Methodological Jigsaw: Out and in the Frames[1]

Yeraldine Aldana Gutiérrez
Universidad Distrital Francisco José de Caldas

Introduction

¿Quién eres? Who am I? These questions appeared in my life since secondary education due to situations I consider structural and symbolic violence too. These have inspired me to connect my life experiences to research. To introduce this chapter, I must explicitly acknowledge the life-driven positions from which this study has emerged and developed. I feel like a *mestiza* English language teacher educator who identifies as a bilingual woman and a resilient doctoral student (Aldana, 2020). This positioning has constituted an important source of knowledge inspired or derived from my life experiences to inform research or methodological decisions. This manuscript attempts to share and problematize them beyond *transmitting* these methodological and conceptual possible impossibilities (Aldana, 2021a).

Notwithstanding, research processes are sometimes presented as disconnected from our lives and ourselves; they may occur in our everyday life. Since I could understand it while studying for my Bachelor, I have developed a solid connection to the Universidad Distrital Francisco José de Caldas (UDFJC). In this second home, I learned how to do research differently from some instrumental stances I got familiar with in high school. I could hear others' voices about the qualitative approach beyond the scientific method and its tendency "to prove assertions and test hypotheses." These experiences constitute an important basis for the problematizing attitude regarding methodological decisions here.

Further doors opened in Applied Linguistics (AL) to inspire this reflexivity. One was in my Master's studies, where I realized again that instrumental viewpoints inside AL endured, but there were also possibilities to challenge them. Materials development, critical bilingualism viewpoints, and complexity in AL

---

1   This chapter derives from the research titled English teachers' experiences in peace construction: *turning their "little voices" up.*

were key integrated aspects of that research work. As part of another academic experience as an in-service teacher, I embarked on another journey in the Ph.D. where I focused my attention on Peace Construction (PC) from English Language Teaching (ELT). This decision materialized through articulating family situations related to direct Colombian conflict, the cost to pay when thinking and feeling alternatively (Aldana, 2021c)[2] in a violent version of our academy, and a project developed with preservice teachers about memory and PC from ELT.

Particularly, diverse links in the current research have been made from an informed eclectic attitude (Navarrete, 2009). I have decided to take in my epistemological positioning. Precisely, I refer to a decolonial stance with critical elements[3] in dialogue to avoid purist worldviews. These two complementary perspectives respond to instrumentalizing discourses that deny the possibility of being and doing from alternative manners to make sense of our realities, such as those dealing with the articulation between PC and ELT, as in this study. This suggests decoloniality constitutes multifaceted and dialogical possibilities, which imply diverse ways to vindicate the silenced voices of those in a nonbeing zone (Fanon, 2009). Critical perspectives can support this agency when addressing and challenging power uses and abuses in our societies. As long as we can address and relate to others in our research concerning their multiple humanity and life, this epistemological synergy is possible and socially just.

Both epistemological positionings allow us to connect PC and ELT as part of life rather than something aside from it. English teachers and students live and have multiple experiences in and behind them, even when diverse coloniality (Castro-Gómez & Grosfoguel, 2007) may make them invisible. Language possibilities, including English, mediate and are constitutive to humans' realities in terms of peace or violent experiences. The English language may serve the purposes of peace (Kruger, 2012) or even different types of violence (Galtung, 2016) through interpersonal relationships. This reflects a critical moment in AL where language is not only a linguistic communication system, and its teaching is not its mere transmission.

To weave methodological decisions otherwise in this research, I first contextualize the reader in terms of the research articulated in this methodological proposal. Secondly, I focus readers' attention on three learnings and knowledge from this methodological proposal, considering their particular components. Later, gaps in the methodological decisions appear based on this experience in

---

2   This idea was a key assumption for this methodological proposal from this research reflexivity in both the problematization and the first version of methodological tensions (pp. 2-3) of this study.

3   This epistemological positioning was discussed in Ph.D. class presentations, particularly a text about my epistemological positioning, consolidated in 2019-I.

the present study. They are discussed as an invitation to keep reshaping our methodological research decisions beyond the recipes-driven discourse.

I use a jigsaw puzzle metaphor to represent methodological decisions in this text. This new metaphor in this research may signify the challenging reflexivity of problematizing research methodology that has returned to teachers collaborating with this study and me our right to create knowledge. As part of my experiences in this Ph. D., that first submission about "methodological tensions in 2019" constituted relevant background for the present discussion, contributing to the field and displaying a self-transformation. Reflections on methodology during 2019 and their first written version are re-incorporated here.

The First Jigsaw Piece

To understand the thought and felt "how" behind this research or what we refer to as the "research methodology" in mainstream perspectives, we need to specify what this research looks into. Peace construction has been an issue in Colombia since about 50 years ago, and diverse institutions have tackled it, including the educational one, despite social leaders' forced disappearance, symbolically and physically speaking[4], among whom there are teachers, as some educators express and react to[5].

When problematizing the challenged link between PC and ELT, I noticed English language teachers might differently live peace construction through their proposals invisible by *modern peace frames* (Aldana, 2021b). These refer to an instrumental and objectifying manner to homogenize both PC and English teachers' knowledge, beings, and pedagogical practices (Aldana, 2021b; Fontan, 2013), perpetuated through diverse coloniality. Interactions with other English teachers who have developed proposals on that connection and the exploration of formal and informal documents have made that problem visible to me. This manifests through problematic facts I call amalgams –from my pedagogical discourses– that articulate theoretical and empirical referents. These, in turn, point to enactment and contestation by English language teachers who seem to be denied the possibility of existing outside modern peace discourses (*e.g.*, good practices for peace construction in the XXI century). More precisely, English teachers' experiences, when proposing PC in ELT, remain missing or positioned within a nonbeing zone (Fanon, 2009).

---

4   The mapping of Colombian leaders murdered: https://www.eltiempo.com/colombia/otras-ciudades/el-mapa-de-los-lideres-sociales-asesinados-en-colombia-184408

5   Teachers from the District demonstrations: https://www.dw.com/es/colombia-magisterio-protesta-contra-asesinatos-de-docentes-yl%C3%ADderes-sociales/a-52474239

Subsequently, a personal, academic, and geopolitical interest emerges through a research question as an inner movement, which springs from the problematization. This question appears as a fracturing concern and curiosity around English language teachers' invisibilized experiences throughout PC in ELT. Approaching it may allow other teachers participating here and me to "co-understand" how we have lived PC from and throughout pedagogical proposals, construction, sharing, and even development. It means this research, decolonial doing (Ortiz & Arias, 2019), or this personal and collective commitment would not follow a unidirectional extractivist procedure to collect information but a self and reciprocal effort to understand each other's experiences differently.

I will refer to other ideas underlying "English teachers' experiences" to deepen this proposal's interest. First, the concept about *English teachers'* does not suggest a homogenizing and even less an already known and defined concept, but a diverse social group whose members might not only constitute themselves as peace instructors but as something else through their experiences, including those that remain silent. These are complex and explain how English teachers may be more than a discipline. These teachers' experiences may involve thoughts and local knowledge, their bodies that embrace their emotions and spiritualities emerging throughout PC in ELT, among other phenomena we cannot even foresee. Suffering, tensions, struggles, fears, prayers, wishes, victories, frustrations, and other emotional and spiritual phenomena are part of what we can explore through "experiences" in the present research.

Jigsaw Pieces Together! But Some Are Missing...

Life is a jigsaw puzzle with most of the pieces missing

Anonymous

In this section, I discuss three learnings and insights from this research methodology as the product of epistemological (how may we relate to knowledge?) and ontological (who am I? Who is the other in this research?) reflexivity plus three underexplored methodological research topics derived and related to those learnings. Thus, I will draw on the first version of this methodological tensions chapter as constituting a preliminary ice-breaking scenario for this project to reflect and propose some contributions to the field concerning how to do research from decolonial positionings with critical elements inserted. Different

class presentations I did during 2019 in my doctoral studies, and especially that first written version of methodological tensions, constitute the background of the present chapter and honest thought felt during the process of connecting diverse methodological possibilities that allowed me to be epistemically and ontologically disobedient. These, in turn, represent both the participants' and my contributions to research methodology when constructing knowledge together by understanding each other's experiences from PC in ELT. Three learnings are explained and narrated as follows.

Initially, the first possible learning understands research as not only an extractivist exercise about hypotheses testing but a space for rethinking ourselves, beyond the canonical researcher as a knower "scientist" and the researched as an "object" under study within hierarchical and dichotomous relationships. This learning supports the idea that both those who develop research and participate in it are also humans who think and feel throughout the research while bringing those thoughts and feelings to these processes. The idea of reconfiguring a multilayered locus of enunciation in this study has let me reflect upon who the other and I are or decide to become based on our particular lives.

Thus, hegemonic objectifying frames in research, positioning us within fixed prescribed roles, could be revisited or complemented by other relational perspectives. Regarding them, teachers in this project and I could care for one another while being and interacting differently towards bidirectional comprehensions and sharing of experiences from PC in ELT. This was one of the most important contributions of the first version of this chapter, where I understood others and myself as humans who are concerned with one another even when doing research, as I deepened on later.

At this point, another idea about research derives from this first learning. Research may also be related to an interpersonal interest and care for one another as a possibly neglected ethical issue. This personal concern appeared as a non-instrumental decision in the first semester of 2019 when one teacher participating in this project expressed in one of our encounters that she was worried about my health due to my high stress levels. I realized it was not a comment to overlook in our conversation about her PC experiences. It inspired me to mark this "caring for the other" as a human being because interacting for not merely instrumental goals leads to a permanent rapport based on interpersonal *empathy*. Interaction for research purposes could revisit the cold extractivist communication processes supported by a consent form, symbolizing objective, trustworthy, and "good" research. As a possible alternative, these methodological decisions could embrace the warm and reciprocal concern we can feel throughout our research good living.

Based on the "mutual care as humans" in that first learning, this research has proposed and considered Vasilachis' (2009) distinction between the knowers and the known subjects to discuss the opportunity for researchers and participants to transform and play these roles without restriction. Reconceptualizing research triggers the idea that both English teachers participating in this project and I could play both roles simultaneously, keeping a horizontal and cooperative relationship to harvest data (experiences) as knowledge rather than mining them. During the presentations I developed in 2019 and the written background of this text, I have insisted on the possibility of sharing power in research through that dynamic roles-driven strategy but mainly supported by a transparent and humble attitude. Researchers could take off the supremacy and prestige-based role of superior thinkers to accept participants or known subjects and generate relevant knowledges to be recognized rather than simply and strategically used for the researcher's interests and benefits.

That is why I point out, as a contribution to this project and a second learning here, what I shared in 2019 and explained more within the first version of this chapter: the alternative of pursuing a kind of weaving and weaved methodology rather than a prescriptive one. For that purpose, the methodology concept in this learning is re-signified as a living process that can be transformed instead of an already formulated procedure through prescribed, static, or fixed decisions. On the contrary, it results from the dynamics and complexity of human life. The prefix –co before the verb from the general objective in this study suggests research as a collective and cooperative effort in double hermeneutics (Vasilachis, 2009) that could reinvent research processes. This means I do not aim at creating methodological universals to apply wherever and whoever with, but rather to allow some room for dialoguing reflexivities about research articulated to humans' lives.

I feel identified with the idea that research might constitute the practice and process designed for, from, and linked to life projects, as Puentes (2015) argues when referring to the "Buen Vivir" indigenous epistemological principle. Addressing English teachers' experiences, which involve situations where their voices have disappeared due to colonial mechanisms in multiple life scenarios, lets me advocate a re-humanizing methodology that does not necessarily center the human beings but supports an intersubjective dialogue. It would take place concerning what surrounds and across English teachers' real and concrete bodies intersected with other ways of existence (Walsh, 2015).

In this manner, extractivist practices can also be challenged, based on this second learning, through the cooperative effort for re-humanizing methodological decisions made together for possibly "non-dehumanizing" research (Ocaña *et al.*, 2018). This is why interaction possibilities in this proposal transform

throughout the development of this project with known subjects who have the right and capacities to express their perceptions and experiences not only about PC but also on the processes and procedures in this project, *e.g.*, they suggest interaction alternatives in each encounter; or they decide on the nicknames to identify themselves in this study, as I explained in the background of this chapter. Particularly, this learning and methodological decision emerged from interaction with some known subjects who seemed uncomfortable with instrumental and distant labels assigned to them in research and pedagogical contexts that place them within a passive possibility of existing. From that moment, we perceive how known subjects (English teachers collaborating here) also started contributing to these proposal methodological decisions as knowers.

Connecting the first and second learnings, constructing an ongoing methodology becomes consistent and relevant for cognitively and socially just research (Sousa, 2018). This seems attainable when transforming the possibly inherited attitudinal roots that place us within a peripheral area to be told how to be and do for fulfilling different actions, such as "research" in ELT. An alternative attitude seems to lead us to an –everlasting– epistemological reflexivity and evolving criticality as guides for selecting appropriate tools from the box (Vasilachis, 2009) and tackling what emerges throughout the research as a collective and acknowledged effort instead of a one-way advantageous process. In other words, I referred to a pair of learnings that entail an important assumption dealing with a transformed "how" behind qualitative research. This *how* may not constitute a prescribed set of instrumental decisions which are not even chosen by ourselves as possible teacher-researchers or educators, much as a recipe-driven inquiry discourse has been naturalized. In contrast, this project suggests a "how-who-why" attitude supporting the use of toolboxes towards the possibility of opening them and using "this sentence or that idea as a screwdriver or spanner to produce a short-circuit"[6] (Foucault, 1975, par. 16, as cited in Morris & Patton, 1979).

When I first accounted for that alive and less rigid methodology, I wrote about these decisions and tensions from toolboxes taken from "a field of possible uncertainties"[7] I enjoy being in nowadays. This is because re-locating myself within the bricoleur role and sharing power in research with English teachers collaborating in this study makes me feel peace of mind. A more horizontal

....

6   This is the translation of the direct text: Si les gens veulent bien ouvrir les, se servir de telle phrase, telle idée, telle analyze comme d"un tournevis ou d 'un desserre-boulon pour court-circuiter…

7   In the first methodological tensions chapter, pages 10-12 explain what I referred to when proposing *uncertainties* in methodological decisions as part of the most relevant contribution, enriched by known subjects and knowers.

(heterarchical) relationship became a target since power might not be the problem in social scenarios that present inequalities (from everyday life, such as the academic ones, and then in research processes), but how we use it. An important assumption behind it is the resignification of the word: "participants" as knowers and known subjects whose active and relational role within this research supports our suspicious minds to address and approach our worlds and ourselves there. Hence, these uncertainties inside methodological decisions are neither complete nor universal. Each particular research study can differently transform and contribute to them in an effort beyond the instrumental recipes-driven discourse, which resembles more a fill-in-the-gaps procedure that places teachers within a passive role.

In this field of uncertainties, we can consider and acknowledge what we have learned about research methodology by putting it into an informed and eclectic (Navarrete, 2009) rather than a capricious dialogue with alternative perspectives. This means a field of uncertainties is not grounded in an exclusionary and denying basis but a pluriverse where resignifying certain taken-for-granted methodological concepts and options seems possible. This is even more likely when we can articulate our research methodologies to a "how-who-why" attitude and account for it from our personal and lived transformation in our beings. Hence, methodological decisions in uncertainties can remain due to the political dimension involved. Therefore, the field of uncertainties does not imply a denial of our previous selves, but a connection between them and our renewed and re-oxygenated bodies with the learned, unlearned, and relearned knowledges resignified.

Even when the qualitative, inductive, and interpretive approach as defined by mainstream authors in educational research may have an impact on how I understand this proposal methodology from a qualitative lens, interactions with known subjects and knowers have inspired me to problematize the white colonizing dimensions of it, mainly directed towards a naturalized rational methodology, as asserted by Ortiz and Arias (2019). There, canonical hierarchies and distance between subject-objects remain[8]. In so doing, I have reflected upon ontological and ethical assumptions behind this research proposal to possibly respond to hybrid realities where English teachers' complex experiences occur and may contribute to collectively created procedures or processes for interacting within a relational possibility.

In this project, I would like to re-signify the qualitative interpretive approach as an "intuitive methodology otherwise", which can be constructed and

---

8   This is inspired by the background version of this chapter and directly taken from the project paper (p. 13-14).

reconstructed in the development of the study through intersubjective dialogues. Considering Walsh (2015), Ocaña *et al.* (2018), and my beliefs as a mestiza teacher-researcher, it is possible to think about research from a *different* locus where interactions with English teachers as known subjects and knowers may not only produce knowledge to approach research questions but also the path to arrive at them. This interest does not look for denial of what has been done so far in research theory, but one epistemological and ontological assumption about possibilities of doing and sounding differently when approaching invisible experiences. Here, I bet on an ongoing methodology to guide interactions with others as human beings. Prescribed fixed decisions are not part of the plan because they transform while developing our interactions, according to how, what, and why we particularly want to re-signify our experiences. This implies integrated epistemological and ontological assumptions about creating a methodological proposal transformed throughout the process and consolidated inductively at the end of this project.

On the other hand, a third broad learning also comes from the permanent reflexivity behind the construction of this project, and it challenges the communication alternatives privileged by the modern paradigm, even for research purposes. Despite the natural and human worlds being linked together, mirroring several communication practices and options, the modern literate white man only attributes high value to the alphanumerical signs. That can be illustrated through books, articles, and even academic presentations, at least in the ELT field, which rely on the linguistic sign as the naturalized possibility to propose and share research. The linguistic movement has colonized the multiple options to (re)signify the world so that images are sometimes considered noisy data in academic journals and event presentations, as three participants of this project and I have experienced. It may reflect a subtle reminder of the ELT field of colonialism where the drawn and body images to signify the world and our experiences seem drastically replaced by letters and later printed ones.

With this, I am not referring to a radical position from which we should only employ or consider one or the other communication possibility to interact with others in inquiry. In contrast, I value the linguistic option and visual or other communication alternatives in research. Becoming sensitive to the everlasting possibilities to signify and re-signify teachers' and my experiences in PC from ELT has constituted an important part of this learning. This is because a complementary relationship among multiple and diverse modes of communication seems to represent other types of interaction to harvest data as knowledges springs from our experiences in the form of collective and uncertain multimodal constructions (Kress, 2010).

Precisely, when thinking about interactions with others as known subjects and knowers from the problematization stage, language constituted something more than the code per se, and thus it gets broader to include any resource for producing and reproducing those various types of worlds (Vasilachis, 2009) humans live in and create. More room for "another" (Mignolo, 2003, p. 217) modes of signifying them in research deserves attention, as proposed in this project. These possibly ignored language resources for interacting with the other in research include colors, shapes, movements, (re)location of material objects, sounds, images in photos, pictures or drawings, and various additional semiotic resources that may constitute what we can identify as multimodality (Kress, 2010). This one in turn also extends to the articulation between signs, societies, and people with political and sociocultural positions that allow them to re-signify their realities within particular social and cultural contexts, as part of social semiotics (Kress, 2010).

This suggests and urges us to rethink the text concept as one that involves a myriad of signs integrated without friction or constraint to re-signify our lifeworld experiences. Uncertain methodological decisions related to interaction possibilities in this research may employ and acknowledge these (social) semiotic convergences that could respond to our co-understanding, as stated in the general aim of this project, from an intersubjective basis.

Additionally, since this methodological field of uncertainties involved teachers' experiences in PC from ELT pedagogical proposals as a focus for interacting, teachers collaborating and I have shared them by showing resources already developed in our pedagogical proposals or even drawing on additional supporting tools to re-elaborate meanings and complement our interactions as interlocutors. Those resources could overlap or differ from those mentioned above as long as we find it relevant to communicate our questions, answers, doubts, silences, suggestions, and reactions... In this manner, these interactions are not reduced to alphanumerical possibilities. Still, they open the floor for diverse modes of communication that can be selected both before each interaction or in situ.

The first time I presented methodological ideas about solving that collective interest behind the research objective in October of 2019, I referred to a methodological tension in using multimodal interviews or multimodal narratives. Nevertheless, evolving criticality afterward made me realize that methodological decisions do not correspond to that black-and-white attitude. Therefore, I returned to the interactions with teachers collaborating in this study during the problematization, while also exploring how other English teachers have proposed their methodological decisions in research about PC in ELT. As a result, a *field of uncertainties* in the background of this text emerged as a proposal to

illustrate both a possible way of devising interactional strategies to build up a rapport with other humans and an inner state of thoughts and feelings to construct knowledges. Considering some ideas from all the previous sources to juggle them allowed me to experience an out-and-in[9] the frames move in this field of uncertainties and weave this project's interaction possibilities to relate to each other while co-understanding our experiences.

Keeping the narrative tone in this chapter, it was in the first semester of 2020[10] in my Ph.D. studies that another idea emerged from the field of uncertainties to refer to and continue the construction of this everlasting or ongoing methodology. It was another way to talk about that interaction between the teachers collaborating here and me that could be characterized by the multimodal tenet above. Since reciprocal rapport and human contact suggest interpersonal interactions, the concept of *encounters* emerged in this study as a tool from the available boxes. This one allowed me to link and reflect on the how-who-why regarding the where and when to interact with the other known subjects and knowers in this study. Through encounters, interpersonal contact with known subjects and knowers could be explained and devised concerning "the 'with whom' and 'from where' questions that bring to the fore the importance of relationality" (Walsh, 2015, p. 16).

Pursuing the social link or liaison in its diverse manifestations seems a deep and robust move for interacting. This means social contact and rapport with real humans inside social and cultural encounters, as discussed in ELT literature, may constitute an inner force that urges people to interact. This suggests communication in research processes does not necessarily equal rapport between humans. Therefore, I started considering the interaction with known subjects and knowers as a social or human contact when we encounter. As it occurs in humans' everyday life, encounters in this project can be supported by multiple communication media and language use in analogous or virtual scenarios, or even both. At this point, *encounters* as a methodological possibility let me account for an alternative resource to harvest data and generate knowledge from experiences, keeping a relational connection with the uncertain nature of EL teachers' lives.

The concept of *encounter* appears in different sources within critical and decolonial perspectives. On the one hand, critical encounters appear as "both a live dialogue and a confrontation that we can carry out a posteriori" (Genel &

---

9   This is the title of the first written version and then the background of this chapter.

10   On February 26th, I presented a transformed locus, a restated interest in experiences, and some methodological assumptions in which other layers were recognized. On April 22nd, the first version of the overall research project with this methodological proposal was also devised.

Deranty, 2016, p. 18). Thus, dialoguing may involve both continuities and discontinuities to produce diverse types of knowledge. On the other hand, Castro-Gómez and Grosfoguel (2007), based on Levinas, suggest that encounters with others may allow our subjectivities to shape and reshape. Subsequently, encounters can be described as political scenarios where political positions emerge since unequally constituted knowledge(s) and wisdoms meet, concur, and interact. In any case, generating familiar and affectively comfortable encounters for known subjects and knowers to express our experiences is key.

Another aspect to complement the idea that encounters could be characterized by being multimodal in previous paragraphs involves the bilingual use of language during these interactions. Interestingly, conversations with participants as known subjects and knowers throughout the problematization let me identify the importance they attributed to both English and Spanish when referring to their experiences in PC from ELT. This situation shed light on both bilingual and even plurilingual potentialities to acknowledge, as part of these *multimodal encounters*, where teachers as known subjects and knowers also constitute themselves using the language they choose to express themselves. Using those languages and others are also welcomed due to the multimodal dimension of encounters because languages represent social and semiotic resources. Consequently, multimodal encounters involve and recognize bilingual practices performed throughout them in which the linguistic sign is relevant, but not the only one to (re)signify our experiences, as also highlighted in the background of this updated version.

From this research proposal, re-signifying and complementing methodological possibilities and perspectives from multiple toolboxes may constitute another important contribution that connects the three learnings here, from integrating decolonial and critical perspectives. These permanent and everlasting co-constructed methodological decisions with known subjects and knowers are the product of epistemological and ontological reflexivity (Vasilachis, 2009). These choices may respond alternatively to a recipes-driven discourse inside colonial research methodology. The field of uncertainties constitutes a decolonizing space that allows us to propose alternatives. An expectation in this project is thus to achieve a solid methodological position and initiative inductively created until the end of this project, but constituting just one of the multiple options to devise in the field of uncertainties. This jigsaw puzzle is partially finished because other pieces remain hidden in unexpected places while others still need to be designed.

Some Hidden Jigsaw Pieces

An everlasting move in and out of the frames for devising alternatives from a field of uncertainties to a prescribed methodology constitutes a missing piece in

the ELT area. Although there are proposals within the qualitative approach from the critical stances that have attempted to challenge a modern understanding of research, I consider the decolonial project on a *multiple and plural how* is as relevant as still unexplored. This seems an important gap, but I would like to warn explicitly about something: uncertainties, as supported by toolboxes, are created according to the problematization, and they may constitute neither a trendy methodological perspective nor a universal, radical, or rejecting the proposal in regards to what has been done in mainstream research theory. The honest employment of relevant tools from the boxes will make us use and juggle one resource and the other from mainstream or alternative options that will probably allow us to understand an incipient exploration of the uncertainties field as a pluriversal methodological project.

Furthermore, based on my experience, I consider more research is still required about ethical issues in inquiry. Various reflexivity I did during both semesters of 2019 in the Ph.D. was about this methodological proposal. This was re-humanizing for me because I had struggled with methodological rigidity all my life, even in those related to ethical issues that should go beyond the administration of consent forms. I felt incomplete and in debt with people collaborating in my previous research experiences, when only considering ethics in those terms. If others participating in our studies are not precisely manipulable objects from whom we can only extract information, we could propose and devise different options to both approach them to construct pieces of knowledge together during the development of the study and acknowledge their contribution to it, rather than invisibilizing them at the end of the project and get the credit for all what they also contributed to.

What if we revisit procedures and conceptualizations inside utilitarian ethics more concerned with a personal individual benefit at the expense of *disappeared others*? From this project, I proposed in the background of this text inspired by known subjects and knowers that the possibility to explore relational ethics towards the care for one another would contribute to this missing piece. However, there is still much work to do for comprehending it.

Simultaneously, a decision in construction now has to do with the processes and strategies we could include here for knowledges interpretation in decolonial stances integrated into critical ones. Since there is a different way to problematize our realities and co-construct derived knowledges grounded in our interactions with teachers collaborating in this study (multimodal encounters), a new concern on how to make sense of co-constructed knowledges has emerged. To tackle it, we are pursuing a similar horizontality to that one achieved in co-constructing knowledges (data). In this manner, we are pursuing relevance and respect for

each other's voices more than validating rigid theoretical perspectives. At this point, not only one approach to "data analysis" has been considered, but perhaps a combination of different tools or resources, once again, as bricoleurs. Specifically, grounded theory and narrative analysis could support our emerging knowledges interpretation approach.

Lastly, another topic to continue involving refers to the connection between the locus of enunciation and the epistemological positioning of those who do research and their inquiry. Albeit some professors recognize researchers' loci and epistemologies as political decisions from which they develop their work, I consider that a neglected methodological topic in research theory and work is the explicit concern with an ontological, epistemological, and thus experiential background in researchers that transcends their inquiry. Instrumental methodologies may set aside or avoid this discussion for considering our loci and epistemological positioning as a possible bias for research, even when they could connect studies to teacher-researchers beings beyond the common and, at times, only external contextualization of research action.

Concluding to Start

Previous pieces of this jigsaw puzzle already assembled support this research development. Methodologically speaking, they refer to the components of this research we discussed in the first part of this manuscript. Constructing peace and ELT has also served as a dialogical and reflective space to problematize methodological decisions. Horizontal and dynamic possibilities to develop communication and interpersonal strategies toward rapport have chiefly guided this methodological proposal. This one, in turn, is particularly described in the jigsaw puzzle pieces together section. As this is an everlasting or ongoing methodological proposal, some missing pieces remain to articulate. Some are discussed here; however, they are neither the only ones, and even less were nor they found and selected –as dominant research suggests–. Contrastively, we can create, weave, harvest, or construct them. As educators and researchers, this means we can create conceptual and methodological proposals within our inquiry.

References

Aldana, Y. (2020, November 4-5). Peace construction in ELT as a resilient doctoral student: a pleasing metamorphosis [Guest speaker]. 3rd *Training Research Meeting and Seedbeds,* Universidad Minuto de Dios.

Aldana-Gutiérrez, Y. (2021a). Possible Impossibilities of Peace Construction in ELT: Profiling the Field. *HOW Journal, 28*(1), 141-162. https://doi.org/10.19183/how.28.1.585

Aldana-Gutiérrez, Y. (2021b). English teachers' sites in the Diverse lands of Peace. In H. Castañeda-Peña, CH Guerrero-Nieto and P. Méndez-Rivera. *ELT Local Research Agendas II*, 75-102. Universidad Distrital Francisco José de Caldas.

Aldana-Gutiérrez, Y. (2021c). Una lectura otra sobre la construcción de paz en la enseñanza del inglés. *Análisis, 53*(98), 1-40. https://doi.org/10.15332/21459169.6300

Castro-Gómez, S., & Grosfoguel, R. (Eds). (2007). Prologue. The Decolonial Turn. Critical Theory and Heterarquical Thought. In *The Decolonial Turn. Reflections for an Epistemic Diversity beyond Global Capitalism*, 9-23. Century of Man Publishers.

Fontan, V. (2013). *Descolonización de la paz*. Pontificia Universidad Javeriana.

Galtung, J. (2016). *Violence, cultural, structural, and direct*. Strategy Notebooks, 183, 147-168Fanon, F. (2009). *Black skin, white masks*. Akal Editions.

Genel, K., & Deranty, J. (2016). *Recognition or Disagreement: A Critical Encounter on the Politics of Freedom, Equality, and Identity*. Columbia University Press.

Kress, G. (2010). *Multimodality: A social semiotic approach to contemporary communication*. Routledge.

Kruger, F. (2012). The role of TESOL in educating for peace. *Journal of Peace Education, 9*(1), 17-30. https://doi.org/10.1080/17400201.2011.623769

Mignolo, W. (2003). *Local stories / global designs. Coloniality, subaltern knowledge, and border thinking*. Akal Editions.

Navarrete, Z. (2009). Eclecticism in the social sciences. The case of Political Discourse Analysis. In R. Soriano & M. Ávalos (Eds.), *Political Analysis of Discourse: Intellectual Devices in Social Research* (pp. 139-151). Plaza and Valdés editors.

Ortiz, A, & Arias, M. I. (2019). Do decolonial: disobey the research methodology. *Findings, 16*(31), 147-166. https://doi.org/10.15332/s1794-3841.2019.0031.06

Ortiz-Ocaña, A., Arias-López, M., & Conedo, Z. (2018). Other methodology in social, human, and educational research. Decolonial doing is a decolonized process. *FAIA, 7*(30), 173-200.

Sousa, B. (2018). *The end of the cognitive empire. The coming of age of epistemologies of the South*. Duke University Press.

Vasilachis, I. (2009). Los fundamentos ontológicos y epistemológicos de la investigación cualitativa. *Forum Qualitative Social Research (FQSR), 10*(2), 1-25. https://ri.conicet.gov.ar/handle/11336/112261

Walsh, C. (2015). Decolonial pedagogies walking and asking. Notes to Paulo Freire from AbyaYala, *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 34*(1), 9-21, https://doi.org/ 10.1080/02601370.2014.991522