
8-6-2022

Multivocality as Practice of Critical Inquiry for Social Justice

Cesar Cisneros

Universidad de Tarapaca, ccisnerosp@academicos.uta.cl

Follow this and additional works at: <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr>



Part of the [Critical and Cultural Studies Commons](#), [Quantitative, Qualitative, Comparative, and Historical Methodologies Commons](#), and the [Social Justice Commons](#)

Recommended APA Citation

Cisneros, C. (2022). Multivocality as Practice of Critical Inquiry for Social Justice. *The Qualitative Report*, 27(8), 1529-1546. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2022.5507>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the The Qualitative Report at NSUWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Qualitative Report by an authorized administrator of NSUWorks. For more information, please contact nsuworks@nova.edu.



Multivocality as Practice of Critical Inquiry for Social Justice

Abstract

Multivocality has been clearly and in detail present in social science reflection since the impact of the so-called linguistic turn and nowadays it has also presence in the qualitative inquiry current discussion. To explore how multivocality can be a practice of qualitative inquiry for social justice is the goal of this contribution. It is a global picture of epistemic violence that has subjugated knowledge and practices along with executing genocides and exterminations of otherness to build societies without social, epistemic, and cognitive justice that my goal is to unveil the horizon of modern social sciences to get a better understanding of the new ways of knowledge construction committed to the emancipation of those dominant hegemonic social practices that have made possible the existence of human misery and social, epistemic, and cognitive injustices. So, I will examine the concept of multivocality within social theory to bring it into play with the social justice, epistemic violence, and epistemicide contemporary discussions. Doing so will make its current position within qualitative inquiry practices more transparent. Putting rebellious, creative, poetic, performative, and subversive imaginations into play to discover another social order is what animates me now: building a world in which many worlds exist, building a world with multivoicedness and vari-voicedness inside; many voices without hierarchies or domination or extermination between them. In this paper I will try to delve into the background of our scientific and humanistic knowledge to understand our real political commitment to emancipation, freedom, and social and epistemic justice; however, I will only concentrate on what I assume are the consequences of applying Bakhtin's concept of multivocality to qualitative research in its pursuit of social and epistemic justice.

Keywords

epistemic justice, social justice, Bakhtin, epistemicide, epistemic violence, reactionary populism

Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-Share Alike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

Acknowledgements

The project was supported by UTA Mayor 3771-22 by University of Tarapacá, Chile.

Multivocality as Practice of Critical Inquiry for Social Justice

César A. Cisneros-Puebla
University of Tarapacá, Chile

Multivocality has been clearly and in detail present in social science reflection since the impact of the so-called linguistic turn and nowadays it has also presence in the qualitative inquiry current discussion. To explore how multivocality can be a practice of qualitative inquiry for social justice is the goal of this contribution. It is a global picture of epistemic violence that has subjugated knowledge and practices along with executing genocides and exterminations of otherness to build societies without social, epistemic, and cognitive justice that my goal is to unveil the horizon of modern social sciences to get a better understanding of the new ways of knowledge construction committed to the emancipation of those dominant hegemonic social practices that have made possible the existence of human misery and social, epistemic, and cognitive injustices. So, I will examine the concept of multivocality within social theory to bring it into play with the social justice, epistemic violence, and epistemicide contemporary discussions. Doing so will make its current position within qualitative inquiry practices more transparent. Putting rebellious, creative, poetic, performative, and subversive imaginations into play to discover another social order is what animates me now: building a world in which many worlds exist, building a world with multivoicedness and vari-voicedness inside; many voices without hierarchies or domination or extermination between them. In this paper I will try to delve into the background of our scientific and humanistic knowledge to understand our real political commitment to emancipation, freedom, and social and epistemic justice; however, I will only concentrate on what I assume are the consequences of applying Bakhtin's concept of multivocality to qualitative research in its pursuit of social and epistemic justice.

Keywords: epistemic justice, social justice, Bakhtin, epistemicide, epistemic violence, reactionary populism

Our time and our contemporaneity shape an extremely complex global reality. It is a challenge for qualitatively-driven social science to decipher all the tangled circles of power and socialities that maintain social inequality. Living with equality in democratic harmony between individuals, social institutions, and the environment continues to be a dream aspired by the whole of humanity. The nineteenth-century Hegelian dream of the unity of the diverse seems to have been achieved at the end of the twentieth century although often it has been a dictatorship that eliminated the differences. That century ended with a reassessment of Herder's idea (Berlin, 1976) that expressed the opposite: to respect the diverse within the unit. Despite this, after a long time of domination of some nations, people, classes, and races over other nations, people, classes, and races, we are still asking ourselves how such inequality has been possible and continues to be so in the world. Furthermore, questions about how this unfair world social order was built and how it is maintained globally remain unanswered, although we must all act to change the circumstances that allow it to continue. Emphasizing the unity of the diverse led to ignoring and even eliminating differences for the sake of a supposed or

desired uniformity. Colonizing otherness proved to be a more effective strategy of domination than extermination.

Social differentiation or social division occurred over time with the annihilation of otherness through ignoring, marginalizing, dominating, oppressing, or exterminating it. Since the advent of modernity consisted of ignoring, subordinating, eliminating, or oppressing the other, Monasterios (2008) has shown that the primary postcolonial theoretical sources operated from different historical and cognitive perspectives. From India, Bhabha (1994) has framed the origin of modernity in the eighteenth century and has enriched our perspectives with concepts such as hybridity to analyze cultural dominance. In contrast, the postcolonial Latin American thinkers as Dussel (1995) and Quijano (2000) date the emergence of modernity to the sixteenth century and show how conceptual debates related to it are rooted in ancestral and historical legacies. Mignolo (2011) has shown how the narrative of modernity needed the notion of “primitives” to create the spatial colonial difference and to define the identities of supposed superior and inferior human beings. Colonization was based on such terrible assumptions and the effects of such narratives have been substantial, as Spivak (1988) has demonstrated by introducing the concept of epistemic violence: “...in the context of colonial production, the subaltern has no history and cannot speak...” (p. 28).

From postcolonial thought, when analyzing the dynamics of global capitalism by means of his notion of coloniality of power, Quijano (2000) proposes that we include conflict, domination, and exploitation as the basic elements to be considered to study the changes on such social dimensions as work, race, sex, natural resources, authority, governance, and public authority. In such direction, coloniality of power is an important category when thinking about the social geography of capitalism. Coloniality of power also had and still has influence in the ways science is organized and institutionalized in each society. Throughout human history, then, the dominant and hegemonic centers produced knowledges, theories, and methods, and the dominated peripheries had to consume and reproduce them to understand their environmental and social realities. Their indigenous knowledge and practices were undoubtedly taken away from them. So, we can think of the discussion of postcolonial, decolonizing, and indigenous knowledge systems (Smith, 1999) as a kind of rebellion against the knowledge, theories, and methods of the conquerors on the knowledge, theories, and methods of the dominated. We live together on a planet, but we inhabit different worlds.

Global coloniality (Escobar, 2004) has marginalized, repressed, or even annihilated the knowledge and culture of subaltern groups; it seems like this oppression will never end. The postcolonial turn has brought us to other perspectives to analyze our actions regarding cultural products, ethics, conquerors and conquered, knowledge, values, and traditions. Accompanying postcolonial thought, the decolonial option attempts to divest or “delink” from Western starting points, particularly epistemic and subjective ones, with the aim of, as Mignolo (2011, p. 54) asserts: “...contributing to building a world in which many worlds exist...”

All human societies, whether economically developed or not, with official religions or not, with supremacy of one group over another or not, with democratic political systems or not, with humanitarian leaders or not, with peace and well-being in all spheres of life or not, and with many other contrasts, inhabit the same, unique planet. Although we have differences, building a just and utopian world in which all of our groups coexist peacefully is today a global demand. Santos' affirmation (2016) that there is no global social justice without global cognitive justice is echoed and, slightly modified by Tshaka (2019, p. 136) as: “...there cannot be social justice without epistemic justice...” It is valid to assume that every fight for social justice is inherently also a fight for epistemic and cognitive justices.

This global picture of epistemic violence that has subjugated knowledge and practices as well as genocides and exterminations of otherness to build societies without social, epistemic, and cognitive justice is the subject of this paper. My goal is to broaden the horizon

of modern social sciences to get a better understanding of new ways of knowledge construction committed to the emancipation from those dominant hegemonic social practices that have made possible the existence of human misery and social, epistemic, and cognitive injustices.

The academic community involved in qualitative research has made diverse efforts to face this challenge of social justice. Just to cite an example we have the compilation made by Denzin and Giardina (2009), whose volume expresses the community's collective desires to establish a politics of hope for the future. The sociological imagination of this very active scientific community has been filled with inspiration to satisfy such desires for transformative participation in such a way that the rebellious, creative, poetic, performative, and subversive imaginations are also playing a role. In that direction, I previously explored the impacts of scientific reflections on creativity and subversion as very important social and individual processes (Cisneros-Puebla, 2021). With such diverse imaginations in mind, in this paper I will try to delve into the background of our scientific and humanistic knowledge to understand our real political commitment to emancipation, freedom, and social and epistemic justice. So, in what follows, I will examine the concept of multivocality within social theory to bring it into play with the contemporary discussions on social justice, epistemic violence, and epistemicide. Doing so will make its current position within qualitative inquiry practices more transparent. Putting rebellious, creative, poetic, performative, and subversive imaginations into play to discover another social order is what animates me now: building a world in which many worlds exist, building a world with multivoicedness and vari-voicedness inside, many voices without hierarchies or domination or extermination between them.

Multivocality as an Analytical Horizon

Multivocality as a research topic was barely discussed in the various editions of the *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Compare Guba and Lincoln (2005, p. 212): "...We occupy a historical moment marked by multivocality, contested meanings, paradigmatic controversies, and new textual forms..." which also appears in Denzin & Lincoln (2018, p. 210) to Lincoln et al. (2018, p. 250): "...Rather, we stand at the threshold of a history marked by multivocality, contested meanings, paradigmatic controversies, and new textual forms...", or the abstracts from seventeen international congresses of qualitative inquiry held in Urbana-Champaign, Illinois, numbering over 20,000 presentations. You will notice that the subject does not appear before the fourteenth Congress in 2018 in a thematic session dedicated to multivocality. In short, it had not been considered a relevant topic in prior congresses, although, without a doubt, papers presented from the performative ethnography or new materialism approaches to name a few, have tangentially addressed it. This is despite the fact that the topic of multivocality has been clearly and in detail present in social science reflection since the so-called linguistic turn in the 1970s. And for that reason, we will take a short jaunt on some background with a central clarification: here I will not understand by multivocality the simple collection of layered multiplicity of meaning, nor just gathering multilingualism in social research, nor simply write surreal "exquisite corpse" as layers of individual voices; neither it is just the result of a bricoleur's eclectic research.

Contemporary discussion around the notion of multivocality begins with Bakhtin's contributions. When critically analyzing literary works and due to the influence of Lunacharsky, Bakhtin (1984, p. 6) wrote:

...A plurality of independent and unmerged voices and consciousnesses, a genuine polyphony of fully valid voices is in fact the chief characteristic of Dostoevsky's novels...

Before Bakhtin, Lunacharsky had already posed the problem of polyphony concisely and thoroughly as Bakhtin (1984, pp. 32-33) himself notes:

...I concede that Bakhtin has succeeded not only in establishing more clearly than anyone had before him the enormous significance of the multi-voicedness in the Dostoevskian novel, its role as the most essential characteristic feature of his novels, but also in correctly defining that extraordinary (and in the works of the vast majority of other writers, unthinkable) autonomy and full validity of each ‘voice,’ which is developed to such a staggering degree in Dostoevsky...

Bakhtin's thinking (Morris, 2003) is amazing for its impact on social science. As has happened with many earlier thinkers such as George Herbert Mead, Charles Peirce, and Ludwig Wittgenstein, some of the concepts coined by him had been around for a long time and others have received little further attention. Bakhtin (1984) has a privileged place among the classics of narrative studies together with Paul Ricoeur (Collington, 2001) and a special place in the reflection on dialogue together with Vygotsky (Eun, 2019), for example, although there is also a discussion (Rule, 2011) about their commonalities with Freire regarding dialogue and their differences regarding dialectics. In the same way that a certain influence of Mikhail Bakhtin (Hamera, 2018) and Paulo Freire (Denzin, 2003) is recognized in the practice of performance ethnography, it is important to recognize that the critical appraisal of their complete works is still pending. In this paper, however, I will only concentrate on what I assume are the consequences of applying Bakhtin's concept of multivocality to qualitative research in its pursuit of social and epistemic justice.

Having as a perspective the evaluation of the quality of the research, Cho and Trent (2014) think of multivocality as one of the means, practices, and methods of establishing credibility to achieve excellent qualitative research. The eight “big-tent” criteria proposed originally by Tracy (2010) to conceptualize quality in qualitative research include: (1) have a worthy topic; (2) use abundant, sufficient, appropriate and complex rich rigor; (3) the study is characterized by sincerity; (4) marked by credibility; (5) affects a variety of audiences through resonance; (6) provides significant contribution; (7) considered ethical; and (8) has meaningful coherence. Tracy has also defined that multivocality as:

...closely aligned with the notion of crystallization and showing rather than telling, is multivocality. Multivocal research includes multiple and varied voices in the qualitative report and analysis... (p. 844)

For Cho and Trent (2014) the research's quality regarding multivocality is based on characteristics such as: thick description and *verstehen* practices of seeing social actions, emphatic understanding of many different meanings, awareness of cultural differences, intense collaboration with participants, and sharing various diverse approaches from traditional to experimental. In another sense, participatory, autoethnographic, and feminist approaches seek out participants' voices, even friendships, to form a core part of the research process. Furthermore, engaging friendship as a type of participant collaboration requires “radical reciprocity;” that is to say, a shift from “studying them to studying us” as Tillmann-Healy (2003, p. 735) has pointed out. The understanding of friendship itself as an ally rather than an ethical enemy or a lie necessary for conducting ethnographic research puts more emphasis on methodologies of conversation and intervention. Living freely all relationships with others without absurd distinctions allows multivocal work to be produced, built, and enjoyed. Thus, learning from, with, by, and for the group being researched transforms the inquiry (Reedy &

King, 2019) into a dialogic relationship with effects radically opposed to vertical tradition of dominance.

It is possible to see that the topic of multivocality represents not only a means to evaluate the quality of the inquiry, as Tracy (2010) suggested, but also a practice that could modify the interaction between the research participants, as Reedy and King (2019) and Tillmann-Healy (2003) formulated. Such modifications, by concentrating only on this second aspect, may destroy hierarchies by establishing horizontal relationships between the participants in the conversation, providing an opportunity for the appearance of the miracle of dialogical lives together.

There have been projects studying multivocality as a way to interpret the negotiation on the “right” ways to perform ancestral rituals in Tanzania (Fischer, 2016), analyzing different forms of multivocality on representations of women studying war-time news bulletins broadcast in Yugoslavia in 1991 (Pankov & Mihelj, 2011), exploring on exegetical meaning of urban infrastructure megaprojects (Van Marrewijk, 2017), reflecting on multivocality by collaborating in the production of knowledge in other language and translating it to the lingua franca (González & Lincoln, 2006), and researching on multivocality of the street histories in a Cypriot city (Akoka et al., 2021). With this small sample, I have tried to exemplify that multivocality in qualitative inquiry has had two meanings so far, regardless of Bakhtin, Ricoeur, Vygotsky, or Freire's conceptual historical legacies: one associated with rigor and evaluation of the quality of qualitative inquiry itself and the other linked to the production of multiple voices coming together or multivocal narratives. Before continuing with my examination of the concept of multivocality, let me also briefly look at how epistemicide stands as the antipode of multivocality. In doing so, I will also have to draw attention to the concept of sympoiesis that from a posthumanist position brings us closer to debating the multivocality of “making with” another, when the other is non-human.

Epistemicide and Sympoiesis as Epistemological and Ontological Frameworks

Let us initially look at epistemicide and epistemic violence in terms of the dominance of one language over another in scientific communication. According to Bennett (2007, p. 159), what can be named English academic discourse emerged in the seventeenth century and continues today. In such context, Bennett highlighted that the word ‘epistemicide’ was coined by Boaventura de Sousa Santos in 2005 (p. 154).

Although for Santos (2005, p. xviii) such hegemonic dominance is not only linguistic:

...in the name of modern science, many alternative knowledges and sciences have been destroyed, and the social groups that used these systems to support their own autonomous paths of development have been humiliated. In short, in the name of science, epistemicide has been committed, and the imperial powers have resorted to it to disarm any resistance of the conquered peoples and social groups...

Nevertheless, some years before Grosfoguel (2013, p. 77) had formulated that:

...the four genocides/epistemicides of the long 16th century are the socio-historical condition of possibility for the transformation of the “I conquer, therefore I am” into the epistemic racism/sexism of the “I think, therefore I am” ...these four genocides/epistemicides are frequently discussed as fragmented from each other. The attempt here is to see them as interlinked, inter-related to each other and as constitutive of the modern/colonial world’s epistemic

structures. These four genocides were at the same time forms of epistemicide that are constitutive of Western men epistemic privilege...

Such four genocides/epistemicides committed during the 16th century are: the genocide in the name of the "purity of blood" of Muslims and Jews during the conquest of Al-Andalus, the genocide of the native peoples of America and Asia, the trafficking of native Africans as slaves for America, and the accusation and burning of women with Indo-European knowledge as witches.

Nonetheless, Santos (2016, p. 92), in a kind of dialogue with Raimon Panikkar, affirms that:

...The energy that propels diatopical hermeneutics comes from a destabilizing image that I designate epistemicide, the murder of knowledge. Unequal exchanges among cultures have always implied the death of the knowledge of the subordinated culture, hence the death of the social groups that possessed it. In the most extreme cases, such as that of European expansion, epistemicide was one of the conditions of genocide...

Although, there are some criticisms to Santos such as that of Giri (2021) who debates the practical application of the diatopical hermeneutics and proposes an ontological epistemology of participation to make possible the analysis of multiple cultures and traditions of thought in what he calls multi-topical hermeneutics.

Epistemicide is present in many varied ways in the world, geographically, for example, as attested by the case of the agro-activism to defend and reclaim nature through heritage seeds, eco-farming initiatives, farming cooperatives, and others which are happening in Palestine in the context of Israeli occupation (Meneley, 2021), or the case of reflecting on how specific politics of epistemicide influence the India's textile industry in relation to the cultivation of indigo dye from colonial times to the present day (Mukherjee, 2019), or the case of defending the quest for epistemic liberation by discussing the possibilities of ending epistemicide in Africa (Masaka, 2018), or, last but not least, to sum up the Gukurahundi Genocide (1983 to 1987) in Zimbabwe of which Mpofu (2021, p. 45) wrote:

...The combination of genocide and epistemicide kills people and their culture and seeks to replace them with another people and culture, to create a new world in the absence of political opponents. Further, epistemicide produces intentional ignorance of the truth and insulation from ethics and justice for the perpetrator of violence...

Epistemicide is also present by knowledge areas; for example, Mills and LeFrançois (2018) show that the use of the metaphor of "being like children" to refer to racialized/colonized people, intellectually disabled people, and mad people, operates as a form of epistemicide that considers the effort to analyze the causes of willful ignorance or blindness to white supremacy. Van Milders (2021, p. 13) affirms that epistemicide "...refers to the way in which whiteness has generated a massive waste of experience and knowledge alternative ..." since it constitutes the foundation of the ideology of re-inscribing the normativity and supremacy of whiteness. Moreno Sandoval et al. (2016), in the context of large discussion on epistemicide and scientific method, have proposed Ancestral Knowledge Systems as a conceptual framework to decolonizing social science research methodologies.

In many ways epistemicide expresses the permanent effort to dominate, control, humiliate, disappear, eliminate, or exterminate the other, the different. Fanon (2008, p. 168)

was very bright and clear in his writing, referring to the behavior of the colonizers in their colonies:

...they poured every effort into programs that would make the Negro a white man. In the end, they dropped him and told him, "You have an indisputable complex of dependence on the white man"...

In other words, along with the material extermination of human persons accomplished by genocides, epistemicide, and/or epistemic violence means the cognitive extermination of knowledge, either through disqualification, condemnation, contempt, ignorance, humiliation, insult, aggression, or abuse, and last but not the least, making the other feel inferior.

Even today in the XXI century, with the practice of epistemological racism (Kubota, 2020), the knowledge produced by academics belonging to subaltern and/or minority groups continues to be marginalized and erased. Let us now move from epistemic violence to sympoiesis. Haraway's definition of sympoiesis is very precise, (2016, p. 58):

...Sympoiesis is a simple word; it means "making-with." Nothing makes itself; nothing is really autopoietic or self-organizing. In the words of the Inupiat computer "world game," earthlings are never alone. That is the radical implication of sympoiesis. Sympoiesis is a word proper to complex, dynamic, responsive, situated, historical systems. It is a word for worlding-with, in company. Sympoiesis enfolds autopoiesis and generatively unfurls and extends it...

With such definition and the relevance of Haraway's idea, the posthuman and new materialism perspectives have strengthened their inspiring presence for the analysis of the complexity of the relationships between what is and what is not, what is and may be.

In this way, for example, Lakitsch (2021) updates Thomas Hobbes' political thought on nature to discuss the construction of subjectivity even in relation to the non-human in the sense that people "...Participate in processes of becoming with (sympoiesis) others in the 'multispecies muddle'... yet maintain the ability to articulate one's perspective as such..." (p. 10), which is totally relevant as it leads, for example, to ecological engineering practices dedicated to making soil to compensate for its degradation through the study and organization of being in the world of the human (us) and the non-human (worms, for example), as Meulemans (2020, p. 101) has shown by conceptualizing the human being and the worm through the notion of sympoiesis in practices of soil construction, "... which describes processes in which life forms are always 'making-with,' or 'worlding-with, in company,' rather than 'making themselves' (as in autopoiesis)...". Precisely in that direction of thinking about the ways Haraway has been advocating "making with" other species and life forms, sympoiesis, to go forward into a precarious future, Behrisch (2021, p. 669) has dramatically written:

...we're joined in an unbounded web of relations with each other and other species, cancer, and COVID-19 among them. Staying with the trouble means making our way forward with others, making with to navigate through the difficult times...

In terms of the emergence of post-humanist or "new materialist" ecopolitics interested in the production of a future less harmful to the planet, our own conception of what nature is as another "actor" produced by our own human action leads to establishing critical forms of reflexivity.

In 2021, given the uncertainty of the future of COVID-19, the notion of syndemic expresses the social and biological interactions between human and non-human that perfectly confronts us with the limits of our consciousness. The COVID-19 syndemic leaves us facing an uncertain future given the complexity of the interactions between the social and the biological, which clearly and harshly confronts us with the limits of our knowledge and sensitivity in the face of the inexplicable and unknown. This world of otherness expressed with the concept of sympoiesis opens our experience towards freedom or towards the excess of death.

In this field of epistemology Bakhtin (1986, p. 161) appears also as an essential author to think about the limits of cognition in relation to the non-human:

...In opposition to the subject there is only a voiceless thing. Any object of knowledge (including man) can be perceived and cognized as a thing. But a subject as such cannot be perceived and studied as a thing, for as a subject it cannot, while remaining a subject, become voiceless, and, consequently, cognition of it can only be dialogic. ...The activity of one who acknowledges a voiceless thing and the activity of one who acknowledges another subject, that is, the dialogic activity of the acknowledger. The dialogic activity of the acknowledged subject, and the degrees of this activity. The thing and the personality (subject) as limits of cognition...

New Developments and Perspectives on Multivocality as Practice of Inquiry

Diverse current experimental, post experimental, militant, collaborative, critical, and reflexive, among other traditions, have integrated multivocality as critical practice of inquiry: collaborative writing, performative autoethnography, participatory action research, arts-based methods, feminist and queer theories, and some other qualitative inquiry approaches are currently producing insights and knowledge that are substantial components of our theme. But as a topic, multivocality has remain influential in cultural and literary studies, linguistics, and literacy research, but also in disciplines such as archaeology, social and collective memory studies, and so on.

Bicultural techniques as the Dialogical Facilitation Method (Uttal & Frausto, 2021) based on social interventions addressed to immigrants in US, acknowledge that there are going to be value differences and possible conflicts when two persons from different cultures come into contact. Bergset and Ulvik (2021) have defined and used multivoicedness as an analytical tool for exploring refugee parents' narratives in Norway. In a sort of move toward transformative qualitative inquiry, Flores et al. (2021) propose the *pláticas* and *testimonios* as methodologies developed by them as Chicana Latina feminists to theorize the knowledge and experiences shared in informal conversations with participants in their research projects.

There has been intellectual production about multivocality to study localized language practice (Dyers, 2015), or about conceptualizing it as a form of dialogical inquiry approach or novel form of qualitative inquiry (Wells et al., 2021). From another perspective, Sluka and Robben (2007, p. 19) wrote about how in the new ethnography exists an "increased awareness" of multivocality defined as multiple voices representing multiple interests or "realities" which has raised issues of signature, authority, and advocacy. On the other side, Rodman's contribution outside the spatial turn stated:

...Multivocality often involves multilocality. Polysemic places bespeak people's practices, their history, their conflicts, their accomplishments.

Narratives of places are not just told with words; they can be told and heard with senses other than speech and hearing... (1992, p. 649)

Akkerman et al. (2006) uses Bakhtin's ideas (1981) on speech genres to analyze how boundary-crossing voices can be turned into a meaning-generating venture in a boundary-crossing research project funded by the European Commission. It has also been of interest to analyze collaborative work and conversations between scientific research teams through various Computational Discourse Analysis Models (Rosé & Lund, 2013; Suthers et al., 2013) to illustrate multivocality as a process of knowledge production.

Related to sympoiesis, some colleagues have analyzed it, for example as an illuminating way for exploring creativity (Gale, 2021) or to explore collaborative writing (Gale & Wyatt, 2022), reflecting on slow philosophy by caring elders with deep anxiety (Behrisch, 2021), on thinking about the links between sympoiesis and generosity (Hughes et al., 2018), sympoiesis and sympathy and speculative fiction (De Freitas & Truman, 2021), sympoiesis and early childhood from feminist perspective Otterstad (2019), and for understanding human-dog relations in dementia by the principle of diffraction (Jenkins & Ritchie, 2021). For Lewis (2018, p. 336)

...Writing is sympoetic: While the name on the byline of the article is mine, the various mutually incompatible thoughts that gestated its contents, like the labours that gestated (all the way into adulthood) the thinkers of those ongoing thoughts, are many... "authorship can only be coauthorship"... Sympoiesis can be a curse as well as a blessing...

Haraway (2016, p. 33), in her recognition of Dempster's first idea on sympoiesis of systems without self-defined boundaries, also criticizes the conceptualization of systems' autonomy as a constant or independent living form and recall that the term sympoiesis is for (p. 61):

...collectively- producing systems that do not have self-defined spatial or temporal boundaries. Information and control are distributed among components. The systems are evolutionary and have the potential for surprising change...

In the construction of the memory of peoples through archaeology, Wylie (2019) formulates a critical, sensitive, and accurate description of the role that some collaborative archaeologies have had as accomplices of a system of oppression. Writing about the future of archaeology, Jones (2009, p. 84) has pointed out that multiple voices shape our heritage, not just the voice of the archaeologist-scientist:

...The notion of multivocality was clearly a reaction to the totalizing voice of the scientific method. Allied to the concept of multivocality was the notion that a series of competing viewpoints arose with the adoption of perspectives from a range of disciplines.

While in the permanent redefinition of the field of archaeology from processual vs post processual (archaeological terms for positivist vs postmodernist approaches) Kristiansen (2009) has recalled that: "...Postprocessual approaches focus on interpretation, multivocality, meaning, agency, history..." (Hodder 1999, p. 12, quoted by Kristiansen, p. 40) and from a decolonial perspective, Atalay et al. (2014) are among many who have been struggling to

define, build and teach a specific approach that trains archaeologists to advocate for a radical multivocality that empowers all voices to speak about the past.

On the other hand, on the realm of collective memory from a processual approach that wanted to be suggestive at that time, Cisneros-Puebla et al. (2016) organized a multivocal work to recreate the voices and beings of 43 young students murdered in Mexico. The exercise-tribute condensed 30 efforts from different countries' authors, with different approaches and different "ways of seeing and feeling" a bloody event in the social history of a people. What Appadurai (1988, p. 17) has expressed in relation to the ethnography can perfectly invite us to reflect on how to think multivocally does not simply mean giving a voice to the participants or putting many voices together; it means creating multivoiced narratives:

...But the problem of voice is a problem of multiplicity as well as a problem of representation. How many voices are concealed beneath the generalizations of reported speech in much ethnography? And how many voices clamor beneath the enquiries and interests of the single ethnographer? How can we construct our voices so that they can represent the diversity of voices we hear in the field? How can we construct in anthropology a dialogue that captures the encounter of our own many voices with the voices we hear and purport to represent? The problem of voice ("speaking for" and "speaking to") intersects with the problem of place (speaking "from" and speaking "of") ...

Performing a multivoiced inquiry is not a simple result of making a call, selecting a specific meeting place, inviting friends or colleagues, or bringing together the project participants and adding their different voices with different timbres, tones, meanings, lifeworld, and so on to assemble or to interpret a creative spontaneous polyphony (Wyatt et al., 2011).

Grounded on this musical metaphor applied to literary criticism, it is possible think about polyphony in qualitative research. Bakhtin (1984, p. 21) thinks that:

...The essence of polyphony lies precisely in the fact that the voices remain independent and, as such, are combined in a unity of a higher order than in homophony. If one is to talk about individual will, then it is precisely in polyphony that a combination of several individual wills takes place, that the boundaries of the individual will can be in principle exceeded. One could put it this way: the artistic will of polyphony is a will to combine many wills, a will to the event...

In this sense, qualitative inquiry must be polyphonic and multivocal; it is not possible to deny the irreducible multi-centeredness or "polyphony" of human life. I am always a witness of the miracle of dialogical lives together, either from my inner life as a person or because of my relational self.

To propose autoethnographic performance methodology, Spry (2001) – following Geertz – has argued that ethnography must combine as many genres as our imagination allows to resist to "...the impersonal, nonemotional, and unrhethorically charming representation of self in academia..." (p. 723) which the social science's dominant styles have imposed. She also reminds Goodal and his defense of the transgressive composition of autoethnography by its multivocality, and Denzin (2006) claims it by their "polyvocal texts" (p. 420).

Before moving on to the concluding section, I want to illustrate some of the basic features of the previously developed discussion. Figure 1 summarizes these characteristics:

Figure 1*Different approaches reflecting on multivocality in qualitative inquiry*

Methodological framework	Performative approach	Activism approach	Collaborative approach	Decolonizing approach
Disciplines or knowledge areas	Performative ethnography, autoethnography	Critical archaeology, militant ethnography, Critical qualitative inquiry, feminism	Collaborative writing, posthumanism theories, collaborative archaeology	Postcolonial theories
Strategies	Writing from the heart	Hermeneutics	Multivocal writing	Testimonios, pláticas and indigenous methods
Epistemological and ontological sources	Sympoiesis	New humanism	Posthumanism	Coloniality
Authors	(De Freitas & Truman, 2021), (Gale, 2021), (Wells et al., 2021), (Denzin, 2006), (Spry, 2001)	(Wylie, 2019), (Jones, 2009), (Otterstad, 2019)	(Atalay et al., 2014), (Kristiansen, 2009), (Gale & Wyatt, 2022)	(González & Lincoln, 2006), (Flores et al., 2021)

Conclusion

Currently it is impossible to think about multivocality without Bakhtin and the complex network of relationships that are woven with other intellectuals of the stature of Freire, Vygotsky, and Ricoeur, just to mention some authors, in the context of debates around symbolic interactionism, pragmatism, hermeneutics, linguistic turn, spatial turn, dialogic or semiotic self, new materialism, posthumanism, and many others.

It is necessary to link the topic of multivocality, first to the historical-cultural discussions about epistemicide and second to the political debate about social, epistemic, and cognitive justices. The practice of qualitative inquiry is observed from perspectives more comprehensive and holistic, in such a way that the transformative, committed, militant, rebellious, and creative practice of qualitative research is not only not lost but it is increased. As Shukaitis et al. (2007, p. 9) have written:

...Militant research starts from the understandings, experiences, and relations generated through organizing, as both a method of political action and as a form of knowledge...

If we position ourselves at the juncture of the beginning of the second decade of the 21st century, while we are still living in the times of the COVID-19 pandemic and the civilizational recompositing and mundane changes in our processes of daily interaction, work,

love, solidarity, etc., it is necessary to ask: what is next? In the perspective of a transformative practice of research, this question could be unfolded: will left-wing activists of a younger generation aspire more radically to develop liberation strategies? Or will right-wing activists continue to deepen the practices of reactionary populism? Whether we are on one side of the scale or on the other, it is precisely from that decision that I recover a brilliant thought from Madison (2009, p. 189) to weigh towards what future we are contributing:

...Instead of conventionally positioning the dangerous inside the field, what might happen if we think of ourselves as being dangerous? What if we carry the danger with us, embody it, and carry it with us into the field? Consider the option that we, ourselves, could be dangerous....

I could ask in order to provoke: are we dangerous from our deepest self in the field of the struggle for liberation or are we dangerous because we collaborate to preserve the injustices? And precisely, from the set of essays edited by Geiselberger (2017), I want to highlight those ideas that help me to accurately characterize reactionary populism as political expression and mobilization of resentment between the different political regimes and social classes that allow us to understand why ethnonationalist supremacism of all kinds, misogyny and prejudices against all diversity, hatred against immigrants, and many other injustices are still growing in the 21st century. That might help us, for instance, to understand the emergence of regimes like those of Xi Jinping in China, Erdoğan in Turkey, Mohamed bin Salmán in Saudi Arabia, Putin in Russia, János Áder in Hungary, Andrzej Duda in Poland, Donald Trump in the USA, and López Obrador in Mexico, just to name a few. Reactionary populism has thus been the right-wing option.

We must be very attentive, because we can learn from the case of archaeologists, of whom we provided some ideas a little above. For example, thinking from the global South, González-Ruibal et al. (2018), conceptualizing archaeologists as producers of value through inheritance, claim they are totally irrelevant to global capitalism; as producers of symbolic values through multivocality and multiculturalism, in addition to being irrelevant they become politically harmless. In this way, multivocal approaches practiced in peripheral countries, which could appear as progressive, actually become complicit in a system of misuse of memory and archeology itself. Since multivocality has even been caricatured as an attempt to give all voices a chance, even offensive voices, in what they describe as “epistemic populism.”

At the end, the panorama seems somewhat uneven: in the cultural evolution and maintenance of the archaeological heritage, the misuse of memory caused by the pretense of integrating multivocality is debated; in ethnographies of various types, multivocality is even integrated into sympoietic approaches in search of epistemological openness and, in general, in qualitative inquiry committed to social justice, feelings such as compassion, hope, love, and friendship, among others, are reassessed in order to achieve the sublimity of liberated perspectives.

Anyway, in the times to come it is anticipated that the demand for multivoiced research must be increasingly present among the criteria to evaluate our work as builders of knowledge and new realities that promote the transformation of the world and social, epistemic, and cognitive justices.

I think it is relevant to conclude by recalling that Bakhtin (1984, p. 69), with a certain Herderian air, was opposed to relativism and dogmatism, and taking this into account is essential to continue and strengthen until the end the development of multivocality as a practice of inquiry:

... We see no special need to point out that the polyphonic approach has nothing in common with relativism (or with dogmatism). But it should be noted that both relativism and dogmatism equally exclude all argumentation, all authentic dialogue, by making it either unnecessary (relativism) or impossible (dogmatism). Polyphony as an artistic method lies in an entirely different plane...

In qualitative inquiry, the dialogue will appear in the form of dialogic nature of consciousness because to live means to participate in dialogue. That is the dialogic nature of human life itself.

References

- Akkerman, S., Admiraal, S., Jan Simons, R., & Niessen, T. (2006). Considering diversity: Multivoicedness in international academic collaboration. *Culture & Psychology, 12*(4), 461–485. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067X06069947>
- Akoka, K., Clochard, O., Polyzou, I., & Schmoll, C. (2021). What's in a street? Exploring suspended cosmopolitanism in Trikoupi, Nicosia. In C. Lejeune, D. Pagès-El Karoui, C. Schmoll, & H. Thiollet (Eds.), *Migration, urbanity and cosmopolitanism in a globalized world* (pp. 101-110). Springer.
- Appadurai, A. (1988). Introduction: Place and voice in anthropological theory. *Cultural Anthropology, 3*(1), 16-20.
- Atalay, S., Clauss, L. R., McGuire, R. H., & Welch, J. R. (2014). *Transforming archaeology. Activist practices and prospects*. Leaf Coast Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (C. Emerson, Trans. & M. Holquist, Ed.). University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). Toward a methodology for the human sciences. In M. Bakhtin, C. Emerson, M. Holquist (Eds.) & V. McGhee (Trans.), *Speech genres and other late essays* (pp. 159-172). University of Texas Press.
- Behrisch, T. J., (2021). Cooking a pot of beef stew: Navigating through difficult times through slow philosophy. *Qualitative Inquiry, 27*(6), 667–676. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800420941057>
- Bennett, K. (2007). Epistemicide! The tale of a predatory discourse. *The Translator, 13*(2), 151-169. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2007.10799236>
- Bergset, K., & Ulvik, O. S. (2021). Parenting in exile: Refugee parents' multivoiced narratives. *International Social Work, 64*(3), 412–415. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020872819825778>
- Berlin, I. (1976). *Vico and Herder: Two studies in the history of ideas*. Viking.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. Routledge.
- Cisneros-Puebla, C. A., Alatorre, F., Allen, M., Bénard, S., Castañeda, D., Castañeda, Y., Charmaz, K., Davidson, J., De La Garza, S., Espinoza, A., Faulkner, S. L., Ferreyra, G., Gilgun, J., Gutiérrez, L. F. G., Hein, S. F., Hernández, D., Biber, S. H., Labarthe, V. J., Johnson, J. M., ... Tilley- Lubbs, G. A. (2016). 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 . . . 43: Justice! Ay! Ay! Ayotzinapa: A challenge for new critical qualitative inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry, 22*(6), 447–465. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800415615622>
- Cisneros-Puebla, C. (2021). Creative subversion: Staking a claim for critical qualitative inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry, 27*(3-4), 455–464. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800420933298>
- Collington, T. (2001). Space, time and narrative: Bakhtin and Ricoeur. *Space & Culture, 4*(7-

- 9), 221-231. <https://doi.org/10.1177/120633120000300502>
- Cho, J., & Trent, A. (2014). Evaluating qualitative research. In P. Leavy (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 677-696). Oxford University Press.
- De Freitas, E., & Truman, S.E. (2021). New empiricisms in the anthropocene: Thinking with speculative fiction about science and social inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 27(5), 522–533. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800420943643>
- Denzin, N. K. (2003). *Performance ethnography: Critical pedagogy and the politics of culture*. SAGE.
- Denzin, N. K. (2006). Analytic autoethnography or de'ja`vu all over again. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 35(4), 419-428. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891241606286985>
- Denzin, N. K., & Giardina, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Qualitative inquiry and social justice. Toward a politics of hope*. Routledge.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. (2018). Paradigms and perspectives in contention. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (5th ed., pp. 195-212). SAGE.
- Dussel, E. (1995). *The invention of the Americas: Eclipse of "the other" and the myth of modernity*. Continuum.
- Dyers, C. (2015). Multilingualism in late-modern Africa: Identity, mobility and multivocality. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 19(2), 226-235. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006913489203>
- Escobar, A. (2004). Beyond the third world: Imperial globality, global coloniality, and antiglobalization social movements. *Third World Quarterly*, 25(1), 207–230. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0143659042000185417>
- Eun, B. (2019). Two diverging paths toward a common destination: The dialogism of Vygotsky and Bakhtin. *Culture & Psychology*, 25(4), 484–502. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067X18820635>
- Fanon, F. (2008). *Black skin, White masks*. Pluto Press.
- Fischer, G. (2016). Talking to Chief Mkwawa: Multivocality and negotiation in an ancestral offering in Tanzania's Southern Highlands. *Ethnography*, 17(2), 278-293. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1466138116632788>
- Flores, J. F., Hamzeh, M., Delgado, D. B., & Zareer, I. H. (2021). Theorizing knowledge with pláticas: Moving toward transformative qualitative inquiries. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 27(10), 1213–1220. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10778004211021813>
- Gale, K., & Wyatt, J. (2022). Making trouble with ontogenesis: Collaborative writing, becoming, and concept forming as event. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 28(1), 80–87. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10778004211026898>
- Gale, K. (2021). Now you see me, now you don't: Living with Deleuze, intimating in the dance of movements, moments, and sensation. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 21(6), 466–472. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15327086211037760>
- Geiselberger, H. (2017). *The great regression*. Polity Press.
- Giri, A. K. (2021). With and beyond epistemologies from the south: Ontological epistemology of participation, multitopial hermeneutics and the calling of planetary realizations. *Sociological Bulletin*, 70(3), 366–383. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00380229211014666>
- González, E. M., & Lincoln, Y. (2006) Decolonizing qualitative research. Nontraditional reporting forms in the academy. In N. K. Denzin & M. D. Giardina (Eds.), *Qualitative research and the conservative challenge* (pp. 193-215). Left Coast Press
- González-Ruibal, A., González, P. A., & Criado-Boado, F. (2018). Against reactionary populism: Towards a new public archaeology. *Antiquity*, 92(362), 507-515. <https://doi.org/10.15184/aqy.2017.227>

- Grosfoguel, R. (2013). The structure of knowledge in Westernized universities: Epistemic racism/sexism and the four genocides/epistemicides of the long 16th century. *Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge*, 11(1), 73-90.
- Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (2005). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluence. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 191-215). SAGE.
- Hamera, J. (2018). Performance ethnography. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (5th ed., pp. 631-661). SAGE.
- Haraway, D. (2016). *Staying with the trouble: Making kin in the Chthulucene*. Duke University Press.
- Hodder, I. (1999). *The archaeological process: An introduction*. Blackwell.
- Hughes, H. E., Bridges-Rhoads, S., & Van Cleave, J. (2018). Work/think/play in qualitative and postqualitative inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 24(9), 599-602. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800417733499>
- Jenkins, N., & Ritchie, L. (2021). From reflection to diffraction: Exploring the use of vignettes within post-humanist and multi-species research. *Qualitative Research*, 21(6), 975-989. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794120920258>
- Jones, A. (2009). Into the future. In C. Gosden, B. Cunliffe, & R. Joyce (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of archaeology* (pp. 83-100). Oxford University Press.
- Kristiansen, K. (2009). The discipline of archaeology. In C. Gosden, B. Cunliffe, & R. Joyce (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of archaeology* (pp. 25-53). Oxford University Press.
- Kubota, R. (2020). Confronting epistemological racism, decolonizing scholarly knowledge: Race and gender in applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, 41(5), 712-732. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amz033>
- Lakitsch, M. (2021). Hobbes in the anthropocene: Reconsidering the state of nature in its relevance for governing. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, 46(1), 3-16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03043754211008677>
- Lewis, S. A. (2018). Acomradely politics of gestational work: Militant particularism, sympoetic scholarship and the limits of generosity. *Dialogues in Human Geography*, 8(3) 333-339. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2043820618800603>
- Lincoln, Y., Lynham, S., & Guba, E. (2018). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences, revisited. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (5th ed., pp. 213-263). SAGE.
- Madison, D. S. (2009). Dangerous ethnography. In N. K. Denzin & M. D. Giardina (Eds.), *Qualitative inquiry and social justice: Toward a politics of hope* (pp. 187-197). Left Coast Press.
- Masaka, D. (2018). The prospects of ending epistemicide in Africa: Some thoughts. *Journal of Black Studies*, 49(3), 284-301. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021934717753731>
- Meneley, A. (2021). Hope in the ruins: Seeds, plants, and possibilities of regeneration. *EPE: Nature and Space*, 4(1), 158-172. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2514848620917516>
- Meulemans, G. (2020). Wormy collaborations in practices of soil construction. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 37(1), 93-112. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276419851857>
- Mignolo, W. (2011). *The darker side of Western modernity: Global futures, decolonial options*. Duke University Press.
- Mills, C., & LeFrançois, B.A. (2018). Child as metaphor: Colonialism, psy-governance, and epistemicide, *World Futures*, 74(7-8), 503-524. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02604027.2018.1485438>
- Monasterios, E. (2008). Uncertain modernities: Amerindian epistemologies and the reorienting of culture. In S. Castro-Klaren (Ed.), *A companion to Latin American literature and culture* (pp. 553-570). Wiley-Blackwell.

- Moreno Sandoval, C., Mojica, R. L., Montelongo, L. T., & Juárez, M. (2016). Ancestral knowledge systems. A conceptual framework for decolonizing research in social science. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, 12(1), 18-31. <https://doi.org/10.20507/AlterNative.2016.12.1.2>
- Morris, P. (2003). *The Bakhtin reader: Selected writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev and Voloshinov*. Arnold.
- Mpofu, W. J. (2021). Gukurahundi in Zimbabwe: An epistemicide and genocide, *Journal of Literary Studies*, 37(2), 40-55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02564718.2021.1923695>
- Mukherjee, K. (2019). Development through epistemicide: The case of indigo. *Social Change*, 49(4), 573–589. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0049085719873484>
- Otterstad, A. M. (2019). What might a feminist relational new materialist and affirmative critique generate in/with early childhood research? *Qualitative Inquiry*, 25(7), 641–651. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800418800760>
- Pankov, M., & Mihelj, S. (2011). Nationalism, gender and the multivocality of war discourse in television news. *Media, Culture & Society*, 33(7), 1043-1059. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443711415745>
- Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of power, Eurocentrism and Latin America. *International Sociology*, 15(2), 215-232. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580900015002005>
- Reedy, P. C., & King, D.R. (2019). Critical performativity in the field: Methodological principles for activist ethnographers. *Organizational Research Methods*, 22(2), 564-589. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428117744881>
- Rodman, M. C. (1992). Empowering place: Multilocality and multivocality. *American Anthropologist*, 94(3), 640-656. <https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1992.94.3.02a00060>
- Rosé, C. P., & Lund, K. (2013). Methodological pathways for avoiding pitfalls in multivocality. In D. D. Suthers, K. Lund, C. P. Rosé, C. Teplovs & N. Law (Eds.), *Productive multivocality in the analysis of group interactions* (pp. 613-637). Springer.
- Rule, P. (2011). Bakhtin and Freire: Dialogue, dialectic and boundary learning. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 43(9), 924-942. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-5812.2009.00606.x>
- Santos, Boaventura de Sousa (2005). 'General introduction.' In Boaventura de Sousa Santos (Ed.), *Democratizing democracy: Beyond the liberal democratic canon*, Vol. I of *Reinventing social emancipation. Toward new manifestos*, Verso, xvii-xxxiii.
- Santos, Boaventura de Sousa (2016). *Epistemologies of the south: Justice against epistemicide*. Routledge.
- Shukaitis, S., Graeber, D., & Biddle, E. (2007). *Constituent Imagination: Militant investigation, collective theorization*. AK Press.
- Sluka, J. A., & Robben, A. C. G. M. (2007). Fieldwork in cultural anthropology: An introduction. In J. A. Sluka & A. C. G. M. Robben (Eds.), *Ethnographic fieldwork. An anthropological reader* (pp. 1- 28). Blackwell Pub.
- Smith, T. L. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. Zed Books.
- Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 24-28). Macmillan.
- Spry, T. (2001). Performing autoethnography: An embodied methodological praxis. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 7(6), 706-732. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107780040100700605>
- Suthers, D. D., Lund, K., Rosé, C. P., & Teplovs, C. (2013). Achieving productive multivocality in the analysis of group interactions. In D. D. Suthers, K. Lund, C. P. Rosé, C. Teplovs, & N. Law (Eds.), *Productive multivocality in the analysis of group interactions* (pp. 577-612). Springer.
- Tillmann-Healy, L. (2003). Friendship as method. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 9(5), 729-749.

- <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800403254894>
- Tracy, S. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight “big-tent” criteria for excellent qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(10), 837–851. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800410383121>
- Tshaka, R. S. (2019). The advocacy for Africanity as justice against epistemicide. *Black Theology*, 17(2), 132-149. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14769948.2019.1627094>
- Uttal, L., & Frausto, L. R. (2021). Collecting immigrant voices to inform a participant-centered dialogical facilitation method. *Qualitative Social Work*, 20(5) 1393–1411. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1473325020968899>
- Van Marrewijk, A. H. (2017). The multivocality of symbols: A longitudinal study of the symbolic dimensions of the high-speed train megaproject (1995–2015). *Project Management Journal*, 48(6), 47–59. <https://doi.org/10.1177/875697281704800605>
- Van Milders, L. (2021). White hallucinations. *Postcolonial Studies*, 25(2), 175-191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13688790.2021.1938834>
- Wells, R., Barker, S., Boydell, K., Buus, N., Rhodes, P., & River, J. (2021). Dialogical inquiry: Multivocality and the interpretation of text. *Qualitative Research*, 21(4), 498-514. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794120934409>
- Wyatt, J., Gale, K., Russell, L., Pelias, R. J., & Spry, T. (2011). How writing touches. An intimate scholarly collaboration. *International Review of Qualitative Research*, 4(3), 253–278. <https://doi.org/10.1525/irqr.2011.4.3.253>
- Wylie, A. (2019). Crossing a threshold: Collaborative archaeology in global dialogue. *Archaeologies: Journal of the World Archaeological*, 15(3), 570-587. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11759-019-09385-4>

Author Note

I was Professor of Sociology at Autonomous Metropolitan University-Iztapalapa, Mexico for more than 30 years before retiring. I am currently affiliated to University of Tarapaca, Chile as associate professor. My bachelor’s degree was in Psychology, my Master’s in Rural Sociology, and my Doctorate in Political Science. I have taught Qualitative Methods and Social Sciences Epistemology for a long time. I have been a visiting professor at the International Institute for Qualitative Methodology, University of Alberta, Canada (2001-2003), in the CAQDAS Networking Project at University of Surrey, UK (2008) and Department of Philosophy and Social Sciences in the University of Augsburg, Germany (2015-2016). Nowadays I belong to Editorial Boards in journals as *Qualitative Sociology Review*, *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *Qualitative Health Research*, *International Review of Qualitative Research*, *Departures in Critical Qualitative Research*, among others. And I was the responsible editor for the Spanish version of *FQS (Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research)*, 2001-2016. Please direct correspondence to ccisnerosp@academicos.uta.cl.

Acknowledgements: The project was supported by UTA Mayor 3771-22 by University of Tarapacá, Chile.

Copyright 2022: César A. Cisneros-Puebla and Nova Southeastern University.

Article Citation

Cisneros-Puebla, C. A. (2022). Multivocality as practice of critical inquiry for social justice. *The Qualitative Report*, 27(8), 1529-1546. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2022.5507>
