIV, the "sun king" [a lot of verbal fluctuation/emphasis here].</p> <p>We start to hear a clip, it's the same harpsichord one from the very beginning. There's some inaudible reaction from a person in the front row, and Charlie gestures to them and goes, "right?" As they listen, there are laughs from the crowd. Toward the end of the clip, Nate also makes an utterance toward an audience member.</p> <p>Sound clip ends, Nate says this is from Jean Baptiste Lulie</p>	<p>Now they are starting to get more comfortable and to engage the crowd more.</p> <p>I want to come back to how they listen, perhaps how they model behaviors in terms of exaggerating their reactions so that the audience can see which parts of the music they respond to as they listen analytically.</p>

	(???) , who was a crazy figure, used to conduct with a huge staff that he dropped on his foot.	
7:00	<p>Nate says that composer got gangrene and died. There's extended laughter from both hosts and the audience.</p> <p>Nate continues on saying that this chord progression is super popular, and has been used by a bunch of composers (lists them off, gesturing with his hand), as well as by Britney Spears and her co-writers, whom he names.</p> <p>Nate says now we're starting to get into the "depths" of the song. In addition to the chord progression, the duality is also emphasized by the fact that there are two choruses, something that a music theorist (whom he names) has written about. He says let's hear the first chorus ("the OG chorus") and then a clip plays.</p>	<p>During this, Charlie is looking over at Nate intently, with an "I'm paying attention" face.</p> <p>Charlie is the one who is controlling the clips (we know this because he has the laptop), but it's kind of interesting that his cueing/playing isn't shown while Nate is talking -- at least in terms of how this is edited, this section is Nate's section.</p> <p>More interesting gesture throughout this segment.</p>
8:00	<p>Nate says now we're going to need your (the audience) help, because we need to sing it. So he says, "this side of the room" (gesturing) is going to sing, and Charlie is going to lead them. Charlie nods and chuckles in affirmation.</p> <p>So then Nate counts them off (1, 2, 3, 4...) and Charlie starts singing "oops I did it again, got lost in the game, you played with my heart, oh baby baby". Crowd sings along, although there's also lots of laughing. Lots of laughing at the end as well.</p> <p>Nate remarks that this audience must have done a lot of choir. More laughs.</p> <p>Nate now says that there's a second chorus, after a dated interlude that references Titanic (big laugh from audience). There's a different chorus, and then the clip starts to play. "Oops I, did it again to your heart..."</p>	<p>**** Yessss! This is where I really start to get interested. Why did they say that they "NEED" to sing it. What purpose does singing it serve?</p> <p>Charlie and the audience are tentative as they sing, but they are still committed, they still play along. What gets everyone to buy into this awkward ask?</p>
9:00	Segment starts with the clip still playing, Nate and Charlie are	Interesting how this one is harder for the audience to sing

	<p>listening, both with eyes downward.</p> <p>Then Nate leads his side of the room through the second chorus, pointing out that this one starts with a pause/not on the main beat. So he counts them out “1, 2, 3, 4, pause [clap]” then proceeds to sing with them “oops I did it again to your heart...”</p> <p>Audience singing along, a bit quieter than the first chorus.</p> <p>They stop singing, Nate gives a big outward sigh, says “Chills.” Tells them again how great a job they did. More chuckling from the audience.</p> <p>Then Nate points out that what’s really interesting is at the end of the song, when the two different choruses come together. Clip plays. Charlie and Nate listen, eyes cast down.</p>	<p>along with, although some still do. Maybe because it’s not as familiar as chorus 1?</p> <p>The theater of saying that they good job, but maybe being sarcastic -- Nate would have to say that no matter WHAT the audience did.</p>
10:00	<p>Clip continues to play. Nate doing a little groove motion.</p> <p>Now Nate leads them in doing both choruses together. Charlie will lead one side of the room in “Oops I did it again” [nate sings it out as an example] and Nate will lead the other side in “PAUSE[clap!] oops I...did it again with your heart...”</p> <p>They start doing it, Charlie first, then Nate. Audience is singing along. Both Charlie and Nate are also using their hands to conduct. You can see some audience members on the far edge in the front row bumping/grooving as they sing.</p> <p>They finish up. There are some light claps. Charlie reflects and how good they were, “They got me -- I had to sing along with them.” Nate says that went better than they expected.</p> <p>Nate says that this ending is leaving us with a question: Who is Britney spears? Which chorus is she? Says that this was very vexing.</p>	<p>The two-part sing along was actually *really* good! I also thought that it sounded WAY better than I would have expected. They really got the timing right.</p> <p>As they reflect on how well it went, this seems truly genuine and they seem super proud of the audience.</p> <p>I just love this so much!</p>

12:00	<p>Nate says that by performing multiple aspects of her identity, she is doing something we all do all the time.</p> <p>Charlie refers back to “competent cheese” -- and how that critics wouldn’t have said the same thing about Renaissance music. Charlie says that he things critics have caught up in the past 20 years, and are now more “switched onto pop music” as an artform. Laughs from the crowd. Charlie acknowledges them and says they had to drop the name of the show/book at least once, like movies do. More laughs.</p> <p>Charlie continues on to say that they still get pushback, got a 10-page email from a critic recently calling them lowbrow. Nate shakes his head, sighs, says that was rough. More big laughs. Charlie continues that most of the feedback they get is “pop music was better back then.” He responds “Ok Boomer,” big big laugh from audience.</p> <p>Charlie says that pop music has really only been around for 100 years, and that it has always been pretty industrialized/manufactured. Think of MoTown.</p>	<p>Here we see the “handoff” from Nate to Charlie. This is clearly now Charlie’s section, and it begins with a monologue.</p> <p>Some things to come back to: How Nate practices reflective/performative listening to what Charlie is saying (when we do get to see it...)</p> <p>Charlie seems a *lot* more comfortable and natural now than he did at the beginning of the show. He’s still reading from a script, I think, and referring to it (it’s in his lap), but doing it in a super natural way.</p> <p>Might want to come back to exactly what the crowd is responding to, when they are laughing. Humor is a big part of the educational process here.</p>
14:00	<p>Charlie talks about how people complain that it’s the same chords over and over. Says that luckily we have Nate here with a “Very tiny piano.”</p> <p>Transitions into keyboard medley from Nate, who plays and sings at the same time: when the night is cold... -- feel free to sing along... YMCA ... tonight, we are young (Charlie sings along, too), so let’s set the world on fire (Nate’s voice cracks -- Charlie says he had a cold recently) ... Baby baby baby, ooo ... ends with little crescendo, BIG claps, Nate jokingly says, “thank you thank you.”</p> <p>Charlie notes (interpreting what Nate played) that there’re the same chords, recycled, refers back to “la folia” which Nate mentioned in his earlier monologue -- it’s always been this way.</p>	<p>So much happening here. I want to come back to elements of embodiment -- playing and singing, but also juxtaposition, how creating a medley makes the “sameness” pop.</p> <p>The audience seems to be super digging this part!</p>

16:00	<p>Charlie talks about another criticism: melodies are uninspired. He gives an example of Taylor Swift, who writes “absolute hooks” and can change it up (gestures), makes it fresh but you feel like you know it. But also, she’s not afraid to play one note at a time (emphasized with gesture). Turns to Nate.</p> <p>Nate plays on the keyboard a single note over and over, sings: Are we out of the woods, are we out of the woods yet...</p> <p>Charlie says ok, so there are reductive qualities, but it’s also innovative in terms of structure, form, rhythm, timbre -- want to go into each of these, specifically timbre, rhythm and form.</p> <p>Charlie says let’s start with timbre.</p> <p>Nate interjects: T-I-M-B-R-E- <i>TAM</i>-ber [both spells out and says phonetically]. Charlie says that he got it wrong for the first 40 episodes or so.</p> <p>Charlie then starts talking about there’s a critique that pop music is boring (takes on briefly persona of “Competent Cheese” again, with facial expressions), but that’s just not looking hard enough.</p>	<p>Lots here: Signposting! Notice how Charlie introduces the concepts, then repeats them -- now we know that we are going to learn 3 key terms.</p> <p>I like how Nate interjects. And Charlie is an empathetic figure for audience listeners who didn’t know the term already.</p> <p>So, an interesting blend of concepts (terminology) and examples -- they are very adept as using both language, delivery, and gesture to make these music concepts “pop” (pun intended)</p> <p>Also, I didn’t notice this before, but they are totally developing this “Competent Cheese” figure as a narrative/rhetorical foil! He’s the “machine” against whom they rage.</p>
18:00	<p>Charlie defines and describes timbre: Color or tone, currency, it’s how artists stand out. Notes that is is Important but least theorized compared to other music concepts -- we don’t have the language to talk about it -- I have dictionaries about other things, rhythms and melodies (gestures like a big stack). Charlie says instead, we use vague words like warm or tinny, scratchy. He kind of squints, calls it textural, rubs hands together.</p> <p>Nate jumps in and talks about a study where scientists have analyzed a brain wave for listening to rough sound (rubs his head, points at his temple), like Louis Armstrong -- your brain will light up in the part that is associated with feeling something rough (rubbing his arm).</p>	<p>Love how CHarlie explicitly grapples with the concept of timbre and how hard it is to put into words: “we don’t have the language to talk about it” this is super important! In order to understand/analyze sonic concepts, you need WORDS! All of his delivery, body language, etc. is signaling that he’s struggling to put his finger on this slippery thing.</p> <p>“When you say timbre is something you feel that’s literally true.” ← another thing I want to come back to: EMBODIMENT!</p>

	<p>(Charlie interjection: Not a scientist, he's a different kind of doctor)</p> <p>Nate: When you say timbre is something you feel that's literally true. Talks about smooth v. rough as a feeling.</p> <p>Charlie says the voice of artist Sia is a great example.</p>	
20:00	<p>Charlie says Sia is a pop star without a face, covers it with her hair. But people don;t know her for her image, they know her for her sound. [Looking down at script a lot.]</p> <p>He says her vocal rasp illustrates, [smiles] well, I'm just going to play the clip: <i>I'm going to swing, from the chandelier...</i></p> <p>[Wide view so we can barely see them, but I think Nate is nodding, responding to the high notes]</p> <p>Charlie says this is incredibly reckless.</p> <p>Nate interjects saying Charlie is a new dad, does not approve of swinging from the chandeliers unsupervised. [lots of laughs]</p> <p>Charlie says that's true, good burn... pauses for a long time..what were we talking about? Oh!...</p> <p>Charlies says vocalists are identified by their timbre, you know who a singer is even with a new song you've never heard. But it's not just vocalists, instrumentalists do this as well. So today we are going to play a little game...</p>	<p>[WISH WE COULD SEE CLOSE UP OF NATE AND CHARLIE BUT INSTEAD WE SEE AUDIENCE WIDE SHOT]</p>
22:00	<p>Charlie says we're going to call the game "It's going down, I'm yelling timbre." (crowd laughs) Nate is bent over.</p>	<p>This game is super interesting. What is the purpose? Why single out one person rather than crowd-source it?</p>



	<p>Needs a volunteer who knows guitar. Someone says “me” Charlie points at them, asks her to introduce herself., Nate asks if she’s a guitarist. She says yes, has been playing for 12 years. Introduces herself as Amanda.</p> <p>Charlie says I’m going to play 3 different guitarists, you are going to have to identify them with no material whatsoever.</p> <p>Plays clip one, guitar riff</p> <p>We see her frown, shaking her head, I’m getting a Jimmi Hendrix vibe. Charlies says yeah! Claps. Nate says he would have said Clapton, Amanda says, “Clapton’s not that jazzy”. Charlie says Nate is losing, Amanda is winning.</p> <p>Second clip, fuzzier/distorted guitar riff.</p> <p>My mind is thinking Tom Morello. Charlie says woo, that’s really appropriate. Nate says yes, but it’s wrong. Charlie says it’s actually St. Vincent, she’s known for fuzzy, distorted sound.</p>	<p>Also interesting how they frame it as being really hard -- it’s ok if you don’t get it, etc.</p> <p>Amanda’s facial expressions as she tries to guess are super interesting.</p>
24:00	<p>Third clip. Amanda looks super intent/focused as she tries to guess. She makes a guess, it’s wrong...</p> <p>Charlie says does anyone else have an idea? Someone in the crowd shouts out that it's Santana. It's the right answer.</p> <p>Nate says this was impossible.</p> <p>Charlie gives Amanda a prize -- it's a sticker! Holds it up in the air and then someone runs it to her.</p> <p>Charlie says it's a ridiculous game, but notes that in the room/audience, there WERE people who lit up with recognition when they heard the clips.</p>	<p>More good listening facial expressions from Amanda.</p> <p>Interesting how they bring the rest of the crowd in here.</p> <p>Also, the transition into the second game is a bit interesting the way it's structured as a bait and switch -- Charlie is about to tell us, then says, no, let's not do that, let's do it through a game instead..</p>

	<p>Nate says he can do it with tenor sax, but let's not try it. There's a little back and forth banter.</p> <p>Charlie interjects people really do develop a "sonic signature". A contemporary artist who does this really well is....pauses, actually better if we have someone guess. Wants to put a family member on the spot, Cousin Mimi (who shouts out "mimimimi") but then gives the mic to cousin John. Charlie says I'm going to play a song, all I want is your honest reaction.</p>	
26:00	<p>Charlie says for this game, there is no wrong answer. Listening for timbre, the texture of the sound.</p> <p>Plays Skrillex clip, "oh my god" brrrggghhhh (beat drop)</p> <p>We see cousin John, mouth wide open, head tilted.</p> <p>We see Nate, he is bouncing back and forth.</p> <p>Charlie asks John what words he would use. He says rough, chaotic, but it changed a couple of times.</p> <p>Charlie asks Cousin Mimi is this your favorite kind of music? [Laughs] Not quite...</p> <p>Charlie says there's a scientific study where this song was used as mosquito repellent against Dengue fever. Charlie says he's not a scientist, but apparently it worked. But doesn't recommend trying that at home...</p> <p>Now he says let's try an experiment: What if we were to take that same music and play it on the piano. Turns to Nate. Nate plays.</p> <p>Charlie asks John, How would you describe those sounds?</p>	<p>More opportunities to look at someone's facial expressions as they listen -- we have some nice views of Cousin John reacting and conveying that reaction with his face. With the Skrillex clip, he's almost shocked... it's visceral. Also an interesting moment when he can't find the words. What is going on there?</p> <p>Also embodiment from Nate.</p> <p>Interesting use of "experiment" -- like they are exploring these ideas together on the fly</p> <p>I can't tell if Nate has this memorized or is reading off a score?</p>

	<p>John pauses, seems to have trouble finding the words... uhhhh... Charlie says no wrong answer... John says, Totally in a different direction. Just kinda there... (grinning)</p> <p>Nate: That's often how my playing is described (looong chuckle)</p>	
28:00	<p>Charlie says same notes, but on piano, differently quality -- it's the timbre that brings it alive.</p> <p>He names the song explicitly, Skrillex, "Scary Monsters and Nice Sprites." He describes those growling, bristlings sounds as having upended the dance music scene, brought it into the mainstream.</p> <p>May have been part of why Taylor released this song -- plays a clip of "Trouble": <i>Now I'm lying on the cold dark floor...Trouble...Trouble... [instrumental section]</i></p> <p>Charlie says that she was clearly influenced by the wobbly base.</p> <p>Why timbre? You can stand out. It is the currency, it is sonic signature.</p> <p>Charlie says, When you feel like I'm uncomfortable, I'm bored, I don't know how to listen...Timbre is a way of tuning your ear (gesture), challenging yourself to listen.</p> <p>Nate: Another way that sound can push the envelope is rhythm, and right now the genre that is doing that most successfully is trap.</p>	<p>Here Charlie puts a lot of very deliberate, concrete language on a fuzzy concept: <i>growling, bristling, wobbly base</i>. Note that he also labels the song and validates/justifies it by mentioned the charts, the grammy, it's influence.</p> <p>Returning to exact language from before: currency, sonic signature.</p> <p>** TIP for how to listen, Charlie is trying to give us a very practical way to engage our ears. This is the handbook, the analytic action. ← come back to this, even though it's not fully formed, there is preliminary language and gesture for cueing audiences to turn their ears on in new ways.</p> <p>Transition to next topic: RHYTHM (hand off itself is a little easy to miss)</p>
30:00	<p>Nate says trap as a genre is also critically disparaged, laced with language of race and pathology. He defines it: Style of southern hip hop known for "heavy base and woozy textures"</p> <p>Nate says, One element of trap is the trap hat.</p>	<p>Love the language used throughout this section.</p> <p>Yesss, we finally get some karaoke! Notice how Nate demonstrates with his own voice, a way of making sense through making the sounds.</p>

	<p>He says it's like a high hat from jazz: <i>tss tt ttt tsss</i> [makes with is voice, also gestures accompany]</p> <p>Nate describes the trap hat like a "jazz hat on steroids." They <i>tick tick tick</i> [more karaoke] and rattle off and skitter into quick pulses of energy.</p> <p>Mentions artist from Dirty Projectors they had on the show, who said trap drums were a "new vocabulary."</p> <p>Nate says, Let's get to know trap hats through the song "Swimming Pool" by Kendrick Lamar.</p> <p>Listen for the <i>tick tick ttickckitickck</i> in the song [and says where we'll hear it]...</p> <p>Clip plays.</p> <p>Nate says this sound has become ubiquitous, you can hear in it Lizzo's "Cuz I love you," sure enough, there in the background. Again directs us where to listen.</p> <p>Plays clip.</p> <p>Both Charlie and Nate nodding heads along to trap hat as clip plays.</p>	<p>Also a really nice example of how he directs what to listen to before the clip plays, cueing you where to focus the audience's attention.</p> <p>Also nice use of definition, tying in language.</p> <p>Really interesting stuff going on with the trap hat being a "new vocabulary" in music</p>
--	--	--

### In-class reflection questions

1. What are you paying attention to? Why?
  - *The language the hosts use to describe sounds - because I am interested in how narrative and language can scaffold our ability to listen to sounds analytically*
  - *The physical listening practices that are demonstrated (both hosts and audiences), especially embodied listening - Because I am trying to figure out what listening even is*

- *The way non-speech sounds are used to demonstrate music principles - Because I want to know what types of sounds are effective, and what ways of presenting them are effective*
- *How the entire show is structured in order to support an overarching narrative - Because I care about holistic/overarching narratives*
- *Explicit instructions for cues to develop “an ear” - Because this is the ultimate goal?*

2. What is the relationship between what you are attending to and your research interests (drawing on your conceptual framework)?

*The things I am attending to reflect assumptions that analytic listening is valuable, and that it is a skill that can be learned, and that narrative (and interaction) are powerful ways to develop those skills. I am also attending to things that I could turn into techniques, features, or patterns that I could incorporate into design prototypes that I will create.*

3. What is backgrounded and foregrounded in your activity log?

*Foregrounded: The hosts*

*Backgrounded: The audience*

4. What is the nature of your observer comments? Any patterns?

*I was a bit surprised with how much I focused on physical, bodily actions. I had initially planned to analyze audio only, which would not have included these at all!*

5. How might you develop a new way to reduce the video into an analyzable form?

*Ooof, this is really hard... I think maybe I need to come up with some way of describing gestures, but I am not sure how...*

6. What do you wish you would have paid attention to more?

*I feel like part of this is because of the way the video is edited (we rarely get to see the audience), and also because most of the artifacts I examine (podcasts and other audio narratives) DON'T have an audience...*

*In the future, though, I will engage audiences -- but maybe I need to do that sooner?*

7. Identify three places you hope to dig in deeper for the second part of the assignment. Why did you choose these three?

*The things that are super interactive:*

- *The sing-along of the two choruses*
- *The quiz game*
- *The “karaoke” of the trap hat*

*After class, I went back and logged the rest of the video (this time with 3-minute intervals), mainly because I wanted to check to see if the one-minute section to zoom in on is here or in the first half hour. This log is a lot messier and has less detail!*

Elapsed Time	Activity Summary	Notes/Interpretations
33:00	<p>Nate talking about syncopation, how rhythms can give you emphasis where you don't expect it  "violation of structural expectations"  Syncopation makes you want to move your body  Reference to happy birthday (chuckles)</p> <p>Asked Charlie to demonstrate creative possibilities of trap hats - clip plays, lots of trap hats...</p> <p>Nate: what was that buzzing?</p> <p>Charlie: Sounds that repeat, as they get fast enough, it turns into a tone (does karaoke, zzzzzz, moves his hand)</p> <p>Plays clip again, slow to fast...</p> <p>Nate: let's bring it back to Kendrick Lamar, zoom in on second verse. Trap hats tick along, will subdivide the underlying beats into groups of 2. (counts out 1-2-1-2-1-2-1-2)</p>	<p>Look at Nate's hands as he talks about syncopation</p> <p>Also look at their faces as they listen.</p> <p>Nate's face just explodes into a smile as it goes low to high in the clip</p>
36:00	<p>Nate: KL is rapping in subdivision of 3 -- then does the rap ("I see the feeling...") then counts it as 1-2-3-1-2-3</p> <p>Let's take a listen (clip plays)</p> <p>Nate: This is crazy, has a profound affect on us, caught between even and odd divisions of the beat  USES hands -- CHARLIE then reaches over and</p>	<p>Again, hand use during this is super interesting</p> <p>Note how Charlie takes the reins, we transition into his section, but Nate jumps in during a kind of collaborative listing of holiday songs</p> <p>Because I am trying to take these notes more quickly, I am getting frustrated at how much I am missing!</p>

	<p>they try to connect them</p> <p>Nate: our brain is caught between them, it's dissociating, unnerving, but also pleasurable It's a reflection on multi-generational alcoholism, but it also makes you feel inebriated.</p> <p>Charlie: Ok (crowds laugh)</p> <p>Nate: She gets it.</p> <p>Charlie: Transitions to talking about form, elusive part of pop music</p> <p>Nate: Least sexy part.</p> <p>Charlie: Form is how the sections are laid out (uses hands.) Since 1960s, verse chorus form has been dominant. But before 1960s, AABA form was dominant, Over the Rainbow, Blue Moon...</p> <p>Nate jumps in with holidays songs.</p>	
39:00	<p>Charlie, to demonstrate AABA, we have a master of AABA improv art sitting next to me (Nate)</p> <p>Nate does a little bow in his chair</p> <p>Nate: AABA was so appealing and dominant because it's very industrial, you can just churn out AABA songs. A lot of pop music has used factory model, Song writers would just (lots of gestures here)</p> <p>Let's do one together now, We need 3 sections exactly the same (As)...then a contrasting B section.</p>	<p>Interesting collaboration with the audience here...</p> <p>Lots of back and forth interactions that I can't capture at this pace</p> <p>Also interesting mix of performance/improv and scripted purpose (he is truly doing this on the fly, but it is to meet a pre-determined pedagogic goal)</p>

	<p>Let's get a title... think of a pithy phrase or idea...Shout out suggestions</p> <p>Audiende: "When the rain's fallin" ... "Church time" (banter between these) "Gosh I love my hat!" (reactions, laughs) Nate: That's what we're going to use</p> <p>Asks for suggestions of words that rhyme with hat: spat, chat, cat</p> <p>Nate: So let's say the first verse is (laughs) I was walking down the street one day, a beautiful woman (noit gender specici)_ a beautiful person stopped for a chat, they said they dug my fedora, gosh I love my hat (huge pffffssshhhh sigh)</p>	
42:00	<p>Nate: Got through one section, let's do the next... I was uh uh (lots of uhs) I was out with my friend, we got into a spat. They criticized my bowler. Gosh I love my hat. I'm not saying it's a good song, people.</p> <p>B section, presents contrasting information -- I used to walk around with ny head so bare. Now I can't imagine not having a chapeau there.</p> <p>Final A section, what's our last word, cat (uhhh uhhhh lots of pauses) I love head gear so much, I even have one for my cat. They're decked out in a ... what's another kind of hat? Basebal cap. Gosh we love our hats.</p> <p>Nate begins to play on the keyboard, sings... (uses verses from above)</p> <p>He's looking up, kind of off into the distance.</p>	<p>At times you can see him looking confused/self-critique</p> <p>Lots of hemming/hawing, creating space for himnself to think on the fly</p> <p>Intersting hand-off to Charlie at the end</p>



	<p>Huge cheers when he finishes the song.</p> <p>Nate: Asterisk, not a great song, but it's a song (Charlie interjects) and it took us 4 minutes to write it. That's the power of AABA form. But then we get into the 1960s, rock artists need a more flexible form, so tell us about verse chorus</p>	
45:00	<p>Charlie: Verse chorus form -- verse establishes material, storytelling happening. But you might have a pre-chorus. We can think of it as a roller coaster.</p> <p>Rhianna's "We found love" -- let's start off with the verse [plays clip]</p> <p>As it plays, Charlie is grinning big, Nate is bobbing his head...</p> <p>Nate: beginning of the roller coaster</p> <p>Charlie, now we have to build, go tick tick tick tick tick [plays clip] (As it plays, they are looking up, acting like they are on a roller coaster)</p> <p>Charlie: This is the loop di loop (plays clip, Nate is dancing)</p> <p>Charlie: Where would you go next? (asking audience)</p> <p>Audience: Back to the verse. Charlie: Every song since the 1960s does that...except for Rhianna. She adds 2 entirely new sections to the song...one of the first to do so.</p> <p>The build [plays clip, Nate and Charlie dancing with fits this time] Clip cuts off right before the drop</p>	<p>Lots of hand movement from Charlie here describing trajectory of VCV form</p> <p>Introduces metaphor (rollercoaster), then repeatedly calls back to it</p> <p>The dance movements here are so interesting -- they are definitely trying to play up the roller coaster metaphor with their bodies</p> <p>Love how they picked a song that both demonstrates the pattern, but then also the BREAK from/evolution of the pattern -- so we can understand both in the same song</p> <p>Also the move of not playing the drop was great...the audience seemed to love it</p>

	<p>and the audience laughs</p> <p>Nate: Play the drop you monster [plays clip]</p>	
48:00	<p>Charlie: This is a lot of fun...but it was very strange at the moment, Songs weren't doing this. This idea of build and drop was borrowed from Calvin Harris + electronic dance music. Maybe we can move the two and take the energy higher. Then everybody copied that idea, until trap music became the dominant sound... Increased potential emotional intensity of the song.</p> <p>So what? Nate and I get very excited about this, but the reason we do it is...it reveals something about the song that you might miss otherwise. (Looking back and forth, Nate to other side of room)</p> <p>Highest moment, doesn't have any words to sing along to, all you have is your body moving.</p> <p>We call this "the pop drop" talk about it on our show, write about it in our book.</p> <p>EDM isn't the only contributor, a lot is being upended, more recent releases from hip hop and trap. Kanye's "Follow God" actually has no chorus at all.</p> <p>Nate: Stream of consciousness, James Joycian monologue</p> <p>Charlie: I'm gonna let you own that... Travis Scott, "Sicko Mode" -- it's 3 different songs pfffsssh mashed together into one mega-song. Also Beyonce's Lemonade, the song "Formation" (crowd member audibly says "YES")</p>	<p>Mostly an expository section here, but again, interesting gesture, interesting transitions between where Charlie is playing his gaze, interesting banter</p> <p>Also interesting "high/low" culture schtick with the James Joyce reference</p>

	<p>I think there's two choruses. Let's take a little vote</p> <p>[plays a clip] That's a chorus, But I think this is a chorus too [plays second clip]</p>	
51:00	<p>[clip continues]</p> <p>Charlie: So what do we think. If you think first chorus is the chorus, raise hand... second chorus, raise your hand.</p> <p>Nate: Trick question, it's the "I slay" section, dark horse contender.</p> <p>Charlie: First part is repeated more frequently, but the "ok ladies get in formation" is the name of the song... she's playing with the idea that we need to have a chorus at all. Every section should be a hook. You just want every section to be memorable.</p> <p>Nate: This is an exciting moment. We are on the precipice of the next tectonic shift (BIG hand movements) in pop form. There have only been two, AABA, verse chorus, maybe we are in a miasmic zone between verse chorus and whatever is next. So, stay tuned people. If you hear something on the radio and are like what is this song form, tweet us, we'll be interested.</p> <p>Charlie: Timbre, rhythm, song form, this is how pop music works. If you find yourself in status, you can put on this hat... you don't want to be that snob, that oops i did it again critic, we can turn our ears on...calls back to book ... that central vocabulary that helps us listen more deeply. ,I use those tools for when I'm lost, they help ground me by having a vocabulary.</p> <p>Transitions into Q&amp;A at 51:36</p>	<p>Buy the book, yadda yadda... email list, yadda yadda...</p> <p>Interesting how the end tries to bring it back, and also the focus on VOCABULARY as the key tool, even though they used (and demonstrated) all these others, like embodiment, repetition, isolation, karaoke, etc...</p>

--	--	--