

1 June 2016



Ms Angela Williams


Dear Ms Williams,

I am pleased to advise that the Thesis Examination Committee (TEC) has determined that you be awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy without revision.

I enclose copies of the examiners' reports for your information. In accordance with the University Course Rules - section 10.61 (b), thesis revisions must be made within 12 months of the date of this letter. If this is not possible, it is important you contact me to discuss the matter and request an extension of time in which to complete the revisions, or a fail grade may be awarded.

Please note there may be a difference between the draft resolution in the HPS report and the final resolution as noted in this letter.

Finalisation of your record -

In order for you to be eligible to graduate, the Graduate Research School (GRS) will require the following information **before the graduation deadline** for the ceremony you wish to attend.

1. A PDF copy of your final thesis, as approved by your HPS.
2. An email from your HPS confirming that she/he approves the revisions and that they have been made in accordance with the resolution as stated by the TEC (if applicable).
3. A completed and signed copy of the Digital Repository Form, which is required by the UOW Library in order to upload your thesis onto its Research Online site.

If you have any questions or concerns about any of the requirements listed above, please contact your Student Management Officer at the GRS. Following receipt of the three items listed above, the GRS will complete your student record and you will be eligible to graduate.

Graduation -

Once you are eligible to graduate, please refer to the following website for all information regarding graduation: <http://www.uow.edu.au/student/graduation/UOW063544> If you require specific information about the ceremonies, please contact Student Central on 1300 ASK UOW (1300 275 869), International dialling +61 2 4221 3927 or askuow@uow.edu.au.

Yours sincerely,



Sue Flint

Manager, Graduate Research School

cc: Dr Su Ballard
Dr Shady Cosgrove
Dr Joshua Lobb

**Graduate Research School
Research and Innovation Division**

University of Wollongong NSW 2522 Australia

P: +61 2 4221 5452 F: +61 2 4221 5697

graduate-research-school@uow.edu.au www.uow.edu.au

HEAD OF POSTGRADUATE STUDIES REPORT ON HDR THESIS EXAMINATION

PART 1: STUDENT DETAILS

STUDENT NAME	Angela Joye Williams			DEGREE	PhD
STUDENT NUMBER	2536110	HPS	Dr. Susan Ballard		

PART 2: GENERAL OVERVIEW OF EXAMINATION REPORTS

Both examiners agree that the thesis represents a significant piece of work. Both recommend that the candidate be awarded the degree without revision. Both examiners recommended the thesis receive special commendation.

Prof Gibbs comments that "This is a compelling, extremely powerful and deeply affecting piece of writing" that "commands respect". Prof. Heiland calls it "an exceptional piece of work," adding that the theoretical range in the literature is admirable. Both also recommend that Williams move to publication of both the memoir and the critical thesis. I recommend that the candidate delete the unnecessary adjectives in the abstract as per Professor Anna Gibbs' suggestion.

Based on these comments I recommend the candidate receive the degree without revision, and with a special commendation.

PART 3: HPS DRAFT RESOLUTION for TEC

<i>That the candidate:</i>	<i>Tick one (✓)</i>
a) be awarded the degree without revision.	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) be awarded the degree subject to minor revisions, specified by both examiners, being completed to the satisfaction of the HPS.	
c) be awarded the degree subject to substantial revisions, specified by both examiners, being completed to the satisfaction of the HPS.	
d) be awarded the degree subject to (minor/substantial/) revisions, specified by examiner....., being completed to the satisfaction of the HPS.	
e) be awarded the degree subject to substantial revisions, specified by the examiners, being completed to the satisfaction of the HPS and being sighted by Examiner {.....} for confirmation of the revisions to his/her satisfaction.	
f) be required to resubmit the thesis in revised form for examination after a suitable period of study and/or research.	
g) (in the case of doctoral theses) (i) be awarded the degree of Master of Philosophy - Research without further examination; or (ii) be permitted to submit the revised thesis for examination for a Master of Philosophy - Research	
h) That the thesis be sent to a third examiner.	
i) That the candidate not be awarded the degree.	

If your draft resolution is different from that provided by the thesis examiners please justify the variation below:

I have suggested the revised resolution selected above for the following reason(s):

--

PART 4: JUSTIFICATION OF EXEMPTIONS TO EXAMINERS REQUESTED REVISIONS

ALL REVISIONS SUGGESTED BY BOTH EXAMINERS ARE REQUIRED TO BE MADE UNLESS CONTRARY ARGUMENTS ARE PUT FORWARD BY THE HPS. IF THIS IS THE CASE, THE JUSTIFICATION MUST BE CLEARLY STATED BELOW: IF THE THESIS HAS HAD A THIRD EXAMINER, ALL THREE EXAMINERS' REPORTS MUST BE ADDRESSED IN THIS REPORT.

I BELIEVE THAT THE FOLOWING REVISIONS SUGGESTED BY THE EXAMINER(S) SHOULD **NOT** BE MADE.

NOTE: EXPAND TABLES AS REQUIRED AND ENSURE YOU ADDRESS EACH REVISION INDIVIDUALLY.

EXAMINER 1 NAME:.....

1	The following revision should <u>NOT</u> be undertaken:
Justification:	
2	The following revision should <u>NOT</u> be undertaken:
Justification:	
3	The following revision should <u>NOT</u> be undertaken:
Justification:	

EXAMINER 2 NAME:.....

1	The following revision should not be undertaken:

Justification:	
2	The following revision should not be undertaken:
Justification:	
3	The following revision should not be undertaken:
Justification:	

EXAMINER 3 NAME:.....

1	The following revision should not be undertaken:
Justification:	
2	The following revision should not be undertaken:
Justification:	
3	The following revision should not be undertaken:
Justification:	

I have liaised with the supervisors in the preparation of this report. (HPS to tick to confirm) ☒



HPS Name: ...Dr Susan Ballard..... Signed:.....

.....06/05/2016.

**UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG
EXAMINER'S REPORT FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

22/1/2016

Name of Candidate: Angela Williams

Student No: 2536110

Title of Thesis: It's all just a game, you know, a stupid power game': Memoir as a practice in self-surveillance

School: School of Arts, English and Media

Name of Examiner: Prof Anna Gibbs

Department: School of Humanities and Communication Arts

Institution: University of Western Sydney

Report Due: January 22, 2016

1. REPORT (Please circle appropriate responses)

I report that in my opinion:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| (a) the thesis provides evidence that the candidate conducted original research; | <input checked="" type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO |
| (b) the thesis demonstrates that the candidate has made a significant contribution to the knowledge of the subject concerned; | <input checked="" type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO |
| (c) the thesis reveals that the candidate has a broad understanding of the discipline within which the work was conducted; | <input checked="" type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO |
| (d) the thesis contains material suitable for publication; | <input checked="" type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO |
| (e) the candidate has presented the thesis in a manner and level appropriate to the field of research; and | <input checked="" type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO |
| (f) the literary standard of the thesis is adequate. | <input checked="" type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO |

2. RECOMMENDATION (please select one and tick appropriate box)

After examination of the thesis (and support papers), I recommend that:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (a) the candidate be awarded the degree without revision; | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| or (b) the candidate be awarded the degree subject to the minor revisions specified being completed to the satisfaction of the Head PG Studies; | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Recommendations continued overpage

or (c) the candidate be awarded the degree subject to the substantial revisions specified being completed to the satisfaction of the Head PG Studies; []

or (d) the candidate be awarded the degree subject to the substantial revisions specified being completed to the satisfaction of the Head PG Studies and being sighted by the examiner(s) for confirmation of the revisions to their satisfaction; []

or (e) the candidate be required to resubmit the thesis in revised form for examination after a suitable period of study and/or research; []

in this event, are you prepared to examine the revised thesis? YES / NO

or (f) as there are exceptional circumstances, the candidate be required to attend an oral examination to determine whether a satisfactory standard of competence in the work has been attained; []

or (g) (i) the candidate be awarded the degree of Masters Research without further examination; or []

(ii) the candidate be permitted to submit the revised thesis for examination for a Masters Research degree; []

or (h) the candidate be not awarded the degree. []

3. COMMENDATION (please circle appropriate response)

The thesis is outstanding and I recommend it receives special commendation.

☒ YES ☐ NO

I commend this thesis because, in my discipline, it meets **all three (3) criteria** listed below:

1. a contribution to the field of study that is exceptionally innovative and original; and
2. suitable for publication in an esteemed book or in refereed journals of high repute; and
3. this thesis is amongst the best presented I have read.

4. RELEASE TO THE CANDIDATE OF EXAMINER'S COMMENTS

It is University policy that examiners' reports will be provided to candidates after the result of the examination has been determined.

It is University policy that examiners' names will be provided to candidates after the result of the examination has been determined.

Examiner  Date 20/3/16

Please note that failure by examiners to submit a written report, in addition to this form, will result in this report not being considered.

EXAMINER'S REPORT

PhD

'It's all just a game, you know, a stupid power game': Memoir as a practice in self-surveillance by Angela Williams

This thesis consists of two components, one critical and the other creative. The creative component takes the form of a memoir entitled 'Snakes and Ladders', detailing the experience of the author in the NSW prison system. This is a compelling, extremely powerful and deeply affecting piece of writing thoroughly deserving of a wider audience, and indeed, with some relatively minor editing to remove repetition and perhaps foreground more clearly some of the work's central metaphors, seems very likely to be commercially publishable. Should this be the case, I think it likely that the work would find a wide and appreciative audience.

Not many Australians are familiar with the workings of the justice system nor with prisons or how they are experienced by those who are unfortunate enough to find themselves in one, and yet the number of people who do is steadily increasing – rather like an eerie and unwelcome return of Australia's colonial past. In my view, this means there is a need for works like this one, which – through personal memoir representing hard won firsthand experience, observation and reflection - critically examine the machinery of the justice system and its impact on the lives of those who come into contact with it. This impact, as the writer shows, is often far from positive, and too often fails at any attempt at rehabilitation or the meaningful transformation of lives. In this writer's case, it would seem that her eventual exit from the system and successful completion of the work of the PhD has been entirely due to her own courage and determination, unaided by the system that is supposed to offer help and re-integration, as well as delivering justice. While I would not necessarily agree with all her conclusions (such as endorsing the creation of an 'us' and 'them' set of relations between guards and prisoners), this writer's reflections are sincere and intelligent, and command respect from readers.

The dissertation component of the work is thoroughly researched, lucidly written and cogently argued, and I think it might be possible to publish one or possibly two essays from this part of the work. The use of Foucauldian and Althusserian concepts of surveillance, discipline and interpellation to construct a theoretical framework for textual analysis works well. The readings of the works by Kate Holden, Ahn Do and David Hicks are insightful studies of the genre of memoir and I think form the strongest part of the work. The parallels between memoir and surveillance as forms of production and shaping of subjectivity through the construction of 'narrative identity' are clearly drawn and raise interesting questions which could well be pursued beyond this particular project, which already establishes some clear conclusions.

I have some reservations with the abstract for the thesis, which is written more in the style of a publicity blurb than a scholarly summary, using as it does terms such as 'compelling' - which is actually an accurate description but is superfluous and rather irritating here, and I think such unnecessary adjectives would be better removed before the award of the degree. This, however, is a minor matter and should not be allowed to detract from the very real strengths of both the critical and creative components of the work, which I have no hesitation in recommending for the award of PhD without other amendment or revision.



Professor Anna Gibbs
Writing and Society Research Centre and
Digital Humanities Research Group
School of Humanities and Communication Arts
Western Sydney University

**UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG
EXAMINER'S REPORT FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

Name of Candidate: Angela Williams

Student No: 2536110

Title of Thesis: It's all just a game, you know, a stupid power game': Memoir as a practice in self-surveillance

School: School of Arts, English and Media

Name of Examiner: Associate Provost Donna Heiland

Department: Academic Affairs

Institution: Pratt Institute

Report Due: January 22, 2016

1. REPORT (Please circle appropriate responses)

I report that in my opinion:

- | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| (a) | the thesis provides evidence that the candidate conducted original research; | <input checked="" type="radio"/> YES / <input type="radio"/> NO |
| (b) | the thesis demonstrates that the candidate has made a significant contribution to the knowledge of the subject concerned; | <input checked="" type="radio"/> YES / <input type="radio"/> NO |
| (c) | the thesis reveals that the candidate has a broad understanding of the discipline within which the work was conducted; | <input checked="" type="radio"/> YES / <input type="radio"/> NO |
| (d) | the thesis contains material suitable for publication; | <input checked="" type="radio"/> YES / <input type="radio"/> NO |
| (e) | the candidate has presented the thesis in a manner and level appropriate to the field of research; and | <input checked="" type="radio"/> YES / <input type="radio"/> NO |
| (f) | the literary standard of the thesis is adequate. | <input checked="" type="radio"/> YES / <input type="radio"/> NO |

2. RECOMMENDATION (please select one and tick appropriate box)

After examination of the thesis (and support papers), I recommend that:

- | | | |
|--------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (a) | the candidate be awarded the degree without revision; | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| or (b) | the candidate be awarded the degree subject to the minor revisions specified being completed to the satisfaction of the Head PG Studies; | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Recommendations continued overpage

or (c) the candidate be awarded the degree subject to the substantial revisions specified being completed to the satisfaction of the Head PG Studies; []

or (d) the candidate be awarded the degree subject to the substantial revisions specified being completed to the satisfaction of the Head PG Studies and being sighted by the examiner(s) for confirmation of the revisions to their satisfaction; []

or (e) the candidate be required to resubmit the thesis in revised form for examination after a suitable period of study and/or research; []

in this event, are you prepared to examine the revised thesis? YES / NO

or (f) as there are exceptional circumstances, the candidate be required to attend an oral examination to determine whether a satisfactory standard of competence in the work has been attained; []

or (g) (i) the candidate be awarded the degree of Masters Research without further examination; or []

(ii) the candidate be permitted to submit the revised thesis for examination for a Masters Research degree; []

or (h) the candidate be not awarded the degree. []

3. COMMENDATION (please circle appropriate response)

The thesis is outstanding and I recommend it receives special commendation.

YES / NO

I commend this thesis because, in my discipline, it meets **all three (3) criteria** listed below:

1. a contribution to the field of study that is exceptionally innovative and original; and
2. suitable for publication in an esteemed book or in refereed journals of high repute; and
3. this thesis is amongst the best presented I have read.

4. RELEASE TO THE CANDIDATE OF EXAMINER'S COMMENTS

It is University policy that examiners' reports will be provided to candidates after the result of the examination has been determined.

It is University policy that examiners' names will be provided to candidates after the result of the examination has been determined.

Examiner Donna Philand Date April 25, 2010

Please note that failure by examiners to submit a written report, in addition to this form, will result in this report not being considered.

Thesis: Angela Williams, 'It's all just a game, you know, a stupid power game': Memoir as a practice in self-surveillance

Evaluated by: Donna Heiland, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, Pratt Institute

Submitted: April 25, 2016

Angela Williams' thesis is an exceptional piece of work: bold in both conception and execution. It consists of two parts: the first a strong and persuasive argument about the relationship of memoir to surveillance; the second a deeply felt, deeply thought and deeply compelling memoir that makes that relationship real. Each of those parts could each stand on its own as a significant contribution to critical and creative literature, respectively. Read together and in relation to each other, they have a rare force.

The central claims of the critical portion of the thesis is that memoir can be understood as a form of self-surveillance, and that when memoir functions in this way it is "a revolutionary" act that allows the memoirist to re-claim his or her identity, resisting and re-writing the "official" version of that story. This is a claim that made immediate sense to me when I read it, as truly fresh, strong and well-earned insights will often do. It almost at once made me start to re-think the range of genres and texts that I knew in which a writer was shaping him or herself for an audience, and—in a way that critical writing does not always do—made me want to read more.

The argument in its unfolding is sophisticated, carefully thought through, and persuasive. I admire particularly the theoretical range of the literature that Ms Williams has read and synthesized in order to make her case: more than once I found myself wondering if she would make a particular connection: would she draw in Louis Althusser's notion of "hailing" a subject into a being s/he can not refuse? Yes. Would she connect her comments on self-surveillance to Benjamin Franklin's exercises in self-formation? Again yes. She has constructed her theoretical framework for the dissertation with considerable rhetorical skill, leading her reader through one body of literature after another – on surveillance, self-surveillance, memoir, identity, narrative more generally – and demonstrating how each provides scaffolding for the next as she shapes the totality of the theoretical framework for her argument.

Equally impressive is her construction of the methodology by which she comes to an understanding of her three case studies and her own remarkable memoir. Her focus on problems and solutions—and within that broad framework, on her authors' attention to how their writing functions as a tool of self-classification and risk mitigation, aimed at achieving discipline and ultimately resistance to the stories told by "official" culture—is clear and useful. At the same time, I appreciate that Ms Williams notes so frankly the challenge of shaping this kind of analysis in light of the fact that "memoir is inherently personal" and that her approach—as any approach—is to some degree "subjective." There is a humanity in these acknowledgements that is part of what makes her writing such a pleasure to read, and there is a truth to what she says, though I would add that I think she does a fine job of moving beyond the subjective to make—as she aims to—an argument well grounded in both the theoretical contexts she provides for her work and her close attention to the texts she analyzes.

As I read through her introductory chapters and moved through the case studies that she offers, I found myself pausing on the moment that is at the heart of her modeling of how memoir serves to effect an essential transformation in its subject, and that is therefore key to her readings of the case studies: that moment when the author turns to writing as a form of “discipline.” My interest was in the linking of the work of “discipline” with the notion of creating a “normative model of personhood” (Eakin). This phrase—“a normative model of personhood”—appears often in the thesis, generally in the near company of the related concepts of “narrative fidelity” that brings with it “the logic of good reason” (both from Fisher), and is always understood as an element in an act of “oppositional surveillance” that ultimately stands as the act of resistance that marks the triumph of the memoirist.

The reason for my pausing was this: I was struck by the positive force of this act of “normative” self-formation. If norms are often the cause of a problem—oppressive and ripe for being torn down (the way, for example, that changing laws about same-sex marriage are lessening the hetero-normativity of marriage as an institution in the US)—that was not the case here. Rather, the construction of that “normative model of personhood” was clearly a way of crafting a solution to the trauma or difficulty or problem that had motivated the writing of the memoir in the first place.

And so I see at the heart of Angela Williams’ exegesis a confident (re-)claiming of what is meant by the words “normative” and normal.” The author asserts the memoirist’s power to define what is normative, and so to take power in the world she inhabits. This is a forceful point, and one she could highlight and develop when she returns to this work and readies it for publication (as I hope she will – I say more about this below).

Moving on to the case studies, I will say simply that they are well chosen, work effectively together as group, and are—as individual acts of analysis—succinct, persuasive, and affirm the power of memoir to serve as an effective form of resistance to prevailing narratives. I could speak about each reading at some length, but there is much more I want to say, about Ms Williams own memoir, and so I will move on.

Angela Williams’ memoir is a superb piece of work. Ms Williams own analysis—in the critical portion of the thesis—of the memoir makes clear that the six-week experience of incarceration that forms the structural spine of the memoir is also the catalyst for integrating the stories, and identities, of Angela Marino and Angela Williams. The memoir also bears witness to the realities of the Australian women’s penal system, to the complex realities of women’s lives that land them within that system, and to the relentless self-discipline necessary to push back against and ultimately exit that system.

The reader takes on the role of witness in perhaps a different sense, watching the confident narrator of the memoir’s remarkable opening pages be taken back—so quickly, so painfully—to that identity she thought she had shed, and at the same time aware of that confident narrator always in the background, shaping the story, controlling its pace, its level of detail, its temporal jumps, its astute cultural analysis. As Angela Williams herself notes, she lets us know—through her writerly skill—that “it’s okay, [she’s] done this before, [she] can survive.” And this strategy supports the reader as she makes her way through a narrative that compels reading (it was hard

for me to put it down), that creates a sense of connection (I kept wanting to talk with the narrator, ask questions), that inspires outrage (I had known so little about any kind of prison, so little—in spite of all the theory I've read—about the power dynamic that allows and sustains any state system of incarceration), and that also inspires enormous confidence (in the power of learning, thinking, and individual will).

One remarkable thing about the overall arc of the memoir—as the narrator moves from Mulawa to Berrima to Emu Plains and then to the confines of her home—is the visibility of the work, of the discipline (in the author's terms) that it takes to create that narrative arc. Not all literature is born of such a crucible but some of it is: Angela Williams' art emerged from her sustained effort at “transforming pain to power” (to cite the American performer / author Daniel Beaty).

I said earlier that I hope Angela Williams will publish this thesis. I can envision that happening in a variety of ways (and perhaps she is way ahead of me here). The critical portion of the thesis can stand on its own, as can the memoir.

I can also imagine the critical portion of the thesis developing into a larger study—one that perhaps takes a longer historical view, or looks even more expansively at the place of memoir in relation to other literary genres (the potential list is long), or takes on its relationship to the wide and disparate range of “reality” narratives that are so ubiquitous. should Ms Williams wish to do that.

And I can imagine the memoir being published in its current form, or—and I would recommend this—with the critical analysis as a prologue, perhaps in a shorter form. The theoretical and methodological discussion of surveillance and memoir would interest many readers, and the author's analysis of her own work is very effective.

I am very glad to have had the chance to serve as an evaluator of this thesis. As I hope is evident, I was engaged by the work, impressed by it, and moved to think deeply about a range of topics—some familiar, some less so. My field of vision had widened and my knowledge has increased as a result of reading this work.