

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

This form is to be completed after each supervision

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

<b>Date of supervision</b>	06/04/2022
<b>Date form completed</b> (Form to be completed within two days of meeting)	06/04/2022

**Written work submitted or other purpose of supervision**

- To discuss the prologue I shared with Grace, *Developing a Research Character*
- To discuss potential examiners

**Brief comments on written work**

Grace suggested it was a good idea to focus on voice in the prologue, and to continue doing so throughout the dissertation writing, using voice as material, and that the dissertation would feel like it's missing something without that since it's such an overt feature of the practice.

The aim is to provide conditions that enable the reader or viewer to go through a shift in mood, or character, within the reading or viewing experience. But to achieve this, it may not be necessary to address the reader in the writing. I could still potentially provoke the reader to come to their own conclusion indirectly, rather than address them directly with my aims. In fact, maybe this Brechtian disruption in which the text includes a meta-discussion of itself is no longer so disruptive or estranging anymore, as it's become a recognisable trope through overuse. In a way it may be more refreshing to maintain the magic or illusion of the text, as suggested by some 1990s theatre work (c.f. Sarah Kane)

The prologue talks about what it's doing, at the same time as demonstrating it. Maybe this demonstration is more important than the telling, and in a way the novel writing enables this to happen without explicitly stating aims, as happens in the dissertation.

Maybe this difference in approach whether in the novel, videos or academic writing, also has to do with genre, and treating a genre of communication like one of my 'characters'. If the PhD and the institutional framework surrounding it molds me into a different sort of artist to the one I was before I started the PhD, then perhaps it acts as a sort of character - a frame that is simultaneously enabling and limiting in the kinds of insights I can produce from within that framework. Highlighting the space of 'academic writing as an artist during my PhD' as a kind of *character* could demonstrate the partial nature of the knowledge or insight such a genre is able to produce. The PhD offered my art practice just another kind of character to explore.

Grace suggested making use of the architecture of the thesis genre; footnotes, bibliography, introduction, methods, citation, contribution to knowledge etc, to emphasise its character within my own writing. She

compared this to the work of Howard Barker (architecture of the theatre) and Ian White's writing on the cinema.

References suggested by Grace:

- Howard Barker
- Sarah Kane
- Ian White in the sensible stage and his website / lux

**Topics discussed in supervision:**

Regarding my recent performance experiments that focus on inhabiting a character and relinquishing control over the resultant story, Grace suggested I explore repetition as a means of habitualising my relationship to a character. Perhaps this way I will stop even thinking about maintaining the inhabitation of the role, and storytelling might become easier with practice into that character. I think after this run of performance experiments, I will try a run of 10 performances that repeat the same character/story segments, and iterate both.

I could then look at the videos as a kind of journaling process in which I am developing a character. Perhaps I could also write a journal alongside the 10 performance experiments.

We also discussed adding Simon Faithfull to the list of potential examiners.

**Research Progress (*issues relating to the thesis*)**

Since I met with Stephen on 29 March, I have:

- continued writing my penultimate chapter, *Classes of Character and a Politics of Inner Self*
- recorded 6 / 10 of the 'Hypothesis 2 Performance Experiments,' that focus on character over storytelling
- designed and written an application for a Graduate School Grant to fund a crowd sourcing survey in which I will ask 150 participants to 'diagram the self', with the hope of generating visual data of implicit models of self mechanics (to support the section of my thesis titled *The Shape of a Thinking Thing*)

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

- I have proposed a presentation at the upcoming Teaching and Learning conference at Glasgow School of Art called *Teaching Originality in the Age of Machine Learning*

**Action agreed for next supervision**

- Katarina to ask Stephen to add Simon Faithfull to the list of potential examiners

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

Not discussed

**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.**