

Rethinking our critical methodologies: practices of intervention/research with gender perspective

Repensando nuestras metodologías críticas: prácticas de intervención/investigación con perspectiva de género(s)

María Mercedes Palumbo  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9765-1293>

CONICET-Universidad Nacional de Luján, Argentina, mer.palumbo@gmail.com

Laura Celina Vacca*  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8102-7533>

*Universidad de Buenos Aires and Universidad del Salvador, Argentina,
celinavacca@yahoo.com.ar*

Marcela Alejandra País Andrade  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1164-5691>

CONICET-Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina, maky2007@gmail.com

*Corresponding author:
Laura Celina Vacca,
celinavacca@yahoo.com.ar

Abstract: This article is the result of a joint work between two research teams of the College of Social Sciences of Universidad de Buenos Aires (Argentina) which share a concern regarding research methodologies in Social Sciences from critical perspectives. The objective is to analyze our practices of intervention/research with gender perspective in an UBACyT project of the aforementioned institution as a case study. From a qualitative methodology, we combined instances of observation-participation, meetings to exchange ideas and experiences between the teams, and the delivery of a workshop. The results indicate that the methodological practices under study had a double dimension; namely: “internal”, which referred to the daily dynamics of group work, and the “external”, associated to the relation between those who research and their subjects of study. The conclusions highlight the central role of the loving and democratic cross-sectional logics, in relation to the two methodological dimensions, in line with feminist epistemologies.

Key words: methodology, practices of intervention/research, feminist epistemologies.

Resumen: Este artículo es fruto de la vinculación entre dos equipos de trabajo de la Facultad de Ciencias Sociales de la Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina, quienes compartimos la preocupación por la metodología de investigación en ciencias sociales desde perspectivas críticas. Nos proponemos analizar nuestras prácticas de intervención/investigación con perspectiva

Reception:
July 25th, 2022

Approval:
November 08th, 2022



de género(s), tomando como caso de estudio un proyecto UBACyT acreditado por la mencionada institución. Desde una metodología cualitativa, combinamos instancias de observación-participación, reuniones de intercambio entre equipos y la realización de un taller. Los resultados plantean que las prácticas metodológicas en análisis se configuran en una doble dimensión: “interna”, que refiere a las formas del trabajo grupal cotidiano, y la “externa”, asociada a la relación entre quienes investigan y sus sujetxs de estudio. Las conclusiones destacan la centralidad de la amorosidad y la democratización como lógicas transversales a las dos dimensiones metodológicas, en línea con las epistemologías feministas.

Palabras clave: metodología, prácticas de intervención/investigación, epistemologías feministas.

Introduction

The present article gathers a series of reflections and analyses produced in the context of joint work between two research teams of the College of Social Sciences of Universidad de Buenos Aires (UBA), who share our concern in rethinking the methodological research practices in social sciences from critical perspectives. One of the teams puts forward the UBACyT project “*Discursos y prácticas en/desde las Políticas Públicas en la Argentina reciente. Estudios de intervención/investigación con perspectiva de género(s) y feminismo(s)*” [Discourses and practices in/from Public Policies in recent-times Argentina. Intervention / research studies with gender perspective and feminism], conducted by one of the authors of the present article. And the other is the Institutional Recognition Project (IRP) “*implications and challenges in the use of critical epistemological and methodological in Social Sciences*”, conducted and codirected, respectively, by the other two authors. We share being white cis women and researcher-professors with the institution above.

In a previous publication (Palumbo and Vacca, 2020), we carried out a theoretical characterization of critical perspectives in the Latin American tradition that conceives research from the logic of commitment (Elías, 1990). As common features, we pointed out that researchers¹ incorporate

1 Written language is a way to visualize generic brands, owing to this, we resort to “x” when we refer to universals in which everyone may be included, regardless if they are recognized as men women or trans. Even if the use of X is somewhat informal, even uncomfortable, its use in formal spheres such as the academy is a tool to make it explicit the heteronormativity in language, believing in two sexes / genders, which, following Wittig (1986)— is a fundamental base, not only of sexism, but also homophobia and heteronormativity.

into their practice ideological-political positionings and the needs of the subjects under study, re-versioning the classic distancing between subject and object from an epistemic schema of the subjects, proper to the science of positivist nature.

In this very movement, knowledge production articulates with objectives aimed at transforming the reality that is intended to explore, in function of such political/ideological stances. In specific terms, we identified participatory action research (PAR), militant research, decolonial o decolonizing methodologies, and collaborative research, as fundamental perspectives that express such logic in its epistemological and methodological postulates. In this query, from IPR we understood there was a distance between the enunciation of largely epistemological reflections, and the challenges and tensions implied by the setting into motion of methodologies informed in such critical perspectives. Therefore, we decided to start a research process on knowledge production practices for the purpose of approaching these perspectives in the act, not only from their enunciations and starting suppositions.

In this way, in the search for teams to carry out this task, we establish a link between both projects. Research / intervention with gender perspective carried out by UBACyT was a breeding ground to think of *other* methodologies (País Andrade, 2022). Dialoging with this group allowed adding feminist epistemologies to contest other critical perspectives previously reviewed in terms of continuities and singularities, by questioning androcentric output vested in an alleged neutrality and universality (Maffia, 2019). From this standpoint, corporality, historicity and political, cultural and emotional traversing of those that research is understood as constituent of scientific practices (Harding, 1987; bell hooks, 2004).

In this line, we consider that research cannot be carried out on research practices exclusively on the basis of the methodological and / or epistemological theory alone, as it is in action that strategies and decisions of everyday activities are created. The link between both teams was stated in terms of a joint dialogue space, in which, from interchange, we would be able to build consensus, make decisions regarding the linking dynamic, and advance toward the shared production of reflections and analyses (Palumbo and Vacca, 2021). The present article is an outcome of such linking from the roles of direction and co-direction of the two teams.

In specific terms, in this article we set to analyze our methodological practices carried out from research / intervention with gender perspective in

a participatory and territorial key as a goal (País Andrade, 2018), taking as a study case the aforementioned UBACyT project. To do so, we carried out a series of instances where the IRP team accompanied the work meetings of UBACyT together with other series of readings, informal conversations and shared interchanges, which allowed us to outline the axes of analysis presented in the article. The outline made us restate that the examined methodological practices have a dual role: the “internal”, where emphasis is placed on daily meetings and group work as fundamental formative instances to define the sort of academic practices carried out; and the “external”, referred to the particular way the relationship between researchers and the subjects under study is stated from a situated and committed thinking.

In this way, the present article puts forward the analysis of a methodological academic work from the construction of categories adjusted to such experience as a self-critical and thoughtful revision tool of our research practices in dialogue with the critical epistemic-methodologic tradition in social sciences.² In the first section, we show the linking process between the two teams that started in March 2021, their foundations and characteristics, which then led to this writing. In the second section, we retrieve the main definitions on the implications of researching / intervening with gender perspective from the interdisciplinary mark, and linked to Social Work (SW), intuitional history and epistemological foundations. In the third section, we approach the particular analysis of the methodological practices undertaken by UBACyT team in the two aforementioned meanings, referred to the internal and external dimensions of the methodology. To close the article, we expose a series of reflections.

The linking process between teams in methodological key

The link between UBACyT and IRP teams is framed in the movement that intended to make the IRP project, presented in the introduction, from the theoretical intellection of epistemological and methodological critical perspectives in social sciences toward the approaching to practices and particular working ways in the context of research works considered critical.

In this transit, we decided to start by analyzing practices developed in a sphere we are familiar with such as the College of Social Sciences of UBA,

2 A systematization story of the experience of linking between IRP and UBACyT, on the basis of which the analysis proposed in this article is produced, is available at Palumbo and Vacca (2021).

in which we lived, firstly as students, and then as graduated, professors and researchers. From the reading and quantitative analysis of a database of 182 registered projects in such academic unit between 2016 and 2019, we found the abstract of a UBACyT project presented as “an intervention / research study with gender perspective”.³ From the concerns of IRP project, this conceptual pair stated by the abstract was newfangled as they joined two aspects that usually appear and function excised. In the first reading of materials of the UBACyT team (País Andrade, 2018; Nebra, 2021), we found other elements coherent with the critical perspectives we revised: the interdisciplinary option, socio-anthropologic approaches interested in recovering the voices of the social subjects, the mention of PAR, among the sources where they take their methodological principles from.

After the virtual meeting of the authors of this article in March 2021, we identified a community of personal interests and affinities translated into the establishment of working agreements and the proposal to carry out with a collective process of knowledge production between the two projects of the college. Even if there is profuse characterization of the stakes and challenges implies in the establishing of an epistemic schema between subjects and academicians and extra-university subjects (Palumbo and Vacca, 2020), we consider that it is a less-thought of side when it comes to relations between university teams.

In our case, the linking took place between the subjects who share certain languages, times, professional spheres, institutions, logics and rules. These common starting aspects might operate in favor of collective knowledge production. However, we notice such coincidences are not free from contradictions and challenges, especially as it intends to scan methodological aspects that require to “unveil” the preparations of the research and the everyday working dynamics inside and outside a team. Some identified topics that may produce tensions between teams are around decisions regarding authorship, personal and political disputes in university life, differences in epistemological and methodological criteria, or else, competence dynamics in the academic field.

In spite of this warning about possible tensions, we concur on the opening of the teams to face joint work from a collaborative, participatory

³ This reference comes from the abstract of UBACyT’s “*Continuidades y rupturas en/ desde las Política(s) Públicas en la Argentina reciente. Estudios de intervención/investigación con perspectiva de géneros*” (2018-2020) [Continuities and ruptures in/from the Public Policies in contemporary Argentina. Intervention/research Studies with gender perspective], which is the background of the project part of 2020-2021 programming.

and loving logic, as well as in the predisposition to move toward reflexivity processes to potentiate our practices. To be coherent with our common stance as regards the classic academic logics of extractive nature, we establish a general starting agreement to generate supplies on the base of which the enquiries of IRP team nourish the methodologic work of UBACyT. We consider this “give in return” is neither solved in a single instance nor at the moment of socializing the results, as it a to-and-fro continuous process, in this regard, reflexivity (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 2014; Guber, 2001) and joint analysis were fundamental parts of the journey travelled by both teams.

In the context of the described link, we produced, from a qualitative methodology (Vasilachis de Gialdino, 2007), the empirical base that supports this article’s consideration. The members of the IRP project were present as “observers-as-participants” (Flick, 2004), at the monthly meetings of UBACyT groups, which were virtually held over 2021. These meetings were devoted to the reading and exposition of the productions of their members (master and doctorate theses, lectures). In the context of the conditions of knowledge production imposed by the pandemic, in the such year the decision to pay special attention to methodological aspects had been made, an issue that had represented an important flow of discussions and reflections at the beginning of UBACyT team, as it will be developed in the following section.

In like manner, we agreed on formal interchange instances between the authors of the present article, where we socialized the earliest analyses of the observation registries of monthly meetings. In one of such interchanges appeared the reading key that will accompany us in later reflections on the consideration of the dual dimension of the methodology that structures the present article: the methodological understood in key of linking and collaboration does not circumscribe to knowledge production, but also the production of a collective that researches.

Moreover, we engaged in informal conversations centrally between the team leaders, though it was not possible to replicate them with the rest of the team, due to the virtualization of academic work as of 2020 and kept over 2021, which restricted the possibilities of informal contact in monthly meetings with the rest of the members which, face to face, usually take place minutes before and after formal encounters. In this regard, the participation of both teams in the face-to-face end-of-year celebration, organized from UBACyT, with favorable epidemiologic conditions allowed broadening the relationships that had been fostered from mediation proper to virtuality.

The assembly of written materials also produced another instance to objectify the methodological look on UBACyT project and its securing of team linking. The draft of the first chapter of the book (Palumbo and Vacca, 2021) was boosted by IRP and tried by UBACyT group prior to its sending. Here, we received valuable comments from various members that allowed us to define questions, clarify, and even think of new aspects comprised in the methodological. In like manner, this article is beyond the exercise of commenting materials by both teams; it takes up the challenge of expressing by writing the polyphony involved in the linking practices, based on the decision of a drafting shared between the members of both projects.

It is worth mentioning there was a workshop in May 2022, organized by IRP team in agreement with UBACyT group, which encouraged a conversation from the definition of axes that had emerged with force from the analysis of observation registries and formal and informal interchanges. Not only did this workshop intend to be coherent with the positioning that “delivers” in return of reception and information provided, but also produced a new instance to obtain information, while at once, joint reflexivity and analysis.

The analysis shared here comes from a heavily inductive process. The categorial construction around the methodological dimension of practices to research and intervene —which structures the sections of the present article— started from the native forms of announcing and practicing of the UBACyT project members, which we accessed from the aforementioned interchanges, observations and the workshop. The goal was to build theorizations from empirics in association with the theoretical coordinates that always guide the look of researchers. In this sense, we had from the IRP project with categories that came from previous hermeneutic-interpretative works around critical epistemological and methodological standpoints in social sciences, with the perspective of methodological readings that have been supported from the start in UBACyT team, as well as shared accumulation of reflexivity on our research practices.

Intervention or research?

These dialogues which were woven between the teams managed to rebuild a space in which what was “given in return” turned into “let us offer changes” to the ways of being and take part of the research processes. It also became a generous space —it allowed us to enter someone else’s kitchens—, sororal

—share recipes of daily practices— and loving —owing to their forms of research inwardly and outwardly in both groups.

This dialogue between kitchens tensed academic knowledge which usually materializes “the social” in terms of “objectivity”, demanding to turn the everydayness of our practices into measurable categories and contesting out previous knowledge. Therefore, university is usually the space-time where practice separates from the theory and research (considered neutral, objective and scientific, but also selfless) carried out in parallel to social intervention (subjective, tendentious, acritical, though committed). In this sense, reconstructing the history of UBACyT group allowed us to understand the tensions, negotiation and decisions at the time of researching and intervening in and from social sciences. Moreover, it allowed us to the multiple voices and the various enunciations set into motion in this regard.

UBACyT group appears in 2013 at the intersection of three axes: a demand from two recently graduated women (Carolina and Liz) to generate a space devoted to study public policies to deepen into the Final Research Work (FRW) of the TS course they studied together; the one of listening and reception by Sociology / Anthropology professor who directed the FRW (Marcela); and, feminist militancy the three of them had been developing in various spaces that interpellated public policies.

This initial milestone caused the incorporation of other graduates and advanced students working with gender perspective in SW undergraduate courses, Social Communication, Sociology, Political Science and Anthropology (presently, there is a member from Psychology), who started to rethink the idea of intervention as a privileged space for knowledge production. On the basis of this reflexivity as an exercise in group doing, the intervention/research “was justified” from gender perspective, which turned out to be the beginning of the theoretical-methodological development.

In doing, “gender” was now referred as gender(s) to break with the sex-generic binomial and incorporate trans identities; intervention/research from the category of genders formally appears in 2018 as a main theoretical-methodological approach because of the need to explain what this research group carried out in its kitchen and which now has 15 members. At the time, the “recipes” were made explicit and participatory methodologies, cultural studies, gender studies, and feminism were included —from the permanent task of reflexivity— as everyday dialogues.

That is to say, the methodological reflection of the “task” of research was produced in and from the intervention spaces of the very practices that provided the group experience with meaning. Understanding this “experience” as a historic, social, and cultural product (Scott, 1988; Trebisacce, 2016). Moreover, in these transits, the subjectivities recognized and reconfigured as women and the diversity they intervene/research: the reflection on the “other” forms (País Andrade, 2022) of producing knowledge, which make the external methodological dimension of the group, signified the usual forms of organizing and managing the group itself in its internal methodological dimension. Bering in mind the contingent and eventful actions that scientific practices entail — scholarships, member incorporations, et cetera— (Bennett, 2010).

In this winding walking, theories and methodologies intertwined in a loving, sororal and collective dance, which entailed frequent dialogue between south epistemologies (Quijano, 2007; Lugones, 2008) and feminist epistemologies (Haraway, 1991; Korol, 2016), reassembling a decolonized and situated scenario (Anzaldúa, 2016; Haraway, 1991) that positions the group members as critical professionals and from social sciences, making room for incorporating intersectional perspectives (Crenshaw, 1989; Lugones, 2008; Viveros Vigoya, 2016).

In this process, intervention becomes meaningful in the professional decision space, always crossed by previous conceptions on similar situations and the social actors involved. Various demands and fields of knowledge blend and combine. From here, the world is observed and obviously, also life, wellbeing, identities, subjectivities, diversities, etc. That is to say, the anthropologic reflexivity gives an account of the fabrics that do not end in theoretical categories of analysis, but entail a critical character (sometimes conservative, others transforming) that may make intervention a research space merging in participatory actions.

From this comes the setting into motion of time-space in social intervention as a “fields of situated knowledge” to reconfigure a theoretical-methodological standpoint that contests the field of social sciences in general. In like manner, the academic practices that enable various places of enunciation and valorization of the agency of body and emotions of the subjects that intervene in/from/with social sciences are hierarchized.

The dual methodological dimension in intervention/research practices with gender perspective

The dialogue between the groups has enabled us to participate from various places and roles, though complementary, in a case as a leader of UBACyT project and on the other as observers-participants from IRP. This dual insertion in the same field of study enables us to explain the intervention/research practices from a dual methodological dimension: 1) the external (how knowledge is produced in the articulation between group and the field of study, that is to say, *making research*); and 2) the internal (how methodological knowledge is produced from the ways of academic groupness where labor inserts, i.e., *being with others* researching).

In this section, we retrieve the empirical material we gradually systematized and the reflections on the basis of such participations in dialogue with the identified dimensions. For the case of critical epistemological and methodological standpoints —for the interests of the present article—, this dual dimension of the methodology unfold in daily practices of knowledge production that reconfigure the extra-university subjects' ways of relating from committed and participatory logics (external dimension); and in the production of a research group, understood as training space, where forms of linking signed by care are not only desirable, but also necessary (internal dimension).

Well now, in the dialogue with the observations and conversations, we assume the existence of a certain correlate in the construction of the two referred dimensions. Ultimately, what is at stake in both is the proposal of a specific form of linking with and between the subjects (bodies, emotions, knowledge). The configuration of the internal dimension of the methodology —either in terms of loving and democratic or competence, valorization of knowledge and know-how links of other people or inferiorization— is also expressed in the ways the relationship with the subjects of study. And conversely, the way the external dimension of the methodology —in terms of commitment or instrumentality, encouragement to agency or objectification— has implications in the working ways between peers inside the university teams.

1) External dimension

The possibility of defining the external dimension of the methodological in this experience allows us to name the ways to approach the extra-

university study subjects to produce knowledge. To explain this, we will identify two subdimensions: a) *the production of situated knowledge*; and, b) *the interdisciplinary and intertextual stake*. Observing the articulations between the multiplicity of enunciation places, while inter-discipline and intertextuality enables accounting for the negotiations and disputes to broaden academic limits. This classic methodological dimension in academic spaces —which we call external and which in theoretical-empirical research responds to the way of approaching the part of reality under study and the subjects that compose it— allows us to dive into our own study case.

Even if it is classic dimension, the subjective relation established with it in the training spaces is complex. In one of our monthly meetings,⁴ a space was devoted to interchange between teams (UBACyT and IRP), heeding our early analyses. The answers to the question regarding what the relationship between the members of the project with the research methodology is dealt with experiences in the degree, or in their first drafts.

The graduate thesis was the first experience and I hated it because in reality, I was given no methodology. I can't even reread that thesis, it's a shame. I was given no methodological guidance. It was as though jumping out (Lynda's intervention. Meeting 6, September 30th, 2021).

Over the degree, the methodology I had was ugly... I believe the methodology was also like a monster, something dark, a dark cloud (Intervention by Camila S. Meeting 6, September 30th, 2021).

Methodology is the subject none wants to take, it's a bad word, it's an ugly guy (Intervention by Camila R. Meeting 6, September 30th, 2021).

We underscore that in the interventions above the rediscovery of “methodology” from places other than “the ugly”, “hate”, “the subject none wants to take” links with the already referred internal dimension. This is, by “making friends with methodology” (Mercedes’ intervention. Meeting 6, September 30th, 2021) there is a change from and in the belonging to a research collective that intentionally fosters its training character and where a group conformation that allows for sharing processes and contribute with all is built. It entails a relocation of the subjects regarding the methodology from places with more agency, hierarchization of the subjectivity of the researcher as a constituent part of the process of knowledge production and to consider collective links nodal, though

4 Meeting 6, September 30th, 2021.

authorships and drafts shall be individual, following the parameters of the academic canon.

a) *Production of situated knowledge*: as regards the first aspect—which we may call “situated thinking and knowledge”— we state that it is a transversal element to the critical contemporary epistemological and methodological perspectives of Latin American origin. The situationality gives an account of the search for advancing knowledge production that starts and particularly takes into consideration the concrete geographical, cultural and historic contexts in which it is carried out.⁵ In the case of the intervention/research practices of the UBACyT team, the notion of situated knowledge is markedly retaken from Haraway (1991), who—from feminist epistemologies—proposes to specify the standpoint from which one starts to approach a portion of reality; standpoint that configures on the basis of context, subjectivity and the shared ethical-political positionings of the one researching. This situated knowledge, as a shared epistemic-methodologic axiom, is noticed in action in its practices where reads and references to these epistemologies are shared, and where the forms of knowledge production are contested from.

On one side, this positioning implies situating the one that researches in the multiple intersections of the working, academic, militant and personal environment of the practice. It is interesting to link this situated thinking to the particular creation of the group, where the trajectories cross with political-partisan and gender militances, and in some cases with works in the State, taken up from places of leading roles and social intervention. On the other side, it entails locating the researchers in the contexts of the subjects of study from a place associated with intervention. In this regard, the director of the project defines the methodology in an interesting way where this dual situationality that entails learning about oneself in the task of learning about the others: “the methodology is the very process of learning in and from life itself, and the transformation people do with the others [...] it is to learn about oneself, not only learning about the others” (Marcela’s intervention. Meeting 7, October 27th, 2021).

In this regard, the multiple places of enunciation of the people who produce knowledge materialize in questions that intend to make subjective context explicit and the singular standpoint as expressed by Haraway

5 By systematizing the coincidences between P. Freire and O. Fals Borda, who are foundational for the tradition in which their theoretical perspectives are inscribed, Torres Carrillo (2020) emphasizes the situated nature of their works.

(1991). Likewise, it was evinced in the reiteration of the question in the terms: “where are you in this research you’re sharing with us?”. We find several forms of naming themselves by the team members:

Alex, researcher/poet/lesbian; Sergia, militant/researcher/queer; Julieta, social worker/researcher; Micaela, “*estatala*” (state worker)/researcher. These names give an account of complex enunciation places where the academy connects with professions, militances, and sex-gendered identifications. It shows intersectionality where the canon demands the subjective totalization of the figure of the academician in dissociation with other identities

Far from understanding personal crossings as biases, these are presented intervening in the election of a topic, in the construction of a sensation of lack that is intended to revert, and in the passion that sustains a knowledge process. In some cases, it is recognized that these multiple identity inscriptions enable a link with the subjects of study from more personal places. However, they are also sources of tensions in methodological practices.

In one of the meetings,⁶ in which one of the thesis presentations was in charge of Sergia, the interchange was around the negotiation of strategies proper to both fields (research and militance) when a political-partisan militance space one belongs to is researched. This dual identity was expressed as a generator of personal angsts and, at once, reflections as academicians. In such meeting, Sergia stated:

A research topic that doesn’t make the militance to kick you out, not uncomfortable, and accepted in the degree. These are the pangs of a dual enrollment. Many people avoid this by researching other thing or plainly, do not research. We can’t let it go; it is not something stupid. I don’t feel as comfortable being militant and being exposed [the conflicts around the selected experience]. Do I have to choose between being militant or researcher? (Sergia’s intervention. Meeting 7, September 27th, 2021).

Indeed, the construction of situated knowledge, from a particular standpoint, is marked by this overlaps and tensions, by these hybrid villages, as one of the team members calls them (Nebra, 2021) in her doctoral thesis. We identified the thematization of methodological aspects that turn dilemmatic: the care of organizations at the time of communicating the enquired, the construction of complex balances between what is known as a militant and what the subjects stated the formal context of the interviews.

⁶ Meeting 7, 27/10/2021.

In another meeting,⁷ Matías —a member of the State work team— shared his master thesis plan, in which he put forward intervening/researching in his own work space. Group deliveries were around the need to situate in that process and reflect about himself as a researcher in his work place. Some of the questions expressed were the following: “how are you doing the research being yourself an agent of the State?”, “What will be your place as a male coworker thinking the group process of you female coworkers in your work place?”, “What is the task of reflexivity that you will do, even if it is not an anthropologic thesis?”, “what is your role there?” (reconstruction of various interventions in Meeting 5, August 25th, 2021).

As in the previous case, reflexivity on the situationality of the producers of knowledge also becomes methodological aspects such as the construction of hypotheses that do not seek to corroborate new starting points, but an opening to the amazement before the naturalized, the selection of a sample without the very biases of the affinities in everyday labor relations, the speakable and that which prefers to be omitted when a former colleague is interviewed. These refer to the need of reflexivity to known oneself, and at once, the search for possible objectivity in the construction of the coordinates to approach to an object of enquiry as close.

In parallel, one of the group problematizations that allowed us to continue deepening into the notion of situationality appeared as regards the undertaking of fieldwork from a stance critical to the epistemic extractivism (Grosfoguel, 2016), or what a member calls “falling with a parachute and go away for nothing in return” (Nebra, 2021: 41); how to summon the actors’ voices without affecting their places of enunciation which, as in the case of those who research, are multiple and complex.

That is to say, how to configure synergies among the complexities of linkings with the subjects of study. The construction of a link with extra-university students bears a foundational mark of TS in UBACyT, the mayor in which the team started and which according to comments in the workshop teaches them to “speak to the others” (Record of workshop observation, May 31st, 2022). In this regard, intervention/research practices give an account of the confluence and complementation of various sorts of goals (transformation and production of knowledge, respectively), know-hows (territorial, professional, and academic), and of a particular imbrication between practice and theory in the production of situated knowledge.

⁷ Meeting 5, August 25th, 2021.

The doctoral dissertation (Nebra, 2021) of one of the historic members of the UBACyT team (meeting 2, April 29th, 2021) allowed us to visualize some of the decisions she made on the terrain, positioning from gender perspective. In the meeting, the member commented that she always prioritized the intervention objectives over those of the research (Observation records of Meeting 2, April 29th, 2021). In this same line, she points out:

I decided to effectively behave as a social worker [...] this I wanted to say, that I always gave priority to the actions linked to ensure social intervention over those that intend to receive specific recognition, though this was against the research (Nebra, 2021: 42).

From framing the research to develop her thesis, she modelled a way to relate to the subjects; that is, build the relation on the basis of near modes, the demands did not match the objectives of knowledge strictly, respectful time management.

In like manner, this framing produces movements in the legitimization of know-hows in conjunction with knowledge production. On one side, it positions the subjects as carriers of valuable knowledge regarding the objects under study. In the workshop we organized jointly with IRP and UBACyT, a series of comments pointed at the need to valorize the “know-hows of the territory” and to avoid hierarchization supported on the mere possession of expert knowledge or what was called “the hierarchies of the title” (Workshop observation registration, May 31st, 2022). Furthermore, not only does it valorize the expert knowledge associated to the academicians’ identities as such, but also the practical knowledge that responds to other possible family, militant and sex-gendered ascriptions. In the terms of the aforementioned doctoral dissertation shared in the meeting of the team, the existence of this practical knowledge—which made it “native” of the field even before becoming a researcher—worked for the interlocutors as a reassurance that “won’t kill us in a paper” (Nebra, 2021: 37), facing a possible intellectualist bias.

Out of the previously mentioned aspects comes centrality taken by practices in the working ways of UBACyT team. In one of the monthly meetings, a postgraduate student, who had recently incorporated, shared one of her earliest interests and asked the collective for reading recommendations (Intervention by Camila R's. Meeting 7, October 27th, 2021). The intervention of the team leader suggested approaching the topic from practices, to transit from an experience linked to interesting contexts: “Instead of thinking of a research problem, do things: voluntarily enroll into the workshop and join groups that go and teach gender in the jail

[...] Go and start with the practice itself. It seems it is good to experience, to live" (Marcela's intervention. Meeting 7, October 27th, 2021).

Likewise, in another meeting, the person presenting their work located from and in the practices when she stated that "our territory is with the actual partners" (Micaela's intervention. Meeting 4, July 1st, 2021). Her thesis puts forward taking territory and public policy to university, and conversely, take academic production to the territory. This positioning tenses a form of research, an academic trajectory, and postgraduate education that is signified by the group as the bearer of theoretical emphasis. It entails developing strategic knowing-doing to "introduce" what they do —their practices, modes of making science— in the academic logics of which they also want to partake.

Indeed, stating loving forms of linking, the legitimization of the know-hows of the territory and the emphasis of intervention and practices enable the production of situated knowledge. The stake and challenges from this point at the fact of not disavowing the intersectionalities crossed by the very subjects of study who conjugate with the people they research, nor to strip them of agency by means of "maternalist /paternalist" looks and approximations.

About this last point, we underscore the case of Micaela, another member of UBACyT team, who shared her ongoing work with heavily subordinated actors such as transvestite and trans-infancies in popular neighborhoods (Meeting 4, July 1st, 2021). In her representation, she insisted on calling attention to transvestites and trans-partners as regards they do not want to be objects of study of academic projects, but protagonists of their stories and the research processes around them. From this listening to the partners' desires, whom she knows closely due to her intervention as a worker of the State, the methodological decision of not interviewing those infancies so as not to render them vulnerable and take care of their experiences and displacements. From her dual inscription as a state worker and academician, this team member —who researches, works, and militates in the same context— claims: "I'm not a cis that speaks of or in relation with transvestites, but I talk to them" (Micaela's intervention. Meeting 4, July 1st, 2021).

After her exposition, there were interventions that contested such "excess" of care and protection to transvestite and transinfancies. One of the comments was:

I have this doubt on what academic extractivism is and what not. Tell me, with all your militancy and activisms in the State and political stance, is interviewing your trans

partners academic extractivism? Your goal is your dissertation to become a contribution to all that. If not, I believe we are being fundamentalists: I can't talk about transvestites because I'm not a transvestite (Yanina's intervention. Meeting 4, July 1st, 2021).

Another intervention pointed out that such previous knowledge possessed and which turns them into individuals which "do not come from the outside and are aware of" is key to think other modes of academic work that configure "friendly environments" and "amicable interviews" (Intervention of Julieta V. Meeting 4, July 1st, 2021). The discussion emphasized the need to inhabit and endure contradictions and discomfort as regards the study of transvestite identities not being so, to research and do not consider themselves an academy due to the strong professional inscription as a social worker, to pursue intervention-transformation goals parallel to knowledge production. Mediated by group interchange, preserving the contradiction was fostered, which may be solved avoiding the dialogue with such infancies, but to turn it into a methodological tool and driver of the thesis, to "research in and from such contradiction". Indeed, the "fabric" built with transvestites and trans, according to the member, from her role of "state agent", is fundamental to support the assembly of a loving frame. At once, the existence of this previous relationship legitimizes her being as a researcher with the subjects and territories.

b) The interdisciplinary and intertextual stake: as already pointed out, inter-discipline is part of the foundational mark of the creation of the UBACyT team. Even if the origin is SW, presently, its members come from four of the five undergraduate courses: sociology and SW graduates, gradually students from communication sciences and political science incorporated; adding to the theoretical-methodological of the anthropological discipline and a member from psychology.

Well now, we consider that not only does inter-discipline evoke the dialogue between original academic disciplines, as recognized in the workshop developed, enriched the group practices of intervention/research (observation register, May 31st, 2022), but it also refers to intertextuality that emerges in the pluralization of knowledge production sources and in the reinvention of communication formats, dissemination and scientific drafting.

As regards the pluralization of sources, in a meeting where Alex presented her ongoing work was thematized around poetry, not only as an object of enquiry of the team member, who defines herself as researcher-poet, but also as a source for the intelligibility of the world

(meeting 3, May 27th, 2021). Here, we find the theoretical, epistemological and methodological fingerprint of epistemological feminism that accompanies the search to contest the dominant scientific rationale, which provides reason with centrality in detriment to emotion, sensibility and experience. Somehow, we identified the shared idea that only from a solid methodological justification is it possible for the movements of academic canons to acquire legitimacy. As pointed out by the project leader regarding the presentation, there is a methodological challenge to “makes poetic-literary and social analysis speak in unison” (Marcela’s intervention. Meeting 3, May 27th, 2021). In the same intertextual sense, literature was recurrently mentioned as reading recommendations, as input for theses and drafts, as well it integrates bibliography hosted in the shared digital library.

These other records that bear the mark of art (literature, poetry, music) are presented as central for the activation of creativity and passion in those who research. In a number of opportunities these were associated with pleasure and play. The native category of “warm dynamics” (intervention by Camila S. Workshop, May 31st, 2022), utilized to account for inter-subjective groups links, also applies for the counterpoint we listen to in the interventions between knowledge production considered cold and the warmth of other registers that enable the building of “aesthetics” and “erotica” around knowledge. In this line, the epistemic-methodological and subjective proposal of UBACyT team point at training and participating of the “cold” academic logics from the warmth of pleasure; i.e., integrating and recognizing the inhabiting of two worlds, being “passionate and framed at once” (Carolina’s intervention. Workshop, May 31st, 2022). To do so, the aforementioned knowing-doing is fundamental for the purposes of meeting the academic demands without giving up aesthetics and erotica.

Additional to the pluralization of sources, we notice the essay of other forms of saying linked to peer communication (in the context of academic events, university lessons, dissertations) and dissemination. Forms of saying in which, as commented in one of the meetings, “the part of desire, and emotion is noticed, to feel the goosebumps” (Marcela’s intervention. Meeting 3, May 27th, 2021). Over this line, the possibility of holding a performance, to give a lecture in a congress and the tensions entailed by academic formalities. Both in the workshop and informal between this article’s authors, dissemination strategies were recalled and took place as a team in order to reach a wider audience by means of technology.

Among them, distinguishable is the production of spots in 2018, which were uploaded to a YouTube channel after the rejection of a law on the legal termination of pregnancy by the Representative Chamber in Argentina, and a common diagnosis regarding the necessity to broaden interlocutions because “we’re talking to ourselves” (registration of conversation between the authors of the article, March 16th, 2021). Once again, in this case, the dissemination seems to be associated to the artistic and cultural field.

Writing also emerges as a space for the inscription of epistemic-methodological disputes. Given their condition of a large part of the team, that is, postgraduate students, the thesis of gender reversion insisted on group discussions. The facilities of UBACyT were propitious to experiment and exercise the creative intervention of formats that would be later assessed in other academic contexts. In the succession of meetings, the references to the thesis of one of the members were reiterated (Nebra, 2021) as an accomplished example of this struggle in the field of writing. It meets the evaluation parameters of a doctoral thesis and, at once, incorporates what she calls “the ludic power of playing as a producer instance capable of giving the words life and movement... and as windows to the knowledge to the world” (Nebra, 2021: 9). To do so, it resorts to a series of resources such as the use of parenthesis to assembly plays on words, poetry as intertext and the drafting of a “zero chapter”, where their feminist and critical epistemological positioning is described.

From the interpretation of what the research practices of UBACyT team provides us with, not only does inter-discipline relate to the possibility of transcending the limits and constrictions of scientific disciplines, but also aperture —spoken and written— to other cultural-artistic registrations that are the source, content, and communication strategy of the knowledge produced. Here, the knowledge of how to narrate and how to narrate oneself that comprises emotion, beauty and passion concurs.

2) Internal dimension

Interwoven and inseparable from the external dimension, ascertaining the interiority of the methodological enables us to approach —more integrally— the everyday work we collectively give ourselves to produce knowledge. This internal dimension of the methodology linked to the group creation acts as a “laboratory of daily work” (record of the team meeting, March 16th, 2021), to practice novel forms of academic exercise.

Group dynamics to train researchers seems to be managed, in this study case, by means of democratic forms that contest academic hierarchies and the configuration of this role. The processes of knowledge production also play in the links and decisions of daily tasks. In this way, methodological training does not start and finish, for example, by coursing the subjects corresponding to the curriculum, but also may be taught in continual movement and construction, which is constantly exercised in the link and dialogue with others: with the study subjects, partners, colleagues, tutors. In order to be able to explain how this is produced in UBACyT team, we differentially noticed: a) *the management of hierarchies*, understood as a way to manage the meeting of people with differences trajectories and roles, but who intend to work together; and, b) the care of links as a part of a positioning that recognizes the academicians' affectivity and emotions. a) *the management of hierarchies*: to the extent the links inside the training group space are configured, research practices are modeled. Here underlies an epistemological supposition of the perspective that gathers the UBACyT team: knowledge is built with others. This collective dimension of knowledge is oftentimes eclipsed by the dynamics proper to academic careers and their logics of individual accreditation; however, it is a constitutive aspect of knowledge production such as it comes from the analyzed methodological practices. This translates as the importance acquired by the group as an identity that needs to be recognized and valued according to their readings, productions, councils, contacts and the moments of sociability experience by the members of the research teams. During the meetings of UBACyT teams, this dimension was enacted as a usual way to work and relate between partners, even with different trajectories and roles. An instance of this was the first 2021 meeting, in which sharing patterns and advice to fill in the online SIGEVA format was proposed, understood as necessary strategic knowledge for the individual academic trajectory and also, to visualize group work (meeting 1, March 31st, 2021).

Over the meetings and mainly after the dialogue between both teams, the director presented her concerns regarding the role and management of group dynamic. The main concern was that certain questions about how to conciliate a logic of horizontal relationship with the academic criteria that acquire direction and coordination in formal and practical terms, as well as the expectations of those who do not hold such roles and have to be guided and advised. Well now, what do hierarchies mean inside an academic work

team? Which criteria do they follow? What is implied in building horizontal links? How are differences and/or conflicts managed? How does this influence research practices?

Over the workshop we organized from IRP in order to rethink the systematization of joint work, an interesting change tool place in relation to what hierarchies mean inside a group. One of the members with the least seniority in the team, commented that frequently, in the company of a partner with a master or doctorate, she perceived a hierarchy that did not mean something negative:

People who hold a master or a decorate, who state so, do not have another value, but their words are weighty. I believe all of us belong to the group, but have various degrees and titles, hierarchy in also function of the respect for knowledge the partner has and the value it has (Lucrecia's intervention. Workshop, May 31st, 2022).

In a similar sense, another partner stated that recognizing the training of others was stimulating to find out that in the future one might also reach such position (Intervention by Camila R. Workshop, May 31st, 2022). These interventions produced an intense dialogue on what everyone thought regarding the fact of validating a hierarchical role because of the fact of holding a "degree" and what sort of inequality it shows.

In this regard, successive reflections tended to disassemble the validation of academic hierarchies only because of the title itself inside the group, though not falling into a naïve stance that disavows the advantages of those who have an accreditation of their training in an academic field. One of the members stated:

It is good to think that if we hierarchize people, it is because of knowledge, as there is a comment that expresses hierarchy from academic knowledge; it is right to put it that way and not in more general terms, the way such individual is at a higher position, thinking of those hierarchy pyramids only because that person carried out or leads a research work. If we are thinking of alternative ways to understand knowledge production, it is good to value in the same way the knowledge each one has brought from different places (Intervention by Camila DV. Workshop, May 31st, 2022).

In this line, the UBACyT project was reflected upon as a space where knowledge is produced in a circular manner from the interchange of know-hows and collective accompaniment of the various roles where one them is. In this way, the structure of the group dynamic is not the academic résumé, but what a partner called "the résumé of action" (Matías' intervention. Workshop, May 31st, 2022), which allows receiving feedback from various standpoints and roles.

The fact of going back from certain notions that provide the word accredited by a title inside the group has to concur with the methodological to advance the work, as already mentioned when we referred to the external dimension of the methodology. For example, a partner commented that from a stance that validates everyone's words is a lesson for the exercise of research understood as a collective practice supported on the link with others.

I usually consider legitimate what people tell me, I research because those who research frequently do so from a very critical place, not constructive and far from reality [...]. The fact that in this group we value one another and that made me value others as well, together with other aspects such as my training in social work (Intervention by Julieta N. Workshop, May 31st, 2022).

Furthermore, in the same meeting, two other aspects that might help understand what hierarchies entail in the group dynamic were mentioned. One of them comes from the "career" within the UBACyT team. In this regard, a member stated that the fact of having spent long time with partners deactivated any unequal logic based on accreditation criteria (Matías' intervention. Workshop, May 31st, 2022). Likewise, another aspect referred was the time available to engage in the group project conditioned to receive research grants or part-time professional contracts, which may become inequality inside the group unrelated to each of the members' training.

All in all, we understand that hierarchies between partners in the context of group work take place in three main areas, even if re-signified according to the logics of critical knowledge production: hierarchies by "title", "career", and "commitment". This re-signification means that hierarchy is not stable and rigid, but changes in function of a dynamic based on dialogue and knowledge interchange. "The one with the word, the one with the title", as summarized by the director in the context of this exercise in group reflexivity (Marcela's intervention. Workshop, May 31st, 2022), referring to the importance of validating the all the members' voices, beyond their previous careers and/or current position in the academic ladder (recently graduated, students, grant holders, doctor candidates, etcetera).

Well now, this does not mean that the circulation is always fluid or lacks silence, boredom, conflicts, discomfort or discontent, as referred in the workshop (intervention by Camila R. Workshop, May 31st, 2022). These situations contest other forms of hierarchy almost exclusive to academic training trajectories: the relationship between the directors and

the directed. As previously mentioned, the UBACyT project starts from methodological practices that intend to produce horizontal participatory logics of labor, how to carry out group presentations on a day in the field; undertake joint writing, or even, propose a fair and clear allotment of the money available for the project in order to afford fees for congresses or tuition, among other issues.

However, there are certain limits that tension horizontality when these apertures turn neither into answers nor everyone's active participation; or when there is an expectation that decisions are made by the leaders, and to a certain extent "faces the problems" (Record of a meeting of teams, July 13th, 2021). This overlaps certain logics of academic work that become unequal roles such as availability to meet deadlines or requirements to apply for project renewals, which cannot be met by everyone at the same extent, since contributions are defined by formal criteria and actual possibilities according to individual academic trajectories.

b) The care of links: in the context of the group workshop, various interventions tried to pinpoint care and trust as the two main forms to manage uneven roles and face the conflicts that may arise from joint labor (Record of the workshop, May 31st, 2022). No hierarchy was denied in any case, with their already mentioned particularities; thereby, we understand that intending to manage them democratically does not imply a naïve horizontality, but necessarily an explicit reflexivity of the tensions and limits of the UBACyT project's labor dynamic, which contests the meaning of researching on the academic field from critical standpoints.

During the monthly meetings, we noticed a number of references to the way the links are proposed inside the group. The annual agenda proposed that in each meeting one or two of the members presented their own production and the partners returned ideas, readings and comments to improve the presentations. To a large extent, these interchanges put into play a way to relate signed by nearness and affection: "sharing works of our own is a brave and generous act, in a sphere already known to be kind and a network" (Marcela's intervention. Meeting 2, April 29th, 2021); "reading with commitment is an affectionate act" (Intervention of Julieta N. Meeting 2, April 29th, 2021); "a lot of information, texts, authors, which are not in the manuals, circulate in this group. Other authors circulate, here we are creating forms of knowledge construction. Always from affection, what is ever present here is love and affection" (Intervention by Camila S. Meeting 6, September 30th, 2021). At once, the generous and respectful reception we the members of IRP had as participating observers, together

with the dynamics in this regard we noticed in the group interchanges, which concurred with those textual records.

In the same line, by mid-2021, when we had already spent some months of the linking process between IRP and UBACyT project, we held a meeting between both teams' leaders with a view to conversing and systematizing the earliest joint reflections. Care held a distinguishable place, not only from the intuitions of those involved in the group work, but also from the director's voice, who underscored the way in which the team received new members, took them in, and almost immediately the interchange of links, texts, advice, contacts, etc. took place (Record of the meeting of the teams, July 13th, 2021).

In the context of the interchange between partners, accomplishing group intimacy is deemed important intending that inputs and readings among them take place outside the "academic formality" and from the emotion that points at contesting "where are you in this research? What happens to you when you write this?" (Record of the meeting of the teams, July 13th, 2021). It is then understood that this sort of questions is part of the necessary reflexivity for the production of situated knowledge; and for that to appear, a space lived as loving and kind is necessary, that works as a supportive network to make room for the subjective expressions of research tasks. Likewise, this works in opposition to certain logics sometimes that take place in other academic spaces, where the one who reads "destroys" the work of others without dimensioning the one who writes as someone who put a lot of themselves in their production (meeting 3, April 27th, 2022).

As regards the proximity of group dynamics, a member commented in one of the meetings:

Observing other people's processes helps. There are fears of our own, then you meet people in similar stages, with plenty of academic doubts and similar existential experiences, and that helps not to be afraid, that it is something possible, it is the process one has to undergo and it isn't unendurable (Lynda's intervention. Meeting 6, September 30th, 2021).

Not only does one learn from recognizing shared fears and uncertainties though, but also the passion to research a certain topic. After the intervention of a partner, who considered herself passionate and personally involved in the work she was presenting, the director encouraged the rest of the group: "for those preparing their topics and research questions, I want you to perceive that passion, to feel thrilled by the research your topics, to feel excited telling the tale. Those initiating listen in order to learn how to choose your topics" (Marcela's intervention. Meeting 3, May 27th, 2021).

In this way, in this same movement there is, on one side, the transmission of a methodological practice not usually approached in the academic canon (that is to say, how to recognize the emotions of the subjects that research and make them part of the process); and on the other, “desire flows into the academy” (Micaela’s intervention. Meeting 3, May 27th, 2021), tensioning the usual limits of knowledge production, understood as objective, neutral and devoid of emotional aspects. In this case, the articulation of feminist epistemologies with the positionings and the production of knowledge of UBACyT project.

Moreover, from the role of the director, it is important to recognize the “emotional trajectories” (Record of the meeting of the teams, July 13th, 2021) of each member of the team; that is to say, not only is it essential to find out the stage where the academic training of the person is, but also the particular moment of their lives: “I’m far, at 10.000 km, and Maky notices right away when I’m wrong” (Intervention by Camila S. Meeting 6, September 30th, 2021).

The accompaniment from the direction in training is in group and individualized at once, since there are collective examples of work, there are other moments that need personalized monitoring in varying intensity, according to the characteristics of each individual: some share aspects of their private lives and are more open, or need more continual presence, or else conversely. This goes hand in hand with positioning as a training director, in which care is understood as an intrinsic part of the relationship established with those directed, of the methodological learning and knowledge production:

Being a director, it is impossible to detach each one’s thesis from their own situation, what happens, and whose is. Because from here one finds out, what happens to each one. Person by person, particular methodologies are set up. A permanent challenge. [Methodology] is beautiful, research is beautiful (Marcela’s intervention. Meeting 6, September 30th, 2021).

All in all, group training spaces such as the projects funded, possess specific working dynamics that may directly cross the academic trajectories of those who are part of them. That is to say, research is taught and learnt from the methodological tasks in strict sense, and also from the training dynamics that suppose a particular way to experience the links between peers and directors. In the case of UBACyT, the constant search for the construction of a generous and careful framework, signed by politics, ethic, and love, entails not only a way to relate between the members of the team, but also entails a correlate with the individual and collective research practices.

In this context, we witnessed the tension of usually prevailing logics in the production of knowledge such as individual authorships and academic trajectories, the displacement of emotions and affectivity of academic work, the prevalence of an instrumental relationship with university partners, frequently perceived as competitors, and the reproduction of hierarchical and asymmetric relationships in the links between those who direct and the members of the research teams.

Final reflections

Analyzing the methodological practices that the UBACYT group has been reconfiguring from the category of intervention/research with genders' perspectives, in the key of participation and territory allows us to discuss other modes of producing knowledge from critical stances. It enables us to wonder what and who we are interested in researching, where we locate to do so and which "tools" we produce to do so. Moreover, it challenges us to wonder about the place we hold in the cognitive experience and what we do with such knowledge.

In this journey, we proposed two methodologic dimensions to give an account of the tensions, negotiations and bridges between the "external" (academic production of knowledge), analyzed by means of *production of situated knowledge and the interdisciplinary and intertextual stake*, and the "internal" (the forms of group organization), explained by means of *the management of hierarchies and care of links*. In these dialogues we placed the value in democratization and loving practices that transversalize the experiences considered in our study case: the mode of *making* research (external) with the forms of *being with others* in this process (internal).

On one side, we observe other forms of advancing academic work from aspects of social life that are generally invisible in this sphere: emotion, love, sorority, "intimacy", accompaniment, etc. Here, the UBACyT group is understood as a place for care, not as a competitive one or necessary to "survive" in academic life. On the other side, the enunciation pluralities of our researches and those who produce them, conceived as an intersectionality of voices that make knowledge production from the subjectivity of research complex, contribute to thinking the practical concretion of the critical methodologies we have been studying.

To close, we may summarize that the work in the present article entailed, in the first place, understanding tensions, negotiations and bridges between the ways in which knowledge is produced and the forms

of organization of those who produce it. To do so, we explained the way the analyzed intervention / research practices conceive the subjects as academicians crossed by various emotions (passion, interest in a topic, but also reticence, fear, and uncertainty) and show that any sort of knowledge starts from a specific situationality which allows making ourselves certain questions, linking ourselves with certain actors and producing some answers. Secondly, understanding the various manners in which critical methodologies produce democratizing and loving participations inwardly and outwardly of the teams. To do so, we describe the links established among the ones who partake of knowledge production —who research and are also researched— and from the recognition of subjectivity and situationality. In this way, a practice thought of from and for the link with others (either partners or subjects of study) is set into motion, and in which love and democratization become transversal and constitutive aspects of daily tasks.

These two dimensions (internal and external) set into motion in our work enabled us to approach the modes in which the known methods are contested in their dialogue with other ways of configuring methodological practices not identified beforehand. These other ways are co-built by individual and collective work, by forms of grouping and links with our subjects of study by means of a reflexivity process, thus giving life to other forms to find out about ourselves from social research.

References

Anzaldúa, Gloria (2016), *Borderlands. La frontera*, España: Capitán Swing Libros.

bell hooks (2004), “Mujeres negras. Dar forma a la teoría feminista”, en bell hooks, Brah, Avtar, Sandoval, Chela y Anzaldúa, Gloria, *Otras inapropiables. Feminismos desde las fronteras*, España: Traficantes de sueños.

Bennett, Jane (2010), “The force of things”, en *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*, Estados Unidos: John Hope Franklin Center Book.

Bourdieu, Pierre y Wacquant, Loïc (2014), “El propósito de la sociología reflexiva”, en *Una invitación a la sociología reflexiva*, Argentina: Siglo XXI.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé (1989), *Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics*, Estados Unidos: University of Chicago Legal Forum.

Elías, Norbert (1990), *Compromiso y distanciamiento. Ensayos de sociología del conocimiento*, España: Cultura libre.

Flick, Uwe (2004), *Introducción a la investigación cualitativa*, España: Morata.

Grosfoguel, Ramón (2016), “Del «extractivismo económico» al «extractivismo epistémico» y al «extractivismo ontológico»: una forma destructiva de conocer, ser y estar en el mundo”, en *Tábula Rasa*, núm. 24, Colombia: Universidad Colegio Mayor de Cundinamarca. Disponible en: <http://www.revistatabularasa.org/numero-24/06grosfoguel.pdf> [24 de julio de 2022].

Guber, Rosana (2001), *La etnografía: método, campo y reflexividad*, Guatemala: Norma.

Haraway, Donna (1991), *Ciencia, cyborgs y mujeres: la reinvenCIÓN de la naturaleza*, España: Cátedra.

Harding, Sandra (1987), “Is There a Feminist Method?”, en *Feminism and Methodology*, Estados Unidos: Indiana University Press.

Korol, Claudia [comp.] (2016), *Feminismos Populares, Pedagogías y Políticas*, Argentina: Chirimbote, América Libre y El Colectivo.

Lugones, María (2008), “Colonialidad y género”, en *Tábula Rasa*, núm. 9, Colombia: Universidad Colegio Mayor de Cundinamarca. Disponible en: <https://www.revistatabularasa.org/numero-9/05lugones.pdf> [24 de julio de 2022].

Maffía, Diana (2019), “Disidencia sexual y epistemología de la resistencia”, en *Avatares Filosóficos*, núm. 5, Argentina: Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Universidad de Buenos Aires. Disponible en: <http://revistas.filo.uba.ar/index.php/avatares/article/view/3417/2312> [24 de julio de 2022].

Nebra, Julieta (2021), “Medidas (y) alternativas para jóvenes (varones) en una experiencia penal territorial. Una investigación socioantropológica desde un Centro Sociocomunitario de Responsabilidad Penal Juvenil en el conurbano bonaerense” [tesis doctoral], Argentina: Facultad de Filosofía y Letras de la Universidad de Buenos Aires.

País Andrade, Marcela (2018), *Perspectiva de géneros. Experiencias interdisciplinarias de intervención/investigación*, Argentina: Centro de Integración, Comunicación, Cultura y Sociedad.

País Andrade, Marcela (2022), “Las experiencias culturales/artísticas (trans)feminista como formas ‘otras’ de hacer antropología”, ponencia presentada en el VIII Congresso da Associação Portuguesa de Antropologia, Portugal: Universidade de Évora.

Palumbo, María Mercedes y Vacca, Laura Celina (2021), “La academia se investiga a sí misma: una experiencia de coproducción de conocimiento”, en Córdoba, Liliana *et al.* [eds.], *Política, gestión y evaluación de la investigación y la vinculación en y desde las ciencias sociales en América Latina y el Caribe*, Argentina: Universidad Nacional de Córdoba y Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales.

Palumbo, María Mercedes y Vacca, Laura Celina (2020), “Epistemologías y metodologías críticas en Ciencias Sociales: precisiones conceptuales en clave latinoamericana”, en *Revista Latinoamericana de Metodología de las Ciencias Sociales*, vol. 10, núm. 2, Argentina: Universidad Nacional de La Plata. Disponible en: <https://www.relmecs.fahce.unlp.edu.ar/article/view/Relmecs076/13362> [24 de julio de 2022].

Quijano, Aníbal (2007), “Colonialidad del poder y clasificación social”, en Castro Gómez, Santiago y Grosfoguel, Ramón [eds.], *El giro decolonial. Reflexiones para una diversidad epistémica más allá del capitalismo global*, Colombia: Siglo del Hombre Editores.

Scott, Joan (1999), *El Género: Una categoría útil para el análisis histórico*, México: Fondo de Cultura Económica y Universidad Autónoma de la Ciudad de México.

Torres Carrillo, Alfonso (2020), “Freire y Fals Borda. Praxis y emancipación”, en Cendales, Lola *et al.*, *Paulo Freire y Orlando Fals Borda. Educadores populares*, Venezuela: Editorial Laboratorio Educativo.

Trebisacce, Catalina (2016), “Una historia crítica del concepto de experiencia de la epistemología feminista”, en *Cinta de moebio*, núm. 57, Chile: Universidad de Chile. Disponible en: https://www.scielo.cl/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0717-554X2016000300004 [24 de julio de 2022].

Vasilachis de Gialdino, Irene (2007), *Estrategias de investigación cualitativa*, España: Gedisa.
Viveros Vigoya, Mara (2016), “La interseccionalidad: una aproximación situada a la dominación”, en *Debate Feminista*, vol. 52, México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
Wittig, Monique (2006), *El pensamiento heterosexual y otros ensayos*, España: Égales.

María Mercedes Palumbo. Doctor in Education Sciences, CONICET-Department of Education of Universidad Nacional de Luján (CONICET-UNLu), Argentina. Research line: political-pedagogical practices of popular movements in Argentina; as a continuity, she develops an epistemic-methodologic perspective attentive to knowledge production critical modes. Recent publications: 1) Palumbo, María Mercedes (2022), “Reseña crítica de *El cobarde no hace historia. Orlando Fals Borda y los inicios de la investigación-acción participativa*”, in *Praxis Educativa*, vol. 26, no. 2, Argentina: Universidad Nacional de La Pampa. 2) Palumbo, María Mercedes (2021), “Reflexiones epistémicas acerca del estudio de la subjetividad en movimientos populares”, in *CUHSO*, vol. 32, no. 1, Chile: Universidad Católica de Temuco. 3) Palumbo, María Mercedes and Vacca, Laura Celina (2021), “La academia se investiga a sí misma: una experiencia de coproducción de conocimiento”, in Córdoba, Liliana *et al.* [eds.], *Política, gestión y evaluación de la investigación y la vinculación en y desde las ciencias sociales en América Latina y el Caribe*, Argentina: Universidad Nacional de Córdoba and Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales.

Laura Celina Vacca. Doctor in Sociology, College of Social Sciences (Universidad de Buenos Aires) and College of Economic and Entrepreneurial Sciences (Universidad del Salvador), Argentina. Research lines: cultural policies of identity, mainly referred to intercultural contexts involving indigenous populations, and proposal of critical research epistemologies and methodologies in social sciences. Recent publications: 1) Palumbo, María Mercedes and Vacca, Laura Celina (2021), “La academia se investiga a sí misma: una experiencia de coproducción de conocimiento”, in Córdoba, Liliana *et al.* [eds.], *Política, gestión y evaluación de la investigación y la vinculación en y desde las ciencias sociales en América Latina y el Caribe*, Argentina: Universidad Nacional de Córdoba y Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales. 2) Morgan, Muriel, Sidy, Bettina and Vacca, Laura Celina (2021), “Formas de la corporalidad en el pensamiento ilustrado entre España y América Latina”, in *Histórica*, vol. 45, no. 1, Peru: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú. 3) Palumbo, María Mercedes and Vacca, Laura Celina (2020), “Epistemologías y metodologías críticas en

Ciencias Sociales: precisiones conceptuales en clave latinoamericana”, in *Revista Latinoamericana de Metodología de las Ciencias Sociales*, vol. 10, no. 2, Argentina: Universidad Nacional de La Plata.

Marcela País Andrade. Doctor in Philosophy and Letters (Anthropology Area), Instituto de Ciencias Antropológicas [ICA] (Universidad de Buenos Aires-CONICET), Argentina. Regular professor in Social Work in College of Social Sciences (UBA), Postgraduate professor in Universidad de las Artes (UNA) and in Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO) in the Area of Communication and Culture in Argentina. Research lines: culture, policies, (trans)feminisms management, intervention/research in and from social sciences. Recent publications: 1) País Andrade, Marcela (2022), “Sinergias entre la cultura en movimiento y el movimiento (trans) feminista actual en argentina”, in *Revista de estudios de género, La ventana*, vol. 6, no. 55, Mexico: Universidad de Guadalajara. 2) País Andrade, Marcela (2021), “Tensiones de género(s) y desafíos (trans)feministas: Políticas culturales y gestión pública”, in *Comunicación y Medios*, vol. 30, no. 44, Chile: Universidad de Chile. 3) País Andrade, Marcela, Suárez, Camila, Zani, Alejandra and Kaplan, Yanina (2021), “(IN)VISIBILIZACIONES EN Y DESDE EL ASPÓ. Un estudio interseccional de los vínculos entre comunicación, cultura y cuerpo”, in *Avatares de la Comunicación y la Cultura*, no. 21, Argentina: Universidad de Buenos Aires.