

## PRAXICAL VIOLENCE PODCAST TRADUCTION

### **00:00:03 Marianne Daher**

Hello! Welcome to this chapter on praxical violence in public policies for intervention in poverty. Much has been written and commented on institutional violence, gender violence, psychiatric violence, school violence, obstetric violence, among many others. In this chapter we will talk about a particular form of violence that occurs in social programs, and that has the participants, the professionals, and the institutions as protagonists. This, based on a research project funded by the Chilean Ministry of Science, where we conducted forty interviews with professionals and participants in the main social program in our country, both in urban and rural areas. We have carried out this work together with a large research team, led by me, Marianne Daher, I'm a psychologist, with a master's degree and a doctorate in community social psychology from the Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile. Currently, I coordinate the professional specialization line in community social psychology at the School of Psychology of this university.

### **00:01:10 Antonia Rosati**

Hello, I am Antonia Rosati, a community psychologist also from the Pontifical Catholic University of Chile, and a Master of Social Sciences with a major in sociology of modernization from the University of Chile.

### **00:01:22 María José Campero**

Hello, I am María José Campero, a community psychologist also from the Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, and with a Master's degree in International Health and Development from the London School of Economics.

### **00:01:31 Marianne Daher**

The three of us are academics and researchers from Chile, a country in the Global South, and we have worked for several years in the field of social programs. In addition, we are promoters of the website [www.praxiscomunitaria.com](http://www.praxiscomunitaria.com), through which we seek to contribute to the socialization and democratization of knowledge.

### **00:01:52 María José Campero**

What a thrill to be able to share this research. To begin, Marianne, why don't you tell us where we have developed this work that we are going to talk about today?

**00:02:02 Marianne Daher**

Yes, it is indeed a great emotion. And well, I think I represent ourselves by saying that we are here by pure vocation, and that our work as community psychologists who work in poverty is done from the depths of our hearts. And I also believe that I represent many of us who see this world more and more broken, and who pour our whole being to try to make it a little better. But I also think that we don't always stop to think about how much we've been wrong, how many times we've inadvertently failed. And well, this study, on praxical violence, on these small acts of violence in social intervention, at least for us, is not only about institutions, or about other people who work in poverty, or about people with whom we work, which is what we will tell you in this podcast... But also, and from the beginning, it has dealt with our own work and with each of the times that we have been oppressors, that we have dominated, that we have failed to offer dignity.

**00:03:14 María José Campero**

Yes, it has been a bucket of humility, especially from our position as academics, which can often lead us to a very arrogant place. And realizing that in each practice, in each discourse that we were discovering in this study, we also reflected something of ourselves. And it has been an invitation to be better by seeing how we have been worse, and discovering how we realize these things, raising awareness and trying to overcome them as well.

**00:03:44 Antonia Rosati**

Totally, it has been a truly very personal and also vulnerable path, which has challenged us directly, and from which we have really learned that we can all be oppressors, even being women, Latinas, Spanish-speakers, underestimated and often discriminated against. We can all oppress and we all have done it at some point, right? and we will surely do it again. That is why we really never have to lower our guard and we always have to be very attentive. So well, in this context we are very grateful to our team and to the space that this project has offered us to be able to reflect on this topic, with the hope that our own change will slowly generate a chain of transformation.

**00:04:21 Marianne Daher**

That's right, and in this sense, we believe that it is necessary to maintain a critical look at public policies for intervention in poverty, not only considering their positive aspects, which are many, but also looking at their

negative aspects, such as the tendency to assistencialism and the consequent damage to autonomy and dignity that this causes in the participants of social programs.

**00:04:47 María José Campero**

Well, yes, in fact, in Chile, community psychology has allowed us to move in that direction, right? There are several people investigating public policy from a critical perspective. But bad practices have not yet been analyzed in such depth. And despite that, every time we talk about praxical violence, people tell us that it makes a lot of sense to them, that they see it in their work spaces, and that it is also an important reality to make visible. So, well, maybe we'll go Marianne, why don't you tell us how it is that we understood praxical violence?

**00:05:18 Marianne Daher**

Yes, of course. We define praxical violence as the exercise of asymmetrical power in symbolic and practical dimensions, by a subject who exercises it and an object towards which the violence is directed, establishing a relationship that is detrimental to the actors involved and the aims of public policy.

**00:05:37 María José Campero**

And grounding it a bit, could you tell us what we mean by the symbolic dimensions and the practical dimensions?

**00:05:45 Marianne Daher**

Yeah, it can be a bit cryptic indeed, haha, so thanks for the question, and also, well, because this is essential to understanding the phenomenon of praxical violence. Here we are inspired by the concept of praxis of Maritza Montero, who is the mother of community psychology in Latin America, and we understand praxical violence considering, on the one hand, these symbolic elements that refer to discursive or theoretical aspects, for example, how they are named or they think about people, roles, programs and, on the other hand, practical elements, associated with actions, but also with inactions, for example, how the different actors treat each other or relate to each other.

**00:06:29 María José Campero**

Of course. There one could think that they are intimately linked dimensions, right ?

**00:06:35 Marianne Daher**

That's how it is. The praxis is recursive, since the symbolic positions generate, reinforce or weaken practices that are consistent with them and, in turn, the practices generate, reinforce or weaken symbolic positions. For example, let's take the case of assistencialism, right? understood as a symbolic positioning. This can be seen reflected in actions that professionals do, such as doing things for the participants, and not letting the participants do them autonomously.

**00:07:08 Antonia Rosati**

Perfect, yes, of course. Both things are very connected. Listen and I keep thinking, what do you mean by subjects of violence? Who are these subjects?

**00:07:16 Marianne Daher**

Well, the subjects of violence, who exercise praxical violence, in this case are three: the institutional framework, understood as the institutions that manage and implement social programs; the professionals, who we also call intervention agents; and the participants of these programs, which in the case of Chile are usually women living in poverty.

**00:07:39 Antonia Rosati**

Perfect...and who are the objects of this violence?

**00:07:45 Marianne Daher**

In this case, there would be two objects of violence, which are the actors towards whom the violence is directed, understood as victims, and which would be the agents and participants. So, well, to bring this to everyday life, which is the intention of this podcast, taking into account the subject that exercises violence, Anto and Coté, Can you tell us how the institutional framework exercises it?

**00:08:13 Antonia Rosati**

Yes, of course. Well, we start, on the one hand, with violence from the institutional framework, which is directed both at the agents of intervention and at the participants, right? Towards the agents, we see in the first place that in symbolic terms violence is exerted towards them from a top-down logic, centralized and, what we call standardizing public policy, where there are very vertical and imposing logics with respect to the design and implementation of policies, the programs, without considering or incorporating the local knowledge of the intervention agents. We also see, for example, another form of violence that occurs in a constant inspection of the work of the agents, which they experience from a feeling of persecution, of hyper-demand, as their work is basically evaluated according to the coverage, the number of sessions carried out, records or achievement of goals.

**00:09:02 Marianne Daher**

Yes, and about this an intervention agent told us, and I am going to quote her verbatim: “it is the fact that it is an obligation, as well as: 'oh, I have to call this person, because otherwise they will evaluate me badly' . And try to be cordial, while behind you you have a whip that you don't know if it wants quality, quantity or what”.

**00:09:23 María José Campero**

Hmm... that metaphor of the whip is very strong. And we also identified a complicated contradiction between discourse and practice, in addition, adding to this problem of control, a contradiction between discourse and practice in regard to the bond established between intervention agent and participant . So, we see how, on the one hand, the program promotes the development of a bond, but there are no instances of education, training, supervision or materials that help build such a bond. And finally, despite the importance of the quality of this bond, the agent is evaluated on meeting sessions, and questions of that order, right?

**00:10:08 Marianne Daher**

Sure, thanks Cote. And regarding violence in practical terms, how does it happen when it is directed at agents?

**00:10:15 Antonia Rosati**

Well, in terms of this more practical dimension, on the one hand, we see the existence of very precarious working conditions for intervention agents, associated, for example, with having a fixed-term contract, non-payment of taxes, low remuneration as well . We also see this problem in the lack of protocols to deal with complex and risky

cases that intervention agents have to deal with, such as, I don't know, situations of sexual harassment or abuse. And finally, this leaves them in a situation of great vulnerability and great risk, adding in some cases the institutional rigidity of demanding that they also carry out the actions contemplated even when this type of situation exists.

**00:10:51 Marianne Daher**

Yes, terrible. In fact, this was reported by an intervention agent, who shared with us in a moment of trust and great care towards her, let's say, in the face of, due to this abusive situation and I am going to quote her verbatim, she told us: "As it was time for the work sessions, my co-workers told me 'try to have the sessions in the library', but the institution said 'the sessions are at home, not in the library', and you like 'this old man, I came , he grabs me, he kisses me here, he kisses me here', I get to his house, he locks it, I mean, how do you want me to feel?"

**00:11:29 María José Campero**

Damn yes, that was a very clear case of abuse. Well, on the other hand, we still saw an over-demanding structuring of work, right? Adding to this, associated of course with the large number of assigned families and the excessive administrative work that this entails, which generated work overload in the agents, and they remained, they spoke to us of a feeling of being "*over-collapsed*", which it produced a lot of burnout finally. And it was also quite problematic to identify the absence of care towards the agents, because the program agreement does not consider this, so it is left to the discretion and will of each team, and deep down it is not guaranteed by the institutional framework.

**00:12:13 Marianne Daher**

Yes. To share with those listening to us that, in fact, we have been working on the issue of burn out for many years, and we consider it a consequence of this phenomenon of praxical violence. Eh... well, if you want to know more, once again we invite you to visit our website. So yes, there are quite a few elements of violence towards intervention agents. I wonder what happens with the violence exerted towards the participants from the institutional framework. Anto, can you tell us a little more about it?

**00:12:48 Antonia Rosati**

Yes, well, um... from the institutional framework towards the participants we see a violence in which a macro-numerical and objectifying logic of public policy usually prevails, where it is said that families are understood as

“*numbers*” that must be taken care of, rather than as people that it is actually important to bond with them. To this is added, deep down, the feeling of some participants that they are being used by the program, feeling, for example, that they are invited to join only to verify numbers in political campaigns or in public accounts, regardless really what is the intervention that is going to be offered to them.

**00:13:22 Marianne Daher**

Yes, in fact, an intervention agent told us, speaking about her participant: “She felt that later it was published in the media: “they had so many families that graduated”. But... 'what did they do to me?' They haven't done anything, they didn't give me anything, they didn't even listen to me, nothing”

**00:13:40 María José Campero**

Mmm yes. Well, adding to that, we also identified a normalizing logic, which was associated with the fact that in the program there is a normative notion about what is desirable to overcome poverty: get a job, get an education, generate income. This, even when for some participants these elements might not be so important, valuable or a priority.

**00:14:02 Antonia Rosati**

Surely that was talked about a lot, wasn't it? And also, well, to that we add the judgment of participants from the institutional framework, who are accused of lying and altering information, for example, in the targeting instrument to be part of the program. Um... we also see this logic of fiscalization by the State when we see that there are some who conceive that the program seeks to control family dynamics, for example, by conditioning monetary transfers on health care or children's education. Well, in addition to that, something that we find very present is that in the program there would be a assistencialist logic, associated to giving them many benefits or material aid, and putting the emphasis on “*giving them*”, from a paternalistic logic, doing things or actions for the participants, rather than allowing them to be the ones to carry out said actions, and this ultimately does not facilitate the autonomy of people either.

**00:15:00 Marianne Daher**

Exactly. And in practical terms, how does violence occur towards the participants?

**00:15:07 María José Campero**

Well, in practice, what we identified was a methodological rigidity of the program, which was often out of step with the reality of all families and participants, and this also often led to the exclusion of some people, for example, because of their educational level or illiteracy, right? by not being able to read certain documents or perform certain activities. And these practices, in addition, unfortunately favored the reproduction of patterns of inferiorization of people.

**00:15:35 Antonia Rosati**

Yes, well, in addition we also recognized certain inconsistencies in the institutional framework, for example, people are encouraged to enter the labor market, that they have some paid job, but when people finally have an income, even if it is a minimum wage, they do not qualify for many benefits, so there is a contradiction there as well.

**00:15:55 Marianne Daher**

Mmm yes. Well, thank you both very much. At least for me the panorama is clear, although it is obscure, regarding the violence exerted from the institutional framework. Eh... now we could talk about the violence exerted by intervention agents, do you think?

**00:16:09 Antonia Rosati**

Of course. Well, the Agents can exercise praxical violence fundamentally towards program participants, that is what we found.

**00:16:17 Marianne Daher**

And this is symbolic and practical too?

**00:16:20 Antonia Rosati**

Exactly, both ways exactly. First, at a symbolic level, we find that violence is exercised through an approach that we call non-guarantor of rights, since there are many agents who do not conceive of the State as an entity that



should watch over the rights of people, and in that sense they are very critical of the requirements, or speak of “*demands*” that the participants make regarding such basic things, such as the satisfaction of food needs, for example, or housing. In addition, it is said that many times they are “*given*” more than what people should be given, or that some participants are “*ungrateful*”, again as if what is offered in the program was a favor, right? . Um... another way that we also found of approaching in a violent way was the assistencialism one, where it is said that the participants are “*favoured*”, “*helped*”, “*supported*”, and that in some cases they are even “*taking advantage*”, “*demanding*”, “*claims*”. And in this way, it is pointed out, for example, that some people simply “*want to be given everything*”, referring, for example, to the fact that they make exclusive, excessive use, excuse me, of the benefits and that they position themselves as “*victims*” of the system even.

**00:17:31 Marianne Daher**

Hmm, yes... Something I would like to share with those who are listening to us is that throughout the analysis we were very careful not to over-interpret the data, and everything that Anto and Côté tell us comes from the verbatim statements of the study participants, which obviously makes it more impressive... In fact, an intervention agent told us verbatim regarding her participant: “Everything was a claim, everything was a complaint, everything, the State and everyone, we did nothing right, she never received anything, and she always had been a victim of everything.”

**00:18:04 María José Campero**

Yes, there is a clear disqualification there, right? Instead, we also saw other approaches that were more subtle, for example, the approach that we call dependency, which we saw in two ways. On the one hand, when we saw that the participants depended on the aid or benefits offered by the program and other public institutions, to the point that they lost interest in working and making an effort, then, in this approach, the agents alluded to a certain comfort or passivity, No? again in a disqualifying tone. And on the other hand, we saw how this was also linked to a notion of the participants as “*dependent*”, “*demanding*”, “*insistent*”, “*incisive*” for excessively requiring their help, right? Em... and for their part, the intervention agents in this approach also carry out actions from a paternalistic position, using notions such as “*we take them*” to a certain place, “*we postulate them*” to a certain benefit, defining in a way... unilaterally the goals of intervention or assigning “*tasks*” to achieve them, right? But again from this more subtle place, but equally disqualifying.

**00:19:14 Antonia Rosati**

Of course, well, that also goes hand in hand with an inferiorizing approach towards the participants, which is expressed above all in a lack of confidence in their agency and in their capacities, finally. On the one hand, we see that it is considered, for example, that some participants, because they have a *"lower"* or *"inferior"* educational level, that they do not *"understand"* the accompaniment process or the connection with the network of opportunities, and because of this is many agents say, and choose *"not to waste time"* explaining what it is about. Em... there are also other agents who told us, for example, that the participants, because they were vulnerable, *"would not have other possibilities"*, thus minimizing their capacities and referring that *"much more cannot be asked of them"* in the intervention. In fact, well, an extreme version of this inferiorization even leads to an explicit disqualification, for example, by trivializing aspects of the participants' lives that are important to them, or even in some cases denigrating their living conditions, for example, the place where they live.

**00:20:11 Marianne Daher**

So it was, in fact, regarding trivializing important aspects of people's lives, an agent shared with us: "what does it matter to me if the dog gets lost if what I want is to do the session". When obviously for this participant her pet was a fundamental company. And another participant told us that her agent told her about her house, and I quote: "she came to see my house and said 'this house is not very good, this house is to be destroyed'. In other words, a very strong comment when an external person is talking about your own home like that.

**00:20:47 María José Campero**

Yes, no, both quotes are very strong... And we also see a certain contradiction, and this was interesting, because just as the participants are inferiorized or disqualified, we also saw that there was this next approach that we named over-agency, in which the agents considered that the fulfillment of goals depended mainly on the will of the people, and they dismissed or disregarded the contextual or structural conditions that precisely influenced the achievement and progress of the participants, em... disregarding things such as poverty itself, family problems, parenting tasks, lack of time, labor difficulties, among thousands of others, right? Things that of course impact the possibilities that the participants have. And as a result then, the participants were over-responsible for their capacity for action, alluding to the fact that the unsuccessful cases of intervention had to do with personal characteristics, such as a negative attitude or pessimism, right? um...

**00:21:46 Marianne Daher**

Sure, that's right. Well, there are many symbolically violent approaches from the agents to their participants... Anto, can you tell us now how violence occurs in practical terms?

**00:21:58 Antonia Rosati**

Yes, of course. What we see here, we find several bad practices. In interactional terms, we see that in some cases there is a very distant, cold, unfriendly, very formal and serious treatment, and even in some cases a way of relating to the agent that is openly unpleasant. Um... we also saw some derogatory, pejorative or even denigrating references towards some participants, for example, pointing out that they have "*complexes*" of personality, that they are unpleasant, annoying, or even referring to some participants with very denigrating words, such as "*fucking old women*" [*vieja de mierda*].

**00:22:32 María José Campero**

Yes, and to this is added the technical nature of the intervention, right? What does it have to do with making a poor implementation, a superficial, standardized accompaniment, without fulfilling minimum aspects, such as when the agents told us that some were unpunctual or told us about cases in which they did not even arrive at the sessions, right? There are agents who cut off contact with the participants, blocked their calls, did not provide information and did not provide support even if they had previously committed.

**00:23:03 Antonia Rosati**

Yes, it is that exact, they are finally unfulfilled promises. But well, in addition to that, we recognized a certain questioning and control towards some participants, expressed, for example, in the fact that some agents questioned what these participants said about meeting goals, and in the face of this, it is proposed that home visits are finally a strategy to prevent people from hiding information or lying about their situation. In other words, there is a basic distrust.

**00:23:29 Marianne Daher**

Yes, how strong everything they comment, but mainly this distrust that well, finally permeates the entire intervention, it seems.

**00:23:37 Antonia Rosati**

Yes, totally. Well, and also on top of that, we find various enforcement practices. Some agents point out that they try to “*convince*” their participants to establish certain goals, even though the person has an interest contrary to that, or they try to make them have the same opinion as the agent, for example, about family or personal problems. In addition to this, there are also agents that “*demand*” or push people to meet their goals by certain deadlines, and in their words, they do so even if it's “*subtly*” or “*diplomatically*” .

**00:24:07 Marianne Daher**

Yes, in fact, the latter sometimes translates, as we say here in Chile, into a “*bossing*” [mandoneo], that is, giving orders, as a participant told us when asked about the roles in the program, who well, I quote verbatim: “I don't know, I think it was the guidelines, the tasks that my intervention agent carried out, and following them, fulfilling them. I think my role was to fulfill what she brought, and her role was to say 'you have to do this, this and this’”.

**00:24:38 Antonia Rosati**

Yes, the imposing logic is notorious...

**00:24:42 Marianne Daher**

Yes, totally. Well, now that we have seen the institutional framework and also the violence from the intervention agents, we could talk about how the participants exercise violence, which is also a more sensitive issue.

**00:24:57 María José Campero**

Yes, it is a very delicate subject. Because we effectively identified that the participants also... the participants also exercised praxical violence towards the intervention agents, but also towards themselves and towards other participants, right? in these three directions.

**00:25:13 Antonia Rosati**

Sure, good. Now, the violence towards the agents was mainly through bad practices, linked both to how they participate in the program and how these actors interact. The same in this case, it is interesting and important to

point out that they do not correspond to aspects that are violent in themselves, but that we do see that they are practical aspects that can precipitate praxical violence.

**00:25:34 María José Campero**

Of course. Sure, and these bad practices, in technical terms, had to do with things that we have been talking about, such as a lack of commitment, a low willingness and little proactivity to participate in the intervention, or having excessive expectations regarding the program, right? Em... the lack of commitment, for example, we saw it in... when they described accompaniments where there was resistance, indecision, lack of interest or even little recognition of the importance of the program in general. For example, there would be... there were participants who were not at home, even when they had sessions scheduled, who did not answer the phone to their agents, who blocked their number or who changed their phone number or address and did not notify them. And in general, these issues were associated with being on the program, they commented on us like that, right? they associated them with being in the program exclusively for the monetary transfers and not really for the psychosocial support that it also includes. And well, and also, on the other hand, we also saw this low disposition in a continuous resistance of the participants to develop skills, as they told us, right?, rejecting the opportunities that were offered to them in the program, and it was something that they expressed with this metaphor of "*putting on a wall*".

**00:26:44 Marianne Daher**

Yes. Well, and on the other hand, the lack of proactivity referred to "*not mobilizing*" for what they wanted to achieve, and that has to do with not leaving their homes to carry out basic procedures or procedures, such as going to the medical check-up . Eh... an intervention agent told us: "it costs us a lot, a lot for them to leave their house. Really, a lot. I think that's what costs the most, that they mobilize."

**00:27:07 María José Campero**

Sure, yes, that was central. And also regarding the excessive expectations of the program, but above all in the capacity of the intervention agents, we saw that the participants called their agents as "*angel*" , "*little angel*" , "*priest*" , or also on the other hand, they expressed themselves critically, such as making negative judgments or blaming their agents when benefits were not awarded, or they did not access any service or program. Deep down, they either idealized them or blamed them for the results of the intervention.

**00:27:38 Marianne Daher**

Sure, thanks Cote. Anto, now it would be nice if you can tell us about bad practices in interactional terms.

**00:27:46 Antonia Rosati**

Of course. Well, the... what we saw in poor interactional practices from the participants to the agents, we identified, on the one hand, a personal invasion of the life of the agents, for example, in calling them or sending them messages outside of the working day, even when it had already been agreed that this was not part of the work. Um... we also saw some bad-treatment, for example, participants who responded very badly to their agents, expressing a lot of annoyance, displeasure, or in other cases not showing any interest in the sessions and even ignoring their agents, there, in front of them.

**00:28:19 Marianne Daher**

Yes, that was very unpleasant indeed, and an agent told us: "you go and you're talking to her and the lady is watching TV, chewing gum, as if to say 'is it going to take long?'".

**00:28:33 María José Campero**

Yes. Well, but they also told us cases more serious, where they reported damage to integrity, situations of sexual harassment, threats towards the agents, the families of the agent, verbal and physical aggression. And well, many times they also told us that this seemed to be linked to cases of substance use, generally from male participants towards female intervention agents, which is also an interesting fact to think about.

**00:28:59 Marianne Daher**

Yes, well, in my opinion this is clearly violent on the part of the participants towards their intervention agents, but... well, we also know that the participants exercised violence towards themselves and towards other people. Eh... Anto, can you tell us a little more about that?

**00:29:17 Antonia Rosati**

Yes, ok. This type of violence could be observed above all on a symbolic level. Eh... we note, on the one hand, a naturalization of poverty, where some participants refer to living in a certain “*accustomed*” situation with the situation they live in, and even speak of a feeling of hopelessness, “*learned hopelessness*”.

**00:29:36 Marianne Daher**

That's how it is. In fact, an agent commented on how the place where her participant lives influences, and I quote her verbatim: “Once a user told me 'what happens is that the *pobla* [poor neighborhood] catches you, the *pobla* catches you, catches you in such a way that you get used to living that way, you get used to it”.

**00:29:53 María José Campero**

Of course. We also saw discourses of inferiority with little recognition of one's own agency and of the ability to change this situation, this idea of getting used to it, being trapped, and in this exercise a lot of importance was also given to an external person, such as the agents, will reflect their capabilities to the participants. So there again we see that they referred to them as “*mom*”, “*older sister*”, “*superhero*”. And we specifically saw a certain particularity in the issue of illiteracy, in which some people felt ashamed for being illiterate or “*less educated*”, and preferred to “*not try*” to do certain things, not even review documents that they had to sign, or request permission for matters that are of their absolute autonomy, such as making bank transfers.

**00:30:41 Antonia Rosati**

Yes, well, in that line we also saw, for example, participants who positioned themselves very much from “*obedience*”, in their words, valuing in that sense, being “*disciplined*”, complacent. For example, some participants said “*comply with with the agent in everything*”, and saw “*complying*” as a way of rewarding the effort and dedication of their agent, and in this sense, they spoke of “*not failing*” the agent, of not “*discredit him*”, rather than doing it for their own well-being. Em... this in the end also had the form of not “*going against*” the agent, or not contradicting him to maintain a good relationship, and in that sense they do not communicate, for example, their needs so as not to “*bother*” him or avoid “*make him angry*”, that is, always from a logic of inferiority.

**00:31:21 Marianne Daher**

Yes, well, and indeed it was. It is interesting to note that this “*anger*” was not always perceived by the agents. Eh... in fact, an intervention agent told us that her participant had told her: “ma'am, I know you, you're angry”. And she told her, “I don't get angry, I never get angry.” In other words, zero visibilization or self-criticism regarding their own feelings.

**00:31:50 María José Campero**

Yes, very little awareness or as perception of the agents of that anger that the participants perceived, and that was very interesting. Now, another form that we saw of violence by the participants towards themselves was these insistent expressions of “*thank you*” towards their agents for the “*help*” they were given, without placing said “*help*” as a responsibility of the State in guaranteeing their rights. rights, right? where your agent has a job responsibility and is not doing you a personal favor. Then a certain feeling of debt towards their agents was also generated.

**00:32:25 Marianne Daher**

Exactly, yes, in fact, this feeling of debt was commented verbatim by an intervention agent, who said: “You do your job and you do it with love, so they, the participants, sometimes want to thank what you do and you always They have him as a trick, a little gift, any little thing”. As if they had to give you something in return to thank you for the work you are doing.

**00:32:47 Antonia Rosati**

Yes, no, well, totally. Well, that would be the violence of the participating people towards themselves, right? But how is this violence manifested towards other program participants? Côté, if you can tell us about that.

**00:33:01 María José Campero**

Yes, regarding what has to do with violence towards other participants, we saw two discourses, one of over-demanding the other participants and another disqualifying. The first had to do directly with criticizing the participants, believing that they are too “*dependent on state aid*”, in their words, and that they misuse the benefits and opportunities of the program. And of course these criticisms were linked to conceive the program as an “*opportunity*”, a “*miracle*”, an opportunity “*fallen from heaven*”, taking the words of the participants, and



questioning those who then "*do not take advantage of it*", and treating them again as "*ungrateful*" precisely of what this "*miracle*" offered, right? Very far from this guarantee of rights, from this notion of guarantee of rights.

**00:33:50 Marianne Daher**

Exactly, and well, a participant told us literally, criticizing other people who did not take advantage of this miracle: "The person who does not take advantage of these opportunities, apologizing, with your permission, is a 'weon' or stupid. A tremendous opportunity is lost. I have tried to give everything on my part to make the most of the benefits I have received in these two or three years. So, the one who doesn't take advantage of it is because he doesn't want to and doesn't feel like it".

**00:34:16 Antonia Rosati**

Yes, that quote is very strong. Well, we also see that there are participants who also refer to other people in an openly disqualifying way, for example, regarding their socioeconomic or educational situation, saying pejorative expressions, such as, for example, that the other participants are "*roto*" or "*ignorant*".

**00:34:34 Marianne Daher**

Yes, this is how an agent told us about her participant, and told us: "Every time she had to be with other people, for example, she treated the other users as 'roto'. She said that her companions were 'rotos', rude, undermining the woman who does not know how to read or write. I mean, very sad.

**00:34:52 María José Campero**

Yes. Yes, also in this line, a participant referred to the others as "*manipulatives*", as... she told us, "Some think, and this verbatim, 'ah, I'm going to cry a little bit to my agent to see if he gives me that help"

**00:35:06 Marianne Daher**

Sure, that's right, haha. Therefore, violence, well, not only concerns the institutional framework and the agents of intervention such as... let's say subjects who exercise praxical violence, but also, as we have seen, the participants

can be uh... subjects who also exercise this violence. Well then, faced with this complex phenomenon, I wonder, sometimes I wonder, what can we do? Are there ways to overcome praxical violence? Or is everything lost?

**00:35:38 Antonia Rosati**

Haha, yes, no, definitely yes. There are ways to overcome praxical violence. We were able to recognize several approaches that allow us to overcome it or at least reduce it and thus advance towards a more humanized intervention. And this is also key, because it is not only about making this problem of praxical violence visible, but we are also interested in advancing in its approach and overcoming it.

**00:35:58 Marianne Daher**

Great, thanks. How interesting and hopeful, so good, thanks Anto for the analysis you did on these approaches, and... can you tell us a little more?

**00:36:07 Antonia Rosati**

Of course. Well, on the one hand, we find approaches to overcome praxical violence, which basically favor its overcoming, some from the institutional framework and others that have to do with approaches specific to the bond between intervention agent and participant. I am going to start with the first ones, those of the institutional framework, telling you a little, that we identified five approaches aimed at overcoming praxical violence: a guarantor of rights, another participatory, a situated, critical and caring. That's five. To start with, for example, the rights-guarantee approach implies understanding that people have the right to be part of the program and that, therefore, this is not a "*favor*". This at an institutional level, that there is clarity about that. With this, it is key to convey that the public policy at the base of the program is guaranteed by law, and that it is also important that there are resources for the effective guarantee of the rights of people, especially those who live in situations of extreme vulnerability, and who require immediate support to meet, for example, basic needs. Also, it is important that greater priority be given to the families of the program to access various services, benefits or programs, and that the available offer be constantly expanded, formalizing, for example, institutional alliances to effectively guarantee that these rights are guaranteed.

**00:37:24 María José Campero**

Of course. I am going to join in there, to support Anto and tell you about it, talk about the second one, right? Which is the participatory approach, which means putting, contrary to what we have related, putting autonomy and freedom at the center of the people participating in the intervention process. For example, to decide to participate or to be able to withdraw from the program at any time. Where it was also important that at the institutional level both the goals and the intervention actions be established jointly between the intervention agent and the participant, in a coordinated, horizontal way, right? the person and not so much for standardized compliance, which has been so criticized.

**00:38:04 Marianne Daher**

Exactly, this joint work is fundamental. And well, an intervention agent told us verbatim: "The intervention must go according to the needs of the family, what people are telling you, it is flexible by allowing it to be done according to what one believes pertinent, but also to what the family is requesting"

**00:38:23 María José Campero**

Precisely, that is the idea... flexibility and relevance, right? for the intervention to be participatory. Which leads us to the third approach, which is the situated approach, which involves precisely considering the particularities of the participants, their families and their contexts. That is to say, favoring that the intervention be personalized, offering conditions so that the agents can know the reality of families in depth, where it is key to have alternatives so that people can meet their intervention goals, considering different living conditions and possibilities. And in this sense, institutional flexibility is important, and understanding of the difficulties that people may have, for example, to attend support sessions, to meet certain intervention goals, whether due to contingencies or crises that we have had for some time. Time, or family and personal situations, right? And an intervention situated in this sense considers the differences, for example, between urban and rural contexts for the implementation of the programs, which is something that we are also seeing in this research.

**00:39:22 Marianne Daher**

That's how it is. And what is the critical approach about, Anto?

**00:39:26 Antonia Rosati**

Well, the critical approach implies having a problematizing position on the scope and limitations of public policy. Eh... this considers that there is awareness at the institutional level, an awareness that, for example, this program is a program that is there, which accounts for a certain over-focusing of the policy on people in situations of extreme poverty, excluding for that reason other vulnerable groups. For example, this is the case in Chile of the “*middle class*”, where many families are located who also face multiple risks and who are left out of public policies. That on the one hand. On the other hand, we also see that this approach implies recognizing institutional aspects that generate discomfort in people and that foster praxical violence, such as, for example, understanding that people, who often told us that there is a low allocation of resources to public services, a scarce and slow help that they receive from the services, and how this is generating a certain malaise that is important that this experience is also understood and recognized at an institutional level.

**00:40:26 María José Campero**

Of course. Well, and the last one, the care approach, which we identified for overcoming violence, has to do with a way of doing things, where the importance of the well-being of agents and teams is recognized. So here the work stress and the burnout that we saw in the teams is made visible, and their care is valued, both for the well-being of the agents, but also understanding that this is something that favors the bond that they can build with the participants. And therefore, we saw that it is key to have care instances that are formal and systematic to prevent this burnout, which, as Marianne mentioned, was also something that we investigated in an emerging way in the research.

**00:41:06 Marianne Daher**

Yes, that's right, one hundred percent in agreement, moreover, with what you point out, that is, these instances have to be formal and systematic. And well, care being another of our research topics, we invite you to visit our website, in case you want to delve into this phenomenon. But well, connecting it with what an intervention team leader told us, who told us: “When you work in harmonious environments and in environments where you realize that the other cares about you as a person and as a professional, this also influences having greater commitment and bonding with the other, in this case with the participants, and we know that through this bond we can achieve all the objectives. So, indeed, care has a positive influence on the professional”. Well, then, taking the... this last element of the vignette that refers to the bond between the intervention agent and the participants, which we know is very important, and which is also one of the main results of our research, eh... Côté, could you Tell what would be the approaches to overcome praxical violence taking into account this important aspect?

**00:42:15 María José Campero**

Of course, regarding the bond, eh... we identified four approaches related to the bond: one of them focused on the formation of a strengthened bond, another focused on autonomy and agency, another on awareness and reflexivity, and finally an approach of dignity and humanization. Of course they are all connected to each other, but starting with this approach focused on the formation of a strengthened bond, this approach has to do with something that is good, we already presented in an article that we published this year 2022, where we propose that there are three dimensions of the bond: the interactional, the technical and the affective. And in the case of the strengthened bond, these three dimensions are strengthened. We invite you to read the article, but briefly: the interactional dimension, when it is strengthened, is characterized by the generation of spaces that are comfortable, warm, experiences of interpersonal pleasure, good treatment, respect, authenticity, horizontality, reciprocity, right?, co-responsibility, mutual valuation. And when the technical dimension is strengthened, we see that there is an adequate exercise of the professional role by the agent, and a high involvement by the participants, which is seen in their commitment and motivation, where they show an active, proactive and responsible role. And lastly, when the affective dimension is strengthened we see that there are sensations of closeness, of affection, there is emotional support; and there are expressions of "*genuine interest*" and empathic listening between this duo, right? And it is in this type of bond, in which the three dimensions are strengthened, where we saw that it was possible to contribute to overcoming praxical violence to a greater extent than others where these dimensions are weakened.

**00:44:01 Marianne Daher**

Perfect, thanks Coté, yes. In fact, that result turned out very well and we presented it to the intervention agents of the program and it made a lot of sense to them, so it is a good approximation to think about overcoming praxical violence. Now, Anto, can you tell us about the approach based on autonomy and agency?

**00:44:20 Antonia Rosati**

Of course, well, in this approach what we see is that on the part of the intervention agent it is fundamental to promote the autonomy of the participants, encouraging their agency and trusting that they can really achieve changes in their lives and also transmitting this explicitly to the people.

**00:44:34 Marianne Daher**

Yes, in fact, an intervention agent told us verbatim: "They feel that we believe in them, which is true, so one tells them 'I believe in you, I know that you will be able to, you will achieve it', and you're all the time reinforcing that."

**00:44:48 María José Campero**

Of course. Of course, the agents also offer guidance but as *"advice"*, *"suggestions"*, *"guides"* or *"explanations"* so that the person himself explores areas of his well-being, can evaluate alternatives and autonomously carry out the necessary actions to improve his life, where they always keep in mind that, and this is the main thing, that the final decision belongs to the participant.

**00:45:11 Antonia Rosati**

Of course, along this line, what we saw is that the agents seek to promote autonomy progressively, starting, at the beginning, for example, by taking steps to facilitate the bond themselves, but then moving towards management that is joint or finally, in the best of cases, that this is finally carried out by the participant, and in this way paternalism is avoided.

**00:45:32 María José Campero**

It is interesting that in this approach it is also considered that the agents encourage the autonomy of each member of the family and not only of the participant, even when this comes into tension.

**00:45:46 Marianne Daher**

Yes, great. Well, all this has to do, as we have seen, with the intervention agent, but what about the participants?

**00:45:55 Antonia Rosati**

Yes, well, in this approach the participants act autonomously throughout the process, transmitting availability to do the intervention, exploring their interest independently and actively requesting information if necessary.

**00:46:09 Marianne Daher**

Of course, well, this is how one participant commented: "My agent was telling me that I had to look for more information about the processes of starting a business, and I started doing it. I looked for recipes, how to prepare

them, I got on the Internet and started to see if I wanted to work on this, how I had to get certified, all that, and all this on my own”.

**00:46:31 María José Campero**

Of course, that quote illustrates very well how people take responsibility, how they fulfill their commitments, how they carry out all the necessary procedures to advance their goals and the intervention in general. And besides, people trust their abilities to achieve achievements in their life, and they take ownership of said achievements and of each one of the advances towards them.

**00:46:49 Marianne Daher**

Yes, well, great, now let's talk about the approach based on awareness and reflexivity?

**00:46:56 Antonia Rosati**

Well, in this approach, on the part of the intervention agent em... the progressive awareness of his participant is key, so that deep down his goals make sense to him and to also work on personal or family problems that people may not necessarily recognize at the beginning as such. For this, it is very important to make certain issues visible repeatedly, especially issues that are more complex, such as the health of family members or the violation of the rights, for example, of children. But all this has always to be done with respect, patience, a lot of empathy and care, above all.

**00:47:33 María José Campero**

Yes. Well, and in that line too, the agents are concerned with educating partners from respect and from dialogue, right?, as Antonia said. And this implies not judging people for having ideas, experiences or dynamics that may not be shared, or beliefs or cultural practices that are deeply rooted and that may be difficult to change, such as some family dynamics or associated issues, for example to gender relations, which they also told us.

**00:47:56 Marianne Daher**

So, well, that's how an intervention agent expressed it verbatim, who told us: "We understand that we are going to make certain problems they have visible, we are going to support them so that they understand things that must be modified, but we also understand that, for example, with chauvinism, there are things that don't change them and unfortunately we have been working with them for two years and sometimes in two years we can't get women, for example, to empower themselves and get out of that circle of violence, sometimes you can't. So, I think it's respect too. Suddenly they talk to you about religion and sometimes you don't share that, or they talk to you about politics and you have to be quiet because it's not right for you to insert or impose your own ideals".

**00:48:38 Antonia Rosati**

Of course, precisely, it is also to respect that difference, right? Um... we also actually see many times that the agents commented that it was important to try to understand the origin of the differences with their participants, precisely from empathy. For example, understand that the behaviors and decisions of your participant can be explained, I don't know, in that he had a complex childhood or other types of difficulties.

**00:48:56 María José Campero**

Yes, or respect that people also do not want to advance in certain areas, such as, for example, educational leveling, which appeared to us more than once. They can offer encouragement and guidance, but not push or force you to set certain goals.

**00:49:13 Marianne Daher**

Yes, well, great with everything the intervention agent does in this approach, but what about the participants?

**00:49:20 Antonia Rosati**

Well, the people participating in this approach act from reflexivity. This includes showing openness to the agent's orientations, welcoming his ideas, his reflections, his opinion, with which perhaps at the beginning he did not agree, but as the path of intervention progressed, perhaps to share and appreciate. It also has to do with expressing one's own point of view to the intervention agent, despite disagreements or differences in perspective, and it also implies clearly conveying to the intervention agent how people feel with the accompaniment and communicating assertively difficult feelings, for example, discomfort, annoyance, embarrassment. All this from reflexivity.



**00:50:04 Marianne Daher**

Great, thanks Anto. Well, and now yes, we are going for the last approach that is that of dignity and humanization to overcome praxical violence, can you tell us a bit, Coté?

**00:50:14 María José Campero**

Yes, well, to those who are still here, thank you for your attention, haha, with this approximation we tell you the last one, right? Em... in this approach, the intervention agents precisely promote the dignity of the participants, fostering symmetry, humility, acceptance, empathy, recognition of the other, social dignity and empowerment of the participants. For example, symmetry is worked on by strengthening a horizontal position, avoiding a place of superiority, as we discussed earlier. And this implies getting to know the participants, but also making themselves known, for example, sharing personal experiences, of course, without burdening the participant with personal or work problems, but building a bonding space from a more horizontal place.

**00:50:58 Antonia Rosati**

Well, so it is also necessary, on the part of the intervention agent, to be humble, in the sense of "*not looking down*" on the participant, always having a respectful attitude and avoiding judging them for their living conditions, such as I don't know, if he has a lower educational level.

**00:51:13 Marianne Daher**

Yes, and a participant told us that verbatim, she said: "My agent is very humanitarian, it's not because she belongs to the municipality, I don't know, she may be from another social level. No, she is like any other person, an ordinary person, very simple".

**00:51:30 María José Campero**

Of course. And with regard to welcoming and empathy, we also saw a willingness to welcome the person when they need support, when they are distressed, or in a situation of need, right? But there it was also very key to recognize and validate the suffering, even when the agents have not, have not experienced similar situations. And

what an agent told us is interesting, that for this it is very important to take care of the capacity for amazement, without failing to empathize with people's problems, despite the fact that they are repeated in different participants, because each experience is speaking of a suffering that is particular and that is valid.

**00:52:05 Marianne Daher**

Yes, that's how it is. In fact, that intervention agent told us: "I believe that we should never lose the ability to be amazed at the slightest problem, whether of minor, medium or greater complexity, because it can affect us all in different ways. And that's key, if you lose that, the capacity for amazement, I think that's where I'll retire", hahaha.

**00:52:25 Antonia Rosati**

Hahaha. Well, added to this, we find recognition, which considers very specific aspects such as, for example, treating the participants by name, reminding them of information about their family, that is, being clear, for example, about the names of the members of their family, what they do, also express concern about what is happening if they are applying for some benefit. And for this it is key to have a look that is not homogenizing or standardized, but that recognizes the particularity of each family.

**00:52:52 María José Campero**

Yes, well, as well as... it is seen in the interest to facilitate the continuity of participation in the program, supporting this to happen in what is required, and this in contrast to considering the person as a number and nothing more the intervention is over, and he is "*erased*" from the program if he does not meet the commitments.

**00:53:10 Antonia Rosati**

Exactly, well, for its part, social dignity is also important in this approach, which has to do with doing the job, as an agent, in the best possible way, avoiding prejudice, promoting respect, being humble and simple, beyond that there are socioeconomic differences between both actors, that is, between agent and participant. So, this finally translates into offering a close, friendly treatment, preventing the person from feeling uncomfortable because they are in a vulnerable situation or because they need some support, and constantly reinforcing that they do not lose dignity for that. That is precisely why the name is of social dignity.

**00:53:47 María José Campero**

Yes, that is why it is also emphasized that the person deserves to receive a response and support for their queries or concerns, even more so considering that they live in a situation of great vulnerability, as are the participants in this research, right?

**00:54:01 Marianne Daher**

Yes. Well, and now we are talking about empowerment, do you mind?

**00:54:06 Antonia Rosati**

Yes, well, empowerment considers that the agent recognizes the installed capacities that are in the person, understanding that they may require support to channel them towards their goals, but that it is not that the agent *"introduces"* or installs them, but rather that they already exist previously. This is why it is proposed that in reality the agent fulfills a role of facilitator or *"bridge"*, recognizing that the changes in the life of the person are the result of their own effort and decision. And for this, it is very important that their achievements are made visible, whether they are big, whether they are small, whether they are the result or the process, transmitting to them that they are capable of transforming their lives.

**00:54:41 Marianne Daher**

Yes, and that was clearly expressed by an intervention agent, who told us: "We are only here to guide them, for them to mobilize and for them to discover their skills that they already have installed. It's not like we discovered gunpowder either, haha. In many families they have that initiative to generate strategies, the issue is that they do not know how to do it. So, we show them, we guide them in how they have to do it, how actions are generated, how goals are generated. Then, finally, the family begins to take out the resources and the capacities that they already have installed". So good, it's been really nice, haha, reading these more positive vignettes to end the podcast. And... Well, in these vignettes we are talking about families and participants, so I wonder what role these people play in this approach.

**00:55:31 María José Campero**

Yes, a very important role. For example, what the participant does in this approach is to humanize her agent. For this, again, empathy, care, trust, and appreciation of the humanized work that the agent does on her part are key,

right? For example, specifically empathy and care, consider things like being kind, respecting, understanding limitations, not demanding things that are out of the agent's reach, right?, that *"get out of their hand"* . And this is especially important when there were participants who had had previous negative experiences, and who could understand that the agent who is working with them today is not responsible for what another agent did at another time.

**00:56:10 Marianne Daher**

Yes, that was literally expressed by one participant, whom I am going to quote again, who said: "I was always very kind to my agent, very respectful, I always treated her with great respect. In fact, when she came to my house to explain the program to me, I told her what had happened to me the previous time in another program similar to this one, where I had wasted my time, and I let her know this but with great respect, because it wasn't his fault".

**00:56:36 Antonia Rosati**

Exactly well, in addition to that respect, we see that the trust and credibility of the person participating in the ability of their agent to perform a job that effectively promotes opportunities and helps them achieve life goals is key. Also, it is important that you trust that it is possible to establish a positive bond with your agent.

**00:56:55 María José Campero**

Yes, and finally, the evaluation of humanized work has to do with precisely appreciating the personal and emotional involvement that agents often have, which goes beyond what is strictly technical. And this includes reflecting and transmitting personal and humanizing characteristics to the agent, such as, for example, his closeness, warmth, empathy, which is something fundamental that we see that appears as something central to overcoming praxical violence.

**00:57:23 Marianne Daher**

Great. Well, thanks Coté and Anto. Everything we have talked about is very interesting. Of course, I kept thinking about the violence that is exerted by the participants towards their intervention agents. Perhaps other people could understand this violence as a kind of resistance to negative aspects of the programs, for example, a resistance to assistencialism or paternalism, what do you think?

**00:57:51 Antonia Rosati**

Yes, this is certainly a possibility that should be considered. However, we believe that it is important not to justify violence in any direction. And in that sense, um... we think not, in our investigation we actually talked about serious cases of sexual harassment and even physical threats to physical integrity from participants to agents, being important for us that these situations are not naturalized or justified.

**00:58:24 Marianne Daher**

Yes, well I completely agree. And well, thinking about overcoming praxical violence, in addition to these approaches that we saw, some of which are associated with the institutional framework, others with the bond between the intervention agent and the participant, do you think that perhaps other forms of keep going? Eh... Maybe as community psychologists we could consider the role of the community, right? and talk a little about it.

**00:58:55 Antonia Rosati**

Yes, well, the approximations that we have proposed are lights to move forward, without a doubt, but the same with respect to your query about the community, well, one could think that a way to overcome praxical violence is community strengthening. Because it could happen in a community, when it is empowered, its members are in a better position to recognize, first, that they are victims of praxical violence and therefore to demand a more dignified treatment and advance in the transformation of power relations towards more symmetrical ones, right? However, we believe that this is complicated when we work with people in a situation of poverty, which is not, where they do not consider themselves a community, nor do they want to be, but rather seek to overcome this situation.

**00:59:35 María José Campero**

Yes, that is, that is really a critical knot, which we have already talked about, about how work to overcome oppression is understood from the decolonial approach in the framework of this great podcast, because we have realized and we have talked, that in this approach, many times the central, decolonial exercise revolves around the recovery of the word and the narratives from the same communities about themselves, in order to be strengthened. And this is then based on the vindication and revaluation of that axis of identity by which these communities were excluded or oppressed in the first place. How to be a woman, be indigenous, LGBTQI+, be from the Global South,

and so many more, right? And that they have taken these axes and from them that community has been re-articulated for a new vindicating narrative, right? For example, we saw this in the LGBTQI+ community and how the term queer was re-appropriated, right? that had a pejorative use in the 19th century and is now one of vindicated pride, right? Or in the Chilean case, the case of diagnoses... of people with mental health diagnoses, how they resignified madness, the place of madness, and how this permeated how they are treated at a social level, but also the work of the health institutions.

**01:00:57 Antonia Rosati**

Yes, well in fact, all this development of the narratives and, which is very important, has been accompanied by new contemporary theories, such as the decolonial approach, which you mentioned, right?, or the recognition policies, which have come to make more complex the most classic theories of oppression, for example, like the Marxist one. However, it is equally important to recognize that social class is still a fundamental axis of oppression in many societies, as is the case in Chile, and therefore must also be considered a source of violence. And let's not forget about that too.

**01:01:26 Marianne Daher**

Yes, I agree, although well, it is difficult to think about the exercise of appropriation, valorization and re-narration that you were commenting on, when the axis of identity, bone in terms of exclusion, is being poor, let's say, as is the case of the the participants of... of this social program that we analyzed. So, it seems important to ask how to work on this and how to promote community strengthening when the identity axis does not imply pride nor is it an identity that one wishes to have, but on the contrary, what is wanted is, or there is a desire to go out of this axis, right? and not articulate as a community based on this axis.

**01:02:13 María José Campero**

Yes, and in fact it would also be important to consider this dimension of social class in order to understand the bond that exists between the intervention agent and the participant. Because at least in our case study, although the participants are from the lower class, and the agents in general are from the middle class, in these classifications, there is not so much socioeconomic distance between the two because they share the same territory, therefore they share similar situations of vulnerability and even when they told us that the agents also required state benefits, limiting this distance, right?

**01:02:49 Marianne Daher**

Of course yes. And well, changing the subject, I think it would also be important to think about how to approach praxical violence not only as external observers, which was the exercise we did in this study, but from the very people who exercise it, motivating that... motivating in this in a reflective, self-critical and participatory look. However, taking into account the rigidity of the institutions and the resistance of the people, doing this would clearly imply a great challenge. For this reason, we believe that it is important that there are safe spaces of trust, that do not imply risks for those who try to look at themselves and address this violence, right? However, at the moment these spaces are not always available. We know that what prevails in social policy is control, demand, burnout and in this sense, this would require a cultural or even paradigmatic change, regarding the processes of transformation, learning and self-criticism. Well, then, I think that all these are issues that we have to continue thinking about and working on, and promoting in order to overcome praxical violence, without obviously neglecting the approaches that we have already shared with you, and well, maintaining this critical exercise in our daily praxis, which is what invite this wonderful podcast. So with this we end, thank you very much for the invitation, for listening to us and well, in turn we would like to invite you to write to us in case you want to reflect together with us regarding this phenomenon, or share your experiences with us. Remember that you can visit our website which is [www.praxiscomunitaria.com](http://www.praxiscomunitaria.com) and follow us on Instagram, which is called Praxis Comunitaria, hahaha. So thank you very much!

Thank you very much.

Bye!

Bye, thank you very much.

Bye