1. According to the Viswesweran, how can the three modes of attention (temporality, silence and multiple identities) produce a feminist ethnography that is informed by feminist epistemology and enacts knowledge as situated and relational? Illustrate each of the modes of attention through the analysis of Uma and Janaki’s narratives.

 According to Viswesweran, three modes of attention (temporality, silence and shifting identities) may produce a feminist ethnography which conceives of identities as “multiple, contradictory, partial and strategic” (pg.50). Attention to temporality, for instance, can enable an ethnographer to take into account for the impact of time and space upon the knowledge accessed and produced. What and how a participant tells, and what and how a researcher comes to know or not know it cannot be detached from time and space. Secondly, as in the case that Uma does not reveal the truth about her first marriage (pg. 43), silence can address to the power relations between the ethnographer and participant and can show how silence can be strategic for the participant’s agency about what to tell or not. And lastly, shifting/multiple identities need to be considered as a mode of attention. For example, Janaki’s ‘betrayal’ to her friend, Uma, in which she reveals her secret, tell us different dimensions of power relations and how Janaki’s identities are shaped by them. Even if Janaki befriends to her for a long time, her fear of poverty and weakness is reflected by her into her friend's story which shows Janaki’s multiple identities take place within this feminist ethnography.

2. What exactly constitutes "betrayal" in Viswesweran’s account and how is betrayal re/contextualised in biography, wider historical context and the ethnographic relation? In what way does Viswesweran’s relations to the women research participants change and how does she become accountable?

 In Viswesweran’s account, feminist readings of “betrayal” take places. Firstly, it implies the “delusion of an alliance” (pg.40) between/among women. According to Viswesweran, ‘differences’ among women have to be considered, and separateness of women need to be taken into account even if feminist innocence for creating an alliance between women might be betrayed by relations of power. For instance, Viswesweran has been present in the field as a researcher which is a much more privileged position for the production of knowledge, even though she wants to produce knowledge about the women in the field. Secondly, as in Janaki’s betrayal to Uma, betrayal can be ‘a marker for women’s agency’ (pg.42). She reveals Uma’s secret to Viswesweran and ‘betrays’ her friend, however, this betrayal also help Janaki to project her fears as a woman and to secure her sense of weakness which is produced by power inequalities Jana went through.

3. Interference is a concept engaged in feminist technoscience studies. What is interference? What is the potential of this concept for understanding the relations between differences such as gender, disability and class? How does it nuance the approach of intersectionality and its geometrical models?

 Interference, as Moser quotes from Oxford Dictionary, has a dominant meaning that implies mathematical metaphors, and points to “disturbance of the transmission or reception of radio waves by extraneous signals or phenomena” (pg.538). However, as Moser discusses, feminist technoscience studies suggest an alternative meaning for this term which takes the audience to the question of ‘difference’ and “character of the relations and interactions between differences.” (p.543). However feminist technoscience does not think of interference as if it does “start from a point, a location, which is someone’s location..…in an ongoing and structurally stabilized production of differences and inequalities.” (Ibid.). In this sense, interference is different from intersectionality because it does not place the subject into the centre of the circle of power relations to understand how the subject is interconnected to the power relations which is moving around. Rather, interference approaches to “difference” as “complex, contradictory, unpredictable, and often also surprising” (556) which avoid us arriving at simple and generic conclusions. In this regard, we can say that feminist technoscience studies address to “the different temporalities of the coexistence, convergence, and divergence of differences in interactions” (557) by the term of interference.