Research Article

PRAXICAL INTEGRITY: IMAGINING CONSTRUCTIVE AND PURPOSEFUL TRAINING FOR LIBERATING DECOLONIAL COMMUNITY INTERVENTIONS

Marianne Daher[*]; Antonia Rosati[*]; María José Campero[*]

In community intervention it is important to reflect and engage in training on how to relate to others in ways that are not oppressive or colonial, but rather liberating, because oppressive relationships are not dismantled solely through critique, but also through the active construction of new and transformative ways of relating. To advance this effort, this article seeks to offer guidance for those of us engaged in community intervention and training, to develop approaches and intervention actions related to the institutional framework, community intervention agents, and participants, moving toward a relational position that fosters liberation. To this end, based on empirical findings from a research project, we introduce the concept of praxical integrity, which is composed by approaches associated with the institutional framework (commitment with social justice approach, critical approach participatory approach, situated approach and care approach), approaches associated with the bond between community intervention agent and participant (strengthened bond approach, autonomy and agency approach, awareness and reflexivity approach, and dignity and humanization approach) and intervention actions (frame, guide, inform, connect, follow-up, motivate, support emotionally, conscientize and empower). We discuss how praxical integrity, to be developed, requires safe spaces in both community intervention and training, so that institutional representatives, community intervention agents, and participants can trust and explore liberating ways of relating to one another. We understand this as a form of training that is both grounded in and oriented toward the development of radical solidarity and decolonial love in community intervention.

***Keywords**: praxical integrity, praxical violence, decolonial community psychology, symmetrical power, relational praxis, reflexivity and training, situated knowledge and practice.*

1. Introduction

Relationality —which refers to the way in which beings relate to one another, emphasising the importance of relationships in understanding identity, agency, and structure (Okwechime, 2025)— has emerged as a relevant topic from a decolonial approach in community intervention (Dutta et al.,2023; Sonn et al., 2025), being important to incorporate it in training and intervention spaces. In the literature on community intervention, much has been said about the important

[*] Escuela de Psicología, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile ANID FONDECYT Iniciación 11200394

role of community intervention agents and how the relationships with participants should be (Andersson, 2013; Barbero & Cortés, 2011; Boira et al., 2010; Winkler et al.,2014). However, from our perspective, these discussions have remained mostly theoretical, lacking empirical grounding and often overlooking the role of other key actors involved in community interventions, such as the institutional framework and the participants themselves.

Our concern about the relationships in community intervention is developed in Chile, a Latin American country. Latin America refers to the group of countries in the Americas where Spanish and Portuguese are spoken, shaped by a shared history of colonisation. It encompasses regions from Mexico through Central and South America, and the Caribbean. The history of Chile in relation to coloniality shows how hierarchies rooted in Spanish colonisation —such as racial stratification, land dispossession of Indigenous peoples, and Eurocentric cultural dominance— have endured beyond independence, influencing present-day social and political structures, along with the colonial influence of other countries, such as the United States. Chile has a unique history of community intervention and community psychology, a discipline marked by effort, resistance, and continuous growth (Krause et al., 2011). For much of the 20th century, community intervention in Chile was often shaped by prevailing political interests, as well as by Catholic organizations. During the civic-military dictatorship (1973-1990), much of this organizational structure of community intervention was dismantled, and the resistance to oppression emerged through non-governmental organizations, territorial groups, and more progressive ecclesiastical bodies, all operating in a semi-clandestine manner. With the return to democracy, non-governmental organizations flourished within organized civil society, and community intervention increasingly became incorporated into public policy (Alfaro & Berroeta, 2007).

Reflecting on the relationships between these three actors —institutional framework, community intervention agent and participants— is particularly important in our region, Latin America. This, considering that community intervention is often carried out by institutions with colonial logics, that is, expressions or practices that, explicitly or implicitly, reproduce structures of thought and relationships inherited from colonialism —such as the State. In this context, assistentialistic logics (treating people as subjects of assistance and dependency) and paternalistic logics (treating people as subjects without resources and autonomy) tend to prevail, as recognized by various Latin American authors (Alfaro, 2012; Reyes-Espejo et al., 2015; Rozas, 2018; Wiesenfeld, 2014). Moreover, we have identified a specific form of violence within community intervention, called praxical violence, which reflects the asymmetrical exercise of colonial power in these contexts (Daher et al., 2024a). While this form of violence is intrinsic to community intervention, it is intertwined with other forms of structural and cultural violence that challenge and tension the social transformation practices enacted by community psychologists (Dutta et al., 2016). For this reason, we believe that a decolonial approach is essential for analysing and developing relationships in this field, as it encourages reflection not only on social conditions but also on the colonial structures and interactions that continue to shape and dominate us (Fanon, 1961; Quijano, 2007) in the community field. In this sense, it helps to understand that in institutions that can be colonial, such as the State, coloniality is not only manifested in historical and material structures, but also in social relationships, power dynamics, and the interests and agency of individuals. But, at the same time, it allows us to see how, within

these same spaces, it is possible to recognize decolonial glimpses that enable resistance to coloniality, which in this article are reflected in praxical integrity.

However, from our experience, the critical lens that often characterizes the decolonial approach may sometimes fall short in offering constructive alternatives (Daher et al., 2026) for those of us working in community interventions and training —undergraduate and graduate studies, specializations, supervision, technical assistance, among others—. This is particularly relevant when it comes to guiding our work in the community field, especially in relation to how actors engage with one another. In this regard, we advocate for a critical yet proactive perspective on how the institutional framework, community interventions agents, and participants should relate, recognizing that oppressive relationships are not dismantled solely through critique, but also through the active construction of new, transformative ways of relating.

On the other hand, from our decolonial standpoint —and as mentioned in the announcement of this special issue— "despite acknowledging the role of colonial power discourse, the rhetoric of decoloniality does not always align with actions". This highlights the fact that, in many cases, the decolonial approach remains at a symbolic, discursive, or rhetorical level, without adequately engaging with the dimension of action or practice. However, if we are to address the relationship between the institutional framework, community intervention agents, and participants, we must incorporate both a symbolic and a practical dimension. This connects with the concept of praxis, which calls for the integration of theory (the symbolic dimension) and practice (the practical dimension) in a continuous process of reflection (Montero, 2004).

For this reason, our aim in this article is to offer guidance for those of us engaged in community intervention and training, to develop approaches and intervention actions related to the institutional framework, community intervention agents, and participants, moving toward a relational position that fosters liberation.

This article is guided by this objective, grounded in our positionality as Latin American women and community psychologists. Our histories have been shaped by growing up and working in contexts marked by social inequality, authoritarian legacies, capitalist and neoliberal dynamics, and persistent colonial structures. At the same time, we recognise that our academic training, professional status, and linguistic privilege (writing in English as non-native speakers) position us with certain advantages. In this sense, we position ourselves within a context that is complex and oppressive in many ways, while acknowledging that we hold a certain position of privilege that allows us to observe, research, and reflect on the bonds within social intervention. From this position, we aim not only to shed light on the violence that occurs in this field, but also to contribute a constructive perspective on how to relate.

In a previous publication on praxical violence, we pointed out that working on these issues had been a "very personal and also vulnerable path, which has directly challenged our subjectivities as community psychologists and intervention agents. We have learned that we can all be oppressors, even being women, Latinas, Spanish-speakers, underestimated and often discriminated against" (Daher et al., 2024a, p.202). In light of this experience, which relates to becoming aware of praxical violence, we now value the opportunity to reflect on and write about praxical integrity. This allows us to connect with the more constructive side of the decolonial approach that guides us. So, we are glad to be able to offer both discursive and practical alternatives to prevent and address possible situations of oppression that often go unnoticed in

our everyday work. Likewise, it inspires us to imagine ourselves outside of oppression, moving toward new forms of radical solidarity in how we relate to and work with our teams and students, as well as with people and communities. In this line, we reflect on how we can relate to one another in ways that amplify human potential and subjectivities, within a relational context that can be transformed through a new praxis.

2. Contextualization

This article is based on a case study about social policies for overcoming poverty, which we conducted within the framework of the research project FONDECYT Iniciación a la Investigación 11200394, "Social programs for intervention in poverty: Key aspects of the participant-intervention agent, group-community, and socio-institutional bonds", funded by National Agency for Research and Development (ANID) of the Chilean government. The social policy analysed in this case aims to enhance the social and occupational skills of its participants to foster social inclusion, improve quality of life, promote autonomy, and facilitate engagement with both the community and institutional services. To achieve this, community intervention agents assess and monitor each participant across six key dimensions: employment and social security, income, health, education, housing and environment, and social support and participation. The intervention is delivered over a two-year period and includes psychosocial support provided by the community intervention agent in weekly sessions. In addition, it offers community support by connecting participants with relevant social services and other participants living in similar situations, as well as the provision of both conditional and unconditional cash transfers. This intervention is implemented in both urban and rural areas throughout the country.

The objective of our research project was to analyse the bonds between community intervention agents and participants. We applied qualitative methodology (Flick, 2015) and utilized a maximum variation purposive sampling (Patton, 1990). This sampling strategy involved selecting participants that allowed for a comprehensive exploration of the various forms and expressions the object of study might take. In our case, the aspect that varied was the quality of the bond between participant and community intervention agent, associated with whether it was a positive or negative/complex bond. This was crucial for understanding the complexity of this bond and how its characteristics differ depending on its quality.

The access strategy was carried out through an alliance with the public institution implementing the social policy. The national and/or regional program coordinators provided the research team with the contact information of the community intervention agents, and these agents shared the participants' contact details. The invitation to participate was extended by a research assistant to promote voluntary participation.

A total of 40 individuals participated, specifically 20 pairs consisting of 20 community intervention agents and 20 participants. The community intervention agents were mostly female professionals from the social sciences (psychologists and social workers) that work in local governments that implement the social policy under analysis. The participants were women between 25 and 59 years old, all mothers, engaged in domestic, independent, or informal work, and living in extreme poverty. We conducted semi-structured individual interviews (Flick, 2021). We developed two thematic interview scripts (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009): one for the community

intervention agents and another for the participants. Both thematic scripts were organized into the following sections: introduction, general questions, intervention modality, dimensions and characteristics of the community intervention agent, dimensions and characteristics of the participants, characteristics of the relationship between the agent and the participant, the connection between the agent–participant relationship and the quality of the intervention and closing. Some key questions from the thematic script (participant version) included: How would you describe your bond with your community intervention agent? What aspects do you think facilitated or hindered this bond? What contextual aspects (family, neighbourhood, institutions, among others) influence this bond? How would you describe a typical intervention session with your agent? What actions does your agent take? What attitudes or skills does your agent encourage you to develop? How are you involved with the intervention? Which of your own skills or personal characteristics do you think influence the bond with your agent? What is the role of a community intervention agent? What is your role as a participant? Do you consider this bond important for achieving the intervention outcomes? How would you define an ideal bond? The interviews were carried out by members of our research team who had been trained by the principal investigator. They lasted approximately one hour, were audio recorded, and transcribed.

We performed a critical qualitative analysis (Daher et al., 2026) that integrates the critical approach with qualitative research through reflexivity and rigor, aiming to make situations of social injustice and justice visible. Our methodological proposal involves a critical positioning; preparatory actions for analysis; the critical qualitative analysis itself, conducted through comprehensive technical steps; situated considerations; analytical particularities —including theory-based and emergent phenomenon analysis, analysis of problematic and constructive aspects, and first- and second-level analysis— as well as necessary precautions; and finally, the respectful communication of the analysis. Critical qualitative analysis is theoretically grounded in the proposals of the critical approach, specifically those coming from the decolonial approach (Fanon, 1961; Quijano, 2007), critical community psychology (Evans et al., 2017; Kagan et al., 2020) and Latin American community psychology (Montero, 1982; Wiesenfeld, 2012), and is technically grounded in qualitative research (Denzin & Lincoln, 2012; Flick, 2015). The analysis was conducted by the research team, but during some interviews, findings from previous interviews were shared with the participants to ask them for reflections and allow them to contribute with their perspectives on specific topics of interest.

We obtained approval for the study from the Scientific Ethics Committee for Social Sciences, Arts, and Humanities at the Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, and we conducted the informed consent procedure. To ensure rigor, we employed the intersubjective triangulation (Cornejo & Salas, 2011) through weekly spaces for discussion and reflexivity within our research team. This project has generated various publications and support materials, which can be accessed at www.praxiscomunitaria.com.

3. Results

In another work, we presented the phenomenon of praxical violence, which is defined as “the asymmetrical exercise of colonial power by a subject (institutional framework, community intervention agents, or participants) in symbolic and practical dimensions, which targets an object

(community intervention agent or participant), resulting in the reproduction of power relationships that are detrimental to the actors involved and to the aims of community intervention" (Daher et al., 2024a, p.194). This phenomenon was revealed going beyond the good intentions of the actors and common sense to uncover hidden power dynamics (Evans et al., 2017; Montero, 2011).

However, we believe that the training of people interested in the community field must not focus solely on what students and professionals should avoid or refrain from doing to prevent the reproduction of colonial logics, that is, expressions or practices that, explicitly or implicitly, reproduce structures of thought and relationships inherited from colonialism. They also need constructive and affirmative guidance for their work. Because of this, in this article —and as a way to overcome and prevent praxical violence— we propose the concept of praxical integrity. We define it as the exercise of symmetrical power, enacted through symbolic approaches related to the institutional framework and the bond between community intervention agent and participant, along with practical intervention actions that establish relationships nourishing both the actors involved and the aims of the community intervention. As already noted, praxical integrity prevents praxical violence and can also address it when it occurs, in a reactive manner. In the first case, it would be advisable to apply all the approaches and actions. In the second case, depending on the factors generating praxical violence, it is important to strengthen those approaches and actions that can help to counteract it.

Our understanding of power is relational, dynamic, and graduated (Serrano & López, 1991), and this has important implications for how we conceptualize praxical violence and praxical integrity. To begin, we recognize that the social policy establishes certain differences in roles and power among the institution, intervention agents, and participants, but it can also constitute a space that is as symmetrical as possible within those differences. However, there is always a risk that such asymmetry may become magnified (praxical violence), which underscores the importance of preventing this phenomenon through praxical integrity. Now then, when praxical violence has already occurred, praxical integrity contributes by progressively introducing approaches and intervention actions that make relationships less asymmetrical —or more symmetrical. A fundamental element in moving from asymmetry to more symmetry is the reflexivity and critical awareness of the actors involved. In this sense, this approach is grounded in the belief that dialogue and joint reflection can transform practices, recognizing both the resources of the actors and the dynamic nature of social relationships.

Both praxical violence and praxical integrity emerge from what we heard and learned from community intervention agents and participants. Although they did not explicitly describe their discourses and practices as decolonial, they referred to concepts aligned with the decolonial approach, such as autonomy, awareness, empowerment, humanization, social dignification, and recognition. This is why we address praxical violence and praxical integrity from a decolonial perspective. In this sense, praxical integrity is already present in their discourses and is being enacted in practice, and at the same time, it is a concept that contributes to the decolonization of community intervention.

In this article, we present the approaches and intervention actions that compose praxical integrity, addressing different actors. The approaches associated with the institutional framework (social programs and their representatives such as directors, coordinators, supervisors, among

others). The approaches related to the bond between the community intervention agent (professionals, technicians, monitors, etc.) and the participant (individuals, families, groups, communities, etc.) focus on both parties. The intervention actions pertain to community intervention agents.

For each type of actor, we present questions designed to encourage critical reflection and awareness. Then, we provide a brief description of how each actor may exert praxical violence. Subsequently, we outline the elements of praxical integrity that prevent or address such expressions of praxical violence.

3.1 Approaches associated with the institutional framework: the role of institutional representative

As an institutional representative (director, coordinator, supervisor, among others), how often do you think people that represent institutional frameworks genuinely care about the quality of community intervention, recognizing it as a commitment to social justice? In what ways are institutions capable of being self-critical and maintaining a critical perspective on community intervention? Do institutions promote interventions that are horizontal, collaborative, and contextually relevant? How often do institutions take actions to safeguard the well-being of those who work and those who participate in them? What actions can directors, coordinators and supervisors promote within the institution to foster approaches aligned with praxical integrity?

Regarding the institutional framework, we observe that praxical violence manifests in two ways (Daher et al., 2024a). First, when it originates from the institutional framework toward community intervention agents, it involves colonial rigid demands and labour precariousness. Colonial rigid demands include a top-down logic —a centralized and standardizing community intervention that fails to incorporate the local knowledge of community intervention agents— constant inspection of their work (often experienced as persecution and excessive demands), and contradictions between discourse and practice, especially regarding the importance of developing a bond between community intervention agent and participant versus other institutional requirements, such as number of sessions, number of people attended, achievement of programmatic goals, among others. Labor precariousness refers to precarious working conditions for community intervention agents, an over-demanding work structure, the absence of protocols to handle complex cases, work overload that leads to feelings of being "over-collapsed" and burnout, and a lack of care measures from the institutional framework.

Second, we observe that praxical violence from the institutional framework toward participants involves an objectifying process of colonization. This manifests as a macro-numerical logic in community intervention —where participants are reduced to mere "numbers"; a normalizing logic that imposes a standardized notion of how to address the social problems participants face, such as poverty; a supervision-focused logic, in which participants must constantly prove their eligibility (for example, demonstrating they are poor enough to enrol); and an assistentialistic and paternalistic logic that "does things for" participants rather than enabling them to develop their autonomy.

To prevent or overcome these situations of violence and advance toward praxical integrity, we present five approaches regarding the role of the institutional framework: the commitment with

social justice approach, the critical approach, the participatory approach, the situated approach and the care approach.

3.1.1 Commitment to social justice approach

The commitment to social justice approach implies recognizing that actions are necessary to promote the equitable distribution of resources, opportunities, and rights within a society, especially for the most vulnerable. So, it entails acknowledging at the institutional level that participants deserve to be part of the community intervention and that, as a result, their participation is not a *"favour"* from the institution, but also a commitment derived from social justice. It is essential to communicate that, if applicable, community intervention is legally protected, and guarantee that adequate resources are being used to effectively safeguard the well-being of participants, particularly those facing extreme vulnerability and in need of immediate support to fulfil their basic needs (e.g. food, health, among others). This approach is also reflected in how participants understand the community intervention not as a gift, but as something they are worthy of, as evidenced in the following quote: "For she [participant], it is her right to have all of that [referring to the intervention], because she is part of a vulnerable family. It's also an extended family, a very large one, (...) it's her right to be helped" (Interview 41, community intervention agent). However, it is essential to understand that the relationship between the community intervention and the participants is one based on commitments with the participant, but it also concerns the responsibilities of the participants. Additionally, it is important to prioritize participants' access to various services, benefits, or programs, while continuously expanding the range of available opportunities and establishing formal institutional partnerships to ensure the guarantee of social justice measures. In this sense, it is relevant that policymakers, funders, government representatives or other actors promote partnerships, agreements, referral channels, and other necessary institutional mechanisms to guarantee the rights of the most vulnerable people, whether in areas such as health, education, employment, social security, and others.

3.1.2 Critical approach

The critical approach highlights the importance of institutional frameworks recognizing their own limits and capacities in the implementation of community interventions. It involves institutional awareness about preferences of interventions, for example, regarding the disproportionate emphasis on people in extreme poverty, which leads to the exclusion of other vulnerable groups, such as the *"middle class"*, who in some countries also face multiple risks, but are often neglected by community interventions. Furthermore, it involves acknowledging institutional aspects that contribute to discomfort and unrest among participants and community intervention agents. These aspects may include insufficient allocation of resources to public services, inadequate and delayed support from these services, among others. Recognizing this at the institutional level is important for correcting them, and for embracing and understanding the frustrations of the participants, as pointed out by a community intervention agent: "There are participants who are more critical —not of us personally, but of how the social system and state support are structured" (Interview 29, community intervention agent).

3.1.3 Participatory approach

The participatory approach reinforces the need for the institutional framework to promote participants' autonomy and freedom in the community intervention process. This includes the right to decide whether to participate or withdraw from community intervention at any time. Additionally, it is crucial that the establishment of intervention goals be a joint effort between the community intervention agent and the participant, with the participants having the space to shape the intervention goals and the processes necessary to achieve them. This collaboration should occur in a coordinated and egalitarian manner, rather than through rigid compliance with standardized protocols. As a community intervention agents said: "From the initial diagnosis, from the moment we sign the commitment letter —which outlines the participant's responsibilities and duties— we always emphasize, even before starting the session, that the intervention is voluntary, that the person accept it, and that by accepting the intervention, they are also committing to honour the agreements we reach together. It's a joint effort" (Interview 39, community intervention agent).

3.1.4 Situated approach

The situated approach highlights the importance of institutional frameworks being responsive to the specific realities of participants, their families, and their contexts. This approach highlights personalized interventions, providing from the institution the conditions for community intervention agents to gain a deep understanding of the realities faced by participants. It also involves offering alternatives that enable participants to achieve their intervention goals, considering their diverse living conditions and circumstances. This makes it possible to carry out a more integral and versatile approach with all participants, in terms of properly developing the different phases of the community intervention, considering the specific characteristics of each participant and adjusting the process, accordingly, basing on local knowledge. In the words of a community intervention agent: "'We're ultimately very versatile —or we have to develop that versatility— because we work with many different types of participants. From single-person households, single-parent, two-parent, extended families, and so on. We work with all kinds of participants. So, you need to have that flexibility and that expertise" (Interview 35, par. 34, community intervention agent). Also, institutional flexibility is key for addressing difficulties that participants may encounter, such as attending support sessions or meeting specific intervention goals due to contingencies or crises. Additionally, a situated approach recognizes the disparities between urban and rural contexts in the implementation of community interventions, and also gender, ethnicity, aging and other differences, from an intersectional perspective.

3.1.5 Care approach

The care approach reinforces the need for the institutional framework to recognize the importance of community intervention agents and psychosocial teams' well-being. It involves acknowledging and addressing work-related stress and burnout among team members. Prioritizing the well-being of community intervention agents is not only beneficial for their own personal satisfaction, but also crucial for fostering a strong bond with participants and the

achievement of intervention goals: “When you work in harmonious environments —where you can tell that others care about you as a person and as a professional— it also changes the way you commit to and connect with others. At least in this intervention, we know what the objectives are, and we know that through that connection, we can achieve all of them” (Interview 20, team leader). Consequently, it is essential to establish formal and systematic care practices to prevent burning out. It is especially important to have spaces for catharsis, decompression and emotional support; technical spaces for case supervision, team dialogue, and feedback on the intervention process; and training spaces focused on the relationship between community intervention agents and participants, as well as on complex issues related to the intervention (e.g. domestic violence, sexual abuse, problematic substance use, among others).

3.2 Approaches related to the bond: the role of community intervention agents and participants

As a community intervention agent (professional, technician, practitioner, facilitator, among others), what kind of relationship do you establish with the participants? What aspects of this relationship do you consider most important or valuable? How does it make you feel to build a strengthened bond with your participants? How many opportunities for autonomy do you offer to the participants? What spaces for critical awareness about the participants’ lives do you promote with them? Do you care about helping participants feel valued and dignified?

As a participant in the community intervention (whether at the individual, family, group, or community level, among others), how would you describe the relationships you develop with the community intervention agents? What elements of that relationship do you consider most relevant or meaningful? How do you contribute to generating a strengthened bond with the community intervention agent? How much agency do you demonstrate in the intervention? In what way do you practice self-awareness in the context of intervention? Do you make the community intervention agent feel humanized in the interaction with you?

Regarding the bond between community intervention agents and participants, we observe that praxical violence manifests in two ways (Daher et al., 2024a). On the one hand, when it originates from community intervention agents toward participants, it is expressed through colonial invalidation, in the sense that they undermine the dignity of the participants. This considers five aspects. First, a personal favour approach, where community intervention agents do not see their role as guaranteeing people’s rights but rather as doing “favours” for them, with the discretion to decide whether to provide them or not. Second, an assistentialistic approach, where community intervention agents view their role as “helping” participants, positioning them just as people in need and with no resources. Third, a perception of participants as “aid dependents”, in which community intervention agents see participants as passive and reliant on their assistance. Fourth, an inferiorizing approach, where community intervention agents relate to participants with a lack of confidence in their capacities, denying their agency. Fifth, conversely, an excessive focus on personal agency, where community intervention agents consider their role mainly dependent on participants’ will and agency to achieve their goals, thereby disregarding the contextual or structural conditions.

On the other hand, we identified that praxical violence from participants toward community intervention agents involves a transgressive reproduction of colonial interactions, which reflect

learned or internalized patterns of domination, imposition, or violation of others' boundaries. This transgression unfolds as a progressive sequence of deteriorating interactional practices, starting with participants' refusal to engage with us or with the intervention itself. It also includes intrusions into our personal lives —such as receiving inappropriate messages or calls outside of working hours, even after having clearly communicated professional boundaries. Furthermore, we experienced situations of mistreatment, where participants responded to us with rudeness, disregard, or visible irritation. In more severe cases, some of us were subjected to direct attacks on our personal integrity, including sexual harassment, threats, and verbal or even physical assaults.

To prevent or address these violent situations, and to move towards praxical integrity, we propose four approaches related to our roles as community intervention agents, as well as those of the participants: the strengthened bond approach, the autonomy and agency approach, the awareness and reflexivity approach, and the dignity and humanization approach.

3.2.1 Strengthened bond approach

The strengthened bond approach involves three dimensions of the bond between community intervention agent and participant: the interactional, the technical, and the emotional. When a bond is strengthened, these three dimensions are enhanced (Daher et al., 2022). The interactional dimension is characterized by creating comfortable and warm spaces, fostering experiences of interpersonal satisfaction, treating each other with respect, authenticity, equality, reciprocity, shared responsibility, and mutual appreciation. The technical dimension involves the community intervention agent fulfilling their professional role effectively, while the participants show high levels of engagement and motivation, taking an active, proactive, and responsible role. The affective dimension is characterized by feelings of closeness, affection, and emotional support, as well as expressions of *"genuine interest"* and empathic listening. Bonds that are strengthened in these dimensions have a greater capacity to prevent or overcome praxical violence compared to partial bonds, where some of the dimensions of the bond are weakened (Daher et al., 2024b). This can be understood in the way that strengthened bond foster a sense of safety for both actors, enabling them to contribute more effectively to the community intervention, as illustrated in the following quote: "This close relationship means that I [community intervention agent] am more motivated to do my job, (…) since there's affection, there's also more dedication to the participant, which makes you become more involved, and when you're more involved, of course you try to do your job much better. So, the fact that there's a bond is beneficial for both parties, I mean, for her, she feels safer, and for me too, because I enjoy working with her" (Interview 8, community intervention agent 8).

3.2.2 Autonomy and agency approach

The autonomy and agency approach promotes community intervention agents to work over participants' autonomy, and in participants to empower and take charge of their own lives. Community intervention agents must trust in the participants' ability to make real changes and explicitly communicate this belief to them. While offering guidance -which community intervention agents frame it as *"advice"*, *"suggestions"*, *"guidelines"* or *"explanations"*-, they must

allow participants to explore different avenues for well-being, assess opportunities, and autonomously take the necessary actions to improve their lives. Ultimately, the decision-making power rests with the participant. In this approach, community intervention agents strive to gradually promote autonomy, initially taking steps together, and eventually enabling participants to independently navigate the process, thereby avoiding paternalistic and assistentialistic attitudes.

Participants, on their part, should strengthen their agency throughout the process by demonstrating their willingness to engage in community intervention, exploring their interests independently, and actively seeking information when needed. They should assume responsibility, fulfil their commitments, carry out all necessary procedures to advance towards their goals in the community intervention, and trust in their own capabilities to achieve progress in their lives. As a community intervention agent said: "I think one of [the participant's] strongest traits is that she is very resourceful and optimistic; she has always been eager to do things, (...) she was always the one who clearly understood where things were headed, and her perseverance was important too" (Interview 25, community intervention agent). Also, participants should take ownership of their achievements and each step towards them.

3.2.3 Awareness and reflexivity approach

The awareness and reflexivity approach emphasizes community intervention agents to work on the progressive development of participants' awareness, and for participants to take part in the intervention process in a reflective and intentional manner. It is essential for community intervention agents to help participants make sense of their intervention goals and address issues that may not be initially recognized. To achieve this, it is crucial to repeatedly highlight certain topics, particularly complex ones, such as health problems or violations of children's rights. However, this must be done with respect, patience, empathy, and care. It is important to refrain from judging participants based on their ideas, experiences, or dynamics that may differ from the community intervention agent perspective; as well as their beliefs and cultural practices, including family dynamics and gender relations. Understanding the origins of these differences with participants is vital, and empathy plays a key role. For example, recognizing that participants' behaviours and decisions can be influenced by complex childhood experiences or other difficulties. Also, it is essential to respect that participants may choose not to make progress in certain areas, such as educational attainment. So, while community intervention agents can provide encouragement and guidance, they should not impose or coerce participants into setting specific goals, understanding that the participant is the one who decides over their own life. As a community intervention agent indicated: "Clearly, we always tell them: it's your decision, you are the one who makes the decisions, I'm only going to give you some guidance, an opinion, and you have to weigh whether what I'm saying is useful to you or not, or see how you handle it" (Interview 33, community intervention agent).

As participants, it is important to engage in the intervention process with reflexivity. This entails being open to the guidance provided by community intervention agents, welcoming their ideas, reflections, and opinions, even if there may be initial disagreement. As community intervention progresses, participants should be receptive to and value these perspectives. However, it is always crucial for participants to express their viewpoints to the community

intervention agents, even in cases of differing perspectives. Additionally, participants should feel entitled to communicate how they feel about community intervention and to show their difficult emotions, such as discomfort, annoyance, or embarrassment, in an assertive and reflexive manner.

3.2.4 Dignity and humanization approach

The dignity and humanization approach emphasizes community intervention agents to work fostering symmetry, humility, acceptance, empathy, recognition, empowerment and social dignity. And in participants this approach highlights to practice empathy, care, trust, and appreciation for the dignifying work carried out by the community intervention agents.

Regarding the community intervention agent, symmetry is achieved by cultivating a horizontal position and avoiding any sense of superiority. This involves community intervention agents getting to know the participants while also allowing oneself to be known, such as sharing personal experiences without burdening the participant with personal or work-related issues, thus creating a bond from a more equal standpoint. Humility is crucial, and community intervention agents should maintain a respectful attitude and refrain from judging based on participants' living conditions or educational level. This implies having a humble attitude during community intervention, without reinforcing the socioeducational distance or the different roles with the participant simply because he or she is the community intervention agent. As a participant said: "[The agent] it's not like you see her and think… oh, because she works for the municipality, she's from another social level. No, nothing like that, she's just like any other person, and she really connects with you, everything she says, she's a very common down-to-earth person" (Interview 36, participant). Acceptance refers to the willingness to support participants in times of distress or need, recognizing and validating their suffering, even if the community intervention agents have not personally experienced similar situations. Empathy is important for community intervention agents to maintain a sense of wonder towards participants' problems, even if they are recurring themes among different participants, as each experience speaks to a unique and valid suffering. About this a community intervention agent expressed: "I care about her [participant] story, I care about her life, I care about what happened to her. And even though I don't tell her 'Hey, I'm putting myself in your shoes', unintentionally she starts to feel that I am empathizing, that I am putting myself in her place" (Interview 33, community intervention agent). Recognition is also significant, such as addressing participants by their name, recalling information about them, and expressing concern about their progress in the community intervention, such as when applying for benefits. For recognition, it is relevant to avoid homogenization and instead recognize the particularity of each participant. Also, it is important to see the participant beyond being a *"vulnerable person"*, recognizing them, above all, as a person. In addition, if the participant does not meet a specific intervention requirement, the community intervention agent should make efforts to facilitate their continued participation. This contrasts with treating participants as just another number and *"erasing"* them from the community intervention. Empowerment involves community intervention agents recognizing the existing capacities within each participant and understanding that they may require support to channel these capacities towards their goals. However, the community intervention agent does not *"introduce"* or install these capacities; they already exist within the participants. Therefore,

the community intervention agent serves as a facilitator or *"bridge"*, acknowledging that the changes in participants' lives result from their own efforts and decisions. Also, it is crucial to make participants' achievements visible, whether big or small, complete or in progress, and to convey to them that they can transform their lives. Finally, social dignity is equally important, with community intervention agents committed to performing their role to the best of their abilities, free from prejudice and promoting respect with the participants. This translates into offering a close, friendly approach that prevents participants from feeling uncomfortable due to their vulnerable situation or need for support, while consistently reinforcing that their dignity remains intact. In this sense, during home visits, efforts should be made to avoid making the participants feel uncomfortable due to their situation of poverty, respecting their home and personal space, and valuing the way the participant welcomes the community intervention agent with whatever they are able to offer (for example, offering a glass of water or some food). Likewise, it is kept in mind that the participant deserves to receive answers to their questions or concerns, as well as support from the community intervention agent, even more so considering that they live in a situation of significant vulnerability.

On the part of participants, humanizing their community intervention agents is crucial. This involves empathy and care, which means being kind, respectful, and understanding of their limitations, avoiding demands that are beyond the community intervention agent's capabilities or *"out of their hands"*. This aspect becomes particularly important when participants have had previous negative experiences, as they need to recognize that the current community intervention agent is not responsible for past actions by other agents. A participant referred to this situation as follows: "I was always very kind to her [community intervention action], very respectful; I always treated her with a lot of respect. In fact, when she came to my house to explain the community intervention to me, I told her what had happened the previous time, that I had wasted time. I made sure to let her know that as well, but in a very respectful way, because it wasn't her fault, it was just so she would understand why I was feeling negative" (Interview 32, participant). Building trust and credibility in the community intervention agent's ability to effectively promote opportunities and help participants achieve their life goals is also essential. Additionally, it is important to trust that a positive bond can be established with the community intervention agent. Finally, evaluating the dignifying work involves acknowledging the personal and emotional involvement that community intervention agents often bring, which goes beyond their technical dimension. This includes recognizing and appreciating the community intervention agent's characteristics related to their interactional and affective dimensions, such as their closeness, warmth, and empathy.

3.3 Intervention actions: the role of community intervention agents

As a community intervention agent, how do you carry out community intervention? Do you follow clearly identifiable actions, or do you rather improvise based on emergent participants' needs? How can you develop intervention actions that are relevant and sensitive to the participants' circumstances? What are the benefits of considering and planning intervention actions?

Regarding the role of community intervention agents toward participants, we identified that praxical violence can manifest as what we have termed denigrating deficiencies (Daher et al.,

2024a). These appear, on the one hand, in poor technical practices —when community intervention agents carry out superficial and standardized interventions, impose goals, or give orders to participants. On the other hand, they emerge in interactional terms —when they relate to participants in a distant, cold, unfriendly, or unpleasant way, or when they make derogatory or pejorative remarks that undermine participants' dignity.

To address these violent situations and promote praxical integrity, we propose nine intervention actions, based on our understanding that community intervention must be flexible but also organized around clear and intentional practices. These actions are presented in increasing order of complexity: frame, guide, inform, connect, follow-up, motivate, support emotionally, conscientize, and empower.

3.3.1 Frame

Frame is an action where community intervention agents should define the objectives, scope, and limitations of the community intervention, as well as establishing the interactional and technical aspects of the bond between the community intervention agent and the participant, both at the beginning and throughout the process. As a community intervention agent said:

> I believe it has to do with distinguishing the type of relationship one has with the [participant]. She knew it was a professional relationship. That I was her [community intervention agent] because it was also part of my job to be there accompanying her, and she was aware of that, she understood it clearly. There was a relationship based on trust, she knew I could guide or help her with whatever she needed, but that we were not friends. Still, I was someone she could trust (Interview 4, community intervention agent)

3.3.2 Guide

Guide is an action where community intervention agents should guide the establishment of goals and address other important situations for the participant. It includes providing guidance towards more complex situations from a psychoeducational perspective. As a participant said:

> [Referring to her community intervention agent] It's about understanding me as well and putting themselves in my shoes, to understand me. Because if I'm not in the other person's shoes, how am I going to be able to understand them? How am I going to explain things? And how am I going to guide them toward what they're really struggling with, toward what they're really not seeing clearly? (Interview 38, participant)

3.3.3 Inform

Inform is an action where community intervention agents should provide information to the participants about the opportunities available within the network. It includes dispelling myths, correcting misinformation, gathering necessary information, and reinforcing information to support the achievement of the community intervention goals. As one community intervention agent pointed out:

> Although we [community intervention agents] work within a particular community intervention, we provide all the relevant guidance regarding the available services and

> benefits that may exist in the local government, or at the regional level. If they [participants] have doubts or concerns about anything, or if one day they need, I don't know, some social assistance or something, the phone is always there to stay in contact (Interview 27, community intervention agent)

3.3.4 Connect

Connect is an action where community intervention agents should connect the participant with the opportunities network. It includes managing or accompanying the process of applying for and accessing benefits, services, and programs. It also entails facilitating and expediting access to essential material assistance, providing referrals, and monitoring the participant's connection with available networks. But it is important to convey that the allocation of benefits, services, and programs does not depend on the community intervention agent. Regarding this interventive action, a community intervention agent indicated:

> When that participant turns to the network and asks for help, many times they don't feel heard. However, when they have support through accompaniment, they are listened to, networks are created, opportunities arise to support them. So, I feel that creating a community intervention with personalized accompaniment, as it works today, has been a very important milestone in the lives of many participants (Interview 39, community intervention agent)

3.3.5 Follow-up

Follow-up is an action where community intervention agents should monitor the participant's progress throughout the process, as well as identify and address emerging needs and challenges. It includes maintaining communication between sessions of the community intervention, being attentive to inquiries or requests for support, reinforcing topics that may have been overlooked, and acknowledging the achievement of intervention goals. As a community intervention agent said:

> [Recreating a conversation with a participant] "Ok, let's set a goal. Do you think that by December you could schedule an appointment [to apply for a benefit] and study?". "Yes". "Alright, we have a goal". And then we reassess whether it was achieved, and along the way we monitor progress. "Are you going to apply for the appointment [for a housing benefit]? How's the savings going? How much do you have so far?" That's how we monitor whether the goals were achieved or not (Interview 14, community intervention agent)

3.3.6 Motivate

Motivate is an action where community intervention agents should encourage and reinforce the participant's engagement in community intervention. It aims to help the participant establish intervention goals and take the necessary actions to achieve them. Regarding this intervention action, a community intervention agent mentioned:

> I try to look for the positive side of the situation, even if it's very negative; I try to identify the participant's resilience. There's always a way to overcome it, we can move

> forward somehow, and that gives people a sense of hope. And that brings positive results (Interview 16, community intervention agent)

3.3.7 Support emotionally

Support emotionally is an action where community intervention agents should offer emotional support to the participant in everyday situations and when facing specific problems. It includes active listening, genuine concern, and validation of the participant's feelings. This is relevant, as was expressed by a participant:

> He [the community intervention agent] told me it was completely normal, after going through that virus [referring to COVID-19], after being in a place away from my family [referring to the quarantine residences], to feel vulnerable, to feel sad for not seeing them, for not being able to touch them… So, many times he just let me cry, he listened to me, he gave me advice (Interview 10, participant)

3.3.8 Conscientize

Conscientize is an action where community intervention agents should promote awareness among participants regarding issues that may not be visible or identified as problematic. Through joint and respectful reflection, these relevant and/or urgent situations can be recognized and addressed to safeguard the participant's well-being. In relation to this intervention action, a community intervention agent indicated:

> We had to work on the issue that she [the participant] was very overprotective of her youngest daughter [she wouldn't let her leave the house]. (...) I gave her some guidance, always respecting what she thought, but I also tried to help her see the need to give her daughter a bit more independence. (…) I had to be on the other side and get her to reflect or realize that, in fact, she was causing her harm (Interview 33, community intervention agent)

3.3.9 Empower

Empower is an action where community intervention agents should promote the participant's self-confidence and autonomy. It includes explicitly valuing their ideas and strengths, encouraging the exploration of fears and limiting beliefs, instilling confidence in their abilities, fostering skill development, providing tools, acknowledging that they can take actions independently, encouraging proactive decision-making, and recognizing their achievements. A community intervention agent referred to this action as follows:

> In this case, it's entirely about not losing that sense of wonder, being able to recognize the abilities they [the participants] have, making them feel that they are important and that they can, ultimately, be part of something, that they can change their own well-being conditions, that they can change their attitude towards life, and always, always, always recognize their abilities (Interview 35, community intervention agent)

3. Discussion

In this article, we explain the concept of praxical integrity, understood as the exercise of symmetrical power, through symbolic approaches related to the institutional framework and the bond between community intervention agents and participants, and practical intervention actions, establishing a relationship that is nourishing to the actors involved and to the aims of the community intervention.

The approaches associated with the institutional framework are commitment with social justice approach, critical approach, participatory approach, situated approach and care approach. The approaches associated with the bond between community intervention agent and participant are strengthened bond approach, autonomy and agency approach, awareness and reflexivity approach, and dignity and humanization approach. The intervention actions, addressed by the community intervention agents are frame, guide, inform, connect, follow-up, motivate, support emotionally, conscientize and empower. These approaches and intervention actions make it possible for us to address praxical violence, as well as to prevent it.

In Chile, community intervention has evolved from improvisational and reactive responses to emergencies toward more professionalized and systematic forms of practice. This transformation has involved the integration of paradigms, models, approaches, concepts, and technical tools, shifting from the predominance of post-positivist paradigms and competency-based interventions to a greater diversity of paradigms (including constructivist-systemic and socio-critical) and models (including network model and sociocultural amplification model, which includes the decolonial approach) (Daher & Rosati, 2026). Additionally, globally spread frameworks —such as intercultural, gender-based, participatory, critical, and decolonial approaches —have been incorporated. Nevertheless, we recognize the need to advance further by adopting a more self-critical perspective; one that, through reflexivity, enables us to acknowledge that situations of violence may occur within community intervention, and that safe spaces can be created to reflect on how to prevent intervention from being subsumed under colonial logics, moving instead toward more liberating relationships, aligned with praxical integrity.

A possible question arising from this point concerns whether an emphasis on symmetrical power may risk overlooking deeper structural inequalities that extend beyond improving relationships. It is worth noting that the proposal of praxical integrity, as it emerged from the experiences of our participants, primarily addresses issues related to agency and relationships among actors, rather than structural aspects. However, within its approaches, one with a more structural orientation can be identified —namely, the commitment to social justice, which implies recognizing that actions are necessary to promote the equitable distribution of resources, opportunities, and rights within a society, especially for the most vulnerable. While this approach is important, we acknowledge that it is limited, and that it is necessary to move toward a more radical understanding of social justice —one that involves removing or transforming the structural conditions that generate inequality and constrain the lives of individuals and collectives. This dimension of social justice did not clearly emerge from the data, likely because the social policy analysed operates mainly at the micro and mesosocial levels. Nevertheless, we consider that advancing social justice requires both transforming relationships and pursuing structural change,

as both constitute collective tasks involving all sectors and social actors. In this sense, the focus on human agency and relationships should not make us lose sight of structural change, but we must also remember that this field itself plays a role in fostering transformation.

A similar reflection we want to introduce is regarding the intervention actions, which operate at different levels in terms of their transformative potential. They are presented in order, beginning with the most basic ones (frame, guide, inform, connect, follow-up), which are necessary to jointly establish with participants the foundations for transforming their conditions, and moving toward the more complex ones (motivate, support emotionally, conscientize, and empower), which have a greater capacity to enable participants to transform their living conditions. With these intervention actions we want to emphasize that, in community intervention, it is sometimes important to deploy basic actions as a way of creating the conditions for broader transformation —whether at the individual, community, or social level—. This process is not exempt from ethical and political tensions or challenges regarding the possible implications or hidden impacts of our actions at the macrosocial level; however, it entails recognizing and validating the differentiated needs of individuals and communities, as well as their own rhythm and progress toward transformation. In this sense, while we recognize that there is still room to move toward a more radical and transformative decolonization of practices, we wish to acknowledge and value the contributions of the participants, with their own constraints, considering that praxical integrity constitutes a necessary step toward advancing in that direction.

So, we want to highlight the importance of creating spaces for training and reflecting on the interactional and relational dimensions of social intervention, where institutional representatives, community intervention agents, and participants can openly express themselves about their ways of relating and engaging in community intervention. Likewise, the message we want to communicate is that just as it is necessary to recognize situations of violence and power relations, it is equally crucial for our professional practice to foster spaces for reflexivity and training where we can envision new ways of relating within community intervention. This is connected to the call to sustain both critique and possibility simultaneously, and to inhabit the complexities of resistance, radical hope, and the imagination of what could be (Fernández & Salinas, 2025). The creation of these safe spaces for dialogue allows us to foster radical solidarity, which involves a collective willingness to explore radical alternatives in how we interact and engage with one another (Sonn et al., 2025). As we nurture these safe spaces, it becomes possible for us to build trust and share questionable approaches, interventive actions that may have caused harm, and the challenges we face in adopting new ways of carrying out community intervention. This can only happen when we create space to be fully present with our histories, struggles, vulnerabilities, passions, desires, and dreams —where we can share and reflect on our journeys and embodied knowledges (Dutta et al., 2023; Fine, 2018). In this way, we can humbly and collectively reimagine how we can —and how we deserve to— relate to one another in community intervention.

Based on our experience, some recommendations for engaging in safe spaces for dialogue about praxical violence and praxical integrity in institutions, where colonial logics persist, such as the State, include: deeply understanding the institution (e.g., its history, actors, values, and working logics); connecting the decolonial approach with the institution's values, guidelines or goals (e.g., social justice, diversity, inclusion); recognizing the institution's strengths and resources; highlighting weaknesses as opportunities for improvement; promoting the discussion

of these topics through experiential, reflective, and participative methodologies; and presenting testimonies from internal and external actors, among others. However, we recognize that efforts to foster new forms of relationality within institutions may face a range of obstacles —institutional (such as organizational rigidity, inertia of established practices, and an orientation toward the fulfilment of quantitative indicators), political (including divergent interests in community intervention and a tendency to prioritize the number of services delivered over their quality), and economic (such as budgetary constraints and reductions in human resources). In this sense, advancing in this direction requires a profound cultural transformation —one that challenges the prevailing emphasis on rewarding efficiency and instead promotes a culture grounded in the value of relationship building, a process to which the notion of praxical integrity can meaningfully contribute.

This exercise of developing praxical integrity connects with decolonial love, which we understand as the embodiment of solidarity and responsibility that, through reciprocal and humanizing relational recognition, leads us from a state of oppression to one of liberation that upholds and affirms dignity (Fernández & Salinas, 2025). In Atallah's (2022) terms, this relates to our effort to allow new relationalities to emerge for healing and justice —relationalities that contest colonial patterns of power and centre decolonial solidarity and radical love. Thus, the creation of propositional spaces, grounded in a spirit that is both critical and constructive, can be seen as an act of decolonial love or radical love in two senses. First, in the sense that we foster a safe space built on trust, solidarity, and relationality to dialogue about how we relate. Second, in the sense that we seek to generate reflections that liberate relationships within community intervention, thereby contributing to the transformation of the colonial relations that still permeate it. In a similar way, praxical integrity can be connected with the love ethic of bell hooks (2000) —a model of relationship-oriented activism that encompasses dialogue, nonviolence, interconnectedness between people and between people and nature, the pursuit of justice, personal reflexivity, sharing power, and solidarity, according to Godden (2017). So, it can be argued that the ethic of love relates to praxical integrity in two ways. The ethic of love is reflected in the approaches and intervention actions of praxical integrity through its critique of power asymmetries and its emphasis on valuing relationships within social intervention. It is also manifested in the dialogical spaces necessary for developing praxical integrity, where mutual care, respect, and commitment to well-being must prevail. In this sense, the concept of love permeates not only the content and scope of praxical integrity but also the processes necessary for its development.

Similarly, praxical integrity can be understood through certain Latin American perspectives. As proposed by Freire (1970), we understand that critical dialogue lays the foundation for love related to praxical integrity. Also, we recognize that to make praxical violence visible or detecting the risk of its occurrence, as well as moving toward praxical integrity, entails shifting from a naïve consciousness of social intervention to a critical consciousness of both the intervention itself and the relationships we establish within it. Building on this, we want to highlight the power of critical but love-founded dialogue within institutions, practitioners and communities to create the necessary conditions for transforming relationships in the context of community intervention.

Moreover, praxical integrity is an invitation for community psychology to continue freeing itself from colonial logics. According to Martín-Baró (2006), psychology has colonial roots that must be

overcome to contribute to the liberation of oppressed peoples, through new epistemologies and forms of praxis. New epistemologies reinforce the need to create knowledge in alignment with what people and communities aspire to be, emphasizing the importance of considering their perspectives in the construction of knowledge. In turn, new forms of praxis involve engaging in a transformative activity of reality that allows us to understand it not only in what it is, but also in what it is not, insofar as we seek to orient it toward other forms of being. Praxical integrity, emerging from the reflections of intervention agents and participants, and guided by a horizon of love and care in social intervention, may serve as a contribution in this direction.

This also invites us to continue reflecting on how we conduct research in community psychology in ways that are more reflexive, participatory, and that recognize the value of people's experiences and meanings, grounded in the principles of epistemic integrity (Daher et al., 2023) and epistemic justice (Stevens & Sonn, 2021). The latter would allow us to move beyond the prevailing research practices in Chile, which tend to prioritize the scientific method, without providing sufficient space for knowledge generation rooted in popular wisdom. In this sense, we drew inspiration from Fals Borda's (2015) proposals for participatory and "feeling-thinking" *[sentipensante]* research, in which feelings, lived experiences and mind are combined, and every act of inquiry is carried out with empathy and sympathy toward others, valuing and including differences. Finally, we are grateful for the opportunity to write this article, as doing so allows Global South to make visible the approaches and interventive actions that embody praxical integrity in diverse contexts. These findings represent situated knowledge produced in Chile, being relatively transferable, considering that the type of community intervention studied is very common both worldwide and throughout Latin America, and that the contextual characteristics —related to colonialism, authoritarianism, and neoliberalism— are representative of many countries around the globe. In addition, the phenomenon of praxical integrity is transferable internationally, as it relates to global frameworks such as the commitment to social justice approach, the critical approach, the situated approach, and the participatory approach, among others, as well as to central concepts in community psychology at a global level, such as awareness, autonomy, and reflexivity.

This transferability applies both to territories in Latin America and other parts of the Global South —fostering South–South solidarity— and to the Global North, as in both cases we can contribute to dismantling hegemonies in knowledge and practice related to community intervention and training. Now then, it is acknowledged that, in line with situated knowledge (Haraway, 1988), it is not possible to propose a standardizing and universal form of knowledge, but rather a certain version of reality as a product of material and symbolic processes. In this regard, according to Montenegro and Pujol (2003), it is necessary to reflect on the possibility of social transformation and social intervention without resorting to universal truths. Thus, praxical integrity is presented as a transferable concept, but considering the decolonial approach, we invite those who consider these approaches and intervention actions to explore the ways and new meanings that praxical integrity may take on in their own contexts and from their own forms of knowledge, thereby fostering local and situated practices.

References

Alfaro, J. & Berroeta, H. (2007). *Trayectoria de la Psicología Comunitaria en Chile: Prácticas y Conceptos.* Universidad de Valparaíso.

Alfaro, J. (2012). Posibilidades y tensiones en la relación entre Psicología Comunitaria y políticas sociales. En A. Sánchez, J. Alfaro, & A. Zambrano (Comps.), *Psicología Comunitaria y políticas sociales: reflexiones y experiencias* (pp.45-75). Paidós.

Andersson, B. (2013). Finding ways to the hard to reach. Considerations on the content and concept of outreach work. *European Journal of Social Work, 16*(2), 171-186. https://doi.org/10.1080/13691457.2011.618118

Atallah, D. (2022). Reflections on Radical Love and Rebellion: Towards Decolonial Solidarity in Community Psychology Praxis. In S. Kessi, S. Suffla & M. Seedat (Eds.), *Decolonial Enactments in Community Psychology* (pp. 75-97). Springer.

Barbero, J.M. & Cortés, F. (2011). *Trabajo Comunitario, organización y desarrollo social.* Alianza Editorial.

Boira, S., López del Hoyo, Y., Tomás, L. T., & Gaspar, A. R. (2010). Evaluación cualitativa de un programa de intervención psicológica con hombres violentos dentro de la pareja. *Acciones e Investigaciones Sociales, 28,* 135-156. https://doi.org/10.26754/ojs_ais/ais.201028484

Cornejo, M. & Salas, N. (2011). Rigor y Calidad Metodológicos: Un Reto a la Investigación Social Cualitativa. *Psicoperspectivas, 10*(2), 12-34. https://doi.org/10.5027/psicoperspectivas-Vol10-Issue2-fulltext-144

Daher, M. & Rosati, A. (2026). *El Ciclo de Intervención Social: Una Propuesta para la Formación Transformadora Integral y la Acción Social.* [Unpublished book manuscript].

Daher, M., Campero, M.J. & Rosati, A. (2024a). Decolonial approach and community psychology in social policy. In C. Sonn, J. Fernández, J. Ferreira, M. Eviandaru & N. Malherbe (Eds.), *The Handbook of Decolonial Community Psychology* (pp. 187-206). Springer.

Daher, M., Rosati, A. & Campero, M.J. (2024b). Agentes de intervención y participantes de programas sociales: vínculos fortalecidos con efectos integrales y vínculos parciales/debilitados con efectos limitados. En C. Leyton (Ed.), *Implementación de políticas sociales en Chile* (pp. 113-134). RIL Editores.

Daher, M., Rosati, A. & Campero, M.J. (2026). Critical Qualitative Analysis: Making social justice issues visible through critical reflexivity and rigor. [Manuscript under revision].

Daher, M., Rosati, A. & Cifuentes, S. (2023). Report Failure in Applied Research and Social Program Evaluation: An Invitation to Epistemic Integrity. *Review of General Psychology, 27*(4), 387-395 https://doi.org/10.1177/10892680231170018

Daher, M., Rosati, A., Campero, M.J., Guarda, T. & Bunster, E. (2022). Strengthened bond between intervention agent and participant in psychosocial and community programs: from an administrative relationship to a technical-affective bond. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 32*(5), 814-829. https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2601

Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (2012). *Manual de investigación cualitativa.* Editorial Gedisa.

Dutta, U., Fernández, J. S., Galletta, A., & Langhout, R. D. (2023). Participatory action research as movement toward radical relationality, epistemic justice, and transformative intervention: A multivocal reflection. In H. Cooper, M. N. Coutanche, L. M. McMullen, A. T. Panter, D. Rindskopf, & K. J. Sher (Eds.), *APA handbook of research methods in psychology: Research*

designs: Quantitative, qualitative, neuropsychological, and biological (pp. 305-327). American Psychological Association.

Dutta, U., Sonn, C. & Lykes, M.B. (2016). Situating and contesting structural violence in community-based research and action. *Community Psychology in Global Perspective, 2*(2), https://doi.org/10.1285/i24212113v2i2p1

Evans, S. D., Duckett, P., Lawthom, R., & Kivell, N. (2017). Positioning the critical in community psychology. In M. A. Bond, I. Serrano-García, C. B. Keys & M. Shinn (Eds.), *APA handbook of community psychology: Theoretical foundations, core concepts, and emerging challenges* (pp. 107-127). American Psychological Association.

Fals Borda, O. (2015). *Una sociología sentipensante para América Latina (Ed. V.M. Moncayo)*. Siglo XXI Editores.

Fanon, F. (1961). *The Wretched of the Earth.* Grove Press.

Fernández, J. & Salinas, D. (2025). Psicología de la abolición: Principios para una psicología de la liberación decolonial hacia El Mundo Zurdo. *Teoría y Crítica de la Psicología, 21,* 47-81.

Fine, M. (2018). *Just research in contentious times: Widening the methodological imagination.* Teachers College Press.

Flick, U. (2015). *El diseño de investigación cualitativa.* Ediciones Morata.

Flick, U. (2021). *Doing Interview Research.* Sage.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogía del oprimido.* Siglo XXI Editores.

Godden, N. (2017). The Love Ethic: A Radical Theory for Social Work Practice. *Australian Social Work, 70*(1), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1080/0312407X.2017.1301506

Haraway, D.J. (1988). *Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective.* Routledge.

hooks, b. (2000). *All about love: New visions.* William Morrow.

Kagan, C., Burton, M., Duckett, P., Lawthom, R. & Siddiquee, A. (2020). *Critical Community Psychology: Critical Action and Social Change.* Routledge.

Krause, M., Jaramillo, A., Monreal, V., Carvacho, H. & Torres, A. (2011). Historia de la psicología comunitaria en Chile: Desde la clandestinidad a la política pública. En M. Montero & I. Serrano-García (Comps.), *Historias de la Psicología Comunitaria en América Latina: Participación y transformación* (pp. 115-138). Paidós.

Kvale, S. & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing.* Sage.

Martín-Baró, I. (2006). Hacia una psicología de la liberación. Hacia una psicología de la liberación. *Revista electrónica de intervención psicosocial y psicología comunitaria, 1*(2), 7-14.

Montenegro, M. & Pujol, J. (2003). Conocimiento situado: un forcejeo entre el relativismo construccionista y la necesidad de fundamentar la acción. *Interamerican Journal of Psychology, 37*(2), 295-307.

Montero, M. (1982). La Psicología Comunitaria: Orígenes, Principios y Fundamentos teóricos. *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología, 16*(3), 387-399.

Montero, M. (2004). *Introducción a la Psicología Comunitaria: Desarrollo, Conceptos y Procesos.* Paidós.

Montero, M. (2011). Nuevas perspectivas en psicología comunitaria y psicología social crítica. *Ciencias Psicológicas, 5*(1), 1-13.

Okwechime, E. (2025). Relationality, decolonisation and practice-based methods: developing narratives for future making practices. *Culture and Organization.* Online first. https://doi.org/10.1080/14759551.2025.2566321

Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods.* Sage.

Quijano, A. (2007). Coloniality and Modernity/Rationality. *Cultural Studies, 21*(2-3), 168-178. https://doi.org/10.1080/09502380601164353

Reyes-Espejo, M.I., Olivares-Espinoza, B., Berroeta, H. & Winkler M.I. (2015). Del discurso a las prácticas: Políticas sociales y psicología comunitaria en Chile. *Polis, 14*(42), 387- 413.

Rozas, G. (2018). *Decolonialidad, desde la psicología social comunitaria. Universidad* Austral de Chile.

Serrano, I. & López, M.A. (1991). Una perspectiva diferente del poder y el cambio social para la psicología social-comunitaria. *Revista de Ciencias Sociales, 29*(3-4), 348-382.

Sonn, C., Kivell, N., Madyaningrum, M., Daher, M., Stevens, G., Barhouche, R. & Keast, S. (2025). "We Are Not Alone in the World": Creating Possibilities for Transnational Radical Relationality, Epistemic Justice, and Expanded Ecologies of Knowledge Through the Indaba Podcast. *American Psychologist, 80*(8), 1199–1212. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0001495

Stevens, G. & Sonn, C. (2021). *Decoloniality and Epistemic Justice in Contemporary Community Psychology.* Springer.

Wiesenfeld, E. (2012). Community Social Psychology in Latin America: myths, dilemmas and challenges. *Global Journal of Community Psychology Practice, 3*(1), 26-41.

Wiesenfeld, E. (2014). La Psicología Social Comunitaria en América Latina: ¿Consolidación o crisis? *Psicoperspectivas, 13*(2), 6-18. https://doi.org/10.5027/psicoperspectivas-Vol13-Issue2-fulltext-357

Winkler, M.I., Alvear, K., Olivares, D. & Pasmanik, V. (2014). Psicología Comunitaria hoy: Orientaciones éticas para la acción. *Psicoperspectivas, 13*(2), 44-54.