

Goldsmiths, University of London
SUPERVISION RECORD (MPhil/PhD)

This form is to be completed after each supervision

Student Name:	Katarina Rankovic	Student Reference:	33300528
Department:	Art	Date of Birth:	13/03/1994
Date of Initial Registration:	23/09/19	Expected Submission Deadline:	2022
Supervisor 1:	Michael Archer	Supervisor 2:	Grace Schwindt
Funding Status: (Self-Funded/ ESRC/AHRC/Other)	Self-Funded	Full time/ Part time:	Full time
Thesis Title:	Scripting for Agency		

Date of supervision	20/12/2021
Date form completed (Form to be completed within two days of meeting)	20/12/2021

Written work submitted or other purpose of supervision

Upgrade submission: <https://www.katarinarankovic.art/upgrade>

The draft (online) upgrade submission consisted of:

- Abstract
- Exhibition of Practice (works included: *Time Off*, *Suburbia*, *The Man on the Ceiling*, *The Trickle*, *Traitor Effect* and *Homo Horizontalis*)
- *Anomaline* (my novel, written during the PhD and submitted as documentation)
- Contextual Review
- Dissertation Sample
- Structural Outline
- Timeline to Completion

Brief comments on artwork and written work

- The project needs to be made more clear
- The videos show stereotypes and outsider perceptions of people, and the characters are not complex - they are like comedy sketches from the 1980's about housewives or Eastern European people.
- Probably the most important part of the proposal is the way in which I use storytelling / words in the videos / artwork.
- Grace felt the proposal of having different sides to a self and performing them seems like a sad view of reality. For me, the proposal is liberating because I find my own conditioning towards consistent self presentation suffocating and oppressive. Grace sees it as stemming from capitalist pressures to perform. But I find having to maintain a consistent personal 'brand' (the social agent 'Katarina') more capitalistic and pressuring. Likewise, I feel more comfortable and free when I'm allowed to be inconsistent and variable.
- The last paragraph of the abstract feels like an afterthought and is not very clear.
- There are different approaches to dealing with the subject of diversity, e.g. Edward Said's work, so be clear about what I mean when I use that term.

Topics discussed in supervision:

- **The ideas in my written dissertation have grown out of the artworks, not the other way around.** In the works, I'm actively searching within myself for my own character inheritance. The subsequent dissertation writing then attempts to reflect and draw questions/conclusions from that data.
- **Clarify my usage of the term 'diversity' in the last paragraph of the abstract - how I use such notions and what I want to explore in them:** What I meant by the last paragraph of the abstract was a proposal about where the PhD might be headed in terms of a conclusion. I wanted to take the matter of diversity, (in terms of the way in which the word is today employed in popular media in the context of, e.g. 'Diversifying the workplace/ educational institutions') and suggest that concerns about 'diversity' currently stop at the level of the social agent (the habitual representative character of a human being), and do not extend to the human being itself. In my research, a human being is seen to be a character-playing machine, and therefore a site of considerable diversity in itself. I wonder then if conceptually collapsing the social agent with the human being removes complexity from, and flattens, the human being, in exchange for humans' ability to organise at a social level. I'm therefore calling for a distinction to be made between the social agent and the human being, and for a communal conversation about whether we can cope with more complexity when it comes to the re-presentation of human beings in social systems. In other words: *How does understanding the human being as a machine that plays out character - and therefore a machine capable of generating diverse character - affect the question of increasing diversity in society?*
- **Bear in mind the following questions as central to the upgrade exam:** What is the field of knowledge you are researching? What will your new contribution to that field be? What are the items of the contribution and what are they doing? Do these contributions fulfill their promise?
- **The Novel:** If the novel is going to be included in the submission, it has to be made clear in the Abstract and elsewhere how the work is making the argument of the thesis alongside with the videos. Or, there is the possibility of including it as documentation (but I need to clarify this with Stephen or Edgar and in relation to regulations).

Research Progress (issues relating to the thesis)

The thesis and its components are becoming a bit more coherent and clear.

Research Training and Professional Development: (review of training needs, relevant conferences, funding, presentations and publication)

Action agreed for next supervision

- Edit the submission in response to Grace's comments
- Follow up with Edgar / Stephen about what exactly is meant by documentation and whether the novel could sit within that category or not, or any other ways in which it might be appropriate for the novel to be submitted

Date of next supervision (if more than two months from now, briefly explain)

A follow-up supervision shortly after the upgrade examination.

Declaration of confirmation: By ticking this box it is confirmed that the information above is correct and accurate according to both the student and the supervisor at the time of the meeting. All Supervision Record Forms should be stored and subsequently attached to the Annual Progress Report Form.