International Journal of Gender, Science and Technology
http://genderandset.open.ac.uk

Technoscience and Affected Bodies

Andrea Quinlan

Cornell University, USA

ABSTRACT
Technoscientific objects are commonly cast as distant and unfelt by the researchers who study them. How technoscientific objects can *act* on researchers bodies is rarely explored. This paper reflects on a feminist technoscience study on the Canadian Sexual Assault Evidence Kit (SAEK), a forensic tool used to document survivors' physical injuries and identify perpetrators of sexual assault. By examining the process of researching the SAEK's forty-year history, this paper considers how empirical objects can get under researchers' skin and be felt through and in their bodies. In doing so, this paper examines intersections between affect and technoscience and explores how affected bodies can be useful 'detectors' of technoscientific relations and methodological resources for studying technoscience. It proposes that embodied responses to technoscientific objects can deepen understandings of not only the objects themselves, but of the world(s) of relations in which they operate. Artistic rendering is proposed as a methodological strategy for capturing affect in feminist technoscience studies.

KEYWORDS
Affect; Sexual Assault Evidence Kit; Violence Against Women; Feminist Technoscience Studies

Technoscience and Affected Bodies

> *"My number was called and I'm wheeled into a medium-sized room where three women in white lab coats are waiting. They speak softly, tell me their nurse and doctor names, [and] what they will do... Like an annual physical, they light my eyes, touch me, bend, tap, prod and weigh me…Then they ask me to tell my rape. They write everything down, record the data on forms with numbers and codes that have been waiting for me to be raped…The women who treat me explain everything in apologetic tones, whisper commands in powdered voices… They are efficient and distant as they spread a circular plastic sheet on the floor and ask me to stand on it and remove my robe. They brush the hair on my head and between my legs pluck[ing] fifteen pubic hairs by the root...stirrups, gloves, stainless steel inside me, entering, expanding. From a nearby microscope a woman's voice says, "We've got sperm here, one's still alive." I tell her to kill it and she looks at me and smiles. Everything is collected in vials and plastic or under glass, labeled with my name. All these pieces of me are placed in a kit to be touched and examined, probed and considered some more, somewhere, by someone, for something" (Doe, 2003, p. 13).*

During its forty-year history in Ontario, Canada, the Sexual Assault Evidence Kit (SAEK) has been commonly heralded in popular media for its ability to capture incriminating forensic evidence of sexual offenders (Quinlan, 2013). The SAEK is a cardboard box filled with swabs, paper bags, bodily fluid vials, and a series of forms for documenting physical trauma on survivor's/victim's bodies[1]. In some cases, forensic scientists analyze the kit to formulate a DNA profile of a sexual offender and to interpret evidence of bodily trauma for use in criminal trials. While popular narratives of the SAEK often point to its success in identifying and helping to prosecute sexual offenders, there is a more complex and nuanced story of the SAEK to be found (Quinlan, 2013). This paper explores new tools for seeing complexities of technoscientific objects. It considers how researchers can become affected by the technoscience that they study and how researchers' affected bodies can serve as tools for understanding the complexity of technoscience.

Feminist technoscience studies scholars have given much attention to the relationship between technoscience and the materiality of bodies. Scholars in the field have charted how technoscientific objects, such as the pap smear, the IUD, the cervical stabilizer, and the plastic speculum, act on and alongside women's bodies (Casper & Clarke, 1998; Dugdale, 2000; Takeshita, 2012; Vostral, 2011; Hasson, 2012; Murphy, 2012). Despite this analytic attention to technoscience acting on bodies, scholars in the field have given limited attention to the relationship between technoscientific objects and *researchers'* bodies. In this paper, I explore how technoscientific objects can get under our skin as researchers and be felt emotionally, psychologically, and physiologically during the course of research.

I take up this exploration with a further incentive to consider what affect might offer to the study of technoscience.

Drawing attention to our own researching bodies is fruitful to the project of building knowledge about technoscience. In order to chart how technoscientific objects act on and around other bodies, it is useful to be cognizant of how these objects are acting on our own bodies during our research. Considering our own affected bodies in relation to technoscience need not become an unproductive "inward turn," as Tomkins and Eatough (2010) along with others have accused many forms of reflexivity to be. If we pay attention to our affected bodies in research, it does not necessarily follow that our attention is being drawn away from the technoscience we study and the worlds in which they operate. Instead, turning inward to our affected bodies can serve as a methodological tool that can simultaneously draw our attention *outwards* towards complexities of technoscience that might otherwise go unseen.

John Law (2000) argues that "the body is so important: for it is a detector, a finely tuned detector…an exquisite and finely honed instrument that detects…patterns of interference between modes of ordering" (p. 27). Here I consider the questions: how might the affected body act as a detector, what modes of ordering and new complexities of technoscience might it help to reveal, and how might we capture the affected body's detections?

THE 'UNFELT' OBJECT

Despite the interest in emotion and affect in research over the last decade across various disciplines – what some have called the "affective turn" (Clough & Halley, 2007) – Science and Technology Studies (STS) has remained largely untouched by these discussions. The discussion of affect in research runs counter to the common practice in much STS scholarship of seemingly examining technoscientific objects from afar. In tales of technoscience, objects have commonly appeared to be unfelt by the researchers who study them. Bruno Latour and Steve Woolgar's (1986) pioneering study of the Salk Institute featured laboratory objects that seemed miles away, as if the researchers had managed to hover above them, watching them in action from a distance. Similarly, Bijker's (1997) well cited study of bicycles and Callon's (1986) influential study of scallops and fisherman featured objects that appeared distant, unfelt, and untouchable by the researchers studying them.

Studying unfelt technoscience is a tradition that has been notably challenged by feminist scholarship on technoscientific objects that act on bodies. Through detailed case studies of pap smears, IUDs, and cervical stabilizers, along with many others tools and technologies, feminist scholars have usefully sketched the interconnections between bodies and technoscience. In so doing, they have illustrated how technoscience can be *felt* in the body. However, much of this work focuses on how technoscientific objects are felt by other bodies, and do not focus on how technoscience may be felt through and by a researcher's body. More often the object of study appears as separate and distant from the researcher's material body. To this trend, however, there are some notable exceptions.

Takeshita (2012), who studied the IUD, and Singleton (1996), who studied the cervical smear, both describe their own bodily relationships to the objects they studied. Takeshita identifies herself as a relatively satisfied IUD user, and Singleton, in a similar tone, discusses how she has made use of the cervical smear test. These descriptions highlight the largely positive ways that the objects have acted on these researchers' physical bodies, albeit not during research but instead, during their daily lives.

Takeshita (2012) and Singleton's (1996) narratives importantly point in the direction of *felt* technoscientific objects. However, I wish to go further. Here, I am interested in ways that technoscientific objects can act[2] on researchers' bodies not only in positive ways, but also in more nuanced and sometimes negative, although not necessarily unproductive, ways. To explore this further, I now turn to one technoscientific object that has acted on and affected my own body during the course of research.

THE SAEK: A TECHNOSCIENTIFIC OBJECT

My research on the Sexual Assault Evidence Kit (SAEK) traced the forty-year history of the SAEK in Ontario Canada, through its early development in the late 1970s to its current use in the Canadian medicolegal system in the 2010s (Quinlan, 2013; Quinlan, 2011). Through this historical narrative, I sketched the SAEK's transformation through changing technologies, criminal law, medicolegal practice, and anti-rape feminist movements. I conducted 62 interviews with medicolegal professionals (police, nurses, crown and defence lawyers, and forensic scientists) and anti-rape activists in Ontario. I also drew on extensive archival records, media files, survivor/victim narratives, and legal case files. By pulling this array of historical threads together, the study wove a story of the SAEK gaining credibility and authority in the Canadian Criminal Justice System as an objective technoscientific "witness" of sexual assault.

As the study revealed, the SAEK's design and associated practices were profoundly shaped by technological development and scientific practice and expertise. To reflect this here, I describe the SAEK as a *technoscientific object* – a term which captures the notion that divisions between science and technology are fluid and often collapsible in practice (Latour, 1987; Haraway, 1997). According to Haraway (1997), the term technoscience offers a "non-hyphenated energy…[that] mimes the implosion of science and technology" (p. 51). Employing this sentiment, I understand the SAEK to be a technoscientific object that binds and blurs science and technology.

The SAEK is a technoscientific object that acts directly on bodies, as Jane Doe's (2003) narrative of her SAEK exam colourfully illustrates. It is an object that is quite literally felt by the survivors/victims who experience it. Any discussion of how researchers might feel the kit during the course of research must acknowledge that the kit is literally felt in the forensic exam room in very physical, material, and sometimes traumatic and violent ways. My own discussion of being affected by the SAEK during my research is not done to diminish or displace the significance of survivors'/victims' felt experiences of the kit. Instead, I initiate this discussion to

consider what my own experiences of being affected by the SAEK might offer to my analysis and understanding of this technoscientific object.

AFFECT AND TECHNOSCIENCE

Researching sexual violence can be an emotionally consuming, physically depleting, and dispiriting task. Close and prolonged contact with stories of brutal bodily violence can leave inerasable marks. Campbell (2002), narrating her research team's experience of researching rape, writes,

> We mourn for the victims and ourselves: our loss of innocence, safety and well-being. Bearing witness to these stories of trauma was painful, and we became saturated with hurt. The constant contact with rape reminded us that we too could be victimized (p. 11).

She sketches how she and her research team "felt rape" (p. 11) through five emotions during their research: loss, pain, fear, anger, and hope. Stanko (1997) tells a similar story of feeling her own emotional exhaustion during her research on violence against women. Both scholars argue that understanding these emotions must be a central part of researching violence against women, as they influence researchers' ability to see and understand violence and are revealing of the pervasive effects of violence against women.[3]

Campbell (2002) and Stanko's (1997) work lay some useful ground for recognizing affect in research on violence against women and technoscience. Their focus on emotion can be extended in the case of research on a technoscientific object that acts on sexually violated bodies. To understand the many dimensions of feeling during the course of my research on the SAEK, I wish to push Campbell's (2002) notion of "felt rape" a bit further to include emotional, physical, and psychological dimensions of feeling.There is little consensus amongst feminist scholars on the meaning of affect (Koivunen, 2010). While some have argued that affect is distinct from emotion, in that affect is corporeal, whereas emotion is largely subjective (Massumi, 2002), others have taken affect to be emotional and psychological, physiological, and social (Brennan, 2004). Here, I suggest that a broad understanding of affect is most useful to understand how technoscience acts on researching bodies. Technoscience can be felt through researchers' embodied responses, which include many interconnected corporeal dimensions of emotions, physical sensations, and psychological reactions. Attending to these corporeal dimensions of research can open up greater possibilities for understanding technoscience.

In Merleau-Ponty's (1945/1962) seminal work on perception, he describes the body as the "the subject of perception" (p. 239), through which we engage with the world. Perception, he argues, is always mediated through bodies, and is therefore always embodied. Extending this argument into the realm of technoscience, we might say that our perceptions of technoscience are always mediated through our affected embodiments. This need not be seen as a threat to our understanding of technoscience, but can instead be viewed as a potential resource for building knowledge of technoscientific worlds. Linda Finlay (2006) argues that a researcher's awareness of herself as an embodied being can offer new meaning and insight into the subject she studies. Taking up this argument, I suggest that casting light on our

embodied responses to technoscience can illuminate new meanings of the technoscientific objects we study. Even further, our affected embodiments can serve as important detectors for new and unseen complexities of technoscience.

SAEK Affecting Bodies

While I have never felt the SAEK in the same physical, painful, and intrusive way as Jane Doe (2003) and many other survivors/victims have, I felt the SAEK during my research. By suggesting this, I do not mean to diminish or trivialize survivors'/victims' experiences of the SAEK. Their experiences are markedly and importantly different than my own. That said, while I was charting the SAEK's history, I felt the SAEK in ways that usefully expanded my understanding of the world(s) in which the SAEK acts. Here, I am proposing a more abstracted notion of feeling, whereby technoscientific objects are felt through the narratives that are written about them, the protocols that exist for their use, and the practices that shape them.

While tracing the threads of the SAEK's history, I came to understand the SAEK as a technoscientific object that was designed for my body and other bodies like mine. The first SAEK was designed in Ontario, Canada in 1981 and its construction reflected narrow conceptions of sexual assault of the time (Quinlan, 2013). The Canadian Criminal Code in 1981 did not include a broad definition of sexual assault, but instead defined rape as forced vaginal penetration committed by someone other than a woman's husband. This legal understanding of rape as being a non-consensual act against a female body was inscribed[4] on the SAEK's original design (Quinlan, 2013). The first SAEK contained female body maps for nurses and doctors to record visible marks of trauma on a survivor's/victim's body and written instructions for mapping trauma on female bodies. When analyzing these body maps and instructions, I was continually reminded of my own female body. They reminded me that the SAEK was designed to be a technoscientific object that – to use Jane Doe's (2003) words - was waiting for me, and others like me, to be raped. With these feelings, I could not treat the SAEK as a distant unfelt object. Instead, the SAEK was an object that could provoke a continued awareness of my own body, and more importantly, of my imagined traumatized body.

The SAEK acted on me during my research in other ways as well. Reading the SAEK's protocols and associated practices was difficult to do without imagining how they *might* act on my own body, and how this *might* feel – an imagining which often produced physiological reactions. The first SAEK included a specified protocol for nurses and examining doctors to pluck 50 individual head hairs and 12 pubic hairs from a survivor's/victim's body (Provincial Secretariat for Justice, 1979). The administration of local anesthetic for this procedure was not included in the standardized protocol of the SAEK exam, but was instead left to the discretion of the examining physician (Provincial Secretariat for Justice, 1979). Alongside SAEK protocols, reports of forensic examinations of rape survivors/victims described physicians' common practice of forcefully, and sometimes violently, inserting un-lubricated speculums into women's vaginas. In 1973, Williams & Williams illustrated this common practice through a recorded discussion between two medical professionals facing a survivor/victim in an emergency ward:

> A: I kind of doubt this one. What was she doing in a tavern alone, with her husband in Vietnam! I just can't believe some of these women.
> B: It figures. You can't trust any of them – not even your own wife. If I caught 'em together, I'd kill him first, then her. All a woman has to do is scream "rape" – and a guy is ruined.
> A: Well, what shall we do with this one?
> B: How about the biggest speculum we've got without any lubricant! (p. 391)

In this description, the speculum used in the SAEK exam becomes an instrument of violence and revenge on women who dare to be in public places unaccompanied by their husbands. The SAEK's potential to hurt traumatized bodies was felt through these violent descriptions of practice.

Life was breathed into these reports and protocols as I read survivor's/victim's narratives of their often traumatic and painful experiences with the SAEK. Jane Doe (2003), cited above, vividly described the physically invasive procedures of the SAEK exam and the medical examiners' cold distance as they searched her body for signs of rape. Du Mont, White, & McGregor (2009) captured similar sentiments about the SAEK in their study on survivors'/victims' experiences of the SAEK exam. While some survivors/victims found the SAEK exam to be an empowering experience that gave them a sense that they were "doing something" (p. 778), others described it as deeply traumatizing and revictimizing. Quotes from these survivors/victims provided vivid pictures of the SAEK as a revictimizing technoscience. One woman narrated her experience as follows:

> I felt violated…[S]itting naked on a table with your legs spread, and someone in-between your legs...it was hell. I didn't deserve to be put through that…the last thing I wanted is to be violated, sitting in a room half naked having blood-work done and being touched (p. 778).

In a similar study, Jane Doe (2012) quoted women who had experienced the SAEK exam as "painful, humiliating, [and] intrusive" (p. 368). I felt these survivor/victim narratives in my body, in ways that became useful for understanding the SAEK in medicolegal practice.

While the reports, protocols, and narratives were all merely texts describing actions of the past, they were often difficult to read without feeling a twinge in the body, a squeamishness, almost an imagined pain. Through the narratives, protocols, and reports of the SAEK's use, I began to feel and understand the SAEK as a *potentially* violent technoscience. While the SAEK does not always act in violent ways, its potential to do so is significant to the SAEK's story. As I began to understand the SAEK's potential for violence through my own embodied responses to what I was reading, the SAEK was stripped of its innocence. Unlike the microscope and the test tube, the SAEK is a forensic technoscience that can violently act in and on traumatized bodies. My embodied response to the SAEK revealed it to be a complex technoscience that can be empowering for some, and for others have the potential to be invasive, violent and revictimizing.

Understanding the SAEK in this way shed critical light on other texts, most importantly media and law-enforcement reports that portray the SAEK as an inherently empowering and justice-serving technoscience for survivors/victims of

sexual assault. It made it possible to see nuance within dominant narratives of the SAEK as technology that can minimize trauma and promote survivors'/victims' healing. My embodied responses to the SAEK made it possible to see it as a technoscience that does not easily fit within the idealized picture of forensic justice so often painted in media representations of sexual assault investigation.

My embodied responses to the SAEK also arose during several of my interviews. Many of the police officers I interviewed described the SAEK exam as a useful tool for testing a survivor's/victim's credibility and commitment to her/his report of sexual assault. These claims were often accompanied with broader, generalized statements about how common it is for survivor's/victim's (particularly women) to falsely report sexual assault. These statements reflected the well-documented trend of police relying on rape myths (most particularly that women lie about sexual assault) in sexual assault investigations and dismissing sexual assault reports as unfounded at an unparalleled rate to other crimes (Estrich, 1986; Doe, Dale, & Bain, 2011; Alderden & Ullman, 2012)[5]. Listening to these descriptions of police practice around the SAEK produced embodied responses that, like those of the protocols, reports, and narratives, helped to elicit new understandings of the SAEK.

Many of the police that I interviewed revealed how they use SAEK to identify false reports of sexual assault. Some claimed that a survivor's/victim's willingness to consent to the SAEK exam reflects her commitment to her report of sexual assault and the likelihood of its truth. One said,

> Sometimes there's complainants that come in and maybe the details are a little sketchy and you are not sure if this is going to be legitimate or not and you ask them to go up to [name of sexual assault treatment centre] and have the kit done…and the prospect of that probably in some cases, in a false allegation is too big of a step for someone to follow through on and they withdraw their complaint…you are stopping an unfounded allegation at the onset, once they kind of realize what is involved.

This police investigator revealed how the SAEK can be used as a formidable tool to threaten potentially false reporters of sexual assault. Placed alongside my developing picture of the SAEK's potential for violent revictimization, this threat felt particularly direct.

Other police described ways that they indirectly or directly force the SAEK on survivors/victims who they believe to be telling the truth. One police officer, describing what he does when faced with survivors/victims who are reluctant to go to the hospital to have an SAEK exam, said,

> I've never had a person outright refuse a kit. I've had them say no, and *I'll just sit them* in the car, and I'll drive them there myself, and I'll say 'well we are here now, let's go in and do it.' [emphasis added].

The "drive" that this police investigator referred to was a hospital based sexual assault treatment center a half an hour away. He continued by saying, "they are usually pretty up for anything as far as we need to get this done." In contrast to these direct forms of coercion, other police officers described more indirect coercive pressures to have an SAEK exam. Many asserted that they always tell survivors that the SAEK is "voluntary" and that they "never insist on doing something

medically to her that she doesn't want". However, they also claimed that they commonly tell survivors that the SAEK will ensure "a more thorough investigation" and will give police "a better shot at finding who did this, so that he won't do this to you or anybody else again". Another said that he routinely describes the SAEK as a step that a survivor can take to "help us out," and in return, the police investigators can "giv[e] them some sort of justice", as if one depended on the other. Taken together, these varying practices highlighted how police can pressure survivors/victims into having an SAEK exam, either directly by forcing them to go to the hospital, or indirectly by telling them that the SAEK is a necessary step for ensuring the safety of themselves and others. These descriptions of practice revealed how the SAEK can be used to pressure survivor's/victim's into complying with medicolegal investigations.

Some police claimed that the SAEK is useful for gathering signs of a survivor's/victim's trauma and testing the truthfulness of his/her report of sexual assault. Some claimed that a survivor's/victim's emotions in the SAEK exam often reflect whether or not s/he is telling the truth. One said,

> It's not too difficult to tell when someone is telling the truth, because they are very emotional…when you are sexually assaulted the emotions really *leak out* whether you want them to or not... And then there's people that come in and they won't shed a tear and they are like laughing, and you know people respond differently, however, we are talking about being raped. And you can giggle? I question that [emphasis added].

The assumption that sexual trauma is visible in a survivor's/victim's emotions in the SAEK exam has long been dispelled as a misguided and overly simplistic view of survivors'/victims' responses to sexual assault (Bakht, 2012). And yet, these long-standing myths of the overly emotional sexual assault survivor/victim crept into some of my interviews with police investigators.

In 1986, Susan Estrich described the sexism that often drives police investigations of sexual assault and revealed how "real rape victims" (p. 1088) in the eyes of police are often those whose emotional presentation and experience of rape fit the sexist stereotypes that define the rapes police choose to believe. Despite the decades of police training and education around sexual assault since Estrich penned her critique in 1986, my interviews revealed that many police continue to employ stereotypes of emotional survivors/victims who willingly consent to the SAEK exam in their investigations of sexual assault.

Listening to how police sometimes use the SAEK in coercive, threatening, and interrogating ways, and how misogynist, victim hating and blaming sentiment can easily creep into police practice, was sometimes difficult to stomach.[6] At times I had to stop reading, transcribing, and listening to cry, laugh, or just breathe. These embodied responses exposed the significance of police practice to the SAEK's story. They revealed how important other actors and their practices are to the SAEK being a potentially violent and invasive technoscience. The SAEK does not act alone, my embodied responses reminded me. Instead, it is part of a network of actors whose practices help to enact the SAEK as a potentially violent, invasive, and revictimizing

technoscience that is used to test survivor's/victim's credibility and their commitment to their report of sexual assault.

Stanko (1997) and Campbell (2002) argue that emotional responses to research data need not be seen as threatening to research. Instead, they suggest, emotional responses can serve as methodological resources. Extending this argument, I suggest that all forms of affect, which include interrelated emotional, physical, and psychological dimensions, can be of use methodologically. If technoscientific objects can be felt by the researchers who study them, they can be seen and diffracted in different and sometimes more nuanced ways.

My affected body forced me to look deeper into the SAEK's story. It forced me to question many of the popular claims of the SAEK's successes and to understand some of its complexities. My affected body demanded a remembrance that the SAEK was initially designed to act on female bodies in ways that sometimes were (and are) incredibly painful and traumatic. It served as a "finely honed detector" (Law, 2000, p. 27) of how the SAEK operates in practice, and is often tied to deeply embedded rape myths in police practice and used in ways that can retraumatize survivors/victims. Most importantly, my affected body forced my continued recognition of the SAEK as a material object that has the potential to act in violent ways against other bodies. These critical remembrances usefully grounded my trek through the law enforcement reports and media descriptions of the SAEK as a necessary and valuable forensic tool that is inherently empowering for all survivors/victims. When I read media files and government reports lauding the developments of the SAEK and its utility in sexual assault investigation and prosecution, my bodily responses to the SAEK forced an important critical remembrance of survivors/victims that the SAEK has (violently) acted upon. In this way, my affected body acted as a detector of the SAEK's complexities and thus served as an important methodological resource in tracing the SAEK's history in medicolegal practice.

CAPTURING AFFECT

To suggest that affected bodies can be useful resources for studying technoscience raises new questions about how to capture affect during the course of research. How do we transform bodily reactions into useful methodological tools? How can we capture what our affected bodies are detecting? If affect is going to be made useful in studying technoscience, these questions cannot be ignored.

During my research on the SAEK, I found that the written word was often too restrictive to capture my emotional and physiological responses to the SAEK. Instead, I experimented with visual forms and more creative modes of expression. Throughout my data collection and analysis, I kept a sketchbook of drawings and paintings that I would turn to in moments when I wanted to capture my embodied responses to the object I was studying. I used this artistic work as an "alternate writing technology" (King, 1994, p. 2) for exploring the affects of my technoscientific object, as well as the object itself.

Visual art can be spontaneous, intuitive and, at times uncontrollable. These qualities of visual expression make them particularly useful for exploring affect and technoscience. I did not begin my drawings or paintings with a clear narrative of what I wanted the images to say. Even if I had, this narrative would not have necessarily been what appeared on the canvas. True to Latour's (2005) understanding of non-human actors, paints, canvases, and drawing pencils can "act" on images in ways that are sometimes very much out of an artists' control. The images served as laboratories[7] where I was experimenting with different lines and shapes *and* simultaneously exploring my own stories about the SAEK. The unpredictability of artistic rendering was useful in understanding my own emotional and embodied responses to the SAEK and also revealing some of the complexity in the object itself.

One of these paintings, which I later titled "The Technoscientific Witness," featured a woman hovering above the SAEK in what medical practitioners term the anatomical position. In this image, there are no edges to unwind the crime scene tape that wraps her body. The tape instead marks what her body has become. The woman is white, young, thin - the body that the kit was originally designed for.[8] The hands covering her body mark her violation, as she stands surrounded by violent colour. This image captured an extremely raw picture of the SAEK's potential for violence and my embodied responses to it.

In writing up the results of my study, the images that I created reminded me about my own relationship to the technoscientific object that I was studying. They reminded me that the SAEK is not a distant object that acts outside of the body, but is instead, an object that is used on bodies, in ways that can be painful, distressing, traumatic, and violent. Most importantly, they reminded me *how* and *why* I study the SAEK. Without these images, my embodied responses to the SAEK could have been lost in the moments after reading a survivor's/victim's narrative or transcribing an interview. The images helped to make aspects of my affected response to the SAEK visible and open to subsequent analysis. During my writing, I returned to these images to remind myself about my embodied relationship to the object I was studying, how the SAEK had affected me during the course of my research, and how my felt responses were affecting my analysis.

Visual artistic rendering is one tool for capturing affect. There are perhaps other forms of artistic expression, such as dance, theatre, and poetry that could have been similarly useful. Alternative tools of expression that sit outside the bounds of academic writing can be effective tools for exploring the unarticulated and perhaps un-articulatable affects of the objects we study. If we take seriously the assertion that affected bodies are useful in researching technoscience, then much more exploration on different possible technologies for capturing affect is needed.

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

Examining how technoscientific objects can affect researching bodies can be a useful tool for studying technoscience. Our affected bodies remind us how our embodied selves are materially located in our investigation and how these aspects of ourselves are shaping our perceptions of technoscience. They can reveal where

our personal and political commitments lie and where the bounds of analysis may be. Recognizing our own affected bodies in research need not be a self-reflexive trap that unproductively draws our attention inward. Instead, our affected bodies can push understandings of technoscience in new directions. They can offer new depths to analyses of technoscience and all its complexities and they can reveal aspects of an object's story that may have otherwise gone undetected. Casting light on our affected bodies can thus be an invaluable technique for studying technoscience.

In her list of questions for feminist technoscience, Donna Haraway (1991) asks, "what other sensory powers do we wish to cultivate besides vision?" (p. 194). Affected bodies can be a useful sensory power for technoscience studies. If we can feel our objects of study in our bodies, we can see technoscientific objects and the world(s) of relations in which they work in different and possibly more multi-dimensional and complex ways. Affect is a sensory power that researchers in technoscience studies could benefit from cultivating.

ENDNOTES

[1] In this paper, I adopt the imperfect term *survivor/victim* to refer to those who have experienced sexual violence. While the terms survivor and victim have been separately criticized as inadequate and misleading (Allard, 1997; Lamb, 1999; Atmore, 1999; McCaffrey, 1997, Spry, 1995; Doe, 2012), the combined term survivor/victim acknowledges that people's identities in relation to their violent experiences can be complex, multiple, and changing and proposes the possibility that there can be identities in-between or beyond survivor and victim.

[2] I deliberately use the verb *act* in relation to the SAEK to illustrate the possibility of a non-human object acting, a notion that I draw directly from Actor-Network Theory (Latour, 2005; Law, 2004).

[3] This argument has roots in earlier feminist writings on emotion, which were largely inspired by Alison Jaggar's (1989) work on the importance of emotions in feminist epistemology.

[4] Here I take up Akrich's (1992) notion of inscription. For Akrich, technological design involves inscribing or marking technological objects with "particular visions of the world" (p. 209). See Quinlan (2013) for more discussion on the SAEK and its history of inscription.

[5] Crew (2012) found that in some Ontario police organizations, 32.45% of sexual assault reports are dismissed as unfounded, as compared to 3.43% of reports of other crimes.

[6] My use of a bodily descriptor is purposeful.

[7] Here, I am drawing on Latour's (2005) suggestion that a written text is a social scientists' laboratory. Latour argues that the text is a place for "trials, experiments, and simulations" (p. 149). I propose that art can be a different kind of laboratory, which is not bound by the restrictions of academic writing, and where affect can be effectively explored.

[8] For further discussion see Quinlan (2013).

REFERENCES

Akrich, M. (1992). The de-scription of technical objects. In W. Bijker, & J. Law (Eds.), *Shaping technology/building society* (pp. 205-224). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Alderden, M., & Ullman, S. (2012). Gender difference or indifference? Detective decision making in sexual assault cases. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 27*(1), 3-22.

Allard, S. A. (1997). Rethinking battered woman syndrome: A black feminist perspective. In K. J. Maschke (Ed.), *The legal response to violence against women* (pp. 73-90). New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Atmore, C. (1999). Victims, backlash, and radical feminist theory or, the morning after they stole feminism's fire. In S. Lamb (Ed.), *New versions of victims: Feminists struggle with the concept* (pp. 183-212). New York: New York University Press.

Bakht, N. (2012). What's in a face: Demeanour evidence in the sexual assault context. In E. Sheehy (Ed.), *Sexual assault law in Canada: Law, legal practice and women's activism* (pp. 591-612). Ottawa, ON: University of Ottawa Press.

Bijker, W. (1997). Of bicycles, bakelites, and bulbs: Toward a theory of sociotechnical change. Cambridge: MA: The MIT Press.

Brennan, T. (2004). *The transmission of affect.* Ithaca: NY: Cornell University Press.

Callon, M. (1986). Some elements of a sociology of translation: Domestication of the scallops and the fisherman of St. Brieue Bay. In J. Law (Ed.). *Power, action, and belief: A new sociology of knowledge?* (pp. 196-223). London: Routledge.

Campbell, R. (2002). *Emotionally involved: The impact of researching rape*. London: Routledge.

Casper, M., & Clarke, A. (1998). Making the pap smear into the 'right tool' for the job: Cervical cancer screening in the USA, circa 1940-95. *Social Studies of Science, 28*(2), 255-290.

Crew, A. B. (2012). Striking back: The viability of a civil action against the police for the 'wrongful unfounding' of reported rapes. In E. Sheehy (Ed.), *Sexual assault law in Canada: Law, legal practice and women's activism* (pp. 211-239). Ottawa, ON: University of Ottawa Press.

Clough, P., & Halley, J. (2007). *The affective turn: Theorizing the social.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Doe, J. (2003). *The story of Jane Doe.* Toronto, ON: Vintage Canada.

Doe, J. (2012). Who benefits from the sexual assault evidence kit? In E. Sheehy (Ed.), *Sexual assault law in Canada: Law, legal practice and women's activism* (pp. 355-388). Ottawa, ON: University of Ottawa Press.

Doe, J., Dale, A., & Bain, B. (2011). A new chapter in feminist organizing: The sexual assault audit steering committee. *Canadian Woman Studies, 28*(1), 6-13.

Dugdale, A. (2000). Intrauterine conception devices, situated knowledges, and making of women's bodies. *Australian Feminist Studies, 15*(32), 165-176.

Du Mont, J., White, D., McGregor, M. (2009). Investigating the medical forensic examination from the perspectives of sexually assaulted women. *Social Science and Medicine, 68*, 774-780.

Estrich, S. (1986). Rape. *Yale Law Journal, 95*, 127-177.

Finlay, L. (2006). The body's disclosure in phenomenological research. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*, 19-30.

Haraway, D. (1991). *Simians, cyborgs, and women: The reinvention of nature.* New York: Routledge.

Haraway, D. (1997). *Modest_Witness@Second_Millennium. FemaleMan©_Meets_OncoMouse™*. *Feminism and TechnoScience*. New York: Routledge.

Hasson, K. A. (2012). Making appropriation 'stick': Stabilizing politics in an 'inherently feminist' tool. *Social Studies of Science, 42*(5), 638-661.

Jaggar, A. (1989). Love and knowledge: Emotion in feminist epistemology. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Philosophy, 32*(2), 151-176.

King, K. (1994). Feminism and writing technologies: Teaching queerish travels through maps, territories, and patterns. *Configurations, 2*(1), 89-106.

Koivunen, A. (2010). An affective turn?: Reimagining the subject of feminist theory. In M. Liljeström & S. Paasonen (Eds.). *Working with affect in feminist readings: Disturbing differences* (pp. 8-28). New York: Routledge.

Lamb, S. (1999). Constructing the victim: Popular images and lasting labels. In S. Lamb (Ed.), *New versions of victims: Feminists struggle with the concept* (pp. 108-138). New York: New York University Press.

Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-network theory.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Latour, B. & Woolgar, S. (1986). *Laboratory life: The construction of scientific facts*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Latour, B. (1987). *Science in action: How to follow scientists and engineers through society.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Law, J. (2000). On the subject of the object: Narrative, technology, and interpellation. *Configurations, 8*(1), 1-29.

Law, J. (2004). *After method: Mess in social science research.* New York: Routledge.

Massumi, B. (2002). Parables for the virtual: Movement, affect, sensation. Durham: Duke University Press.

McCaffrey, D. (1997). Victim feminism/victim activism. *Sociological Spectrum, 18*, 263-284.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1945/1962). Phenomenology of perception. London: Routledge.

Murphy, M. (2012). *Seizing the means of reproduction: Entanglements of feminism, health, and technoscience*. London: Duke University Press.

Provincial Secretariat for Justice [ca. 1979]. *Forensic evidence form.* Records of the Provincial Secretariat for Justice special project on helping victims of sexual assault (RG 64-10, Box B703421, Folder "Sexual Assault – victims"). Archives of Ontario, York University, Toronto, ON.

Quinlan, A. (2011). Tracing the Messy History of Forensic DNA Analysis in The Canadian Legal System. *Studies in the Sociology of Science, 2*(2), 11-18.

Quinlan, A. (2013). Stabilizing the technoscientific witness: A history of controversy, medicolegal practice, and the Ontario Sexual Assault Evidence Kit. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Department of Sociology, York University.

Takeshita, C. (2012). *The global biopolitics of the IUD: How science constructs contraceptive users and women's bodies.* London: MIT Press.

Tomkins, L., & Eatough, V. (2010). Towards an integrative reflexivity in organizational research. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal, 5*(2), 162-181.

Singleton, V. (1996). Feminism, sociology of scientific knowledge, and postmodernism: Politics, theory, and me. *Social Studies of Science, 26*, 445-468.

Spry, T. (1995). In the absence of word and body: Hegemonic implications of "victim" and "survivor" in women's narratives of sexual violence. *Women and Language, 18*(2), 27-32.

Stanko, E. (1997). I second that emotion: Reflections on feminism, emotionality, and research on sexual violence. In M. Schwartz (Ed.), *Researching sexual violence against women: Methodological and personal perspectives* (pp. 74-85). London: Sage.

Vostral, S. (2011). Tampons: Re-scripting technologies as feminist. In L. Layne, S. Vostral & K. Boyer (Eds.), *Feminist technology* (pp. 136-153). Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Williams, C. C., & Williams, R. A. (1973). Rape: A plea for help in the hospital emergency room. *Nursing Forum, 7*(4), 388-401.