ENGAGING REFLEXIVE DECOLONIAL PRACTICES IN COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY INQUIRY & EDUCATION

Mazna Patka[*], Tiffeny R. Jiménez[**], Hana Shahin[*], Olya Glantsman[***]

1.   Situating the Special Issue

The idea for this special issue developed through a series of conversations among the four of us (Mazna, Tiffeny, Hana and Olya) over time, rather than from a single moment or exchange. These conversations were shaped by shared concerns about where we are located, how we teach and engage in research, and how knowledge is authorized or constrained within community psychology. Mazna and Hana had repeatedly discussed the difficulty of finding journals willing to seriously engage scholarship centered on the United Arab Emirates or grounded in decolonial perspectives. Around the same period, Mazna and Tiffeny were in dialogue through the Society for Community Research and Action's International Committee, reflecting on how the field defines itself and which forms of practice and inquiry are normalized or sidelined. When Olya joined these discussions, her work in community psychology education aligned closely with these concerns, particularly regarding institutional and pedagogical assumptions. What began as parallel conversations became a shared process of questioning the conditions that shape community psychology and considering what it might mean to engage decolonial practices within and beyond existing structures. These discussions have continued throughout the development of the special issue, not as a search for consensus, but as an ongoing practice of critical reflection, disagreement, and accountability in relation to our work and its effects.

Decoloniality, as we understand it, is not a topic or a framework to be applied, nor is it a fixed position that one reaches. It exists along a continuum because all of us are embedded in colonial systems, even as we work to unsettle them, and where one is located on that continuum is shaped by history, context, and material conditions. For this reason, we were attentive to how contributors understood decoloniality in relation to their own locations and what it meant for them to engage it in practice. This orientation shaped the special issue as both a publication and a practice, with an editorial process grounded in care, reciprocity, and accountability rather than extraction or hierarchy. Throughout the process, we returned repeatedly to questions of how decolonial commitments are lived in classrooms, communities, research practices, and editorial relationships, while recognizing that these enactments necessarily differ across contexts.

[*] Zayed University, Dubai, United Arab Emirates
[**]National Louis University, Chicago, Illinois, United States of America
[***]DePaul University, Chicago, Illinois, United States of America

2.   Editorial Reflections and Process

The call for abstracts (Appendix A) was shaped by the conversations and commitments that informed the development of this special issue. It was written not only to invite submissions, but to welcome work grappling with the effort to embody and practice decoloniality across different contexts. We were interested in how community psychologists were attempting to work otherwise through relationships, methodologies, pedagogies, and forms of knowledge making, including the tensions and limits of those efforts. In crafting the call, we aimed to signal that multiplicity in voice, form, and location was welcome, and that submissions would be met with accompaniment rather than gatekeeping. This orientation required sustained attention and continual discussion among us as editors as questions and uncertainties emerged.

Throughout the editorial process, we met regularly and remained in constant dialogue. These discussions were not ancillary to the work but central to how decisions were made. We used this time to question our assumptions, examine how editorial norms operate, and reflect on how power circulates through evaluation, citation, and claims of rigor. This included sustained attention to whose knowledge is centered, which geographies are treated as normative, and how expectations of speed and productivity shape what is possible within academic publishing.

This work also took place during a period of what felt like escalating global violence and crisis. The genocide in Gaza began after we had started working on the special issue and remained present as we negotiated decisions, reflected on our responsibilities, and worked through disagreements. This period was marked by overlapping genocides, dispossession, ecological devastation, and entrenched inequalities that are enduring products of coloniality and Western imperialism. These conditions made visible how structures of domination and extraction continue to organize whose lives are treated as valuable and whose are rendered expendable, in ways that are uneven yet deeply interconnected across contexts. Within community psychology, this raised persistent questions about what it means to practice in ways that do not simply describe these realities, but engage responsibility, resistance, and refusal through situated decolonial praxis, including within editorial labor itself.

Through these ongoing discussions, we came to understand coloniality not only as an institutional condition, but as a set of habits that also shape our own scholarly and editorial reflexes. We saw how easily familiar patterns of hierarchy, control, and extraction can reappear, even when intentions are otherwise. If coloniality is reproduced through everyday practices, then decolonial commitments must also be enacted through everyday practices, including how decisions are made, how disagreement is held, and how accountability is sustained.

From the outset, we were clear that the commitments of the special issue should not reside only in the published papers. Our editorial practice was guided by care, reciprocity, and accountability, understood as conditions of work rather than abstract values. This required attention to communication, pacing, transparency, and responsiveness to contributors as people working within specific institutional, political, and material constraints.

2.1 Author-Editor Meetings

Author–editor meetings were built into the editorial process as a way to address limits within conventional peer review, particularly for work attempting to engage decolonial practices. After

abstracts were accepted, authors were invited to meet with at least two members of the editorial team prior to or during manuscript development. These meetings were not used to assess quality or readiness for publication. Instead, they provided space to clarify context, discuss analytic direction, and surface questions that could not be easily addressed through written feedback alone.

The meetings were optional and scheduled at the authors' discretion. Some authors met with us once, others returned at multiple points, and some chose not to meet at all. This flexibility reflected an understanding that authors were working under different institutional, political, and personal constraints. The purpose was not to standardize engagement, but to respond to what authors needed at particular moments in the writing process.

A central focus of these conversations was context. Authors were encouraged to explain where their work was situated, what constraints shaped their choices, and what it meant for them to attempt decolonial practice in their specific settings. This often included discussion of positionality, not as a formal section to be completed, but as a way to make analytic decisions legible. These conversations helped clarify how methods, relationships, and forms of representation were connected to local conditions rather than abstract commitments.

These meetings created space to address form and structure in ways that written reviews often cannot. Authors used them to test ideas, work through uncertainty, and consider how unfamiliar or complex approaches could be communicated within journal constraints. Rather than replacing peer review, the meetings helped align editorial feedback with what authors were attempting to do and the conditions under which they were doing it.

These conversations did not eliminate power asymmetries or structural limits, nor were they intended to. They created space for authors to explain their contexts, how they understood decoloniality within those contexts, and how they were attempting to engage decolonial work in practice. This made it possible for subsequent editorial and review processes to respond to what authors were actually doing, rather than to abstract expectations detached from context. For work engaging decolonial efforts under uneven conditions, this distinction mattered.

2.2 Learning Communities

In addition to individual author–editor meetings, we created optional learning community meetings to extend relational engagement across all contributing authors. These meetings were designed to bring authors together to learn about one another's work, share experiences, and access collective support while navigating the demands of decolonial scholarship within academic publishing.

The learning communities were open to all authors, regardless of whether they had participated in individual meetings. Participation was voluntary, and the structure of each meeting was shaped by what participants identified as most needed at that point in the process. Some sessions focused on early writing and the challenges of articulating decolonial commitments within disciplinary expectations. Others centered on navigating peer review, including how to interpret feedback, manage uncertainty, and sustain momentum when encountering institutional barriers.

By bringing authors into conversation with one another, the learning communities created opportunities for connection that extended beyond individual manuscripts. They supported a

sense of shared engagement without collapsing difference, and they reinforced the understanding that decolonial work in publishing involves not only intellectual labor, but also relational and emotional labor carried under uneven conditions.

2.3 The Peer Review Process

The peer review process was structured to support development rather than function primarily as a gatekeeping mechanism. Reviewers were approached as collaborators in the work, with attention to how feedback could help authors clarify context, analytic intent, and engagement with decolonial practice. Our working assumption was that manuscripts could move toward publication when authors were supported in explaining what they were attempting to do and why those choices mattered within their specific settings.

Peer reviewers included both contributing authors and scholars who were not submitting to the special issue. This combination allowed for dialogue across shared commitments while also bringing in perspectives not directly embedded in the project. Reviewers were asked to focus on explanation and specificity rather than correction or enforcement of disciplinary norms. In particular, they were encouraged to read with attention to context, recognizing that authors were writing from different parts of the world, institutional locations, and linguistic traditions, and to focus on whether the manuscript provided the information needed for understanding without requiring external searching or assumed familiarity.

Each manuscript received feedback from two peer reviewers and at least two editors. In a small number of cases, only one peer reviewer was secured due to difficulty identifying available reviewers. The review process was double blind, with the exception that editors identified themselves in their own reviews. This choice reflected our responsibility to respond to manuscripts with an understanding of the broader aims of the special issue and the context authors had shared during earlier conversations. Editorial feedback focused on alignment with the issue and on helping authors present a clear and complete account of their work.

Reviewers were provided with guidance intended to support constructive and restrained engagement (see Appendix B for our Peer Review Checklist). They were asked to avoid requiring citation of particular scholars or canonical texts, requesting additional data collection, or offering generalized critiques that were difficult for authors to address. Where clarification or revision was needed, reviewers were encouraged to offer concrete suggestions tied directly to meaning and coherence rather than stylistic preference. Authors were supported in specifying how their work engaged decolonial practice in relation to context, relational accountability, and action, rather than critique alone.

Throughout the process, peer review was treated as a form of collective labor oriented toward learning and development rather than compliance. Reviewers were informed of this orientation from the outset, and all published articles acknowledge their peer reviewers by name in recognition of their contributions to the process.

3.   Care, Constraint, and the Limits of Decolonial Practice

Putting these commitments into practice required sustained attention to the tension between care and constraint. From the outset, we were working within institutional requirements related to indexing, formatting, and production timelines, even as we sought to resist extractive and hierarchical editorial habits. Each aspect of the process was developed in dialogue and revisited as the work unfolded, informed by what we were hearing from authors and by the limits of the journal structure itself.

Care shaped how we approached authors, but it did not remove responsibility to the collective. We sought to support authors in articulating their work in ways that honored context, voice, and intention, while also being transparent about constraints related to word limits, timelines, and editorial capacity. This flexibility was grounded in respect for the realities of writing and life, but it required continual judgment about what accountability meant to the larger group of contributors.

In moments when editorial feedback risked steering manuscripts in directions not initiated by authors, we limited further intervention and clarified that decisions about content and direction rested with them. At the same time, we encountered situations where accommodation and openness did not lead to greater clarity or readiness. For papers that were not included in the special issue, extensive time extensions, repeated rounds of feedback, and significant editorial support were offered over several months. Despite these efforts, the manuscripts did not reach a form that could be included in the issue within the available timeframe. These moments required us to examine whether continued accommodation was supporting authors' capacity to move their work forward or instead extending the process without increasing clarity, readiness, or author ownership.

Relationality unfolded unevenly across the process. Some authors engaged primarily through conversation and collective reflection, while others preferred structured written exchange and focused revision. Both approaches were valid. What became clear was that relationality does not take a single form, nor does decolonial practice require uniform expression. Respecting multiplicity meant attending to different ways authors connected, worked, and communicated, without privileging one as more authentic than another.

At the same time, we observed how colonial habits reappeared in subtle ways. In some moments, theory and citation became protective tools rather than points of dialogue. In others, relational language blurred boundaries, requiring us to reassert clarity and responsibility. These instances prompted reflection on whether care was being enacted in ways that supported agency or inadvertently deferred necessary decisions. We understood these patterns not as individual failings, but as effects of academic systems that train scholars to seek safety in proof, productivity, and compliance.

There were moments when we reached the limits of what we could reasonably accommodate, both in terms of editorial capacity and responsibility to other contributors, and decisions had to be made accordingly. These decisions were not acts of exclusion, but acknowledgments that some work required more time than the structure of this issue could allow.

This experience reinforced for us that relationality is not an achieved state but a continual orientation. It must be renewed through reflection, adjustment, and willingness to name limits. Acting in decolonial ways does not mean getting it right. It means remaining accountable to

process, to people, and to the conditions shaping what is possible. We expect that our understanding and practice will continue to evolve, and that when we look back on this process months or years from now, we may identify decisions we would approach differently. We offer this reflection not as closure, but as an acknowledgment that decolonial practice requires ongoing learning, revision, and accountability.

4.   The Journey of This Special Issue

This special issue brings together scholarship that engages decolonial praxis as situated, relational, and ongoing work. Across two issues, the collection reflects multiple ways scholars, educators, practitioners, and collectives are questioning inherited assumptions, confronting colonial structures, and attempting to practice differently within the constraints of institutions, disciplines, and communities. Rather than advancing a single framework or definition of decoloniality, the papers attend to how decolonial commitments are understood and enacted across distinct contexts, histories, and conditions.

Given the number and breadth of contributions, the special issue is presented across two issues. Issue 1 focuses on unlearning, reflexivity, and institutional disruption. Issue 2 turns toward re-centering education and knowledge-making, storytelling as method and practice, and collective healing, solidarity, and future-making. The chapters that follow function as organizing orientations rather than fixed categories. While many papers speak to multiple movements, each paper is situated in one chapter to preserve clarity, with the recognition that decolonial practice resists neat boundaries.

4.1 Issue 1

Chapter 1: Unlearning and Self-Reflexivity

The papers in this chapter engage unlearning as deliberate, relational work that requires sustained attention to positionality, accountability, and ethical responsibility. Reflexivity is treated not as a methodological step, but as a practice shaped through relationships and lived experience. This work is taken up in *Learning Through Messy Attempts at Heart-Centered Reflective Praxis* by Chancer and Ramirez, which examines solidarity work between Indigenous and non-Indigenous collaborators and the tensions that arise when settler positionality is interrogated without being centered. Reflexive accompaniment is examined in *Using Critical Reflexivity to Decolonise Community Research: Listening to the Voices of Mothers Navigating an Early Childhood Support System in Chile* by Quiroz Saavedra, which traces how reflexive practice reshaped the researcher's role and understanding of ethical engagement.

Also included in this chapter is *Embodying Decoloniality: Three Community Psychologists' Reflections on Our Practice and Learnings* by El-Sayeh, Stewart Baker Cervantes, and Patterson, which draws on experiences across Canada, Egypt, México, and the United States to examine how colonial assumptions surface within professional practice and how authors attempt to work differently. Together, these papers emphasize reflexivity as work that requires attention, humility, and responsibility rather than resolution or certainty.

Chapter 2: Disrupting the Colonial Academy

This chapter brings together papers that critically examine academic institutions as sites where colonial power is reproduced, contested, and sometimes actively resisted. The focus here is on how knowledge, curricula, legitimacy, and institutional silence are structured and challenged.

Curricular and disciplinary critique is central in *Decolonizing the Discipline: A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Psychology Curriculum at Zayed University* by Bin Thalith, Al Hamedi, and Almehairi, which examines how Western psychological knowledge is privileged and institutionalized within a UAE context. Related concerns are taken up in *Decolonial Educational Practice: Reimagining a Business School in Dubai* by Marochi and Kamath, which explores how accreditation pressures constrain decolonial dialogue within business education. *Japan's Community Psychology through the Decolonial Lens: Exploring Colonial Mentalities and Pathways to Social Justice* by Kuwayama, Sasao, Yanagii, Takahashi, Bando, and Ouchi similarly interrogates disciplinary silences and epistemic dependence within a Japanese context.

Institutional complicity and refusal are addressed directly in *Confronting Institutional Silences: A Collective Response to Genocide and Epistemic Erasure* by the Rooting Refusal Collective, which documents embodied acts of refusal within the Global North academy. Related tensions are explored in *Interrogating Academia's Lack of Support for Decolonization: Bridging Decolonial Theory and Action* by Scholars for Collective Liberation, which centers student organizing for Palestinian liberation and the institutional responses it provoked.

This chapter also includes *From Privilege to Productivity: Neoliberal Subjectivity and Counter Narratives in Indonesian Education* by Nugroho and Patria, which examines how neoliberal and colonial logics shape student subjectivity while also identifying sites of resistance. Together, these papers foreground disruption as necessary labor that carries personal, political, and institutional consequence.

4.2 Issue 2

Chapter 3: Re-Centering Education and Knowledge Making

The papers in this chapter focus on efforts to re-center education and knowledge-making around relational, contextual, and community-grounded practices, while remaining attentive to constraint. Rather than positioning education as a neutral site, these contributions treat it as a space where epistemic authority is negotiated, contested, and reworked through practice.

Training and intervention are examined in *Praxical Integrity: Imagining Constructive and Purposeful Training for Liberating Decolonial Community Interventions* by Daher, Rosati, and Campero, which introduces a framework grounded in care, dignity, and relational accountability across institutional, relational, and action-oriented dimensions. Pedagogical reconstruction is also central in *Toward a Liberatory Pedagogy: A Reflexive Journey of Relational Care and Critical Consciousness* by Barhouche, which traces course design as an extension of lived experience shaped by migration, community organizing, and critical consciousness.

The question of epistemic dominance within higher education is examined directly in *Decolonizing The Knowledge Canon: Reflective Case Studies Across Four African Universities* by

Maseti, Rwakijuma, Tessema, and Kiguwa, which reflects on pedagogical and research practices across South Africa, Ethiopia, and Uganda. Drawing on reflexive case studies, this contribution addresses how Western knowledge canons shape teaching, research, supervision, and community engagement, while also identifying strategies scholars use to navigate, disrupt, and reconfigure these dynamics within their institutional contexts.

Decolonial engagement with formal schooling is examined in *Decolonizing Education in Zimbabwe Through a Heritage Based Curriculum: A Reflexive Practitioner Inquiry* by Mudzingwa, which offers a reflexive account of curriculum reform grounded in practice. Drawing on autoethnographic reflection, policy analysis, and classroom-based inquiry, the paper examines how Zimbabwe's Heritage Based Curriculum seeks to re-center local knowledge, languages, and historical continuity, while also identifying ongoing constraints related to teacher development, assessment, and resources. Education is framed as a site where decolonial intentions are actively negotiated within inherited institutional structures.

Re-centering education through transnational and collective dialogue is further developed in *Positioning a Critique of Global Academic Knowledge Systems: Re-Imagining Community Psychology Education through Transnational Dialogues* by Jiménez, Ferreira, Pelupessy, and Baker Cervantes. This paper critiques the colonial foundations of global academic knowledge systems while advancing a pluriversal approach to community psychology education grounded in relationality, collective learning, and epistemological resistance. The emphasis here is on knowledge co-production across contexts rather than the replacement of one canon with another.

Knowledge-making through narrative and dialogue is further explored in *Storytelling as Resistance: A Podcast-Style Epistemology for Decolonising Education in Japan* by Okuyama and Okuyama, which uses podcasting as a pedagogical and epistemological intervention that centers dialogue, listening, and shared meaning-making. Together, the papers in this chapter approach re-centering as ongoing work that requires attentiveness to power, relationship, and responsibility, rather than the substitution of one canon for another.

Chapter 4: Storytelling and the Creation of Alternative Worlds

This chapter foregrounds storytelling, narrative, and creative practice as central to decolonial inquiry. These papers treat story not as illustration, but as method, relation, and political action. Youth-led media work is examined in *Radio-making as a Practice for Youth-Led Counterstorytelling for Re-existence* by Jayawardana and Sonn, which documents how radio-making enabled young people to author their own narratives and challenge dominant framings. Narrative refusal within academic knowledge production is enacted in *Reimagining Worlds Without Whiteness: A Research-to-Podcast Journey through Counter-Modernity Inquiry* by Truscott, which develops conceptual and practical tools for confronting whiteness through collective dialogue and public scholarship.

This chapter also includes *Dear Diary: Reimagining Academic Knowledge Production and Publishing from an Intersectional Decolonial Lens* by Shahin, Brown, and Patka, which uses diary-style narrative to expose how peer review and publishing function as sites of epistemic control. Together, these papers demonstrate how storytelling creates space for alternative ways of knowing, relating, and imagining otherwise.

Chapter 5: Healing, Solidarity, and Future-Making Beyond Modernity

The papers in this chapter center healing, solidarity, and care as collective and political practices enacted under conditions of ongoing harm. Rather than treating healing as an outcome that follows violence or disruption, these contributions examine how care, continuity, and future making are practiced alongside suffering, displacement, and systemic abandonment. The focus here is not institutional reform or narrative experimentation, but the sustaining of life, dignity, and relation when harm is persistent and structural.

Clinical and organizational practice is examined in *Decolonial Practices in Clinical Social Work and Mental Health Therapy: A Model for Inclusive Organizational Structures* by Meléndez-Vega, Butterworth, and Palermo, which explores how decolonial and Indigenous frameworks can reshape mental health practice and organizational life. Healing is approached as relational and ecological work that challenges Eurocentric clinical models and redistributes responsibility from individuals to communities and institutions.

Questions of future making under colonial constraint are taken up in *Rethinking the Construction of Future Goals in Peruvian Rural Youth: A Case Study of Sancos, Ayacucho* by Gutiérrez, Salas, Távara, Yépez, and Costilla. Drawing on participatory work with rural Andean youth, the paper examines how colonial ideals of professional success, migration, and development shape young people's aspirations while rendering local, relational, and community rooted futures precarious or undesirable. Youth navigate love, sexuality, intergenerational obligation, and belonging alongside imposed narratives of progress, revealing future making as a relational and ethical process rather than an individual choice.

Collective and ancestral care is foregrounded in R*eclaiming Black Ecologies Of Care: Decolonial Practices in the Ifá Orìsà Community* by McNally-Hair, which examines one form of African Traditional Religious practice as living infrastructures of healing, mutual aid, and cultural continuity. Through ritual, collective responsibility, and spiritual lineage, care is situated as a communal obligation that repairs colonial harm while sustaining connection across generations and geographies.

Relational accompaniment and ethical tension are explored in *Being in Two Places at Once: A Reflexive Case Study of Anti-Colonial Research Activities at the Creek and the University* by Ellison and Cantua. The paper reflects on the ongoing labor of maintaining accountability to community partners while navigating the demands and resources of the colonial university. Rather than framing decolonial work as resolution or exit, the authors attend to care as a sustained practice shaped by contradiction, restraint, and responsibility across uneven institutional terrain.

Testimony, survival, and moral witnessing are central in *Femicide: Sudanese Women's Stories of Rape and Oppression* by Osman, Hassanin, and Masud, which centers Sudanese women's narratives as acts of collective survival and refusal of erasure amid ongoing violence and global neglect. In this paper, testimony functions not as a narrative method or representational strategy, but as a practice of care, solidarity, and continuity. Healing and future making are not deferred to a time after harm, but are enacted through faith, community, and shared responsibility in the present.

Collective knowledge making grounded in lived experience and mutual accountability is examined in Collaborative Practices with Homeless People in Buenos Aires, Argentina: A Critical Approach to Power Knowledge Relationships in Community Psychology by Sapey, Di Iorio,

Falzone, Campos, Rodríguez Lizama, Rigueiral, Armentano, Iglesias Penna, and Cancinos. The paper documents a co research collective composed of people with lived experience of homelessness and academic collaborators, emphasizing care, reflexivity, and shared responsibility as conditions for producing knowledge together. Here, healing is enacted through dignity, trust, and sustained relational work across unequal social positions.

Together, the papers in this chapter frame future making as grounded in care, solidarity, and relational responsibility rather than optimism or resolution. They emphasize that decolonial practice does not only involve critique or disruption, but also the sustaining of life under conditions where harm persists. By centering healing as collective work, these contributions insist that care itself is a site of political action and a necessary condition for imagining futures beyond modernity.

5. Conclusion

This special issue does not offer a singular model, definition, or endpoint for decolonial practice in community psychology. Instead, it brings into conversation a set of situated efforts that grapple with coloniality as it is lived, negotiated, resisted, and sometimes reproduced across research, education, practice, and publishing. Across both issues, the papers reflect work under constraining conditions, making visible not only possibilities but also tensions, limits, and unfinished questions. We offer this collection as an invitation to remain attentive to context, to relationship, and to responsibility, and to recognize decolonial praxis as ongoing work rather than achieved position. We do not assume that the processes described here are complete or exemplary, including our own. Rather, we hope this special issue contributes to continued dialogue, reflexive accountability, and collective learning about what it means to practice community psychology in ways that take colonial histories, present violences, and relational obligations seriously, while remaining open to revision as conditions, understandings, and responsibilities continue to shift.

APPENDIX A
COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY IN GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE
SPECIAL ISSUE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Engaging Reflexive Decolonial Practices in Community Psychology Inquiry & Education

Special Issue Co-Editors:
Mazna Patka, Tiffeny R. Jiménez, Hana Shahin, Olya Glantsman

The *Community Psychology in Global Perspective Journal* invites you to submit an abstract to the upcoming special issue on **Engaging Reflexive Decolonial Practices in Community Psychology Inquiry & Education**. For more information on this journal see: http://siba-ese.unisalento.it/index.php/cpgp

Growing global consciousness underscores the urgency of addressing ways in which imperialism, colonialism, and neoliberalism manifest within practices of education and are complicit with the global project of coloniality. The escalation of social justice movements, heightened awareness of systemic inequalities, and calls for decolonization have brought these issues to the forefront of academic discourse. However, despite acknowledging the role of colonial power discourse, the rhetoric of decoloniality does not always align with actions. This special issue aims to amplify voices and perspectives that contribute to this crucial conversation, offer insights into transformative practices, and create space to support collective reflexive co-learning on decolonial practices in community psychology inquiry and education.

Formal education has been a common strategy of colonization and nation building given that the experience of learning is carefully delineated to inform, design, and employ people into socio-political structures that uphold Western superiority in all life domains; this is what allows those in power to maintain the current structure. Educational settings play a central role in colonizing through various forms of socialization, academic capital, assumptions about the global nature of knowledge, knowledge production, and potential lack of critical analysis of more natural pathways for dissemination/communication. They provide the rationale for maintaining the status quo and the basis of frameworks for practice through traditions of science, teaching, mentoring, and learning. Globally, there has been increasing awareness of the problematic nature of the limitations and assumptions embedded in institutions of education and increasing calls for decoloniality within Community Psychology, associated fields, and transdisciplinarily. A systemic transformative shift in paradigms that allow for alignment of being and doing is necessary. We hope for pedagogical approaches that will allow for more critical, liberatory, and decolonial approaches to reconsider the nature of education, assumptions embedded in science, and what is perceived to be valid knowledge and ways of knowing and being.

This special issue is a call to action - for our colleagues to investigate what we have come to regard as knowledge. Inevitably, this investigation also involves questioning what we have come to know as "science", or knowledge production, the role of institutional structures in maintaining norms that allow harm to remain embedded in the status quo, and to re-examine power dynamics within educational settings. We hope to explore together what we, as a global community, are doing to push against Western imperialism and epistemicide within settings and places of education. This call for proposals invites scholars, researchers, educators, students, and practitioners to contribute *Reflexive Case Studies* to share attempts, challenges, and tensions with engaging decolonial practices that comment on historical context and positionality as it relates to choices of action. More specifically we are interested in learning about successes and challenges with enactments of liberatory and decolonial approaches to inquiry and education. We encourage sharing of suggestions or re-imagining renewed opportunities in teaching, learning, and inquiry.

General points for potential authors to consider:

1.   Submissions must be Reflexive Case Studies (Qualitative Inquiry), but we also welcome papers using mixed/integrated methods. Submissions may include links to video, audio, or images to promote accessibility of content. While the majority of papers will be research articles (minimum of 70%), we will also welcome:

    a) Reports of community practices (no more than 20%)
    b) Perspective articles (no more than 10%)
    c) Literature reviews or journalistic opinion papers will not be considered

2.   At least two reviewers will review submissions. The Special Issue co-editors will engage authors in a dialogue (likely through Zoom) to support submissions through the publication process.

    a. Authors will be asked to serve as peer reviewers, but serving as a peer reviewer will not be mandatory. Those who choose to serve as peer reviewers will be asked to participate in a co-learning process on using decolonial practices in peer review.

3.   There will be an optional learning community where authors of accepted abstracts will be invited to learning community sessions. These sessions will provide opportunities for co-learning and community-building space to support continued understanding of different ways of knowing and   knowledge.

4.   We (Mazna Patka, Tiffeny R. Jiménez, Hana Shahin, Olya Glantsman) invite potential authors to meet with us via Zoom to discuss any questions/concerns about the special issue. Contact us at ReflexiveDecolonialPractices@gmail.com

Kindly submit an abstract of 300 to 500 words (references are not required and are not included in the word count), double-spaced, one inch margins, 12 point font, in Times New Roman, Calibri or Arial. Accepted manuscripts must adhere to the journal's instructions for authors,   available   at   http://siba-ese.unisalento.it/index.php/cpgp/about/submissions#authorGuidelines

Link to Abstract Submission Site: https://forms.gle/rCBMbN6yD5kbUjJZ9

Important Dates:
Abstract Submission is **due on January 6, 2025**
Final manuscripts will be due on November 1, 2025.

Glossary

We grappled with the varying definitions of some terms we used. Therefore, we provide a brief glossary of how we use them. Submissions are not limited to our definitions, so we welcome varied understandings of these terms as they relate to specific contexts/situations.

Coloniality: Refers to the "colonial matrix of power" (CMP) (Quijano, 2000) or coloniality of power interrelating the practices and legacies of European colonialism in social orders and forms of knowledge. Some have referred to coloniality as the dark side of Modernity, which was the basis and justification for the exploitation of the world and its resources by European systems of domination. This matrix of control operates through control or hegemony over authority, labor, sexuality, and subjectivity by way of political administration, production of materials, and exploitation of land and people.

Community Psychology: Community psychology is regarded in this special issue as a transdisciplinary practice and science that may be labeled differently depending on the context, however the emphasis is on social or structural inquiry/research/investigation grounded in actions linked to reducing harm to our communities or addressing root causes that reach for justice. Various contexts may label this work differently as coming from various disciplinary trajectories (e.g., Social Justice Education, Social Innovation).

Decoloniality: Decoloniality is a movement that seeks to dismantle the enduring effects of colonialism and Eurocentrism by centering marginalized voices and promoting alternative epistemologies rooted in indigenous knowledge and resistance. It aims to foster liberation from oppressive structures and create more equitable and inclusive societies.

Decolonization: Decolonization is the process of undoing colonial systems of oppression, including political, economic, social, and cultural domination, often by formerly colonized peoples reclaiming their autonomy and sovereignty. It involves challenging colonial legacies, redistributing power, and advocating for the rights and self-determination of marginalized communities historically subjected to colonial rule.

Education: Education is defined broadly to include both informal and formal knowledge sharing that can take place in all locations.

Epistemology: Epistemology is the philosophical study of knowledge, investigating its nature, acquisition, and justification. It explores questions about what we can know, how we know it, and what distinguishes justified beliefs from mere opinion.

Inquiry: "An examination into facts or principles: RESEARCH" (Merriam-Webster, 2024)

Reflexive Case Study (or Contextual Reflection): A process whereby a person/group explores their own situation and past experience with the phenomenon to identify ways of dismantling and re-creating systems and structures through alternative ways of thinking, knowing and action.

Readings that have Influenced Our Thinking

Avery, S. (2023). Dear reviewer *n*: An open letter on academic culture, structural racism, and the place of indigenous knowledges, with a question from one indigenous academic to the decolonizing academics who are not. *Social Inclusion, 11*(2), 232-234. https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v11i2.7245

Cantú-Sánchez, M., de León-Zepeda, C., & Cantú, N. E. (2020). *Teaching Gloria E. Anzaldúa: pedagogy and practice for our classrooms and communities*. The University of Arizona Press.

de Sousa Santos, B. (2007). Beyond abyssal thinking: From global lines to ecologies of knowledges. *Eurozine. https://carleton.ca/mds/wp-content/uploads/santos-Abyssal-thinking.pdf*

Decolonial Futures Collective. (2020, September 1). *The house of modernity*. [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nAke2iQ53jc

Delgado Bernal, D., Burciaga, R. & Flores Carmona, J. (2016). Chicana/Latina testimonios as pedagogical, methodological, and activist approaches to social justice. Routledge.

Demeter, M. (2022). Development studies in the world system of global knowledge production: A critical empirical analysis. *Progress in Development Studies, 22*(3), 239-256.https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/14649934211060155

Freire, P. (1992). Pedagogy of hope: Reliving pedagogy of the oppressed. Bloomsbury Academic.

Grosfoguel, R. (2007). The epistemic decolonial turn. *Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World, 1*(1). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233028182_The_epistemic_decolonial_turn

Hall, B. L. & Tandon, R. (2017). Decolonization of knowledge, epistemicide, participatory research and higher education. *Research for All, 1*(1), 6-19. http://doi.org/10.18546/RFA.01.1.02

Jeater, D. (2018). Academic standards or academic imperialism? Zimbabwean perceptions of hegemonic power in the global construction of knowledge. *African Studies Review, 61*(02), 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1017/asr.2017.132

Jiménez, T. R. & Lee, G. (2022). Radicalizing psychology; Embodying decoloniality. *Global Journal of Community Psychology Practice, 13*(1), 1-32. https://www.gjcpp.org/en/article.php?issue=42&article=258

Jiménez, T.R., Mingo, E., Viola, J., Olson, B. & Balthazar, C. (2023). Foundations of Relational Ethics: Introducing a Continuum of Community Psychology Praxis. *Global Journal of Community Psychology Practice, 14*(1), 1-27. https://www.gjcpp.org/en/article.php?issue=44&article=274

Keast, S. (2020). Psychology education and the neoliberal episteme in Australia. *Theory & Psychology, 30*,(4), 507-527. https://doi.org/10.1177/50935953453423029092266574

Mignolo, W. D. & Walsh, C. E. (2018). *On decoloniality*. Duke University Press. https://www.dukeupress.edu/on-decoloniality

Mika, C. (2017). *Indigenous education and the metaphysics of presence: A worlded philosophy*. Routledge.

Muller, S. M. (2022). *The incentivised university: Scientific revolutions, policies, consequences*. Springer International Publishing.

Prakash, M. S. & Esteva, G. (2008). *Escaping education: Living as learning within grassroots cultures*. Germany: P. Lang.

Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America. Nepantla: Views from the South, 1(3), 533–580. https://edisciplinas.usp.br/pluginfile.php/347342/mod_resource/content/1/Quijano%20(2000)%20Colinality%20of%20power.pdf

Seckinelgin, H. (2023). Teaching social policy as if students matter: Decolonizing the curriculum and perpetuating epistemic injustice. *Critical Social Policy, 43*(2), 296-315.

The Toyin Falola Interviews (2024). TF interviews: A panel discussion on decolonization/decoloniality. [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WG0wn62xjtc

APPENDIX B
ENGAGING REFLEXIVE DECOLONIAL PRACTICES IN COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY INQUIRY & EDUCATION

Special Issue in Community Psychology in Global Perspective
PEER REVIEWER FORM

Author Guidelines from Community Psychology in Global Perspective

http://siba-ese.unisalento.it/index.php/cpgp/about/submissions#authorGuidelines

The 7,000 word count does not include references, glossary, and appendices. While APA allows for footnotes, authors should generally avoid including footnotes. Supplemental content that would go in a footnote should be included in the Glossary. Also remember that all authors are welcome to use decolonial processes and styles in their submission.

All Authors: Please see the review criteria below as you prepare your manuscript for submission.

Abstract Number (DO NOT EDIT):
Abstract Title (DO NOT EDIT):
Type of Article (DO NOT EDIT):
Reviewer Name:
Reviewer Email:
Reviewer's Positionality in Relation to Article:
Our goal is to cultivate a learning community around this special issue in which all papers have the potential to be published. With the support of peer reviewers, we aim to help authors develop manuscripts that both situate their work within regional contexts and enhance clarity for an international readership. The relational process we emphasize is between the authors and the guest editors. We approach this process as one of collaboration and dialogue, offering strengths-based feedback that clarifies points of confusion, aligns each paper with the purpose of the special issue—enacting approaches to decolonizing education and inquiry—and supports ongoing, respectful communication throughout the editorial process.

Instructions for Peer Reviewers

Thank you for taking the time to support this special issue through your peer review. In line with the theme of the issue, we invite you to approach the review using a decolonial lens. This means recognizing that scholarship may take varied forms, and the review process itself should honor diverse epistemologies, voices, and contexts. The criteria below are not intended to impose rigid boundaries, but rather to support each submission's potential toward publication.

We ask that your feedback be constructive, specific, and strengths-based, with the goal of enhancing the article's clarity, relevance, and accessibility for a global audience. Reviewers may consider, but are not limited to:

- Suggesting references that contextualize the work, such as local initiatives, regionally grounded literature, or publicly available materials (e.g., community-based reports, videos, or online media).
- Identifying places where the argument could be more clearly expressed or situated within a local or global context.
- Recommending tools that support understanding—such as glossaries or expanded definitions—especially when authors draw on regionally specific concepts or practices.

Please approach this process as a collaborative dialogue between you and the guest editors, with the shared aim of supporting authors at different stages in their scholarly and decolonial journeys. The tone of your comments should reflect a spirit of generosity and respect for varied scholarly traditions.

We ask that reviewers avoid:

- Requiring citations of specific scholars or canonical texts.
- Making vague or broad comments that are difficult to address.
- Requesting additional data collection.
- Offering critiques on language or writing style that are not directly linked to meaning or clarity.

If something in the paper is unclear, please be specific and offer actionable suggestions to improve clarity or connection to the issue's focus on decolonial education and inquiry.

Lastly, to reflect the collaborative nature of this special issue, each published article will acknowledge its peer reviewers by name. Please confirm your name is correctly listed above.

Questions? Please reach out to reflexivedecolonialpractices@gmail.com if you have any questions during the peer review process.

Review Criteria	Response and Rationale
What are the strengths of this paper? Is there something you learned from this article that makes a unique contribution?	

Does the paper include an introduction that provides a brief understanding of the issue in context?	
Is the focus of the paper explicitly related to decoloniality? If yes, how/in what sense? Note: All papers will require historical context, particularly in relation to coloniality/neo-colonialism/imperialism/decolonization/decoloniality.	
If necessary, is a glossary of terms included? If not, which terms might be helpful to include in the glossary?	
Are power dynamics in relation to decoloniality or colonialism discussed? Is it adequately addressed?	
Do the author(s) engage in some form of reflexivity?	
Do the authors envision a future where things change?	
Research Articles Only: Does the method section include information about participants, materials, and procedures? If not, what is missing? How might it be incorporated?	
If aspects of APA style are missing in the article, specify what exactly is missing. For example, if an in-text citation is not included in the reference page, state which in-text citation does not have a reference.	
Other (Please Specify):	
Other (Please Specify):	
Other (Please Specify):	
Are you willing to review this same article once the author(s) revises their paper?	

Guest Editor Comments

Mazna Patka	
Tiffeny Jiménez	
Hana Shahin	
Olya Glantsman	