

CARTOGRAPHY AND FEMINIST EPISTEMOLOGIES: A RESEARCH WITH/ABOUT FAMILIES AND PARENTING¹

Ana Cecilia Marotta Méndez², Orcid: 0000-0002-3544-3931

Anna Paula Uziel³, Orcid: 0000-0001-7807-3910

ABSTRACT. In this manuscript, contributions and reflections are presented about how articulations of cartography and feminist epistemologies are powerful and relevant for research with families and parenting. Some decisions and methodological approaches made in the doctoral thesis *Family fictions, adolescents between care and transits*, carried out during the years 2015 to 2019 in Uruguay, are specified. First, the theoretical and epistemological framework that supports the ethical and political positioning of the researchers and the research-intervention practices carried out is raised. Next, some points are shown where the epistemic-theoretical connections between cartography and feminist epistemologies were emerging in research practice. Namely, in the reconstruction of the problem-object of research, in the choice of the participants' point of view and in the analysis process that focuses on the experience of encountering adolescents and the emergence of analyzers that destabilize and catalyze the research processes in families and parenting.

Keywords: Cartography; feminist epistemologies; families.

CARTOGRAFÍA Y EPISTEMOLOGÍAS FEMINISTAS: UNA INVESTIGACIÓN CON/EN FAMILIAS Y PARENTALIDADES

RESUMEN. En este manuscrito se presentan aportes y reflexiones acerca de cómo la cartografía y las epistemologías feministas, en articulación, son potentes y resultan pertinentes para la investigación con familias y parentalidades. Se puntualizan algunas decisiones y abordajes metodológicos realizados en la tesis doctoral *Ficciones de familias, adolescentes entre cuidados y tránsito*, realizada durante los años 2015 a 2019, en Uruguay. En primer lugar, se deja planteado el entramado teórico y epistemológico que da soporte al posicionamiento ético y político de las investigadoras y a las prácticas de investigación-intervención realizadas. A continuación, se marcan algunos puntos donde las conexiones epistémico-teóricas entre cartografía y epistemologías feministas fueron emergiendo en la práctica de investigación. A saber, en la reconstrucción del problema-objeto de investigación, en la elección del punto de vista de los participantes y en el proceso de análisis donde el énfasis se ubica en la experiencia de encuentro con los adolescentes y la emergencia de analizadores que desestabilizan y catalizan los procesos de investigación en familias y parentalidades.

¹ The study in this manuscript received funding from the National Agency for Research and Innovation under the code POS_NAC_2018_1_151194.

² Facultad de Psicología. Universidad de La Republica –Udelar, Montevideo, Uruguay.

³ Universidade Estadual do Rio de Janeiro –UERJ, Rio de Janeiro-RJ, Brazil.



Palabras clave: Cartografía; epistemologías feministas; familias.

CARTOGRAFIA E EPISTEMOLOGIAS FEMINISTAS: UMA PESQUISA COM/SOBRE FAMÍLIAS E PARENTALIDADES

RESUMO. Neste texto discutimos acerca de como a cartografia e as epistemologias feministas, articuladas, são potentes e apropriadas para pesquisas com famílias e parentalidades. Pontuamos algumas decisões e abordagens metodológicas realizadas na tese de doutorado *Ficciones de familias, adolescentes entre cuidados y tránsitos*, realizada durante os anos 2015 a 2019, no Uruguai. Em primeiro lugar, apresenta-se a trama teórica e epistemológica que dá suporte ao posicionamento ético e político das investigadoras e as práticas de pesquisa-intervenção realizadas. Na sequência, marcamos alguns pontos de conexão epistemológicos e teóricos entre a cartografia e as epistemologias feministas que foram emergindo durante a pesquisa. Quais sejam, a reconstrução do problema de pesquisa, a eleição do ponto de vista dos e das participantes e o processo de análise, cuja ênfase está na experiência de encontro com os e as adolescentes e a emergência de analisadores que desestabilizam e catalisam os processos de pesquisa sobre famílias e parentalidades.

Palavras-chaves: Cartografia; epistemologias feministas; famílias.

Introduction

This article proposes to contribute methodological tools for research with families and parenting from the perspective of situated social psychology. This study is based on a PhD dissertation in Psychology, and particularly on the academic tutorship relationship between its authors. The work on the *interstitial space* (Rousillon, 2002) of academic tutorship generated interest in writing this joint article.

The purpose of this manuscript is to share some conceptual and methodological tools that originate from cartography (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004) and from feminist epistemologies (Haraway, 1991; Harding, 2015), which have fertilized the PhD research *Family fictions, adolescents between care and transits*. These contributions are significant for understanding the collective processes of subjectivity production in contemporary families. Contemporaneity, defined as an action bound to time as it takes distance from it but adheres to it (Agamben, 2018), accomplishes this goal through dephasing and anachronism. Therefore, initiatives contemporary with the times we live in compel us to develop complex thinking and research activities that recover the experiential and intimate knowledge of children and adolescents. We witnessed a change of the times in which families and parenting as socio-historical constructions are expressed through a plurality of open and diverse relationship universes. New configurations, mobile and transitional, emerge, in which crystallizations are diluted and new meanings for inhabiting love, erotic and parental relationships appear. Changes become denser in their socio-historical dimension, and families and parenting take place and are produced in the intersectionality of generations, social classes and races, among others.

First, some reasons for applying the cartographic method in psychological research will be mentioned, which are related to the usefulness and pertinence of this method to

address the problems of subjectivity. Second, some contributions from feminist epistemologies to science studies will be reviewed, emphasizing the partial articulations between cartography and feminist epistemologies. Readers are here warned that this study does not aim to establish a guideline for methodological procedures but rather to elaborate on the partial articulations between both theoretical and epistemological perspectives in the production of knowledge based on the study *Family fictions, adolescents between care and transits*. Part of the sections of the study will be shared, departing from some points on the intensity of effects, which show the interdependence of the meetings between the researchers and the adolescents, and theoretical clarifications. In this way, this article seeks to show the possibilities that the cartographic method and feminist epistemologies offer, proposing new forms of conducting research in the field of families and parenting.

1. Plots: Methodological and epistemic-theoretical clues for research with family

1.1. When a picture speaks a thousand words: from tree to rhizome

The term 'rhizome' appears in the introduction of the book entitled *A thousand plateaus* (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004), and works as an opening matrix to understand the thinking proposal introduced by the book. Deleuze and Guattari (2004) criticize the modern forms of Cartesian thinking, which plot a tree as the hegemonic way of thinking in science. This way of thinking operates based on representation, state the authors, and it places reality in a significant a priori in which logical reasoning would be the key for the understanding of meanings. From this tree-perspective, there would be a previous representation that organizes and determines the ways in which we give meaning to reality: the image of the tree-book as imitation of the world. In the PhD dissertation, as the analysis of the field material progressed it found how family phenomena and self-nominations do not fit in the concept representing the same; on the contrary, they require opening to thinking of new categories that challenge their participation in theories and/or default ways of interpreting the world.

In turn, multiplicity is one of the principles on which the rhizome acts, being n-1, where the multiple contains the One. This means that there is no previous unity from which two or three, or multiple, would derive. The image of the rhizome as a system: "[...] as an underground stem is radically different from the roots and the culms. The bulbs, the tubers, are rhizomes" (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 12). Therefore, different points connect to one another. Differently from the tree where there is an order, in the rhizome, the points connect and interconnect, being also semiotic links of different order, which act under the principles of connectivity and heterogeneity:

Each trait refers to a linguistic trait: semiotic links of any nature are connected to it with very diverse coding forms, biological, political, economic links, etc. [...], bringing into play not only different sign regimes but also statutes for the state of things. In fact, collective enunciation agencies work directly in machine-like agencies, and it is not possible to establish a radical cut-off between sign regimes and their objects (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 13).

Esther Díaz (2007) refers to rhizomatic modulation to explain the path of the real and of cartography as a method that allows - through rhizomatic thinking - for producing reality through a map. Force lines are mapped, which are interconnected but still remaining as lines composed of different registers.

We opted for taking the sense in which the rhizome acts, through a rhizomatic thinking that operates based on an effect and intensity logic for which the analysis of implications (Lourau, 1994) is key for the production of multiplicity and also for the identification of strata as analyzers (Lourau, 1994; Manero, 2015) for the research topic. Both concepts, implication and analyzer analysis, originate from the corpus of institutional analysis (Lapassade, 1989; Lourau, 1994; Deleuze & Guattari, 2004) from which the cartographic method derives. These analyses are theoretical keys for the whole research process.

The doctoral thesis was not initially proposed as a cartography; instead, the research mode progressively became rhizomatic, while the object of study 'family' unfolded in a rhizomatic way. An emerging plane has been the relationship between families and politics that appears in the analysis of the discourse of adolescents, which is permeated by the geopolitical context of the research, where conservative sectors defend the traditional heterosexual and nuclear family model. These forms of political coding of the 'family' topic currently compose micropolitics where the discourses of the adolescents interviewed emerged. The produced knowledges become, in turn, a political matter in which power relationships rather than mere representations of reality are at play.

2.1. Feminist-epistemologies: re-doing science

Sandra Harding (1991, 2015) and Donna Haraway (1991) are two contemporary thinkers in the field of science and technology philosophy that are part of the 21st century feminisms. Both follow and potentiate the movement initiated by the feminist approaches to social studies about science and technology that emerged in the 1970s, postcolonial studies during the 1980s that showcase new standards for the objectivity, rationality and sound method of science. Based on feminist research and studies in the field of women, these standards challenge the basic assumptions of research and higher education institutions.

In the book *Objectivity and diversity*, Sandra Harding (2015) deals with the problem of objectivity in science and shows how this is often employed as an 'elevator word' as a metalanguage for 'truth', 'reality' or 'rationality'. However, she also indicates that the word refers to a set of assumptions that are used with different purposes, for example, to enhance or block democratic agendas. The author develops a critical position about the definition of what science is and how it is produced; showing the power and politics play intrinsic to those debates. In this sense, Harding denounces the predominance of an androcentric position in the production of knowledge and ventures in diversity, proposing to include excluded groups in scientific decision-making as the effects of scientific studies and policies affect their lives. Objectivity and diversity become matters of democratic ethics as participation in research goes beyond the physical presence of the studied subjects, according to Harding (2015), who proposes a diversity that respects the values and interests of all citizens and protects the most vulnerable groups from a political and economic perspective. In her work, the author asks about science philosophy and its ideal priorities and practices with respect to global historical trends in an intervention inside its field of study that also transcends other aspects of academic and scientific institutions.

Harding (1991, 2015) introduces the concepts of 'strong objectivity' and 'strong reflectivity', which became terms of daily use, as they propose that diversity allows for maximizing objectivity as a method that responds to the epistemic and political agenda. This agenda goes hand in hand with an opening of science to the emancipatory changes of society, intertwining it with science and politics.

In turn, Donna Haraway (1991) believes that the position of the oppressed offers a privileged objectivity about other worldviews that are subject to the dominant interpretations of society. In the introduction of her book *Modest witness* (Haraway, 2004), the author refers to this character as an invisible ventriloquist that would talk through objects, being the researching subject who gives the floor to the researched object without adding any of their mere opinions, of their partial corporality. In this way, the modest witness-researcher receives the 'extraordinary' power of establishing the facts. The witness is objective, according to themselves, ensuring the alleged clarity and purity of the objects. Haraway (2004) questions this and wants to present a new type of modest witness, more corporeal, less elegant and optically dense.

Both philosophers agree on their point of view about objectivity in science and the importance of localizing and situating knowledge production. Strong objectivity insists that both subjects and objects of the knowledge-producing practices should be localized. Localization does not consist of adjectives or labelling by race, sex or class. Localization is not what is concrete with regards to the abstract of decontextualization. Localization is always partial, always, finite, always an intense play of foreground and background, text and context, that constitutes critical research. Most of all, localization is not transparent nor self-evident (Harding, 2015).

2. Articulations and partial knowledge

Articulations between cartography and feminist epistemologies occurred during this study conducted in Uruguay from 2015 to 2020. These and no other socio-historical and political conditions built partial perspectives of partial knowledge on the meanings of living in family for the adolescents participating in the study. Knowing that processes produce movements in whom researches them and in research subjects, an ethical approach that implied accompanying the movement of adolescent production was selected. This entailed the construction of a common plane (Kastrup & Passos, 2013) where these two elements related to one another and with the researcher, with movement and transformation weighing on both terms. Research practices build relationships between subjects and partial connections among them (Haraway, 1991). Like fictional worlds that show families as changing subjective formations belonging to a political and sexual order. Therefore, it is necessary to constantly encompass their construction, which cartography prioritizes despite the moralizing discourses about it, showing the links between politics, families and subjectivity.

2.1. Cartography as a research method in psychology

Cartographic research has always been considered a reality intervention practice that allows for encompassing its construction process. In addition, it is a methodology that banishes the idea of the researcher as a transversal subject and transforms the overlap of different orders, such as personal, familiar, institutional and religious, into analysis. Some authors, starting from Lourau (1994) have called this implication.

Cartography deals with the strategies of desire in social formations (Rolnik, 1989) and connects with the clinical exercise of psychological practices developing nowadays. The research questions that drove the study sought to understand how adolescents live changes in family and become subjects in these new family compositions in case of divorce or

separation of their parents. These questions are related to the subjectivity of the period and to families as privileged spaces of human subjectivation.

Our understanding of subjectivity derives from the reinterpretation made by Deleuze (2018) about subjectivation in Foucault, which offers clues to consider subjectivity as a 'fold out of the subject', with the subject-families neither inside nor outside this. What is subjective is produced in the fold as a reflection not about itself but about the world. In other words, the way of conceiving subjectivation does not refer to the psychical constitution exclusively from an intrapsychical dynamic, but subjectivation is understood as that dimension of the subjective that emerges in collective processes.

Suely Rolnik (1989) directs cartographers to turn their attention to the strategies of desire in any social formation. Therefore, it is not about what sector or problem of reality they deal with but the attention they pay to the strategies of desire. This implies focusing on their productive forces, a desire that produces new imaginary constructs rather than a lack of them. On these paths, it is understood that it is possible to situate oneself in psychology when undertaking cartography.

In a work by Javier Rey and Andrés Granese (2018) about the validity of cartography as a research method in Psychology, the authors refer to this aspect as follows:

There are several motives that lead us to conceive cartography as a valid and necessary research method for Psychology, which is necessary because Psychology oscillates between scientific and clinical practice. When the need for producing academic knowledge in psychology is imposed, the scientific practice takes all the scene, reducing the clinical approach to the elements that the dominant science may conceive and include in its research methods, overlooking matters such as events and intuitions that form clinical psychology as much as the states, the continuous processes, behavioral data, psychometric results, etc (Rey & Granese, 2018, p. 29).

2.2. Articulations with feminist epistemologies

When advancing the research, we started noticing that feminist perspectives introduced elements that coincided with the cartographic view. In the first chapter of the book *Otras formas de reconocer (Other forms of knowing)*, Bárbara Biglia (2014) introduces some of the advances and dilemmas of feminist perspectives on social research as a proposal to transform reality. The author underscores that the transition from epistemological theory to methodologies is a field to continue to enrich and that the challenges posed by feminisms are easier to address in the theoretical field than in the methodological field:

Therefore, when we say that there could and should exist a feminist methodology, we do not refer to the information collection and analysis techniques that are used until they are discarded, but we opt for a research practice that is coherent with the feminist tenets and that rethinks and redesigns according to the specificities of the study, its context, purpose and, of course, the adopted feminist position (Biglia, 2014, p. 26).

Cartography in feminist code will therefore allow us to situate feminist teachings in research, using the epistemology of the knowledge-based epistemology proposed by Haraway (1991):

The feminist position is not the only one, because our maps require too many dimensions for that metaphor to give ground to our views. But the purpose of an epistemology and a policy of responsible and committed positions sought by theorists of the feminist perspective continue to be eminently

powerful. The purpose is to have better versions of the world, that is to say, the 'science' (Haraway, 1991, p. 338, author's emphasis).

Going back to the idea of a critical view in the gendered and heterogeneous space of science, paraphrasing the author, she believes that feminism loves science and the partly understood. This radical acceptance of incompleteness and no-totalization of thinking is key as an ethos of cartographic research. Nevertheless, Haraway (1991) warns about relativism and the ethical-political responsibility of conducting research from these perspectives.

Relativism and totalization are both 'divine tricks' that promise, at the same time and as a whole, the view from all the positions and from nowhere, which are common myths in the rhetoric surrounding Science. But it is precisely in politics and epistemology from partial perspectives where the possibility of an objective, sustained and rational search is possible (Haraway, 1991, p. 329).

Biglia (2014) summarizes the task of diffracting feminist methodological knowledges and invites to acknowledge that we women know through ourselves and produce some realities instead of others, that this production is conducted through representations and that we should assume them by giving voice to the subjects with whom we do research; we can also modify their own meanings and messages. Here, Biglia (2014) stops dialoguing with the implication and transversality analysis, which are institutional analysis tools that allow us to analyze our place as researchers not only by focusing on the object of our study but by broadening the scope of the analyses that intersect us, the forces that form us and the elements we bring with us to work.

To summarize, the feminist perspective grew as we moved forward with the study, which opened the possibility of an 'event' for cartography by exposing the gendered field of science, the overlapping between gender relationships and knowledge production, knowledge-power relationships and a strong focus on conceiving other ways of doing 'objective' but not neutral science. Both approaches potentiate each other as they propose other forms of intervention, thinking and experiencing the social and research-intervention to transform reality. In this sense, we attempt to make cartography a useful tool for feminist approaches.

The topic of family calls for cartography and the feminist perspective as it forces us to follow processes while understanding that the family is not static despite being composed of several crystallizations. Additionally, talking about family pushes us to take a stance on how we live and conceive it since we are constantly affected by our senses.

3. Connections and shifts: three points on rhizomized families

Three points were selected to show the crossings between cartography and feminist epistemologies during the development of the study. The aim is to share how these theoretical-methodological tools operated in different moments of the process and to continue with the problem, as stated by Haraway (2019):

In fact, continuing with the problem requires to learn to be truly present, not as an pillar that is blurred between horrible or Edenic pasts and apocalyptic or salvation futures, but as mortal beings intertwined in myriad incomplete configurations of places, times, subjects and meanings (Haraway, 2019, p. 20).

3.1. The origin of the research problem

The research questions of the dissertation were initially posed by formulating the single parenting problem and then deconstructing family models and the invention of what has been denominated as family fictions and parenthood landscapes. Single parenthood was the starting point taken, and it corresponds to a situation in which one parent assumes the care and rearing of their children. As we observed, this situation can occur in different ways and be lived in different modes; therefore, the first perspective-taking was to think of single parenthood as a unique and transcendental phenomenon. In addition, almost all the teenagers interviewed had contact with their parents but spent most of their time with the mother. Would it be ethically adequate to classify this situation as single parenthood? Single parent family? Single parent household?

As the above mentioned, in the framework of the cartographic method as a transformative intervention of reality (Kastrup & Passos, 2013), we recognized the 'object' of study as a co-emergent effect of the research process, while this object was under construction and reformulation throughout the study. We faced the challenge of problematizing single parenthood, as 'single' indicates quantity of one and we observed how the 'one' became blurry as an imaginary production to conceive the exercise of single parenthood in the contexts of our interviewees. Although the adolescents lived with only one of their parents, their lives that transited and circulated across different care networks challenged the 'object of single parenthood', as it was slippery and mobile, beyond the demographic categories from which we departed. Fonseca and Costa (2013) propose that the object-problem consistency is not related to an immutable substance or essence form to be discovered. The authors defend the importance of sustaining the tension between change fluidity and permanence in this process. The authors warn that the ontological consistency of the objects is produced in a double operation of the complexity and tension of heterogeneous relationships without a homogeneous unity.

Eduardo Passos and Regina Benevides de Barros (2009, p. 18) propose "Cartography as a research method and the outline of that experience plane, encompassing the effects (on the object, the researcher and knowledge production) of the own course of research". From this perspective, the inseparability between knowing and doing, between research and intervention is put forward; moreover, intervention is conducted in the experience of agency between subject and object, theory and practice in a same experience plane where object, subject and knowledge "[...] are co-emergent effects of the research process" (Passos & Barros, 2009, p. 18). In this sense, knowing is creating realities and therefore this first destabilization regarding the object of study progressively transformed and formed, placing focus and shape in the contemporary transformation of families as a field of problems. Definitely, what occurred in the research process was that single parenthood became a multiplicity of single parenthoods. At the same time, this generated conditions for revising the internalized family models and the new contemporary parenthood versions. As above mentioned, this led us to think that single parent households are different from one another.

3.2. Choosing the adolescents' point of view

A second point refers to the selection of the point of view of adolescents as a group with limited presence in research but with a privileged epistemic position for being situated in the margins (Biglia, 2014). The Ecuadorian researcher Moscoso (2009) wonders if it is possible to establish a link between feminist theories and childhood, and obtain a positive answer, since as a population group, adolescents do not fit within the masculine object of

science from whose position of power serves as a basis for creating theoretical construction for disciplines.

From our position as researchers, we understand that adolescents develop particular subjectivation modes in family as they are from a generation different from that of adults due to their dates of birth and the period when they grow up. Likewise, due to their development stage, they have conditions to confront other generations and the society where they live. This confrontation has a repertoire of new resources to venture coding modes for bonds in the sex-gender system, based on type of sensitivity and ways of relating to others. This is the origin of the interest in capturing these attempts of adolescent singling that are not always visible in the 'social whole' as they escape the male- and adult-centered logic. Perhaps the reason behind this is that an element of the social-transformation order in a capitalist production world is at stake, according to Guattari and Rolnik (2006), which cancels alternative lifestyles and promotes a single sense for human fulfilment characterized by oppression, consumption, the destruction of natural resources and the marginalization or exclusion of large human masses. Regarding this, the authors express: "It is necessary that each one reassert themselves in their particular position, which makes this position live, articulated with other singling processes and resist all attempts of levelling from subjectivity [...]" (Guattari & Rolnik, 2006, p. 65).

In other words, feminists refer to knowledge based on and produced by research subjects as stakeholders and agents for objective knowledge. In this sense, the contributions of feminist scholars to intersectional thinking (La Barbera, 2016) become a support to understand and deal with different inequalities in play in the concrete situations lived by adolescents.

3.3. Analysis techniques in cartography

Analyzing is like this: a procedure that multiplies the meanings and creates new problems (Barros & Barros, 2013, p. 375).

The analysis started during the meeting with the adolescents as research subjects, and the experience with them turned out to be key because the analytical process occurred in this relationship, as stated by Renault de Barros and Barros de Barros (2013, p. 376): "The analytical method then consists of giving visibility to relationships that form a specific reality, in which the researcher is entangled". On this point, the internal validity of the study is at stake, as it is affected by the emergence of the meanings in the accounts of participants, and encompassed by a review of the knowledge produced by other researchers. The debate on the meaning of the 'datum' for cartography is relevant to shed some light on what cartography analyzes. In this sense, the analysis allowed us to progressively discover the object that appears as given and as evidence to access the singularity of the processes. In connection, it resonated on us the idea of 'data harvesting' (Kastrup, 2009) that offers cartography as it implies hard work from the beginning of research. We use this term to explain how qualitative data is produced from the beginning with special emphasis on how the analysis generates data with the purpose of harvesting and dissemination in the academic community.

Concretely, life stories were collected from adolescents, which were listened to and transcribed, and then shared with them in order to generate a meeting point with the

interviewees that allowed for accompanying the movements they wanted to make by emphasizing some aspect and clarifying others. When they rediscovered their written stories in a second meeting, adolescents were able to give new meanings to what they had said, as well as corroborating, adding and disagreeing with their previous constructions. Research is alive.

Renault de Barros and Barros de Barros (2013) express that the analysis has a clinical-political dimension because it enables a subjective re-positioning in this case of the adolescents and the own researcher. From the position taken, we attempted to suspend our perspective as observers (Passos & Eirado, 2009) and let them participate in the writing of the analysis of their stories, as well as in the construction of the problems for the analysis.

The cartographic approach marks an interpretation path that has its implicit epistemological elements and specific ways of action. From this perspective, all research is intervention (Passos & Barros, 2009) and therefore we considered “[...] the effects of the research process on the research object, researchers and their results” (Passos & Barros, 2009, p. 17) in the production of qualitative data.

Cartography as a research method is drawn as an experience plane, encompassing the effects (on the object, the researcher and knowledge production) of the research course. Considering that the object, subject and knowledge are co-emergent effects of the research process, research cannot be guided by assumptions on reality: the know-what of research (Passos & Barros, 2009, p. 18).

Along the interviews and successive readings, some analyzers emerged, whose recurrence, regularity and disruptions in the narrative of the interviewees produced the analysis of the material and mapped the composition plane. According to Lourau in the work *The institutional analysis* (1994), an analyzer will be “[...] what allows for revealing the structure of the institution, provoke it, force it to speak” (Lourau, 1994, p. 282). The same works as an institutional provoker and articulator of diverse meanings, being a hinge concept that enables a route for process research.

Among the first analyzers (Lourau, 1994; Manero, 2015) identified in the reading of the interviews are the recurrence of denominating family the people adolescents live with and the affective bonds as organizers of family fictions, the transit of teenagers across different households, the deployment of care practices towards children and adolescents by different stakeholders and in different extra-family spaces, the organization of domestic work in the households, the processes of autonomy of the adolescents, and the presence-absence of the parent with whom they do not live in the narratives. These analyzers mainstreamed the field as we edited the life stories. They provided a glimpse of the singularity of each story, as well as the intersection, coincidence and divergence points among stories. Analyzers operated as tools for catalyzing the research process, generating shifts and new meanings for research with families.

Final considerations

In the majority of PhD dissertations, the explanation of the methodology takes a specific chapter or section where there is a series of practical knowledge that supports scientific research. This section offers the reader a clear and detailed explanation about the procedures used in the course of the study. It is important that researchers can explain the tools and procedures used, as well as the meetings held with the participants of studies, techniques employed to perform the analysis and the form of presenting the results. Since

the possibility of showing these procedures often depend on the belonging and exclusion limits between scientific communities and expert knowledge.

These writings reveal the epistemological premises of the research in terms of the nature of knowledge and reality. In this sense, cartographic writing has its own characteristics as it is supported by a grid whose central organizer is, precisely, the articulation of methodological tools with a specific epistemic, theoretical and political place from which research departs. It is written at the same time as the encounters with people, places and theoretical readings, in a sociopolitical context whose coordinates imprint intellectual production.

Likewise, in this manuscript we attempt to draw from the epistemic-theoretical connections between cartography and feminist epistemologies that emerged during the research practice, marking some points that show how these interconnections act in different moments: in the reconstruction of the research problem-object, in choosing the participants' point of view and in the analysis process where the emphasis is placed on the experience of meeting with adolescents, as well as the emergence of analyzers that destabilize and catalyze research processes in family and parenting.

References

- Agamben, G. (2018, 23 de Mayo). ¿Qué es lo contemporáneo? *Lobo Suelto*. Recuperado de <http://lobosuelto.com/que-es-lo-contemporaneo-giorgio-agamben/>
- Barros, L. M. R., & Barros, M. E. B. (2013). O problema da análise em pesquisa cartográfica. *Fractal - Revista de Psicologia*, 25(2), 373-390.
- Biglia, B. (2014). Avances, dilemas y retos de las epistemologías feministas en la investigación social. In I. M. Azkue, M. Luxán, M. Legarreta, G. Guzmán, I. Zirion, J. A. Carballo (Eds.), *Otras formas de (re)conocer: reflexiones, herramientas y aplicaciones desde la investigación feminista* (p. 21-44). Vitoria-Gasteiz, ES: UPV.
- Deleuze, G. (2018). *La subjetivación. Curso sobre Foucault III*. Buenos Aires, AR: Cactus.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (2004). Introducción. In G. Deleuze, & F. Guattari (Eds.), *Mil mesetas: capitalismo y esquizofrenia* (p. 9-21). Valencia, ES: Pre-textos.
- Díaz, E. (2007). *Entre la tecnociencia y el deseo. La construcción de una epistemología ampliada*. Buenos Aires, AR: Biblos.
- Fonseca, T. M. G., & Costa, L. A. (2013). As durações do devir: como construir objetos-problema com a cartografia. *Fractal – Revista de Psicologia*, 25(2), 415-431.
- Guattari, F., & Rolnik, S. (2006). *Micropolítica: cartografía del deseo*. Madrid, ES: Traficantes de Sueños.
- Haraway, D. (1991). Conocimientos situados: la cuestión científica en el feminismo y el privilegio de la perspectiva parcial. In D. Haraway (Ed.), *Ciencia, cyborgs y mujeres. La reinención de la naturaleza* (p. 313-346). Madrid, ES: Cátedra.

- Haraway, D. (2004). *Testigo_Modesto@ Segundo_Milenio. HombreHembra@_Conoce_Oncorratón®: feminismo y tecnociencia* (Colección Nuevas Tecnologías y Sociedad). Barcelona, ES: UOC.
- Haraway, D. (2019). *Seguir con el problema. Generar parentesco en el Chthuluceno*. Bilbao, ES: Edición Consonni.
- Harding, S. (1991). *Ciencia y feminismo*. Madrid, ES: Morata.
- Harding, S. (2015). *Objectivity and diversity: another logic of scientific research*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Kastrup, V. (2009). O funcionamento da atenção no trabalho do cartógrafo. In E. Passos, V. Kastrup, & L. Escóssia (Eds.), *Pistas de método da cartografia. Pesquisa-intervenção e produção de subjetividade* (p. 32-51). Porto Alegre, RS: Sulinas.
- Kastrup, V., & Passos, E. (2013). Cartografiar é traçar um plano comum. *Fractal - Revista De Psicologia*, 25(2), 263-280. DOI: 10.1590/S1984-02922013000200004
- La Barbera, M. C. (2016). Interseccionalidad, un 'concepto viajero': orígenes, desarrollo e implementación en la Unión Europea. *Interdisciplina*, 4(8), 105-122.
- Lapassade, G. (1989). *Grupos, organizações e instituições*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Francisco Alves.
- Lourau, R. (1994). *El análisis institucional*. Buenos Aires, AR: Amorrortu Editores.
- Manero, R. (2015). El analizador y el sentido del análisis. Génesis teórica del concepto. *Área 3. Cuadernos de Temas Grupales e Institucionales*, 1(19), 1-18.
- Moscoso, M. F. (2009). La mirada ausente: antropología e infancia. *Revista Electrónica Aportes Andinos*, 1(24), 1-10.
- Passos, E., & Barros, R. B. (2009). A cartografia como método de pesquisa-intervenção. In E. Passos, V. Kastrup, & L. Escóssia (Eds.), *Pistas de método da cartografia. Pesquisa-intervenção e produção de subjetividade* (p. 17-31). Porto Alegre, RS: Sulinas.
- Passos, E., & Eirado, A. (2009). Cartografia como dissolução do ponto de vista do observador. In E. Passos, V. Kastrup, & L. Escóssia (Eds.), *Pistas de método da cartografia. Pesquisa-intervenção e produção de subjetividade* (p. 109-130). Porto Alegre, RS: Sulinas.
- Rey, J., & Granese, A. (2018). La cartografía como método de investigación en psicología. *Psicología, Conocimiento y Sociedad*, 1(34), 1-34. DOI: 10.26864/PCS.v9.n1.4
- Rolnik, S. (1989). *Cartografia sentimental, transformações contemporâneas do desejo*. São Paulo, SP: Editora Estação Liberdade.
- Rousillon, R. (2002). Espacios y prácticas institucionales. La liberación y el intersticio. In R. Kaës, J. Begler, E. Enriquez, F. Fornari, P. Fustier, R. Roussillon, & J. P. Vidal.

(Eds.), *La institución y las instituciones. Estudios psicoanalíticos* (p. 188-213). Buenos Aires, AR: Paidós.

Received: Apr. 26, 2021

Approved: Jun. 11, 2021