

THE OPENER - SHARING THE PERFORMER'S PROCESS

LANGUAGE IN ARTISTIC PRACTICE:

An investigation into the use of oral language in rehearsal and teaching situations within the music performance field

*Christian Stene 04/02/2025
Ph.D. Artistic Research Fellow
The Grieg Academy - Department of Music
Faculty of Fine Art, Music and Design - University of Bergen, Norway*

INTRODUCTION:

The Opener is a one-year artistic research pilot program (March 2024-March 2025) with members from the Grieg Academy in Bergen and external members from the Academy of Performing Arts in Bratislava.

This subproject of The Opener aims to examine new ways of documenting and disseminating the use of language in artistic practice, namely in rehearsal and teaching situations.

Performative knowledge is often exchanged during rehearsal and teaching situations. This usually occurs as spontaneous interactions and dialogues between colleagues, teachers, and students and is unique in meeting the needs of that specific event. This insight is rarely reflected on regarding what language is used.

This subproject seeks to give insight into teaching and rehearsal situations in the form of recorded sessions and interviews with transcriptions and analysis of these to uncover what language is used to achieve certain results.

CASE STUDIES:

I have examined six case studies where rehearsals and teaching situations have been documented and recorded. Some of the case studies (Schubert and Collaboration concert with Sergej Tchirkov) were linked to projects planned in my artistic PhD project: (Re)Phrasing—Shaping Music with Modern Instruments (2022-2026).

The case studies I used to give insight into rehearsal situations were:

-Bernt Kasberg Evensen's Elegia for clarinet and string orchestra with The Opener member Ricardo Odriozola, Christian Stene, and the Grieg Academy Chamber Orchestra in February 2024

-Franz Schubert's Der Hirt auf dem Felsen with The Opener members Hilde Haraldsen Sveen, Diana Galakhova, and Christian Stene in March/April 2024

-Collaboration concert with The Opener members Sergej Tchirkov and Christian Stene in September-December 2024

The case studies I used to give insight into teaching situations were:

-Masterclass and interview with James Kanter (Principal clarinet of the Pacific Symphony Orchestra (retired), Professor at the University of California, Santa Barbara, studio musician, and famed mouthpiece maker) who has been in the field for over 60 years in April 2024

-Masterclass and interview with Annelien Van Wauwe (Soloist and Professor at the Royal Conservatoire in The Hague) who is at the forefront of a new generation of soloists/teachers from September/October of 2024

-Masterclass and interview with Christian Stene (Associate Professor/Ph.D. Artistic Research Fellow at The Grieg Academy) and students at the Academy of Performing Arts in Bratislava from October 2024

METHODS:

I recorded every rehearsal and masterclass session on video. With each case study having several sessions, there was a vast amount of video documentation for this subproject. I decided that Artificial intelligence, or AI, would be the most efficient and feasible method for use in transcription and data analysis. This is in line with The Opener's aims of experimenting and trying different ways of reflecting within the music performance field¹.

I used TurboScribe², which is an AI transcription service, to isolate the text spoken by each active speaker in each of the rehearsal and teaching cases. This speech-to-text technology is powered by Whisper which is claimed to be the most accurate and powerful AI speech-to-text transcription technology currently available³.

I exported the video files for each rehearsal/masterclass/interview session as pure audio files with Final Cut Pro. These smaller files were then uploaded to TurboScribe using its highest accuracy mode powered by Whisper large-v2. I then saved the transcription as a Word file, and the active speakers were named manually by myself.

For this study, I wanted to focus on the language used in the interaction between The Opener members in rehearsal situations and the language used by the teachers in the masterclass situations. I therefore had to isolate this material manually where other staff and/or students were involved to be omitted from the analysis. For Evensen, where a student orchestra was involved and students sometimes interacted, I manually removed the student speakers so that the data contained just the transcription of the conductor (Ricardo Odriozola) and soloist (Christian Stene) who are The Opener members. This was also done for an open rehearsal with Schubert where other staff and students participated. For the masterclasses, the teachers' interaction was isolated manually by myself.

For the data analysis, I used Microsoft Copilot⁴. This is an AI-powered chat service similar to ChatGPT but built on different technologies. Both are LLMs or Large Language models.

¹ <https://www.uib.no/en/kmd/171262/opener-sharing-performer's-process#background-and-questions>

² <https://turboscribe.ai>

³ <https://cdn.openai.com/papers/whisper.pdf>

⁴ <https://copilot.microsoft.com/>

Since there were several rehearsal/masterclass sessions, I combined the different transcription files into one for each case study to feed the next step of data analysis as only one file upload is currently supported for Microsoft Copilot. For the rehearsal situations, I asked AI to analyze the interaction between musicians and the language that was used. For the teaching situations, I asked AI to analyze the teacher's dialogue and the language that was used. The next step was to ask AI to compare the three rehearsal and teaching situations for similarities and differences as well as compare all rehearsals and teaching situations for similarities and differences. I also asked AI to compare the similarities and differences between the three interviews.

ANALYSIS:

I uploaded the transcriptions and analyses as single files to Microsoft Copilot with the following prompts:

-I prompted the transcriptions with:

Make a detailed analysis of the following conversation and look for patterns in the language that is used to achieve results on 11/01/25

-I combined all three rehearsal analyses files and prompted:

Analyze the following three rehearsal analyses and look for similarities and differences in approaches between them on 15/01/25

-I combined all three teaching analyses files and prompted:

Analyze the following three teaching analyses and look for similarities and differences in approaches between them on 15/01/25

-I combined all three interview transcriptions and prompted:

Analyze the following three interviews and look for similarities and differences in approaches to teaching between them on 15/01/25

-I combined the teaching and rehearsal comparison files and prompted:

Analyze the teaching and rehearsal comparisons and look for similarities and differences in approaches between them on 15/01/25

I asked the same questions for all three interviews of the teachers in the masterclasses. The questions were:

-Could you describe your background as a teacher/professor? How did you get into teaching and developing your methods?

- Is there a specific goal or philosophy you are aiming for in your teaching?
- How is the balance between structure and spontaneity in your lessons?
- Can you say something about the way you have approached the methodology of your teaching and what influences have shaped this path?
- How reflected is the language you use in a teaching situation?
- Is your choice of wording dependent on the implied tacit knowledge of a given student?
- What is the relationship in your teaching between the verbal aspect and demonstration? And what kind of words do you use?
- Has your approach to teaching changed throughout your career? If so in what ways and why?
- What do you consider is the relationship between control and freedom when teaching?
- Have you employed any experimental or unorthodox methods in your teaching?

RESULTS FROM AI:

REHEARSALS:

-Evensen Rehearsal Analysis

Prompt: Make a detailed analysis of the following conversation and look for patterns in the language that is used to achieve results on 11/01/25

Key Patterns and Language Analysis

1. Directive Language

- **Examples:** "Let's get a sense of this," "Let's do it this way," "Let's work from the beginning."
- **Purpose:** Directive language is used to guide the rehearsal process, set tasks, and provide clear instructions. It helps in maintaining focus and ensuring that everyone is on the same page.

2. Collaborative Language

- **Examples:** "We can try to do it in two minutes," "We have a whole piece to prepare," "Let's try it again."
- **Purpose:** Collaborative language fosters a sense of teamwork and shared responsibility. It encourages participation and collective problem-solving.

3. Reassurance and Positive Reinforcement

- **Examples:** "It's fine," "That's great," "That was very nice."
- **Purpose:** Positive reinforcement is used to build confidence and motivate the participants. It helps in creating a supportive environment where individuals feel valued and encouraged.

4. Technical Language

- **Examples:** "D sharp here and then F sharp there," "No vibrato in the clarinet," "Subdivide it."
- **Purpose:** Technical language is essential for precise communication about musical elements. It ensures that specific instructions are understood and executed correctly.

5. Descriptive Language

- **Examples:** "It's actually pretty nice," "There's a different color," "It's very soft."
- **Purpose:** Descriptive language helps in conveying the desired sound and emotional quality of the music. It aids in aligning the performers' interpretation with the conductor's vision.

6. Problem-Solving Language

- **Examples:** "I think we can really be careful with the dynamics here," "Maybe it's just the part because to me this piece, it's not, it's many pianissimos and then there's a fortissimo part."
- **Purpose:** Problem-solving language is used to identify and address issues in the performance. It involves analyzing the music and suggesting solutions to improve the overall execution.

7. Encouragement of Experimentation

- **Examples:** "We can try it again," "Maybe it could be nice," "Let's do these four phrases again."
- **Purpose:** Encouraging experimentation allows for creative exploration and refinement of the music. It promotes a flexible approach to rehearsing and finding the best interpretation.

Conclusion

The conversation in the transcription is characterized by a blend of directive, collaborative, and supportive language. The use of technical and descriptive terms ensures clarity and precision, while positive reinforcement and encouragement foster a productive and motivating rehearsal environment. This combination of language patterns is effective in achieving the desired musical results and maintaining a harmonious working relationship among the participants.

-Schubert Rehearsal Analysis

Prompt: *Make a detailed analysis of the following conversation and look for patterns in the language that is used to achieve results on 11/01/25*

Key Themes and Patterns

1. Coordination and Planning

- **Scheduling and Invitations:** The participants discuss the logistics of their rehearsal and performance schedules, including inviting people and planning around holidays.
 - Example: "We have to invite people. So we have to... We have to... To go... To invite. We have to do it. Just after Easter."

- **Instrument Usage:** They talk about which instruments to use and how to manage them during the rehearsal.
 - Example: "So I used both instruments last time you said, right?"
- 2. **Feedback and Adjustments**
 - **Tuning and Sound Quality:** There is a focus on the tuning of instruments and the quality of sound produced.
 - Example: "Guys, it's not very tuned. I'm so sorry. It's normally better than that."
 - **Performance Adjustments:** Participants give and receive feedback on their performance, discussing how to improve and adjust their playing or singing.
 - Example: "I noticed it, that it was drier than I'm used to. That's the only thing. I don't know if it's better or worse."
- 3. **Communication and Collaboration**
 - **Expressing Uncertainty:** Participants often express uncertainty and seek confirmation from each other.
 - Example: "I don't know. I brought them."
 - **Encouragement and Support:** There are instances of encouragement and support, helping each other feel more confident.
 - Example: "It's very nice."
- 4. **Technical Discussions**
 - **Musical Techniques:** Detailed discussions about musical techniques, such as the use of pedals, dynamics, and phrasing.
 - Example: "What do you think about the pedal? Was it too dry? I was trying to leave a bit here, a bit there."
 - **Instrument Characteristics:** Conversations about the characteristics of different instruments and how they affect the performance.
 - Example: "It's more like, because I think with a piece like this we have this unknown, or we don't think about what we have heard, but we copy it in a way."
- 5. **Reflective and Analytical Language**
 - **Reflecting on Past Performances:** Participants reflect on previous performances and rehearsals to identify areas of improvement.
 - Example: "I felt much freer now than the last time. I feel like just then we really was the first time together."
 - **Analyzing Musical Pieces:** They analyze the musical pieces they are working on, discussing their interpretations and emotional expressions.
 - Example: "It's really about being reminded and to have this... When you stand up there and think about what's under there and what can be, I mean, it's this translation into whatever."

Language Patterns

- **Repetitive Affirmations:** Frequent use of affirmations like "Yeah, yeah, yeah" to show agreement and understanding.
- **Politeness and Apologies:** Use of polite language and apologies to maintain a respectful and collaborative atmosphere.

- Example: "I'm so sorry."
- **Questions and Clarifications:** Asking questions and seeking clarifications to ensure everyone is on the same page.
 - Example: "What do you mean?"

Conclusion

The conversation is characterized by a collaborative and supportive environment where participants actively engage in planning, giving feedback, and making adjustments to improve their performance. The language used is reflective, analytical, and often repetitive, emphasizing coordination, technical discussions, and mutual support. This approach helps them achieve their goals and enhance their musical performance.

-Collaboration Concert Rehearsal Analysis

Prompt: *Make a detailed analysis of the following conversation and look for patterns in the language that is used to achieve results on 11/01/25*

Structure and Flow of Conversation

1. **Introduction and Context Setting:**
 - The conversations often start with setting the context, such as discussing the piece they are about to rehearse or the specific section they need to work on.
 - Example: "So, it's a nice short piece, it's sort of standard repertoire for the clarinet."
2. **Technical Discussions:**
 - The musicians frequently discuss technical aspects of the music, including tempo, dynamics, phrasing, and breathing.
 - Example: "What is the tempo? Yeah, so I need to breathe after, you called it the second time, before the rubato."
3. **Problem Identification and Resolution:**
 - They identify specific problems or challenges in the music and work collaboratively to find solutions.
 - Example: "I think the combination blends very nice. Because there are some overtones in the clarinet that you have also in the accordion."
4. **Experimentation and Feedback:**
 - The musicians experiment with different interpretations and provide feedback to each other.
 - Example: "Can we try the other repertoire? I don't know which time you have, I would like to do this again."
5. **Repetition and Reinforcement:**
 - They often repeat sections of the music to reinforce learning and ensure consistency.
 - Example: "Should we try that before we play it through again?"

Patterns in Language Used

1. **Collaborative Language:**

- The language is highly collaborative, with frequent use of inclusive pronouns like "we" and "us."
- Example: "Let's see what happens."

2. **Technical Terminology:**

- The conversation is rich in technical musical terminology, reflecting their expertise and focus on precision.
- Examples: "tempo primo," "più lento," "overtones," "contrabasses."

3. **Supportive and Encouraging Tone:**

- The tone is supportive and encouraging, with both musicians validating each other's efforts and contributions.
- Example: "Yeah, I think the combination blends very nice."

4. **Clarification and Confirmation:**

- They frequently seek clarification and confirmation to ensure mutual understanding.
- Example: "So you're playing exactly the piano?"

5. **Problem-Solving Language:**

- The language is solution-oriented, focusing on identifying issues and collaboratively finding solutions.
- Example: "But it worked out, I guess."

6. **Reflective and Analytical Language:**

- They reflect on their performance and analyze what worked and what didn't.
- Example: "I think it's easier than it used to be."

Achieving Results

- **Clear Communication:** The musicians achieve results through clear and precise communication, ensuring that both parties understand the technical and interpretative aspects of the music.
- **Collaborative Problem-Solving:** They work together to solve problems, experimenting with different approaches and providing constructive feedback.
- **Repetition and Practice:** Repeating sections and reinforcing learning helps them achieve consistency and improve their performance.
- **Supportive Environment:** The supportive and encouraging tone fosters a positive working environment, enabling them to work efficiently together.

Overall, the conversation demonstrates effective collaboration, technical expertise, and a supportive approach to achieving musical excellence.

-Comparison Rehearsal Analysis

Prompt: *Analyze the following three rehearsal analyses and look for similarities and differences in approaches between them on 15/01/25*

Similarities

1. **Directive Language:**
 - All three analyses mention the use of directive language to guide the rehearsal process. This includes giving clear instructions and setting tasks to maintain focus and ensure everyone is aligned.
2. **Collaborative Language:**
 - Each analysis emphasizes the importance of collaborative language, fostering a sense of teamwork and shared responsibility. This includes phrases like "Let's try it again" and "We can try it in two minutes."
3. **Technical Discussions:**
 - Technical language is a common feature across all analyses. This includes discussions about musical elements such as dynamics, intonation, phrasing, and instrument usage to ensure precise communication and execution.
4. **Positive Reinforcement:**
 - Positive reinforcement and encouragement are highlighted in all analyses. This helps build confidence and create a supportive environment where participants feel valued and motivated.
5. **Problem-Solving Language:**
 - Each analysis notes the use of problem-solving language to identify and address issues in the performance. This involves analyzing the music and suggesting solutions to improve the overall execution.

Differences

1. **Focus on Specific Aspects:**
 - **Evensen Rehearsal:** Focuses on dynamics, intonation, and coordination among different sections of the orchestra.
 - **Schubert Rehearsal:** Emphasizes tuning, sound quality, and the logistics of rehearsal and performance schedules.
 - **Collaboration Concert Rehearsal:** Concentrates on tempo, dynamics, phrasing, and breathing, with a strong emphasis on experimentation and feedback.
2. **Participants and Context:**
 - **Evensen Rehearsal:** Involves two main participants, Ricardo Odriozola and Christian Stene, working on a musical piece.
 - **Schubert Rehearsal:** Involves three participants, with Christian Stene, Hilde Haraldsen Sveen, and Diana Galakhova, discussing various aspects of their performance.
 - **Collaboration Concert Rehearsal:** Features two musicians, Christian Stene, and Sergej Tchirkov, discussing and rehearsing different pieces of music.
3. **Language Patterns:**
 - **Evensen Rehearsal:** Uses a blend of directive, collaborative, and supportive language with a focus on technical and descriptive terms.
 - **Schubert Rehearsal:** Characterized by reflective and analytical language, with frequent use of affirmations, politeness, and apologies.
 - **Collaboration Concert Rehearsal:** Rich in technical terminology and supportive language, with a strong focus on clarification and confirmation.
4. **Approach to Experimentation:**

- **Evensen Rehearsal:** Encourages experimentation to promote creative exploration and refinement of the music.
- **Schubert Rehearsal:** Reflects on past performances and analyzes musical pieces to identify areas of improvement.
- **Collaboration Concert Rehearsal:** Emphasizes experimentation with different interpretations and provides feedback to each other.

Conclusion

While all three analyses share common elements such as directive language, collaborative efforts, technical discussions, positive reinforcement, and problem-solving language, they differ in their specific focus areas, participants, language patterns, and approaches to experimentation. These differences reflect the unique contexts and goals of each rehearsal session, contributing to their overall effectiveness in achieving musical excellence.

MASTERCLASSES:

-Masterclass With James Kanter Analysis

Prompt: *Make a detailed analysis of the following conversation and look for patterns in the language that is used to achieve results on 11/01/25*

Structure and Flow

1. Introduction and Context Setting:

- James Kanter begins by setting the context and explaining the purpose of the session.
- He uses questions to engage participants and encourage them to think about the concepts being discussed.

2. Demonstration and Explanation:

- James Kanter often demonstrates techniques on the clarinet and explains the underlying principles.
- He uses analogies and relatable examples to make complex concepts more understandable.

3. Interactive Engagement:

- The conversation is highly interactive, with James Kanter asking questions and prompting participants to share their thoughts.
- He encourages guessing and participation, creating a collaborative learning environment.

4. Feedback and Correction:

- James Kanter provides specific feedback on participants' performances, highlighting both strengths and areas for improvement.
- He uses a mix of positive reinforcement and constructive criticism to guide participants.

5. Practical Exercises:

- The session includes practical exercises where participants apply the concepts being discussed.
- James Kanter gives detailed instructions and monitors the participants' execution, providing real-time feedback.

6. Encouragement and Motivation:

- James Kanter frequently encourages participants, helping to build their confidence.
- He acknowledges their efforts and progress, fostering a positive and supportive atmosphere.

Language Patterns

1. Questioning:

- James Kanter uses open-ended questions to stimulate thinking and engagement (e.g., "Who wants to take a guess at what produces a sound on the clarinet?").
- He also uses rhetorical questions to emphasize points (e.g., "Isn't that funny? Nobody wants to take a guess. I'll bet everybody knows.").

2. Analogies and Metaphors:

- James Kanter employs analogies to explain technical concepts (e.g., comparing the clarinet's sound production to the suction created by a vacuum).
- These analogies help participants visualize and understand abstract ideas.

3. Positive Reinforcement:

- James Kanter frequently uses positive language to reinforce good performance (e.g., "Beautiful. Really spirited.").
- He balances criticism with praise to maintain participants' motivation.

4. Detailed Instructions:

- Instructions are clear, detailed, and often broken down into smaller steps (e.g., "Form your embouchure, move the air fast enough, and the reed starts to vibrate, and we have a sound.").
- James Kanter ensures that participants understand each step before moving on.

5. Empathy and Support:

- James Kanter shows empathy by acknowledging participants' feelings and challenges (e.g., "You'll get over being scared talking to me, we'll have fun.").
- He creates a safe space for learning by being approachable and supportive.

6. Technical Terminology:

- The conversation includes specific technical terms related to clarinet playing (e.g., "embouchure," "reed," "ligature").
- James Kanter explains these terms as needed to ensure participants' understanding.

Key Themes and Concepts

1. Sound Production:

- Detailed discussion on how sound is produced on the clarinet, focusing on airspeed and reed vibration.
- Practical demonstrations and explanations of the mechanics involved.

2. Tone and Dynamics:

- Emphasis on controlling airspeed to produce different dynamics and tones.
- Techniques for adjusting sound color and intensity in different acoustic environments.
- 3. **Performance Techniques:**
 - Strategies for managing performance anxiety and adapting to different performance settings.
 - Tips for making on-the-fly adjustments during a performance.
- 4. **Practice and Improvement:**
 - Importance of consistent practice and specific exercises to build endurance and control.
 - Encouragement to practice challenging sections slowly and methodically.

Conclusion

The masterclass transcription reveals a highly interactive and supportive teaching style. James Kanter uses a combination of questioning, analogies, positive reinforcement, and detailed instructions to effectively communicate concepts and guide participants. The language is both technical and empathetic, creating an environment conducive to learning and improvement. The focus on practical application and real-time feedback helps participants internalize the lessons and apply them to their playing.

-Masterclass With Annelien Van Wauwe Analysis

Prompt: *Make a detailed analysis of the following conversation and look for patterns in the language that is used to achieve results on 11/01/25*

Key Patterns in Language Use

1. **Encouragement and Positive Reinforcement**
 - **Examples:** "Very good!", "Beautiful!", "Great, you did it."
 - **Purpose:** To build confidence and motivate the students. Positive reinforcement helps in creating a supportive learning environment.
2. **Direct Instructions**
 - **Examples:** "Can you start one more time from the beginning, please?", "Try it once more from the piano."
 - **Purpose:** Clear and direct instructions ensure that students know exactly what is expected of them. This helps in maintaining focus and structure during the session.
3. **Guided Discovery**
 - **Examples:** "What is it that makes you stress right here?", "Can you think of that when you are playing?"
 - **Purpose:** Encouraging students to think critically about their playing and discover solutions themselves. This fosters deeper understanding and self-reliance.
4. **Analogies and Imagery**
 - **Examples:** "Think of having two fists between your feet.", "Imagine you are playing a bird song."

- **Purpose:** Using analogies and imagery helps students visualize concepts, making abstract ideas more concrete and easier to grasp.
- 5. **Technical Feedback**
 - **Examples:** "Make sure that you bring all these notes together in a really tight legato.", "Use a little bit more air support here."
 - **Purpose:** Providing specific, technical feedback helps students improve their technique and understand the nuances of their instrument.
- 6. **Encouraging Experimentation**
 - **Examples:** "Try it out.", "Experiment with exhaling."
 - **Purpose:** Encouraging students to experiment promotes creativity and helps them find what works best for their individual style.
- 7. **Questions to Engage Students**
 - **Examples:** "Was it easier or harder?", "Do you have any questions?"
 - **Purpose:** Asking questions keeps students engaged and encourages active participation. It also helps the instructor gauge the students' understanding.
- 8. **Repetition for Emphasis**
 - **Examples:** "One more time.", "Let's do it again."
 - **Purpose:** Repetition reinforces learning and helps students internalize concepts and techniques.
- 9. **Personalization**
 - **Examples:** "You know exactly what you want.", "Feel free to keep thinking a lot of music."
 - **Purpose:** Personalizing feedback makes it more relevant to the individual student, addressing their specific needs and strengths.

Conclusion

Annelien Van Wauwe's approach in the masterclass is a blend of encouragement, direct instruction, guided discovery, and technical feedback. The use of analogies, imagery, and questions helps in making the learning process engaging and effective. Encouraging experimentation and repetition ensures that students not only understand the concepts but also apply them confidently.

-Masterclass With Christian Stene Analysis

Prompt: *Make a detailed analysis of the following conversation and look for patterns in the language that is used to achieve results on 11/01/25*

Structure and Flow

1. **Introduction and Setup:**
 - Christian Stene begins with a friendly greeting and sets the expectations for the session.
 - He ensures the participant is comfortable and understands the session's duration and goals.
2. **Feedback and Instruction:**

- **Positive Reinforcement:** Christian Stene frequently uses positive language to encourage the participant (e.g., "Beautiful playing," "Nice," "Bravo").
 - **Specific Feedback:** He provides detailed, specific feedback on various aspects of the performance, such as breathing, phrasing, and dynamics.
 - **Demonstrations:** Christian Stene often demonstrates techniques to provide a clear example.
3. **Technical Advice:**
- **Breathing Techniques:** Emphasis on planning breaths and using breathing to maintain tension and support.
 - **Sound and Dynamics:** Discussion on finding different colors in the sound and shaping long notes.
 - **Instrument Handling:** Tips on handling the clarinet, including fingerings and embouchure adjustments.
4. **Interactive Exercises:**
- Christian Stene engages the participant in exercises to practice the techniques discussed.
 - He encourages the participant to try different approaches and provides immediate feedback.
5. **Encouragement and Motivation:**
- Christian Stene maintains a supportive tone throughout, acknowledging the participant's efforts and improvements.
 - He emphasizes the importance of practice and self-awareness in achieving better results.

Language Patterns

1. **Empathy and Support:**
- Christian Stene uses empathetic language to connect with the participant (e.g., "I understand," "It's fine now").
 - He validates the participant's efforts and progress, creating a positive learning environment.
2. **Clarity and Precision:**
- Instructions are clear and precise, often broken down into manageable steps.
 - Christian Stene uses specific musical terms and references to ensure the participant understands the feedback.
3. **Encouragement and Positive Reinforcement:**
- Frequent use of positive reinforcement to build confidence (e.g., "Beautiful sound," "Great job").
 - Christian Stene highlights the participant's strengths while gently addressing areas for improvement.
4. **Interactive and Engaging:**
- The conversation is interactive, with Christian Stene asking questions and encouraging the participant to reflect on their performance.
 - He uses a conversational tone to keep the participant engaged and motivated.
5. **Technical and Practical Advice:**
- Christian Stene provides practical advice that the participant can immediately apply.

- He explains the reasoning behind each suggestion, helping the participant understand the importance of each technique.

Conclusion

Christian Stene's masterclass is characterized by a supportive and interactive teaching style. He uses a combination of empathy, clarity, positive reinforcement, and practical advice to help the participant improve their performance. The language patterns observed in the conversation are effective in creating a positive learning environment and achieving the desired results.

-Comparison Masterclass Analysis

Prompt: *Analyze the following three teaching analyses and look for similarities and differences in approaches between them on 15/01/25*

Similarities

1. Encouragement and Positive Reinforcement:

- **James Kanter:** Uses positive language to reinforce good performance (e.g., "Beautiful. Really spirited.").
- **Annelien Van Wauwe:** Frequently uses phrases like "Very good!" and "Beautiful!" to build confidence.
- **Christian Stene:** Provides positive reinforcement with comments like "Beautiful playing" and "Great job."

2. Interactive Engagement:

- **James Kanter:** Highly interactive, asking questions and prompting participants to share their thoughts.
- **Annelien Van Wauwe:** Engages students with questions to encourage active participation (e.g., "Was it easier or harder?").
- **Christian Stene:** Maintains an interactive conversation, asking questions and encouraging reflection.

3. Detailed Instructions and Technical Feedback:

- **James Kanter:** Provides clear, detailed instructions and specific feedback on performances.
- **Annelien Van Wauwe:** Gives direct instructions and specific technical feedback (e.g., "Use a little bit more air support here.").
- **Christian Stene:** Offers precise instructions and detailed feedback on various aspects of performance.

4. Use of Analogies and Imagery:

- **James Kanter:** Uses analogies to explain technical concepts (e.g., comparing sound production to a vacuum).
- **Annelien Van Wauwe:** Employs analogies and imagery to help students visualize concepts (e.g., "Imagine you are playing a bird song.").
- **Christian Stene:** Uses practical advice and demonstrations to clarify techniques.

5. Supportive and Empathetic Approach:

- **James Kanter:** Shows empathy by acknowledging participants' feelings and challenges.
- **Annelien Van Wauwe:** Personalizes feedback and encourages experimentation.
- **Christian Stene:** Uses empathetic language and validates participants' efforts.

Differences

1. Focus on Guided Discovery:

- **James Kanter:** Encourages guesses and participation, creating a collaborative learning environment.
- **Annelien Van Wauwe:** Promotes guided discovery by asking students to think critically about their playing (e.g., "What is it that makes you stress right here?").
- **Christian Stene:** Less emphasis on guided discovery, more on providing direct feedback and demonstrations.

2. Emphasis on Practical Exercises:

- **James Kanter:** Includes practical exercises with real-time feedback.
- **Annelien Van Wauwe:** Encourages experimentation and repetition to reinforce learning.
- **Christian Stene:** Engages participants in exercises but focuses more on immediate application of techniques.

3. Language Patterns:

- **James Kanter:** Uses a mix of rhetorical and open-ended questions to stimulate thinking.
- **Annelien Van Wauwe:** Uses direct instructions and questions to engage students.
- **Christian Stene:** Maintains a conversational tone with clear and precise instructions.

4. Technical Terminology:

- **James Kanter:** Uses specific technical terms related to clarinet playing and explains them as needed.
- **Annelien Van Wauwe:** Provides technical feedback but uses more analogies and imagery.
- **Christian Stene:** Uses specific musical terms and references to ensure understanding.

Conclusion

All three instructors share a supportive and interactive teaching style, emphasizing positive reinforcement, detailed instructions, and the use of analogies. However, they differ in their focus on guided discovery, practical exercises, and language patterns. James Kanter and Annelien Van Wauwe encourage more student participation and critical thinking, while Christian Stene provides more direct feedback and demonstrations. Each approach has its strengths, contributing to an effective and engaging learning experience.

-INTERVIEW ANALYSIS

Prompt: *Analyze the following three interviews and look for similarities and differences in approaches to teaching between them on 15/01/25*

Similarities:

1. **Passion for Teaching:**

- All three interviewees express a deep passion for teaching and a desire to pass on their knowledge and experiences to their students.

2. **Individualized Approach:**

- Each teacher emphasizes the importance of understanding the individual needs of their students and tailoring their teaching methods accordingly. They recognize that each student is unique and requires a personalized approach.

3. **Importance of Communication:**

- Effective communication is highlighted by all three interviewees. They stress the need to articulate concepts clearly and use language that resonates with their students.

4. **Balance Between Structure and Flexibility:**

- All three teachers mention the need for a balance between structured lessons and the flexibility to adapt to the moment. They acknowledge that while structure is important, being able to respond to the needs of the student in real time is crucial.

5. **Role of Demonstration:**

- Demonstrating techniques and concepts is a common theme. They believe that showing students how to do something can be more effective than just explaining it verbally.

Differences:

1. **Background and Influences:**

- **James Kanter:** His teaching is heavily influenced by his mentors, particularly Dominic Fera, and his experiences as a professional clarinetist. He focuses on values such as integrity, sincerity, and passion.
- **Annelien Van Wauwe:** She draws from her diverse experiences with teachers from different countries and her background in yoga. She emphasizes a non-judgmental and positive approach, encouraging students to find their own voice.
- **Christian Stene:** His approach is shaped by his experiences of relearning and refining his techniques. He values sound quality and the importance of a focused, consistent sound across all registers.

2. **Teaching Philosophy:**

- **James Kanter:** His philosophy revolves around repaying the debt of gratitude to his mentors by passing on their values and teachings to his students.
- **Annelien Van Wauwe:** She focuses on creating a positive and supportive learning environment, allowing students the freedom to explore and develop their own interpretations.
- **Christian Stene:** He emphasizes the importance of sound quality and technical control, believing that mastery of these elements leads to musical freedom.

3. **Use of Experimental Methods:**

- **James Kanter:** He does not mention using experimental methods, focusing instead on traditional techniques and values.
- **Annelien Van Wauwe:** She incorporates techniques from yoga, particularly in breathing and posture, to enhance her teaching.

- **Christian Stene:** He uses props and exercises to help students focus on specific aspects of their playing, such as using ping-pong balls to reduce tension in the hands.
- 4. **Reflection and Adaptation:**
 - **James Kanter:** Reflects on his teaching choices and adapts his methods based on the needs of his students, particularly in high-stakes situations like auditions.
 - **Annelien Van Wauwe:** Continuously reflects on her teaching and adapts her methods to suit the individual needs of her students, emphasizing a positive and non-judgmental approach.
 - **Christian Stene:** Reflects on his own experiences and the challenges he faced, using these insights to inform his teaching and help students avoid similar pitfalls.

Conclusion:

While all three teachers share a passion for teaching and a commitment to individualized instruction, their approaches are shaped by their unique backgrounds and experiences. James Kanter focuses on passing on the values of his mentors, Annelien Van Wauwe emphasizes a positive and supportive environment, and Christian Stene prioritizes sound quality and technical control. Each teacher brings his or her own perspective and methods to their teaching, creating a rich and diverse learning experience for their students.

-COMPARISON REHEARSAL AND TEACHING ANALYSIS

Prompt: *Analyze the teaching and rehearsal comparisons and look for similarities and differences in approaches between them on 15/01/25*

Similarities

1. **Encouragement and Positive Reinforcement:**
 - **Teaching:** All instructors use positive language to reinforce good performance, such as "Beautiful" and "Great job."
 - **Rehearsal:** Positive reinforcement is also highlighted, helping to build confidence and create a supportive environment.
2. **Interactive Engagement:**
 - **Teaching:** Instructors engage students with questions and encourage active participation.
 - **Rehearsal:** Collaborative language is used to foster teamwork and shared responsibility, with phrases like "Let's try it again."
3. **Detailed Instructions and Technical Feedback:**
 - **Teaching:** Instructors provide clear, detailed instructions and specific feedback on performances.
 - **Rehearsal:** Technical discussions about musical elements such as dynamics, intonation, and phrasing are common.
4. **Use of Analogies and Imagery:**
 - **Teaching:** Analogies and imagery are used to explain technical concepts and help students visualize them.

- **Rehearsal:** While not explicitly mentioned, the use of descriptive language suggests a similar approach to clarifying techniques.
- 5. **Supportive and Empathetic Approach:**
 - **Teaching:** Instructors show empathy by acknowledging participants' feelings and challenges.
 - **Rehearsal:** Supportive language and encouragement are used to create a positive environment.

Differences

1. **Focus on Guided Discovery:**
 - **Teaching:** Some instructors encourage guesses and participation, creating a collaborative learning environment.
 - **Rehearsal:** The focus is more on providing direct feedback and demonstrations rather than guided discovery.
2. **Emphasis on Practical Exercises:**
 - **Teaching:** Practical exercises with real-time feedback are included to reinforce learning.
 - **Rehearsal:** Exercises are used, but there is a stronger emphasis on immediate application of techniques.
3. **Language Patterns:**
 - **Teaching:** A mix of rhetorical and open-ended questions is used to stimulate thinking.
 - **Rehearsal:** Language patterns vary, with some sessions using reflective and analytical language, while others focus on technical terminology and supportive language.
4. **Technical Terminology:**
 - **Teaching:** Specific technical terms related to the instrument are used and explained as needed.
 - **Rehearsal:** Technical discussions are more focused on musical elements and performance logistics.
5. **Approach to Experimentation:**
 - **Teaching:** Encourages experimentation and critical thinking about playing techniques.
 - **Rehearsal:** Experimentation is used to promote creative exploration and refinement of the music, with feedback provided to each other.

Conclusion:

Both teaching and rehearsal approaches share common elements such as positive reinforcement, interactive engagement, detailed instructions, and a supportive environment. However, they differ in their focus on guided discovery, practical exercises, language patterns, technical terminology, and approaches to experimentation. These differences reflect the unique contexts and goals of each setting, contributing to their overall effectiveness in achieving musical excellence.

DISCUSSION:

Using TurboScribe was quite effective although laborious in the material preparation with a lot of screening needed to isolate the correct speaker parts required for the analysis. Manually checking some of the transcriptions, I found it wasn't always accurate in establishing the speech related to a certain active speaker. For the purpose of this subproject though, I found it gave sufficiently accurate data needed for the analysis.

For Microsoft CoPilot, the accuracy and type of prompt I asked led to different answers even when the same question was asked twice. I first started with these questions to see what differences there were in the resulting answers:

«Analyze the following conversation and look for patterns»

«Look for patterns in the following conversation»

«Detailed analysis»

«What language is used to achieve results»

I ended up combining these with the following prompt for more accuracy and consistency in the data analysis of the rehearsals and masterclasses:

«Make a detailed analysis of the following conversation and look for patterns in what language is used to achieve results»

I derived the comparison and interview questions from the experience of the above without a trial run.

Using AI tools, although time-consuming in material preparation, was an effective way to analyze a lot of data and assist in the search for patterns in the use of language in rehearsal and teaching situations. This was also a preferred method to remove any bias in the analysis as I was involved in most of the case studies and AI could be seen as a neutral part in determining the results of the analyses and comparisons. It was beyond the scope of this subproject to delve into the different language categories the AI engine used to classify the interactions in the case studies.

What was clearly noticeable in the AI results is that the analyses and comparisons did not bring up any negative aspects related to any rehearsal or teaching sessions. Whether this is by design is difficult to assess as some of the rehearsals and masterclass sessions did contain certain critiques at times.

What insight can be gained from examining the language used in rehearsal and teaching situations to open up the knowledge field in music performance situations? Is there a commonality between the communications seen in the different case studies? Can this contribute to the artistic discourse of our field?

There is a very strong oral tradition within the music performance field. I found that examining the results of the language used in the rehearsal and teaching case studies and comparisons was a valuable reflection to affirm some of the similarities and differences in these spontaneous interactions and dialogues between colleagues, teachers, and students. It has made me more conscious of the type of collaborative partner and teacher I am and what language I use in these different situations. For rehearsal situations, the repetitive affirmation was something my colleagues were more active in their use. This provides an encouraging and supportive environment with the ability to achieve improved results that I can focus on more in future collaborations. For teaching situations, it was clear I provided more direct feedback and demonstrations and focused on the immediate application of techniques

instead of guided discovery. This is in line with my practical side as a musician and educator where analogies, imagery, and guided discovery might be a method that I can favor for use with some students reflecting on the results the other teachers have had in their masterclasses.

CONCLUSION:

Directive, collaborative, and supportive language is the common thread that leads through these case studies. Although there are certain differences in approaches to each rehearsal and teaching case study, I found the patterns of commonality between them in terms of encouragement, support, interactive engagement, and collaborative language as clear. The AI results show that a positive collegial and collaborative learning environment is aimed for in all the different case studies with frequent use of affirmation and positive reinforcement leading to environments where both rehearsal and teaching situations can achieve favorable results.

How we use language effectively as performers and teachers is vital in achieving the results we are after. By analyzing the language we used in rehearsal and teaching situations it is possible to reinforce the aspects that achieve favorable results to be even more effective in the exchange of performative knowledge. Reflecting on this usage for this subproject has been a discovery that affirms the values I have as a musician to foster the process of constant improvement as a collaborative partner and teacher.

Using AI in this subproject has been a new way for me to examine the use of language in artistic practice and one of the aims of The Opener, «...to experiment with different methods of opening up the knowledge filed and finding ways of documentation that can help communicate and create a stronger sense of a community of sharing...»⁵. This could naturally be expanded upon to incorporate even larger groups of musicians and teachers/students from potentially different countries and to include investigations into the sociocultural similarities and differences. For this subproject in the one-year artistic research pilot program The Opener, these six case studies have provided me with a certain insight into rehearsal and teaching situations. With the rapid evolution of AI, a potential expanded investigation could contribute even more to the artistic discourse in the music performance field in the future.

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS:

Ethical considerations have been made concerning the use of the recorded video material of the case studies in that all participants have been informed and consented to be part of this subproject.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:

The completion of this subproject could not have been possible without the members of The Opener research group, especially those involved in the specific case studies: Ricardo Odriozola, Hilde Haraldsen Sveen, Diana Galakhova, and Sergej Tchirkov; James Kanter and Annelien Van Wauwe for participating and being interviewed for the study; the students who contributed to the Evensen rehearsal and participated in the masterclasses in Bergen and Bratislava; Morten Nordheim for

⁵ <https://www.uib.no/en/kmd/171262/opener-sharing-performer's-process#oral-language>

guidance in the search for effective AI tools; and Einar Røttingen for the inclusion in this pilot program and the catalyst and organizer of The Opener.

REFERENCES:

<https://cdn.openai.com/papers/whisper.pdf>

<https://copilot.microsoft.com/>

<https://turboscribe.ai>

<https://www.uib.no/en/kmd/171262/opener-sharing-performer's-process#background-and-questions>

<https://www.uib.no/en/kmd/171262/opener-sharing-performer's-process#oral-language>