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* + 1. This paper is separated into five sections, however many of these sections will overlap and repeat one another. As the distinctions between these sections come into question they get blurrier. This project attempts to take a deconstructive approach to the established qualitative research interview method by reconstituting the traditionally dominant roles and procedures of the interview process with new fluid meanings. Just as this project dwells in (and on) the ruined structure of the traditional qualitative interview it will also dwell in (and on) the ruins of the assignment’s structure.
  + Research Questions

1. How do Athens’ independent musicians move into their more public practices and mark them in distinct ways?

Personal relations inform this project just as they inform any other thing that motivates us to act. The idea that researchers are unbiased observers divorced from all personal motivation is deceptive. In his book *Michel Foucault: The Freedom of Philosophy* John Rajchman (1985) quotes Foucault on his autobiographical relation to research,

Each time I have attempted to do theoretical work, it has been on the basis of elements from my experiences – always in relation to processes that I saw taking place around me. It is in fact because I thought I recognized something cracked, dully jarring, or disfunctioning in things I saw, in the institutions with which I dealt, in my relations with others, that I undertook a particular piece of work, several fragments of an autobiography. (Foucault quoted by Rajchman p. 35-36)

Researching topics of personal interest does not make a scholar irresponsible. The rational and scientific logic behind objectivity assumes a concrete reality with present and unchanging beings, but once subjectivity comes into question being, presence, and existence all become problematic.

An interest in local music communities and culture and their differences from the dominant music culture industry spurred this interview with two local Athens musicians that also pursue other careers. Another factor contributing to the topic’s significance was my recent introduction to Michel Foucault’s theory on the care of the self, which inquires into, as St.Pierre (2004) explains, “how one should conduct oneself in relation to codes of action and to others.” (p. 339) Foucault’s relation of poststructural theory to the social construction of the subject in their everyday practices created new lines of meaning between other poststructural theories I’m interested in and my own relation to the processes of subjectivity as a doctoral student and local musician and promoter. Foucault’s theory on the care of the self made the realm of the social human and the subject’s actions within it relevant to me again in a poststructuralist framework. Summarizing this point much more gracefully St.Pierre (2004) explains, “Foucault’s and Deleuze’s point is that the concept of ethical self-formation through technologies of the self can indeed be reconfigured based on the moral codes, self-forming activities, and relationships available in postmodern culture.” (p. 341) Even in a postmodern frame the actions we take still matter.

By removing the researcher from the dominant role of the guiding questioner, and instead having the researcher transparently confront subjectivity and difference in relation to a longtime friend, this project opens up space for new forms of questions that result from lines of flight during a casual conversation, as opposed to an objective interview between interviewer and respondent. These lines of flight are no longer limited by the academic scope of the research topic and the traditional interview structure, however the theory of the researcher and the topic at hand still enter the conversation just in new and surprising ways.

In her dissertation inquiring about the social construction of women’s identity in Milton, Alabama Elizabeth Adams St. Pierre (2004) argues, “friendship relations in Milton are private spaces, loopholes, with attendant practices the women both find in their culture and invent that encourage subversive citation and the disruption of the fierce public codes that aim to keep women in their place." (p. 342) Instead of inquiring about the books clubs of the women of Milton, Alabama I inquire into my own friendship relations and how we reconstruct those private spaces and loopholes bring them into our public practices. While continuing to critique the subjective emphasis of nostalgia this project references several invented signifiers immediately recognizable only to those friends in those private spaces and loopholes, however it is the different ideas (or absence of ideas) these signifiers clue us into that is related to the topic at hand.

The private space of Riggonia and the loophole of the Riggonian accommodate and resist. Highlighting the Riggonian voice as opposed to the independent musician’s voice or some Other’s voice, Alecia Youngblood Jackson (2003) quoting Deleuze explains, “foreground[s] contradiction and disjunction.” (Deleuze quoted by Jackson p. 693) The contradiction of the subject rises and melts away. A riggonian “plane of consistency” or style comes to light based in its disjunction and relation to difference as opposed to its conformity. In his translator’s foreword to Deleuze and Guttari’s (1987/1980) famous Rhizome chapter, Brian Massumi discusses this more open interpretation of consistency,

what Deleuze and Guattari call consistency – not in the sense of a homogeneity, but as a holding together of disparate elements (also known as a "style"). A style in this sense, as a dynamic holding together or mode of composition, is not something limited to writing. Filmmakers, painters, and musicians have their styles, mathematicians have theirs, rocks have style, and so do tools, and technologies, and historical periods, even -- especially -- punctual events. (p. xiv)

In other words, consistency is always made up of many differing elements put together. Consistency is the combination of different ideas whose energy or resonance sometimes leaves a reverberation that can be interpreted as traces of its dynamism. This project attempts to examine and interpret the riggonian plane of consistency and its reverberations.

2. How does a Riggonian move into their more public practices and mark them in distinct ways?

I expect that the majority of my audience have never heard of Riggonia, and that even fewer would say they could define what it is. I struggle with this question in every instance with which it is posed, as do all Riggonians. But the Riggonian emphasis on differance (in the Derridian sense), the deferral of meaning as a means to meaning, also emphasizes how deconstructing voice is vital as it places doubt on the act of translation as a representation of something “real”. Jackson (2003) argues that voice “like any act of language, *produces* rather than *reflects* reality, and working in the limits of voice exposes the ways in which the researcher's voice as well as the voices of participants betray meanings and significations of experiences." (p. 704) This project attempts to use a Riggonian style to work the limits of voice and deconstruct the traditional qualitative interview structure that reconstitutes the binary distinction between us/them, interviewer/respondent, me/other.

The logic behind the traditional qualitative interview method assumes that to uncover “what is really going on” it is necessary to sit down with and question those subjects that directly experience(d) something relating to the researcher’s topic. This logcentric focus on presence and voice denies the productive capacity of language and continues to reinforce dominant binary distinctions. Jackson suggests that qualitative researchers should consider her concept of rhizovocality when attempting to work the limits of voice. Jackson (2003) explains her concept as “Rhizovocality, in its multiplicity and contingency, is difference within and between and among, it highlights the irruptive, disruptive, yet interconnected nature of positioned voices (including the researcher's) that are discursively formed and that are historically and socially determined - irrupting from discursive pressures within/against/outside the research process." (p. 707) A focus on riggonian voice as an irruption works the limits of voice by constructing a space based in difference and fluid reconstitution instead of attempting to represent the voice of an Other.

3. How does the traditional qualitative research interview method overlimit subjectivity?

The significance of this question has already been addressed in the preceding pages, but to expand further, retrieving the authentic voice is actually an impossible action in a poststructural paradigm. There is no truly authentic self to be voiced as all the distinctions that make up the self are socially constructed. Once the researcher makes this break they are then posed with the question, “how can research be “made to mean?” (Lather, 2000b).” (Jackson p. 703) The traditional logocentric methods become problematic. This project’s interview style is not to expose truth, but to deconstruct the interview itself and open up space for new meanings. Brian Massumi puts it nicely when he argues that once the researcher arrives at this point, “The question is not: is it true? But: does it work? What new thoughts does it make it possible to think? What new emotions does it make it possible to feel? What new sensations and perceptions does it open in the body?” (Deleuze & Guatarri, p. xv)

Arrangement and Description

The interview was conducted at fellow Riggonian JR’s house, in a room where he spends much of his time creating and reflecting. Both JR and ML sat on the floor facing a projection screen where video clips of questions and live stream video were projected. The audio came from two stereo speakers placed on a mantle behind us. The on-board camera of a laptop, which was placed below the projection screen, provided a live stream video of ML and JR which was layered in with the video clips from other interview settings. The video clip questions were triggered wirelessly from an iPad linked with VDMX 5 VJ software. No time restrictions were placed on the interview process. A one hour and 21 minute video and audio recording (using the laptops built-in microphone) of the interview was produced with only one cut due to a minor technical difficulty around the one hour and thirteen minute mark.

When I first approached JR about doing the interview I informed him that I intended to take a riggonian approach. I also assured him that it would be a casual process free from the pressures of accuracy and etiquette. JR is a close friend of mine and has been for quite sometime. Therefore he is somewhat familiar with my theoretical background and research interests. I told him I wanted to deconstruct the dominant binary inscribed in the traditional interview process by blurring the distinction between interviewer and respondent, and that he is the perfect respondent because (as he is well aware) I have often thought that he is me. Luckily, I agreed with myself, at least long enough to agree to do the interview.

But this focus on the selection and arrangement process only serves as a distraction. The interview should not be attributed to and explained in relation to its subjects, as that bypasses the interview itself as a subject. Deleuze and Guattari (1987/1980) explain the basic structure of the medium and reference the problematic dominant tendency of attribution,

A[n] [interview] has neither object nor subject; it is made of variously formed matters, and very different dates and speeds. To attribute the [interview] to a subject is to overlook this working of matters, and the exteriority of their relations. It is to fabricate a beneficent God to explain geological movements. In a[n] [interview], as in all things, there are lines of articulation or segmentarity, strata and territories; but also lines of flight, movement of deterritorialization and destratification. (p. 3)

Although Deleuze & Guatarri were specifically referencing the book instead of the interview here, their arguments about the social distinction between subject/object support the subject replacement of the term “book.” Replacing “book” with “interview” allows us to reinterpret their arguments in the context of the ruined structure of the traditional qualitative interview.

In this project I did not conduct the interview on my own, but even if I had written and asked every question myself attributing the interview to me would still be reductionist and shortsighted. Understanding the interview as a process attributed to a specific subject confines our thoughts from addressing the exteriority of its relations. The interviewer/respondent binary constructs a relation of dominance and authority that confines the structure of the interview, thus overlimiting the lines of flight that could potentially occur otherwise.

* + The Interview Guide, Protocol, and It’s Rationale

This project’s interview guide was not directly used during the interview process. Instead the guide was used to design a MIDI controlled question cueing interface on the Lemur application for iPad. A single word label hinting at the question’s topic was given to each button that had been assigned to a video question clip. Even though the interview stuck to the same order of questions written in the interview guide, the questions presented in the clips only served as guiding questions that could then be discussed and/or supplemented with more questions by both JR and ML. ML would cue the next guiding question once they both agreed to move on.

A casual conversation does not stick to the structure that a traditional interview guide and transcript assume. The traditional structure of the guide and the transcript relies on the overlimited logic of the established interview process, which confines the proliferation of thought preventing lines of flight and mandating structured response. The time/money-consuming transcription process could also discourage traditional researchers from taking the extra time to pursue these lines of flight. This confinement leads to a much more reserved and structured process, one with less interruption and less active dialogue. Researchers look for methods that can streamline the workflow instead of disperse it. The interview becomes technologically mediated by the knowledge of traditional interview process. I would have agreed less and probed less had I realized the labor involved in the transcription process. I would have controlled lines of flight and more carefully and structured my words to guide as opposed to a more stream of consciousness flow. This logic reconstitutes the binary between interviewer/respondent and me/you thus overlimiting the space. Many more ideas and new relations flow from an active and casual discussion than from the structured question/answer format, which Raj pointed out during the interview process when he explains, “now im thinking about the question as a question so I’m thinking of an answer as an answer rather than just thinking of how it is you know?” (Interview Transcript, p. 3) In this project no time restrictions were enforced in order to better facilitate a free flowing less anxious conversation.

Despite these critiques of the traditional interview method, traces of its process still remain in this project. For example, some of these fragments can be found in the video clips traditional interview context, the use of recording technology to create a reproduction of the moment, or in the question/response format structuring our discussion. We do not go above, or transgress, the interview process. Instead, this project operates in its ruins. This riggonian interview resonates a consistency or style leaving reverberations that construct what Deleuze and Guattari call a plateau. Brian Massumi explains,

Each “plateau” is an orchestration of crashing bricks extracted from a variety of disciplinary edifices. They carry traces of their former emplacement, which give them a spin defining the arc of their vector. The vectors are meant to converge at a volatile juncture, but one that is sustained, as an open equilibrium of moving parts each with its own trajectory.” (Deleuze & Guattari, p. xiv)

Included in a multiplicity of interpretations, the crashing bricks could be related to the different video clip questions pulled from multiple disciplinary contexts, and the volatile juncture could be related to the interview itself, as it was constructed from all these moving video clips addressing different topics.

This project’s rationale is informed by a multiplicity of poststructural theory including Deleuze and Guattari’s theories on nomadic thought and the rhizome, Foucault’s analysis on Care of the Self, and Alecia Youngblood’s concept of rhizovocality. Through this grid of scholars the project’s riggonian-style interview attempts to function as a deconstructive probe to work the limits of voice in the qualitative research interview method. Even though none of these theories were ever specifically discussed during the interview their perspectives were inscribed into the process. For example, when JR and ML were talking about their first memories the interview took a line of flight relating to enlightenment moments. JR and ML end up agreeing that these enlightenment moments stick with you whether you can recall their specific revelations or not.

ML:I remember the moment as if it was one of the most important moments of my life but I can’t remember anything. Nothing spurred it, nothing happened, you know? I can’t remember anything about what I realized. [laughter]

JR: I’m sure its still, you realized it though. In my mind, like, you realized it and it did influence your life, and you know that still it’s in there. Maybe you don’t always remember being like, that’s the challenge is like remembering, you have these enlightenments through the course of chaggin life and then like you know you forget them and that’s the challenge just trying to remember “oh yeah I realized that”… (Interview Transcript p. 23)

Just as these enlightenment moments come and go throughout life so do our interpretations of reality. For a researcher these fluid interpretations of reality are often guided by theories that they have read. Theory allows researchers to constantly reconstitute their interpretations. Theory can change your way of thinking on all matters, whether you are aware of it doing so or not. Deleuze and Guattari (1987/1980) also believe in this concept as Brian Massumi explains, “The authors’ hope… is that elements of it will stay with a certain number of its readers and will weave into the melody of their everyday lives.” (p. xiv) St. Pierre (2004) describes this process as something more conscious and direct when she argues that, “This is the work of interpretation, of using theory to make sense of living, to make a contingent sense of living, since different theories allow us to interpret differently." (p. 345) With this view of theory as practice the distinction between theory and method begins to drip away.

Summary of the “Findings”

The traditional structure of the interview and the structure of this assignment construct the interview process as a means to an end. The traditional researcher must present “findings”, which signify what the researcher found to be “true” about their research question from the “data” provided by the voice of the participant. Clearly this view is problematic from within a poststructural framework.

The traditional interview process is logocentric. The requirement of “findings” assumes a concrete reality with a set truth waiting to be found. It assumes presence and existence. The concepts of presence and existence shift focus to the subjects, whether it be the interviewer or the participant, which distracts from the interview’s exterior relations. Instead of questioning the interview’s relation to the reconstruction of other processes and ideas the traditional qualitative framework naturalizes the interview process and the subject’s role in the process as a representation of the “real”.

This project’s first two research questions, whose only difference is the specific subject of the question, become the same question once we begin to question and deconstruct the subject/object binary. Again replacing the term book with interview in Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987/1980) discussion of the rhizome,

“There is no difference between what a[n] [interview] talks about and how it is made. Therefore a[n] [interview] also has no object. As an assemblage, a[n] [interview] has only itself, in connection with other assemblages and in relation to other bodies without organs. We will never ask what a[n] [interview] means, as signified or signifier; we will not look for anything to understand in it. We will ask what it functions with, in connection with what other things it does or does not transmit intensities, in which other multiplicities its own are inserted and metamorphosed, and with what bodies without organs it makes its own converge. A[n] [interview] exists only through the outside and on the outside.” (p. 4)

Now the third research question also gets blurry. An examination of the interview and its relations to things outside of it makes the research question’s specification of independent Athens’ musician vs. Riggonian irrelevant. Even though surprising ideas about that relationship do emerge from the text of the interview, a broader view inquiring into how subjects are constructed through their practices comes into sight. We are no longer limited to the interview’s interior address on the subject’s specific daily practices, but opened up to examine the exterior relation of the interview to that process of identity construction. We are no longer confined to ask “how does the subject construct their personal identity through their specific practices?” instead we can now ask “how does the interview process relate to the process of identity construction?”. This denaturalizes (or demystifies) the voice of the other as a representation of truth and the interview as the method that reveals that truth.

Paradoxically, this broadening of scope that includes the exterior relations of the interview also allows the specifics of the interview text to take on a new relevance. The interview transcript no longer reflects the assemblage of the interview, but it is instead another assemblage linked with the interview. When a transcript is structured into grammatically correct sentences it further removes the text from the recording (in this case a video). However, grammar can also be used as an interpretation of tone. This is why you may see many questions without question marks, as during the transcription process they were interpreted to be rhetorical statements, not questions to prompt a response. There are always multiple interpretations of any text.

Through this exterior relation between assemblages, the anecdotes and ideas written into the text of the interview transcript are released from their confinement within the interview process and can be analyzed from a multiplicity of perspectives. For example, one video clip question from a 1982 interview with the Grateful Dead on David Letterman’s show asks “Video clip w/ BW, JG, and DL: DL: Is that, Is that, Is that generally thought of as a flattering term though? Is that Is that general” (Interview Transcript, p. 4) In this case a relation is spurred by the interview transcript’s translation of technological malfunction that resulted from user error during the interview. The application used to cue the clips is touch sensitive and inconsistent; it also loops the clips requiring that the user cue the live feed again before the loop will stop. A questioning of the technological apparatus’s relation with interpretation during the interview process emerges once the interview transcript assemblage is exteriorly linked with the assemblage of the interview.

The relation of the social construction of identity to the interview process sheds light on what being a riggonian could mean. The oneness, the flow, the interconnectedness of all things, and whatever else you want to name this unnamable concept is referenced throughout the interview. Even though it manifests itself to us through different theoretical backgrounds it is a recognition of the resonance of all things that moves with Riggonians into their more public practices. It is the relation between the assemblages of the interview process and the riggonian process of identity construction that becomes important, not the authentic and accurate representation of the subject’s anecdotes about life as a Riggonian. “ML: So the name doesn’t only typify the place the name typifies a whole bigger unity or oneness or you know its something undefinable something that we cant really uhhh define.” (Interview Transcript, p. 3)

Another example from the interview transcript that can be used to link the riggonian process back to the assemblage of the assignment exemplifies how it is not the text that becomes unimportant, but instead the specificity of the subject. Multiple identities were constructed just as the interview was constructed. The assemblage of the interview can be linked to the assemblage of the subject. The figure of the Riggonian becomes an analogy.

Video Clip of Saphira: How does a Riggonian move into its more public practices and mark them in distinct ways?

...

JR: Man, that is one of the toughest questions. Its either a difficult task or either a really easy task because different riggonians do it in different ways we all have our own balance that we have of actually publicly expressing riggonian stuff we do it in different ways I mean someone like willie d I would say there really is no…like…

ML:[laugher] separation?

JR: no separation at all for him which is both a good and a bad thing maybe but I mean we are always all riggonians anyway I mean when I think of riggonians in a public place it always comes alive to me as soon as I see another riggonian. Then no matter where we are I feel like oh we can be riggonian again. Like if I ran into a riggonian at the state capital or something then we could be riggonians there.

ML:.. And I guess I kinda and this whole interview process or this whole thing im doing I mean I guess its kinda its me trying to be Riggonian in my school setting you know me trying to uh /JR: Well the martian/take a different approach.

JR: the martian leader is always uncompromisingly passionate about, you know, what is true to his heart and riggonia is basically what is true to him and so he is admiringly uncompromisable about it he is really a warrior for riggonian culture you know he brings it into an institution like UGA, school, and you know basically there is really no one there… there really is no curricula or classes that really fit what he is doing but he is still doing it within the structure of the education system somehow.

ML: Just like with you and law though I assume? I haven’t seen you in the courtroom I don’t know what you do or anything like that but I know that you uh you know take your riggonian ethics or virtues or morals or something like that you know with you into law. But I mean…

JR:I try to, I might, I may not be as successful but uh you know of some of it you know a lot of the riggonian things to me, are connected to me, to like to me that are universal truths like Taoist truths and you know just truths about the flow of the universe, the oneness, and I try to incorporate that into all my decision makings. also the difference between positive and negative vibes just as far as interacting with other humans. I mean that’s something that I have to use on a daily basis just to uh, / ML: yeah/, you know.

ML: But your dealing with negative vibes a lot that you just have to overcome right is that what you are saying that you just have to be aware of that?

JR: Personally, yeah and that’s a challenge but also just like sometimes the only thing that I can do for someone is just talk to them about positive vibes. /ML: yeah yeah yeah like Frank/ or whatever its all I can do and just be like you know there’s positive things and thoughts you can have and move forward you know that’s all I can do for them.

ML: Yeah and you are free to do that, like, you can do that. You don’t have to be confined to that you know or whatever to the negativity.

JR: Ultimately though its just that riggonian life and culture has… is definitely intrinsically part of who we all are such that its going to influence you know our public lives to you know whether we really express it like literally or whatever

ML: Because it’s in everything we do.

JR: It is but you know it comes it literally and at like shows and stuff we are literally like we wear riggonian clothes and we chant riggonian things and were not always doing that that’s more the celebration of the culture.

ML: Yeah kinda like material representations though you know at that point you know or just like something you can physically see but there is something like I said earlier like a virtue or an ethics there is something to it maybe it is just that flow and that oneness that’s a good point maybe it is just that. [laughter] (Interview Transcript, p. 1-2)

The traditional qualitative interview method reconstitutes a multiplicity of binaries reinforcing the authority of the dominant roles and the distinctions they rely on. Interviewer/respondent, subject/object, us/them, me/other all rely on a weary kind of thought that doesn’t reflect the multiplicity and interconnectedness in nature. Deleuze and Guatarri (1987/1980) explain this outdated mode of thought when they argue,

One becomes two: whenever we encounter this formula, even stated strategically by Mao or understood in the most "dialectical" way possible, what we have before us is the most classical and well-reflected, oldest, and weariest kind of thought. Nature doesn't work that way: in nature, roots are taproots with a more multiple, lateral, and circular system of ramification rather than a dichotomous one. (p. 5)

The distinction between the summary of my findings and my reflections on the experience also blur as experience itself comes into question. The interview process itself reconstitutes interpretations of meaning.

Reflections

The term reflection also becomes problematic in a poststructural framework as it assumes there is something to be reflected. It assumes the existence of a concrete meaning, and uses this to validate a search for the “truth.” Instead of using this section to construct concrete truths about the interview process and its subjects, I’d rather use it to interpret and explore some problems I encountered while attempting to complete this assignment from within the ruins of its traditional structure.

The transcription process constructs a significant relationship between technology and the interview process that is often overlooked. This project used a video reproduction of the interview rather than a reproduction that is solely audio. While I was transcribing the video I realized that the structure encouraged by the textbook privileges verbal communication over non-verbal, and that the signifiers provided were not able to reconstitute all the subtleties constructed in the video. From the perspective of a traditional qualitative researcher I was amazed at the amount of data being excluded during the transcription process. From a poststructural perspective this served to emphasize the point that translation is always an act of interpretation.

I also found that many of the mutterings during the interview were reconstituted as hiss on the video. The mutterings were transformed from intelligible words into unintelligible noise. All translations will differ even if they are technological translations, because all translations are interpretations.

The transcription process further emphasized this relationship between technology and the interview through its grammatical structure. The user’s error in controlling the technology constructed technological artifacts that were highlighted in the written transcript. An example of this is already constructed and interpreted above in the section labeled Summary of “Findings.”

Technology also structured the interview process by placing the constructed subjects in the face of the apparatus. This reconstruction positions them under the pressures of an invisible audience to whom they must reconstitute themselves. Just like Jennifer Lawrence we were aware of our invisible audience. They were referenced several times during the interview. At one point JR even asked, “can we talk off of record?” (p. 17)

One critical question that still creates a huge barrier to this project’s attempt to deconstruct is the question of shedding distinctions. I still took the role of the researcher (and interviewer) in that I chose the questions and edited the video clips. I did not remove myself completely from the role of the guiding questioner.

Also, a fixed order was set for the questions and that order served to structure the interview more than I would have liked. An instrument that chaotically related words and phrases from multiple disciplines to create new questions and relations could function more successfully and divorce any fixed order.

I also considered that the technology could be interpreted as the interview guide, thus opening up space for the socially constructed subjects to interact in a less confined structure. If technology takes the role of the interviewer, the interviewer can then be interpreted as passive instead of active. This new passive relationship between technology and the socially constructed human allows the interview guide to be strayed from or even abandoned. However, we can always decide to turn back to the technology to move on to the next section of the structure. This opens up space for JR and ML to probe each other with more questions or comments of their choosing. It frees the humans to go on any line of flight they want and then return to the dominant structure at the click of a button. It also opened up more space for interruptions in the interview process.

I found that interruptions facilitated lines of flight, but that the concept of the interruption was structurally aggressive in the traditional transcription format. It reminded me of the Italian composer Alessandro Bossetti who invented an interruption machine that he plays while he talks. When played the machine randomly selects from a databank of reproductions of his voice constructing random phrases that serve to interrupt his talking and send him on new lines of flight. But I digress, the potential of the interruption is much too extensive of a topic to begin to address in any satisfactory way here.

In this age of the exponential speed of information and its building kinetic energy I like to think that slowing down and thinking/processing is a useful process. I find I can grasp new perspectives presented in texts much more effectively when I take it slow. Deconstructive opening feels most powerful for me when it is approached cautiously and thoughtfully, not tied up in the kinetic energy of information that weighs so heavily on the concept of individual intellect. That is a race humans cannot win.

I close my reflections with several questions that emerged during this process:

-How might the interview process change as a researcher becomes more familiar with it?

-How might the interview process changes as a researcher becomes more familiar with the transcription process?

-How might those changes change the responses in the interview?

-During the interview I would often answer many of the questions first. Does this help deconstruct the interviewer/respondent binary or does it reinforce by guiding the response to the question?

-Is memory reliable?

-If memories are socially constructed are they always changing?

-What is the difference between memories, dreams, and experience?

-How is nostalgia related to experience and presence?

-How do we handle names in a poststructural framework?

-How is laughter related to nostalgia?

-Is it considered simultaneous talking if the words of one person fall into the spaces between the other person’s words or only when they literally overlap?

-Can the reproduction of a moment replace the original memory of that moment?

-Does representation still make sense in a poststructural framework?

-How grammatically correct should the transcription be? Include slang and dialect?

-What are the advantages and disadvantages of interviewing someone you aren’t acquainted with versus somebody you already know?

-How do you choose the stranger to be interviewed?

- Aren’t you already speaking for the stranger the moment you select them based on some distinction or categorization?
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