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Abstract

Hip-hop, copyright, Wikipedia, Creative Commons, Lawrence Lessig, cut, and paste. Switch those words around and you have the first sentence of a lot of research on remix. Yes, but what is it like to, you know, do it? This is an autoethnography about the process of remix. Over the course of four years and a severe personal tragedy, the author has remixed parts of other student capstone projects into poems and other creative works. He reflects on what the process of conscious, artful remix has taught him as a communications professional.
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Chapter 1: The beginning

It wasn’t supposed to be like this. My original proposal, and the reason that I entered into this program, was to identify potential best-practices for meaningful engagement and communication in rural communities. I wanted to examine the impact that technology has had and is having on rural Alberta municipalities (under 15,000) that are within 100 kilometres of Edmonton or Calgary. I was interested, from a cybernetic perspective, to examine the potential points of degradation between the input (message delivery) and output (what is received) and how that is impacted by the decline of local media (e.g. closing of weekly newspapers), the rise of global media, and overall access (or lack thereof) to technology (e.g. Alberta’s SuperNet and “last-mile” initiatives). I wanted to do this because these are the kind of places I work, and these are the kind of issues that impact my job.

That was the plan. And this plan made sense to me until one sunny afternoon in late August when I received a very clear message from my mother: your father has been arrested. I’m still processing the degradation of this output.

Within a couple of hours, I was sitting inside the RCMP station of my rural Albertan home town, looking at a sad, bedraggled, old man through smudged bullet proof glass. The man, it seemed to me, looked an awful lot like my dad. And when I asked him what happened, he just shrugged defeatedly. He didn’t defend himself against the horrible charges against him, he couldn’t, even if he wanted to – he was too drunk to remember.

That was the last day I ever saw him.

A few months later, he would hang himself in the closet of an apartment in another rural Alberta town (he had been run out of the other one). The man at the funeral home asked me if I wanted to see him one last time before he was cremated, but he didn’t recommend it. I’m still not
sure if saying yes would have cleared the image of him sitting so pathetically in jail from my mind.

Over the next few months, more facts and accusations were revealed about what had happened. I was sad for the victims, embarrassed for myself, and horrified for my own children. I was questioning my own abilities as a father, brother, son, and husband. I didn’t know what to do. In short, I was depressed.

Personal and professional issues aside, my neat and tidy two-year graduate program designed for working professionals had also been interrupted. I had taken the year off, but it didn’t feel like enough time. Passion, or a reasonable facsimile of it, was something I severely needed at the time. I was more than floundering, I was face down in the mud and didn’t want to get up. My wife Amber convinced me that I should continue with the program and try and finish it. She’s encouraging like that; not ever letting me wallow in my own self-pity.

So, I went back, back to school.

It seemed like (and turned out to be) a good idea. But sitting in a class with new classmates, watching my old classmates convocate on Twitter, I felt listless and unmotivated. My passion was gone, and I was more than floundering. I was face down in the mud and didn’t want to get up. Cybernetics and rural Alberta didn’t seem as interesting. Whatever intentions I had started this program with had disappeared and I needed to find a new motivation or some kind of epiphany.

Some kind of epiphany

It feels bad to say that I wasn’t enjoying my class on research methods. It wasn’t how or what was being taught, but neither qualitative or quantitative was making any impact. The longer the class went on, the more need there was to pick a method to use for our capstone project – that was the entire purpose of the class. Even if there was a method that interested me, I still hadn’t
found a topic to work on (my cybernetic interest in rural community engagement already long gone).

During the section on ethnography, the professor had us read Sarah Wall’s autoethnography on autoethnography (2006) and Ronald Pelias’ lament on being an academic tourist (2003). I was fascinated. Something resonated. Not only was it interesting to read – there was emotion and a sense of vitality that a lot of the other material seemed to lack – but it also felt important, like the authors had something to say rather than they had to say something (the difference between desire and contractual obligation).

In communications we are forever talking about authenticity. Clients want to know how to get more clicks on their links, views on their videos and more engagement with their brand. They want to know: how can we go viral? Whether it’s internal or external communications, social or traditional tactics, the advice is always to be authentic and interesting (Morgan, 2017; Samuel, 2017; Thornton, 2018). This might be why I am so attracted to autoethnographic research; a what’s good for the goose sort of situation. ¹

Having found a method, all I needed now was something to, you know, research.

In our first year, we had read about remix. We read Lessig (2008) and Mason (2009) and discussed the implications that remix has legally and creatively. It’s a popular thing to talk about because you get to listen to a lot of music and watch videos like RIP!: A Remix Manifesto (Gaylor, 2008). Inevitably this leads to Girl Talk.

¹ My favourite project during this degree has been (hands down) using action research (Stringer, 2014) to work with a local not-for profit agency to find technological solutions to some of its communications challenges. Autoethnography has been described as “action research for the individual” (Wall S., 2006, p. 754).
Journalist Zachary Lazar (2011) describes Gregg Gillis (aka Girl Talk) before and during a show:

Minutes before showtime, I found Gillis alone in a kind of abandoned break room. His baseball cap had been replaced by a sweatband, and his custom basketball shoes — Nikes that really do say “Girl Talk” — sat on a folding chair beside him. He wrapped athletic bandages carefully around both of his feet: for the next 70 minutes on stage, he would dance so hard that he would be sick to his stomach afterward, like a marathon runner. The intensity with which he dances occasionally makes his feet bleed. He can’t stop his feet pounding, his head bobbing. Before he found the right kind of table, adjusted to the proper height, he got dark bruises on both thighs from crashing against it in his trance.

Something that makes you dance so hard that you feel sick to your stomach. Something that makes you dance so hard that your feet bleed. A way to research it in a genuine and authentic way? This is the kind of epiphany I’m chasing.²

But why?

Jefferson, Lessig, Mason, and many others romanticize the “yeoman creator” (Lessig, 2008, p. 135) so well that it’s made me want to be one; to see how my life changes as a citizen, communications professional, and student. Lessig writes:

Just as Jefferson romanticized the yeoman farmer working a small plot of land in an economy disciplined by hard work and careful planning, just as Sousa romanticized the amateur musician, I mean to romanticize the yeoman creator. In each case, the skeptic could argue that the product is better produced elsewhere—that large farms are more efficient, or that filters on publishing mean published works are better. But in each case,

² I’m embarrassed to add this but Amber thought it was important to note that I also wore a sweatband while writing most of this capstone.
the skeptic misses something critically important: how the discipline of the yeoman’s life
changes him or her as a citizen (p. 131).

Sarah Wall (2006) writes that “knowledge does not have to result from research to be
worthwhile, and personal stories should have their place alongside research in contribution to
what we know about the world in which we live” (p. 11). Lessig says that “Speaking teaches the
speaker even if it just makes noise” (Lessig, 2008, p. 135) So that I say: let’s speak. Let’s do a
personal story. Let’s document. Let’s journal this mother with the goal of acknowledging “the
inextricable link between the personal and the cultural to make room for non-traditional forms of
inquiry and expression” (Wall S., 2006, p. 9). Let’s see what it feels like to remix something. Or,
at least, let’s see what it feels like for me to remix other student capstone projects.

**Chapter 2: Literature Review**

Let’s start with Mason (2009). He writes of the history of remix, underlining that it is not a new
(digital only) idea. He references Hebdig (1979; 1987) and Chang (2005) and other remix
historians. He demonstrates the significance of the art form and writes as if from the pulpit:
preaching the gospel of remix, converting followers into doers. He specifically talks about
textual remix in the form of the Old Testament and Qur’an. He calls remix a “the most powerful
forces in pop culture” (p. 82) and “nothing less than a new way to communicate” (p. 94).

Read Lessig. Lessig didn’t invent remix, but he did write a book called *Remix* (2008). In
this book, Lessig writes like he’s not just writing about the law but as if our creative lives are at
stake. Even more than ten years later, though a lot of Lessig’s optimism about the transformative
power of remix seems quaint (as Wikipedia eats itself from within, as Google does *some* evil,
etc). Even though he might have got some of it wrong, it doesn’t mean that he’s not right about
the value of remix; particularly about how technology enables the amateur to “create in contexts
that before only professionals ever knew” (p. 108).
Listen to Girl Talk, Kayne, Kid Koala, etc. Don’t like it? Listen to something else. It’s all remix anyway. Watch your kid program in Scratch (or try it yourself), by the end of the day they (or you) will be coding and remixing memes. Read Joyce. Read Burroughs. Watch YouTube. Remix is popular culture. Popular culture is remix. Roland Barthes writes that a text “is a space of many dimensions, in which are wedded and contested various kinds of writing, no one of which is original” (Barthes, 1967).

But it’s not just cool; remix is important. Much like the various parts of dead criminals that Frankenstein stitched together, remix can be many things: transcendent, beautiful, ugly, terrifying, and humbling depending on your point of view. “A great remix,” writes Masons, “is much more than the sum of its parts” (2008, p. 71). And, sure, sometimes it reeks of rotting flesh and tries to kill you, but other times it smells like perfume and “hearts going like mad and yes I said yes I will Yes” (Joyce, 2008) and, well, it changes everything.

Because like Borschke writes (2011), all this isn’t new or digital. “Humans”, writes Mason (2008, p. 71) “have always created new things by repurposing old ones.” It’s more than just Lessig and copyright or copyleft: Gunkel (2016) shows that there is common ground on both sides of the remix debate: both value concepts such as originality, innovation, and artistic integrity. The literature shows that remix can be an important tool in knowledge mobilization (Levin, 2013), community building (Knobel & Lankshear, 2008; Leary, 2007), pedagogy (Dusenberry, Hutter, & Robinson; Smith, West-Pucett, Cantrill, & Zamora, 2016), and can even be used to disrupt hegemony (Cheong & Lundry, 2012). Scholars like Markham (2013) describe remix as a “generative tool for thinking creatively” (e.g. dance, bricolage, etc.). Dusi (2015) uses remix to show “intermediality can be ‘a bridge between medial differences.’” Etc. Etc. Etc.

Remix is also important to examine because, as Lessig and Mason point out, technology has created an entire society of remixers. In 1980, Alvin Toffler coined the term prosumer to
describe people who were “neither producers or consumers” but rather an amalgam – “consum[ing] what they themselves produced” (p. 283). Ritzer et al. (2012) refer to the “coming age” (now) and the opportunities that new technologies (e.g. Web 2.0) allow for consumers not simply to be marketed to but to play a role “in producing shared meanings” of the brand itself (becoming prosumers). Building on this concept, Nakajima (2012) examines the concept of prosumption in the art world, looking at its origins to the rise of information and communications technologies. Nakajima argues that the “practise of art has always been a process of prosumption” and that while the balance has shifted between production and consumption, the modern-day trend (enabled by technology) blurs “the line that separates artists and viewers or audiences, or producers and consumers.”

In a different vein, Cheong and Lundry (2012) write about the concept of prosumption with a focus on its social and political implications as a means of fighting terrorism and a valuable tool in political resistance. The idea that a person/group’s ability “to foster critical, independent media texts and memes to resist the influence of official and corporate news producers” (p. 489) helps to show that remix is more than just stealing or appropriation. Channeling Lessig (2008), Cheong and Lundry cite video remixes within Singapore (among other examples) that “can significantly alter the ways in which people perceive and remember public authorities” (p. 504). In lieu of, or sometimes in addition to, monetary compensation for their creations, Cheong and Lundry point to the “feeling of satisfaction or catharsis” (p. 505) that political prosumers/remixers feel.

---

3 Much later, Axel Bruns proposed the terms “produsage” and “produsers” (2008). A produser is someone who is not a traditional content producer “ but are instead involved in produsage - the collaborative and continuous building and extending of existing content in pursuit of further improvement” such as in open source software, wiki-communities, and multi-user online games (Bruns, 2007). Personally, I just prefer to call them people.
Prosumption whether economically, politically, or artistically is synonymous with remix. When Lessig’s chapter “Little Brother” references (2008, p. 132) Bricklin’s “cornucopia of the commons” (2001), he is describing prosumption – that the content we produce is essential to the services we want to use (e.g. the CDBD database, Netfix’s recommendation algorithm, Google’s search results, etc.). Both economically and culturally we can both remix our own (and others) experiences/data as well as have our experiences/data remixed by others (as individuals and by corporations).

Remix as pedagogy and community development

Remix is not just good for Google and finding new music, it’s also good for our brain. A major theme that emerges when you read the literature for articles on “remix and practice” is remix’s value within an educational setting.

Dusenberry et al. (2015), for example, writes about the importance of adaptability for technical communications professionals and how this can be achieved through multimodality in their education. By mixing pedological approaches, students are better able to problem solve and think critically. The ability to transform information into different forms (e.g. infographics, podcasts, etc) is essential not only to understanding information but to be able to communicate it to a wide audience.

Smith et al (2016) look at Connected Learning Massive Open Online Collaboration (CLMOOC) and the transformative possibilities of remix, outlining four distinct mobilities and relational tendencies: “bursting, drifting, leveraging, and turning” all of which reveal remix “as an emergent, iterative, collaborative, critical practice with transformative possibilities for openly networked web-mediated professional learning.” By causing a sharp, short increase in

4 This could be an interesting diversion into cybernetics and feedback. I will resist it (for now).
production (bursting) over a broader area of study (drifting), remix participants are able to better leverage the available resources and, in some cases, even disrupt the process (turning) – “unmaking assumed power relations” (p. 9). Similarly, Leary (2007), describes successful results using remix with his students. For himself, while the process is messy – he describes the loss of control, the under- and over-estimation of his students, issues with academic language, etc – it is also worthwhile. In trying different ways to remix and reconstitute text, Leary challenges both his students and himself, achieving positive results.

Remix can also create a useful lens on culture and education within the classroom. Building on the work of scholars like J.P. Gee, Knobel & Lankshear (2008) analyse LOLcats and other memes. They see remix in both video and music as a powerful tool for manipulation and distribution. That’s what remix, in a variety of formats can do: create discourse with the text, with the author. It also creates another level, a community (or communities) unto itself (as in the case of the LOLcatters).

From an educator’s viewpoint, there is also an important opportunity found within (collaborative) remix culture for both “learning about music” and “opening up new avenues for musical imagination” (e.g., by enjoying it “in a deep and meaningful way”) (Michielse and Partti 2015). After looking at the IndabaMusic.com remix platform, Michielse and Partti discuss the concept of “small creative acts.” The idea presented (based on Jenkins et al. (2006) is that creativity is not the end goal in remix (used within an educational context), rather the development of new creative skills (literacies) and “critical analysis skills.”

**Remix as a ‘means of enquiry’**

The development of new technologies is challenging the traditional methods of qualitative research – both how it is/can be conducted and how the information will be used in the future. Markham’s (2013) exploration of remix uncovers five elements: generate, play,
borrow, move, and interrogate. As with others she raises questions of quality and credibility, ultimately determining that “the most successful remixes are those that have longevity and can be seen by many to hold a mark of quality.” “Successful remix,” Markham writes, “reaches beyond the merely sufficient to the monumental.”

Eduardo Navas (2012) talks about Remix (he capitalizes it) as a form of discourse and discusses its impact on culture. The book includes many personal anecdotes about his experience with remix (mostly hearing it but also as a DJ himself). Navas see Remix as a “cultural variable”, something that is able to “move and inform … in ways not always obvious as discussed in remix culture.” He calls Remix “a cultural glue” and ultimately see it as able to “become a tool of autonomy” (p. 4). The stand out example of this (brought out by Navas but also cited by others like Change (2005), Mason (2009), Hebidge (1987), and Rice (2003)) is the rise of hip-hop and DJ culture from the late 60s in Jamaica, into New York in the 70s, into the juggernaut of what it is/has become today around the world. Whether in overtly political situations such as Jamaica’s (Chang) or within the more overarching politics of race and representation (Navas), groups have used remix in music to affect change.

Bochner and Ellis (2003) write about the struggle to legitimize art as a basis for inquiry. Compared to quantitative research (and even other qualitative research) an arts-based model can be seen as less appropriate or not as valuable. Bochner and Ellis describe their experience visiting an art university in Finland and the transformative research that is being done by the faculty and staff but also the struggle for the university to “show the appropriateness of alternative forms of representation” (p. 506). They argue that using an arts-based mode of narrative inquiry(e.g. poem, painting or another artefact), opens a conversation (as opposed to a conclusion) and, as a result, “art as inquiry [becomes] a transgressive activity” (p. 507). They write:
As spectators, most of us are trained to look at art and ask, what do I see? But as a form of language, art can become reflexive, turn on itself, invite us to question our own premises, to ask, how do I see? What can I know? How do I know what I know? Then, art becomes a process and form of inquiry. Art can be representational, but it also can be evocative, embodied, sensual, and emotional; art can be viewed as an object or a product, but it also is an idea, a process, a way of knowing, a manner of speaking, an encounter with Others; art can reveal an artist’s perceptions and feelings, but it also can be used to recognize one’s own. (p. 508)

Of course, “remixing something doesn’t necessarily make it better” (Mason, p. 84) and Mason points to cases where the remix has undermined or “devalued” the original idea. But even if the remix isn’t artistically successful, this kind of work can be valuable (as a process), especially when presented with (more traditional) research (Canon Poindexter, 2002). Butler-Kisher (2002) encourages such use of “artful portrayals” in qualitative inquiry as a way to “help push the boundaries of qualitative work.” These portrayals, Butler-Kisher argues, can mediate both our own understanding and that of others.

**Remix as a/r/tography**

This is where the art comes in. As remix does not require art or an artist (e.g. prosumerism, produsage, etc), does an arts-based research approach to research offer any specific benefits?

Marshall McLuhan is complimentary of artists. He writes in *Understanding Media* that “Just as higher education is no longer a frill or luxury but a stark need of production and operational design in the electric ag, so the artist is indispensable in the shaping and analysis and understanding of the life of forms, and structures created by electric technology” (1964, p. 79). To McLuhan the artist is “someone on the frontiers of perception, who looks at information overload with the goal of pattern recognition, to see things before anyone else” (Coupland, 2009,
And while this art would increasingly involve hotter mediums like radio and film, for McLuhan the English professor, it started with text and writers like Edgar Allan Poe, James Joyce, Ezra Pound, Wyndham Lewis, and Ford Maddox Ford (Lamberti, 2012).

As a form of research, Springgay et al. (2005) unpack the concept of what they call a/r/tography: “an understanding of arts-based research as enacted living inquiry” that is “attentive to the sensual, tactile, and unsaid aspects of artist/researcher/teachers’ lives.” A/r/tography, they write, “is a methodology of embodiment, never isolated in its activity but always engaged with the world … [a methodology that] “dislocates complacency, location, perspective, and knowledge” (p.898). As a methodological process, a/r/tography “infuses understandings of metaphor and metonymy” (p. 904). Specifically dealing with the act of visual journaling and the “messy, uncomfortable, and complicated” places that this can take a/r/tographers, Jevic and Springgay (2008) propose an “ethical relationality between self and other” that liberates from “the narrow confines of right and wrong.” In doing so, the a/r/tographer’s work can be more responsive and uncover more layers.

In his essay about the craft of scholarly research, Daft (1983) proposes a new approach (for its time) to research that involves, among other methods, research poetry. Writing before arts-based research advocates such as Bresler or a/r/tographers as Springgay (2005, 2008), Daft sees that value of crafting research that is informed by “error and surprise, storytelling, research poetry, emotion, common sense, firsthand learning, and research colleagues.” His premise is that formal research techniques are insufficient and that looking at an “uncertain, emotional, human side of research” can be “science at its best.”

As with others (Cannon Poindexter, 2002), Prendergast (2006) credits research poetry as a “performative act” that reveals both the “researcher and participant.” Leavy (2010) writes of her personal experience in discovering arts-based research. Connecting to Springgay (2008) and
others, she writes about the ability of this kind of research to “expose, highlight, and undermine power” and how research poems can “expose the false separation of science and art.” Leavy’s use of poetic montage illustrates her own experience and is meant to act as a mirror to the reader to reflect on their own experiences. There is a struggle in Leavy’s piece that evokes emotion, both in her explanation and her poems. She writes, if as researchers, “if we seek to illuminate, reveal, give meaning, surely there are many languages through which we can communicate.”

Another example is Ward (2011) whose research project with four disabled students in New Zealand uses poetic re-presentation in dealing with the potential ethical research dilemmas. The dilemma is to make the research message “transparent” and to tell the appropriately tell the story of those being researched. As in the case of Poindexter (2002), Finley and Knowles (1995), and Canon Poindexter (2002), Ward presents a how-to-guide to creating found poetry and conduct arts-based research. Particularly instructive is her explanation of the five things that poetic re-presentation allowed her to do: 1) foreground students’ stories, 2) to create verisimilitude, 3) to focus on the ‘essence’ of the experience, 4) to create coherent storylines, and 5) to create evocative text (Ward, 2011).

Of course, not everyone likes poetry. Maréchal and Linstead (2010) write about some of the criticisms of research poetry. They admit that while there are valid “ontological, epistemological, and methodological” critiques, these “do not render the position irretrievable.” They provide a valuable caveat when they say that research poetry can be useful and provide greater understanding but only if the research/poet undertakes “considerable procreative preparation, observation, and trial and error.”

Canon Poindexter (2002) who wrote poems based on interviews with HIV patients, acknowledges the disadvantages of using research poetry: “it’s usefulness as a form of data re-presentation is debated and controversial.” At its core, there is a problem with evaluation –
specially, how do you (or anyone else) evaluate research poetry? Poindexter does not go as far as Butler-Kisher (2002) in proposing that the artefacts resulting from research not be shared, but does mention that they are “perhaps not appropriate for re-presenting data in a scholarly report” instead finding usefulness in “classes and training sessions.” Above all, poetry can be difficult and, if not presented properly, readers can be easily lost by the format alone (Lahman et al., 2011).

**Remix as a ‘passage to somewhere else’**

*For reasons at the core of this book, inspiring creativity is more important than whether you or I like the creativity we've inspired* (Lessig, 2008, p. 130).

The danger of remix is that it become more about the process than the artefact (or what the artefact represents). Discussions of legality and technique, while intrinsic, can distract from the point that the author/poet/researcher is trying to make. I keep going back to a quote from an article about Danger Mouse’s *The Grey Album* – a critically acclaimed mashup of Jay-Z vocals/lyrics and Beatles music: “Remarkably, there was one crucial thing at the heart of *The Grey Album* controversy that was never really addressed: the music” (Fairchild, 2014). Really, he’s only kind of right. The controversy was not about the music; the controversy was about rights and legality – the music itself, was generally well received, placing 58 on *Rolling Stone* “100 Best Albums of the 2000s” (2011) and a 7.7 on *Pitchfork* (Pemberton, 2004). But I think that Fairchild’s point is more about the legacy of the album and how, in retrospect the discussion is about the method not the music. Fair enough. I think that it is good to be conscious of this when approaching my project – is it more about the process or the product? Does it even matter?

Hill and Monroy-Hernandez (2012) discuss the correlation between quality and quantity of remix within online collaborative communities. They look at Scratch, an online programming language and community where you “create your own interactive stories, games, and
animations” (Scratch, n.d.). In their analysis of the Scratch community Hill and Monroy-Hernandez conclude that there is a paradox between generativity and originality – that works with qualities that increase remix participation do not always engender quality (original) products but also sometimes do. It’s a wishy-washy conclusion, but points to the frustration of remix: that it can go well or go poorly.⁵

In their reflection on the experience of examining approximately 50 narrative interviews with international doctoral students, Lahman et al. (2011) consider two approaches to the same data: 1) a traditional qualitative approach, and 2) “three poems created by two of the present authors directly from the participants’ words.” Each author received both approaches and evaluate their feelings and learnings from the respective methods. Notably, value was found in seeing both forms side-by-side (similar to Butler-Kisher and Canon Poindexter (2002). The authors also discovered that “formed poetry seems to require some type of training perhaps even in the reading.” Springgay et al. may or may not be overstating the case when they call a/r/tography as “a passage to somewhere else” (p. 909) but, then again, that could work in both a positive or negative connotation.⁶

Some critics are vocal about the dislike of remix (well, bad remix). Daisy Jones, for example, is so fed up with poor quality ones that the nicest thing she writes is “let’s euthanize mash-up culture and burn it in a kiln so only its ashes remain” (Jones D., 2016). But Olga Gorunova (2012) argues that even in the idiotic, “there is a power to reveal something profound about the nature of certain forms of creative digital production, culture and subjectivity.” In works considered idiotic (e.g. popular YouTube video, memes, email forwards, etc), particularly

---

⁵ On Girl Talk mash-ups for example journalist Zachary Lazar writes “The mash-ups sound ironic to the ironically inclined and like pure joy to the joyfully inclined, and for both camps they’re fun to dance to” (2011).

⁶ This reminds me of an old commercial where the person gets on a plane that he thinks is going to Hawaii but finds out that it is heading to Winnipeg. Not all passages lead to better places.
in creating them, an individualization occurs that is both authentic and allows “the inhabitation of the present, creating modes of living that explore the true through the false.”

All of this to say that the point of remix is my case is not the remix itself (what is produced) but the process of remix (what is experienced). Even if the artefacts themselves are considered idiotic less than ideal, the idea of remix as pedagogy, enquiry, and a/r/tography makes the endeavor worthwhile. My concern is not so much the value of remix or its impact on culture (I’ll leave that to Lessig) but, rather, on what it feels like for myself to remix and what it teaches me about both myself and what I am deconstructing.

Chapter 3: Research Design & Methodology

The autoethnographic why

“Of all the disciplines, ethnography perhaps is situated best to provide the tools for digging below mundane surface appearances ... to display a multiplicity of alternate meanings” (Thomas, 1993, p. 6).

Arthur Bochner says that most social science writing isn’t read because it’s “inaccessible, dry, and overly abstract” (2012, p. 161). This isn’t just for the general public, even those of us who have to read it for their job or other reasons can find it a slog to read through most academic writing.

“Between science and art,” says Carolyn Ellis (2004, Class Two, para. 19), “is a sprawling middle ground of qualitative researchers who seek to analyze events, find patterns, and create models for their data.” This is where autoethnography exists, in the middle ground. In one of her many autoethnographies, The Ethnographic I, Ellis outlines the distinguishing features of an autoethnographic project. Most pieces are written as a story in the first person, focusing on a single case extended over time and often disclosing “hidden details of private life and highlights
emotional experience.” The result is a more intimate relationship between the author and the reader: one of “involvement and participation.”

Autoethnography “is a qualitative, reflexive, ethnographic method where the researcher is also the subject of inquiry” (Deitering, 2017). It is ‘auto’ in that it is a highly personalized narrative or account – it is about the self. It is an ethnography because the narrative is an analysis or interpretation of the sociocultural meanings of the self’s experiences within a culture or subculture (Sparkes, 2000). Also known in other academic circles and times as critical autobiography, reflexive ethnography, personal sociology, evocative narrative, auto-anthropology (Ellis & Bochner, 2000), autoethnography has no shortage of epithets.

At its heart, autoethnography is writing about epiphanies that come from an experience and considering the ways that these epiphanies may come to others (Ellis & Bochner, 2003). Autoethnographers view research and writing as “socially-just acts” – trying to “produce analytical, accessible texts that change us and the world we live in for the better” (Holman Jones, 2005, Ellis & Bochner). The process is akin to a mixture of autobiography and ethnography – not only writing about a personal experience and epiphanies but analyzing them and considering ways “others may experience similar epiphanies” (Ellis & Bochner, Section 2, para. 5).

Autoethnography is meant to engage “the self, emotions, and the body” by bringing the reader closer to the text (Ellis, 2004, Class One, A Personal History, para. 57) and the encourages the writer/researcher to “engage, interrogate, and embrace” their stories (Spry, 2001, p. 708). This means creating a narrative, and through narrative “we learn to understand the meanings and significance of the past as incomplete, tentative, and revisable” (Ellis).

You don’t have to be depressed to connect with autoethnography. There are cases, particularly in the social sciences, where academics find that there “something missing” within more traditional qualitative and quantitative research methods because the academic literature
doesn’t “fit” within an individual’s (limited) experience. In these cases, it can be argued that “subjective dimensions … are best expressed through the personal voice” (Douglas & Carless, 2013, p. 88). This kind of research helped autoethnographic pioneers such as Carolyn Ellis to understand the “inextricable connection between story and theory” (Ellis, 2004, Class Two, Term of Choice, para. 32).

**The autoethnographic lie**

When I first proposed this method, a professor warned me to be cautious and work carefully. She said that “there are a lot of people who don't trust autoethnography or consider it a method. Something more of navel gazing!” Autoethnography has been criticized by some quantitative researchers for either being too artful and not scientific and by other qualitative researchers for being too scientific and not sufficiently artful (Ellis et al., 2010). It has been called self-indulgent, faux-psychotherapy, and criticized for lacking the necessary systematic and methodological rigour (Wall, Ellis). In one of Ellis’ classes, a student asks her, “Isn’t [autoethnography] just a way to avoid theory? Or to get out of interviewing people?” (2004, Class Two, Definition and History, para. 38) I get this. I worry about it myself: if the project is a way of getting out of “real” work. Am I doing it to avoid doing real research?

   Even within the autoethnographic community itself, there is a struggle to identify what the method really is and what it is not. Is it a memoir? Is it a personal reflection? More importantly, what would not be considered an autoethnography? (Wall S. S., 2016; Anderson L., 2006; Charmaz, 2006).

---

7 She’s not wrong about this omphaloskepsis, autoethnographers love to write autoethnographies about writing autoethnographies.
The autoethnographic try

To overcome such points of criticism, Wall (2016) encourages autoethnographers to “be clear about their purpose, provide a level of analysis, and attend to the ethical issues that arise in this form of work” (p. 5).

While there is not an objectively “right” way to do research, Deitering (2017) suggests that “[a]ll researchers should rigorously and carefully consider their methodological choices, and all researchers should make the reasons for their choices visible” (p. 4). Autoethnographers must, therefore, be rigorous in their approach, “critically examin[ing] the work itself” (p. 4), working to be both “analytical and emotional, therapeutic, and inclusive of personal and social phenomena” (Ellis & Bochner, Section 5, para. 4). The rigour of an autoethnographer, however, is not so much based on a “preoccupation with accuracy” but on the ultimate goal of creating “analytical, accessible texts that change us and the world we live in for the better” (Ellis et al, s.5, pp. 5; Holman Jones, 2005).

This doesn’t mean that facts are not important within an autoethnography, only that facts can sometimes be unstable when it comes to memory and story. The impact of a quantitative study is in the data, but an autoethnographic work is successful when it touches the reader’s heart and helps them understand what the author has experienced and where it could fit in with their own experience. As Bochner writes, “[t]he burden of the social science storyteller is to make meaning out of all the stuff of memory and experience; how it felt then and how it feels now” (2012, p. 161).

The following is my attempt at doing just that – to make meaning out of my experience in remix. As I have slowly put together these poems over the last few years, I have been keeping notes and doing research on remix, autoethnography, and a/r/t/ography. I have started, stopped, and given up completely more times than I care to mention. I have sent away poems and received
rejections. I have squandered opportunities. I have written and deleted and written and deleted and written and forced myself to keep 26 of my ugly babies. I took a month off of work and went away with my family to Mexico. Almost every morning I woke up early and sat down with the poems and my notes in front of me and to try and make some meaning out of the experience. I tried to write about what it felt like create the poems and why I did the things that I did. I reflected on what they mean to me now and what I learned during the process. I also ate a lot of tacos.

Chapter 4: What is it like to remix?

Finding a recipe

There are recipes for remix. So many recipes.

Matt Mason’s (2009) was the first one I read. In his Quick Mix Theory 101 he says there are four basic ingredients: an idea, an idea of your audience, some ideas from other people, and a little bit of originality. Mix those ingredients together in six simple steps and you’ve created a remix. Sounds simple enough.

Before him, poet Tristan Tzara inspired artists like William Burroughs and Brion Gysin when he provided a very specific set to follow in Section VIII of his “dada manifesto on feeble love and bitter love” (1920):

Take a newspaper.

Take some scissors.

Choose from this paper an article of the length you want to make your poem.

Cut out the article.

---

8 One horrible example of a squandered opportunity is that Amber suggested I contact the McLuhan House in Edmonton to about getting some space to write in (because, you know, McLuhan). They thought it was a great idea and offered me some desk space that I never used.
Next carefully cut out each of the words that makes up this article and put them all in a bag.

Shake gently.

Next take out each cutting one after the other.

Copy conscientiously in the order in which they left the bag.

The poem will resemble you.

Some artists have almost automated the entire process, distilling the art into a science and trading their scissors in for spreadsheets. Rivers Cuomo (Weezer, 2016) describes his song writing process as having a spreadsheet of words and phrases that he's collected from overheard conversations, journal work, and other places. The spreadsheet categorizes the words and terms into various themes and rhyming patterns (eg. # of syllables). He then creates a song out of this catalogue of phrases.9

The process seems a lot like making pancakes, a lot of variation within a similar recipe. At the end of the day, remix involves the same basic ingredient: someone else’s work. The difference between a successful and unsuccessful remix comes down to the skill and artistry of the chef.

**Picking the ingredients**

I wasn’t sure what to pick. A book, a song, a painting – I could choose almost anything to remix. Overwhelmed by the choice, like Verbal Kint in *The Usual Suspects* (Singer, 1995), I looked around the room for inspiration. All I saw were students.

---

9 I’m not endorsing this as a song writing method. In fact, it might be the reason behind reviews such as “Rivers Cuomo and company have delivered a bland and energetic romp that feels more like a half-hearted tribute to Bowling for Soup than the rough, wry material they came onto the scene with back in 1994” (Ferenzi, 2017).
If I’m going to be writing about my own experience, it made sense to write about my own experience as a student. Making a capstone project based on completed capstone projects struck me as both clever and convenient (especially with many of them already being in the Creative Commons). It was also meant to be an homage to the student’s work. While it might be true that “professional knowledge is not static” (Jones, Procter, & Younie, 2015), it’s not exactly on the move either. Once created, as with a lot of graduate and post-graduate work, MACT capstone projects exist primarily in the minds of the authors and on the University of Alberta’s Education & Research Archive (ERA). Having all of that work and those beautiful words just sit there, electronically gathering dust is, well, if not tragic than at least an opportunity.

Not that I can do anything on a grand scale (I don’t even know if I can do something on a small scale) but it’s been argued that even small creative acts can produce a meaningful difference (Michielse & Partti, 2015; Dusi, 2015). So, I decided to do a small creative act.

A small creative act

*Figure 1. Scan of Engaging the Community in an MSP/Calder*
The first pieces I created from Moria Jean Calder’s capstone “Engaging the community: Communications strategies in municipal sustainability planning in Alberta” (2010). I’ve never met Ms. Calder and know absolutely nothing about her other than what she reveals in her capstone.\footnote{I went back-and-forth about whether or not to contact Ms. Calder before starting this project.} The choice was solely based on two factors: 1) her work was in the Creative Commons\footnote{Creative Commons is a “nonprofit organization that enables sharing and reuse of creativity and knowledge.” They are best known for the licenses that allow creative material to be reused and shared in a variety of “legally sound” ways (Creative Commons, 2018).} and 2) the topic was municipal sustainability planning.

I thought it might be better to remix a work with a Creative Commons licence, so I filtered those capstones projects first. While this gave me a shorter list to work with, I still found myself overwhelmed with choice. Reading the titles and the browsing through the content of various capstones, I wasn’t even sure what I wanted to find. Inspiration, I suppose. Interesting phrases, maybe. I kept looking.

Municipal sustainability plans (MSPs) might not be everyone’s cup of meat (Dylan, 1969) but, to me, there’s a definite appeal. A few years previous I worked for the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association (AUMA) helping to create an MSP for the City of Wetaskiwin. It seemed like a good enough connection besides, who am I to blow against the wind? (Simon, 1986)

Reading through Calder’s capstone, I immediately felt some nostalgia at familiar acronyms and town names. I dug in and tried to enjoy her insights in the planning process but, ultimately, I was too distracted trying to find interesting phrases – something that I could work with – to get the point of the work.

I printed the entire capstone out to get closer to the text. At first, I thought I might try Cuomo’s (Weezer, 2016) spreadsheet method but this seemed too onerous and I settled on a
highlighter and a pencil instead. Searching through the text, I highlighted whatever jumped out to me. Phrases like “Finally, I thank God for all he has given me” (Calder, p. i), “normative, value-laden concept” (p. 4), and “the technocratic model decision-making remains in the hands of the experts” (p. 14). I wasn’t sure what I was going to do with these highlights, I just kept writing and highlighting.

One line that stood out is when Calder is writing about the risks of backcasting and brainstorming when it comes to creating an action plan, the major risk being that “anything is possible given a long enough timeline” (p. 45). This, of course, is not a controversial statement. It’s also not central to Calder’s thesis. But it stood out to me because, like most things I’m interested in, it reminded me of me. It’s something that I love to say clients when asked about communications projects (I also like to add in the word “budget”). Even with this project, indeed, given a long enough timeline, anything is possible.

Figure 2 and Figure 3 are intended to be printed on paper or canvas and displayed together, either next to each other or apart (with either Figure 2 or Figure 3 appearing first). The space that

---

12 Some of the more cynical among us might take exception to the word “anything” but the reality is that even the most skeptical naysayer can’t know what is and what is not possible in an infinite timeline.

13 I suppose, just keep in mind the word infinite.
separates the works conveys the length of the timeline that has been given (arbitrary, either by the creator, the curator, or the commissioner).

By being able to choose both the separation space and the order, the curator becomes part of the remix. The viewer/reader is forced to create everything in their own mind (anything) along with the steps to do so within the arbitrary timeline. This simulates either a feeling of dread (at the endless possibilities) or joy (at the endless possibilities). It is also a stark reminder that despite the truth of this statement, the reality of and for each person is a very limited timeline.

Getting personal

Figure 4: It is input

It is input
It is inputted. It is input. It is inputted. It is input.
It is inputted. It is input. It is inputted. It is input.
It is inputted. It is input. It is inputted. It is input.
It is inputted. It is input. It is inputted. It is input.
It is inputted. It is input. It is inputted. It is input.
It is inputted. It is input. It is inputted. It is input.
It is inputted. It is input. It is inputted. It is input.
It is inputted. It is input. It is inputted. It is input.
It is inputted. It is input. It is inputted. It is input.
It is inputted. It is input. It is inputted. It is input.
It is inputted. It is input. It is inputted. It is input.
It is inputted. It is input. It is inputted. It is input.

It’s all recorded.

Figure 5: this chapter

this chapter
this chapter begins with a description an overview

the chapter ends with a discussion

finally, i thank god for all he has given me.

My favourite sections of the capstones, both to read and to remix, came from the Acknowledge section or any place where real people were speaking.\textsuperscript{14} Whether as an interviewee (Figure 5) or as the voice of the author (Figure 5) this was language that was different from the rest of the

\textsuperscript{14} By “real people” I mean anyone who wasn’t speaking with an academic accent.
capstone; language that felt more appropriate as poetry. These are also sections that I could identify with as a student.

The poem “It is input” is part of a direct quote from a participant called “Olds 5” who is responding to a question about the public input process in the Town of Olds, Alberta (Calder, p. 40). By repeating the line 10 times the reader experiences the monotony that can be a real part of the public engagement process. The words skew together, not physically, but in the mind or on the tongue both from their repetition but the strangeness evoked by the choice of “inputted.” What exactly is being entered in or input is left to the imagination of the reader. Not knowing what has been input and when it has been accomplished becomes moot for, yes – whatever it was and whenever it was done – it has all been recorded.

With “this chapter” I know that I wanted to write based on Calder’s line: “Finally, I thank God for all that he has given me” (p. 2) To me, it was both a beautiful sentiment and something that stuck out from the rest of the text. Invoking God, bringing the Divine into the capstone, makes the project much larger than a fulfilment of a degree requirement, it becomes about life. The poem is meant to show that as children, or at the beginning of our chapter, we are given an overview of life from our parents, teachers, and others. We spend the first years of our lives consuming content and making decisions that will set the course of what we will do with the remaining fifty or so years. The chapter closes with our death and, most often a discussion of our life’s accomplishments at our funeral.

15 While inputted can be technically considered the past tense of input (which can also itself be in the past, present, and future tense) its usage is not without debate (Merriam-Webster, 2019).
Speaking of funerals

I found this in my notes while I was still working on the Calder remix:

This project is getting smaller and bigger at the same time. I'm just rereading the engagement capstone. Parts of it anyway. Looking for words and phrases. Trying to imagine images. Is this how real remix comes?

I've enforced a process. I've selected a process and I could have selected anything. I was excited for a moment, but is that how I still feel? How do I separate my anxiety over creating something from the anxiety trying to understand something? What part of how I feel comes from the art and what part comes from the remix?

A new muse

That’s where I ended with Calder’s work. Honestly, I’m not sure why. I have more poems and half-works and there’s more that could be mined from this capstone. Going back to my notes, I don’t make a clear distinction, but I must have been searching for more variety or a project that was more directly about the process of remix. While there were a couple that I considered\(^\text{16}\), in the end the one that became the focus for the lion’s share of my remix project was “Participation in the Remix culture: Situating the Remix culture in an academic environment” by Evelynn Poirier (2014).

The title itself was just too perfect, like a personal invitation or maybe a dare for to me to participate in the remix culture.

---

\(^\text{16}\) I really wanted to use Glenn Kubish's amazing “Remix in the Stephen Duckett cookie incident” (2014) both because it’s about remix and a Stephen Duckett just wanting to eat his cookie (CTV News Edmonton, 2019). If I had, I think the temptation would have been too great to get very silly with the works. I’m still not sure whether or not I made the right decision.
PARTICIPATION IN THE REMIX CULTURE

Abstract

According to a report released in 2011 by the Pew Institute, plagiarism has increased 55% in the past 10 years and most College administrators believe easy access to computers and the internet is the reason. This study undertakes to expand on this assumption by situating plagiarism in the context of a culture that rewards collaborative knowledge construction and dissemination through shared online networks. This study employs a cross sectional design to explore and interpret the relationship between plagiarism and non-academic information sharing activities. Data was gathered using a structured questionnaire from a convenience sample of first-year post-secondary students at NorQuest College in Edmonton, Alberta. An analysis of plagiarism policies from colleges located in Alberta is also undertaken to determine if academic integrity policies are situated within the emerging context of collaborative knowledge construction. The results of this survey do not lead to an obvious positive relationship between plagiarism and participation in the remix, but findings do illustrate that first year college students do indeed consume, produce, and distribute information on the internet as a part of their normal non-academic life, and a portion of students also directly participate in the remix. Result indicate that students apply a hierarchy of digital information use to a variety of information behaviours. Analysis of academic integrity policies from ten Alberta colleges did reveal that the regulation of plagiarism is not ontologically situated in the premise that knowledge is socially constructed.
The first poem that I wrote based on Poirier’s words is called “just one more revision.”

Also taken from the Acknowledgements section, it continues the theme of repetition that comes through some of the poems based on Calder’s work.

In “just one more revision”, even though I have never met the Dr. Curry whom Poirier credits with the titular encouragement, I still feel a personal relationship with her words. Writing this project, writing every project, is an iterative process that can make me feel lost and overwhelmed. Like reading the same sentence over and over again (see also “It is input”), it can be frustrating. Like reading the same mantra over and over again, it can also be meditative.

Overall, the process is necessary and the statement true, without the revisions, the work would not be complete.
Briankle Chang says that we can never really understand another person’s experience and therefore communication cannot take place (Craig, 2007). This has stuck with me from the beginning of my communications studies. It’s not necessarily about the impossibility of the communications profession but rather, I think, about what our goal as communicators needs to be: if not empathy exactly, then, at least, trying to understand our audience.

Chang’s right about not being able to fully understand. No doubt. But when I am to connect with a piece, a line, a thought, a feeling within a larger text it gives me a charge and if even if I don’t necessarily understand want is being said, it makes me want to understand. A shared experience (e.g. writing a master’s capstone project) combined with authentic and accessible language is the basis for communication that seeks to understand or connect with its audience.

To do this as communicators we need to know our intended audience: What do they already know? What are their attitudes and beliefs? What do they need from this communication? Linda Flower explains that “Effective writers are not simply expressing what they know, like a student madly filling up an examination bluebook. Instead they are using their knowledge: reorganizing, maybe even rethinking their ideas to meet the demands of an assignment or the needs of their reader” (Flower, 2000).

My point isn’t to critique Calder or Poirier and if they are thinking of me as their reader (as a classmate, someone who also studies communications, they definitely are). My point is that to remix these works, I searched for the lines that resonated with me the most. Consciously or not, I was distilling the larger capstone into a kind of empathy concentrate that I could use to create something that made for impactful art.
Adding through subtraction

Figure 8: References without references.
PARTICIPATION IN THE REMIX CULTURE

Other solutions for prevention of plagiarism include unique assignments that can’t be easily replicated on the internet ( , ), plagiarism-themed instruction ( , , & , ) and improved understanding of authorship ( & , ). Likely the most militant position on plagiarism prevention belongs to and from an unidentified “highly selective post-secondary institution in the United States” ( , , ). and approach the plagiarism issue from an economic perspective claiming the return on investment of a post-secondary education is lowered when plagiarism occurs: “there is broad concern that these investments are often compromised by student plagiarism, an illicit behavior thought to have grown increasingly common over the last two decades because of both technological changes and shifting social norms” ( , , ). and equate a post-secondary education to a capital asset: “plagiarism may lower the human capital of those who plagiarize [by] reducing one’s subject knowledge relative to understanding” ( , , ). The authors’ economic perspective was a persuasive factor as and were able to enlist the assistance of faculty members to collect anonymized essays from 28 undergraduate courses in a single semester, without the knowledge of the student participants. The sample was 1256 papers ( & , , , ). The 28 courses were randomized and assigned as either a ‘treatment’ course or a ‘control’ course ( & , , , ). Treatment courses contained a mandatory online plagiarism tutorial and quiz to be completed before students could submit an assignment. Overall, students in the treatment courses had fewer occurrences of plagiarism than students in the control courses, leading and to conclude: “our intervention was designed to reduce the prevalence of plagiarism by educating students about what constitutes plagiarisms and providing them with effective strategies for avoidance. However, it may also be that this intervention reduced plagiarism
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(Probett, 2011) (Estow, Thomas S. Dee)

Brian A. Jacob "
" (2012, p.402). Dee and Jacob

: “

" (2012, p.398). Dee and Jacob

" (2012, p.398). Dee and Jacob

(Dee & Jacob, 2012, p.399).

(Dee & Jacob, 2012, p.403).

Dee and Jacob

: “
I have been experimenting with erasure poetry (Figure 8, Figure 9, and Figure 10). I was inspired by Derek Beaulieu’s *a a novel* (2017) which itself seems to have been inspired by Kenneth Goldsmith’s *Gertrude Stein on Punctuation* (2000).

Beaulieu says that the more he read Warhol’s *a, a Novel*, “the more I felt I needed to figure my way through.” His path was to write or create his way through the work. To do this he took the text of Warhol’s original novel (1968) – a word-for-word transcription of real-time conversations and designed to appear unedited (complete with typos, abbreviations, sound descriptions, etc.) – and erased everything but the punctuation marks, onomatopoeia, and other insertions by the typists. The result is a series of visual and sound poems that shifts the focus from the “author” (a character called Ondine) and onto the “invisible, collaborative labour” of the transcriptionists (Williams, 2016) who helped put the context around the audio they were given.

How did remixing Warhol make Beaulieu feel? Aside from being a way to get closer to the text and by creating through it, it seems to have made him feel good. His original goal was to finish one page a day for each of the 451 pages. In the end, it took Beaulieu less than half of that. He describes the process of scanning the pages and erasing the text in Photoshop to be “very meditative” and would often end up completing more than one page in a session (Beaulieu, 2017).

I had a similar meditative feeling working through Poirier’s capstone. Because her text was already a PDF, I was able to use Adobe Acrobat to isolate and edit individual pages. Instead of erasing, I changed the colour of the reference text white to match the background. It felt like a very deliberate and time-consuming process. I stopped after removing the first reference to see if
there was a faster way to do it. In the end, while Beaulieu’s Photoshop method may have (arguably) been more efficient, hiding the text instead of erasing is conceptually different.

Visually, the two methods are identical; the reader would not be able to see any difference between erased or hidden text. By taking away text the remixer can, as with Beaulieu’s example, “shift the focus” onto something/one other than what the original work is primarily known for (whether intended by the original author or not). In erasing everything except for what the transcriptionists added, Beaulieu’s work starts a conversation about the (often uncredited) work behind the work and the people who perform it. By stripping away the main text, Beaulieu helps to reveal a beauty – an art – in what is not traditionally viewed as an artful process.

Hiding the references within Poirier’s capstone, specifically within the section meant to highlight them, reveals how essential these are to Poirier’s work. Without names, numbers, or links to reference, within the context of an academic work, this becomes a useless page. Any beauty or artfulness created in the arrangement of the punctuation marks is secondary to the frustration of the reader not being able to get what they need from the page that exists to refer them to somewhere they can now never go.

Hiding the references is also what we do, consciously or not, both as artists/remixers and as communications professionals.

Erasing the text is a permanent process (as much as anything is permanent in an electronic format). If the reader wanted to see what had been removed, they would need to go back to a copy of the original work. By masking the text – turning it into the same colour as the background – the original text remains intact. Whether or not the reader is looking at the remixed or original versions, the content is identical, only how it is perceived is different.
What is it like not to remix?

From my notes:

Maybe the better question is, what is it like not to remix? This is basically asking, what is it like not to create; to stop working.

Allow myself to contradict … myself

Scanning the capstone again and again, looking for impactful words and phases, it becomes apparent that the search for empathy has become an almost mechanical process. I likely should have expected this from any process that can be broken down into a recipe.

This mechanical approach to creating art fascinates me. Poet Kenneth Goldsmith (2011a) calls this approach “uncreative writing” which itself is based on Marjorie Perloff’s idea of “unoriginal genius” (2010). Both the concept of unoriginal genius and the process of uncreative writing are heavily rooted in remix culture, both from a textual and visual perspective.

Goldsmith sees the connection in the work of art visual artists like Marcel Duchamp and particularly Sol DeWit who believed that “a work of art should be made with the minimum of decisions, choices, and whimsy” and that “decisions for making an artwork should be made before and that the actual execution of the work is merely a matter of duty, an action that shouldn’t require too much thought, improvisation, or even genuine feeling” (Goldsmith, 2011a, p. 10). By minimizing decisions within the process (and by deliberately making them “uninteresting”) the artist can focus more on the concept behind the work (which, arguably, makes the work itself more interesting).

Even before this, in the early 1900s, Wyndham Lewis was developing Vorticism for writers like Ezra Pound (both of whom would go onto inspire Marshall McLuhan) (Betts, 2016). Dadadists like Tristian Tzara were experimenting with similar mechanical processes with text
(1920), inspiring artists and writers like Brion Gysion, William Burroughs, Ernst Jandl, and Andy Warhol (Perloff, 2010) and a countless number of “uncreative writers, infatuated with the digital age and its technologies” (Goldsmith, 2011a, p. 22) thereafter.

Figure 11: Criminal/Punishment/Quasijudicial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code 1: Criminal/Punishment/Quasijudicial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>offence offence offence violation violation confession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misrepresentation misrepresentation misrepresentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misrepresentation abetting consequence reprimand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transgression stealing theft theft theft disciplinary action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disciplinary action disciplinary action disciplinary action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fraud/fraudulent fraud/fraudulent defrauds unauthorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unauthorized guilty impersonating falsification/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>false falsification/false falsification/false deceive suspected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suspected investigated dealt with/judged dealt with/judged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kidnapping accusation misconduct misconduct misconduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misconduct misconduct mislead mislead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12: overall, the body.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>overall, the body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>body over all the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the body over all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all the body over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over all the body</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I think that while this project fits within this category of uncreative writing, the best examples are the poems in Figure 11 and Figure 12.

The poem “Code 1: Criminal/Punishment/Quasijudicial” (Figure 11) is a different way of interpreting type and number of Code 1 violations Poirier found in her research of (p. 82). By deconstructing the table, the words are forced to sit next to each other, creating both a greater visual density as well as the impression of a block of text rather than a piece of data (it looks like a poem). As well, the reader must now process each word individual, creating a sound and cadence (either internally or externally) that is unique to the viewer/reader. This individualization is further underlined by the choice not to include any punctuation (except for the period at the end to inform the reader that the piece is now over).
In “overall, the body” (Figure 12), I have taken a throw away line from Poirier’s literature review (p. 12) and reconfigured the three original words in four words listed four ways. The construction is straight-forward, listing the words progressively from a backwards order until they are in the correct (original) placement. In changing the order, the original line which would not otherwise standout takes on different meanings. In getting closer to the original text, each line demonstrates iterative process of writing as well as the importance of each word. Taking the phrase out of time and context also creates new meaning and nuance as to what the author could mean (body of literature, their body, the body of another, etc).

Goldsmith says: “I used to be an artist, then I became a poet; then a writer. Now when asked, I simply refer to myself as a word processor” (Perloff, 2005). I not going to pretend to be in the same league either Perloff or Goldsmith, but I can identify with the sentiment. As a communications professional I am hired to give advice on how to, well, communicate something: an idea or initiative. More often, however, my job is to design a brochure, make a video, write copy, etc. This process usually feels like Goldsmith’s statement about being a word processor, just a tool to accomplish a job rather than an artist creating something meaningful (not unlike Warhol’s transcriptionists). But that’s not exactly what Goldsmith means. Or, at least, he doesn’t seem as negative about this transformation from poet to word processor.

Goldsmith teaches a class in which students his are encouraged/rewarded/required to repurpose, plagiarize, and steal and, according to Goldsmith, “they thrive. Suddenly what they've surreptitiously become expert at is brought out into the open and explored in a safe environment, reframed in terms of responsibility instead of recklessness” (2011b). By reframing their environment, students can relax because they are doing what they have learned to do their whole lives – copy and paste.

That’s not to say that the process is without some anxiety.
The anxiety of copy and pasting

I keep trying to explain what I’m doing to people. The results are mixed.

My professors are very supportive. My wife is very supportive. It seems to make sense to them.

Figure 13: it is ok to download stuff from the internet and do what i want with it.

I sent a piece to a couple of my cohorts. A draft of the 'it is ok to download' poster with the fonts shifted (Figure 13). No response. I didn't plan on sending it, but we were talking about the projects and well I volunteered it. That’s ok, people are busy.

I sent out some pieces to a least two literary magazines. Rejected by one; didn’t hear back from another.

I tried to explain the idea to my father-in-law. I’ll just leave it there.

It’s a bit of an anxious process, I suppose, but it’s difficult to pin down the exact reason.

For me, the creative process has always been an anxious one. The desire to write, meets the reality of writing. The blank page stares back, taunting. That’s a cliché for a reason.

The academic environment also makes me anxious. The desire to learn about things like novels and semiotics, meets the reality of how exactly that meets reality. Growing up, my family always placed an emphasis on education but at the same time mocked those who they viewed as overly educated as not being in touch with the real world.

_____________________

17 Other environments that also make me anxious: airplanes, oceans, lakes, swimming pools with no one in them, elevators with too many people in them, parties with any amount of people, the woods with or without people, etc.
Long-story short, I’m an anxious person.

So, does the process of remix cause more anxiety?

Jonathan Lethem asks: “what exactly is postmodernism, except modernism without anxiety?” (Lethem, 2007). As an example, he cites T.S. Elliot’s anxiety around the notes and references he added to The Waste Land. Should authors cite their sources or leave the work up to the reviewer? What if the reader doesn’t get it? Worse, what if the reader finds out that I stole it?

I read Hideo Furukawa's Slow Boat (2017). I hadn't read too much about it other than it was in the style of Haruki Murakami. This was true. Overall, I found the book frustrating on my first reading (not unlike a lot Murakami). What I hadn’t realized, until the end, was that the RMX in the title stood for remix. In the liner notes, Furukawa admits that “This book demands explanation” (p. 84) and that the work was a nod to a short story by Murakami and the chapter titles “borrowed” from another writer. More interesting is his statement that “‘misreading’ is a big part of what this book is about” (p. 84) which he leaves vaguely hanging. I had, I admit, misread the book. I didn’t know that it was a remix, I didn’t get the references, I recognized some of the elements as familiar, and (if I’m being honest) found the work unsatisfying as a reader. But when I read the liner notes and started to understand the concept, the whole book felt different to me. It was like it retroactively made the work more acceptable to me. I’m not sure that I would have been so aware of this if I hadn’t been working on a project about remix. Would I have just accepted that I now liked the book and went on with my life? Maybe. Immersing

---

18 Elliot’s anxiety was not entirely without merit. At the time were reviewers who were critical of his “zig-zag of allusions” and a method that was described as “reticence itself” (Perloff, 2010, pp. 1-2).

19 Does this mean that all remix is designed to be misread? Obviously, this is just applied to his work (and only this one). But there is a trick in remix: if you don't know the original, does it just confuse? If you know the original, but don't understand that this is a remix, does it just confuse? An "original" work is meant to stand on its own, and while a remix can stand on its own, it exists in the context of something that it's based on. An original work also has to exist within the context of what has come before it (but is not usually intended to be “misread”).
myself in remix, however, has left me more aware of the impact and, really, it seems to be better\(^\text{20}\) for the reader/viewer/participant to know what’s being remixed or at least that it is a remix.

*Figure 14: Survey Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>about the student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about values and attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the goal is to ask questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not pass moral judgement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remixing the capstones helped me to understand the dilemma around citation better. In one way, I find that citing my sources takes away from the aesthetic impact. But, overall, I’m not sure if my poems stand on their own without the original sources being easily identified. Specifically, for the poems that are about remix and academic issues such as “Survey Results” (Figure 14), it is important (but not essential) that the reader know the words have been remixed from the work of another student (and that the work is about remix and involved a survey). The context adds to the power of the words and lets the reader situate themselves and be moved (as opposed to a poem or work that is about a more universal aspect of the human condition). At the very least, I think that it adds impact to know where they come from; it helps to demonstrate the purpose (and goes back to Sol Lewitt’s point about conceptual art being more about the concept than the art itself (1967)).

Would *The Grey Album* (2004) be as revered if no one had heard of Jay-Z or The Beatles? Is knowledge of the artist/source necessary for the experience?\(^\text{21}\) There’s a difference

---

\(^{20}\) I’m trying to decide what I mean by “better”, maybe it’s just more satisfying? For example, I remember enjoying episodes of *The Simpsons* long before I got the entire joke or what was being parodied; but watching them now I can appreciate more of the references.

\(^{21}\) Even for those who haven’t heard of (or grown up with) either artist, it seems reasonable that the quality of both source works should still make for an impactful experience.
between finding out after the fact that an author has plagiarized or been heavily inspired and finding out the facts about something, just ask Yann Martell (Blackstock, 2002) or Jacob Epstein (Anderson S. H., 1980). For a work like *Ulysses* (1922), while it helped me to appreciate it more when I studied Joyce’s allusions and remix, it wasn’t necessary for me to enjoy the frenetic immediacy of his writing.

Not that this process was/is entirely devoid of anxiety. While I wasn’t so much worried about ‘getting caught’ or the reader ‘getting the allusion’, there were many moments of self-doubt and questioning the validity of this project. I worried about how the original authors would feel when/if they read the works. I debated with myself about contacting Poirier or Calder (I didn’t). Weird Al Yankovic makes a point of always contacting the artist he wants to parody for permission (Freeman, 2014). I’m not Weird Al, and I’m not making a parody. These works were in the Creative Commons, they literally have a license to be repurposed and remixed (Creative Commons, 2018). But, still, I think I should have contacted them. What kept, what keeps me from doing so is part social awkwardness and part insecurity if the works are, you know, good enough.

I found this in my notes:

> In the end, I’m not sure if selecting capstone projects was the best choice for remixing. I wanted to honour the students and the work that went before me but, in the end, perhaps my eyes were bigger than my stomach. The resulting gap between my desire and my talent might come off more offensive and derivative than was intended.

But I like the spin that Jonathan Lethem puts on the process better:
“Finding one’s voice isn’t just an emptying and purifying oneself of the words of others but an adopting and embracing of filiations, communities, and discourses. Inspiration could be called inhaling the memory of an act never experienced. Invention, it must be humbly admitted, does not consist in creating out of void but out of chaos. Any artist knows these truths, no matter how deeply he or she submerges that knowing” (2007).

**Letting the poems find me**

Katie Fitzpatrick (2012) used poetry as part of her research on marginalized youth in New Zealand. She found that just as a poet must listen, so must the academic listen and “spend time with words, and let the poems find you” (Hunt, 2009). I’ve found this to be true. As mechanical as the process can be (and as meditative as that is), there is an art to it that brings me closer to ideas.

*Figure 15: Haiku No. 1, No. 2, No. 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Haiku No. 1</th>
<th>Haiku No. 2</th>
<th>Haiku No. 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>as a disc jockey we appropriate phrases academic death.</td>
<td>when knowledge is shared the act of remixing exists within the ba.</td>
<td>thoughts of another to form new understanding appropriation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the three haikus I wrote (Figure 15), although the process was mechanical (and not unlike River Cuomo’s spreadsheet suggestion), obviously not every word or phrase I found with five or seven syllables was usable. To do this somewhat (hopefully) artfully required spending time with the words, finding out what was being said and, really, letting the poem come to me.

But the value of spending time with the words comes from both sides – the reader and the author. McLuhan says that “As the age of information demands the simultaneous use of all our faculties, we discover that we are most at leisure when we are most intensely involved, very much as with artists in all ages” (1964, p. 379). A poem, such as the haiku’s in Figure 15, allows
the reader to become “artist … because he must supply all the connections” (p. 16). Even when I look at my own poems as I reader, I am looking at the information differently – trying to remember what I removed and why; if I’ve distorted the messages to say something more, something completely different, or if they’ve just become incoherent.

For me as the writer, the process forced me to connect more with the subject than I had when just thinking or writing about it as a concept. By appropriating words and phrases for my own purpose, I was not only acting out what was being discussed but I was researching and engaging both my own perspectives and Poirier’s. McLuhan says that “when information is brushed up against information, the results of startling and effective” (1967). I might be past the point of being startled, but remix did help me think of the text in a different way. Moving the information and formats around like Scrabble tiles around revealed new patterns and ways to communicate the information.

**Every day I write the book**

*Figure 16: how the meaning of things comes to be*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>how the meaning of things comes to be</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>socially constructed meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>becomes the social construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of knowledge and cultural understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asynchr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we interact over space and time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through electronic networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharing and manipulating each other's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural products</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Illustrator Matt Kish (2011) created a picture for every page of *Moby Dick*. He made one every day for 552 days. What does remix mean to him?
"Since the entire endeavor was so deeply personal, I was able to explore what the novel truly means to me … At first, I had identified with Ishmael, feeling like a passenger, a silent observer, on a doomed journey that I has no real control over. But as I started working through the second half of the book, I began to identify more and more with Ahab, obsessed with the idea of the White Whale and the task of finally finishing the art and slaying the monster" (p. xii)

Reading his introduction, you get the sense of what exactly the process is like, especially when the true scope starts to be realized. Kish writes of switching from feeling like a passenger in the first half of the project to identifying more and more with Ahab “and the task of finally finishing the art and slaying the monster.”

I have started to identify with some of these feelings of connection to the material. The poem “how the meaning of things comes to be” (Figure 16) is my attempt to enact the core principles of Blumer’s symbolic interactionalism (Poirier, p. 7). In the piece, I am accessing the capstone itself over space and time through an electronic network. Dividing up the word “asynchronously” leaves the reader intentionally confused but also with enough of each word to make something out; simulating the often-confusing process of socially constructing meaning, especially when things are out of sync or time. The final line “sharing and manipulating each other’s cultural products” is an intimate phrase regardless of what it is being referred to (our human or cultural bodies) that is juxtaposed with what could be considered if not formal than at least euphemistic language.

I wonder if a lot of Kish’s feelings of identification come from the fact that he wrote everyday. It seems obvious, but the more regularly I worked on the pieces, the more connection I felt to them and to the project in general. It started to dominate my thoughts; I looked for (and
found) remix in everything. This isn’t unique to the process of remix, it’s likely more a product of creating and working on something (the act of creation not just the process of remix).

**Conscious vs unconscious remix**

The challenge with this project is to know how remix feels. How can you measure this?

How can I divide between creative processes? What’s the difference between creating something and remixing something creatively? I would argue that there’s no real difference. If everything is a remix, then ‘how it feels to remix’ is how it feels to create - anything. The difference is when you are *consciously* remixing; how is that different? How does that feel?

Sometimes it’s painful. To sit here and think of all the possibilities. There is a weight that exists in conscious remix.

Let’s define it as conscious versus unconscious remix. Unconscious remix is the act of creating, well, anything. Everything that I write is a remix. I am using a pre-existing alphabet; unconsciously remixing phrases that I’ve heard and read many times. Kenneth Goldsmith calls this “‘patchwriting,’ a way of weaving together various shards of other people’s words into a tonally cohesive whole.” But for Goldsmith, this is not a criticism, just an observation of a type of (mostly journalistic) writing that is “literally moving language from one place to another, proclaiming that the context is the new content” (2011a).

An unconsciously remixed poem might be inspired by an image or a feeling or maybe just a single word that I’ve read. The idea will gestate, and I’ll keep playing with it until it makes sense. For me, there’s usually a first draft that comes out a little dirty and then I start to remix my own words; moving phrases around, changing words, trying to clean and polish the idea.
With this project, I already have the words. I'm looking to bring an emotion into the words and/or ideas that already exist. Is that the biggest difference?

I wrote an “original” poem the other day for my in-law’s fortieth anniversary. While it wasn’t a conscious remix of anything, it was based on them, their love, and things that I know are important to them. I guess there was some aspects of remix in it. I tried to incorporate things that were important to them in their life: moments that I knew about from the past and literature that I knew was meaningful to them. It was written quickly, was a first draft, but it feels different than writing these intentionally remixed pieces. There's an academic part, as well, to know that it’s going to be reviewed as part of a larger requirement. So, that's different?

Again, it comes back to trying to separate the act of creation from the process of remix.

**Chapter 5: Conclusion**

What does it feel like to remix?

As an undergraduate I once wrote an essay about the concept of intertextuality in my belly. My proposal was to eat Joyce’s *Ulysses* and see how it changed me. I wrote the essay but didn’t do the eating. Maybe if I had eaten the pages, my life would be completely different. I’ll never know.

With this project, I knew that I needed to get to the table and at least sample some of the text. And while I didn’t always like my own cooking, it feels good to have tried. Somebody, it might have been Dorothy Parker, who stole the line that they don’t like writing, but they love having written (garson, 2014). It’s similar with remix. Because writing is remix. And vice versa.

So, does it feel good to remix?
There’s a joy there to be sure. When it works, when the lines come together and you think something is better than you found it “It is beautiful … as the chance encounter of a sewing machine and an umbrella on an operating table” (Lautréamont, 1868). Which is, I think, to say that it’s good, depending on how much you like seeing sewing machines and umbrellas on operating tables.

If you’re someone like Greg Gillis, maybe remix is what you were born to do, and the answer is yes, and you dance until your feet bleed. And really, if we’re a certain age, living in a certain time, maybe it’s what we’ve all been born to do, and the answer is … sure?

Goldsmith writes about Warhol’s practice but, by extension, is referring to all of us remixers when he says:

We uncreative writers, infatuated with the digital age and its technologies, take this as our ethos, yet it’s only one in a long laundry list of what we find inspiring about Warhol’s practice. His use of shifting identities, his embrace of contradiction, his freedom to use words and ideas that aren’t his own, his obsessive cataloguing and archiving as artistic endgames, his explorations into unreadability and boredom, and his unflinching documentary impulse on the most raw and unprocessed aspects of culture are just a few of the reasons why Warhol’s oeuvre and attitudes remain so crucial and inspiring to today’s writers. (Goldsmith, Uncreative Writing: Managing Language in the Digital Age, 2011a)

Matt Mason goes beyond this sentiment. Not just of us born into a digital age, but everyone from the beginning, we are “are copying machines. We learn by imitating one another. That’s how we learn to speak. That’s how we learn social norms. That’s how culture happens. Everything we do is an invitation to copy” (Baker, 2008).
So, if we’re born to copy, born to remix (maybe some of us more than others), to do it must feel good and come naturally?

I would think that depends on how it feels for you to live. Some of you like life, enjoy it even, but it makes many of us deeply uncomfortable.

But, less dramatically, what I’ve found is that the feeling created by remix is dependent on the project.

Derek Beaulieu says that how we decide to respond to a text tells us more about own our practice and how we perceive what the text permits (2017). I’m inclined to agree. In remixing these capstones, I was not only trying to create art but also trying to create a capstone. This itself makes my original question about what it feels like invalid, or at least way too specific to be applied in a larger context.

The joy of Gillis, the infatuation of Goldsmith, the excitement of Mason, and the passion of Lessig all stem from a place of creative and intellectual inspiration. My project stems from a place of desire (to learn) but is hemmed in by the (self-imposed) constraints of an academic student project. Not that any other remixer wouldn’t have constraints (self-imposed or otherwise), but I feel that the environment I’m working in played a role in how it feels to remix.

But as a communicator, unless we are purely doing art for art sake, we are always working in an environment with constraints (and clients and budgets, etc.) and we are always remixing – whether we are conscious of our copy and pasting or not. You can’t escape remix. McLuhan would say that this is neither good nor bad, it just is, what it is.

What you can choose, however, is artfulness. What made McLuhan insightful/prophetic or whatever you want to call him was that he looked for patterns from the outside, and he found
this door to the outside through art (Coupland, 2009; Betts, 2016; Lamberti, 2012). As a communications professional, too often, I have found myself with a kind of myopic tunnel-vision in trying to understand or help others to understand an issue. This project has taught me that adding an intentional artfulness to your projects (even if it’s just breaking it down to rebuild it) can address some of these communications challenges. It may not solve the issue of understanding, but it helps create empathy, new ways of thinking, and the potential to identify patterns not previously seen.

Finally, I thank God for all he has given me.
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Appendix A: Remixes

— Remixed from “Participation in the Remix Culture: Situating the Remix Culture in an Academic Environment” (2014) by Eve Poirier

everything is appropriated from somewhere else.
Remixing is about remixing
By remix I mean
people who use the Internet
to share
and reshape
things they find
into something new
everything in the assignment is appropriated from
somewhere else.

— Remixed from “Participation in the Remix Culture: Situating the Remix Culture in an Academic Environment” (2014) by Eve Poirier
Finally, I thank God for all he has given me.

this chapter
this chapter begins
the chapter ends

with a discussion
with a description

an overview

Planning in Alberta (2010) by Mora Jean Codner

Running head: GENERIC MINX
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Survey
no participant will benefit
once you have submitted
you will not be able to withdraw

your specific data
will be destroyed.

— Remixed from “Participation in the Remix Culture: Situating the Remix Culture in an Academic Environment” (2014) by Eve Poirier
Survey Results
about the student
about behavior
about values and attitudes

the goal is to ask questions
Not pass moral judgement

— Remixed from “Participation in the Remix Culture:
Situating the Remix Culture in an Academic Environment” (2014) by Eve Fairier
in some way
the language
ideas and
thoughts of another

we all appropriate something
in some way.

— Remixed from “Participation in the Remix Culture: Situtating the Remix Culture in an Academic Environment” (2014) by Eve Foirer
how the meaning of things comes to be
socially constructed meaning becomes the social construction of knowledge and cultural understanding
asynch
we interact over space and time through electronic networks
onously
sharing and manipulating each other’s cultural products

— Remixed from “Participation in the Remix Culture: Situating the Remix Culture in an Academic Environment” (2014) by Eve Fairier
Haiku No. 1
as a disc jockey
we appropriate phrases
academic death.

— Remixed from “Participation in the Remix Culture: Situating the Remix Culture in an Academic Environment” (2014) by Eve Fairier
Haiku No. 2

when knowledge is shared
the act of remixing exists
within the ba.

— Remixed from “Participation in the Remix Culture: Situating the Remix Culture in an Academic Environment” (2014) by Eve Fairier
Haiku No. 3

thoughts of another
to form new understanding
appropriation

— Remixed from “Participation in the Remix Culture: Situtating the Remix Culture in an Academic Environment” (2014) by Eve Poirier
collaboration is defined as cheating
the emphasis here is on the students
preventing them from acting outside a particular paradigm
to catch those who don’t conform

— Remixed from “Participation in the Remix Culture: Situtating the Remix Culture in an Academic Environment” (2014) by Eve Poirier
It is input

It is inputted. It is input. It is inputted. It is input. It is input. It is inputted. It is input. It is input. It is inputted. It is input. It is input. It is inputted. It is input. It is input. It is inputted. It is input. It is input. It is inputted. It is input. It is input. It is inputted. It is input. It is input. It is inputted. It is input. It is input. It is inputted. It is input. It is input. It is inputted. It is input. It is input. It is inputted. It is input. It is input. It is inputted. It is input. It is input. It is inputted. It is input. It is input. It is inputted. It is input. It is input. It is inputted. It is input.

It’s all recorded.

— Remixed from Engaging the Community: Communications Strategies in Municipal Sustainability Planning in Alberta (2010) by Moira Joan Calder
just one more revision
without just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, just one more revision, this paper would not be complete.

— Remixed from “Participation in the Remix Culture: Situtating the Remix Culture in an Academic Environment” (2014) by Eve Fairier
Code 1: Criminal/Punishment/Quasijudical

offence offence offence violation violation confession
misrepresentation misrepresentation misrepresentation
misrepresentation abetting consequence reprimand
transgression stealing theft theft theft disciplinary action
disciplinary action disciplinary action disciplinary action
fraud/fraudulent fraud/fraudulent defrauds unauthorized
unauthorized guilty impersonating falsification/
false falsification/false falsification/false deceive suspected
suspected investigated dealt with/judged dealt with/judged
kidnapping accusation misconduct misconduct misconduct
misconduct misconduct mislead mislead.

— Remixed from “Participation in the Remix Culture:
Situating the Remix Culture in an Academic Environment” (2014) by Eve Fairier
PARTICIPATION IN □□□□□□ CULTURE

There was no overall strategy for managing the participating students. Academics suspected but could not quantify their concern.

Students were explicitly warned. □□□□□□□□□ results show □□□□□□□□□

carelessness, ignorance, dishonesty □□□□□□□□□, a strategy to remedy these faults is a regime of exercises that increases conformity □□□□□□□□□

The emphasis here is on □□□□□□□□□ preventing them from acting □□□□□□□□□
References Without References

Remixed from “Participation in the Remix Culture: Situating the Remix Culture in an Academic Environment” (2014) by Eve Poirier
Work Without References

PARTICIPATION IN THE REMIX CULTURE

Other solutions for prevention of plagiarism include unique assignments that can’t be easily replicated on the internet ( , ), plagiarism-themed instruction ( , , & , ) and improved understanding of authorship ( & , ). 

Likely the most militant position on plagiarism prevention belongs to an unidentified “highly selective post-secondary institution in the United States” ( , ), and approach the plagiarism issue from an economic perspective claiming the return on investment of a post-secondary education is lowered when plagiarism occurs: “there is broad concern that these investments are often compromised by student plagiarism, an illicit behavior thought to have grown increasingly common over the last two decades because of both technological changes and shifting social norms” ( , , ).

and equate a post-secondary education to a capital asset: “plagiarism may lower the human capital of those who plagiarize [by] reducing one’s subject knowledge relative to understanding,” ( , , ). The authors’ economic perspective was a persuasive factor as and were able to enlist the assistance of faculty members to collect anonymized essays from 28 undergraduate courses in a single semester, without the knowledge of the student participants. The sample was 1256 papers ( & , , ). The 28 courses were randomized and assigned as either a ‘treatment’ course or a ‘control’ course ( & , , ). Treatment courses contained a mandatory online plagiarism tutorial and quiz to be completed before students could submit an assignment. Overall, students in the treatment courses had fewer occurrences of plagiarism than students in the control courses, leading and to conclude: “our intervention was designed to reduce the prevalence of plagiarism by educating students about what constitutes plagiarism and providing them with effective strategies for avoidance. However, it may also be that this intervention reduced plagiarism

Remixed from “Participation in the Remix Culture: Situating the Remix Culture in an Academic Environment” (2014) by Eve Fairier
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PARTICIPATION IN THE REMIX CULTURE
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Remixed from “Participation in the Remix Culture:
Situtating the Remix Culture in an Academic Environment” (2014) by Eve Fairier
The Spinal Model of Knowledge Creation

- Situating the Remix Culture in an Academic Environment (2014) by Eve Faison

- Remixed from "Participation in the Remix Culture: Situating the Remix Culture in an Academic Environment" (2014) by Eve Faison.

- The term socialization emphasizes that this is a collaborative activity involving active engagement.

- Knowledge that is appropriated in this phase of the model is enhanced by the act of contributing to and sharing ideas, knowledge, and perceptions. The exchange enables the development of intellectual engagement.

- Through this process, the act of knowledge creation is facilitated by the sharing of ideas, knowledge, and perceptions. Knowledge is appropriated through the act of contribution and sharing.
The Final Stage

— Remixed from “Participation in the Remix Culture: Situating the Remix Culture in an Academic Environment” (2014) by Eve Fairier
This investigation is ontologically framed by George Herbert Mead and Herbert Blumer.

Studying the Rethex Culture in an Academic Environment (2014) by Eve Porter
it is ok to download stuff from the internet and do what i want with it.

— Remixed from “Participation in the Remix Culture: Situating the Remix Culture in an Academic Environment” (2014) by Eve Poirier
anything is possible

— Remixed from Engaging the Community: Communications Strategies in Municipal Sustainability Planning in Alberta (2010) by Mara Jean Calder
given a long enough timeline.

given a long enough timeline.
Appendix B: Anagrams for remixing capstones

A Expecting Rim Sons
A Expecting Rims Nos
A Expecting Rims Son
A Expecting Miss Nor
A Expecting Isms Nor
A Expecting Rosin Ms
A Expecting Irons Ms
A Expecting Ions Mrs
A Expecting Is Norms
A Expecting Is Morns
A Expecting Sis Norm
A Expecting Sis Morn
A Excepting Rim Sons
A Excepting Rims Nos
A Excepting Rims Son
A Excepting Miss Nor
A Excepting Isms Nor
A Excepting Rosin Ms
A Excepting Irons Ms
A Excepting Ions Mrs
A Excepting Is Norms
A Excepting Is Morns
A Excepting Sis Norm
A Excepting Sis Morn
A Generic Minx Spots
A Generic Minx Posts
A Generic Minx Stops
A Generic Nix Stomps
A Generics Mints Pox
A Generics Minx Spot
A Generics Minx Pots
A Generics Minx Stop
A Generics MinxOpts
A Generics Minx Tops
A Generics Minx Post
A Generics Nix Stomp
A Recessing Mint Pox
A Recessing Minx Top
A Recessing Minx Pot

(Wordsmith.org, 2019)