



Formative feedback

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

Student name	Gesa Helms	Student number	492645
Course/Unit	Creative Arts 3: Research	Assignment number	4 (video tutorial)
Type of tutorial	(eg video/audio/written)		

Key points

This is a useful record of the tutorial discussion - I have left my notes in the annotated draft of the contextual essay

This tutorial comes 13 months after Research 3 and a couple of months after BoW4. I ask for a discussion of the larger mechanics of the essay itself and its links to BoW, this starts the first point around audience relationships and immersion. I briefly point to key themes here and each (and some further related points are then addressed below in more detail.

Overall, the tutorial is tremendously useful to walk through the thirteen months in between and access and assess the research elements of the work and how this links to the practical work and to some extent forward to SYP. The tutorial is encouraging as to what is already here and present and what it now needs to tighten ready for conclusion of the module.

- Audience relationship and notions of immersion
- Voices in the document
- Unpacking and strengthening academic voice
- Priorities and what to unpack: the role of the blog
- Using the conclusion to go back to aims
- Managing excess

Summary of tutorial discussion

Audience relationship and notions of immersion

I offer some of the discussions points from BoW 4 and in particular the notion of immersiveness as means to invite audiences to engage.

Immersiveness is not seduction, Rachel says. And I offer whether the overwhelm that is facilitated by immersive experiences is not in fact a seductive means, a lure to the audience but also hovers at the edge of discomfort and consent.

Rachel reminds me of an early discussion around reveal/not reveal, a kind of dancing with the audience, of me being seductive: to offer glimpses and to withhold them. So, perhaps I should be more explicit with it and e.g. not to offer that I came to Marks' erotic late.

Engagement can't be enforced, it is always something the audience decides, and immersiveness is no guarantee here.

Rachel's use of tease is interesting and resonant too (and much later we come to how complicated work may be intimidating to access, and so intimidation enters the array of artist/work/audience relationship). After the tutorial I realise I bristle with the 'tease': there seems something resonant as to who is to blame/responsible, and I hold this thought and note it here to return to it later.

Tease of course also manifests in the playfulness of many of my enquiries – not sexually but as ways of probing and dancing.

The discussion also clarifies further how audience is central to my work and considerations, the questions of participation and viewing too (possibly too of voyeurism, they are being addressed in a number of ways in and across the work). This leads too to notions on consent and violence, how Zambreno right at the end introduces violence as theme which she cut right out of the entire Book of Mutter. Rachel suggests *On Violence* by Ma Bibliotheque as reference. I have a memory of how looping and excess tries to circle around violence as means to deal with it (but perhaps this is from another conversation entirely; it feels relevant nonetheless). Much later we talk about complexity and the padlet: Rachel offers that people will engage with it on whatever level they chose to or want to, and that that doesn't affect the complexity.

As to the complexity: be aware of pointing very clearly to what is important (for assessment). Rachel mentions Barthes' *Preparation for the Novel* about fragment and whole (and at what point it falls apart; cf Zambreno's use of Barthes also).

Voices in the document

One of the points for me to ask is of how the excising of the case studies from text to audio works and the hyperlinking there. This leads to Rachel raising the range of voices in and across the text, the use of different font types and alignments to indi-

cate this, so that quotes and case studies can be part of practice and thus not part of the word count. We discuss various ways of designating the word count and how to then conclude what it actually is.

A main action point here is to work on further clarifying and strengthening the different voices (reflective, practical, academic, [check if there are others]).

You might even think of them as geographer, social scientist, artist, writer, educator, as these are all part of your arsenal and play different roles or have different interests and concerns which surface at different times?

Voice then functions for the text as Marks' discussion of the erotic [write this out in text of blog].

Voice then also orientates differently to the audience.

Unpacking and strengthening academic voice

We turn to the role and function of academic voice and conventions and here Rachel feels that voice can be tighter and more confident, and being certain of what needs unpacking and what outsourcing. Some of the sections, while clear, feel quite reflective and could be tighter. I say that that register is of course a choice, but the difficulty of managing the tight word count here remains.

The aim is to present a very clear document, which plays fairly safe in terms of academic conventions and word count.

Priorities and what to unpack: the role of the blog

This clarification is another key action point: to develop a clear set of priorities of what the text needs to address (possibly also use much more limited word counts such as abstract or 20 words to get to the heart of the work) and then to excise what is beyond that. These excised parts can then be reflective, additional posts in a research folder on the blog, hyperlinked such as some of the practice reflections I already included.

Who and what are key theories, authors and what are key works to reference? My current sense would be: Springgay & Trumann and Marks; Jonas, Zambreno and Palmer. These then should get unpacked, other can go to blog, or, e.g. also into a list of referenced works.

The unevenness of discussion from my side is due to the limit of word count while having to demonstrate contextual awareness and relevance. Rachel asks if this may also be part of teasing; I say it isn't, it's quite unsatisfactory.

So, while the methodology and findings are the most important parts, the lit review needs to unpack a few elements (and points to the blog for all else).

At the moment I think the blog needs three key pieces as part of its research folder: a) theory; b) writers; c) voice; but also some more on the rules and excess (the dis-

cussion in the tutorial on excess/fantasy but also relationship to violence is really important).

Aims, findings and conclusions

Aims are super and well set out, I come to them in the findings but not enough in the conclusion. Action point: a conclusion that answers them, rather than one that set out next steps.

Managing excess

The Appendix with Rules: Can this come earlier, these rules are significant. As foreword or prelude? I also suggest to have it as opening quote to start with. Rachel asks: so does this essay manage excess (does it succeed)? I describe how it manages excess through the various satellite objects and a designation of different voices. I then wonder if excess is already being managed by me naming it, by planting that idea in a relational context, in a dialogue and that the other then wonders if there is more, if there is more beyond the parameter of the project. So that it effectively introduces in dialogue a fantasy object that leads the other to seek around and beyond, and to go away with a fantasy (57mins: transcribe in toto).

Will Self: Digital essay Kafka's Wound, a hyperlinked essay. **I just can't find a link to this online -it seems to no longer exist- sorry**

Arno Schmidt's Bottom's Dream

[While listening again, I hear that Rachel also asks whether the project is successful, I didn't hear that in the first conversation. I will come back to this: of what is success in this, what failure? Perhaps questions of control are always both: tight boundaries provide safety but exclude and simplify massively; and vice versa. Does it depend on the actual relational contact in which this is approached and negotiated every single time to give a sense of whether it works?]

Any other notes

We discuss final submission timeline, the absolutely latest being 27 May. I am aiming to submit asap after concluding this feedback report and offer 15 May as indicative time.

Tutor name	Rachel Smith
Date	17.4.21
Next assignment due	15 May 2021