



Open  
College  
of the Arts

Student name	<b>Gesa Helms</b>	Student number	<b>492645</b>
Course/Unit	<b>Creative Arts 3: Research</b>	Assignment number	<b>1</b>
Type of tutorial	<b>(video)</b>		

## Formative feedback

Normally to be written by the student, and endorsed by the tutor with **additions/amendments in red**.

### Key points

Rachel offers to start with what I want to talk about and I begin with a number of questions concerning the broader remit of the course. We start with these (type of work to be submitted; relationship between R/BoW; and the way in which former work/ approaches can become a new thing as we discuss my current focus on the line (as a conference paper and presentation)).

We conclude with a discussion on the submitted proposal and some areas of attention (focus, glossary, conciseness) and how these are best addressed in the next assignment.

Concerns that I raise and that mirror her first reading revolve around breadth but also a need to unpick a whole number of terms, for these, she suggests to use a glossary to not have to overload the text.

### Summary of tutorial discussion

#### Overall course aim and relationship to BoW:

The format of the dissertation is definitely a written one of 5k words with a range of different options of what the written format is. In terms of interest, focus, time, then it can take a supplement (e.g. a video work or installation) that sits in addition to this; this can also be finalised in or be subject of SYP (depending on timescale).

I suggest the following understanding and process for moving between the two current modules: R sets the research design, the rationale for it (and contextualises it), BoW tests, experiments, gains new insights; which in turn are reflected, analysed and refined in R. – Some of this will articulate a little more complex if part of my artistic practice concerns forms such as performative lectures, written texts or instructive documents, but overall this process seems appropriate.

#### Reviewing work and when does the work become a new piece?

I had uploaded a short post on the line (final work for DI&C, which I am currently working with in order to turn into two different formats), and wanted to discuss: - what in this

concerns actually a new work? Are e.g., the different conceptions of the work in relationship to its audience constitutive of a new object? What is in this in relation to academic working practices (institutional critique, specific forms of artistic practice) that are relevant and can be insightful for BoW (and Research).

Rachel encourages me to reflect on

- (a) what has already been done and achieved in DI&C
- (b) what am I looking to do now, new?

And, that part of this process, I am unpicking the methodology of the line to help it inform how I proceed: in terms of space, nearness, performance and relationality. I also raise that the previous form had very little interest in its audience, which now moves to the fore. Rachel advised to be clear about the above and to make a well-informed argument so that I am confident I am not self-plagiarising.

*AP: a blog post that reflects on the above and articulate it forward.*

This discussion also involves my interest and experiences in academic practices while being eager to avoid the work falling into earlier approaches (i.e., to ensure I am not writing a Human Geography dissertation or PhD but one that approaches the material from within a Creative Arts practice); the question of making the conference presentation and text part of the modules or not was informed by this also, and I have a good sense of how the work (and the new work that builds on the line can contribute to this while being qualitatively new to the DI&C material and also presenting an artistic practice that informs BoW/Research)

We discuss *the line and The gap* in detail and I realise they share a number of aspects: as concepts that allow me to explore agency, movement, transgression, reveal/conceal. There is in both (more so in the line) an element of excess, overwhelm and I recognise this (positively: abundance, potentiality) as an element where I am seeking a particular sensation in the encounter and to transmit that sensation. It will be good to get a better handle on this (to gain a bit more fluidity in navigating it. [this characteristic is also in my writing, in how I bound/delimit a topic (or not) and what I raise implicitly, allude to].

### **Research proposal:**

The discussion of the research proposal covered two main areas:

- (a) the need to deal with existing knowledge and explicate accordingly (e.g.: less Bourriard, more feminist; near space etc; do I really want to use memory as baggage).
- (b) difference between reflection and text proper.

For (a), Rachel early on raised the issue of starting and **including a glossary** in which I chart my progress of different concepts over time and introduce them. This is an excellent idea and we discuss how the dissertation through its different sections and aspects of course also functions a piece of art work and what this would look like with my interest in hybridity, written forms and institutional concerns.

Near space as a relational concept that isn't mere body space.

>> the glossary will help me to wrestle with theoretical positions, to articulate when needed.

For (b) we discuss both the final section of the proposal (relationship to earlier work) and key texts and Rachel suggests that much of the former can go towards a reflective blog post while being much shortened in the proposal.

There are a number of further suggestions in terms of editing the document and making it more direct and concise; these are all very helpful and I will revise the document accordingly.

There are **a number of relevant texts/ readings**, the ones I have noted are  
Karen Barad Ma(r)king  
Deleuze/Guattari On the line and their concept of line of flight  
Women who make a fuss

## **Summary of Research Proposal** (amended in the light of the tutorial)

*The near space in an expanded field of drawing: interdisciplinarity, hybridity and contact*

This dissertation proposal seeks to support my Body of Work *drawing/contact* with an investigation into the kinds of relational spaces that are created in an expanded field of drawing. Here it begins with drawing as a performative practice and in turn seeks to understand performance as a drawing practice. If performance is centred on the body of the performer within a specific unfolding time frame - a presence, can we then be curious about the kinds of spaces this is productive of: relationally, sensorially and materially?

The dissertation will inform and reflect enquiries that are interested in modality, site and practice of an expanded field of drawing that sets out with the body as initial drawing tool. Interested in contact implies a curiosity about the fabric that contributes to our articulations of corporeal selfhood (as author, subject and audience). At once immediate, sensorial, tactile it also asks wider questions concerning relationship and presence. These concerns around agency, voice, autonomy are at once informed by older materialisms (notably: a critical materialism of social praxis) and are curious about new materialisms and the constitution of the human body (also in its potential hybridity, one cyborg form or another).

I seek to pursue this programme in a series of investigations:

- (a) a series of drawing/performance enquiries which are mainly focused on the self;
- (b) a series of drawing/performance enquiries which are small scale, intimate and perhaps simply 1:1, either scripted and more formal or more spontaneous in nature;
- (c) larger public workshops, events or performances.

By focusing on different self/audience parameters I seek to investigate the forms of contact, presence/absence in the kinds of near spaces that are productive and produced in drawing/performance, and, as a second step, explore them in a series of adjacent media and forms, folding forward and onward (Bedford, Schneider, Lepecki, all 2012). These forms will mainly be tested, experimented with and developed in BoW and then feed back into the dissertation to complement the

- (d) the recording and further circulation of these in a form that is first written, and can also take a different form, perhaps as an audio-visual essay, a moving image collage or an artist publication.

### **Timeline for Research:**

A1: end of April

A2: end of June

A3: early September

A4: end of October

A5: end of November

## Any other notes

I realise that part of the actual format of the dissertation and its register of writing will depend on what I will settle for – e.g., a creative writing essay will be different to one that primarily reflects on my own working practices – the next assignment will clarify some of this further and we briefly discuss its focus and timeline: ideally as planned by end of June, possibly it will be end of July.

We end with looking ahead at part 2 and discuss some of its remit to articulate and narrow down both theoretical dimensions as well as first literature review.

RS:

This is a good reflection of the discussion

Further detail of texts discussed:

Isabelle Stengers, Vinciane Despret, *Women who make a fuss* Univocal 2014

Karen Barad's chapter 'Ma(r)king Time: Material Entanglements and Re-memberings: Cutting Together-Apart', in *How Matter Matters: Objects, Artifacts, and Materiality in Organization Studies*

Deleuze and Guattari lines of flight: *Thousand Plateau's*, in the rhizome chapter, or *On the Line*

Possibly you might find a useful chapter in the book *Politics in a Glass Case* : Helena Reckitt, 'Forgotten Relations: Feminist Artists and Relational Aesthetics'

Tutor name	Rachel Smith
Date	12.5.19
Next assignment due	30.6.19