



Open
College
of the Arts

Formative feedback

Student name	Sarah-Jane Field	Student number	512666
Course/Unit	Creative Arts Today	Assignment number	5

Overall comments

This is a well conceived and imaginative exploration of themes flagged in the assignment question. The overall presentation is professional, reflecting a genuine commitment to the area of study. The arguments are suitably varied within an overall coherent structure, and a consistent tone of critical evaluation runs through the whole discussion.

Feedback on assignment

Assessment-wise, this ticks all the boxes – more than once. Given the slippery nature of the question the knowledge and understanding you bring to the topic could scarcely be better at this level. This comes down to the choice and use of research sources. The selection here - a judicious mixture of scientific speculation and popular culture – is suitably challenging, credible and engaging. You might yet look into Plato (ideal as real) Kant (space and time are inaccessible because they are subjective intuitions) Derrida (on the metaphysics of presence – see below) and Deleuze (on time and cinema). The sources were threaded together in a way that posed distinct questions without having to resort to a level of rigor inappropriate for this kind of enquiry. This demonstrated good judgement and a very good grasp of the nature of the problem as posed in the question. Moreover, the continuity of the discussion – posing the problem and then inverting it, was a neat way of structuring the argument.. This, along with the

clear prose, organised headings and overall coherence demonstrates well-judged communication skills. Most importantly you showed a critical grasp of the material throughout – something that could only be achieved with the other criteria fully satisfied.

The topic proved interesting therefore, not for a final answer, but as an arena in which (wildly) speculative ideas were pitted against each other. Here for example, having used Self as a way of getting the discussion going you bring him to book by pointing out the excess in his argument. Why, we want to ask, is the rather doubtful loss of narrative an evolutionary change and not just a blip in the fate of storytelling. Dystopian as much as utopian ideas are not known for their modesty whether from the pen of a social critic or a neuroscientist. So it was wise to present the thoughts as theirs rather than ones you had adopted. Credit there for keeping a critical distance whilst exploiting the material as you saw fit. However, an occasional shift to an analysis of the terms could have clinched things more logically. What does interactive amount to and is it really a technological phenomenon? Isn't any old conversation interactive.

The peculiar, not to say weird notion at the heart of your discussion is that discontinuous narrative forms are somehow skewing time. Here you would have benefitted from the distinction between time and temporality. The forward motion of the arrow of time as distinct from the narrative shuffling of past present and future, seems both paradoxical and unchangeable. There has to be something that narrative is seen to depart from, such that the departure confirms rather than denies time as given.

If you are minded to make further changes an interesting and, to my mind by far the most persuasive yet paradoxical thought about temporality comes under the heading of deconstructing the metaphysics of presence (Derrida). Briefly, we think of the real as just what is present to us – occupying the same time and space. But the present is inconceivable without the past and future to frame it, and inconceivable with past and future as a point of transition from one to the other. Post-structuralists will call it a gap, a cut, or caesura to signal the idea that the present is absent.

I spotted just one error – where you have Greenberg at the end you should have Greenfield.

Feedback on reflective commentary

Your reflections are well considered according to the criteria of assessment. The main point that comes across is that your approach is polemical. This seems to govern all else. If you intend to remain with that approach you need to be aware of its limitations – I'm sure you are – that bouncing one idea off another may challenge the reputation of an argument but not so its truth, for which you need to drive one argument to the bitter end.

Learning Logs/blogs

The polemical approach is driven by the learning log which contains a welter of rich and varied material – debated and critiqued on the hoof.

Suggested reading [where appropriate]

As above

Pointers for the next assignment

N/A

Tutor name	Michael Belshaw
Date	20.1.17
Next assignment due	n/a