

Making More Liveable Worlds Beyond Academia: Reflexivity in Collaborative Research Practice

Camilo Castillo

Introduction

On a cold Saturday morning in May 2024, together with some friends, I attended a meeting of the Sindicato de Trabajadores Agrícolas de Sumapaz (henceforth Sintrapaz), a *campesino* (smallholder farmers) organization from the Sumapaz Region, located in the Andean mountains south of Bogotá, the capital of Colombia. That day, we were returning our theses to the organization, a commitment that we had made when my friends and I began our research projects back in 2018. That day was special for us, because for the first time we could share some of our research reflections with some of the people that made it possible. In the years before, we were collaborating with *campesino* communities in Sumapaz through our research projects.

In my case, my research studied the tensions and conflicts between *campesino* communities and public authorities generated by the conservation of the Sumapaz *páramo* (Castillo 2023). Located in the high mountains of the northern Andes, *páramos* have been considered as an ‘strategic ecosystem’ by the Colombian government because of their role in the water cycle. For the life sciences, *páramos* are also unique places that sustain a vast biodiversity (Hofstede et al 2003; Cleef et al 2008), which makes them an important biodiversity hotspot in the world (Madrinán et al 2013). Sumapaz *páramo* is one of the more than 30 *páramos* that exist in Colombia according to the environmental authorities in the country (Morales-Rivas et al 2007; Sarmiento Pinzón et al 2013). Besides, Sumapaz was also one of the epicentres of the origins and development of the Colombian armed conflict in the 20th century (Comisión de la Verdad Colombia 2022).

But despite their undisputed importance for human and nonhuman lives, the conservation of *páramos* have proved to be a very conflictive matter for *campesino* communities. When the Colombian government decided to demarcate *páramos* through maps in order to enforce prohibitions on ‘human activities’ within their limits (Republic of Colombia 2010), a profound conflict with different communities inhabiting *páramos* in Colombia emerged. Previous research on *páramos* conservation in Colombia has analysed the authoritarian conservation scheme organized by the Colombian state with the demarcation of *páramos* (Ungar 2021). So, it is not surprising that the ‘demarcation of *páramos*’ has found resistance from diverse communities living in those places all over the country (Parra Romero 2019; Blake et al 2023).

In the case of Sumapaz, *campesino* communities sued the Colombian Ministry of Environment, since the demarcation of the *páramo* in Sumapaz did not involve any participation from them. A court decision backed the *campesino* demand and since 2019 the Colombian government is making a new demarcation of the *páramo*, which must be made with the participation of *campesino* communities (Rama Judicial de Colombia 2019). In the middle of that dispute, I was allowed by *campesino* communities in Sumapaz to conduct my research in their lands under the commitment of not only sharing my research outputs, but also of collaborating with them in defending their presence in their lands located in what the Colombian government demarcated as a *páramo* area in 2017 (Colombian Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development 2017).

This chapter aims to analyse that collaboration process with *campesino* communities. It highlights the practical importance of reflexivity as the means to navigate the sociomaterial process that makes collaboration possible. It also shows how reflexivity allows to understand the making of collaboration as a process that reveals the dynamic multiplicity of the positions that enable researchers to act in the task of making more liveable worlds. In other words, doing research involves adopting various roles based on the relationships we establish. The way these relationships are assembled in practice, along with our participation in that process, significantly shapes how academic research transforms our positionality as researchers.

Drawing upon my experience researching *páramos* conservation in Colombia and my collaboration with *campesino* communities, the remainder of this chapter empirically explores the relationships between reflexivity, collaboration and making more liveable worlds. In the following section, I show how reflexivity helped me to understand how collaborative research involves a transformative process that reconfigures both the researcher’s position and her capacities to act with others. Then, the second section examines the formation of a collective to situate reflexivity as a back-and-forth process when researchers work in collaborative relationships with collectives beyond academia. Finally, in the conclusion, I present a resituated

version of reflexivity in the context of collaborative research where the question of making more liveable worlds becomes central for researchers.

Collaborative research and shifting positions

The conservation of a place like the *páramo*, which supports the vital processes of multiple forms of life, seems in principle a desirable plan for building more liveable worlds. However, the presence of *campesinos* in *páramos* made visible for environmentalists, public officers and local authorities the contradictions of conservation when it does not address the presence of people.

For *campesino* communities in Sumapaz, the recognition of their presence in the *páramo* by the Colombian government was necessary for defending their lands and their modes of living. That was the expectation that Sintrapaz, the *campesino* organization mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, had when accepting researchers in their lands back in 2020:

I met the president of Sintrapaz in the same restaurant where I had lunch the first day I arrived in San Juan de Sumapaz. When I told him that I was planning to conduct a research about the conservation of the *páramo* and its consequences to the *campesino* lives, he told me that this was a topic that could help them [*campesinos* and Sintrapaz], because the current situation in Sumapaz was going to ‘deepen the environmental conflicts in the region’. (Field journal)

This brief encounter with the Sintrapaz president preceded my first meeting with the assembly the day after. In the same schoolroom where years later I returned my thesis, I presented the project. There, one of the attendees remarked again how ‘conflictive’ was the conservation of the *páramo* in Sumapaz. This problematization of *páramos* conservation by *campesinos* was crucial for getting the approval from Sintrapaz to conduct my research there. That day I reached an agreement with Sintrapaz, which consisted of working with them to critically study the conservation of the *páramo*.

A first mechanism to do it was by attending the meetings organized by the ‘Research Commission’, which was the commission from Sintrapaz responsible for ensuring that researchers like me kept in touch with the organization. These meetings were held from June to August 2020 and, together with other researchers and members of Sintrapaz, we had the chance to discuss the consequences of future policies designed for Sumapaz by the municipal and national authorities.

Since the first meeting, my role as researcher began a transformation. Now, I was mobilized by Sintrapaz representatives as a potential ally that could redescribe topics of relevance for *campesinos* such as, for example, the conservation of *páramos*. Besides, the meeting was also the occasion for

Sintrapaz to highlight our political role as researchers, because according to Sintrapaz members, we as researchers had the potential to articulate our projects to the ‘political processes’ happening in the region. These processes referred to the different activities through which *campesinos* in Sumapaz were strengthening their organizations so they could defend themselves collectively in matters such as the conservation of the *páramo*.

These first steps in engaging with *campesino* organizations from Sumapaz offer an opportunity to think about how reflexivity helped me to navigate across the shifting positions of my role as researcher. First, reflexivity is what enabled me as researcher to recognize key moments in research where other actors, like *campesinos* in this case, were also participating in shaping the concerns of my project. Second, reflexivity made me realize that collaboration is a process where the role and positionality of the researcher is socially negotiated with those with whom we work in our research. Third, reflexivity was the way to be attentive that in order to collaborate with communities like *campesinos* from Sumapaz, it was necessary to ‘articulate’ new relationships so a research project could align with collective concerns such as those of *campesinos* in the Sumapaz *páramo*. Overall, reflexivity became in this project a sensitivity to navigate the relationships and conditions that shaped the relationships I formed with *campesinos* and their organizations. As I will later show, that opens the way for reflexivity to engage with the task of making more liveable worlds.

The conditions for researchers like me to collaborate with *campesinos* were then paved by the situations, like, for example, those meetings, where the

Figure 10.1: *Campesino* house in the *páramo*



attributes and potential actions of us as ‘researchers’ were configured. In this way, the normativity of my collaboration with *campesinos* depended more on those practical circumstances establishing the conditions for collaboration and my role on it, rather than on abstract and idealized notions of collaboration distant from its practical making or from fixed positionalities.

Here, I coincide with Penkler (Chapter 5, this volume) when he argues that through research, we make novel forms of attachments that we make available to the world, which allows us to emerge as researcher subjects. I would add that when those attachments take the form of ‘collaboration’, we become part of relationships where the multiple positions of the researcher subject are more evident. In my case, by establishing a collaboration with Sintrapaz, my position as researcher was also defined by being a ‘potential ally’ and by the expectation from *campesinos* of contributing to the ‘political processes’ taking place in Sumapaz.

When reflexivity attends to the conditions through which we sustain the relationships that make research possible, it becomes more evident that as researchers we do not occupy a single position. In fact, positionality reveals itself as mobile and fluid (Mol and Law 1994), instead of static and fixed. This means that ‘positionality’ is not, at least in collaborative projects, the source for reflexivity, because ‘positions’ are not immediate and given. Positions then, are reflexively achieved, that is, through the relationships that make possible a research project. This consideration invites us to think of reflexivity as mediated by the negotiations and commitments reached with the communities that we work with.

This consideration makes it necessary to respecify previous questions around reflexivity as the active concern with one’s own production of knowledge (Ashmore 1994), because in collaborative research, exploring the consequences of challenging the assumption of the analyst’s (privileged) position (Woolgar 1991) has renewed implications. In the scenario of collaborative research with communities like *campesinos* in Sumapaz, reflexivity works as a sensitivity to understand what happens with our research practices (and ourselves) when engaging in collaborative relationships. For example, collaboration was a condition for making possible my research with *campesinos*, so it emerged as part of my fieldwork configuration. It would not have been possible for me to learn from *campesinos*’ worlds in the *páramo* without the commitment to help them in their struggle with conservation. In that way, becoming a collaborator for *campesinos* was the condition for me to become a researcher of *páramos* conservation.

However, that involved a negotiation in which I was expected by *campesino* organizations to attend political meetings, be part of *campesino* discussions about the conservation of the *páramo* and participate in dialogues with public authorities. This created a discontinuity between my research project and my research role with *campesinos*. By this, I mean that, for *campesinos*, my

collaborative role was restricted to be present in already-made places, rather than creating new ones where my research could contribute to collaboratively find new understandings that *campesino* organizations could appropriate and mobilize in their discussions with public authorities. In other words, although *campesinos* knew that I was doing academic research, for them my position as a collaborator was more important. But it is important to clarify that both positions were not necessarily separated in the view of *campesinos*. They often introduced me to other people or in meetings as a ‘researcher’, however, that position depended on being a collaborator. This could suggest that reflexivity is a way to disentangle the multiple positions that coexist in a collaborative project. Most importantly, reflexivity helps to situate the occasions when certain positions gain more importance than others, without implying that they are fractured or separated.

In that way, my position(s) as researcher were shaped by the collaborative relationships that allowed me to work and think about the conservation of the *páramo* with *campesinos* in Sumapaz. But calling these relationships ‘collaboration’ is not necessarily done with representational purposes or with the aim to describe my particular experience as pertaining to the genre of ethnographic collaboration (Rappaport 2008). Collaboration, here, was more a way to negotiate and build relationships and the researcher’s positions with *campesinos* through my research.

So, reflexivity in collaborative research is important for researchers to trace the connections and new possibilities of action with others beyond academia. In the case of *campesino* organizations in Sumapaz, collaboration with researchers was crucial for them to find new allies that could work with them in their struggle regarding conservation. Here, reflexivity worked in my research to respecify the task of creating more liveable worlds. Because when that task is resituated through collaborative work with communities like *campesinos*, then making more liveable worlds becomes a collective activity that happens beyond academia. For that reason, the activities involved in the formation of the collectives where the task of making liveable worlds is assembled are particularly interesting. They provide the opportunity to situate how research roles and positions are shaped as collectives are formed. In the following section, I spell out how reflexivity helps to navigate the formation of a collective so research positions can be connected with making more liveable worlds.

Reflexivity as a back-and-forth process within collectives

In 2019, after several meetings, *campesinos* from Sumapaz decided to create the ‘Coordinadora Campesina Regional of Sumapaz’ (henceforth Coordinadora Campesina), a regional organization that reunited 48 *campesino* organizations

from Sumapaz and other allied organizations from Bogotá (Coordinadora Campesina de Sumapaz 2019). Its aim was to create a meeting place where organizations that were previously dispersed could now act together against the Colombian Ministry of Environment in their struggle with the conservation of the Sumapaz *páramo*. It was from the Coordinadora Campesina that the assembling of a new *páramo* and conservation in Sumapaz began.

Such a task involved the creation of a collective, that is, the project of assembling new entities and forms of sociality not yet gathered (Latour 2005). It is worth noting that these collectives are more than social, in the sense that they engage both with the human and nonhuman world to generate new spaces of alternative and autonomous existence (Papadopoulos 2018). This is important to take into account, because creating more liveable worlds is a very practical and material activity. Throughout the Coordinadora Campesina, *campesinos* were able, together with other allies including researchers like me, to intervene in the politics of *páramos* conservation in Sumapaz (Castillo 2023).

The main meeting scenarios for the Coordinadora Campesina were the assemblies. They are collective events and occasions where people meet in the same place to discuss and decide over a variety of matters of collective concern. One of the organizations participating in the Coordinadora Campesina was the Research Group on Agrarian and Campesino Studies from Sumapaz (henceforth Research Group). Despite its apparently academic name, the Research Group was not affiliated with any university or educational institution. On the contrary, it was an initiative led by independent researchers and militants from different political organizations. Its aim was to support *campesino* organizations in Sumapaz through the production of knowledge with the expectation of fuelling future debates and the decision-making processes that were taking place within the Coordinadora Campesina.

I mention this organization because, in October 2020, I was invited to be part of it by one of its founders, who was also a member of Sintrapaz. This invitation did not come as a surprise to me, as I was already actively working with Sintrapaz in the meetings mentioned in the previous section. Besides, I was also a regular attendant of the meetings of the Coordinadora Campesina, so I was already familiar with its decision-making process. I wrote the following in my field journal after the first assembly that I attended as a member of the Research Group:

We were in front of an audience of at least 70 *campesinos*, on the previous days we had already arranged our participation in the assembly with the Coordinadora Campesina's Secretary. When it was my turn to introduce myself, I said that I was a member of the Research Group

and that our commitment with the Coordinadora Campesina was to support its discussions and debates from our academic experience. Besides, we also mentioned that our research would be informed by *campesinos'* concerns and preoccupations, so we were basically willing to collaborate with anything that we might help the Coordinadora Campesina. (Coordinadora Campesina Assembly, 28 November 2020, field journal)

That was one of the moments that crystallized the 'we' that my other friends from the Research Group and I were constituting together with the Coordinadora Campesina. From there, my research began to take place in the activities and spaces where collective issues were raised and decisions made (Rappaport 2020). This involved the process of helping in the organization of meetings, writing reports, discussing with public authorities along with *campesinos* and more. My position as researcher also changed for *campesinos* and the Coordinadora Campesina. It became more flexible, since now I was giving reports in the meetings, partaking in discussions and having responsibilities more related to the Coordinadora Campesina than with my research project. Those activities of course shaped my research concerns, but how that happened is a topic that exceeds the purpose of this chapter.

Here, again, reflexivity invites us to think about and navigate the multiple positions that researchers generate in collaborative projects. In the first place, I was producing research about the ontological politics of conservation in Sumapaz. Second, I was a member of the Research Group and, third, I was collaborating with the Coordinadora Campesina. These three positions had different concerns, which of course were not in opposite directions. However, they were not identical, and they were not at play simultaneously everywhere. For example, within the Research Group we had our own views that some *campesinos* and other organizations did not share in the same way. In the Research Group we believed that most of the environmental policy designed for Sumapaz was bad for *campesinos*, whereas other organizations had fewer reservations about environmental policies.

At that point, I realized that becoming a collaborator and member of the Research Group made me also part of the politics of *campesino* organizations in Sumapaz. That meant, to me, that I could no longer work with some organizations in Sumapaz because their members knew that I was part of one organization, so my interests were not perceived as exclusively academic. My collaboration with the Research Group positioned me in a wider arena of political differences and made me more aware of them. In the long term, that limited my ability to learn from other organizations that did not necessarily coincide with the same views that the Research Group had. But at the same time, that created more affinity between me and other *campesinos* and organizations that shared similar views with the Research Group.

So, being a collaborator established a more fluid set of positions and priorities as researcher. There were periods in which I was more active discussing with my friends from the Research Group about an upcoming Coordinadora Campesina meeting, which meant that I was not dedicated in the same way to analysing data or reviewing literature. There were moments, in turn, when I was so absorbed in my thesis writing that I could not join very interesting meetings of the Coordinadora Campesina. Collaboration, then, did not follow a singular trajectory in which all my research positions could be harmonized and accommodated. Sometimes collaboration meant making huge efforts to support the Research Group or the Coordinadora and, sometimes, it meant spending less time with my collaborators to turn those experiences into academic knowledge such as this book chapter.

Coming back to the Coordinadora Campesina, I mentioned earlier that as a collective it was engaged in the project of assembling a different conservation of *páramos* in Sumapaz. So the collective, rather than being devoted to producing more ‘accurate’ representations of the *páramo* and conservation, was engaged with a movement of ontology (Papadopoulos 2018) to reconfigure conservation and the *páramo* altogether. Such an effort could be only sustained by the formation of a collective where this ontological move could be put into practice. For doing so, material activities such as planning legal actions, designing flyers, writing reports, discussing issues, keeping communication with public authorities and others were necessary for the Coordinadora Campesina to maintain the existence of the collective (examples can be found on the website).

The traditional problems addressed by reflexivity were quite different when engaging in collaborations with a collective such as the Coordinadora Campesina. Here, reflexivity was not a matter that emerged with the tensions associated with the representation of ‘objects’ (Woolgar 1991). That was a secondary problem, because in my case, reflexivity was more present in the situations where research did not necessarily involve the representation of phenomena. By this I mean that the Coordinadora Campesina was rather producing and sustaining different subjects and positions, such as activists, researchers, *campesinos* and so on that were necessary for the collective itself. In other words, those who were participating in materializing the Coordinadora were also emerging as new subjects.

In previous paragraphs, I presented an implicit view of reflexivity as a collective achievement, that is, as an outcome of establishing relationships with *campesinos*. I also showed that reflexivity helped to shape my interactions and contributed to orient collaborative research. This back-and-forth of reflexivity will be developed better in the coming paragraphs, but for now, it suggests that reflexivity is not singular. It can be a tool to orient action and on other occasions a collective achievement resulting from working together with other people and expanding our positions as researchers.

To illustrate better this back-and-forth process, my experience working with the collective that *campesinos* were forming is particularly relevant. Mainly because a collective is dealing with shaping its aims and who can partake of it. That creates a situation where attachments are sorted (Bruun Jensen 2007) in a collective, so researchers and other participants can engage in a variegated set of activities like meetings, decision making and, of course, researching. But as I mentioned before, not everybody in the Coordinadora Campesina had to necessarily agree on the same.

In 2021 there were profound differences between *campesino* organizations regarding the negotiations with the Ministry of Environment about the conservation and demarcation of the *páramo*. Those differences could be summarized in positions ranging from rejecting the demarcation policy as the way to conserve the *páramo* and others accepting the demarcation but only if there were guarantees to include the active role of *campesino* communities. However, those differences did not represent any fragmentation of the Coordinadora Campesina, they were not an obstacle to continue the formation of the collective. In fact, the differences were the reason for the collective to seek coordination (Mol 2002) strategies to hang together the heterogeneous coalition that the Coordinadora was in practice.

So, how on earth could a collective with so many differences be sustained? How could *campesinos* and their allies maintain the Coordinadora Campesina? A reflexive approach to that question made me pay special attention to the material organization of the Coordinadora Campesina. Because if there was something called Coordinadora Campesina, where different positions, subjectivities and differences emerged, then there should certainly be practical occasions where all those elements were arranged. That became clearer to me in the meetings held after the COVID-19 lockdown in 2021. One of those took place on 6 June 2021, when the Coordinadora Campesina organized a meeting in the rural area of Pandi, a municipality from the Sumapaz region.

The photo in Figure 10.2 exemplifies this; it shows a scene from the meeting in Pandi. The *campesino* wearing the blue face mask on the right side of the picture is telling the audience that they needed a set of ‘minimum demands’ to negotiate with the Ministry of Environment. Some of the attendees at the meeting can be seen around him, but in the middle, there is a table with a black device on it. It is a projector, which is connected to a laptop. Both are plugged into the socket next to the red window through a cable extension. Near to the window, hanging on the wall, there is a router providing an internet connection to the laptop, so the projector can display the videocall on the white blanket hanging on the wall for attendees that were virtually attending the meeting.

The course of practical action that allowed us to meet that day was possible due to the gathering of all those elements. This arrangement of people, laptop, projector, chair, router, cables and even a white blanket hanging on

Figure 10.2: Hybrid meeting in Pandi, June 2021. People attending remotely and in person



a wall all participated in the making of the *Coordinadora Campesina* that day. If there was a collective that was able to meet, discuss, negotiate and make decisions it was as an outcome of the heterogeneous association of the elements at play in the meeting. This materiality was constitutive of the collective, which means that all these elements were not passive mediums, but the very condition for the composition of the collective and its capacity to act (Rodríguez-Giralt 2011). It should be noted that this coherence of the collective should be understood as a temporal, contingent and precarious effect of the collective capacity of organizing itself in practical action.

Reflexivity was here the means to align my shifting research positions with the task of making more liveable worlds. Being a researcher here meant as well trying with other people (and nonhumans) to compose a collective. That of course was not an objective of my research, but as a collaborator I could not simply distance myself from responsibilities and commitments that arise from organizing a *Coordinadora Campesina* meeting and the subsequent tasks that emerge from it. It was from occasions like that meeting, where we could make come into being the *Coordinadora Campesina* as a collective, that the roles, attributes and subjectivities of all of those participating in it were shaped. So, composing a collective was the way for *campesinos* to make more liveable worlds. Within the collective, that task meant the possibility of creating alternative spaces, where the *páramo* and its conservation could be reconfigured to allow the relationships that maintain the existence of *campesinos* in their lands.

Reflexivity, then, helped me to understand the task of making more liveable worlds as both practical and multiple. Practical, because as I showed in the previous paragraphs, the material associations that allowed the Coordinadora Campesina to act, like for example through a meeting, are the means through which more liveable worlds can be created. And multiple, in the sense that participants that contribute to the formation of a collective are differently shaped when they are engaged in the creation of more liveable worlds. In my case as researcher, this was translated into collaborative activities to support the maintaining of the Coordinadora Campesina. They included writing reports of meetings, helping with the moderation of discussions, making presentations, and more. In short, making more liveable worlds as a collaborator involved an expansion of the kind of activities, positions and places that made possible my research. For *campesino* communities participating in the collective, making more liveable worlds was similarly a task that depended on the permanent collaboration with actors beyond their communities. However, for *campesinos*, making more liveable worlds involved a more immediate and urgent concern to defend themselves and their lands in the middle of the negotiations with the Ministry of Environment around the conservation of the *páramo*.

Conclusions

Back in the 1980s, when reflexivity was in vogue among Science and Technology Studies scholars (Ashmore 1989; Woolgar 1991), it served as a tool to interfere with the conventions of realist representation practices. Now, in an academic world where collaborative projects seem more necessary and common to attune our research work with the task of creating more liveable worlds, reflexivity becomes again an important companion to understand the effects of our research practices. This is crucial for researchers whose work involves close relationships with collectives or communities beyond academia. As I have been arguing in this chapter, reflexivity becomes relevant for researchers seeking ways to account for the conditions that shape the different positions that enable them to establish collaborative relationships in research projects.

When we can reflexively unpack collaboration, we as researchers can be more committed with performative ways of making knowledges, such as those present in collectives like social movements, political organizations, grassroots organizations and so on (Escobar 2008; Rappaport 2020). What this means is that reflexivity reminds us that conducting research for making more liveable worlds does not translate automatically into a set of fixed positions, let alone singular political goals. As the topics we research, and the research work itself, collaboration is uncertain and involves translation and coordination work between diverse world-making practices.

In my case with Sintrapaz, the Research Group and the Coordinadora Campesina, reflexivity served as a compass to understand how my

research relations enacted different research positions in my work. In this collaboration, I engaged with *campesinos* not with the aim of making ‘better’ or more ‘accurate’ representations of them and the *páramo*. Our collaboration involved the very task of working towards the possibility of assembling a different *páramo* conservation where *campesinos* could be a constitutive part of it. For doing so, the material organization of meetings and other activities that I had the chance to support along with more people, whose aim was to intervene (Hacking 1983; Zuiderent-Jerak 2016) into the politics of *páramos* conservation in Sumapaz, were necessary. These activities were the entry point to reflexively understand how research and collaboration could be connected with the creation of more liveable worlds for *campesino* communities in Sumapaz. As I analysed in the chapter, that was a task that required the material composition of a collective and the occasions where it could reach its temporal coherence to hang together despite its internal differences.

This insistence on performativity, that is, the work involved in making both collaborations happen and those involved in it, is perhaps one of the main lessons of reflexivity for the creation of more liveable worlds with(in) collectives. This means that collaborations are necessarily mediated, so they require constant building, supporting and renovating. In that work, researchers involved in collaborative projects are always negotiating with their collaborators their positions and what their collaborations consist of. This basically means that collaboration is not a shortcut to fixed positions, positions cannot be known and established either in advance or once and for all. A reflexive take on collaboration and our shifting research positions is a tool for situating (Haraway 1988) the creation of more liveable worlds.

In this context, reflexivity emerges from *resisting and helps to resist* taken-for-granted notions of collaboration and normativity. In that way reflexivity occurs in a back-and-forth process where it operates to orient action and as a collective achievement. Regarding the former, reflexivity can potentially orient researchers about the multiple positions that they engage in when working in collaborative projects. That can help researchers to better realize the affordances, limitations and challenges of the different concerns and commitments that each position entails. Regarding reflexivity as a collective achievement, the chapter showed that reflexivity is also realized through the relationships that we as researchers create with counterparts in tasks such as making more liveable worlds.

Attending to the activities that form collectives is a reminder that the creation of more liveable worlds must be literally made with others, with whom we can collaborate beyond academia. That is why the invitation for researchers engaged with the creation of more liveable worlds is to cultivate reflexivity, so we can attend to the work that could make worlds more

liveable not only for us as academics, but also liveable for more, including all of those involved in the collectives that we help to shape and sustain.

References

- Ashmore, M. (1989) *The Reflexive Thesis: Writing Sociology of Scientific Knowledge*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ashmore, M. (1994) Social Epistemology and Reflexivity: Two Versions of How to Be Really Useful. *Argumentation* 8(2): 157–161. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00733367>
- Blake, L.J., Chohan, J.K. and Escobar, M.P. (2023) Agro-extractivism and Neoliberal Conservation: Campesino Abandonment in the Boyacá Páramos, Colombia. *Journal of Rural Studies* 102: 103071. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2023.103071>
- Bruun Jensen, C. (2007) Sorting Attachments: Usefulness of STS in Healthcare Practice and Policy. *Science as Culture* 16(3): 237–251. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09505430701568636>
- Castillo, C. (2023) *Reconfiguring Conservation and Ontological Politics*, PhD thesis, Linköping University.
- Cleef, A.M., Rangel, J.O. and Arellano, P.H. (2008) The Paramo Vegetation of the Sumapaz Massif (Eastern Cordillera, Colombia) of the Sumapaz (Massif Cordillera Oriental, Colombia). In T. van der Hammen, J.O. Rangel and A.M. Cleef (eds) *La Cordillera Oriental Colombiana, Transecto Sumapaz*. Berlin–Stuttgart: Verlag J. Cramer, pp 799–914.
- Colombian Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (2017) *Delimitación del Páramo Cruz-Verde Sumapaz a Escala 1:25.000*. Bogotá.
- Comisión de la Verdad Colombia (2022) *Caso: Estigmatización y violencia política en Sumapaz*. Capítulo Territorios. Comisión para el Esclarecimiento de la Verdad, la Convivencia y la No Repetición.
- Coordinadora Campesina de Sumapaz (2019) *Acción de Tutela Delimitación Páramo de Sumapaz–Cruz Verde*. Archive Coordinadora Campesina Sumapaz–Cruz Verde.
- Escobar, A. (2008) *Territories of Difference: Place, Movements, Life, Redes*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Hacking, I. (1983) *Representing and Intervening: Introductory Topics in the Philosophy of Natural Science*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Haraway, D. (1988) Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective. *Feminist Studies* 14(3). <https://doi.org/10.2307/3178066>
- Hofstede, R., Segarra, P. and Mena, V.P. (eds) (2003) *Los páramos del mundo. Proyecto atlas mundial de páramos*. Quito: NC-UICN/Global Peatland Initiative/EcoCiencia.
- Latour, B. (2005) *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor Network Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Madriñán, S., Cortés, A.J. and Richardson, J.E. (2013) Páramo is the World's Fastest Evolving and Coolest Biodiversity Hotspot. *Frontiers in Genetics* 4. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fgene.2013.00192>
- Mol, A. (2002) *The Body Multiple: Ontology in Medical Practice*. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press.
- Mol, A. and Law, J. (1994) Regions, Networks and Fluids: Anaemia and Social Topology. *Social Studies of Science* 24(4): 641–671. <https://doi.org/10.1177/030631279402400402>
- Morales-Rivas, M., J.O. García, T. van der Hammen, A.T. Perdigón, C.E. Cadena Vargas, C.A. Pedraza Peñaloza, N. Rodríguez Eraso, C.A. Franco Aguilera, J.C. Betancourth Suárez, É. Olaya Ospina, E. Posada Gilede and L. Cárdenas Valencia (2007) *Atlas de páramos de Colombia*. Bogotá: Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt.
- Papadopoulos, D. (2018) *Experimental Practice: Technoscience, Alterontologies, and More-Than-Social Movements*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Parra Romero, A. (2019) *Producción y movilización de conocimiento en conflictos socioambientales estudio de caso del conflicto por minería a gran escala y defensa del agua en el páramo de Santurbán – Colombia*, PhD thesis, Universidade Estadual de Campinas. <https://doi.org/10.47749/T/UNICAMP.2019.1096003>
- Rama Judicial de Colombia (2019) *Expediente 11001-33-37-040-2019-00257-00*. Juzgado 40 Administrativo de Oralidad del Circuito de Bogotá, Sección Cuarta.
- Rappaport, J. (2008) Beyond Participant Observation: Collaborative Ethnography as Theoretical Innovation. *Collaborative Anthropologies* 1(1): 1–31. <https://doi.org/10.1353/cla.0.0014>
- Rappaport, J. (2020) *Cowards Don't Make History: Orlando Fals Borda and the Origins of Participatory Action Research*. New York: Duke University Press.
- Republic of Colombia (2010) *Mining Code: Law 1382, 2010*. Bogotá.
- Rodríguez-Giralt, I. (2011) Social Movements as Actor-Networks: Prospects for a Symmetrical Approach to Doñana's Environmentalist Protests. *Convergencia Revista de Ciencias Sociales* 18(56): 13–35.
- Sarmiento Pinzón, C.E., C.E. Cadena Vargas, M.V. Sarmiento Giraldo and J.A. Zapata Jiménez (2013) *Aportes a la conservación estratégica de los páramos de Colombia actualización de la cartografía de los complejos de páramo a escala 1:100.000*. Bogota: Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt.
- Ungar, P. (2021) Assembling an Ecosystem: The Making of State Páramos in Colombia. *Conservation and Society* 19(2): 119–129.
- Woolgar, S. (ed) (1991) *Knowledge and Reflexivity: New Frontiers in the Sociology of Knowledge*. London: SAGE.
- Zuiderent-Jerak, T. (2016) If Intervention Is Method, What Are We Learning? *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society* 2: 73–82. <https://doi.org/10.17351/ests2016.90>