

### **Advisor's Report on Master Thesis**

Student: Antonio Kitanovski

Title of the thesis: The Actor and the Training

Advisor: MgA. Hana Malaníková, Ph.D.

Antonio's thesis is an attempt to reflect his experiences from acting practice, to put it into theoretical context and to name his own acting „method“. Antonio did not consult this thesis with me – I first saw it as a complete text. For this reason, I cannot give evidence about our cooperation and the process of writing, so I will try to evaluate the result.

The thesis has three main parts: in the first chapter the author introduces us to his personal history, when, where and how his passion for theater was born and why he decided he wanted to be a professional actor. At the end of this **Introduction** he promises us that he will reflect his journey “on the basis of personal trajectory through theories of certain individuals“.

The second part (Chapter 2 **The Actor and the Training**) should summarize the most well-known approaches to acting propedeutics such as Michael Chekhov, Konstantin Stanislavski and Declan Donellan. But here the reader becomes very confused – Antonio mixes quotations and paraphrases from the books of the above-mentioned authors with his interpretation of their ideas. There is no concrete personal practical experience. From page 20 we are not sure about what situation the text describes – is it a practice from theater? From a theater school? Is it author's ideal way of working on a performance? Moreover, citations are hard to find in bibliographic sources, since Antonio first worked with Macedonian translations of the literature, and only retrospectively searched for quoted

passages in English editions. In this sense, the least understandable chapter is the **Authentic theater** (page 23). Where does the term come from? How are these claims substantiated?

I think it would work much better if the chapter **The Actor and the Training** followed after the third part of the thesis (Chapter 3 **My practical experience**, Chapter 4 **KATaP Departement** and Chapter 5 **My last performance**) as its outcome, which would be organically based on the author's concrete practical experience. In any case the last part of the thesis is the most valuable and interesting one. I appreciate the conceptuality and self-awareness with which the author reflects his work in Macedonian theater, studying at KATaP and working on his graduate authorial presentation. Thanks to these concrete examples, I suddenly get a better understanding of how Antonio sees himself as an actor and author, what is his approach to acting, what he struggles with and what methods or principles work for him. The conclusions and practical solutions of what Antonio's acting training looks like are very beneficial for the field of our research, i.e. Authorial Acting. Especially because they integrate different cultures and different concepts of theater. And we have evidence that Antonio can work with the stage presence and dramatic situation consciously, sensitively and very impressively. By this I mean his final authorial presentation.

Formally, the thesis works with citations and literature sources in an incorrect and misleading way. All direct quotations should be labeled with quotation marks. Free quotations and paraphrases must be easily found at a particular location in a particular bibliographic source (especially in Chapter 2.4 Authentic theatre). Unfortunately, this is a fundamental, although formal, deficiency of the submitted work.

For this reason, I recommend the thesis of Antonio Kitanovski for defense and propose the grade E.

In Husinec, January 6, 2020

Hana Malaníková