

ARTICLE

Critical research in critical times: actors, authorship and authority in the production of knowledge in Social Work

Investigación crítica en tiempos críticos: actoras, autorías y autoridad en la producción de conocimiento en Trabajo Social

Gabriela Rubilar Donoso¹

University of Chile, Chile

Received: 09/12/2021

Accepted: 25/01/2022

160

How to cite

Rubilar, G. (2022). Critical research in critical times: actors, authorship and authority in the production of knowledge in Social work. *Propuestas Críticas en Trabajo Social - Critical Proposals in Social Work*, 2(3), 160-181. DOI: 10.5354/2735-6620.2022.65601

Abstract

This article analyzes and discusses the position of researchers in critical times, characterized by processes of societal transformation and research efforts aimed at shedding light on sensitive topics such as those that emerge in these contexts such as political violence, pandemics, and transformation processes. To do this, we present the core elements of a research current known as critical qualitative

Keywords:
knowledge
production;
critical qualitative
inquiry; critical
times; research
authorships

research, its connections with social work, and its debates around knowledge production. We then analyze three approaches to reflection on female actors and authorships, each of which activates a different empirical research experience. This is done to illustrate the elements that we wish to analyze critically and challenge within the context of current research, focusing on debates on knowledge generation and the role of researchers in this process. The results presented in this article indicate that, in critical times, it is necessary to strengthen reflective strategies for discussing these matters, deemed to be “sensitive” to research and to researchers, develop devices that not only visibilize the voices of the participants of each study, but which also highlight their singular contributions to knowledge production, and generate resistance strategies and efforts to democratize access to the products of social work research.

Resumen

Este artículo analiza y discute la posición de las/los investigadores en tiempos críticos, haciendo referencia a aquellos períodos caracterizados por procesos de transformación societal y por un quehacer investigativo que aborda temáticas sensibles, como las que surgen en contextos de violencia política, pandemia y transformación. Para ello se exponen los elementos centrales de una corriente investigativa denominada investigación cualitativa crítica, los vínculos de esta con el trabajo social crítico y sus debates en torno a la producción de conocimiento en temas sensibles. Posteriormente se analizan tres encuadres para situar la reflexión acerca de las actorías, autorías y autoridad; cada uno de ellos activa distintas experiencias investigativas empíricas con el propósito de ilustrar los elementos que se ponen en cuestión en el contexto de la investigación actual, tomando como foco los debates en torno a generación de conocimiento y el papel de las/los investigadores en este proceso. Los resultados de este artículo nos indican que en tiempos críticos se precisa potenciar estrategias reflexivas para la discusión de asuntos considerados “sensibles” para la investigación y para las/los investigadores. Esto implica desarrollar dispositivos para visibilizar no solo las voces de las/los participantes de los trabajos investigativos, sino de sus contribuciones singulares a la producción de conocimiento, generando estrategias de resistencia y democratización de acceso a los productos que se derivan de las investigaciones en Trabajo Social. En este sentido, desarrollar investigación crítica en contextos neoliberales implica comenzar a plantearse algunas de estas cuestiones y tomar decisiones al respecto, acerca del trabajo académico que se espera realizar y las tensiones que esto supone.

Palabras Clave:
producción de conocimiento;
investigación cualitativa crítica; tiempos críticos; autorías investigativas



Introduction

This article discusses and analyzes the issue of actors, authorship and narrative authority in qualitative research, specifically in studies that use the biographical approach as a theoretical-methodological research perspective. These aspects are little considered or are poorly understood when defining the intellectual property of the products derived from research with people in general and in the biographical approach in particular, where life stories, narratives or personal accounts are constructed.

To develop this debate, some of the approaches developed together with Cornejo and Zapata (2019) on sensitive issues in research are taken up again and the role of the participants in the research processes that include from the delimitation of the study topics, the design decisions to what, who and how the results of the work are presented. Sensitive issues in research include dilemmas that arise in the course of research processes, but also contextual elements that stress the research itself, hence the emphasis in this article, regarding research in critical times (Rubilar et al., 2020) and the demands of knowledge production in contexts that question the ways of doing research and make new demands on researchers.

162

The reflexivity on the topics under investigation or the role acquired by the participants in the research process is an issue that is usually limited to questions on ethics or research protocols, but in this article it is considered a sensitive issue given the relevance acquired today by the question of authorship in the indicators of academic productivity and in the parameters with which the production of knowledge is measured in neoliberal contexts, and which has not ceased to be valid in the current political and health crisis.

What do we do with what we research? With whom do we write? For whom do we publish? Who is the author of these materials? How are these products returned to the participants? These are some of the questions that have arisen in the development of a longitudinal study that has constructed more than 70 biographical testimonies of social workers and whose results essentially account for the methodological process of studying their trajectories in global terms (Rubilar, 2009, 2013, 2015, 2017). From this study emerges the debate on the authorship of these biographical materials and the questioning of the role in this process of the person who provided their testimony, the team that conducted the interviews, the responsible researcher and/or the co-researcher team, the agencies that finance them, the technical staff in charge of transcribing and coding the interview material.



This article was developed in parallel to a decision-making process on the format of publishing a book with some of the research testimonies of social workers; therefore, it collects theoretically and conceptually the notion of critical research in critical times (Rubilar et al., 2020), an expression that encompasses the position of knowledge production in academic contexts where logics, measurement systems and ways of doing research are disputed under the influence of the neoliberal university, generally little sensitive to the context and the requirements that arise from the participants.

In order to develop this debate, some theoretical contributions of Critical Qualitative Inquiry and its links with Critical Social Work are followed, to later dwell on the issue of actors, authorship and authorities in biographical research. Special attention is paid to the way these issues are approached and their tensions with the logics of appropriation and publication present in current research trends, which individualize authors and researchers and make other participants invisible, stripping them of their authorship.

In order to analyze these aspects, we have taken our own research experiences and those of others, where we have participated as methodological support, with the purpose of empirically illustrating some points of this debate. Therefore, this article intends to review the research practice from the guidelines of the biographical approach and the role played by authorship within it.

Theoretical Background: Critical Qualitative Inquiry & Critical Social Work

Qualitative research is a current that has several exponents, the most widespread and taught in Social Work research training in Chile being Valles (1996), Flick (1998) and lately Creswell (2009, 2015) regarding his proposals on mixed research designs (Veliz, 2021). However, in this article we focus on the contributions of Denzin (2002, 2015, 2017) and his collaborations with Giardina (2015a, 2015b, 2016, 2018) and Lincoln (1994, 2008), followed by Lincoln (2010), Lincoln and Cannella (2004), Lincoln and Guba (2009), Spry (2016), Cannella (2015), Pelias (2015) and Tilley (2019) for the purpose of critical qualitative research, including some exponents of Critical Social Work such as Garrett (2018), Gray and Webb (2020) and Webb (2019).

We wanted to emphasize Critical Qualitative Inquiry, since this current dialogues with the debates on knowledge production in critical times, promoting transformations in the way of thinking and doing research in contexts of crisis marked by the neoliberal influx.



In a contribution by Denzin for the Journal Qualitative Inquiry, he pointed precisely to this aspect when he mentioned:

“Recent decades have seen a resurgence of interest in interpretive methods in the study of culture, biography, and collective human life. At the heart of this view has been the argument that societies, cultures, and expressions of human experience can be read as social text (...) Thus, questions have arisen concerning how texts are “authored” read and interpreted (Derrida, 1981). How lives, authors, societies and cultures enter into interpretive texts is today a highly debated topic (Geertz, 1968).” (Denzin, 2017, p.83)

The authored, which in this article we have chosen to call authorship, includes a debate on the forms of contemporary knowledge production and the appropriation of this by researchers, stressing a central dimension of qualitative research, which is interested, among other aspects, in the lives of people, their behaviors, their interactions (Strauss and Corbin, 1990), while at the same time inscribing this interest in a debate on legitimate/valid forms of knowledge production in schemes of cognitive capitalism. This perspective clearly collides with the way of understanding the indicators of academic productivity and research production in neoliberal contexts.

164

In this sense, critical qualitative research changes the research process, interrogates its own work (Rubilar, 2013), reflects on the ethical and political scope of the knowledge generated, while interpreting its results and findings in the light of the contexts in which it is inscribed. It emphasizes the interrelationships that occur between research subjects and the researched, hence the relevance of the actors who are or are not part of the research processes. Thus, the critical nature of this type of approach implies a review of aspects not considered in other approaches, or approaching them from other positions that stress them. In the words of Becerra:

“There is a strong critique of this type of qualitative research, since according to some it follows an extractivist logic, which means that research is reduced to positive procedural methods of data extraction that are interpreted by predefined constructs, which aligns with Cartesian duality and neoliberal values about how one should know in modernity (Kuntz, 2015a, 2015b) (...) The critical qualitative perspective presents a social justice-based view of how research helps to reveal our society’s problems and solve them (Denzin, 2015).” (Becerra, 2020, p.155)

Hence some of its connections with the research concerns of Critical Social Work and the themes and lines of research that are developed within this current of the discipline,

which propose and address issues that impact relationships between subjects, contexts and structures, questioning the categories assumed as universal truths, and establishing a new mode of interaction, which in the words of Denzin (2015) implies an orientation to change and a greater awareness of power relations in the processes of production and reproduction of knowledge.

Recently Webb (2020), in *The Routledge Handbook of Critical Social Work*, also emphasized these elements and their linkages to feminist, decolonial, anti-oppressive and anti-racist studies. These approaches have been previously worked on in Social Work research by Dominelli and McLeod (1982) and Healy (2000); today they are picked up in Garrett (2018), as well as Gray and Webb (2020), whose work has recently been translated into Spanish. In a complementary way Levy (2014), Cannella et al. (2015) and Kuntz (2015), have advanced on these issues regarding the academy and its role in critical research.

In Chile, the works of Muñoz-Arce (2018), Muñoz-Arce et al. (2021) and Zapata-Sepúlveda (2021), who address among their questions some of these reflections around the production of knowledge in neoliberal contexts, academic extractivism and research reflexivity, could be linked to this current of research.

From critical perspectives, it is essential to assume an approach contrary to extractivism, hence the sensitive nature of the research conducted. In this framework, “sensitive topics” have been called those issues that, given the nature of what is being examined, require research processes in which each stage must be carefully designed and implemented, so that the methods used in the design, production, analysis and generation of results take into account the sensitive nature of the research topic and the power relations with the different actors involved in the research process.

Researchers have considered sensitive issues as a characteristic of the research process (Dickson-Swift et al., 2008). Fahie (2014) proposes to organize this field of inquiry into two main dimensions: i) its impact on the actors involved in the research process; and ii) the way in which researchers reflect on how research is conducted and how the decisions they make are manifested in the research processes and their results.

Adams (2008) and Ellis (2007, 2009) call for constant vigilance about ethical issues in research, given that this is a place where we will never know the results of our decisions a priori and where new questions constantly arise. As has happened with the



longitudinal study at the basis of this paper, as well as in other research illustrated in this paper.

This was what we did in a collaborative publication together with Cornejo, et al. (2019). On that occasion we focused on the effects that research has on the participants of qualitative studies. One of the conclusions of that article was to evidence the need to develop collaborative practices of written production, not only as a way to increase the performance of individual publications, -thus the criticism of the neoliberal logic in the current academy-, but also as an exercise of reflexivity and epistemological vigilance about the research already conducted.

From a biographical perspective, the actors involved are both the researchers and their teams or collaborators, including the subjects who contribute with their stories or narratives to the research; it is about the role of the latter that we reflect on in this article, providing elements of analysis about their inclusion or not in the research products, including the publications that derive from it and the possibility or right they have to dispute the authorship of those materials they consider their own.

Malacrida (2007) shows how the topics studied and the research activities carried out can affect all participants emotionally. She draws attention to the effects that an emotionally demanding project can have on the values and visions of the researchers, especially when dealing with life histories or biographical materials. The biographical approach followed in the elaboration of these testimonies emphasizes the importance of knowing and recognizing the historical-biographical coordinates in which each researcher is located (Rubilar 2013 and 2017) and the generational moment to which the study belongs. Reflexivity and self-awareness in the research process become a key dimension of the analysis, being present in the multiple phases of the research, including, by the way, the moment of making the results public.

Thus, questioning the meaning and form of research requires researchers to be aware of their position as researchers and how they approach the knowledge produced. Kavle (2011) uses the metaphor of mining and the journey to illustrate the extractivist currents and the postmodern conception of knowledge when constructing knowledge from the narratives of the subjects. This theoretical/epistemological position on the mode of knowledge production is related to the way in which the results of this process come to light, sometimes as author, sometimes as editor, sometimes as mediator.



These dimensions are the ones we are interested in approaching from three frames:

First frame:

Actor - What do we do with the research? Who do we write for?

Writing is part of academic work and one of the various ways of disseminating the results of the research and studies carried out. In the academic field, research results are made public in written productions such as reports, institutional reports, books and academic articles, as well as in conferences, presentations at congresses and other formats of oral transmission.

In the written format, journal articles appear as the main means of presenting results and research. Nogués and Cabrera (2016) called it “the tyranny of the paper” and Muñoz-Arce (2018) picks it up in her writing as one of the exponents of neoliberal reason, paraphrasing Harvey (2001):

“Along these lines, and consistent with the neoliberal ethos, the productivity of researchers is measured in terms of their ability to publish their research results in high impact journals (indexed in Web of Science or Scopus, for which preferential scores are assigned).” (Muñoz-Arce, 2018, p.36)

167

The rate of publications/yearly publications, the type of journal where they are published, the order of authors in the publication and the citation index are parameters with which the production of knowledge and the academic trajectory in universities and research centers are measured. In this sense, consolidating an academic and research career in neoliberal university contexts such as ours implies starting to raise some of these issues and making decisions about them, about the academic work expected to be done and the tensions that this entails, hence the relationship with researching in critical times.

Fardella et al. (2015) raised some of these issues in their article about the identity of academics. Under the title of identity and commitment is located a fragment of an interview with a Social Worker who comments:

“(...) for me it has to do with that, with the fact that one has more social and political work, in terms of how you contribute to form the new generation of professionals for your country.” (Fardella et al., 2015, p. 1630)

Some ethical issues of academic work are also addressed in this article, which has continuity in the later approaches of Sisto (2017) and Fardella et al. (2017, 2020), who discuss the neoliberal university financing schemes in a very similar perspective to that raised by Zapata-Sepúlveda (2021). In the case of Chile, universities consider in their financing schemes a basal fund for performance, which is financed based on the accreditation of higher education institutions and the scientific publications produced.

The resources from publications are related to the indexing systems of scientific production. Muñoz-Arce et al. (2021) show the insertion of Social Work in this new knowledge economy marked by logics of cognitive capitalism:

“The payment that must be made to access these publications -indexed in WOS and some SCOPUS- ranges from USD 40.00 (for a 24-hour access to a specific article) to USD 345.00 (for a one-month access to an issue of a journal). This situation, in addition to reproducing the elitist character of knowledge production in social work, reinforces the geopolitical reproduction of valid knowledge - which is constructed by those who can access it and question it from its own codes”. (Muñoz-Arce et al., 2021, p.154)

Simburguer and Neary (2016) and Simburguer (2020) have also critically analyzed these issues for the Chilean context, including in their latest approaches the question, for whom do we write? Undoubtedly, in the academic field we write to inform and report the results of research and to publicize the fulfillment of the proposed objectives; we also write because it is often a requirement of the agencies that finance the projects and a funding mechanism, since the universities alleviate resources by this means, which paradoxically allows us to continue developing the research work.

In other words, the knowledge produced is published at the same time as certain logics that characterize cognitive capitalism are reproduced, a situation that shows the tensions of research in critical times, and hence the importance of paying attention to certain practices and developing discussions about research publication policies with public funding. Opting for open access publications, or paying for them when journals do not have open access, is part of some of the issues that I have begun to discuss as a practice in my own career, collaborating in publications with other authors who also consider

this option, as has happened, for example, with the works published with Galaz and Rubilar (2019), or with Rubilar, Galaz and Labrenz (2020, 2021), and hence the idea of reviewing the standards for publications that are generated in publicly funded research.

Second frame:

Authorship - With whom do we write? Who is the author of the research products?

This point reflects on the incorporation of other non-academic authors in the publications, which leads to a debate on the role of the participants and their disjunctions at the moment of thinking about the publication of the results of the research work.

One way to increase the academic productivity of researchers in countries of cognitive capitalism, with high levels of demand and funding systems associated with individual productivity, is to publish together with other researchers and thus multiply the acceptance rates of articles from all participants. This is certainly an effective strategy, which also has an impact on citation rates, since cross-referencing systems are generated.

When one looks at one's own career in autobiographical terms, I would say that I do not tend to publish very much, at least not by the standards expected in relation to my category (position) or academic reputation. However, my publication rate is at a sufficient level, with some highs or stronger points depending on the years.

The longitudinal study shows that the beginning of the trajectory is marked by individual publications, usually associated with postgraduate completion work (magister and doctorate). The first collective publications or collaborations are generally derived from research projects or studies with internal funding, and then from more competitive funds that include in their evaluation standards the question of publication and academic productivity metrics, including on several occasions precise indications on the type of indexing of the articles.

This sequence is not linear, there are combined schemes, which is what other Social Work researchers have also experienced when publishing articles: in national and international journals; in mainstream and professional journals; in high impact indexed and non-indexed journals; in disciplinary and interdisciplinary journals, where a diversity of publication types and audiences is observed.



Less frequent is the publication with research participants or members of the research team who do not occupy the role of researchers, and therefore do not have the expected levels of productivity. In this case the experiences are less frequent and are limited to formative contexts with undergraduate and graduate students.

In 2015 I published an article with a student. Some colleagues criticized me because I left him as first author, when for me it was quite obvious since the field work had been developed mainly by him and the study was financed with a fund for the promotion of undergraduate student research. Now in 2021 we are finalizing a collective publication that involves a broad group of undergraduate and graduate students; this time the definition of authorship was more explicit, as well as the order of the authors in the document.

Including students in the publications at an early stage not only has benefits for them, but also allows for breaking down some myths about the exclusivity of these areas and the elite conception attributed to the process of writing and publishing. In the cases mentioned in the previous note, these are externally refereed journals and, therefore, blind peer review is also a way of democratizing the production of knowledge. This is an act and a political gesture, which is not so frequently observed in academic spaces where knowledge production circulates, since in general the publication is left in the hands of more established or career actors, leaving for new or initial researchers tasks of dissemination of results to the general public.

The inclusion of undergraduate students, with no previous experience in this field, does not seem to be a widespread experience in the research practices of other disciplines related to social work. Cornejo, et al. (2011) have developed a more systematic practice in this area, although limited to doctoral students.

To close this framework, other experiences of publishing research results with students of the intermediate training cycle in the framework of R&D research initiatives are mentioned for illustration, such as Milla and Rubilar (2015), Rubilar et al. (2020) and lately with students of various training levels, which implies possibilities of intergenerational dialogue not previously considered (Valenzuela et al., 2019).

What is of interest here is to question the fact that academics are authors of student



publications only because they have guided part or all of their research work. In the examples illustrated in the previous paragraph, it is rather the opposite, a joint production that is decided and articulated in this way, including the decision of the position of the authors in the text, without it necessarily being a requirement or a requirement of work in the framework of a formative process or degree term.

Third frame: Authority and positions - Who can talk about research?

In studies that develop or address issues associated with biographical studies, including the participants of the research is not a very recurrent practice either, and they are usually limited to the acknowledgements or comments in the footnotes of the published text. Making the authors and actors of the research visible then becomes a sensitive issue, susceptible to particular analysis and discussion. In this sense there is a political issue at hand, if one follows the guidelines of the biographical approach that is promoted as a theoretical-methodological approach that guides the research work (Bertaux, 1999 and 2005; Rubilar 2017).

With Manés, Chachak and Merino (2021) we extensively debated this point before the definition of the final format of the book *Vejece y Géneros*. This book published in October 2021 included the authorship of the interviewees who acted as informants in the reconstruction of memories of resistance, struggles and collective conquests of LGTB communities in Argentina. The book gathers in total fourteen biographical testimonies produced through qualitative interviews (Kvale, 2011); these testimonies that are developed under the denomination of stories that deserve to be told, were edited, corrected and reorganized following Allport's guidelines and the proposal of singular analysis sustained in Rubilar (2015).

In total, this publication makes visible as authors about thirty people, including both academics responsible for the project, research assistants and the people participating in the study. Following Beverley's tradition of constructing testimonies, this book, which reports the results of this study, highlights that:

“the memory of the past is circumstantial, relative, perishable, dependent on practice” (Beverley, 2012, p.111) so that it is not the search for the definitive truth that mobilizes us, since it does not exist. Knowledge allows us to access different forms of truth, and in this instance it is necessary to inquire into that which has not been addressed.” (Manés et al., 2021, p.25).

It is Beverley himself, in his original publication of 1994, who debates the problem of narrative authority, asking: can the subaltern speak for himself? Does he need the mediation of another? In this regard he points out that it: "... invariably implies that the narrator is no longer in the situation of marginality and subalternity that his narrative describes, but has now reached, precisely, the cultural condition of an author" (Beverley, 2013 p.346). Otherness, in this case, is an extension of that voice and not a replacement or erasure of its authorship (Rubilar, 2013).

A decade earlier, Spivak (1988) had developed a similar argument by saying that the subaltern, lacking enunciation space cannot speak, or at least his own voice cannot be appropriated, but is impostured by another, hence the disputes of narrative authority that we want to put in debate, also picking up the more contemporary contributions of Witkin (2002) and Spry (2016), in dialogue with the approaches of Roscoe (2019) and Larsson (2019) on the use of narrative perspectives in Critical Social Work.

In recent decades, in Chile and worldwide, we have witnessed demands and social movements that seek to make visible those voices silenced in subalternized and unrecognized identities, in terms of their gender identities, racialized expressions or ageism, as happens with children, adolescents and also the elderly.

Allowing subjects to speak in the first person is an experience also activated by other researchers. Callon (1999) highlights the role of ordinary citizens in the production of knowledge and Galinsky (1999) rescues the perspective of children in the very processes that affect them. Some years later, Saracostti et al. (2015) collected this and other publications to account for children's right to participate in research activities and how children have been approached in scientific and academic activities. Beyond ethical regulations and research protocols, it highlights that:

"The new sociology of childhood (Childhood Studies) argues that children and adolescents have the capacity to express themselves and are insightful observers of their lives (...) The conduct of social research from the notion of child protagonism is challenged to make a shift from previous studies." (Saracostti, et al., 2015, p. 239).

Girls, children, young people, the elderly, people in contexts of extreme poverty or communities excluded from the recognition of their political and social rights also emerge today demanding recognition of the authorship of their productions and products

generated by research. This is made explicit by Rain (2020) with regard to women belonging to native peoples in Chile and cultural studies, making adjustments to the protocols in vogue in their research:

“The ethics situated in context invited us to respect the forms that professional Mapuche women adopt to relate socially, based on Mapuche practices. This implied respecting the times and rhythms of the Mapuche culture, where the establishment of trusting relationships between us as researchers and the interviewees was key. For historical reasons of the memories of dispossession (land theft by means of deceitful signatures), the request for informed consent signatures from the women was omitted. Instead, acceptance of the recording of conversations was preferred.” (Rain, 2020, p.4).

The ethical perspectives of biographical research also include the debate about authorship, the order of authors in the publications and, of course, the intellectual property of the products generated from the biographical meetings or interviews held with the participants.

The biographical approach makes it possible to capture the micro-social perspective through interviews with the protagonists, contextualizing it historically based on their own accounts (Sautu, 1998). Therefore, it is possible to affirm that biographical reconstruction is characterized by the existence of a self who is the protagonist of the events or processes analyzed in the study, which take place in historical-political and social contexts, and by the existence of turning points that signal the presence of changes or mark remarkable aspects of the course of the social and personal life of these subjects. Hence the idea of the researcher as a traveler proposed by Kvale (2011), taking into account that the task of biographical research assumes and supports the task of reconstructing contexts, without making invisible a particular becoming or the convergence of an individual life to a historicizing pretension (Argüello-Parra, 2012), hence the relevance of visualizing the authorship of the participants.

To conclude

In this article we have emphasized critical qualitative research, illustrating some research experiences in Social Work that could be ascribed to this current; however, we are aware of the possibility of approaching this debate also in a transdisciplinary way, together with the actors that participate in the production of knowledge in all its stages or phases. This is especially relevant if we consider the keys of recognition and the inversion of subalternity proposed by Spivak (1988).



Spivak's approach dialogues with Spry's proposals on the consideration of the other in the research processes and the performances that this generates in the research practice itself and the effects that derive from it. The above allows us to knot the three axes of analysis or positions that have been used to develop this article, and that interpellate the protagonism of the research participants, as actor, author and authority.

The results of this article indicate that in critical times it is necessary to strengthen reflexive strategies for the discussion of these issues, considered "sensitive" for research and for researchers, to develop devices to make visible not only the voices of the participants of the research work, but also their unique contributions to the production of knowledge, and to generate strategies of resistance and democratization of access to the products derived from research in Social Work.

Hence the invitation to review the ways in which knowledge is produced, disseminated and legitimized, to disseminate little known and unexplored research practices that are part of the research process and the products constructed to people less accustomed to participate in this type of dynamics. Making their voice visible, but above all recognizing their substantive contribution to the generation of knowledge is undoubtedly a challenge and an ethical-political imperative in these times of social transformation for those who are part of the current of Critical Social Work.

References

Adams, T. (2008). A review of narrative ethics. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 14, 175–194. DOI: 10.1177/1077800407304417

Argüello-Parra, A. (2012). Entre el tiempo y el relato. Consideraciones epistemológicas en torno a la perspectiva biográfica en la investigación social y educativa. *Revista de investigación educativa*, 15, 27-47. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25009/cpue.v0i15.17>

Becerra, K. (2020). Investigación cualitativa crítica y derecho: Análisis de su rol en la academia chilena y un estudio de caso. *Revista Pedagogía Universitaria y Didáctica del Derecho*, 7(19), 149-175. DOI: 10.5354/0719-5885.2020.55375

Bertaux, D. (1999). El enfoque biográfico, su validez metodológica, sus potencialidades. *Proposiciones*, 29, 52-74.



Bertaux, D. (2005). *Los relatos de vida. Perspectiva etnosociológica*. Bellaterra.

Beverley, J. (2013). Testimonio, subalternidad y autoridad narrativa. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (eds.), *Estrategias de Investigación Cualitativa* (pp. 343-360). Manual de Investigación Cualitativa Vol. III. Gedisa.

Callon, M. (1999). El Rol de los Ciudadanos en la Producción y Divulgación de Conocimiento Científico. *Ciencia, Tecnología y Sociedad*, 4, 81-94.

Cannella, G. (2015). Introduction: Engaging critical qualitative science. In G. Cannella, M. Salazar & P. Pasque (eds.), *Critical qualitative inquiry: Foundations and futures* (pp. 7-30). Left Coast Press. DOI:10.4324/9781315431178

Cornejo, M. Besoain, C. & Mendoza, F. (2011). Desafíos en la generación de conocimiento en la investigación social cualitativa contemporánea. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 12(1). <https://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1527/3140>

Cornejo, M., Rubilar, G. & Zapata, P. (2019). Researching Sensitive Topics in Sensitive Zones: Exploring Silences, “The Normal,” and Tolerance in Chile. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*. DOI:10.1177/1609406919849355

Creswell, J. (2009.) *Qualitative inquiry & research design. Choosing among five approaches*. Sage.

Creswell, J. (2015). *A concise introduction to mixed methods research*. Sage.

Denzin, N. (2002). Social Work in the Seventh Moment. *Qualitative Social Work*, 1(1), 25–38. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/147332500200100102>

Denzin, N. (2015). What is critical qualitative inquiry? En G. Cannella, M. Salazar & P. Pasque (eds.), *Critical qualitative inquiry: Foundations and futures* (pp. 31-49). Left Coast Press. DOI: 10.4324/9781315431178

Denzin, N. (2017). *Autoetnografía Interpretativa. Investigación Cualitativa*, 2(1), 81-90. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.23935/2016/01036>

Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (comps.) (1994). *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Sage.

Denzin, N., Lincoln, Y. & Tuhiwai, S. (eds.) (2008). *Handbook of critical and Indigenous methodologies*. Sage.

Denzin, N. & Giardina, M. (2015a). *Qualitative Inquiry and Politics of research*. Left Coast Press.

Denzin, N. & Giardina, M. (2015b). *Qualitative Inquiry. Past, present and future. A critical reader*. Left Coast Press.

Denzin, N. & Giardina, M. (2016). *Qualitative Inquiry Through a critical lens*. Routledge.

Denzin, N. & Giardina, M. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry in the public sphere*. Routledge. DOI: 10.4324/9781315143385-14

Dickson-Swift, V., James, EL., Kippen S. & Liamputtong P. (2008). Researching sensitive topics: *Qualitative research as emotion work*. *Qualitative Research*, 18, 133-144. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732307309007>

Dominelli, L. & McLeod, E. (1982). *Feminist Social Work*. Macmillan.

Ellis, C. (2007). Telling secrets. Revealing lives. Relational ethics in research with intimate others. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 13, 3-29. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800406294947>

Ellis, C. (2009). *Revision: Autoethnographic reflections on life and work*. Left Coast Press.

Fahie, D. (2014). Doing sensitive research sensitively: Ethical and methodological issues in researching workplace bullying. *International Journal of Qualitative Method*, 13, 19-36. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/160940691401300108>

Fardella, C., Sisto, V., & Jiménez, (2015) Nosotros los académicos. *Universitas Psychologica*, 14, 1625-1636. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.11144/Javeriana.upsy14-5.nani>

Fardella, C., Sisto, V., & Jiménez F. (2017). La transformación de la universidad y los dispositivos de cuantificación. *Estudos de Psicologia*, 34, 435-448.

Fardella, C., Carriel-Medina, K., Lazcano-Aranda, V. & Carvajal-Muñoz, F. I. (2020). Escribir papers bajo el régimen del management académico: Cuerpo, afectos y estrategias. *Athenea Digital*, 20(1), 1-21. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5565/rev/athenea.2252> .

Flick, U. (1998). *Introducción a la investigación cualitativa*. Morata.

Galaz, C. & Rubilar, G. (2019). Experiencias profesionales en intervención psicosocial: el ejercicio narrativo como metodología de reflexividad y vigilancia epistemológica. *Revista Latino-americana De Metodología De Las Ciencias Sociales (Relmecs)*, 9(1). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24215/18537863e050>

Galinsky, E. (1999). *Ask the Children: What America's Children Really Think about Working Parents*. William Morrow and Company.

Garrett, M.P. (2018). *Social Work and Social Theory: Making Connections*. Policy Press.

Gray, M. & Webb, S. (2020). *Nuevas agendas políticas para el trabajo social*. Universidad Alberto Hurtado.

Harvey, D. (2001). *Spaces of capital*. Routledge.

Healy, K. (2000). *Social Works Practices*. Sage

Kuntz, A. (2015). *The responsible methodologist: Inquiry, truth-telling, and social justice*. Left Coast Press. DOI: 10.4324/9781315417332

Kvale, S. (2011). *Las entrevistas en la Investigación Cualitativa*. Morata.

Larsson, S. (2019). Narrative Analysis and critical social work. In S. Webb (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Critical Social Work* (pp.218-229). Routledge. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351264402>

Levy, P. (ed.) (2014). *The Oxford handbook of qualitative research*. Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199811755.013.009

Lincoln, Y. & Cannella, G. (2004). Dangerous discourses: Methodological conservatism and governmental regimes of truth. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 10(1), 5-14.

Lincoln, Y. & Guba, E. (2009). Ethics and the broader rethinking/reconceptualization of research as construct. *Cultural Studies, Critical Methodologies*, 9(2), 273-285.



Lincoln, Y. (2010). What a long, strange trip it's been.... Twenty-five years of qualitative and new parading research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(1), 3-9.

Malacrida, C. (2007). Reflexive journaling on emotional research topics: Ethical issues for team researchers. *Qualitative Health Research*, 17, 1329-1339.

Manés, R., Chachak, M. & Merlo, Y. (eds.) (2021). *Vejeces y Género. Memorias de resistencias, luchas y conquistas colectivas*. Universidad de Buenos Aires.

Milla, C. & Rubilar, G. (2015). Un asimétrico escenario de relaciones. Valoración de dirigentes mapuche acerca de las relaciones interétnicas. Análisis desde un enfoque triangular. *Antropologías Del Sur*, 2(3), 31-49. <https://doi.org/10.25074/rantros.v2i3.830>

Muñoz-Arce, G. (2018). Razón neoliberal e investigación: resistencias desde el trabajo social. *TS Cuadernos de Trabajo Social*, 17, 32-54. <http://www.tscuadernosdetrabajosocial.cl/index.php/TS/article/view/146>

Muñoz-Arce, G., & Rubilar-Donoso, G. (2020). Social Work Research in Chile: Tensions and Challenges under the 'Knowledge Economy' and Managerialist Research Agendas. *The British Journal of Social Work*, 51(7), 2839-2856.

Muñoz-Arce, G., Rubilar-Donoso, G., Matus-Sepúlveda, T. & Parada-Ballesteros, P. (2021). ¿Qué nos dicen las revistas y redes de investigación en trabajo social? Expresiones y concepciones en torno a la construcción de conocimiento disciplinar. *Propuestas Críticas en Trabajo Social - Critical Proposals in Social Work*, 1(1), 145-162. DOI:10.5354/2735-6620.2021.61241

Nogués, L. & Cabrera, P. (2016). La lógica mercantil en el campo de lo social. *Cuadernos de Trabajo Social*, 29(2), 155-157. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5209/CUTS.25906>

Pelias, R. (2015). Story Located in "Shoulds" Toward a Productive Future for Qualitative Inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 21(7), 609-611. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800414555073>

Rain, A. (2020). Resistencias diaspóricas e interseccionalidad: Mujeres mapuche profesionales en la ciudad de Santiago y el Wallmapu. *Psicoperspectivas*, 19(3). <https://dx.doi.org/10.5027/psicoperspectivas-vol19-issue3-fulltext-2042>

Roscoe, K. (2019). Critical discourse analysis and social work. En S. Webb (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Critical Social Work*. Routledge. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351264402>



Rubilar, G. (2009). ¿Cómo hacen investigación los trabajadores sociales? *Revista de Trabajo Social*, 76, 7-34. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7764/rts.76.17-34>

Rubilar, G. (2013). Repertorios y aproximaciones biográfico-narrativas. Testimonios y análisis de prácticas investigativas en trabajadores sociales. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 14(2), <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs130229>

Rubilar, G. (2015). Prácticas de memoria y construcción de testimonios de investigación. Reflexiones metodológicas sobre autoentrevista, testimonios y narrativas de investigación de trabajadores sociales. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 16(3). <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs150339>

Rubilar, G. (2017). Narrativa y enfoque biográfico. Usos, alcances y desafíos para la investigación interdisciplinaria. *Enfermería: Cuidados Humanizados*, 6 (Especial), 69 -75. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22235/ech.v6iEspecial.1453>

Rubilar, G., Galaz, C. & Labrenz, C. (2020a). Human Rights in Chilean Social Work: Lessons from Chile to Prepare Social Work Students for Human Rights Practice. *Journal of Human Rights and Social Work*, 11-21. DOI: 10.1007/s41134-020-00156-8

Rubilar, G., Santibáñez, C. & Echeverría, V. (2020b). Tiempos críticos. Análisis de la relación entre violencia y personas en situación de calle en contextos de “normalidad” y “excepción”. *Cuadernos Médico Sociales*, 2(60), 23-37. <https://www.gentedelacalle.cl/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/CMSPersonasCalle.pdf>

Rubilar, G., Galaz, C. & Labrenz, C. (2021). Academic and family disruptions during the COVID-19 pandemic: A reflexive from social work. *Qualitative Social Work*, 20(1-2), 587-594. DOI:10.1177/1473325020973293

Saracostti, M., Caro, P., Grau, O., Kinhead, P. & Vatter, N. (2015). El derecho de participación en la niñez: alcances y desafíos para la investigación social. *Revista Reforma y Democracia*, 62, 215-244. <http://www.centrocielo.cl/wp-content/uploads/sites/24/2017/03/derecho-participacion.pdf>

Sautu, R. (1998). *El método biográfico. La reconstrucción de la sociedad a partir del testimonio de los actores*. Editorial de Belgrano.

Simburguer, E. (2020). La universidad del desastre. Trabajo académico y género en tiempos de pandemia. *Revista Latinoamericana*. <http://www.revistalatinamericana-ciph.org/2020/06/10/903/>

Simburguer, E. & Neary, M. (2016). Taxi Professors: Academic Labour in Chile, a critical-practical response to the politics of worker identity. *Workplace: A Journal for Academic Labour*, 28, 48-73. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14288/workplace.v0i28.186212>

Sisto, V. (2017) Gobernados por los números. El financiamiento como forma de gobierno de la Universidad en Chile. *Psicoperspectivas*, 16(3), 64-75.

Spivak, G. (1988). Can the subalterns speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg's (ed.), *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture* (pp. 66-111). Macmillan.

Spry, T. (2016). *Autoethnography and the other. Usetling power through utopian performatives*. Routledge.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basic of Qualitative Research*. Sage.

Tilley, S. (2019). The role of critical qualitative research in educational contexts: A Canadian perspective. *Educar em Revista* 35(75). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/0104-4060.66806>

Valenzuela, P., Rubilar, G., Manquilepe, A., Torres, L., Peralta, C., Arancibia, J., González, J., Soto, V. & Strauss, J. (2021). Experiencias intergeneracionales sobre encierros: pasados, presentes y futuros. Detonantes y reflexiones en clave biográfica tras la pandemia de SARS-CoV-2. *Ultima década*, 29(57), 4-34. DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718-22362021000300004>

Valles, M. (1996). *Técnicas cualitativas de investigación social. Reflexiones metodológicas y práctica profesional*. Síntesis.

Véliz, C. (2021). *Discursos sobre Formación en Investigación y Enseñanza de las Metodologías de investigación social en carreras de Trabajo Social en universidades chilenas* [tesis doctoral, Universidad Nacional de La Plata, Argentina].

Zapata-Sepúlveda P. (2021). Qualitative Inquiry in the Neoliberal Public Sphere: Contesting Accountability Metrics. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 27(10),1246-1249. DOI:10.1177/1077800420970159



Webb, S. (ed.) (2019). *The Routledge Handbook of Critical Social Work*. Routledge.

Witkin, S. (2002). 'New Voices': A Column in Search of Authors, *Qualitative Social Work*, 1(2), 141-4. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/147332500200100202>

Acknowledgments

ANID/CONICYT/ FONDECYT Research project N°1190257 “Longitudinal study of transitions and research trajectories of Chilean social workers” (2019-2023).

About the author

Gabriela Rubilar Donoso holds a PhD in Research Methodology, Universidad Complutense de Madrid (Spain), and a PhD in Human and Social Sciences, Pontificia Universidad de Comillas de Madrid (Spain). She is an academic and director of the Department of Social Work at the University of Chile. Member of the Interdisciplinary Studies in Social Work Research Nucleus (Chile). Research lines: Public policies and social programs, poverty and exclusion, social work research.

E-mail address: grubilar@uchile.cl

ORCID ID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4635-9380>

