

<https://doi.org/10.23913/ride.v16i32.2848>

*Scientific articles*

## **Entre metáforas y proyectos de conocimiento: cartografía crítica del psicólogo–investigador en un proyecto educativo comunitario**

*Between Metaphors and Knowledge Projects: A Critical Cartography of the Psychologist–Researcher in a Community Educational Project*

*Entre metáforas e projetos de conhecimento: cartografia crítica do psicólogo-pesquisador em um projeto educativo comunitário*

**María Alejandra Marcelín Alvarado**

Instituto de Evaluación, Profesionalización y Promoción Docente de Chiapas, México

[thetan.m11@gmail.com](mailto:thetan.m11@gmail.com)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9007-4518>

### **Resumen**

Este estudio se replantea la noción de objetividad en la producción de saberes en intervención social y cuestiona cómo incluso métodos participativos pueden ser absorbidos por lógicas hegemónicas. El objetivo de esta investigación es reflexionar sobre las decisiones de los investigadores y explorar desplazamientos epistemológicos mediante el análisis de metáforas y proyectos de conocimiento, con el fin de aportar a metodologías más inclusivas en psicología comunitaria. El estudio se desarrolló desde un enfoque cualitativo–crítico, combinando la experiencia directa en campo con la revisión de literatura en epistemología social y teoría crítica. Este abordaje permitió que se configurara el proyecto de conocimiento: el investigador como método. Los materiales incluyeron las notas de campo de una experiencia de intervención comunitaria en el estado de Chiapas, México, vinculada a la convocatoria del Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología [CONACYT], así como el resumen entregado a dicha instancia donde se registraron los compromisos asumidos para su ejecución.

Los resultados muestran que los proyectos de conocimiento, configuraciones políticas, éticas y epistémicas, articulan saberes situados. Las metáforas, que operan en dimensiones retóricas, críticas y filosóficas, se articulan con estos proyectos para problematizar al investigador, visibilizar tensiones de poder y generar conocimiento reflexivo y transformador. En las conclusiones este trabajo propone interrumpir la concepción hegemónica de la investigación al posicionar al investigador como método, ya que el conocimiento emerge desde el cuerpo implicado. Se plantea una reconfiguración ontológica del acto investigativo, cuestionando la neutralidad metodológica y la dicotomía objetividad–posicionamiento en contextos de violencia estructural.

**Palabras clave:** intervención comunitaria, investigador como método, metáforas, metodología crítica, proyectos de conocimiento.

### **Abstract**

This study reconsiders the notion of objectivity in knowledge production within social intervention and interrogates how even participatory methods can be absorbed by hegemonic logics. The aim of this research is to reflect on researchers' decisions and to explore epistemological shifts through the analysis of metaphors and knowledge projects, with the purpose of contributing to more inclusive methodologies in community psychology. The study was conducted within a qualitative–critical approach, combining direct field experience with a review of literature in social epistemology and critical theory. This approach enabled the configuration of the knowledge project: the researcher as method. The materials included field notes from a community intervention experience in the state of Chiapas, Mexico, linked to the call issued by the National Council of Science and Technology [CONACYT], as well as the summary submitted to that agency, in which the commitments assumed for its implementation were documented.

The findings show that knowledge projects, understood as political, ethical, and epistemic configurations, articulate situated knowledges. Metaphors, operating across rhetorical, critical, and philosophical levels, intersect with these projects to problematize the figure of the researcher, make power tensions visible, and generate reflective and transformative knowledge. In its conclusions, the study proposes interrupting the hegemonic conception of research by positioning the researcher as method, on the premise that knowledge emerges from the embodied subject. An ontological reconfiguration of the research act is thus

advanced, challenging methodological neutrality and the objectivity–positionality dichotomy in contexts marked by structural violence.

**Keywords:** community intervention, researcher as method, metaphors, critical methodology, knowledge projects.

## Resumo

Este estudo reconsidera a noção de objetividade na produção de conhecimento em intervenções sociais e questiona como até mesmo métodos participativos podem ser absorvidos por lógicas hegemônicas. O objetivo desta pesquisa é refletir sobre as decisões dos pesquisadores e explorar mudanças epistemológicas por meio da análise de metáforas e projetos de conhecimento, a fim de contribuir para metodologias mais inclusivas em psicologia comunitária. O estudo foi desenvolvido a partir de uma abordagem qualitativo-crítica, combinando experiência direta de campo com uma revisão da literatura em epistemologia social e teoria crítica. Essa abordagem permitiu a configuração do projeto de conhecimento: o pesquisador como método. Os materiais incluíram notas de campo de uma experiência de intervenção comunitária no estado de Chiapas, México, vinculada a uma chamada de propostas do Conselho Nacional de Ciência e Tecnologia [CONACYT], bem como o resumo submetido a esse órgão, que registrou os compromissos assumidos para sua implementação.

Os resultados mostram que os projetos de conhecimento, suas configurações políticas, éticas e epistêmicas, articulam conhecimento situado. As metáforas, que operam nas dimensões retórica, crítica e filosófica, articulam-se com esses projetos para problematizar o pesquisador, tornar visíveis as tensões de poder e gerar conhecimento reflexivo e transformador. Em suas conclusões, este trabalho propõe interromper a concepção hegemônica de pesquisa, posicionando o pesquisador como método, uma vez que o conhecimento emerge do corpo envolvido. Propõe uma reconfiguração ontológica do ato investigativo, questionando a neutralidade metodológica e a dicotomia objetividade-posicionamento em contextos de violência estrutural.

**Palavras-chave:** intervenção comunitária, pesquisador como método, metáforas, metodologia crítica, projetos de conhecimento.

**Date Received:** August 2025

**Date Accepted:** February 2026



## Introduction

Bal 's (1997) thesis , it is untenable to conceive of research in the field of community psychology as entirely impersonal. All inquiry begins with a narrator who is part of the narrative itself—that is, a homodiegetic narrator. Although this narrator participates in the events, they can assume a position of expanded knowledge, distinct from the external omniscience typical of the third person, from which they interpret and articulate the story in the first or second person. There is no narrative without an enunciator. This statement allows us to infer that the researcher is not limited to observing, but rather operates as an agent who guides the gaze, constructs meaning, and transforms the concrete effects of their knowledge. In this sense, the method is understood not as a tool applied to a given reality; on the contrary, it is a mechanism that shapes reality as it unfolds.

This conception aligns with the idea that reality is neither singular nor static; it is composed of multiple interactive layers that overflow any possibility of a neutral or totalizing representation (Morin, 2007). Within this framework, although many critical currents such as interpretive sociology, poststructuralism, difference studies, postcolonial thought, and feminist epistemologies have questioned the rigidity of the method, the methodological conversation (Law , 2004) remains anchored in technical notions of rigor and exactness (Íñiguez, 2007). It presupposes that there is a more precise version of reality that must be discovered, explained, or ideally transformed, and that this process must conform to investigative forms validated by the Eurocentric academic tradition (Denscombe, 2025; Navarrete, 2024; Santiago and Aguayo, 2025). This supposed objective version is reinforced, tacitly or explicitly, both by CONACYT —currently the Secretariat of Science, Humanities, Technology and Innovation [SECIHTI]—, as the institution that funds research in Mexico, and by academic publishers that act as mechanisms for legitimizing knowledge.

Since exercising this regulatory function in the scientific field, criteria have been established for evaluating research projects, which must be met by researchers participating in community education projects to become part of the National System of Researchers (SNI). Among these criteria is the requirement to publish in journals indexed in recognized international databases, such as Scopus, JCR, or Scimago. However, in the field of behavioral sciences, particularly psychology, scientific production is concentrated primarily in the United States— followed by the United Kingdom, Germany, Canada, Australia, and the Netherlands— while a large part of the world's population remains underrepresented. This epistemic concentration reduces international representation (Arnett, 2008; Lin & Li, 2023;

Rad, Martingano , & Ginges , 2018) and generates biases in the production and dissemination of knowledge, partly as a consequence of language barriers. Furthermore, publishers in these countries tend to prioritize mainstream methods, generally quantitative and experimental, to the detriment of qualitative or critical approaches (Palser , Lazerwitz , Fotopoulou, 2022). For example, Vizioli (2024) reports that Latin American publications on psychology represent 3.52% of the total coverage in Scopus (n = 1,336), and the distribution of journals across quartiles is as follows: 80.85% are in the fourth quartile, while 19.15% are in the third quartile.

Another relevant criterion for membership in the National System of Researchers (SNI) is the researchers' capacity to address national problems and participate in the design of proposals in coordination with diverse sectors of society. They must also demonstrate their participation in activities that strengthen and consolidate the humanities, sciences, technology, and innovation community, as well as activities or content that promote universal access to knowledge and its social benefits. The Secretariat of Science, Technology, and Innovation (SECIHTI) administers, among others, the Institutional Fund for Scientific, Technological, and Innovation Development (FORDECYT) and the National Strategic Programs (PRONACES). These funds are designed to promote scientific and technological research projects and community outreach. However, although they appear to offer some flexibility in the choice of approaches and methodologies—such as participatory or transdisciplinary research—in practice they establish operational restrictions that favor perspectives aligned with hegemonic logics. In Gramscian terms (Gramsci, 1971), these logics operate as forms of intellectual and moral leadership that present a particular worldview as common sense and legitimize it.

As a consequence, the restrictions imposed by academic publishers and funding opportunities tend to favor research aligned with hegemonic criteria and discourage dissenting forms of knowledge production. Faced with this phenomenon, the need arises to rethink the role of the researcher. They can no longer be conceived as a subject who applies neutral methods to a given object; on the contrary, they actively participate in the production of the reality they study and seek to transform.

In this context, the notion of “performativity of method” (Law, 2004) emerges, which posits that method shapes reality itself according to the interests of hegemonic groups. In response to this perspective, authors such as Chen (2010) in *\* Asia as Method\** , Mezzadra and Neilson (2017) in *\* The Border as Method\** , and Burman (2019) in *\*The Child as*

*Method\** have sought to subvert the disciplined and moralizing forms of academic method. In these cases, the aim is to demystify the method and open it up to disorder, heterogeneity, and incompleteness, traditionally rejected in the name of rigor. This operation allows for the restoration of its political dimension and enables it to traverse other territories of meaning. In this vein, the epistemological questions posed should not be limited to discovering “what the object is”; on the contrary, they expand to “where is it?” and “how does it come into being?” (Mol, 2023). Building on these ideas, a new knowledge project is proposed that understands the researcher as an active participant in the construction of knowledge: *The Researcher as Method*. The following question is posed: How does considering the researcher as a performative method allow for a critical rethinking of research practices dominated by Eurocentric methodological hegemonies in community psychology?

Consequently, and from the perspective of the researcher as method, the purpose of this article is to reflect on the decisions of researchers who participated in community education processes. Likewise, it explores possible epistemological shifts, understood here as potential changes in the interpretive frameworks from which understanding and action are based. These shifts are analyzed through the use of critical metaphors (Hill Collins, 2019) as a conceptual resource that questions power relations, as well as through dialogue with alternative knowledge projects—that is, with counter-hegemonic theoretical - political frameworks that reorient research practices. The intention is to contribute to the construction of inclusive methodologies in the field of community psychology. On an analytical level, attention will be focused on the community psychologist who acted as an educator, whose role consisted of designing and implementing strategies aimed at promoting healthy lifestyles and strengthening the psychosocial well-being of community members, in accordance with the guidelines established by CONACYT (2019). These actions are part of the project “Promotion of habits and healthy lifestyles from the school environment and community in vulnerable conditions”, funded by FORDECYT-PRONACES. The interventions were carried out between 2020 – 2023 in the communities of Tuila El Grande, San Rafael “El Ocote Bandera”, Guadalupe Palmira and Yaltaché Buenavista, localities classified with a high or very high level of marginalization and located in the municipality of Comitán de Domínguez, Chiapas, Mexico.

It should be noted that the study used three sources of information: 1) the 2019 call for proposals for research and advocacy projects on nutrition and comprehensive community health in public schools (early childhood, primary, and secondary) (CONACYT, 2019), 2)

an ethnographic record of the methodological decisions, and 3) the executive summary of the project (Regional Center for Teacher Training and Educational Research [CRESUR], 2019) submitted to CONACYT, designed by a previous group of researchers. In this last source, the diagnostic instruments and other deliverables derived from the intervention were predefined. That is, both the diagnostic instruments and the final project deliverables were predetermined, which influenced the intervention (CRESUR, 2019).

The article's structure follows an argumentative progression that moves from questioning the method as a neutral technique to affirming the educational researcher as an act of resistance. It assumes that the researcher is not a subject who apprehends reality objectively; instead, the researcher is, in essence, the method because, through their decisions, relationships, and ways of knowing, they shape knowledge. In Stengers' (1997) terms, this article argues that its intention is not to offer definitive answers to the problem of performative research. Rather, its intention is to adopt the position of the *fool*. Deleuzian thought, a conceptual figure who maintains a critical distance from dominant certainties, slows down reason, opens a space for doubt about decisions made, and generates a moment of hesitation regarding what is considered appropriate and the actions legitimized in its name. This epistemological shift interrupts the urgency of those who rush to intervene prescriptively in complex contexts and fosters a profound and sustained questioning of the conditions under which knowledge is produced and its effects.

## Materials and methods

This study was developed from a qualitative - critical approach to explore the central hypothesis: the researcher acts as a method, and their decisions shape the production of knowledge in community psychology. Two complementary dimensions were combined, directly aligned with the objectives of identifying practices that reproduce oppression and potential epistemological shifts. The first consisted of selecting a case study: a community education project, specifically psychosocial education, carried out in the communities of Tuila El Grande, San Rafael “El Ocote Bandera,” Guadalupe Palmira, and Yaltaché Buenavista. For the analysis, the 2019 call for proposals for research and advocacy projects (CONACYT, 2019), the project's executive summary (CRESUR, 2019) submitted to CONACYT, and an ethnographic record of the methodological decisions were considered. These decisions included diagnosis—using psychometric and projective tests, surveys, focus groups, and social mapping—and the implementation of workshops focused on self-

awareness, emotional self-regulation, and the development of social skills in children and adolescents. Workshops were also conducted to strengthen support networks among women (CRESUR, 2019). Although the assessment instruments were applied, the results were not processed, as the project was suspended in 2023 following the closure of the center that managed it (Marcelín, 2023). While this could be interpreted as a limitation, it does not affect the objectives of this study, since it focuses on the researchers' decisions and positions rather than the behavioral effects on the participants. To protect the confidentiality of the participants, pseudonyms were used in all personal communications.

The second dimension focused on a narrative review of the specialized literature in social epistemology and critical theory. Priority was given to texts that problematize the logics of legitimation, epistemic authority, and the dynamics of discipline present in community psychology, as well as those that propose insurgent forms of knowledge. This *corpus was selected* from a critical and anti-disciplinary perspective, with the aim of integrating viewpoints that interrogate the power structures that permeate knowledge production and that promote situated, embodied, and politically engaged research practices.

This inquiry logic is characterized by being multipositional, incorporating diverse perspectives and actors in the analysis; situated, contextualizing the research within specific situations; and processual. Monitoring methodological decisions, along with a narrative literature review, allowed for an evolving approach, flexible and adaptable to the dynamics of the experience and emerging findings. From this dual foundation—field experience and theoretical analysis—experiences are gathered and examined through two lenses: metaphors and knowledge projects. This articulation allows for questioning methodological decisions that, consciously or unconsciously, reproduce hegemonic logics or open possibilities for constructing new research practices. The analysis process unfolded through a careful and reflective reading of the materials; special emphasis was placed on identifying metaphors and theoretical shifts that contribute to shaping an alternative knowledge project: *the researcher as method*. Far from seeking a systematic synthesis, the methodology aimed to map an epistemological-political framework (Braidotti, 2000) of the very act of research, with the purpose of questioning the assumptions that underpin decisions. This procedure allows the methodology to be reproduced in other contexts: selecting documented projects, collecting field notes on methodological decisions, conducting a critical literature review, and coding metaphors and shifts, in order to analyze the researcher's performativity in the production of knowledge.

## Results

### The performativity of the method

Although there are critical efforts in the region to diversify research methods, studies such as those by Arocena and Sutz (2015) warn that science and technology policies continue to prioritize quantifiable criteria for scientific output. The problem is that these criteria actively produce the type of knowledge they deem valid. This phenomenon has several consequences. The first is the creation of a profoundly unequal structure that centralizes resources in a small number of institutions and geographical areas, while simultaneously defining the topics and methodologies it considers legitimate. The second is the systematic exclusion of perspectives, approaches, and objects of study that are structurally rendered invisible because they do not conform to dominant standards. That which is not measured or published according to prevailing metrics becomes nonexistent in political and epistemic terms, as it falls outside the circles of validation, distribution, and funding. The third is the reduction and simplification of the inherent complexity of social and cultural phenomena (Morin, 2007) to a set of controllable variables. This epistemological erasure installs “restrictive normative blinkers” (Law, 2004), which impose a limited view of reality insofar as they restrict how and what should be investigated.

This threefold mechanism — centralization, exclusion, and instrumentalization — constitutes what is understood as the performativity and normativity of the method. Following Latour (1991/2007), this methodological normativity derives from what he calls the “modern constitution,” which operates through two simultaneous movements: a) purification, which separates nature/society, facts/values, subjects/objects, when in reality hybrids exist that combine natural, technical, and social elements; b) translation, which renders invisible the negotiations that constitute these hybrids. The belief is established that there are “pure facts” (properties of science) and “values” (properties of politics and culture) (Latour, 2004). Thus, the radical separation between nature and society through the process of purification renders hybrid entities invisible through the process of translation. This operation allows for the artificial classification of hybrids, either as pure natural entities or as mere social decisions; in this way, their mixed character and the negotiations that constitute them are erased. The discoveries of the sociology of science and technology — linked with the lessons of quantum theory — demonstrate precisely the opposite. Latour and Woolgar (1986), in *Laboratory Life*, show that scientific laboratories produce knowledge

through concrete practices, instruments, and collective negotiations that socially construct science. Similarly, Mol (2023), in *The Body Multiple* analyzes how medical technologies and diagnostic methods "enact," that is, they are capable of constructing their objects of study. The sick body is multiple because in different places within the hospital and under different procedures, it presents itself differently. In another field, MacKenzie (2006), in *An Engine, Not a Camera*, examines the social construction of financial markets through the use of mathematical models. Finally, in the social sciences and humanities, ethnographic research such as that of Sarah Pink (2001) reveals that methodological choices affect the observed relationships and the narratives produced. All these works destabilize the idea of pure facts — *matters of fact* — by showing that they are the result of complex manufacturing processes, and reinforce the need to address them as matters of concern — *matters of concern* —, that is, as socio-technical assemblages whose constitution must be problematized rather than naturalized (Latour, 2004).

Thus, a FORDECYT–PRONACES project aimed at addressing national and regional problems produces concrete effects in the communities where it is implemented. The call for proposals (CONACYT, 2019) is ontologically productive, as it shapes the field of research, produces legitimate objects of knowledge, and molds subjectivities by delimiting what can be seen, said, or done. Although it would be possible to integrate dissenting perspectives or qualitative-critical approaches, which are more appropriate for addressing hybrid phenomena, both the call for proposals and the project proposal written by previous researchers establish conditions of possibility that guide the results. Furthermore, they induce specific ways of producing knowledge by prioritizing performance and innovation metrics, and in doing so, they shape the reality that is considered relevant to investigate. This is the case, for example, with the explicit mandate to “develop a monitoring and information mechanism with community participation, operating as a Community School Health Observatory that allows for making visible, monitoring, synthesizing, quantifying, and evaluating the processes and results of each research axis” (CONACYT, 2019, p. 5). This emphasis on quantification and monitoring creates a disconnect between theory and community practice, since local needs and knowledge may be subordinated to the interests of institutional evaluation, expressed in indicators such as the “number of beneficiaries served” or “the improvement of health and well-being” (CONACYT, 2019, p. 4).

In the analyzed research, this was evident during the psychosocial diagnostic phase. Mapping — albeit participatory — and focus groups were used, employing pre-designed question scripts that revolved around specific themes, thus limiting the emergence of concerns or narratives that did not fit the script. Surveys and *tests were also administered*, designed to enable the community, in coordination with the researchers, to “identify, detect, and define the problems and limitations that hinder the processes aimed at the well-being of the school population” (CONACYT, 2019, p. 3). Similarly, the mandate “to remake and/or build a network of collective co-responsibility, [from which] alternatives can be generated to address or eliminate these obstacles and enable new strategies for interaction with the communities” (CONACYT, 2019, p. 3), reflects a linear and pre-structured conception of social action. In this case, local agency is subordinated, and the viability of strategies is prioritized over the contradictions and conflicts inherent in community processes. Thus, the instruments operated as if reality could be captured in a fixed way and defined solely from the epistemological frameworks of academia.

The tension between rigid planning and the complexity of community life calls for theoretical approaches that challenge the totalizing structures of research. In this sense, Stengers 's (2014) proposal of a cosmopolitics that functions as an equality mechanism, suspending definitive conclusions and requiring decisions to be made "in the presence" of that which remains voiceless, unheard, or invisible, is valuable. In practice, this perspective translates into an ethical commitment on the part of the researcher to produce knowledge in dialogue with the people who make up the community and in resistance to their subordination.

### **Multipositional analysis**

Metaphors (Hill Collins, 2019) They function as sensitive threads and conceptual languages that interweave heterogeneous knowledge projects, endowing them with coherence and meaning. In other words, each knowledge project is sustained, explicitly or implicitly, by metaphors that guide its epistemological and ethical-political frameworks. By operating simultaneously in different dimensions — rhetorical, critical-political, and philosophical-epistemological — metaphors enrich the researcher's multipositional analysis and make visible the social, ideological, and political relations that usually remain veiled. In this sense, both metaphors and knowledge projects enable a “quantum jump” ( Barad , 2007 ) , a

discontinuous change in the performativity of the method, one that does not pass through intermediate stages.

In its primary mode of operation, metaphor functions as a *rhetorical figure and narrative construct*. Following Bal (2002) in *\*Conceptos viajeros\**, from a literary and cultural perspective, metaphor is presented as a methodological tool that allows us to read images and texts as interpretive keys that invite us to "look in" and *unfold* the layers of meaning within the objects of study. Complementarily, the cognitive and philosophical theory of Lakoff and Johnson (1980) maintains that human thought is inherently metaphorical, as it structures and understands complex concepts based on more familiar ones, through structural, ontological, and orientational metaphors. These metaphors shape how we experience and act in the world. In community psychology, modifying dominant metaphors—such as moving from “integrating” to “knowing the essence of being”—radically alters interventions, shifting from a model that reproduces exclusions through welfare to an inclusive one (Ocampo, 2024).

In a second mode of operation, the metaphor questions the structures that render voices and practices invisible, and acquires a *critical and political dimension in the construction/resignification of identities*. For Hill Collins (2000), in *Black Feminist Thought*, metaphors are critical and epistemic tools for dismantling regimes of racial and patriarchal oppression, while simultaneously operating as expressive resources that condense subaltern experiences and enable resistance. Hence, I characterize intersectionality as a connective metaphor, that is, as a “shortcut” that mobilizes prior sensibilities to see interconnections and cross-pollinate dialogues between knowledge projects that, from different perspectives, address similar problems. This performative power engages with Butler (2009), who uses images and metaphors to denaturalize categories of identity—especially gender—and expose their normative and constructed nature. Likewise, with Haraway (1991) argues that the “cyborg” subverts regimes of truth, hybridizes ontologies, dismantles dichotomies—human/machine, nature/culture—and opens a space for transgressive possibilities of agency and community. These metaphors produce shifts in thinking and allow us to understand that, in the project of community advocacy, the problems experienced by those in the Global South (Santos, 2014), those located in the “zone of non-being” (Fanon, 1961/2009), and the “non-existent” (Derrida, 1972/1997) are the product of the intersection of multiple and simultaneous systems of oppression (Crenshaw, 1998), in which researchers constitute only one more node. This framework also includes the vulnerable—as if vulnerability were not

part of the human condition (Santiago, 2021)— and those who are constructed as subjects who need to be represented ( Spivak , 1988).

Metaphors also allow us to dismantle rigid categories—such as children, youth, Indigenous people, women, people with disabilities, migrants, or the poor—that were configured through the exclusion of the dominant “other” social group (Young, 2000) and that are frequently considered the target population in psychological and social interventions. Such categories function strategically to confine these groups to physical and symbolic spaces (Foucault, 1961/2006) and/or to justify their paternalistic and regulatory intervention (Young, 2000). In contrast, the critical and political dimension in the construction/resignification of identities calls for a deconstructive and anti-essentialist approach. Braidotti (2000 and 2019) contributes the idea of *figuration*, understood as a visual/conceptual representation that can operate in two ways. On the one hand, it can be essentializing , highlighting particular attributes and fixing them in rigid identities that reduce the complexity of individuals to univocal traits. For example, it is common to speak of Indigenous people as needing to preserve their languages or ancestral knowledge, as if these elements were fixed and disconnected from the historical and social transformations that these communities undergo. On the other hand, figurations (Braidotti, 2000 and 2019) allow us to think of subjectivities as processes of becoming. From this latter perspective, they become critical tools for rethinking the human beyond binary and hierarchical frameworks of representation. In other words, the critical use of metaphors opens up possibilities for the construction of fluid and plural identities that allow for a complex and situated understanding of people and their contexts.

Finally, in a third mode of operation, the metaphor functions in a *philosophical - epistemological dimension* that redefines what counts as knowledge and who can produce it. Braidotti (2019) uses it to expand traditional categories such as identity, subject, and agency from a nomadic posthumanist perspective by articulating ontologies and epistemologies beyond the limits of classical humanism. For his part, Rancière (2000/2004) uses metaphor to question the distribution of the sensible, that is, the distribution of spaces, times and activities that authorizes who and what can see, say and do. Ricoeur (1975) , With his notion of living metaphor , he explains that metaphor is capable of creating new meanings by introducing a *creative deviation into language* ; that is, it expands and displaces previously available frames of reference. In line with these ideas, the researcher is conceived as a

performative subject (Butler, 1990; Foucault, 1975/2003; Lazzarato, 2011/2012) who can subvert the conditions of possibility of knowledge and action.

Metaphors function as devices for the researcher's multipositional analysis because, like a device in Foucault's sense (1975/2003), they are capable of structuring subjectivities, establishing limits to practices, and redefining the conditions that make critical thinking possible, outside of legitimized epistemic frameworks. It should be noted that a single metaphor can activate all three *modes of operation* simultaneously, but each emphasizes them differently, depending on the context and the discursive purpose in which it is employed. This functional polysemy grants metaphors a conceptual plasticity that makes them powerful devices for shaping perception and action in the public and academic spheres (Charteris - Black, 2006; Morgan, 2002; Thibodeau and Boroditsky, 2011).

If the modes of operation show what metaphors do, it is now necessary to activate them as *operational lenses* that displace the place of the researcher, question the dominant ways of researching and open a space for decolonizing knowledge projects.

Within the framework of the researcher as method, operational lenses are used that allow for questioning the researcher from multiple perspectives. The first operational lens, the *researcher as creator of the world* (Rancière, 1976/2008), reveals that their work organizes the "distribution of the sensible." This metaphor makes visible the aesthetic and epistemic mode of research and its political effect; therefore, it also opens the possibility of redistributing voices, questioning naturalized frameworks, and experimenting with languages and formats that expand what can be said and seen in research. This implies that public policies and calls for proposals, by defining which practices are relevant and which communities should be engaged, constitute performative acts that shape the reality of the project even before it begins. In this project, the researchers designed workshops for the development of psychosocial skills in children and adolescents, and workshops aimed at strengthening support networks among women. This population was considered by researchers to be predominantly marginalized, subjected to violence, excluded, and powerless (Young, 2000), as if such oppression depended solely on a lack of individual or collective capabilities. This same limitation in the epistemological perspective is evident in the call for proposals (CONACYT, 2019), which states: "the adoption of dietary consumption patterns that have favored the development of chronic degenerative diseases" (CONACYT, 2019, p. 2).

Another manifestation of the unequal distribution of the “sensitive” emerged when community leaders decided who would participate and who would act as community interlocutors—that is, as authorized “spokespeople” to legitimize the voices of others—even while acknowledging the inherent risks of translation ( Spivak , 1988). Furthermore, although the project was defined as “consensual and accredited with the community” (CONACYT, 2019, p. 6), its development was mediated by the decisions of the representatives and the institution. Participants’ accounts were recorded through official reports, while other, more marginal narratives were relegated to appendices or discarded.

The second operational lens, the *researcher as apparatus* (Foucault, 1975/2003), shifts the focus from the individual to the network of practices, knowledge, metrics, and institutions that normalize procedures, produce “truth,” and manufacture subjectivities—such as those of the author, expert, evaluator, manager, and advisor. In a FORDECYT–PRONACES project, this manifests itself in the influence exerted by ethics committees, particularly when, as in this case, the research involves human beings, as well as in the protocols and analysis *software* —which today may even include the use of artificial intelligence. These elements operate as nodes of a material-institutional system that conditions the researcher’s findings and positions. Complete escape is almost impossible because the researcher operates within a structured system that conditions their work; however, what is possible and desirable is for them to create methodological and ethical practices that question the hegemonic logics of the system and identify and make explicit the normative pressures that condition the research process. Similarly, it is essential to participate in collaborative networks that seek to transform institutional structures from within and outwards ( Spivak , 2018).

The third, the metaphor of the *researcher as a performative identity* , following Butler (1990), highlights the production of the subject through the citational repetition of norms. Thus, being a researcher is the effect of reiterations (writing styles, criteria for evidence, evaluation rituals) that stabilize a professional identity. This framework engages with Lazzarato 's (2011/2012) reflection, for whom contemporary economies of subjectivation produce figures such as the "indebted" or the "entrepreneur of the self," both marked by processes of self-exploitation and a heavy burden of individual responsibility. Such phenomena permeate academia, where researchers participate in a logic of constant competition to preserve their position and prestige within the profession. In this sense, Lyotard (1979/1984) analyzes how the postmodern condition legitimizes itself through its

criterion of performativity (efficiency, utility, and productivity), rather than through the generation of "grand narratives." Under this rationale, social projects tend to be evaluated and prioritized based on their immediate operational capacity, even when their transformative scope is limited. An example of this is the project's executive summary (CRESUR, 2019), in which, when presented to CONACYT, metrics that functioned as indicators of "success" were prioritized, such as: "recognition, analysis and evaluation of results," "attendance and participation of 75% of community members participating in academic and community events," "attendance and participation of 100% of the school staff in academic and community events," "training of 20 health promoters in topics of promotion and prevention of healthy habits," or "development of 50 academic and community events" (CRESUR, 2019, p. 2).

Along these same lines, Han (2012), in *\*The Burnout Society\**, describes how the neoliberal logic of performativity transforms the subject into an entrepreneur of the self, intensifying a self-exploitation that generates psychic and emotional fatigue. The metaphor of the *autistic researcher* functions as a critical image of interpersonal disconnection and the lack of authentic connections (Han, 2012) with the communities with which they work. This metaphor does not pathologize autism, but rather serves to highlight that these disconnections arise from the power structures and norms that regulate research. This is revealed in expressions from some researchers during activities, such as: "We're done, right? I'm leaving" (S. Lara, personal communication, August 2022), "This feels like forever, let's hurry up" (L. Ríos, personal communication, October 2022), or "I'm already tired, let's just finish this and go" (M. Rosales, personal communication, March 2023). Recent studies of Madikizela - Madiya (2023) Creagh et al. (2025) document that this self-exploitation is reinforced in contexts of constant auditing. This lens invites us to intervene in repetition (to try other ways of writing, presenting, validating), to contest the economies of subjectivation (which manage time, obligation, promise, guilt), and to subvert the criterion of performativity that legitimizes knowledge through its efficiency and productivity.

Finally, the metaphor of the *intersectional researcher* (Crenshaw, 1998) reveals that stratifications of gender, race, class, discipline, or institution permeate their practice and reconfigure their possibilities for agency. Examples of this are the data reported by *Gender Report : Women lead for Learning* (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [ UNESCO ], 2025), which shows that women and racialized academics continue to have less access to funding, networks, and visibility compared to their privileged

peers. Tensions arose among the researchers themselves during the project. Some, motivated by their own political agency, wanted to explore topics considered marginal. Others, however, considered these topics “too subjective to be objectively evaluated” (E. Ramos, personal communication, July 2022), or irrelevant because “communities have many needs, and we must prioritize interventions that can be monitored” (E. Ramos, personal communication, May 2022). Some even claimed that “they don’t provide measurable indicators to justify the funding received” (F. Lira, personal communication, 2022), that “we can’t focus on individual cases; the project needs comparable results” (E. Ramos, personal communication, May 2022), or questioned their relevance: “What does that have to do with health?” (M. González, personal communication, February 2023). Ultimately, the final decisions rested with the project managers. However, outside of institutional frameworks, epistemic accompaniment practices were developed, aimed at establishing dialogues with a group of women who voluntarily decided to participate. They narrated how, over time, they have lived their lives fighting to break free from imposed restrictions and to demand respect in their community. They trusted that documenting their stories would serve as a legacy and guide for future generations of daughters and girls.

Taken together, the metaphors that allow us to problematize the researcher as a method operate simultaneously in three modes: 1) rhetorical-narrative, by transforming the genres of enunciation and the plots through which knowledge is constructed; 2) critical-political and identity-based, by denaturalizing hierarchies and positions of the subject; and 3) philosophical-epistemological, by questioning the conditions of possibility, the criteria of validity, and the effects of reality of the method. In this convergence, the researcher in community psychology appears as an implicated figure who shapes knowledge from their position of enunciation.

### **Knowledge projects in dialogue**

A knowledge project constitutes a political, epistemic, ethical, and extra-theoretical configuration—in the sense proposed by Habermas (1987) when referring to the relationship between theory and *praxis*—that cannot be reduced to closed logical systems or abstract notions. Far from it, it presents itself as a form of interpellation of hegemonic ways of producing, validating, and reproducing knowledge. In this sense, the social demands formulated by historically subaltern groups have forced a *rethinking* of traditional ways of constructing theoretical objects. These demands have made visible systematically ignored

problems and have driven transformations in analytical frameworks, as a response to epistemic blindness to concrete forms of oppression (Healy, 2000). Each project is thus anchored in particular critical genealogies that allow for a situated problematization of both the function of the researcher and the regimes of truth, affectivity, and inclusion/exclusion in which the researcher is immersed.

Rancière's notions of *the ignorant schoolmaster* (1987/1991), *the distribution of the sensible* (2000/2004), and *the emancipated spectator* (2008) destabilize the figure of the researcher as a pedagogical expert who monopolizes the distribution of knowledge and presupposes an inequality of intelligences. Thus, the structure of the project reproduces hierarchies of intelligences because it tacitly establishes that academic knowledge is superior. From this perspective, what is at stake is the distribution of the sensible and the recognition of ways of speaking, acting, and seeing that have been historically excluded from the field of scientific knowledge.

However, Rancière's proposal (1987/1991; 2000/2004; and 2008) has been criticized for rendering invisible the structural conditions of oppression—gender, race, class—that mediate all possibilities of enunciation (Bingham and Biesta, 2010). In this sense, Spivak (1988) and Wynter (2003) remind us that not every voice enjoys the same conditions of being heard. Spivak (1988) warns that subaltern enunciation is often untranslatable into dominant frameworks and is therefore silenced and reappropriated, as is the case with communities whose knowledge of intergenerational support practices or forms of community solidarity is reinterpreted by academic experts according to criteria of institutional convenience. Likewise, during the project's development, the women organized collective activities for the care of their families. In reporting their preliminary findings, the researchers described these practices as “community intervention strategies for generating support networks,” oversimplifying the relational complexity and practical knowledge that circulates daily within the community. Wynter (2003) points out that reappropriation is not only epistemic but also ontological: the idea of the human has been historically constructed on the systematic exclusion of the “non - human,” the racialized subject who falls outside the horizon of intelligibility of the Western, bourgeois, white, and property-owning model of man. These reflections are expanded upon by Dhawan's (2024) questioning of the universalist and Eurocentric foundations of humanism. In Dhawan's (2024) terms, it is possible to say that openness to new voices and ways of being will only be possible if the structures of power

and knowledge that have historically determined who can speak and be heard are transformed.

In dialogue with these perspectives, Escobar, in *A Minga for Post-Development (2010)* and *Encountering Development (2012)* shows that the social sciences have contributed to the production of forms of abnormality by classifying entire populations as underdeveloped, backward, or incomplete. These narratives have justified educational intervention for the correction or transformation of such populations, consolidating a regime of truth that positioned the researcher as an agent of civilization.

Foucault, Thomas Szasz (1961), and Basaglia (1968), for their part, problematize the categories of madness and mental illness as political-epistemic constructions serving control and normalization. For Foucault (1975/2003, 1961/2006, and 1976/2008), *modern* reason constituted madness as its necessary “other”; it separated it from rational discourse and confined it both physically and symbolically (Hoyos and Marcelín, 2024). In *\* History of Madness\**, Foucault (1961/2006) reveals that psychiatry and medical institutions emerged as technologies of power that legitimize normative knowledge. In this sense, a specific form of *psychological* science is configured that produces and regulates abnormality. Szasz (1961), from an anti-psychiatric perspective, argues that mental illness is a myth that medicalizes social behaviors, and Basaglia (1968) denounces the institutional violence that transforms the patient into a passive object of treatment. These critiques destabilize the epistemological foundations of the human sciences, and particularly of psychology, by revealing that mechanisms of control and normalization are not limited to the clinical setting, but are reproduced in other contexts.

In the community outreach project, this manifested itself when researchers applied standardized psychometric tests to assess the cognitive abilities or personality traits of children and young people in the community. These tests, following historical logics of categorization and hierarchization (Gould, 1981), placed individuals within ranges of “normality” or “risk” that justified differentiated interventions. Similarly, the practices of medicalizing “madness” (Foucault, 1961/2006) became evident when diagnosing and intervening in emotional or behavioral difficulties based on traditional clinical criteria, aligned with the professional perspective rather than with the subjective experiences of the community. For example, cases of people with alcoholism, women who were victims of abuse, or children with learning difficulties were addressed. This transformed social conflicts or community tensions into individual “deficit” problems that displaced knowledge about

collective care. Finally, the commodification (Burman, 2013) of mental health was reflected in the prioritization of workshops that could generate measurable performance indicators or justify institutional funding. Although this situation did not occur in this project, this violation is also frequently observed in research involving oppressed populations (Young, 2000), when their informed consent is not guaranteed and they are dehumanized by being treated as mere objects of study.

Martín - Baró (1994) conceived of community psychology as a praxis committed to the emancipation of oppressed peoples in Latin America, through accompanying processes of conscientization and returning psychological knowledge to the people. However, this political ideal can be undermined by dynamics similar to those Freire (1970) calls malevolent solidarity, when the educator/researcher positions themselves as an ally without questioning their own privileges or their power relationship with the oppressed. This warning converges with Sandoval's (2000) critique from decolonial feminism, which denounces "simulacra" and proposes the concept of *differential difference* that seeks to preserve otherness without assimilating or absorbing it under the hegemonic logic. These critiques can be directed at research approaches in community psychology that, in the name of inclusion, instrumentalize difference without transforming the social structures that exclude. Thus, certain "well-intentioned" and "solidarity-based" interventions, presented as actions in favor of "social welfare" or "mental health," operate as a gesture of assistance that ends up reproducing the very colonial and hierarchical structures they claim to combat. This phenomenon is observed in everyday comments from researchers: "I'll bring some clothes we no longer need" (I. Marcos, personal communication, April 2022), "Even if it's just a little (...) it's better than nothing" (C. Martínez, personal communication, May 2022), or "They're happy living here, they don't need anything more" (M. Gómez, personal communication, July 2022). Or, in the name of development and inclusion, the expert's authority is reaffirmed, and the other person is placed in a subordinate position that requires intervention or guardianship. This positioning is expressed in phrases such as: "We have to teach them" (E. Quezada, personal communication, April 2022). Even when attempts at "autonomy" are acknowledged, they are immediately dismissed with statements such as "yes, they try, but they are not yet successful," "it is a matter of practice," or "I thought they didn't know" (A. Iglesias, personal communication, October 2022).

In this sense, the intention seems to respond to a phantasmagorical need (Derrida, 1995), a staging that projects the researcher as the supposed savior of the humanities. In line with these discussions, Jameson (1984) warns about the risks of simulacra, the loss of referent in the totalizing narratives of modernity, and the creation of representations emptied of content. Such approaches highlight the researcher's capacity to produce narratives that can obscure or aestheticize forms of violence, thus reinforcing the *status quo* under new languages or discursive forms. However, these same reflections allow us to consider the researcher as a dialogical and ethical - political subject, committed to the transformation of reality through the recognition of the other as an epistemic subject.

The affective and political dimension of *knowledge* also emerges as a fundamental axis. Ahmed (2004) and Illouz (2018) introduce a key critique of affective dimensions in knowledge production. Illouz (2007) denounces how the neoliberal emotional economy captures affects to regulate subjectivities and govern through self-help, self-management, and *coaching*. In the field of community psychology research, this dynamic translates into the naturalization of emotional self - regulation as a desirable competence or skill in oppressed populations, without considering the structural conditions of violence they experience. Ahmed (2004), for his part, argues that certain affects (such as frustration, anger, or fear) are distributed unequally, determining what can be felt, who can feel it, and in what spaces they can do so. Thus, while academic institutions may be more permissive with the manifestation of these affects in dominant groups, they tend to restrict or sanction similar expressions in marginalized groups. This affective regime implies that certain groups must invest more energy to remain emotionally stable in hostile environments.

One of the most significant lessons learned by the researchers was recognizing that women experienced particularly intense emotional strain as a result of the double or triple workload involved in motherhood and working both inside and outside the home. Likewise, expressions observed in the field revealed a pressing need for recognition, as evidenced by comments such as: "It's obvious she answered like that; she's tired of working all day" (A. Iglesias, personal communication, April 2022). Even more important is the recognition that institutional pressure is transferred from the researchers to the women, generating additional tension in their daily lives. This is revealed in expressions such as: "They already have enough work, and then we come along with this," "No wonder they're fed up with seeing us," "They gave me that look like, 'Here she comes again'" (C. Martínez, personal communication, June 2023), to which another researcher responded: "I'd make that face"

(M. Rosales, personal communication, June 2023). As a result of this awareness , the researchers helped to redistribute the burden, for example, by taking on logistical tasks such as coordinating activities and organizing meetings, aware that institutional restrictions limited their ability to completely transform the structures that generated that overload.

All these and other critical theories, together with the approaches of social epistemology, allow the researcher's knowledge project to be articulated as a method to question traditional forms of knowledge production, to make visible the power relations that permeate research, and to promote situated, reflective epistemological practices committed to social transformation.

The challenge for the researcher, as a method and as a knowledge project, lies in inserting themselves into institutional spaces without losing the critical autonomy necessary to question and resist the colonial logics that these same institutions reproduce. This constant tension between the need for recognition and access to resources, and the preservation of a dissenting epistemological stance, is central to preventing institutionalization from acting as a mechanism of co-optation that dilutes demands for profound transformation.

In this context, investigative *practice* requires an ethical - political framework that allows the subject to move strategically within institutional margins without abandoning critiques of the system. This position implies a double responsibility. On the one hand, Bal (2002), in *Travelling Concepts in the Humanities*, Bal (2002) proposes an approach to cultural analysis that demands actively listening to the object of study, without imposing a rigid interpretive framework that silences or subsumes it into pre-configured categories. For Bal, concepts should not colonize the phenomena they seek to understand. On the contrary, they must remain fluid and sensitive to contexts, so that the object of study "speaks" in its own terms, manifests itself from its singularity, expresses itself from its own logic, and confronts the researcher's assumptions. Furthermore, this critical attitude must be maintained even when academic work is absorbed by institutions that could instrumentalize it to reinforce hegemonic models. In this sense, the researcher, as a method, is configured as a reflective, self-critical, and resilient subject, who transforms the conflict between autonomy and recognition into a productive space for epistemological and political renewal.

## **Methodological articulations: the researcher as the axis between metaphors and knowledge projects**

Knowledge projects can be interpreted through the use of metaphors, as these act as tools that allow us to visualize the construction of knowledge within specific social and political contexts. Beyond their illustrative function, metaphors make it possible to identify underlying structures, power relations, and epistemic logics that shape each research experience. By employing them in analysis, we open avenues for questioning hegemonic forms of knowledge production and proposing more critical, sensitive, and open readings, formulating questions such as: From where and for what purpose is research conducted? What images or symbols can contribute to subverting colonial or exclusionary frameworks of thought? In this sense, thinking about knowledge projects through metaphors allows us to recognize them as dynamic processes marked by disputes, agreements, and transformative horizons.

### **Discussion**

The findings confirm that every method is a critical, political, and performative gesture, since its procedures participate in the construction of reality. In this sense, it is also a terrain of knowledge production that has been traversed by the disputes, contradictions, and assertions of the research subject as an epistemic actor.

Consequently, from a political perspective, the researcher as a method is consolidated as an anti-disciplinary act that intervenes from within academic structures to destabilize them, as suggested by Spivak (2018) in her notion of affirmative sabotage. Along these lines, critical-reflective inquiry became a field of tension. The limitations of traditional ways of validating knowledge were revealed, and at the same time, an opening toward the production of embodied, situated, and politically engaged knowledge emerged.

The resulting proposal establishes a kind of "separation-coagulation" (Lugones, 2024), a term that allows us to understand that the barriers imposed by hegemony coexist with the process of "coagulation," understood as creative and subversive recombinations of heterogeneous elements. This proposal constitutes a break with the normative research paradigm, but also an affective, epistemological, and aesthetic reconfiguration of the place from which research is conducted. The methodological construction process revealed that the

researcher, far from being a neutral agent, becomes the method itself: positioning, affect, ethics, body, and history constitute the very conditions of possibility for the research.

Methodologically, the work carried out showed that opting for a flexible approach, rather than a closed or predefined method, does not imply a lack of rigor, but rather a commitment to a multi-positional, situated, and process-oriented logic of inquiry that adapts to the movements of the reality being investigated. This gesture destabilizes the linearity, control, and prediction inherent in traditional methodologies, and reveals the power dynamics that permeate the act of research.

Finally, from an aesthetic perspective, the established images of the researcher and the research subjects are questioned. It is observed that both scientists and non-scientific subjects have historically been inscribed in narratives that essentialize them: the former as bearers of objectivity, legitimized to diagnose and classify, the latter as objects of study, defined by their lack. This methodological process allowed for the recovery of silenced voices, experiences, and emotions, reclaiming the researcher as a presence involved in a process of co-production of meaning.

Comparing the findings of this study with previous research reveals a consonance with works that adopt situated epistemologies and dissident methods. In particular, Pierlejewski (2020) in his proposal *Doppelgänger as Method*, and Siddiqui (2019) in *The Ghost as Method approach underscores* the relevance of the researcher as a committed and situated actor in the production of knowledge. However, according to the review conducted, these studies have not been directly applied in community psychology contexts; they have focused primarily on theoretical analyses or educational and cultural applications. This leaves a gap in the exploration of the researcher's involvement in community contexts. In this sense, the present work contributes to partially filling this gap by adapting the researcher-as-method approach to a practice situated in a specific community psychology context. Furthermore, it demonstrates that the researcher's positioning influences the interpretation of data and the construction of knowledge.

One limitation of this study is its focus on a specific case, which restricts the generalizability of the findings regarding the researcher's role as a method. The conclusions may be influenced by the specific characteristics of the context and the project analyzed.

It is also important to note that, despite the proposal for an epistemological shift that recognizes the researcher as the method, voices within the academic community still defend neutrality as an essential condition for guaranteeing rigor, validity, reliability, and

transferability. This dispute between objectivity and positioning underscores the need to maintain an open dialogue regarding methodological practices.

## Conclusions

Rather than a definitive conclusion, the case study proposes to disrupt the hegemonic view of research as a porous boundary between knowledge, body, and world. The shift toward the researcher as method is not simply a reversal of terms; instead, it constitutes the emergence of a critical question that invites us to consider: what kind of knowledge is possible when the investigating body ceases to hide behind the *mask of technique* ?

Research, often inscribed within logics of control, evaluation, and performance, has contributed—not without resistance—to producing forms of subjectivity that adapt and optimize themselves. The researcher has been part of this machinery, vigilant of their own affectivity, producer of “objective” discourses, and administrator of other bodies (Foucault, 1976/2008). This work is situated at this point of tension, in the discomfort of knowing itself to be implicated.

To propose the researcher as a method is to assume that research does not occur outside the body; it occurs through it, that is, as a surface of inscription, as a field of resonance, as a lens that does not observe from the outside, but from its own fracture. This proposal is not limited to a stance; on the contrary, it implies an ontological reconfiguration of the investigative act (Mol, 2023).

Far from closing the debate between objectivity and positioning, it is argued that this binary is no longer sufficient. In contexts marked by epistemic exclusion and structural violence—such as many that permeate education—methodologies cannot be considered neutral without risking the reproduction of inequalities (Law, 2004). This reflection allows us to rethink methodological practices that recognize the researcher's involvement and foster situated and politically engaged research.

## **Future lines of research**

The analysis identified aspects that are potentially interesting for further development in complementary work, as they exceed the scope of this study. Among these, the need to delve deeper into the life histories, experiences, and social positions (Crenshaw , 1998) of researchers stands out—factors that influence their methodological decisions, data interpretation, and ultimately, the findings they produce. This requires addressing the biographical and institutional dimensions that permeate research practice, recognizing that these dimensions condition the conception, design, and execution of a project.

Complementarily, it is relevant to move towards a “we as method” approach, in which both researchers and communities can account for experiences of resistance against institutions. This formulation expands on Haraway’s (1988) notion of “we,” demonstrating that communities express themselves in their own terms and co-constitute knowledge production processes. Finally, it is essential to consider the researcher in their role as mediator and translator between different realities—human and non-human—capable of using emerging technologies, such as artificial intelligence, in the shared construction of knowledge. This role demands critical reflection on the limits, possibilities, and ethical-political responsibilities that this mediation entails. These future lines of work aim to deepen the relationship between experiences and methodological decisions. They also seek to generate more inclusive and ethically responsible knowledge that promotes collaborative research from the actors themselves, rather than institutionally prescribed intervention.

## **Acknowledgments**

This essay has been developed within the framework of the Postdoctoral Program in Critical Theory and Political - Methodological Perspectives on Transformative Inclusive Education in the Global South, cohort 2024-2025 , taught by the Center for Latin American Studies of Inclusive Education (CELEI), Chile.

## References

- Ahmed, S. (2004). *The cultural politics of emotion*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Arnett, J. J. (2008). The neglected 95 %: Why American psychology needs to become less American. *American Psychologist*, 63(7), 602–614. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.63.7.602>
- Arocena, R. & Sutz, J. (2015). Knowledge policies and universities in developing countries: Inclusive development and the “developmental university.” *Technology in Society*, 41, 5–31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2014.10.004>
- Bal, M. (1997). *Narratology: Introduction to the theory of narrative*. University of Toronto Press.
- Bal, M. (2002). *Travelling concepts in the humanities: A rough guide*. University of Toronto Press.
- Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Basaglia, F. (1968). *L'istituzione negata: Rapporto da un ospedale psichiatrico*. Einaudi.
- Bingham, C. & Biesta, G. (2010). *Jacques Rancière: Education, truth, emancipation*. Continuum.
- Braidotti, R. (2019). Humanidades posthumanas. *Cuadernos Filosóficos*, 16, 1-36 <https://doi.org/10.35305/cf2.vi16.65>
- Braidotti, R. (2000). *Sujetos nómades: Corporización y diferencia sexual en la teoría feminista contemporánea*. Paidós.
- Burman, E. (2013). Memoria, Locura y el Mercado. *Quaderns De Psicologia*, 15(1), 107–119. <https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/qpsicologia.1161>
- Burman, E. (2019). *Fanon y educación: El “Niño como método”*. Morata.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. Routledge.
- Butler, J. (2009). Performatividad, precariedad y políticas sexuales. *AIBR. Revista de Antropología Iberoamericana*, 4(3), 321–336.
- Centro Regional de Formación Docente e Investigación Educativa [CRESUR]. (2019). *Resumen ejecutivo del proyecto* [Manuscrito no publicado]. Comitán de Domínguez, Chiapas, México: CRESUR. <https://bit.ly/3OYJpcL>
- Chen, K–H. (2010). *Asia as method: Toward deimperialization*. Duke University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822391692>

- Charteris–Black, J. (2006). *Politicians and rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://journals.openedition.org/lexis/1691>
- Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología [CONACYT]. (2019). *Convocatoria 2019–07 para la presentación de proyectos de investigación e incidencia en alimentación y salud integral comunitaria en escuelas de educación pública (inicial, básica y media superior)*. [Convocatoria oficial]. <https://bit.ly/3OYJpcl>
- Creagh, S., Thompson, G., Mockler, N., Stacey, M. & Hogan, A. (2025). Workload, work intensification and time poverty for teachers and school leaders: a systematic research synthesis. *Educational Review*, 77(2), 661–680. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2023.2196607>
- Crenshaw, K. (1998). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory, and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 14, 538–554.
- Denscombe, M. (2025). Decolonial research methodology: An assessment of the challenge to established practice. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 28(2), 231–240. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2024.2357558>
- Derrida, J. (1995). *Espectros de Marx*. Madrid: Trotta.
- Derrida, J. (1997). *La diseminación* (M. Fernández, Trad.). Fundamentos. (Original publicado en 1972).
- Dhawan, N. (2024). *¿Rescatar la Ilustración? Las teorías críticas de la descolonización frente al legado europeo* (Prólogo de V. Gago). Siglo XXI Editores.
- Escobar, A. (2010). *Una minga para el postdesarrollo: Lugar, medio ambiente y movimientos sociales en las transformaciones globales*. Ediciones Desde Abajo.
- Escobar, A. (2012). *Encountering development: The making and unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton University Press.
- Fanon, F. (2009a). *Los condenados de la tierra*. Fondo de Cultura Económica. (Original publicado en 1961).
- Foucault, M. (2003). *Vigilar y castigar: Nacimiento de la prisión* (A. Garzón del Camino, Trad.). Siglo XXI Editores. (Original publicado en 1975)
- Foucault, M. (2006). *Historia de la locura en la época clásica* (J. Muñoz Millanes, Trad.). Fondo de Cultura Económica. (Original publicado en 1961).
- Foucault, M. (2008). *Historia de la sexualidad 1: La voluntad del saber* (2ª ed.). Siglo XXI Editores. (Original publicado en 1976).

- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogía del oprimido*. Siglo XXI Editores.
- Gould, S. J. (1981). *The mismeasure of man*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks* (Q. Hoare & G. N. Smith, Eds. y Trans.). International Publishers.
- Habermas, J. (1987). *Teoría y praxis: Estudios de filosofía social* (S. Mas Torres & C. Moya Espí, Trans.). Tecnos. Madrid, España.
- Han, B–C. (2012). *La sociedad del cansancio*. Herder. ISBN 978-84-254-2868-5
- Haraway, D. J. (1991). *Simians, cyborgs, and women: The reinvention of nature*. Routledge.
- Haraway, D. J. (1988). *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham, N. C: Duke University Press.
- Healy, K. (2000). *Trabajo social: perspectivas contemporáneas*. Ediciones Morata.
- Hill Collins, P. (2019). *Intersectionality as critical social theory*. Duke University Press.
- Hill Collins, P. (2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Hoyos González, P., y Marcelín Alvarado, M. A. (2024). Las actividades extraescolares en el medio penitenciario: Aproximaciones reflexivas. *Diálogos sobre Educación. Temas actuales en investigación educativa*, 15(29), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.32870/dse.v0i29.1421>
- Illouz, E. (2007). *Cold intimacies: The making of emotional capitalism*. Polity Press.
- Illouz, E. (2018). *Intimididades congeladas: Las emociones en el capitalismo*. Siglo XXI Editores.
- Íñiguez Rueda, L. (2007). Nuevos debates, nuevas ideas y nuevas prácticas. *Fermentum*, 17(50), 523–534. <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/705/70505003.pdf>
- Jameson, F. (1984). Postmodernism, or the cultural logic of late capitalism. *New Left Review*, (146), 53–92.
- Lakoff, G. y Johnson, M. (1980). *Metáforas de la vida cotidiana [Metaphors we live by]*. University of Chicago Press.
- Latour, B. (2004). Why has critique run out of steam? From matters of fact to matters of concern. *Critical Inquiry*, 30(2), 225–248. <https://doi.org/10.1086/421123>
- Latour, B. (2007). *Nunca fuimos modernos: Ensayo de antropología simétrica* (C. Gutiérrez, Trad.). Siglo XXI Editores. (Obra original publicada en 1991).
- Latour, B. & Woolgar, S. (1986). *Laboratory life: The construction of scientific facts* (2nd ed.). Princeton University Press.

- Law, J. (2004). *After method: Mess in social science research*. Routledge.
- Lazzarato, M. (2012). *La fábrica del hombre endeudado: Ensayo sobre la condición neoliberal* (J. Almazán, Trad.). Ediciones Amsterdam. (Original publicado en 2011).
- Lin, Z. & Li, N. (2023). Global diversity of authors, editors, and journal ownership across subdisciplines of psychology: Current state and policy implications. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 18(2), 358–377. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17456916221091831>
- Lugones, M. (2024). *Peregrinajes: Teorizar una coalición contra múltiples opresiones*. Ediciones del Signo.
- Liotard, J. F. (1984). *La condición posmoderna: Informe sobre el saber* (M. Palmarini, Trad.). Cátedra. (Original publicado en 1979).
- MacKenzie, D. (2006). *An engine, not a camera: How financial models shape markets*. MIT Press.
- Madikizela-Madiya, N. (2023). Transforming higher education spaces through ethical research publication: A critique of the 'publish or perish' aphorism. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 42(1), 186–199. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2022.2048634>
- Marcelín Alvarado, M. A. (2023). Reflexiones epistemológicas derivadas de la praxis investigativa transdisciplinar. *Sophia: Colección de Filosofía de la Educación*, (34), 265–289. <https://doi.org/10.17163/soph.n34.2023.09>
- Martín-Baró, I. (1994). La psicología social desde el compromiso liberador. *Revista Psicología Política*, (10), 23–40. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/descarga/articulo/2652421.pdf>
- Mezzadra, S. y Neilson, B. (2017). *La frontera como método o la multiplicación del trabajo*. Editorial Traficantes de Sueños.
- Mol, A. (2023). *El cuerpo múltiple: Ontología y práctica médica* (P. Santoro, Trad.). Bellaterra, Editions.
- Morgan, M. (2002). *Metaphor and models in the social sciences*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.
- Morin, E. (2007). *Introducción al pensamiento complejo* (8ª ed.). Gedisa.
- Navarrete Saavedra, R. (2024). Psicología social comunitaria latinoamericana: tradiciones críticas y epistemes emergentes. *Psicología USP*, 35(2), pp. 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0103-6564e220123>

- Ocampo González, A. (2024). Desfigurar la inclusión, fracturar lo sensible. *Ficción de la razón*. <https://ficciondelarazon.org/2024/07/31/aldo-ocampo-gonzalez-desfigurar-la-inclusion-fracturar-lo-sensible/>
- Palser, E. R., Lazerwitz, M. & Fotopoulou, A. (2022). Gender and geographical disparity in editorial boards of journals in psychology and neuroscience. *Nature Neuroscience*, 25(2), 272–279. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41593-022-01012-w>
- Pierlejewski, M. J. (2020). *Doppelgänger as method: A framework for examining datafication*. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 25(3), 322–332. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14639491241273927>
- Pink, S. (2001). *Doing visual ethnography: Images, media and representation in research*. London: SAGE.
- Rad, M. S., Martingano, A. J. & Ginges, J. (2018). Toward a psychology of Homo sapiens: Making psychological science more representative of the human population. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 115(45), 11401–11405. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1721165115>
- Rancière, J. (1991). *The ignorant schoolmaster: Five lessons in intellectual emancipation* (K. Ross, Trans.). Stanford University Press. (Original work published 1987).
- Rancière, J. (2004). *The politics of aesthetics: The distribution of the sensible* (G. Rockhill, Trans.; afterword by S. Žižek). Continuum. (Original work published 2000).
- Rancière, J. (2008). *Le spectateur émancipé*. La Fabrique.
- Ricoeur, P. (1975). *La métaphore vive*. París: Éditions du Seuil.
- Sandoval, C. (2000). *Methodology of the Oppressed*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Santiago, J. (Ed.). (2021). *Caras y soportes de la vulnerabilidad*. Los Libros de la Catarata.
- Santiago, R. T. & Aguayo, D. (2025). Anti-colonial methodology in school psychology research with Latine communities. *Journal of School Psychology*, 110, 101452. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2025.101452>
- Santos, B. de S. (2014). *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against epistemicide*. Paradigm Publishers.
- Siddiqui, S. M. I. (2019). *Faith healing at a Muslim shrine in Gujarat, India: Exploring the site, subject, and ghost* [Tesis doctoral, Universidad de Manchester]. <https://research.manchester.ac.uk/en/studentTheses/faith-healing-at-a-muslim-shrine-in-gujarat-india-exploring-the-s>

- Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson and L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271–313). University of Illinois Press. Urbana, IL.
- Spivak, G. C. (2018, 26 de febrero). Sabotaje afirmativo [Conferencia]. European Roma Institute for Arts and Culture.
- Stengers, I. (2014). La propuesta cosmopolítica. *Revista Pléyade*, (14), 17–41.
- Stengers, I. (1997). *Power and invention: Situating science* (P. Bains & P. Pisters, Trans.). University of Minnesota Press.
- Szasz, T. S. (1961). *The myth of mental illness: Foundations of a theory of personal conduct*. Harper & Row
- Thibodeau, P. H. & Boroditsky, L. (2011). Metaphors we think with: The role of metaphor in reasoning. *PLoS ONE*, 6(2), e16782. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0016782>
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO]. *Global education monitoring report 2025: Gender report: Women lead for learning*. <https://doi.org/10.54676/DEOD4878>
- Vizioli, N. A. (2024). Bibliometric analysis of Latin American scientific journals of Psychology through the Scimago portal. *Revista Interamericana de Psicología*, 58(2), e1931. <https://doi.org/10.30849/ripijp.v58i2.1931>
- Young, I. M. (2000). *La justicia y la política de la diferencia*. Madrid, España: Ediciones Cátedra.
- Wynter, S. (2003). Unsettling the coloniality of being/power/truth/freedom. *New Centennial Review*, 3(3), 257–337.