The geopolitics of knowledge production, or how to inhabit a contradiction: introduction to the special issue on the narrative productions methodology

Giazú Enciso Domínguez
University of Houston, Clear Lake
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2287-7666

Álvaro Ramírez March
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, University of Nottingham
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7029-8197

Marisela Montenegro
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7382-9256

The Narrative Productions Methodology (NPM) is a narrative methodology that draws inspiration from Donna Haraway's notion of situated knowledges. This Special Issue (SI) marks the 20th anniversary since NPM was first explained in an article published in Spanish. This collection is the first dedicated publication in English, featuring a translation of this original article, together with eight other contributions that discuss different aspects of the methodology. This introduction is divided into two parts. The first section presents the necessary context for the articles in the collection. It provides a brief history of its origins in 1990s Critical Psychology. It reviews key theoretical notions that inspire it while showing how the contributions of the SI engage with them. The second section of the introduction adopts a more personal tone. Here, we reflect on the contradictions we felt during this project in the context of Anglo-American hegemony in academia. Although the process was complex/complicated on many levels, it was worth it. Our hope with this project is to create bridges between different language-based editorial communities to extend the ongoing conversations on research methods committed to emancipation and social justice.

Keywords: geopolitics, qualitative, methodology, narrative, narrative productions

Twenty years and a translation later

The publication of this Special Issue marks the 20th anniversary of the Narrative Productions Methodology (NPM). Narrative Productions Methodology (NPM) was first explained in Marisela Montenegro's Doctoral Thesis. Later, NPM was materialized in an academic article published in Spanish (Balasch and Montenegro, 2003). To contextualize this Special Issue geographically and temporally, we will say that Álvaro Ramírez was studying for his doctorate and did an internship in Greece; Giazú Enciso was a professor at City University New York, and Marisela was working with scholars around Latin America and Europe Therefore, this work results from lengthy conversations among the editors (but also many other scholars) at different moments about the lack of publications in English and the obstacles that this caused to having conversations with other academics. In these two decades of NPM research, it has now been used in myriad contexts and research fields that range from studies of governmentality in social policies (Ávila, 2015; Carrer-Russell, 2015; Galaz Valderrama et al., 2018; Martínez-Guzmán and Montenegro 2014) to political organizing and activism (Fulladosa-Leal, 2015; Gandarías Goikoetxea and Pujol Tarrés, 2013; García Fernández, 2018; Ramírez-March and Montenegro, 2022); collective memory (Álvarez Martínez-Conde et al. 2020; Piper Shafir and Montenegro, 2017), and intersecting discriminations in Higher Education (BRIDGES Collective, 2022), among others. This research has been carried out mainly in the Spanish state and Latin America. Until now, the methodological discussions and the research cases using NPM have been published primarily in Spanish. This Special Issue is the first dedicated publication in English, featuring a translation of this original article and eight other contributions discussing different aspects of the methodology.

We have divided this introduction into two parts. The first section presents the necessary context for the articles in the collection. We begin by recalling NPM's history and then locate it within a broader tradition of narrative research in Psychology and the Social Sciences. Later, we look at some of the critical theoretical notions that inspire NPM and show how the contributions of this collection engage with them. The articles that make up this issue extend the initial conceptualization of NPM and offer methodological innovations, posing a necessary critique that points to the limitations in NPM's initial formulation. After this presentation of the contributions, the second section of the introduction adopts a more personal tone. Here, we reflect on the contradictions we felt while embarking on such a (cultural, semiotic, and linguistic) translation project in the context of Anglo-American hegemony in academia. This process was complex/complicated for all three of us. Still, it was worth it. Twenty years and a translation later, our motivation with this project has been to create bridges between the Spanish and English-speaking editorial communities to extend the ongoing conversations on research methods committed to emancipation and social justice.

History and principles of the narrative Productions methodology & overview of the contributions to the Special issue

Science is made up of narratives. Scientists rely on them to make sense of the phenomena they study. Science is as much practice as culture, so to say that science is a story, Donna Haraway argues, is no insult (Haraway, 1997). Such a critical point, an argument against universalist accounts of positivist science, is one of the starting points for NPM. A second starting point for the method is the family of methods of narrative inquiry, a paradigm that has progressed in recent decades, increasing legitimacy in Psychology and its neighboring disciplines in the Social Sciences (Andrews, Squire, and Tamboukou, 2013; Caine, Clandinin, and Lessard, 2022; Domínguez and Herrera, 2013; Kim, 2016; Woodwiss, Smith, and Lockwood, 2017). Narratives are placed in the in-between of the personal and the cultural and are then seen as a privileged site to interrogate the intersections of personal and social life. In a general sense, narrative inquiry is based on the premise that human beings have the ability to use narratives to make sense of the world. Nevertheless, this general principle translates into an enormous plurality of theoretical, epistemological, methodological, and ethical-political perspectives with diverging conceptions of narratives and their role in research, thus configuring a field of study with lively discussions (Andrews, Squire, and Tamboukou, 2013). NPM aspires to be localized in this diverse map.

Briefly explained, NPM consists of the co-production of narrative texts between researchers and participants. Both parties carry out a series of meetings until they agree on the final result. However, the participant always keeps the last word in the text. In this issue, the reader will find a Spanish translation of the original article that describes the methodology. This article features a detailed explanation of its procedure and its main theoretical principles.

This first article is very much a product of the institutional context in which the methodology was first developed at the time in which Joan Pujol, Marisela Montenegro and Marcel Balasch, the initial group who developed the methodology, were working in the Department of Social Psychology at Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, (where Giazú and Álvaro, as well as Marisela, obtained their PhDs). This context is well explained in the contribution of Joan Pujol to the issue. He locates the context of the emergence of NPM in the discussions of discursive approaches to Psychology he took part in during the 90s in relation to Critical Social Psychology. Influenced by feminist and postcolonial developments at the time, Pujol mentions how NPM first emerged out of a need to create more collaborative knowledge production, one that was aware and that questioned the asymmetries between researcher and participant that was so often taken for granted by the at the time – asymmetries that are reproduced in the different steps of research, from research formulation to data gathering, and analysis.

It is not our intention here to provide an extended discussion on the foundations of the methodology, which is provided in detail in this issue by both in Montenegro, Balasch

and Pujol's English version of the original article, and Joan Pujol's *methodological and epistemological narrative* of NPM. Similarly, other colleagues have done so in Spanish (Gandarias Goikoetxea and García Fernández, 2014; Pujol Tarrés and Montenegro, 2013). The rest of the section thus describes the principles of NPM only to illustrate how they are extended, subjected to tension, and critiqued by the contributors to this collection. These critiques show the tensions inherent in this form of critical research, the practical difficulties in effectively generating a symmetrical relationship between researchers and participants, as well as the im/possibilities and limitations of social transformation through academic research. This work shows that, as with any scientific project, the project of NPM is far from coherent but rather imperfect and sometimes contradictory.

A dialogical view of language

Reflecting on the diversity of narrative research, Michael Bamberg (2012) distinguishes those approaches that do research *on* narratives and those others that do research *with* narratives. That is, a distinction between approaches that develop a set of techniques to be applied over a narrative text (narrative methods) and those others who see narratives themselves as a research tool – that is, narrative analysis. Thus, narrative analysis works with tensions at the border between collecting and analyzing data (Schongut and Pujol, 2015). NPM subscribes to this latter approach to narrative inquiry, a framework that involves researchers working together with participants in their research to co-construct narratives (Squire, 2007).

The methodology relies significantly on Michail Bakhtin's theory on the dialogical nature of language (Bachtin et al. 2011). For the Russian linguist, the communicative interactions that characterize human action take place in a social context to which they refer – a context that is inextricably linked to them and constitutes these interactions. Bakhtin's account stresses the fact that language is heteroglossic. That is, assertions are always made in response to other voices present in the context of interaction. This aspect of NPM is at the core of Nicolás Schongut-Grollmus, Antonia Larrain, Javiera Navarro Marshall, and María-Alejandra Energici's contribution to this Special Issue. In their article, the authors argue for a deeper engagement with Bakhtin's theory on dialogism so that NPM is more aligned with the purposes of feminist research. This perspective is needed because, in their view, the current emphasis of the NPM in creating a consensual narrative between the researcher and participant risks homogenizing the voice of the participant/s – a contradiction with NPM's purpose. Thus, despite the fact that the methodology acknowledges the heteroglossic, open nature of language, for the authors, the key question remains to what extent the method draws on a dialogism in which various narrative forms are embodied, recognized, or valued (Schöngut-Grollmus et al. 2023). In order to avoid this danger, they urge NPM practitioners to consider seriously Bakhtins' thoughts on *inner dialogicality*: the idea that in every utterance that makes a linguistic interaction, there are multiple voices from the world that come into the conversation, and that would be left aside by a process of co-construction that reaches a consensual narrative. As a possible solution, they untangle a proposal of methodological modification

that aims at ‘openness and no closure’ to be the key goal of NPM (Schöngut-Grollmus et al. 2023). In order to achieve that, they suggest using more elaborative questions during the conversations that lead to textualization (i.e., why, how) so that diverse worlds of meaning can emerge. The resulting text should, in their view, be lively, highlighting the role of disagreement, tensions, and differences. Similarly, the analysis of narratives should take the open nature of language as a starting point, inviting readers to other new interpretations of what is said and not providing a closed one.

Situated knowledge and diffraction

Following Domínguez and Herrera (2013), a central claim of positivist approaches to narrative research has been that narratives have the capacity to represent personal experience and draw theoretical insights from it. In contrast, relativist scholarship argues that narrative construction is shaped by interpretation frameworks people use and are directed to a certain audience in a particular moment and context. Moving forward from the recurrent realism/relativism debate, NPM avoids both the representation of the participant’s voice that is implied in positivist research and the impossibility of certainty that follows from relativist approaches (Hammers and Brown, 2004; Hart, 2004; Visweswaran, 1997).

Specifically, NPM relies significantly on Haraway’s notion of ‘situated knowledges’ (Haraway, 1988) – an epistemological proposal that foregrounds the partiality of the scientific gaze and the inherent responsibility of research practice. Feminist objectivity, in Haraway’s terms, derives from the fact that our gaze as researchers is always partial: in order to reach a situated account of reality, we need to engage in partial connections with others. Similarly, the idea of partiality highlights the ways knowledge is produced from a non-innocent position, always under certain material-semiotic conditions that enable a gaze at a phenomenon, which also implies that they obscure others (Pujol Tarrés and Montenegro, 2013).

As mentioned above, with Donna Haraway’s idea of situated knowledge, she does not seek to represent reality. She is critical of the realist metaphor of reflection, ‘reflexivity only displaces the same elsewhere, setting up the worries about copy and original and the search for the authentic and really real’ (Haraway, 1988, 584). Conversely, what is sought by knowledge production is to ‘make a difference in material-semiotic apparatuses, to diffract the rays of technoscience so that we get more promising interference patterns on the recording films of our lives and bodies’ (Haraway, 2018, p. 16). In line with Donna Haraway’s emphasis on diffraction, the primary focus of NPM lies not in the pursuit of a more accurate portrayal of reality but rather in acknowledging the political ramifications of the knowledge that is generated, trying to find patterns of interference, of deviation, and new possibilities for the articulation of difference. Following this methodological principle, examples of NPM research have privileged working with diverse subject positions. As argued by Joan Pujol in his article, to include during the NPM process, different perspectives that discuss and contrast the participants and the researchers’ perspectives foster the genesis to elaborate theories and promote discussions that consider

more people (Pujol, 2023). An analysis focusing on interference processes is then facilitated by the 'productive distance' between myriad diverging positions – between researchers and participants and between participants themselves.

Expanding on the potentialities of diffractive analysis within NPM, Laura Sanmiquel Molinero's article introduces a new angle from which to look at how diffraction takes place in the process of NPM research. While the Narrative, the text that results from the series of meetings between participants and researchers, is meant to account for that process of exchange, for Sanmiquel Molinero, this text rarely accounts for the subjective changes that take place in between the recursive meeting loop that characterizes the methodology, thus remaining a 'hidden face' of the methodology. Drawing on an example of her research on 'adjustment to disability', the author engages with the notion of the chronotope, or the relation between a given time and space, and proposes the analytical device of *chronotopic diffraction*. This notion is helpful to grasp how produced narratives are the meeting point of socio-historical meanings attributed to the research topic at stake, but also of different chronotopes inside the research process between participants and researchers. Thus, with this notion, she refers to the process by which diffraction occurs in space-time between chronotopes of different research meetings, in which participants read themselves and experience a certain estrangement. This analytical device is particularly relevant for her research, as it captures the subjective changes involved in 'adaptation to disability' that become diffracted by the very process of narrative production. Her case shows that chronotopic diffraction results in a valuable methodological innovation highlighting the process-oriented quality of both psychosocial phenomenon and the methodology itself.

Authorship and agency

As Joan Pujol recalls in his brief history of the methodology, one of the main concerns behind the origins of the methodology was the lack of agency granted to participants in other qualitative methodologies, such as Discourse Analysis. The political principle of promoting agency for participants inside research is translated in both the epistemological framework of the methodology, its procedure, and the uses of the Narratives – the resulting texts of the methodology.

One of the aims of engaged qualitative methodologies is to foreground the voices of subalternized participants. Researchers thus commonly frame their projects as a way to 'give voice' to such communities thanks to their methodological devices. NPM is aligned with the importance of highlighting the views of marginalized communities. However, it is critical of those research methodologies that aim to do so by 'giving voice' to subalternized participants. As Pujol and Montenegro put it,

> While the metaphor of 'giving voice' presupposes the existence of a subject to whom it is politically desirable to give voice, it also assumes that the researcher has the power to give it, considering the researcher as a 'disinterested vehicle' for the voice of the participants. This viewpoint, once again, is a relationship in which

> one position is constructed as a lack (not having a voice) while the other is presented in terms of a complementary excess (capacity and possibility of giving voice); a relationship which, under apparent altruism, hides an asymmetrical relationship of power (Pujol Tarrés and Montenegro, 2013, 34; our translation).

Rather than 'representing' participants, the work of NPM is conceived as creating the conditions of possibility for narratives about a given phenomenon to emerge. As explained in this issue in the translation of the original NPM article, bringing in Haraway yet again, the role of researchers is conceived as being 'co-actor in an articulated practice among unlike, but joined, social partners' (Haraway, 1992, 313, cited in Montenegro, Balasch and Pujol, 2023). This epistemological stance also has consequences for how the authorship of Narratives is understood. Methodologically, the motivation to increase the agency of participants into the fact that participants are granted the ultimate right to validate the content of a narrative. Authorship of a Narrative is, then, theirs. The narrative product of the methodology accounts for their view on the phenomenon. The text is not meant to represent a 'strong' subject but rather a distributed one: authorship is localized in the articulatory networks elicited during the narrative production process. While these are transversal issues addressed by this Special Issue's contributions, two contributors engage in depth with them.

These epistemological and methodological discussions have inspired Catalina Álvarez Martínez-Conde and Isabel Piper (2023), NPM practitioners in the field of Social Psychology of Memory (Piper-Shafir, Fernández-Droguett, and Iñiguez-Rueda, 2013). As explained by the authors in their contribution, promoting participant's agency in research remains an issue in traditional methodological approaches to memory, where testimonies are taken as 'raw data' that is later on used to interpret and be validated by the 'expert' voice of researchers, who craft an objective account of reality that becomes inscribed in history. The author's standpoint is that this not only hides the role of the researcher in eliciting and creating a narration of memory but fundamentally renders participants' agency in research secondary. Posed as an intervention in this field, Álvarez Martínez-Conde and Piper propose using NPM in collective memory research – as they conceptualize Narrative Productions of Memory (2023). In their view, the construction of narratives about the past within research is both a production of memory and a research practice itself. That being said, the status of Narratives is different from that bestowed to the testimony: 'a Narrative of memory is recognized as having the same status of truth as [legitimized] historical knowledge' (Álvarez and Piper 2023), which does not require of the authorized scientific voice to certify its objectivity. This argument is illustrated in their article through the case of research on collective memories of migrant struggles in Barcelona.

While Álvarez and Piper highlight the potentialities of NPM for maximizing the agency of research participants, the contribution of Núria Sadurní Balcells wonders to what extent this is the case in research projects that deal with important intersectional power differences. Drawing on decolonial feminist critique, Sadurní Balcells argues that 'the

promise of agency' is never fully fulfilled in such cases. The reason is that what is understood as valid, legitimate knowledge already depends on the colonial matrix of power. Coloniality brings with it a kind of 'monolingualism' that sometimes makes it difficult for researchers and participants to relate on a horizontal basis whenever their epistemes are located in an asymmetrical relation. In addition to this reflection, she draws from post- and decolonial perspectives. Moreover, bringing Derrida's reflection on the aporia of hospitality into the conversation, Sadurní shows how agency in the context of NPM will always be in the researcher's terms as the research, the participants' selection, and to an extent, the topics that are discussed in the meetings, are all their choice. This notion, she concludes, hinders one of the ethical horizons of the methodology: the creation of symmetry in research.

Social change

NPM draws inspiration from Critical Psychology's concern with finding the ways in which the discipline of Psychology can help to bring about social change in the form of emancipation and social justice (Ibañez, 1997; Íñiguez-Rueda, 2003; Montero, 1994; Parker, 2007). Narratives have an inherent potential for triggering change. As Cabruja, Íñiguez-Rueda, and Vázquez (2000) argued, they are both constructed by and are constructors of relational frameworks that make up our reality. As such, they are not just a way to make sense of reality but have a performative effect: they have the potential to change it insofar as they can strengthen or disrupt established notions of social phenomena.

The relationship between narrativity and social change in research is addressed by Álvaro Ramírez-March and Marisela Montenegro in their contribution, in which they put NPM in conversation with participatory action-research (PAR). The dialogue between both methodologies shows that both methods can be understood as narrative processes: they draw on narrativity to conceptualize both how domination and transformation take place. As shown above, when reviewing the influence of Haraway's proposal in it, NPM's project of social change is strongly based on the *diffraction* of meanings. Diffraction places emphasis on the political ramifications that derive from the knowledge produced. In these decades of NPM research, thus, the methodology has sought to participate in social change by contributing to the production and circulation of alternative accounts of phenomena under study (Martínez-Guzmán and Montenegro, 2014; Schongut and Pujol, 2015). Drawing on past NPM research by other colleagues, the authors argue that the methodology may contribute to social change by (1) challenging the current frames of intelligibility of a given phenomenon, (2) contesting institutionally legitimized and embodied domination orderings, and (3) creating a dialogue between antagonist positions through carefully selecting with whom to produce such narratives. While the importance of such contributions is self-evident, Ramírez-March and Montenegro argue that NPM places excessive importance on the symbolic dimension of power. In their view, the limitations of such an approach become visible when comparing it to PAR's emphasis on p*raxis*, the loops of collective reflection and action that characterize the method. Learning

from PAR, and also in dialogue with the contributions of Shongut et al. and Sanmiquel Molinero in this issue, the authors urge NPM practitioners to foreground the material engagements and bodily transformations that take in the relational space opened while crafting a Narrative with participants (see also Andrés Soriano, Ramírez-March, and Montenegro, 2022).

Lina Marín Moreno describes her experience working with women activists engaged in different movements for the commons in Colombia and Chile (2023). She argues that NPM can help feed the commons by producing knowledge with communities in struggle. This is done by incorporating intermediality into NPM research. Intermediality – the convergence and combination of different media such as text, video, or images – is, in her view, the best way to capture the embodied knowledge of participants of her research, who are in connection to other non-human elements that are essential to life. In her research, she explains how the participants develop a solid connection to their bodies, houses, and other human and non-human contextual elements. The participants defend this inseparability and have developed ways of communicating the meanings of those ties (Marín Moreno, 2023).

Thus, by including other media such as photographs from protests, images, videos made by the activists, or illustrations made in collaboration with an artist, Intermedial Narratives capture the practices of women involved in struggles for the commons, practices that involve 'knowing through the body, extending the body to things and things to the body' (p. 10). By introducing a methodological innovation to grasp the embodied dimension of knowledge, the work of Marín Moreno brings to the fore 'how the articulation with practices, persons, and discourses is in itself, producing of knowledge' (Pujol, Montenegro, and Balasch, 2003, 68, our translation.)

Affect

Marín Moreno's article deals with how knowledge production is inextricably linked to our bodily practices. This issue has been at the center of NPM since its early inception. In the article *Los límites de la metáfora lingüística* [The limits of the linguistic metaphor], the initial team who developed the methodology wonders, 'How can we, if our technologies of representation work in the linguistic realm, introduce embodiment [*corporalidad*]?' (Pujol, Montenegro, and Balasch, 2003, 63, our translation). A possible answer that is given in this same article relates to an aspect that has been present throughout the contributions we have reviewed above: the idea that the methodology also captures the bodily encounters that are implied in the process of narrative production. That being said, however, the extent to which NPM has been able to go beyond textual technologies for representation, as suggested in this article, is modest. This problem is addressed in the last article of the SI by Giazú Enciso Domínguez, who takes up the challenge. Bringing to the fore posthumanist affective definitions of the body, Enciso Dominguez proposes to consider Narratives *as bodies* themselves, that is, with capacities to affect and to be affected. With this, she gives a theoretical background to one of the political principles of the methodology: the intention that the texts co-constructed through

NPM are meant to be public so that different views of the world can be circulated. Seen through the lens of affect theory, Narratives are seen as posthuman agents able to affect those who read them, and vice versa, texts that are subject to being affected by their audiences.

Navigating the Anglo-American geopolitics of knowledge in contemporary academia

Conceiving and editing a Special Issue for this journal has been an experience of mixed feelings, with constant debates among the three of us about what the very act of publishing in today's academia means. We are all relatively new to editing. The estrangement we felt doing it, thus, ended up being a productive place from which to think. This position was not, however, a comfortable one. We cannot offer a clean and linear account of the process. These three years of work were full of contradictions for us, those that we inhabit on a daily basis and that are not sufficiently accounted for within the prevalent narrative of coherence, rationality, and success we are so used to in contemporary academia. Indeed, an 'uncontaminated' narrative of science is one of the tropes that feminist, postcolonial, and decolonial perspectives point to as central to the unquestionability of the Western scientific model. Through this, Modern Science is constructed as the only legitimate way of knowing and its apparatus of scientific dissemination as the only way of accessing it. In turn, this leads to the dismissal – and even annihilation – of all other forms of knowledge that do not fit into the modern/colonial (Walsh, 2007).

Despite the emergence of critical thinking within Psychology and the Social Sciences, the material, literary and social technologies that underpin the Modest Witness, following Haraway's (2018) metaphor, are still very much alive. By this, Haraway refers to how what is considered valid knowledge is defined in a normative matrix of research methodologies and dissemination practices, establishing red lines as to who is entitled to be part of the scientific community and who is not. The dominant positivist narrative of science resembles the 'eye of God,' which sees everything from above yet is not seen (Haraway, 1988). In other words, it needs to recognize knowledge's social, cultural, and geographically localized character. Similarly, the concept of 'Hubris of the zero point,' coined by Castro-Gómez (2005), describes the colonial logic that underlies this non-recognition of the geopolitical localization of knowledge. This logic contributes to the expansion and application of theoretical and methodological models on a global scale that arises locally in the global centers of scientific production but claims to be universal (Macleod, Bhatia, and Liu 2020; Montenegro and Pujol, 2022).

What follows from such a critique of this dominant scientific narrative is that we need to recognize that both research and dissemination practices are 'already engaged' (Prijic-Samarzija, 2016) with a normative and institutional structure. These practices are embedded in networks of power relations, and rather than denying that we, too, as researchers, are part of them, we need to acknowledge what role we play. We need to occupy the tensions these power relations involve rather than trying to resolve them once

and for all. This is what Suryia Nayak (2017) calls 'localization as method,' a practice that she considers the basis of ethical-methodological encounters.

In this section, we take up the challenge posed by Nayak to inhabit the contradictions involved in editing this collection of articles in the English language. Three years ago, we started the project with a motivation to share with a broader public a set of conceptual, epistemological, and political issues related to a methodology that was mostly only available in Spanish until now. The desire to extend these conversations with new colleagues and students drove us here. However, in the process, we have also become aware that this project of translation also means complying in many ways with the current academic hegemony. By publishing in English and seeking recognition from a wider international audience, we paradoxically reinforce the existing inequalities in global academia that derive from the anglocentric geopolitics of knowledge (Curry and Lillis, 2017).

Publishing in English is not easy for either the three of us or the rest of the authors included in this issue, all non-native English speakers (and even some reviewers). We held our meetings and discussions in Spanish, Spanglish, and English and communicated with our authors in the same way. Working in a 'liminal space that arose while we were working and being affected together' (Garcia-Meneses, Enciso Domínguez, and Chanez-Cortés 2023, 6). Being able to communicate in English is a matter of intersecting systems of oppression that are interlocked with Anglo-American hegemony in academia. Having adequate English language skills frequently depends on having the time and material resources to learn and improve them (Ramírez-Castañeda and Manalo, 2020). Oddly, as editors, we found ourselves phrasing the infamous formula of 'Awkward wording. Rephrase' (Clavero, 2010) when we are not proficient in English! However, not all of us can pay for professional translation, copy editing, or proofreading. Most of the participants in this Special Issue, including ourselves for the words you are reading now, had to do so. But writing in English also has an intangible cost for us. We all lose something in the process. We think differently in our first language. For example, we tend to write longer, more complex sentences in Spanish as opposed to the general formula of the English language that sees elegance in short, straightforward ones. Because English affects how we think, we experience what Hohti and Truman (2021) describe as a kind of 'homelessness.' As they beautifully put it, we miss 'being at home: a mode of breathing, dwelling, being at ease, an affective dimension of existence that we identify at once in its absence' (Hohti and Truman 2021, 9). Ironically, we belong to a complex linguistic community that holds onto a colonial language, which has also prospered at the cost of suppressing many indigenous languages (Céspedes, 2021). Inquiring into the naturalization of English as the privileged language of publication, thus, can also contribute to identifying our different colonial legacies beyond it (Curry and Lillis, 2022).

The complex hierarchization process within academic research and dissemination is not limited to the actual use of language for scientific purposes but also how this use becomes recurrent due to particular social, economic, and geopolitical processes related to the

coloniality of power. Currently, English dominates both international conferences and the mainstream scientific editorial industry. Lucía Céspedes's study (Céspedes, 2021) shows that 78% and 62% percent of the journals indexed in SCOPUS and Web of Science, two of the mainstream scientific indexing platforms, only accept contributions in English. Approximately half of the indexed journals in those two databases are edited either in the United States or the UK. Academic production is concentrated in North America and Europe, the so-called academic 'cores' of global science, followed by peripheral and semi-peripheral countries in the rest of the world (Chiappa and Finardi, 2021). Anglo-American colonial geopolitics of knowledge is reproduced through editorial enterprises, indexing metrics, journal rankings, etcetera. Moreover, this matrix of domination has important implications for how and by whom knowledge is produced and for the kind of knowledge that is even considered worthy of producing. Cultural capital is decided 'by geographical distance from "modern" places and epistemic difference from the Eurocentric centers of world power' (Mayblin and Turner 2021, 114).

The construction of 'legitimate knowledge' is highly influenced by assessment regimes based on bibliometric measures – they determine the worth of knowledge (and our worth as researchers) based on where it is published and what language it is written in (Rowlands and Wright, 2020). Academic assessments and tenure promotions depend on publishing in high-ranked journals, which are most common in English (Beigel, 2014). In Spain, where two of us work, despite a current trend following an alternative science assessment in line with the DORA declaration, state academic evaluations in the last two decades have included as indicators of academic 'excellence' publishing in Q1 and Q2 journals indexed Web of Science and Scopus. We do not know how we came to understand the utmost importance of the letter Q in our lives, but here we are! The requirement to publish in English is a barrier for many of us, even those pursuing a career in academia.

As a result, we come here with mixed feelings about what we are doing: Why, if so, is a special issue of QRIP like this necessary? Are we legitimizing English hegemony? Are we simply complying with neoliberal evaluation and trying to survive (publish – in English – or perish [Di Bitetti and Ferreras, 2017])? All these contradictions inhabit this Special Issue. As guest editors, we are at the center of this disarray-ly crossroads, involved in contradictory and paradoxical positions. As clogs in this 'factory' of knowledge production (Montenegro and Pujol, 2013), publishing in high-ranked journals might imply higher job stabilization or promotion possibilities – both for us, as guest editors, and for the colleagues who submitted contributions to this issue. Undoubtedly, one of the reasons we had for undertaking this editorial project. There is no innocence here, as Haraway (1992) would say. That being true, it is to say that this project began with our strong motivation for expanding the chances to share and discuss a feminist-oriented methodology such as NPM, a specific way of doing narrative research that has developed primarily in Spanish-speaking contexts and that has been committed to emancipation and social justice. The product, this Special Issue, is thus not just 'business as usual' for us. It has involved affective, emotional, theoretical, and political commitments toward ethical

encounters in methodology (Nayak, 2017) that can inform future projects of engaged qualitative research in Psychology.

References

Álvarez Martínez-Conde, C., Boteman, C. E. R., Leal, K. F., & Montenegro, M. (2020). Memories of the struggles for the rights of immigrant women in Barcelona. *Critical Social Policy*, *40*(2), 215–233. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261018319895499

Andrés Soriano, J., Ramírez-March, Á., & Montenegro, M. (2022). Metodologías del común desde "la barriga del monstruo". *Empiria. Revista de metodología de ciencias sociales*, *55*, Article 55. https://doi.org/10.5944/empiria.55.2022.34187

Andrews, M., Squire, C., & Tamboukou, M. (2013). *Doing Narrative Research*. SAGE Publications, Ltd. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526402271

Ávila, R. (2015). Bareback sex: Breaking the rules of sexual health and the assumption of risks. *Sexualities*, *18*(5–6), 523–547. https://doi.org/10.1177/1363460714550903

Bachtin, M., Holquist, M., Emerson, C., & Bachtin, M. (2011). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (18. paperback printing). Univ. of Texas Press.

Balasch, M., & Montenegro, M. (2003). Una propuesta metodológica desde la epistemología de los conocimientos situados: Las producciones narrativas. *Encuentros En Psicología Social*, *1*(3), 44–48.

Bamberg, M. (2012). Narrative Analysis. In H. Cooper (Ed.), *APA Handbook of Research Methods in Psychology Vol. 2 Quantitative, Qualitative, Neuropsychological, and Biological*. American Psychological Association.

Beigel, F. (2014). Publishing from the periphery: Structural heterogeneity and segmented circuits. The evaluation of scientific publications for tenure in Argentina's CONICET. *Current Sociology*, *62*(5), 743–765. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392114533977

BRIDGES Collective. (2022). *Dismantling Walls, Building Bridges: Creating antiracist feminist alliances within, outside, and against Universities*. FAC Press. https://buildingbridges.space/wp-content/uploads/Monograph_EN.pdf

Cabruja, T., Íñiguez-Rueda, L., & Vázquez, F. (2000). Cómo construimos el mundo: Relativismo, espacios de relación y narratividad. *Anàlisi: Quaderns de comunicació i cultura*, *25*, 61–94.

Caine, V., Clandinin, D. J., & Lessard, S. (2022). *Narrative inquiry: Philosophical roots*. Bloomsbury Academic.

Carrer-Russell, C. (2018). El dispositivo de acoso escolar homofóbico y transfóbico: Voces en una comunidad educativa. *Sociedad e Infancias*, *2*(0), 211–232. https://doi.org/10.5209/SOCI.59456

Castro-Gómez, S. (2005). *La Hybris del punto cero: Ciencia, raza e ilustración en la Nueva Granada, 1750-1816*. Editorial Pontificia Universidad Javeriana.

Cea-Merino, P., Galaz Valderrama, C., & Montenegro-Martínez, M. (2015). La construcción social de las mujeres inmigrantes en los discursos de la academia. *Psicoperspectivas*, *14*(2), 28–39. https://doi.org/10.5027/PSICOPERSPECTIVAS-VOL14-ISSUE2-FULLTEXT-599

Céspedes, L. (2021). LATIN AMERICAN JOURNALS AND HEGEMONIC LANGUAGES FOR ACADEMIC PUBLISHING IN SCOPUS AND WEB OF

SCIENCE. *Trabalhos Em Linguística Aplicada*, *60*, 141–154. https://doi.org/10.1590/010318138901311520201214
Chiappa, R., & Finardi, K. R. (2021). *Coloniality Prints in Internationalization of Higher Education: The Case of Brazilian and Chilean International Scholarships*. 21.
Clavero, M. (2010). "Awkward wording. Rephrase": Linguistic injustice in ecological journals. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, *25*(10), 552–553. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2010.07.001
Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. (Eds.). (2017). *Global Academic Publishing*. Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/CURRY9238
Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. (2022). Multilingualism in academic writing for publication: Putting English in its place. *Language Teaching*, pp. 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444822000040
Domínguez, E., & Herrera, J. D. (2013). La investigación narrativa en psicología: Definición y funciones. *Psicología desde el Caribe: revista del Programa de Psicología de la Universidad del Norte*, *30*(3), 620–641.
Fulladosa-Leal, K. (2015). Creando puentes entre la formación y la creatividad: Una experiencia de investigación activista feminista. *Universitas Humanística*, *79*(79), Article 79. https://doi.org/10.11144/Javeriana.UH79.cpfc
Galaz Valderrama, C., Álvarez, C., Hedrera, L., & Becerra, M. M. (2018). Intervenciones psicosociales y sus efectos en la trayectoria de mujeres inmigradas en Chile. *Universitas Psychologica*, *16*(5), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.11144/Javeriana.upsy16-5.ipet
Gandarias Goikoetxea, I., & García Fernández, N. (2014). Producciones narrativas: Una propuesta metodológica para la investigación feminista. In I. Mendia Azkue, M. Luxán, M. Legarreta, G. Guzmán, I. Zirion, & J. Azpiazu Carballo (Eds.), *Otras formas de (re) conocer. Reflexiones, herramientas y aplicaciones desde la investigación feminista* (pp. 97–110). Hegoa. http://publicaciones.hegoa.ehu.es/publications/329
Gandarías Goikoetxea, I., & Pujol Tarrés, J. (2013). *De las Otras al No(s)otras: Encuentros, tensiones y retos en el tejido de articulaciones entre colectivos de mujeres migradas y feministas locales en el País Vasco*. https://gredos.usal.es/handle/10366/122225
García Fernández, N. (2018). Love and its Contradictions: Feminist Women's Resistance Strategies in their Love Narratives. *Journal of Popular Romance Studies*. http://jprstudies.org/2017/04/love-and-its-contradictions-feminist-womens-resistance-strategies-in-their-love-narrativesby-nagore-garcia-fernandez/
Garcia-Meneses, J., Enciso Domínguez, G., & Chanez-Cortés, I. (2023). 'Burning toda la mierda': A schizo-affective poem. Culture and Organization, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1080/14759551.2023.2216830
Hammers, C., & Brown, A. (2004). Towards a Feminist-Queer Alliance: A Paradigmatic Shift in the Research Process. *Social Epistemology*, *18*(1), 85–101.
Haraway, D. (1988). Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective. *Feminist Studies*, *14*(3), 575–599. JSTOR. https://doi.org/10.2307/3178066
Haraway, D. (1992). *The Promises of Monsters: A Regenerative Politics for Inappropriate/d Others*. In L. Grossberg (Ed.), *Cultural Studies*. Routledge.
Haraway, D. (1997). enlightenment@science_wars.com: A Personal Reflection on Love and War. *Social Text*, *50*, 123–129. https://doi.org/10.2307/466820

Haraway, D. J. (2018). *Modest_Witness@Second_Millennium. FemaleMan_Meets_OncoMouse: Feminism and Technoscience* (2nd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203731093

Hart, G. (2004). Geography and Development: Critical Ethnographies. *Progress in Human Geography*, *28*(1), 91–100.

Hohti, R., & Truman, S. E. (2021). Anglocentrism in the Academy: On Linguistic Privilege, Mastery, and Hoito. *Reconceptualizing Educational Research Methodology*, *12*(2). https://doi.org/10.7577/rerm.4675

Íñiguez-Rueda, L. (2003). La Psicología Social como crítica: Continuismo, estabilidad y efervescencias tres décadas después de la 'crisis'. *Revista interamericana de psicología = Interamerican journal of psychology*, *37*(2), 221–238.

Kim, J.-H. (2016). *Understanding Narrative Inquiry: The Crafting and Analysis of Stories as Research*. SAGE Publications, Inc. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781071802861

Macleod, C. I., Bhatia, S., & Liu, W. (2020). Feminisms and decolonizing psychology: Possibilities and challenges. *Feminism & Psychology*, *30*(3), 287–305. https://doi.org/10.1177/0959353520932810

Martínez-Guzmán, A., & Montenegro, M. (2014). La producción de narrativas como herramienta de investigación y acción sobre el dispositivo de sexo/género: Construyendo nuevos relatos. *Quaderns de Psicologia*, *16*(1), 111–125. https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/qpsicologia.1206

Mayblin, L., & Turner, J. B. (2021). *Migration studies and colonialism*. Polity Press.

Montenegro, M., & Pujol, J. (2013). La fábrica de conocimientos: In/corporación del capitalismo cognitivo en el contexto universitario. *Athenea Digital. Revista de pensamiento e investigación social*, *13*(1), 139–154. https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/athenead/v13n1.1031

Montenegro, M., & Pujol, J. (2022). Cultural transformation of university social work curricula: Black Lives Matter and the Spanish colonial past. *Critical and Radical Social Work*, *10*(2), 209–225. https://doi.org/10.1332/204986021X16530442276819

Montero, M. (1994). *Contrucción crítica de la Psicología Social*. Anthropos.

Nayak, S. (2017). Location as method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, *17*(3), 202–216. https://doi.org/10.1108/QRJ-02-2017-0004

Parker, I. (2007). *Revolution in Psychology: Alienation to emancipation*. Pluto Press.

Piper Shafir, I., & Montenegro, M. (2017). Ni víctimas, ni héroes, ni arrepentido/as. Reflexiones en torno a la categoría "víctima" desde el activismo político. *Revista de Estudios Sociales*, *59*, 98–109. https://doi.org/10.7440/res59.2017.08

Piper-Shafir, I., Fernández-Droguett, R., & Iñiguez-Rueda, L. (2013). Psicología Social de la Memoria: Espacios y Políticas del Recuerdo. *Psykhe (Santiago)*, *22*(2), 19–31. https://doi.org/10.7764/psykhe.22.2.574

Prijic-Samarzija, S. (2016). Institutional social engagement. *Filozofija i Drustvo*, *27*(2), 429–435. https://doi.org/10.2298/FID1602429P

Pujol, J., Montenegro, M., & Balasch, M. (2003). Los límites de la metáfora lingüística. Implicaciones de una perspectiva corporeizada para la práctica investigadora e interventora. *Política y Sociedad*, *40*(1), 57–70.

Pujol Tarrés, J., & Montenegro, M. (2013). Producciones narrativas: Una propuesta teórico-práctica para la investigación narrativa. In *Coloquios de investigación Socialex* (pp. 15–42). http://generatech.org/sites/default/files/coloquioii.pdf

Ramírez-Castañeda, V. (2020). Disadvantages in preparing and publishing scientific papers caused by the dominance of the English language in science: The case of

Colombian researchers in biological sciences. *PLOS ONE*, *15*(9), e0238372. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0238372

Ramírez-March, Á., & Montenegro, M. (2022). ¿Qué puede hacer la acogida? Aperturas, disputas y críticas en los movimientos sociales por los derechos de las personas migrantes en el Estado español. *Quaderns de l'Institut Català d'Antropologia*, *38 (1)*, Article 38 (1). https://doi.org/10.56247/qua.392

Rowlands, J., & Wright, S. (2020). The role of bibliometric research assessment in a global order of epistemic injustice: A case study of humanities research in Denmark. *Critical Studies in Education*, pp. 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2020.1792523

Schongut, N. S., & Pujol, J. (2015). Relatos metodológicos: Difractando experiencias narrativas de investigación. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *16*(2), 24.

Squire, C. (2007). *HIV in South Africa: Talking about the big thing* (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203946503

Visweswaran, K. (1997). Histories of Feminist Ethnography. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *26*, 591–621.

Walsh, C. (2007). Interculturalidad, colonialidad y educación. *Revista Educación y Pedagogía*, *XIX*(48).

Woodwiss, J., Smith, K., & Lockwood, K. (2018). *FEMINIST NARRATIVE RESEARCH: Opportunities and challenges*. PALGRAVE MACMILLAN.