

Construction of Relational Transformations in an Ecuadorian Context

Diego Tapia Figueroa, Ph.D.
Quito, Ecuador

Abstract

The present investigation understood as a process of relational construction, is the description of the training and supervision with psychologists and social workers of an Ecuadorian NGO, and involved: co-research of the sustained dialogues, with these professional teams about their work experience in their communities; reflection on the impact of this training on the local culture of the team; joint reading research in three years.

The three processes have been based on a social constructionist position, where the criteria for understanding knowledge have to do with its usefulness - to whom is this knowledge useful and how is it valuable? -with its generativity - how will this knowledge contribute to the community so that it continues co-constructing possibilities and future sets? We come from many different local experiences that have been socially constructed and we are going to put them to interact to develop new possibilities for finding new meanings, learning new ways of being in this world.

The present work is the description of that trip, trusting in the dialogue, collaborative learning, and the effort of generating transformative social actions.

Keywords: *curiosity, dialogue, difference, possibilities, relational, reflection, future*

The journey, processes, and relational transformations

"After all, everything that is meaningful comes from relationships, and it is within this vortex that the future will be forged".
Kenneth Gergen (1996, p.2)

The three research processes that are presented in this article and that have served to conclude the Ph.D. thesis in Psychology with the Free University of Brussels (VUB) and the Taos Institute, have been based on a social-constructionist stance, where the criteria for understanding knowledge have to do with its usefulness -to who is that knowledge useful and valuable? - and, with its generativity- how will this knowledge contribute to the community so that it continues to co-construct possibilities and future groups?. We start from many different local experiences that have been socially constructed and that interact to develop new meaningful possibilities and learning in new ways about being in this world.

This text presents critical reflections from the position of relational constructionism and collaborative-dialogic practices collecting what was proposed by Harlene Anderson (1999, 2012, 2017), Kenneth Gergen (2011, 2016), Sheila McNamee (2013, 2016); at the same time that it proposes the description and resignification of the co-research experience in a local culture - that of the context of the Ecuadorian society, in which over three years of research (2014-2016), more than 200 people participated in fortnightly meetings of transformative dialogues that allowed the construction of the Red Convivecia (Coexistence Network)- as well as the possibilities to build processes of social and relational well-being that validate differences, that enhance and expand possibilities, through creative and innovative dialogues, possible futures generators. In this sense, the objective of the relational research process carried out (McNamee, 2016, Gergen, 2016, Shotter, 2015) was to generate dialogues that have the potential to make differences, even though small, in working with children, families, and communities in situations of social vulnerability.

In the learning space with collaborative dialogues, built with the team of technicians and the Red Convivencia (Coexistence Network), we constantly seek to understand the specific characteristics of the local culture of the participants, in addition to making the resources of this culture and the co-researchers visible, so that creative conversations that promote understanding among all take place, different reflection, and innovative learning.

The exercise of thinking with the other was constituted in a process of deconstruction of what is traditionally considered obvious or normal, which opened a questioning process with a critical gaze, to generate the collective construction of something relationally different. Throughout the process, new versions of each participant appeared, resources to share emerged, differences were understood, diversity was appreciated and valued. A process guided by curiosity (given by the human dialogue that humanizes), in which he asked himself from a position of "not knowing" (Harlene Anderson) -of respect precisely- to open the processes and assume co-responsibilities.

The relational process was continuously building freedom to think, to dialogue, to move on to meaningful social actions, generating alternatives, options, possibilities. It was a space for the plurality of voices to dialogue, with curiosity and openness, with a humanly sensitive presence committed to the well-being of everyone and the environment.

The fortnightly meetings with the technical team and the Red Convivencia (Coexistence Network) had different interactive moments. One of the ways in which it was sought to strengthen the technical teams involved in the investigation process was to facilitate a multiplicity of discourses in each meeting so that the plurality of ways in which one can interact with others and treat them is recognized, reflecting on their practices to recognize and value new knowledge, to legitimize their own local knowledge; so that the practices that were generated were more plural and relationally oriented.

The method, in this collaborative learning process, meant being relationally responsible while being in sync with the relationship itself. Sustain the tension of difference with curiosity and respect, create a context for dialogue, facilitate the participants to connect, listen to, understand, and engage in new ways of talking together.

We began recognizing, among ourselves, that when we want everything to be evident, rational, clear, and with a reason, our relationship with the world is impoverished. That what contributes to building trust has to do with working for the well-being of all of us (therapists, social workers, consultants, relationship networks). That respect is related to creating a space for the free expression of the multiple voices that are present and thus opens the possibility of jointly building other local worlds. We wonder: how to dialogue to become relationally responsible for the ideas that were generated in the group?

The processes of joint construction with the community are carried out by talking to connect, understand and be relationally the people that we would like to be with ourselves and with others and to create in Ecuador, a network of relationships and connections that sustain the ideas and makes them practices that generate transformations (hence also the creation of IRYSE -Relational and Social constructionist Consortium of Ecuador- and the biweekly publication of reflective articles on this site: <http://iryse.org/>). Through IRYSE, we develop a sustained work of socialization, divulgation, and training on the positions of relational constructionism, collaborative-dialogic practices, and the generative model.

Creativity and imagination to work significant transformative processes

It was considered important that, by sharing with the Red Convivencia (Coexistence Network, which included psychologists, social workers, educators, administrative staff, institutional networks) their achievements and doubts, their questions and processes, they were able, little by little, in these significant encounters, to give other senses to their own social practices. As Harlene Anderson (1999) argues, "it is an attitude that invites them to tell us how things are for them, what worries them. Shotter suggests that in this listening and responding we do not act in response to an inner plan, but rather we are sensitive "in" a situation, and we do what the situation calls for" (p. 209).

The attention of relational constructionism (Sheila McNamee) focuses on the complex forms of relationship within a culture, a local cultural context. It is about understanding and conceiving research itself as a useful and emancipatory form of the unjust and oppressive social conditions existing in the Ecuadorian society; human and professional interpretations always have a critical nuance.

One of the challenges of this proposal was the implementation of the research from a practical-oriented dialogic perspective, where the multiple participating voices enter the conversation, which the research itself contributes to make visible and give it a new meaning.

Words build people: the way you talk to the other and how you talk about the other, you build it. Social constructionism emphasizes conversations, since, through language and meaning, each human being enters into a relationship with others, thus building their own identity or internal voice. We are beings in relationship. Every idea, every concept is born from the social exchange mediated by language.

Co-investigation with the Red Convivencia (Coexistence Network) can be understood as a journey that began, as described by John Shotter (ISI-Summer, 2015), in turbulent waters and with compasses that gave the illusion of indicating the course; however, it developed in creative and joyful ways, sustained in transformative dialogues. In this context of critical reflection about uncertainty, the perspectives of relational constructionism open up options and alternatives to understand and act differently; to expand the ways of interrelation and the ways in which meanings are constructed.

Kenneth Gergen, quoting Sheila McNamee (1996) says that the interest shifts to "the ways in which a plurality of perspectives are coordinated in coherent patterns of interaction, each of which simultaneously enhances and contrasts particular forms of action" (p. 213).

For social constructionism, the most important function of language is the construction of contextualized human worlds, with a discourse that recognizes, values, and legitimizes otherness and the presence of multiple voices; and puts relational processes as the significance of their reflections, the construction of meanings and the actions that need to be developed.

We seek, following the proposals of John Shotter (2015), new ways of being with ourselves and with others, new ways, genuine and authentic, of being in the relationship with the other. We seek the creation of dialogues committed to the joint construction of common wellbeing.

Research also has the potential to invite to transformative dialogue, if it is conceived as part of social poetry. Therefore, research is also a form of conversation, which is the same as another form of dialogue, and with it -as in any activity committed with relationship -our worlds are described. One can represent the world only in language, in what we do together. Conceiving research as a poetic activity means approaching the tension in research as dialogue, that is, as a conversation that responds to specific relationships and situations and

can therefore broaden the spectrum of possibilities and ideas for other forms of social life (McNamee, 2013, p. 108).

The invitation to open dialogue resulted in the fabric of a multiplicity of connections expanded the relational network and, on it, offered new meanings (built from the exchange of experiences, words, feelings) to the realities that are lived in everyday life. Each one is the same and different with each relationship, and that generates hope.

We have been strengthened with an attitude of responsiveness, which means being attentive to the process of relating to others, to dialogue while listening to be able to respond, to build with the questions-answers that accompany the interlocutor taking care of the relationship. It is not only about responding but also about contributing to the answer, even if it is not an articulated answer, but the mere listening from curiosity to understand and thus connect with the other. Being responsive, therefore, means understanding dialogically and assuming the type of relationship and conversation that we want to have with the other.

How did we do and what did we do together? Process generating questions

"The richness of the question is to open and keep the possibilities open. Different resources and generative questions are used according to the needs and moments of the process." (Dora Fried Schnitman, ABRATEF Congress, Sao Paulo, July 2014).

The following questions seek to initiate a process of collaborative dialogue, which will allow to expand the relationship networks and begin to overcome conceptual and practical ignorance, deploying and developing creative alternatives.

What are we here for? Am I here because of...? It is interesting to know the particular reason why each one is here.

How do we observe, listen, and respond?

What would have to happen so that when this is over, you feel satisfied?

What internal dialogues were you having while listening to me?

How can you contribute, in a meaningful way, so that what happens here is what you expect, and what you would like it to be?

Can you think of a learning moment, a different reflection, that you are going to take from this meeting?

How to propose a language that invites the other to feel involved?

From our initial questions: are they still there? have they been transformed? is there something you want to review?

How do we invite a person into a relationship?

How do you see a community in which we all feel understood and included?

How to start this conversation to build something meaningful?

Reflection on the experience: what has been useful for you from this process?

To give an account of the process: That is the method

The research method (dialogic relational research) used in the process becomes a resource that helps people to get involved, participate, reflect, commit and act in the directions they

co-create together. Investigating will be a process in which we are generating the conditions to relate to what is new, what is different.

As Jan Defehr (2008) explains in his doctoral thesis: "The method, in the practice of collaborative therapy, is always" on the way ", it is always a" premiere ", it is always used for the" first time ", it arises from a particular historical dialogic situation (p. xvi)".

The research method oriented from social constructionism allows us, precisely, the openness to the polyphony of the participating voices and the diversity of existing positions and it is not built previously, or coming from the other, but as Harlene Anderson (2016) maintains it: it is a construction that we do with the other, in conversation.

The method used in this research did not have previously set parameters, previously raised hypotheses, tools, or techniques planned and chosen from a menu of possibilities; it was an investigation with the participation of actors from local contexts, invited to the training space, based on the experience and opinion of the technicians who made their specific culture visible. The method involved conceiving research as a form of social action aimed at the transformation that families and communities needed.

Kenneth Gergen invites us to continually ask ourselves: what is it that matters? what is valuable? From reflective pragmatism, ask ourselves: What do we want to create that matters to others, that has value for others? He explains that the fundamentals of the relational perspective are to create and develop a space of understanding, in which the importance is in the process of the relationship. What someone says will have value and meaning when the other receives it and does something different with it. Where the value lies is in the well-being of the process. Doing relational research to build the future; futures that really matter to us.

How to bring our resources to this dialogue that has a transformative purpose? To be a generative operator, means, to participate actively in the conversation; to be someone capable of noticing the different, the possibilities in the dialogue. Because the position from which we choose to relate is committed to contributing to safeguarding dignity and integrity in all our relationships.

The investigation was constituted in a reflective practice in which to investigate is to ask to expand, process, and understand what is being done together. To learn from what we do and what we could do differently. What interested us in the process and what interests us today is practical knowledge, which is useful for all participants in their specific context of local culture.

As Celiane Camargo-Borges (2014, p.347) explains:

Dialogic epistemology of social constructionism is interested in the creation of conversational practices that can build possible paths for people to continue together. They are interested in the use of a speech that is not persuasive, but one that can be shared, so that conversations do not close, but rather open new inclusive possibilities for these conversations.

It is choosing a different place for the creation of the different. A dialogical position capable of generating conversational action-practices in the construction of new paths aimed at the joint creation of well-being with others and to decide, responsibly, to continue with others, connected and in relation. To continue together, in respectful discourse with otherness, diversity and multiplicity, polysemy; a discourse that is committed to the other as a way of

sharing what is significant, from curiosity and openness that initiates conversations instead of restricting them, that includes all voices in new transformative conversations.

Collaborative conversation requires sharing, trusting, and actively participating to create meanings. The manifestation of this multiplicity and complexity is what was sought to promote in the meetings with the co-investigators, which resulted in this document. In the words of Tom Strong (2003): "Collaborating means keeping what we say or do very close to what the client says, and much less than what our theories establish" (p. 134).

From this perspective, it is understood that what is relational is the basis of everything that is social, and it is from there that the meanings that will allow understanding to develop new constructions for coordinated action arise. Mobilizing all the resources that nourish conversations, asking if there are other ways of conceiving the future, of generating alternatives that allow us to be together in a complex social world that becomes its own because it is jointly transformed.

Harlene Anderson (2012) invites us to reflect on the meaning of transformation: "The change or transformation is generated in language; it is part of the participatory process of understanding and is full of uncertainty and risk" (p. 4). It is the creative and different dialogues, the conversations guided by the connection with others, that contribute to the construction of this collaborative way of being, which expands relational possibilities and generates unexpected future worlds.

Relational ethics and meaningful dialogue

How do we want to live? What do we build together that means well-being? Language is what allows us to be and what builds us; it is in living dialogue that life speaks. By interacting dialogically, we socially build ourselves. Dialogue is a question about the new. What are we creating together, to generate the possibilities of a present with the ethical and political relational conditions, which mean equity, justice, responsibility, and dignity? In the forms of relationships that we experience, the first option is to consider dialogue as a way of being with the other. Other forms of relationship could become abusive and exclusive.

Through dialogue, an attitude of curiosity about differences is promoted. Relational ethics (Sheila McNamee) is not a matter of individual beliefs, values, or principles, it is a relational construction contextualized in a local culture and in a specific historical time. The individual does not exist in himself; he exists as part of relationships and is created through relationships with others.

Ethics is related to language, but with its limits; not with what we can say, but with what is shown in what we say. We access the ethical perspective when we understand that the world is the common story of our language. Dialogue has a pragmatic dimension; it is action in the world. And it is with dialogue that we can develop critical reflexivity. Dialogue opens the world by making sense of it.

As dialogue is an invitation to diversity, the right for each protagonist to tell their own story was recognized; sharing their resources, entering into conversation with other different stories; learning and enriching each other with the transforming power of their strengths, turned into positive and constructive resources for contextualized action that has allowed them to achieve results in favor of their communities.

In a co-investigation what matters, methodologically, is to focus on the "ways of saying things". Relational research looks for new ways of being relationally in the world and creating different possibilities; knowing if it were useful to see the difference and, if it were,

understanding how it was useful; why it would be useful to maintain the differences between these new ways of doing research.

The method also looked for the local history built with the people who participate in those relationships, from wondering about the stories that were not talked about, that were marginal and alternative, finding their potential for building desirable futures.

Emphasis on the dialogic

The words of Kenneth and Mary Gergen (2011, p. 100) help to understand the context in which the research was carried out: "Specifically, what they hope is that their research can help liberate people from oppressive political and economic conditions and generate new opportunities for people".

As this is a relational investigation, it focused on the interaction processes that mean coordination with others, of the actions that we are going to carry out, developing construction possibilities for new ways of being in the world. An investigation guided by positions explained by Sheila McNamee (2013, p. 106):

Research has to be conceived as a constructive process that suggests that we construct and deconstruct descriptions of social life, at the same time that we remain actively linked in the research process the political nature of research is highlighted, emphasizing the need to listen to the multiplicity of voices.

During the three years that this social constructionist research lasted, what began as an invitation to engage in dialogue and learn from each participant, new processes of individual and joint reflection were developed. This generated transformations both in the lives of the co-investigators and their professional practices.

According to Dora Fried Schnitman (1998): "This perspective allows us to wonder about the concepts of "truth", "objectivity", "reality". It underlines an ethical position founded and rooted both in responsibility for our constructions of the world and the actions that accompany them" (p, 27).

The meetings for this research made it possible to question the conceptions established by the prevailing ideology, from the postmodernist position, opening critical conversations about the modernist dogmas of faith. The principles and values that guide people are related to actions, as long as they respond to the cultural and social needs of those who participate in a specific conversational context because they are invitations to form new types of relationships.

It is about people having options to decide in a relational context, inclusively with others. When relationships are restored, a responsibility emerges that makes the participants recognize that space as their own, and there they engage in transformative actions.

Multiple voices from a network under construction

"What is necessary or critical for practice is to always keep in mind the importance of respect for the other person; being open to their differences, being aware of their local knowledge and to invite and use it " Harlene Anderson (2017, personal communication).

In this research, each encounter began with generating questions, to facilitate dialogue and enable the emergence of resources and alternatives. Dialogues were given in small groups of three people -when we were about 12 participants- or in groups of 5 people -when we were between 20 or 40 participants. Among the questions posed that motivated the dialogue of the co-investigators are:

- In this process: What caught your attention about something someone in the team said?
- What significant reflection do you take away from this journey, and what would you like to share?
- What was new to you in this meeting; and what was different about your relationship with the team today?
- What do you think was the most useful for the other participants and the team?

When we open a space for the expression of multiple voices, the important thing is to understand how this diversity is expressed, not only to acknowledge it and respect it but to transform ourselves at the same time that these voices do, by expressing themselves and generating practical actions, these are legitimized because they influence in their contexts and decide their futures. Let us look at some examples of these voices, in this context:

Azucena Sisa (indigenous clinical psychologist):

We have been able to say what we want to happen, or what we would like to happen ... I could feel free without rigid hierarchies, as an equal, no matter where I come from even though I come from a small town and I'm indigenous; I am the same and I can do the same, and that is the motivation that helped me... Complexity, uncertainty, creativity, imagination, curiosity are words that are already in me.

Diego Poma (clinical psychologist):

The readings, the conversations, the reflections, bringing to therapy what we have practiced in supervision, everything has helped me. I value the practice of asking myself questions and dialoguing, asking with respect, interest, openness, and curiosity. This whole process has made me grow, learn from professionals as the facilitator of these spaces and value this new and different style of being with others.

Karen Geerts (Belgian volunteer social worker):

I understand that with this supervision I began to think about the responsibilities that I have with my own life, with the relationships that I wanted to choose, with the ways I want to relate to the families at work. Here I have felt treated like an adult.

Paulina Velasteguí (social worker):

We went from seeing things from individual perspectives, shortcomings, and problems; we believed that being experts was fine. Now there is a tremendous emphasis on people's resources, rather than deficits; we no longer speak of pathologies but strengths; instead of problems, we talk about alternatives and possibilities.

Yvette Ramírez (American volunteer who supported this Foundation in research processes on the work carried out by technical teams):

Ecuador has been a discovery and a challenge for me. I studied at Harvard, where I graduated in sociology. It is complex to work with teams that have many cultural biases. They generalize descriptions about the families they work with; there is no analysis of contexts, details, and connections. And, families, generalize their views on other families without knowing them thoroughly. There is a culture of generalizations and very strong prejudices in this area of Ecuador... You see good intentions in the professionals and also a bit of improvisation and lack of rigor. For example, we work without thinking about future processes of possible research, to learn to do differently, to leave a memory that will serve

those who follow after us. Even to value and recognize the strengths of the type of culture that we have contributed to creating. Here, in this fortnightly space, I feel we are building something meaningful that gives me hope. I feel this culture has enriched my own culture; it has given it more perspective. I leave with more wealth of relationships and new ways of thinking about relationships, with the strength of dialogues.

María N. (student and psychology intern):

I like this about languages, taking care of relationships, not taking for granted that relationships are only there; you have to take care of people. Respect and value other people. Have the courage to be responsible for making decisions. That we speak from uncertainty, as they say from not-knowing seems incredible to me. I am gaining experience from this reflective practice.

Readings of the senses and meanings of these brief testimonies:

"Language is reality...Facts happen, but the meanings we attribute to them are constructed in language" (Harlene Anderson, 1999. p. 269).

This is one of the fundamental differences between content and process, where content is usually information and notions, tools and techniques, methods and protocols; instead, the process is the tendencies, the relationships, the contexts, the interweaving, the construction with the other, the sense of belonging and community. And what is humanly relevant is the connection with the other, connecting together so that learning makes sense because it is collaborative. Because knowledge is created, and transformations are generated in each of the participants and society.

In this joint process, we have carried out truly collaborative, meaningful, and alternative-generating learnings. One of the fundamentals: recognizing that choosing curiosity means mobilizing the resources that relationships offer, the strengths that participants share.

We have also learned that, with dialogues, rather than seeking consensus and agreements, the important thing is to build together new ways of understanding each other; coordinating ourselves for the social actions that we need to develop and that allow us to solve together the problems that families go through and how do we manage the teams we work with.

It constituted a different experience: they spoke while practicing, they dialogued with practical experiences, they gave each other joint meanings, the product of work in small groups that, starting from a question, began to talk and reflect; processing their affinities and diversities.

Understanding that the world and contexts are in permanent mutation and transformation also entails the effort to assume that it is, in social interactions, that a network of meanings is being built, in which we actively participate; with a permanently reflective, participatory, inclusive speech; with the purpose of developing actions capable of contributing to the construction of relational contexts, with well-being for all its participants, valuing local knowledge. That is why this training was developed as a continuous collaborative learning process, with sufficiently contextualized interventions, focused on the mobilization of resources and strengths.

It has been a process of collective construction in which each of the members was able to make their transforming power visible and recognize their importance in the practice of everyone's social relations.

Attached to what happened in the conversations set out in these pages, it would not make sense to draw conclusions that "close" doors, but rather to explore and suggest processes of construction of a life in common, enhancing the resources that communities have, to develop relational possibilities, new critical reflections, collaborative dialogues, unpublished narratives, and languages that create possible worlds.

Questions for the facilitator during the collaborative learning process:

How can I assertively contribute to co-create a relational climate that is positive for this joint learning process?

What specific challenges and expectations do these people have and what's their position when talking?

What other options and alternatives for dialogue can we generate in these encounters that make you feel safe, confident, and connected with the conversational, reflective, and joint learning process?

How to invite you to recognize complexity, to accept that there is no single perspective to understand and work in therapy, in relational and social processes?

How do we organize the conversation to encompass the complexity of the process?

Contributions to the Ecuadorian context

"Creative action not only means choosing but participating in the creation and expansion of possible choices" Harlene Anderson (1999, p. 300).

From this perspective, therapy processes are an invitation to shared freedom, in which the "truth" dissolves, and what is important is the different dialogue about what we can build together. Language produces new actions, relationships, and possibilities (invites to new relationships) and makes us be in each conversation with others. Therefore, the focus is on the relational consequences, maintaining a complex vision, which opens a new space for the multiple voices that are present. And this is done with dialogue, which is a collaborative way of constructing meaning, and thus a research process is carried out that is both relationally ethical and politically transformative.

Affirming these different perspectives, Kenneth Gergen (2016), argues: "The most important are the practices that invite a productive co-creation of meaning, and especially, that break down the barriers of antipathy. In that sense, we can direct attention to practices that allow us to navigate the tumultuous waters of relationships or create community and substitute conflict for coordination" (p. 586).

Something different, productive, and constructive was planted; the teams that have participated by committing to share their knowledge, experiences and needs, have been able to experience other ways of relating, ways based on responsibility and relational ethics, respect for human rights, in a context of acceptance and legitimation of differences.

Collaboration is built on possibilities, creativity, and innovation, the result of conversations and relationships. Through collaboration, new ideas and patterns can emerge, especially as multiple points of view are being compared, measured, mixed (London, St. George & Wulff, 2017, p.1).

Ethics is alien to any type of authoritarian imposition. What we "owe" is, fundamentally, what we love, desire, and want to achieve; they are the values that contribute to our personal

and community fulfillment. To do good is to live authentically as a human being, in connection with others.

Contributions to the researcher: What has happened to my relational being throughout this joint process, this shared journey?

"The facilitating position promotes a process that keeps all voices moving and contributing" Harlene Anderson (1999, p. 138).

As a researcher from relational constructionism, I have been able to broaden my vision to understand that we participate in interrelational processes with others and with their cultural contexts, that it is necessary to maintain a curious spirit to build other relational possibilities through conversations.

Valuing what works and imagining what could be. Inviting us to ask ourselves each time: what do we contribute differently to this local context? How can we take care of our relationships, so that we can jointly create life, meaningful life? What kind of future can I contribute to constructing?

Participating in collaborative conversations (where dialogue is multidimensional) was a challenge; to be in a different way with others, to share, trust and promote the generation of new meanings. To do this, I learned to listen actively, each time, in a different way; to understand the needs of others.

I was open to listening to the questions of each participant, the questions of the relational process and, also, the questions of my internal dialogues; risking being questioned without fear, trusting in the connections that we created, adding my voice in the joint dialogue; without pretending that mine is the last word or the most important.

As I have described, this learning has allowed me to experience that meaning makes sense in relation to a context. For this reason, my position was consolidated in this conviction: consider each one as someone capable, consider all the participants as valid and legitimate interlocutors. Guiding me with perspectives like these: "Wherever we are, let us reproduce the world we aspire to and avoid the one we reject. Minimum policies, policies of resistance..." (Onfray, 2008, p. 212).

Collaborative learning practices are understood as conversational constructions produced in relationships between people; and can be seen and understood in different ways and can be assimilated and given new meanings in relationships with others.

"Each time, it is with utopia that philosophy becomes political, and the criticism of its time takes its maximum extreme. Utopia is not separated from its infinite movement..." Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari (1997, p. 101). I am committed to generating multiple and varied conversations that question the dominant perspectives that support social control; also, from therapy, paying particular attention to the different ways in which the politics of established power manifests itself; permanently questioning the existing social discourse.

Paraphrasing Kenneth Gergen (2017), we must ask ourselves: researching for what reason and for whom? Who is the research good for? Relational research is aimed at creating the future and not looking at the past. It has to do with: what kind of society do we want to build? Whom do we want to see involved? Relational research must be seen as an orientation, a sensitivity about whether we live in a relational world: what kind of world are we having, and what world do we want to create? Things make sense depending on what you do with what I

say or do. I can do the action; however, you can transform it to give it meaning. When we coordinate our actions, the world comes to life.

We assume the responsibility that this is not only a way of being in the world, but it is a way of being in the world with others; a relationally ethical, politically responsible way. The question of how to continue challenges us insofar as it refers us to relationships with others because the "how" to continue can find tentative answers only when it includes the "with". It is not possible to continue if it is not a relational continuous.

I have also learned that, with dialogues, rather than seeking consensus and agreements, the important thing is to build together other and new ways of understanding each other, of coordinating ourselves for the social actions that we need to develop and that allow us to resolve the dilemmas that families face and the teams we work with.

Continually asking ourselves: what is it that matters? what is valuable? From a reflective pragmatism. Ask ourselves: what do we want to create that matters to others, that has value for others? For this, relational ethics also contributes; instead of enclosing and limiting what we are doing, we open the possibilities of everything that can be done and that we can jointly build.

In this addition of multiple voices that dissolve in the air, I find the openings that tell me that the possibilities are endless. Joy is possible, it is that strange form of uncertainty. All questions live in the complexity and uncertainty of the human condition. It is a glowing question. Creating a language "north of the future" (Paul Celan, *In the rivers, north of the future ...*, 1967). Today, which is tomorrow, I welcome you to this intelligent and infinite conversation.

References

- Anderson, H. (1999). *Conversación, lenguaje y posibilidades: Un enfoque posmoderno de la terapia*. Buenos Aires: Argentina Editorial Amorrortu.
- Anderson, H. (2012). Relaciones de colaboración y conversaciones dialógicas: Ideas para una práctica sensible a lo relacional. *Family Process*, 51 (1), 1-20. Recuperado de: <https://es.scribd.com/document/125580289/Relaciones-de-Colaboracion-y-Conversaciones-Dialogicas-Ideas-Para-Una-Practica-Sensible-a-Lo-Relacional>.
- Camargo-Borges, C. (2014). *Em busca de uma formacao integral e ampliada: Construindo práticas colaborativas para o cuidado em saúde*. En *Construccionismo social: discurso. Prática e producao do conhecimento*, Carla Guanaes-Lorenzi, Moscheta, Corradi-Webster, Vilela e Souza (organizadores) (p.341 - 357). Rio de Janeiro, Brasil: Ed. Instituto NOOS.
- Celan, P. (1999). *Obras completas*. Madrid, España: Editorial Trotta.
- DeFehr, J. (2009). *Investigación de Acción Dialógica: El Fenómeno de Agencia Democrática y Transformativa de la Habilidad de Respuesta* (Artículo inédito). Universidad de Winnipeg, USA.
- Deleuze, G. y Guattari, F. (1997). *¿Qué es la filosofía?* Barcelona, España: Editorial Anagrama.
- Fried Schnitman, D. (1998). *Nuevos paradigmas, cultura y subjetividad*. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Editorial Paidós.
- Gergen, K. (1996). *Realidades y relaciones: Aproximaciones a la construcción social*. Barcelona, España: Editorial Paidós.
- Gergen, K. y Gergen, M. (2011). *Reflexiones sobre la construcción social*. Barcelona, España: Editorial Paidós.

- Gergen, K (2016). *El Ser relacional: Más allá del Yo y la Comunidad*. Bilbao, España: Editorial Desclée de Brouwer, S.A.
- IRYSE (2018) Blog del Instituto Relacional y Socioconstruccionista del Ecuador (IRYSE): <http://iryse.org/>
- London, S., St. George, S. y Wulff, D. (2017). ISI readings/lecturas para el ISI 2017-Guía para la Colaboración- Recuperado de <file:///C:/Users/Casa/Downloads/Guia%20para%20la%20Colaboracion%20%20espan%CC%83ol.pdf>
- McNamee, S. (2013). La poesía social de la investigación comprometida con la relación. La investigación como conversación. En Deissler, K. & McNamee, S. (Ed) *Filo y Sofia en diálogo: la poesía social de la conversación terapéutica* (p. 102-109). Ohio, USA: Ed. Taos Institute Publication.
- McNamee, S. (2016). Encuentro virtual de la Red TAOS de investigación relacional.
- Onfray, M. (2008). *La fuerza de existir-Manifiesto hedonista*. Barcelona, España: Editorial Círculo de Lectores.
- Shotter, J. (2001). *Realidades conversacionales: la construcción de la vida a través del lenguaje*. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Editorial Amorrortu,
- Strong, T. (2003). *Cinco directrices para terapeutas colaboradores*. En *Revista Venezolana de Psicología Comunitaria* N. 3. (p.115-140). Caracas, Venezuela: Universidad Católica Andrés Bello.
- Taos Online Seminar. (2017). Social construction: Premises and promises. Recuperado de <http://taoslearning.ning.com/groups2/taos-online-workshop-Spring-2017>

Author Note:

Diego Tapia Figueroa, Ph.D.
 Instituto Relacional y Socioconstruccionista del Ecuador – IRYSE (<http://iryse.org/>)
diego.tapia.figueroa@gmail.com

Translation:

Bruno Tapia Naranjo
tapianaranjob@gmail.com