RESEARCH ARTICLE

Epistemic injustices and participatory research: A research agenda at the crossroads of university and community

Appendix

A Self-Assessment Guide on Epistemic Injustices and Participatory Research

This guide can be applied to ongoing as well as already completed projects.

1) **Name of the research project**

   - Terms used to name the project's title
   - Reasons for this choice

2) **Questions and aims of the research project**

   - Who provided the original input to this project?
   - By whom were the issues articulated at first? Were all the groups/individuals involved able to share their own views on the situation? Which status was attributed to those views (e.g. belief, life experience, experiential or scientific knowledge, etc.)?
   - Was any sort of oppression and/or inequality identified at the beginning?
   - Purposes of the project:

     - Was there agreement or divergence between the different stakeholders (either groups or individuals)?
     - Were the purposes of the project agreed on formally or informally? In what terms?
     - Did the project explicitly aim to reduce inequalities and, if so, which ones and how?

3) **Participants and their knowledge**

   - Individuals and groups participating in the project
   - Designation of these persons/groups:

     - By themselves or by a third-party group?

   - Identification of the different types of knowledge involved

- Which types, by whom and under what terms were they categorised (e.g. know-how, life skills, scientific, experiential/practical, artistic, local, traditional, etc.)?
- What did these terms reveal about the nature of the relationships between participants?
- Was any knowledge set aside or ignored?
- Did any of the types of knowledge draw less attention than others and, if so, which ones? Was special attention devoted to these otherwise neglected types of knowledge? If so, by what means were they encouraged to emerge or to be articulated? (For example, by allowing time for testimonies, training of research team members by lay person, lay references, facilitation methods ensuring the participation of each member, etc.)

4) Knowledge production

○ Knowledge produced during the research process

- Which lessons were learned during the course of the research by each group/ individual (scientific, political, in terms of collective action, etc.)?
- How were these lessons learned? Through which methods, at what stage of the process (data collection, analysis, writing, etc.) and by whom?
- Were ethical guidelines established by the group regarding data ownership, knowledge production and knowledge dissemination?
- Were these guidelines discussed (before the actual beginning, at the beginning, during the research process or at the end) and agreed upon?

○ Validation of knowledge

- Who was involved in the process of knowledge assessment and validation?
- How did it happen and when during the research process development? For instance, during the literature review, definition of the research questions, data interpretation, etc.

○ Knowledge appropriation or sharing

- Did any group or individual gain more than the others from the knowledge produced during the process (from an economic, symbolic, political, etc. point of view)?
- Which ones and why?
- How was it perceived by the group/individual? As 'sharing' or as 'appropriation'?

5) Knowledge dissemination

○ How was the knowledge shared with others beyond the group?
○ Was this knowledge shared in a way that was accessible to the audience? For example, through a variety of formats: scientific articles, multimedia tools, demonstrations, petitions, public information meetings, lay documents, plays, etc.
○ Who actually took part in the dissemination of the knowledge? Were there any rules stipulating who had the right to communicate and disseminate the knowledge produced and under what circumstances? Were they adhered to in practice (for example, where a lay person was to present with one researcher, but they couldn't make it at the last minute, did the researcher do it anyway, or was the symposium restricted to PhD holders)?

○ Who received money for their participation in the research process (for example, salary, compensation, reimbursement)? How was it justified?

○ Did all team members have access to the knowledge produced during the process, for example, through printed or pdf copies of published documents, access to videos or photos taken during the process, etc.?

6) Maintaining/reducing epistemic injustices

Inside the research team

○ Did you feel your opinions, experience and knowledge were valued and respected by the group through the whole process?

○ Did you experience/witness any particular situation (positive or negative) regarding how people's testimonies or knowledge were taken into consideration? For example, appreciating or discrediting a group or a person's point of view? How did you feel in such instances (emotions, feelings, thoughts, etc.)?

○ Were any persons/groups excluded during the research process? Do you have any idea about why or how these situations may have occurred?

○ Did you achieve or restore some balance between positions and/or knowledge that were previously epistemically privileged or underestimated? If so, how did you proceed?

○ What strategies were put in place during the research to reduce epistemic injustices?

▪ Individual strategies: listening, open-mindedness, humility, reflexivity, etc.

▪ Group strategies: non-mixed groups, ethical guidelines, reflection on the criteria for integrating external people, recognition of the multiple positions a person may have or have had, knowledge definition and criteria, etc.

For the public targeted by the research

○ Has the research been successful in reducing epistemic injustices experienced by certain social groups?

▪ Has the research enabled groups to tackle the prejudices affecting their credibility?

▪ Has the research created new knowledge (new terms, arguments, figures, etc.) that will allow epistemically disadvantaged groups to denounce injustices?

▪ Has the research equipped the individuals/groups concerned with tools to acquire new knowledge in order to deconstruct, criticise and, if necessary, transform epistemic injustices?

▪ Have views, practices and knowledge changed? If so, which ones and for what reasons?

7) Final assessment of the research process from the point of view of epistemic injustices

○ Did the research result in sharing, mutual understanding, or even critical reflection on different points of view, or did people/groups stand by their positions?

○ Were research participants able to take a step back to reflect on the position and image they used to be assigned to?

○ To what extent has the research been influenced by external factors (research context, funding, donor requirements, prejudices, media, political pressures, etc.)? Have these factors been taken into account, named and clarified? If so, where and when?

○ What criteria did you use to assess the success or failure of the research?