Towards transknowledging: Epistemic justice matters for language scholars

Johanna Ennser-Kananen, University of Jyväskylä
Sanna Riuttanen, University of Jyväskylä
Yecid Ortega, Queen's University Belfast

Abstract

In this article, we review literature on epistemic oppression and justice for colleagues in the area of applied language studies. Based on this, we develop the concept of transknowledging as an entry point for epistemic justice. We draw from personal accounts and experiences as language scholars to consider an epistemic ecosystem of knowledges that challenges monolithic conceptualizations of how knowledge is created, engaged, and shared. In this process, we argue for more horizontal forms of embracing and celebrating knowledge while disobeying, dismantling, and decolonizing currently dominant modes of thinking. Transknowledging, for us, points to a praxis-oriented, transdisciplinary, and transformative understanding of knowledge processes. We consider the ethical, social, and linguistic dimensions of knowledge, keeping in mind that knowledging is not a neutral endeavor but rather influenced by power dynamics and social structures throughout times and places. We envision transknowledging as the process of acquiring and negotiating knowledge by actively transgressing disciplinary boundaries, subverting colonial knowledge frameworks, and working towards societal transformation in the pursuit of a holistic understanding of diverse beings in relation to others and the space we share.

Keywords: epistemic justice, knowledges, decolonization, language, social justice, transknowledging

1   Introduction

What are three language people doing, studying knowledges and knowledge production? As applied linguists, researchers, and language teacher educators, knowledges were not our main focus when we first started our academic trajectories, or rather, we did not tag our work with knowledge vocabulary. Over time, it became clear that our research participants – typically pre- or in-service teachers, multilingual students of color,

VERTAISARVIOITU
KOLLEGIALT GRANSKAD
PEER-REVIEWED
www.tsv.fi/tunnus

or youth and adults with migration experience – had so much to teach us that could not be captured with the lenses our field offered us. Adhering to the epistemologies of our academic socialization in institutions of the Global North, we learned, and are still learning, to consider linguistic legitimacy (e.g. Ennser-Kananen, 2018) and its sociopolitical underpinnings in different forms and manifestations, for instance as language rights (May, 2005), raciolinguistic ideologies (Flores & Rosa, 2015), or decolonial multilinguality (Ennser-Kananen, Iikkanen, & Skinnari, 2023; Hammine, 2022; Phipps, 2019). No matter how inclusive the concept of language or languaging was that we used, there always seemed to be a large part that we were missing. Our participants were clearly knowers, but they rarely enacted their knowledges through languages, at least not through what we had come to understand as languages. We turned to knowledges, hoping to find a broader approach to describe what our participants were enacting. Bringing and deepening a power-sensitive approach from our academic socialization, we set out to examine how knowledges are validated (or not), accepted (or not), and even noticed (or not), or what Ennser-Kananen (2019) has called *epistemic legitimacy*– and found there already existed a wealth of literature, from which to learn about epistemic hierarchies and oppression, knowledge erasure and commodification, and attempts to (re)build epistemic justice. We come to this work as outsiders to the fields that typically discuss knowledge, including philosophy, sociology, and anthropology, as language scholars who try to look beyond language and make connections to other disciplines.

As we orient ourselves in the literature, we attempt to highlight what language means and how language can be used as a bridge or conduit among diverse and multiple knowledges and different epistemologies. We start from an understanding that the epistemic harm due to colonial, hetero-patriarchal and so-called "western" ways of being has affected communicative interactions and modes of representation. Although, as workers in the academy, we contribute to the creation and reproduction of knowledge hierarchies (Hutton & Cappellini, 2022), we see it as our responsibility to challenge injustices that are done to others. As such, we are grateful to the scholars who came before us and have guided our thinking, and we remain hopeful that this conceptual article will encourage other language scholars to delve into the field of knowledging and epistemic justice to acknowledge and sustain the plurality of knowledges, cultures, and languages around us.

In applied linguistics, we have several frameworks and tools at hand that guide us towards the idea of epistemic justice. These frameworks have served as inspiration for us in proposing a new concept, transknowledging, in the conclusion of this paper. Specifically translanguaging as a worldview and political stance (Wei, 2022) has greatly influenced this concept. As we see it, translanguaging does not necessarily describe the ability to switch between languages, nor is it merely a pedagogical method of instruction, which encourages teachers to facilitate students to use multilingual repertoires. Importantly, it is a perspective that challenges colonial divides between linguistic and epistemic practices that are recognized and valued, and those that are featured on the other side of this "epistemic line" (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2018b; García, Flores, Seltzer, Wei, Otheguy & Rosa 2021; Wei, 2018). Thus, recent work in applied linguistics gives us as researchers and educators an excellent starting point for exploring epistemic (in)justice.

This piece should be read as pointing towards transknowledging, as an attempt to build connections between disciplines and break through rigid boundaries of "western" academic epistemologies. In doing so, we draw on and contribute to approaches to equitable education, especially for linguistically and otherwise minoritized communities. In this bridging of knowledges, we envision language research and education as dynamically related to social constructs such as race, class, gender, ethnicity, ability, faith, sexual orientation, citizenship, and migration status, etc. As an entry point, the next section offers our personal perspectives to elucidate who we are and where we are

coming from in this transknowledging journey, hoping the reader can find their own journey in connecting their personal experiences to language, research, and knowledge, in relation to others.

2 Speaking from within

In qualitative critical and decolonial research (Paris & Winn, 2014; Smith, 1999), the concept of "positionality" refers to the researcher's position or standpoint within the research process. It involves acknowledging and understanding how the researcher's social, cultural, geopolitical, and bodily ways of being in the world influence the research process and outcomes. This positionality or "locus of enunciation" (Grosfoguel, 2011, p. 5) also informs the stance researchers take as they resist and confront hegemonic epistemologies and purposely refrain from uncritically accepting them as sole universal and legitimate forms of knowledging (Mabhena, 2019; Sugiharto, 2020). In the section below, we offer the reader some insights into who we are and where we come from.

2.1 Johanna

I am a white, European woman, who lives in a settler state and was born, raised, and educated in European and North American contexts and institutions, with the exception of one study abroad semester in South Africa. This means that most of my educational trajectory was guided by European/Eurocentric, white, middle-class values and worldviews, and my educational socialization was in fact a process of internalizing those. At the same time, my private and professional life has been a story of Eurocentric epistemic frames becoming brittle and crumbling, as I am learning about subaltern (e.g., non-white, migrant, and Indigenous) ways of knowing. For example, in my previous job as a teacher at a culturally and linguistically diverse school made it clear that many beliefs about language and education did not work for my students who were members of culturally minoritized groups. Similarly, my current research study at a school for adults who have forced migration experience (e.g., Ennser-Kananen, 2021) made me intensely aware of the contingency and bias of my epistemic position. Since (at the latest) then, I have been seeking out opportunities for learning new (to me) ways of knowing and being in the world, as well as for unlearning my familiar ways. In my professional life, this has meant delving into New Materialism and Posthumanism (Ennser-Kananen & Saarinen, 2023), decolonial approaches to research and teaching (Ennser-Kananen et al., 2023), and (re)discovering artistically and playfully critical ways of being an academic (Engman, Ennser-Kananen & Cushing-Leubner, 2023; Aarnikoivu, Ennser-Kananen & Saarinen, forthcoming; Perkins, Ennser-Kananen, Laihonen & Saarinen, 2024). I am grateful for the support and opportunities to keep at it, like this group of authors and this paper.

2.2 Sanna

I am a white European woman who underwent their whole school path in Finland, starting from early childhood education, through upper secondary school, and now holding a Master's degree from a Finnish university. I am the first one in my family to pursue a PhD, though both my parents have Master's degrees. We always read a lot of books in my childhood, and I have always been interested in knowing new things and learning new languages. Though I am good at memorizing facts, I have always felt that that was not real "knowledge"; real knowledge to me was always something you feel comfortable in, something you are passionate about, something you do not have to struggle to remember. Lately, my eyes have been opened to all kinds of knowledges, and ways of thinking about knowledge. I keep expanding those thoughts in my research. I

wish to conduct my research through an intersectional lens, recognizing how different social identities and realities create unique intersections of oppression and/or power for each person. I understand that I may never truly grasp the social reality of my research participants. Then again, I believe that everyone can relate to some aspect of each other and treat each other with compassion, and as members of the human species, we have more in common than differences. Nevertheless, I wish to work towards a more inclusive academia, because including the unique experiences of all kinds of people in the knowledging process can create more knowledge than us white, middle-class people could ever create on our own.

2.3 Yecid

I am a Latinx, cisgender heterosexual man who was born and raised in Colombia to a single mother who cleaned bathrooms in the houses of rich people for a living to bring bread to the table for my brother and me. I am the first one in my family to ever finish high school, undergraduate studies and even completing a PhD degree and now working in the UK. As such, knowlegdes born out of the struggle has already been part of my life, advocating for social justice for the most marginalized communities in society has been at the front and centre of my personal ontoepistemological cosmologies and my current research. However, as a person of color (POC), I also have the role and responsibility of not perpetuating or accentuating whiteness as symbol of power among my own people and instead as a language educator and researcher in the field of applied linguistics I learned to believe in relationships, the relation to ourselves and our territories and our fundamental interdependence of everything that exists (Escobar, Osterweil, Sharma, 2024). I envision transknowleding as a way to articulate a paradigm shift that is necessary in reciprocity and solidarity to other humans, non-human, beyond humans (AI/robot and meta/virtual universes) as core principals to achieve social equity and planetary survival within the framework of a Pluriversal Applied Linguistics towards a world worth living for all (Ortega, forthcoming).

3   Challenging Eurocentric knowledge as a colonial product

Recently, global crises like the COVID pandemic or the climate crisis have sparked a renewed interest in epistemic processes and seem to confirm the notion that Eurocentric knowledge and thought cannot adequately capture global experiences or problems, no less address them effectively. Posholi (2020) has synthesized this "*inadequacy thesis*" straight-forwardly as "Eurocentric thought fails to provide epistemic resources for a proper comprehension of the world." (p. 281). Hand in hand with the recognition of the inadequacy of Eurocentric knowledges goes a renewed interest in knowledges (and languages) that have been erased and marginalized throughout past and present histories in an attempt to hierarchize and hegemonize knowledges from a European standpoint. In order to challenge these existing hierarchies, we must recognize that the generation, evaluation, representation, and tradition of knowledge are intertwined with historical and contemporary colonial processes (de Sousa Santos, 2007[1]).

Tobi (2020) describes how colonizers operated backed by an ideological mix of "enlightenment, racism, evangelism, and liberation" (p. 258) with a mission to bring about "civility" to the "savage" who was portrayed as lacking it. Such epistemic violence was oftentimes exerted via schools and included processes of banning existing languages and epistemic resources and replacing them with those of the colonizer. Potential resistance

---

1. While preparing this manuscript for submission, allegations of sexual misconduct had become public about Boaventura de Sousa Santos (Viaene, Laranjeiro, & Tom, 2023). We stand in solidarity with the victims and reserve the possibility to remove references to de Sousa Santos' work from ours in a future version of this article.

to those imposed knowledge systems or failure to take them up was then interpreted as "further proof of the uncivil and unintelligent nature of the colonised" (Tobi, 2020, p. 260). In the process of epistemic colonization (or "epistemicide", see Mitova 2020, p. 202) and "epistemic oppression" (Mitova, 2020, p. 202), language plays a key role. For instance, Mitova (2020) points to the "intimate connection between epistemicide and what we might call linguicide" (p. 202) and describes this intersection as "targeted hermeneutical injustice" that "deprives the colonised of their own conceptual resources and leaves them at a permanent disadvantage as the eternal second-language speaker" (p. 202), which also solidifies their status as eternal second-class humans. In a similar vein, Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o (1994) reminds us that colonization happens not only on the land but also by oppressing and controlling the mind of the colonized, for instance through banning their languages. Thus, as an important tool for building culture and knowledge, for making sense of the world and of oneself, language needs to be considered in colonial processes as well as in efforts to decolonize knowing and institutions of knowledge legitimation (e.g. by using African languages in African universities, wa Thiong'o, 1986).

Ndlovu-Gatsheni (e.g., 2018a, 2018b, 2020, 2021) has written extensively on epistemic freedom and epistemological decolonization in and for Africa. In reference to de Sousa Santos' notion of "abyssal thinking" and W. E. B. Du Bois' (1903) "colour line", they understand the "epistemic line" as a division between those who have and those who do not have knowledge. As knowledge is tied to humanity, "the epistemic line is simultaneously the ontological line" (2018, p. 17). Erasing that line would be necessary in working towards epistemic freedom, which they understand as follows: "Epistemic freedom is fundamentally about the right to think, theorise, interpret the world, develop own methodologies and write from where one is located and unencumbered by Eurocentrism" (p. 17).

Scholars in the area of translanguaging and raciolinguistics have provided important frameworks for this work of crossing and challenging epistemic lines. Their example illustrates the intertwinedness of decolonizing knowledges and languages, for example by challenging linguistic boundaries that hark back to colonial origins (Heller & McElhinny, 2017; García et al, 2021). Translanguaging and raciolinguistics (García & Wei, 2014; Rosa & Flores, 2015) both promote structures for linguistic and epistemic plurality, something we also envision transknowledging can do. These ideas underscore the significance of recognizing and valuing individuals' multilingual repertoires, acknowledging that language practices transcend monolingual norms and ideologies. More specifically, in classrooms, translanguaging pedagogy advocates for leveraging students' linguistic diversity to foster inclusion and equity (Morales, Schissel & López-Gopar 2020), while raciolinguistic research and education initiatives (Bale, Rajendram, Brubacher, Owoo, Burton, Wong, Zhang, Larson, Gagné & Kerekes, 2023) illuminate how language serves as a means of resistance and solidarity for marginalized communities, challenging dominant narratives, thus undermining "abyssal thinking". By centering the experiences and perspectives of marginalized communities, both translanguaging and raciolinguistics share a commitment to promoting social justice (Cushing, 2022; García & Leiva, 2014), advocating for inclusive approaches to language education, research, and policy as well as helping push the boundaries of knowledge creation and dissemination from within marginalized communities to the world.

In efforts to push, cross, and erase epistemic lines, some scholarship has examined the construction of claims to epistemic universality as they have been made by European schools of thought. Mignolo (2009) has outlined how Eurocentric epistemologies are believed to originate from what Castro-Gomez has called a "zero point" (2007, as cited in Mignolo, 2009), a perspective that generates knowledge from an absolute standpoint that exists outside of socio-historical locations and allows for claims of epistemic universality (Posholi, 2020). Mignolo argues that generating knowledge within and through European universities has been done from the dominant positions of "theology and philosophy-

science" which are "competing with each other at one level, but collaborating with each other when the matter is to disqualify forms of knowledge beyond these two frames" (p. 164). Traditional or Indigenous knowledges are dismissed as myths or superstitions, as they are not perceived to belong to the sphere of knowledges at all. Acknowledging the historical roots of epistemic injustice, its interconnectedness with Eurocentrism and colonialism, and its presence in colonialism's contemporary form, coloniality[2], (see Quijano, 2007), helps create an awareness of how such injustice is interwoven into today's societal and institutional fabric, including in our field and institutions, and simultaneously raises questions about the possibilities of dismantling this system. As researchers at European universities, we should begin the process from within our own systems, following the work of the scholars we present here.

4   Epistemic injustice between the individual and the systemic

Epistemic injustice and oppression have been approached from different perspectives, including some that focus on global policies and in/equities as well as those that analyze individual or interpersonal experiences. In other words, while some scholars have examined the socio-historical roots and manifestations of epistemic inequity, others have looked at interactional and discursive practices through a lens of who is heard, believed, and positioned as a knower. Importantly, these different approaches need to be read in dialogue with each other. If the texts themselves do not already do so explicitly, readers are called to understand macro- and micro-processes as interrelated, for instance by asking how colonial imaginaries are sustained or challenged in contemporary discourse and interaction.

Kristie Dotson (2014) offers helpful concepts for understanding epistemic oppression, which she defines as "persistent epistemic exclusion that hinders one's contribution to knowledge production" (p. 115). She differentiates between reducible and irreducible forms of epistemic oppression, stating that the former can be solved by sharing and using epistemic resources, whereas the latter "can only begin to be addressed through recognition of the limits of one's overall epistemological frameworks" (p. 116). A recognition of our own epistemic – including linguistic – and epistemological limits, both from the perspective of individuals and institutions, must thus accompany this work.

According to Dotson, our in/ability to work towards epistemic justice depends on the epistemological landscapes we inhabit, specifically the following three features: (1) the "situatedness of knowers" (p. 120), which holds that all knowing is contingent as knowers' capacity is limited and dependent on their social and embodied positions, the (2) "interdependence of our epistemic resources", which understands knowing as a collective practice, and recognizes the interdependent nature of knowledge resources and systems, and (3) the "resilience of our epistemological systems" (p. 120), which recognizes knowing and knowledge production as holistic and all-encompassing systems that are resistant to change. Dotson additionally (2014) distinguishes between three types of epistemic oppression: first order (epistemic exclusion based on "inefficient shared epistemic resources") second order (based on "insufficient shared epistemic resources") and third order (based on "inadequate shared epistemic resources"). She stresses that sustainable change towards epistemic justice has to be on the third level, and thus needs to question and transform the knowledge system itself.

Dotson's work has examined epistemic interaction in interpersonal exchange, which is highly relevant for critical language and communication scholars. Drawing on Spivak

---

2. On the difference between colonialism and coloniality, Quijano (2007) explains that although political colonialism has stopped, "the relationship between the European – also called 'Western' – culture, and the others, continues to be one of colonial domination" (p. 169).

(1998), Dotson understands epistemic violence as silencing groups or individuals by preventing them from speaking or being heard. She also borrows from Hornsby (1994) who has defined reciprocity in linguistic exchanges as not merely understanding words but also their intentions, which means that speakers and listeners contribute equally to meaningful interactions. In Dotson's (2011) words, "[sp]eakers are vulnerable in linguistic exchanges because an audience may or may not meet the linguistic needs of a given speaker in a given exchange" (p. 238). For Dotson (2011) it thus follows that epistemic violence "is a refusal, intentional or unintentional, of an audience to communicatively reciprocate a linguistic exchange owing to pernicious ignorance" (p. 238). She continues to explain pernicious ignorance as a recurring form of ignorance that "in a given context, harms another person (or set of persons)" (p. 238).

Dotson points to two practices of epistemic violence through silencing: testimonial quieting, which means the speaker is not recognized as a knower, and testimonial smothering, which means the speaker truncates their message in order to avoid being misunderstood by an (allegedly) epistemically incompetent audience, e.g. if the audience commits microaggressions against a Black speaker, the speaker may choose to adapt their topic or avoid race talk altogether (example by Dotson, 2011, p. 246). Importantly, Dotson highlights the responsibility of the audience in linguistic exchanges. She summarizes: "(P)art of the demand on an audience to communicatively reciprocate in linguistic exchanges concerning unsafe, risky content is demonstrating testimonial competence. Without such a demonstration, audiences execute epistemic violence on speakers." (p. 251.) Dotson's work can be understood as a direct call to applied linguists to build language education and research around testimonial competence and other forms of countering epistemic violence.

Another approach to understanding epistemic injustice is offered by Posholi (2020), who draws on work by Fricker (2007). Posholi (2020) describes epistemic injustice as a process of hermeneutical marginalization, which, in their words, "occurs when some epistemic subjects are excluded or marginalized in epistemic activities that build our shared conceptual resources for interpreting and understanding the world" (p. 291). Rather than perpetuating a view of marginalized communities as epistemologically lacking, Posholi calls for an approach that pays attention to the obstacles the epistemically marginalized face in communicating their realities to the dominant groups and advocates for having those realities included in a collective pool of legitimate knowledge. (However, the idea of a shared knowledge pool is contested and rejected, for instance by Dotson, 2012.)

Posholi further relies on Dotson's (2014) work in her considerations on the ir/ reducable nature of epistemic oppression: She holds that the irreducability of Eurocentric epistemic oppression is rooted in the impossibility of stepping outside the dominant epistemological framework, which, in turn, is underscored by its claims to exceptionality and universality. As Posholi puts it, "the Eurocentric paradigm cannot expose its exclusions and limitations while it remains exclusive and limited" (p. 298). Tying this back to their inadequacy thesis, she explains: "the inadequacy of the dominant Eurocentric paradigm is alleged to consist in the very fact that its theories cannot capture the position and experience of marginalized groups, hindering a proper understanding of the global order" (p. 292). Against this backdrop, Posholi argues in favor of a radical approach to epistemic decolonization, which she sees as the only possibility for overcoming a resilient exclusive epistemic paradigm. Posholi connects this larger sociohistorical and sociopolitical situating of epistemic justice to an interpersonal level, drawing on Fricker's theories of epistemic in/justice, which have been central in this line of work.

In her book *Epistemic Injustice*, Fricker (2007) explains the criticality of being a legitimate knower and contributing to legitimate knowledges in being able to fully live and realize one's humanity and freedom. She differentiates between hermeneutical and testimonial injustice (2007), understanding hermeneutical injustice as the barring of people from access to frameworks that enable them to make sense of their experiences or

communicate them. Testimonial epistemic injustice, in turn, is the exclusion, dismissal, or discreditation of someone's account based on stereotypes related to, for instance, race or gender. While hermeneutical injustice is a systemic, societally constructed and perpetuated problem, testimonial injustice relates to the biases of the individual hearer. Fricker's work has inspired a large number of responses and extensions (e.g., Hookway, 2010; Medina, 2012; Pohlhaus, 2017). Walker (2020), for instance, has applied the concepts to the South African context and shown how they interact:

> Black South Africans faced the struggle of making their experiences intelligible to themselves and to those in power, by demanding recognition and by expanding the pool of shared epistemic materials; in this way the lines between hermeneutic and testimonial forms of injustice blur in actual political and communicative struggles and situations (p. 268).

Related to the striving for epistemic recognition and access is Fricker's notion of epistemic contribution capability or *epistemic reciprocity*, which Walker has found particularly useful:

> Our capability for epistemic contribution, Fricker explains, is developed through all kinds of social [pedagogical] encounters which involve sharing information and forms of social understanding, and in which we are both givers and receivers in the project of making meaning; it requires 'epistemic reciprocity' (Fricker, 2015, p. 79) such that we are all recognized as knowers (Walker, 2020, p. 271).

Fricker's work has sparked much important debate. For instance, in a special issue of *Social Epistemology*, several scholars react to Fricker's theory of epistemic injustice. Discussing epistemic in/justice on the interactional level, Origgi (2012) reflects on what makes us believe something or someone, using the moon landing and "smoking kills" warnings on cigarette packages as examples. Coining the concept of *epistemic trust*, Origgi tries to shed light on our complex process of evaluating information. She explains:

> I define epistemic trust as an attitude with two basic components: a default trust, which is the minimal trust we need to allocate to our interlocutors in order for any act of communication to succeed; and a vigilant trust, which is the complex of cognitive mechanisms, emotional dispositions, inherited norms, reputational cues we put at work while filtering the information we receive (p. 224).

While our default trust is the basis for successful communication, vigilant trust can change based on our judgement of the speaker's content credibility, our moral investment, emotional reactions, and social cues, for instance - and is thus sensitive to our own biases. Tying such reflections on the interactional level back to a more structural view, Anderson (2012) applies epistemic justice to social institutions and systems, explaining the difference between systemic and individual injustice as follows:

> The cumulative effects of how our epistemic system elicits, evaluates, and connects countless individual communicative acts can be unjust, even if no injustice has been committed in any particular epistemic transaction. Nor can we count on the practice of individual epistemic justice to correct for all of these global effects. Rather, the larger systems by which we organize the training of inquirers and the circulation, uptake, and incorporation of individuals' epistemic contributions to the construction of knowledge may need to be reformed to ensure that justice is done to each knower, and to groups of inquirers. (p. 164.)

Anderson goes further in arguing that hermeneutical injustice is always structural, and testimonial can be if there is no individual agent who acted based on identity bias. Fricker distinguishes between innocent epistemic mistakes and wrongful bias that informs epistemic marginalization, and proposes individual epistemic virtue as a remedy,

including the addressing of unconscious individual biases. Anderson criticizes this, arguing that structural epistemic discrimination is more prevalent than suggested by Fricker and structural responses are therefore critical, concluding that "Epistemic virtue is needed at both individual and structural scale" (p. 171). Expanding on these thoughts, Jones (2012) explains how the structural and interactional level of epistemic injustice interplay and amplify each other. According to them, social power and intellectual self-trust are inherently intertwined:

> Our intellectual self-trust is created and sustained socially and is thus porous to social power. Unjust social relations cause epistemic injustice, which undermines self-trust among the underprivileged; unjust social relations cause excessive self-trust among the privileged, which perpetuates epistemic injustice, which further undermines the self-trust of the disadvantaged in a vicious feedback loop (p. 163).

This intertwinedness of interpersonal and systemic epistemic injustice makes it even more insidious, and creates a need to support academics who strive to build professional identities that are sensitive to epistemic injustice. Temper, McGarry and Weber (2019) have provided academic types as a way to inspire and guide researchers in this process. Similar to Posholi (2020), Temper, McGarry and Weber note a gap between dominant epistemic systems and global problems. They state that there are "wicked problems that cannot be solved by purely scientific-rational approach" (p. 1) and advocate for a foregrounding of transgressive knowledges in the face of ecological destruction and global injustices. They argue that since modern science and knowledge production have marginalized and erased other ways of knowing, there is a "need for 'transgression' of academic protocols" (p. 1), which extends to a) transdisciplinary approaches that include non-academic actors and perspectives, b) anti-oppressive science, which exposes hegemonies of power, works against systemic violence, and centers epistemic, social and environmental justice (p. 2), and c) shedding the idea of descriptive science and instead promoting social change. Calling for a deep engagement with "activist, queer, feminist, indigenous and non-Western approaches and methodologies, embodied ways of knowing, and further openness to novel approach and experimentation" (p. 2), the authors describe seven characters (the Tarot deck) of transgressive post-normal scientists: the indigenous scholar/ally, the anti-oppressive researcher, the co-conspirer, the responsible participant, the critical comrade/the dialectic activist scholar, the queer enquirer, and the slow and care-full scholar.

   Temper, McGarry, and Weber's (2019) characters can act as inspiration for researchers in any field who wish to develop their practices to embrace social and epistemic justice. As scholars in the field of applied linguistics, we must be among the first to consider these issues, as they are woven right into the individual interactions, communities, and societies which are the subjects of our study. This paper offers tools for recognizing instances of epistemic injustice in our research processes, from theory building to interaction between researchers and participants, as well as data collection, analysis and distribution. However, as long as the systems of epistemic oppression are in place, true justice will remain out of our reach. The next chapters outline possible pathways, both moderate and radical, to changing our way of thinking about (legitimate) knowledge production, from *knowing* towards *transknowledging.*

5   Disobeying, dismantling, decolonizing

As long as epistemic injustice has existed, it has been resisted (e.g., Goetze, 2018 on hermeneutical dissent). However, as Causevic, Philip, Zwick-Maitreyi, Lewis, Bouterse & Sengupta (2020) have noted, scholarship on epistemic in/justice "has been better at telling us how marginalized communities have been historically and epistemically decentered, rather than showing us how to actively and thoughtfully center these

communities in practice" (p. 7). What new perspectives and practices does a dismantling of epistemic oppression require?

Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2018) has called for a provincialization of Europe and a deprovincialization of Africa, in other words, epistemic justice work should be "centering Africa as a legitimate historical unit of analysis and epistemic site from which to interpret the world while at the same time globalising knowledge from Africa" (p. 18). This includes a shift in the so-called "Global North" towards learning from the "Global South", and a change in traditional imperial research hierarchies, where the Global South delivers data and experiences that are molded into theories in the Global North. Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2018b) stresses that such global "rethinking thinking" is an integral part of the necessary decolonialization process:

> Rethinking thinking is fundamentally a decolonial move that requires the cultivation of a decolonial attitude in knowledge production. It is informed by a strong conviction that all human beings are not only born into a knowledge system but are legitimate knowers and producers of legitimate knowledge. Rethinking thinking is also a painstaking decolonial process of 'learning to unlearn in order to re-learn' as well as an opening to other knowledges and thinkers beyond those from Europe and North America that have dominated the academy in the last 500 years (p. 33).

In a similar vein, Tobi (2020) has called for epistemic decolonization and defined it as "an epistemically faithful and just knowledge-forming practice that is open to, and actively draws on, diverse perspectives" (p. 261, emphasis removed). They call for "fair-mindedness", i.e. the strive towards a diversity of knowledge systems based on "faithfulness to epistemic ends" (p. 269) rather than a competition of knowledge systems or relativist perspectives. They combine this approach with a more commonly used definition of decolonization as "the undoing of colonial legacies" (p. 251), explaining that "(t)hese legacies include—but are not limited to—social, economic, political, legal, and epistemic systems that are present in former colonial states, as a direct offshoot of colonisation (Tobi, 2020, pp. 254–255). In other words, epistemic justice relates to the striving for all forms of justice, and is as such part of a larger decolonial effort that requires a multi-level approach.

Contributing to the multifacetedness of the concept, Posholi (2020) maps out pathways towards academic decolonization that they see as operating along the lines of positive decolonization (rebuilding knowledge systems) and negative decolonization (dismantling Eurocentrism of knowledge) and further as moderate and radical (a dismantling of Eurocentric thought and complete epistemological renewal) ones. In reference to de Sousa Santos, Posholi identifies struggles against oppression as the center of radical approaches to decolonization. Moderate approaches, in turn, view so-called "western" thought as unavoidable and potentially useful for making sense of the world, and can be useful as long as they are "critically engaged from the perspective of the globally marginalized" (p. 285). Posholi concludes that both moderate and radical approaches to decolonizing are necessary and compatible (and a radical approach is implicated in a moderate one).

Relatedly, Mignolo (2009) identifies two main pathways for the necessary epistemic disobedience: de-westernization (e.g., Mahbubani, 2009) and a decolonial position, both of which reject a zero point, but differ in terms of their relation to modernity, production, and economy. More specifically, only the decolonial standpoint entails an anticapitalist stance. Mignolo explains that "[e]pistemic disobedience means to delink from the illusion of the zero point epistemology" (p. 160), which includes an unlearning of the First-Second-Third World order.

Importantly, decolonial scholarship itself may not always be in line with its own values: The work by Mignolo and colleagues has been criticized for appropriating subaltern knowledges and thus reinforcing existing epistemic hierarchies that it claims to

challenge. Cusicanqui (2012) argues that cultural studies in North American universities have detached themselves from the local Indian and Latin American communities in creating subaltern studies and knowledges:

> Yet, without altering anything of the relations of force in the "palaces" of empire, the cultural studies departments of North American universities have adopted the ideas of subaltern studies and launched debates in Latin America, thus creating a jargon, a conceptual apparatus, and forms of reference and counterreference that have isolated academic treatises from any obligation to or dialogue with insurgent social forces. Walter Mignolo and company have built a small empire within an empire, strategically appropriating the contributions of the subaltern studies school of India and the various Latin American variants of critical reflection on colonization and decolonization (p. 98).

Pointing to the complexity of decolonial scholarship and its intertwinedness with academic structures and discourses, Cusicanqui (2012) names a few concrete tools of academic epistemic hegemony, including jargon, academic discourse structures, and isolation from communities. Similar dynamics have been observed by Keane, Khupe, and Muza (2016) in the South African context, where academic norms, genres, and expectations divert and alienate researchers from their work or their communities, so that "[w]hile aiming for the championing of 'Other', for the inclusion of the marginalised, and for breaking the apartheid legacy which included social and intellectual separation, the researcher is ironically usually setting himself or herself apart" (p. 164). This important critique raises larger questions about the possibilities of doing decolonizing work in and through the mechanisms of the academy. It clarifies that anticolonial work within the academy is needed, while at the same time understanding that a decolonized academy may not be attainable. As important steps in the right direction, Cusicanqui (2012) reminds us of the importance of practice and the inadequacy of common diversity discourses:

> There can be no discourse of decolonization, no theory of decolonization, without a decolonization practice. The discourse of multiculturalism and the discourse of hybridity are essentialist and historicist interpretations of the indigenous question. They do not address the fundamental issues of decolonization but instead obscure and renew the effective practices of colonization and subalternization (pp. 100–101).

Cusicanqui (2012) proposes a "political economy" (p. 102) of knowledges, which would replace geopolitics of knowledge that are focused on ideas and structures rather than practice. Geopolitics of knowledges distract from ideas with an "economy of salaries, perks, and privileges that certifies value through the granting of diplomas, scholarships, and master's degrees and through teaching and publishing opportunities" (pp. 102– 103). Instead, a political economy would be intensely informed by practice. Cusicanqui's decolonizing work centers around the Aymaran notion of ch'ixi, which denotes simultaneous being and non-being and refers to the coexistence of contradictory realities, from which anticolonial practice can originate. Rooting her work deeply in their Bolivian and Andean history and ancestry, Cusicanqui (2012) outlines approaches to resistant, Indigenous ways of knowing. For instance, her Sociology of the Image draws on her work with Aymara students and understands visual materials like photographs through Indigenous (e.g., Andean) realities and histories and thus confronts and resists colonial processes. Importantly, true to her concept of ch'ixi, Cusicanqui's attention to language, bilinguality, and translanguaging acknowledges coexisting, also conflicting, cultural differences without reconciling them. Also her work with oral histories has contributed to centering Indigenous ways of knowing. Historically, both visual and oral epistemes have been erased and dismissed by academic work and institutions. Cusicanqui's approach creates pathways to reclaiming them, rewriting histories, and transforming the academy.

   In this section, we introduced some key aspects of decolonizing work, including an intense focus on practice, the reframing, reclaiming, and rewriting of histories, the

intentional centering of subaltern knowledges, and the rejection of epistemic differences that are created and maintained through academic jargon, titles, and hierarchies. All these practices and concepts are applicable to or inclusive of linguistic practices, in other words the centering of subaltern epistemic and linguistic practices go hand in hand. Importantly, our desires and efforts to engage in decolonial work are never straightforward or "pure", but always interwoven with (perceived) obligations to stay in line with academic norms and expectations that serve the maintenance of an epistemic imperial archive (Cushing-Leubner, Engman, Ennser-Kananen, & Pettitt, 2021).

6   Opening pathways towards epistemic justice

Examples of reinventing the epistemic roots and role of universities exist. To name only two, Mignolo (2003) introduces Amawtay Wasi, the Universidad Intercultural de las Nacionalidades y los Pueblos Indígenas in Ecuador, which is not rooted in a European Renaissance (Kantian-Humboldtian) or corporate-neoliberal model of knowledge production, but rather is organized through and around Indigenous knowledges and communities. Mignolo (2003) explains that "the mission of the Universidad Intercultural is not a *recuperation* of ancient knowledge but its *reactivation* in the process of appropriating western technical contributions, although not western values of education that are increasingly complicit with capitalism" (p. 105). Another example offered by la paperson (2017), is Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangi in New Zealand, whose mission states:

> We commit ourselves to explore and define the depths of knowledge in Aotearoa, to enable us to re-enrich ourselves, to know who we are, to know where we came from and to claim our place in the future. We take this journey of discovery, of reclamation of sovereignty, establishing the equality of Māori intellectual tradition alongside the knowledge base of others. Thus, we can stand proudly together with all people of the world. (Vision, mission, and values of Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangi, see https://www.wananga.ac.nz/about/our-vision-and-mission/)

Neither colonial nor anticolonial efforts in academic contexts are ever purely one or the other. In their book *A Third University is Possible*, la paperson (2017) contends that the decolonizing always already exists within the colonizing university and is driven by scyborgs, "persons who have picked up colonial technologies and reassembled them to decolonizing purposes" (p. xiv). Understanding themselves as a "colonial-by-product of empire, with decolonizing desires" (p. xxiii), they offer examples of resisting and acting against colonial processes within educational contexts. In contrast to a first world university that is committed to "accumulation and expansion" (p. 37) of influence and power through degrees, grants, and fees and in contrast to a second world university that critiques but doesn't transform the status quo, la paperson defines the third world university as "*a decolonial project… an interdisciplinary, transnational, yet vocational university that equips its students with skills toward the applied practice of decolonization*" (p. 36, emphasis in original). The third university, which assembles academic resources for decolonizing purposes, is possible and already exists, in pieces, within first and second universities. The work needed towards a third university includes assembling these scraps into machines for decolonizing while recognizing the ideological diversity and vocational and educational responsibilities (e.g., teaching students as scyborgs).

Boni and Velasco (2019) offer another example of how universities can engage in epistemic justice work by showcasing two participatory community-based epistemic justice initiatives, one with dwellers in a slum in Lagos (Nigeria) and one with students in Tolima (Colombia). In both cases, participants were able to act as legitimate knowers, yet, as the authors emphasize, the societal structures that undermine their participation in larger social discourses remained intact, so that their hermeneutic power remained

limited vis-a-vis privileged disciplinary knowledge. Boni and Velasco (2019) thus showed both the opportunities and limitations of epistemic justice initiatives.

Also Gloria Anzaldúa's (2007) work on mestiza knowledges has shown a pathway for alternative knowledging. Her work shows that knowing in and from the Borderlands (La Frontera), an in-between space of insecurity and possibility, enables new epistemologies of contradiction and creativity and undermines the rigidity of "western" academic thinking and writing. Relatedly, Delgado Bernal (2001) has examined the "mestiza consciousness" of Chicana college students and found that what they learn at home is important for their navigating their academic pathways through college. Drawing on Anzaldúa, she highlights the importance of intergenerational community and family knowledges and explains:

> A mestiza is literally a woman of mixed ancestry, especially of Native American, European, and African backgrounds. However, the term mestiza has come to mean a new Chicana consciousness that straddles cultures, races, languages, nations, sexualities, and spiritualities - that is, living with ambivalence while balancing opposing powers" (p. 626).

She further explains that the mestiza consciousness is "both born out of oppression and is a conscious struggle against it" (p. 626). Knowledges like being bilingual and bicultural, commitment to communities, and investment in spiritualities - all these show in how Delgado Bernal's participants approach their studies and college experience, legitimizing mestiza identities and rich epistemic resources.

For another example of epistemically just approaches to educational research, we turn to González (2001), whose work documents the experiences of 15-17-year-old Mexicanas in South Sacramento, positioning them as pensadoras with their own approaches to learning and knowledge. The methodological approach of "trenzas y mestizaje, the braiding of theory, qualitative research strategies, and a sociopolitical consciousness" (p. 641) can be understood as a "technique for advancing cross-disciplinary study, as well as reforming disciplinary canons, one that scholars can look to for illuminating cultural knowledge, its meanings, images, and practices" (p. 646). González describes her approach as a "(g)athering, combing, and braiding" (p. 647, italics removed) of different kinds of knowledges, intertwining her own epistemologies and identities as Chicanca and researcher with familial and research-related interactions and bringing all these in dialogue with existing literature with the goal of reorienting social, educational, and academic deficit discourses about Chicana/Mexicana/Latina students. She emphasizes the role of cultural knowledges for learner success, wellbeing, and excellence and understands her goal to be the positioning of Mexicana students as "active agent of learning and knowing" (p. 652).

Although a systematic review of discipline-specific literature on epistemic justice is not in the scope of this paper, we point to important work that has been done in the disciplines we mostly locate ourselves in. For instance, in the context of migration studies, Amelina (2022) has argued, among other things, for a critical review of "migration" and "migrant" discourses and categories, and a move towards longitudinal and transnational work (e.g. on the de/re-migranticization of individuals and communities) that is sensitive to histories and imaginaries of colonialism and coloniality.

Within education, Yosso (2005) has argued that a common form of epistemic injustice and systemic racism is deficit thinking. Her work on community cultural wealth reminds us that "cultural capital is not just inherited or possessed by the middle class, but rather refers to an accumulation of specific forms of knowledge, skills and abilities that are *valued* by privileged groups in society" (Yosso, 2005, p. 76). Yosso also draws on Oliver and Shapiro's (1995) critique of income as sole indicator of capital and their argument of including, for example, real estate and business ownership in descriptions of the Black/white economic inequity. Similarly, she explains that

> A traditional view of cultural capital is narrowly defined by White, middle class values, and is more limited than wealth—one's accumulated assets and resources. CRT expands this view. Centering the research lens on the experiences of People of Color in critical historical context reveals accumulated assets and resources in the histories and lives of Communities of Color (p. 77).

With her theory of community cultural wealth, Yosso (2005) offers a framework and tool for recognizing and centering a variety of knowledges, including familial, social, navigational, resistant, linguistic, and aspirational capitals.

Further to this, we argue that for epistemic justice to exist, a fair understanding of how knowledge is produced, shared, and accessed must be called into existence. As such, "funds of knowledge" (FoK) as a way of understanding the wealth of knowledge and expertise that individuals and families possess based on their cultural, social, and economic backgrounds and life experiences is key (Gonzalez, Moll, & Amanti, 2006; for a literature review see Llopart & Esteban-Guitart, 2018). This knowledge is often passed down through generations within a community or family and is a valuable resource for learning also in formal educational contexts. Funds of knowledge scholarship highlights the wealth of knowledge within marginalized communities and families and can be seen as an embodiment of a diversity of epistemic perspectives (Llopart & Esteban-Guitart, 2018). As an implementation of epistemic justice activism, it encourages educators and researchers to recognize and value these diverse forms of knowledge and invites us as applied linguists, who are well-positioned to identify and validate minoritized funds of knowledge, to put our teaching, research, and activism in their service. As individual scholars and as a field, we are called to revisit existing frameworks with an eye to epistemic justice. This entails a rethinking of our epistemologies and methodologies, work that has already begun. In the pursuit of epistemically just ways of doing research, scholars have started to pay more attention to the recognition of research participants as knowers, diverse forms of data collection, data analysis, and dissemination, and seeking guidance and inspiration from critical and decolonial forms of doing research (Ortega, 2023; Smith, 1999; Wilson, 2008).

To that end, Smith (1999) clarifies that a "pursuit of knowledge is deeply embedded in the multiple layers of imperial and colonial practices" and explains that to the Indigenous community, it matters little who is there to "take" their knowledges, be it a researcher, journalist, or documentary maker (Smith, 1999, p. 2).

> The word itself, 'research', is probably one of the dirtiest words in the Indigenous world's vocabulary […]. It appalls us that the West can desire, extract and claim ownership of our ways of knowing, our imagery, the things we create and produce, and then simultaneously reject the people who created and developed those ideas and seek to deny them further opportunities to be creators of their own culture and own nations. (p. 1)

She argues for an anticolonial "researching back" approach, following the examples of "writing back" and "talking back" initiatives (Smith 1999, p. 7). As she explains, much of the research in the social sciences has consisted of encounters between the "West" and the "Other", however, only one side of these encounters has been written and talked about. By telling the stories of the "Other" side, a more truthful picture of these encounters and realities can be accomplished.

We have seen a variety of ways to study and name epistemic injustices that surface in interaction. As applied linguists, we are called to understand interaction through these lenses, to see and name epistemic (e.g. hermeneutical) exclusion and violence, clarify listeners' responsibilities for epistemic reciprocity (e.g., Walker, 2020), and insist on ways of interacting and relating otherwise. But we can't stop there. Working towards epistemic justice includes parting from the universality claim of the zero point (Castro-Gómez, 2007) and investing in the provincialization of Europe (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2018a,

2018b). We thus resound Temper et al. (2019)'s call for a culture of "'transgression' of academic protocols" (para 2), keeping mind that vigilant and antihegemonic self-critique and practice (Cusicanqui, 2012) need to be integral parts of such epistemic disobedience (Mignolo, 2009). This will inevitably put us in conflict with demands of the neoliberal and colonial academy, whose market logic and zero point encourage the exploitation of humans and more-than-humans we engage with – and of ourselves. Part of our scholarship, then, must be to develop language and knowledge around this conflict, to facilitate resistance against the imperial archive, to inspire efforts of reshaping and reworking academic processes, and to amplify and grow the ongoing decolonial work in our field. Within applied linguistics, important models for such resistant work exist, for example in critical and historically sensitive revisiting of our field's roots, frameworks, and concepts (e.g., Flores and Rosa, 2015, 2023). In addition, as applied linguists, we can and do study how knowledges are lived, constructed, and negotiated as and through language – in other words, knowledging through languaging is at the very core of what we do. As a field, we are thus well-positioned to work towards a "political economy" of knowledge in Cusicanqi's sense, and use our languaging (our words, modes, genres, discourses…) to "research back" (Smith, 1999) and tell "other" stories of languaging and knowledging (e.g., Anzaldúa, 2007; Delgado Bernal, 2001).

7   Conclusion: Transknowledging toward epistemic justice

Throughout this article, we have built on the understanding that epistemic justice and decolonization are deeply intertwined and share common goals in challenging dominant knowledge systems and promoting inclusivity and equity within the realm of knowledge production and dissemination (Hutton & Cappellini, 2022; Tuck & Yang, 2012; Zainub, 2019). At their core, both critique the dominance of Eurocentric or western-centric epistemologies and recognize the ways in which power dynamics have historically marginalized or silenced certain voices and perspectives. They advocate for centering the knowledges and experiences of marginalized groups and acknowledge their validity and agency in contributing to our collective understanding of the world (Dei & Lordan, 2016).

This transformative approach extends to the promotion of inclusive education curricula, the validation of Indigenous knowledge traditions, and the cultivation of diverse perspectives within academic discourse (Gaztambide-Fernández, 2012). Having learned from the epistemic justice scholarship we reviewed, we posit that a *transknowledging* model helps advance epistemic justice and decolonization by fostering more just and equitable ways of learning by creating new knowledge landscapes that authentically reflect the plurality of human experiences and worldviews, ultimately contributing to greater social justice and onto-epistemic understanding of diverse lives.

In her work on posthumanist approaches to educational research, Taylor (2017) put forth the concept of "knowledge-ing", explaining that "knowledge is emergent and embodied, … knowledge practices are entangled matters of human-nonhuman apparatuses or assemblages". She argues that

> it might be better to think, not of the 'production' of knowledge a finite 'thing', but as an ongoing, intra-active enactment of 'knowledge-ing', that is, as an open-ended process in which sense, intuition and those 'eureka moments' feature alongside and as strongly as logic, deduction and rationality (p. 430).

Expanding on these existing notions, we look to Indigenous communities for guidance. For instance, Keane et al. (2016) importantly state:

> In many indigenous cultures there is not the same emphasis on 'knowledge' as a noun, an object or abstracted product. Knowledge is rather expressed as a 'way of being', 'a

way of knowing', 'a way of living in nature' (Aikenhead 2002) and 'a way of belonging' (Khupe 2014). The notion of knowledge as a commodity, a thing discrete and apart from ourselves, each other and our wisdom of living in the moment assumes a particular view of knowledge that does not exist in an indigenous worldview (p. 166).

Such an understanding of knowledge, or rather of knowledging, has implications for researcher positionalities. Keane et al. (2016) continue:

> From this perspective, the researcher has a place in the research, and obscuring or overlooking this distorts our knowing. The researcher interprets events and creates texts, consciously or unconsciously imprinting themselves upon them. The researcher is not removed from the research process, place, context, and coresearchers; the researcher is herself part of, as well as able to learn from, the research community (p. 166).

Importantly, dismantling the colonial within the academy and elsewhere does not lead to purely decolonial spaces or places, but instead will co-exist with epistemic coloniality. The striving towards epistemic justice includes a repurposing of academic technology for decolonial purposes (la paperson. 2017), a revisiting of our ways of communicating and relating, a leaning into marginalized ways of knowing, and a concept that is relational, engaged, and invested in our social and natural environment and blurs the boundaries between knowing and doing, researchers and community members, and epistemic and other forms of justice.

As such, we propose that to truly disobey and dismantle epistemic injustices, a transformation in the ways in which we understand other knowledges and how we engage with them is necessary. Therefore, we propose a new conceptualization envisioned as "transknowledging", a verb in the gerund and present participle, in a fluid form to convey the praxis and actions of transdisciplinary and transformative understanding of the other through the following key domains:

- *Knowing and knowledging:* Knowing implies having awareness, comprehension, or familiarity with something and can be expanded over time through various means, including education, reading, observation, experimentation, and conversation. The term knowledging recognizes something more profound, namely the notion that knowledge is not merely a cognitive process, but a way of being in the world, of relating to the world around us, human and more-than-human, to our histories and futures, and to ourselves. Knowledging also recognizes the fluidity and power-permeatedness of knowledge, as well as its bidirectionality, i.e. the idea that epistemic negotiations at the interactional level are informed by and feed back into sociohistorical grown systems of knowledge. In that sense, it is always the system, "knowledge", that is at stake, not merely an individual's knowing.

- *Trans-prefix:* The prefix "trans-" in English comes from Latin and usually means "across," "beyond,", and "through", implying a shift or change, and even, to borrow Phipps' (2019) word, a decreation. As Li Wei (2021) has explained in reference to translanguaging, the border crossing of "trans-" occurs between disciplines, languages, identities, and worldviews, and is critical for questioning those boundaries. Conceptualizing transknowledging in resistance to colonial ideologies, we align with this notion of "going beyond" and propose transknowledging as a transgressive desire and move towards epistemic justice that encompasses transformation of any or all aspects of knowledging, including epistemic resources, identities, relationships, and materialities.

- *Praxis*: Transknowledging acknowledges the actions and processes involved in constructing and enacting knowledge, including linguistic practices. Like Keane et al. (2016) we understand epistemic engagement not as "having knowledge" but as "living knowledge". Thus, in line with decolonial scholarship cited above, transknowledging points to praxis, or enacted theory, rather than ownership.

Following Freire's (1970) understanding of praxis as "reflection and action upon the world in order to transform it" (p. 52), transknowledging calls us researchers to engage in a praxis of epistemic justice.

- *Relationality*: Redirecting our gaze from the object "knowledge" to the process and enactment, transknowledging challenges an over-relying on measurements such as tests or exams, and instead validates unmeasurables like familial and communal bonds, engagements, and activism. In line with Barad's (2007) agential realism, as for example used in Taylor's work, this blurs the cut between the "knower" and the "knowable", and emphasizes the entanglement, through which both come into existence. Rather than reinscribing binaries (rational-irrational, academic-non-academic, etc.), transknowledging thus highlights the relationality of knowledges.

- *Historicity*: Inherent in our understanding of transknowledging is the question of how an agent relates to the historical and continued erasure and dismissal of subaltern, minoritized, and Indigenous knowledges. How we engage with ways of knowing is always already a response to this question, even if an unintended one. Transknowledging is radical remembering, awareness, and continuous learning of (epistemic) oppression.

- *Self-reflexivity and (un)learning*: Transknowledging is based on personal and institutional levels of self-reflection. How do we know what we know, how/why does something become "knowledge" or "valuable knowledge"? How is it marked, celebrated, and perpetuated? Self-reflexivity is defined as a process whereby we as researchers "critically interrogate ourselves and one another regarding the ways in which research efforts are shaped and staged around the binaries, contradictions, and paradoxes that form our own lives" (Lincoln & Guba, 2003, p. 283). This resonates with our point on historicity (see above), which calls institutions to develop an epistemic memory and a critical sense of their history that includes learning about processes of erasure, oppression, and marginalization of inconvenient or subaltern knowledging. As transknowledging uplifts the knowledges that have been erased, overlooked, or marginalized for the benefit of current epistemic hierarchies (e.g., land-based knowledges, literacies, pedagogies: Wildcat, McDonald, Irlbacher-Fox & Coulthard, 2014; Corntassel & Hardbarger, 2019), it calls us on a journey of life-long learning and unlearning towards epistemic justice.

In all, as a *practice*, transknowledging, not unlike translanguaging, highlights the unboundedness of knowledges and the power-laden processes of epistemic negotiations that draw on knowledges across time and space. For example, ancestral and contemporary, local and global, material and immaterial, human and more-than-human knowledging can come to the fore in transknowledging encounters. As a *theory*, transknowledging roots itself in commitment to epistemic justice and thus the counter-movements to historical and ongoing epistemic erasure and oppression. Specifically, it hopes to amplify and contribute to existing literature and activism in, for instance, critical applied linguistics, decolonial linguistics, and humanizing approaches to research (Hudley, Mallinson & Bucholtz, 2024; Paris & Winn, 2014; Pennycook, 2001).

In the end, transknowledging is a striving towards decolonizing knowledge, and as Phipps (2019) has pointed out, includes "those who practice decolonising; those who are *willing*" (p. 28). As she continues, "their starting points may be different, depending on their ancestry and their heritage in imperial and colonial practices … but what matters is the will to […] decolonise the mind, heart, body, and thus, consequently, to risk decreation." (p. 28). In this sense, we recognize that *transknowledging* is a risky endeavor, yet one that encompasses all of what we are, who we are, and what we minted to do for humanity -- no more and no less is to be gained.

Funding

Disclosure statement

The authors declared no conflict of interest.

References

Aarnikoivu, M., Ennser-Kananen, J., & Saarinen, T. (in review). Thinking otherwise about internationalization: Mad Libbing a biased field. .

Amelina, A. (2022). Knowledge production for whom? Doing migrations, colonialities and standpoints in non-hegemonic migration research. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *45*(13), 2393–2415. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2022.2064717

Anderson, E. (2012). Epistemic justice as a virtue of social institutions. *Social Epistemology*, *26*(2), 163–173. https://doi.org/10.1080/02691728.2011.652211

Anzaldúa, G. (2007). *Borderlands/La Frontera* (3rd ed.). Aunt Lute

Bale, J., Rajendram, S., Brubacher, K., Owoo, M. A. N., Burton, J., Wong, W., Zhang, Y., Larson, E. J., Gagné, A., & Kerekes, J. (2023). *Centering multilingual learners and countering raciolinguistic ideologies in teacher education: Principles, policies and practices*. Channel View Publications. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781800414150

Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning*. Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv12101zq

Boni, A., & Velasco, D. (2019). Epistemic capabilities and epistemic injustice: What is the role of higher education in fostering epistemic contributions of marginalized knowledge producers? *Global Justice: Theory Practice Rhetoric*, *12*(1), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.21248/gjn.12.01.228

Castro-Gómez, S. (2007). 'The missing chapter of Empire: Postmodern reorganization of coloniality and post-Fordist capitalism', *Cultural Studies 21*(2-3), 428–48. https://doi.org/10.1080/09502380601162639

Causevic, A., Philip, K., Zwick-Maitreyi, M., Lewis, P. H., Bouterse, S., & Sengupta, A. (2020). Centering knowledge from the margins: Our embodied practices of epistemic resistance and revolution. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, *22*(1), 6–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616742.2019.1701515

Corntassel, J., & Hardbarger, T. (2019). Educate to perpetuate: Land-based pedagogies and community resurgence. *International Review of Education*, *65*(1), 87–116. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-018-9759-1

Cushing, I. (2022). *Standards, stigma, surveillance: Raciolinguistic ideologies and England's schools*. Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-17891-7

Cushing-Leubner, J., Engman, M. M., Ennser-Kananen, J., & Pettitt, N. (2021). Imperial straightening devices in disciplinary choices of academic knowledge production. *Language, Culture and Society*, *3*(2), 201-230. https://doi.org/10.1075/lcs.21001.cus

Cusicanqui, S. R. (2012). Ch'ixinakax utxiwa: A reflection on the practices and discourses of decolonization. *South Atlantic Quarterly, 111*(1), 95–109. https://doi.org/10.1215/00382876-1472612

Dei, G. J. S., & Lordan, M. (2016). Introduction: Envisioning new meanings, memories, and actions for anti-colonial theory and decolonial praxis. In G. J. S. Dei, & M. Lordan (Eds.), *Anti-colonial theory and decolonial praxis* (pp. vii–xxi). Peter Lang Publishing, Incorporated. https://doi.org/10.3726/978-1-4539-1857-9

Delgado Bernal, D. (2001). Learning and living pedagogies of the home: The mestiza consciousness of Chicana students. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 14*(5), 623–629. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518390110059838

De Sousa Santos, B. (2007). *Another knowledge is possible: Beyond northern epistemologies.* Verso.

Dotson, K. (2011). Tracking epistemic violence, tracking practices of silencing. *Hypatia*, *26*(2), 236–257. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1527-2001.2011.01177.x

Dotson, K. (2012). A cautionary tale: On limiting epistemic oppression. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, *33*(1), 24–47. https://doi.org/10.1353/fro.2012.a472779

Dotson, K. (2014). Conceptualizing epistemic oppression. *Social Epistemology*, *28*(2), 115–138. https://doi.org/10.1080/02691728.2013.782585

Du Bois, W. E. B. (1903). *The souls of Black Folk.* A. C. McClurg & Co.

Engman, M., & Ennser-Kananen, J., Cushing-Leubner, J. (2023). Mapping (metaphorical) journeys in and against the academy. In P. Jandrić, A. MacKenzie, & J. Knox (Eds.), *Constructing postdigital research: Method and emancipation* (pp. 39–61). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-35411-3_3

Ennser-Kananen, J. (2018). "That German stuff": Negotiating linguistic legitimacy in a German Foreign Language classroom. *Journal of Language and Education, 4*(1), 18–30. https://doi.org/10.17323/2411-7390-2018-4-1-18-30

Ennser-Kananen, J. (2019). Knowledge is power is knowledge: Can we break the cycle of epistemic and epistemological injustice? *Tiedepolitiikka 4*, 33–40.

Ennser-Kananen, J. (2021). "My skin is hard": Adult learners' resistance to racialization and racism. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy, 7*(3), 179–189. https://doi.org/10.1080/20020317.2021.2008113

Ennser-Kananen, J., Iikkanen, P., & Skinnari, K. (2023). Multilingual pedagogies for anticolonial TESOL? An analysis of pre-service teachers' voices from Finland. In K. Raza, C. Coombe, & D. Reynolds (Eds.), *Multilingual TESOL in practice* (pp. 201–216). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-9350-3_31

Ennser-Kananen, J., & Saarinen, T. (2023). *New Materialist explorations into language education.* Springer. https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-3-031-13847-8

Escobar, A., Osterweil, M., & Sharma, K. (2024). *Relationality: An emergent politics of life beyond the human*. Bloomsbury Academic. https://www.bloomsbury.com/uk/relationality-9781350225992/

Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, *85*(2), 149–171. https://doi.org/10.17763/0017-8055.85.2.149

Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2023). Undoing competence: Coloniality, homogeneity, and the overrepresentation of whiteness in applied linguistics. *Language Learning*, *73*(S2), 268–295. https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12528

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Seabury Press.

Fricker, M. (2007). *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the ethics of knowing.* Oxford University Press. https://academic.oup.com/book/32817

Fricker, M. (2015). Epistemic contribution as a central human capability. In G. Hull (Ed.), *The Equal Society* (pp. 73–90). UCT Press.

Gaztambide-Fernández, R. A. (2012). Decolonization and the pedagogy of solidarity. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, *1*(1), 41–67. https://jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/des/article/view/18633

García, O., Flores, N., Seltzer, K., Wei, L., Otheguy, R., & Rosa, J. (2021). Rejecting abyssal thinking in the language and education of racialized bilinguals: A manifesto. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, *18*(3), 203–228. https://doi.org/10.1080/1542758 7.2021.1935957

García, O., & Leiva, C. (2014). Theorizing and enacting translanguaging for social justice. In A. Blackledge, & A. Creese (Eds.), *Heteroglossia as Practice and Pedagogy* (Vol. 20, pp. 199–216). Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7856-6_11

García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism, and education. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765

Goetze, T. S. (2018). Hermeneutical dissent and the species of hermeneutical injustice. *Hypatia*, *33*(1), 73–90. https://doi.org/10.1111/hypa.12384

González, F. E. (2001). Haciendo que hacer - cultivating a mestiza worldview and academic achievement: Braiding cultural knowledge into educational research, policy, practice. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *14*(5), 641–656. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518390110059847

González, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C. (Eds.). (2006). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. Routledge.

Grosfoguel, R. (2011). Decolonizing post-colonial studies and paradigms of political-economy: Transmodernity, decolonial thinking, and global coloniality. *Transmodernity, Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World*, *1*(1), 1–38. https://doi.org/10.5070/T411000004

Hammine, M. (2022). Multilingualism in a decolonial way: A gaze from the Ryukyus. In S. Makoni, A. Kaiper-Marquez, & L. Mokwena (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of language and the Global South/s* (pp. 158–168). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003007074

Heller, M., & McElhinny, B. (2017). Language, capitalism, colonialism: Toward a critical history. University of Toronto Press.

Hookway, C. (2010). Some varieties of epistemic injustice: Reflections on Fricker. *Episteme: A Journal of Social Epistemology, 7*(2), 151–163. https://doi.org/10.3366/epi.2010.0005

Hornsby, J. (1994). Illocution and its significance. In S. L. Tsohatzidis (Ed.), *Foundations of Speech Act Theory*. Routledge.

Hutton, M., & Cappellini, B. (2022). Epistemic in/justice: Towards 'other' ways of knowing. *Marketing Theory*, *22*(2), 155–174. https://doi.org/10.1177/14705931221076563

Hudley, A. H. C., Mallinson, C., & Bucholtz, M. (2024). *Decolonizing linguistics*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197755259.001.0001

Jones, K. (2012). The politics of intellectual self-trust. *Social Epistemology*, *26*(2), 237–251. https://doi.org/10.1080/02691728.2011.652215

Keane, M., Khupe, C., & Muza, B. (2016). It matters who you are: Indigenous knowledge research and researchers. *Education as Change, 20*(2), 163–183. https://doi.org/10.17159/1947-9417/2016/913

la paperson. (2017). *A Third University is possible.* University of Minnesota Press. https://www.upress.umn.edu/9781517902087/a-third-university-is-possible/

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (2003). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The landscape of qualitative research: Theories and issues* (2nd ed., pp. 253–291). Sage.

Llopart, M., & Esteban-Guitart, M. (2018). Funds of knowledge in 21st century societies: Inclusive educational practices for under-represented students. A literature review. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *50*(2), 145–161. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2016 .1247913

Mabhena, C. (2019, December 1). *On the locus of enunciation*. The Sunday News. https://www.sundaynews.co.zw/on-the-locus-of-enunciation/

Mahbubani, K. (2009). The dangers of democratic delusions. *Ethics & International Affairs*, 23(1), 19–25. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7093.2008.00186.x

May, S. (2005). Language rights: Moving the debate forward. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 9(3), 319–347. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-6441.2005.00295.x

Medina, J. (2012). Hermeneutical injustice and polyphonic contextualism: Social silences and shared hermeneutical responsibilities. *Social Epistemology, 26*(2), 201–220. https://doi.org/10.1080/02691728.2011.652214

Mignolo, W. (2003). Globalization and the geopolitics of knowledge: The role of the humanities in the corporate university. *Nepantla: Views from South* (Vol. 4). https://muse.jhu.edu/article/40206

Mignolo, W. D. (2009). Epistemic disobedience, independent thought and decolonial freedom. *Theory, culture & society*, 26(7-8), 159–181. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276409349275

Mitova, V. (2020). Decolonising knowledge here and now. *Philosophical Papers*, 49(2), 191–212. https://doi.org/10.1080/05568641.2020.177960

Morales, J., Schissel, J. L., & López-Gopar, M. (2020). Pedagogical sismo: Translanguaging approaches for English language instruction and assessment in Oaxaca, Mexico. In Z. Tian, L. Aghai, P. Sayer, & J. L. Schissel (Eds.), *Envisioning TESOL through a translanguaging lens: Global perspectives* (pp. 161–183). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-47031-9_8

Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2018a). Epistemic freedom in Africa: Deprovincialization and decolonization. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429492204

Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2018b). The dynamics of epistemological decolonisation in the 21st century: Towards epistemic freedom. *The Strategic Review for Southern Africa, 40*(1), 16–45. https://doi.org/10.35293/srsa.v40i1.268

Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2020). *Decolonization, development and knowledge in Africa: Turning over a new leaf.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003030423

Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2021). The cognitive empire, politics of knowledge and African intellectual productions: Reflections on struggles for epistemic freedom and resurgence of decolonisation in the twenty-first century. *Third World Quarterly, 42*(5), 882–901. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2020.1775487

Oliver, M., & Shapiro, T. (1995). *Black wealth/White wealth: A new perspective on racial inequality*. Routledge.

Origgi, G. (2012). Epistemic injustice and epistemic trust. *Social Epistemology, 26*(2), 221–235. https://doi.org/10.1080/02691728.2011.652213

Ortega, Y. (2023). Charlas y comidas: Humanising focus groups and interviews. *Qualitative Research*, 1468794231176947. https://doi.org/10.1177/14687941231176947

Ortega, Y. (forthcoming). *Pluriversal applied linguistics: Implications for language teaching and research from the global south*. De Gruyter Mouton.

Phipps, A. (2019). *Decolonising multilingualism: Struggles to decreate* (Vol. 1). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788924061

Paris, D., & Winn, M. T. (2014). *Humanizing research: Decolonizing qualitative inquiry with youth and communities*. SAGE.

Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical re-introduction*. Routledge.

Perkins, M. C., Ennser-Kananen, J., Laihonen, P., & Saarinen, T. (2024). "Mitä tummempi sininen, sitä stressaantuneempi olen". Taidepohjainen tapaustutkimus työhyvinvoinnista yliopistossa. *Tiedepolitiikka 49*(2), 52–66. https://doi.org/10.58957/tp.142677

Pohlhaus, G. (2017). Varieties of epistemic injustice. In I. Kidd (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of epistemic injustice* (pp. 12–19). Routledge.

Posholi, L. (2020). Epistemic decolonization as overcoming the hermeneutical injustice of eurocentrism. *Philosophical Papers*, 49(2), 279–304. https://doi.org/10.1080/05568641.2020.1779604

Quijano, A. (2007). Coloniality and modernity/rationality. *Cultural studies*, *21*(2-3), 168–178. https://doi.org/10.1080/09502380601164353

Rosa, J., & Flores, N. (2017). Unsettling race and language: Toward a raciolinguistic perspective. *Language in Society*, 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404517000562

Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples*. Zed Books. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350225282

Spivak, G. (1998). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson, & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture (pp. 271-313)*. University of Illinois Press.

Sugiharto, S. (2020). Enacting the locus of enunciation as a resistant tactic to confront epistemological racism and decolonize scholarly knowledge. *Applied Linguistics*, *amaa023*. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amaa023

Taylor, C. A. (2017). Is a posthumanist Bildung possible? Reclaiming the promise of Bildung for contemporary higher education. *Higher Education*, *74*(3), 419–435. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-016-9994-y

Temper, L., McGarry, D., & Weber, L. (2019). From academic to Political Rigour: Insights from the 'Tarot' of Transgressive Research. In *Ecological Economics* (Vol. 164). Elsevier B.V. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2019.106379

Tobi, A. T. (2020). Towards a plausible account of epistemic decolonisation. *Philosophical Papers*, *49*(2), 253–278. https://doi.org/10.1080/05568641.2020.1779602

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, *1*(1), 1–40. https://doi.org/10.25058/20112742.n38.04

Walker, M. (2020). Failures and possibilities of epistemic justice, with some implications for higher education. *Critical Studies in Education*, *61*(3), 263–278. https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2018.1474774

Wa Thiong'o, N. W (1994). Decolonising the mind: The politics of language in African literature. East African Publishers.

Wei, L. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, *39*(1), 9–30. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039

Wei, L. (2021) Key concepts in applied linguistics: Translanguaging. *ELIA 21*, 163–177. https://revistas.uned.es/index.php/ELIA/article/download/32459/24501

Wei, L. (2022). Translanguaging as a political stance: Implications for English language education. *ELT journal*, *76*(2), 172–182. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccab083

Wildcat, M., McDonald, M., Irlbacher-Fox, S., & Coulthard, G. (2014). Learning from the land: Indigenous land based pedagogy and decolonization. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, *3*(3), Article 3. https://jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/des/article/view/22248

Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. Fernwood Pub. https://fernwoodpublishing.ca/book/research-is-ceremony-shawn-wilson

Viaene, L., Laranjeiro, C., & Tom, M. N. (2023). The walls spoke when no one else would. In E. Pritchard, & D. Edwards (Eds.), *Sexual misconduct in academia: Informing an ethics of care in the university*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003289944

Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *8*(1), 69–91. https://doi.org/10.1080/1361332052000341006

Zainub, A. (2019). *Decolonization and anti-colonial praxis. Shared lineages*. Koninklijke Brill NV. https://brill.com/display/title/39519?language=en