Questions and Responses

1. Interference is 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 is a metaphor, Moser proposes that the study of the making, unmaking and interactions of differences is interference. In her view, the metaphor of interference has the potential to take us beyond the problems inherent in mathematical metaphors identified by West and Fenstermaker and to open up (or perhaps reopen) the question of nature and character of the relations and interactions between differences.

1. “Gender is performative, a matter of doing and interacting rather than naturally given or a social and cultural construction” (p.544). Describe how gender is enacted and with what effects in and through Roger’s joke? In what ways does this gendering mute the enactment of disability? Speculate about the role of Moser’s (and Roger's) affect in this encounter.

Roger’s joke accomplished a gender move. The relationship between Moser and Roger shift from a researcher and a research participant or an able people and a disable people to a man and a woman. The enactment of gender challenged another asymmetric structing of the relation between Moser and Roger which is disability. Roger’s joke challenges the position, relation and power between them which made Moser cannot simply views Roger as disabled, but enforce his identity as a man.

8.  What exactly constitutes "betrayal" in Viswesweran’s account and how is betrayal re/contextualized 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?

Viswesweran views “betrayals” as dilemmas in contemporary feminist ethnography. She said that “Feminist innocence is betrayed by relations of power; betrayal signals the loss of innocence.” Through Viswesweran’s several interviews, “betrayals” can exist and even like a commonplace in biography (includes autobiography), historical context and ethnographic relations which may between not only the researcher and the interlocutor, but between interlocutors. I think it cannot simply be attribute to one’s personality, but more complicated social relations and social identities. The research participants may conceal some “truth” to situate their identities. So, the researcher may get incorrect information for interpretation. Although sometimes the interlocutor’s concealment will has a bad influence on the representation of “truth”, their disclosure of other interlocutors may help to reveal their point of view, such as Janaki’s betrayal of her friend Uma will discover her views about child marriage, she think it is a sin by reveal Uma’s life experience. This also help feminist ethnographers to think of how identities are multiple, contradictory, partial and strategic. The aim of Viswesweran’s ethnography is to theorize a kind of agency in which resistance can be framed by silence. But through these “betrayals”, she understood “silence” can be strategic. She stressed that we should learn how to “hear” silence and understand the meanings behind this silence, and through analysis the information behind these betrayals and silences she takes her responsibility in the ethnography.