
Decolonizing Qualitative Research: Strategies for Inclusivity and Equity

Prof. Dr. Muhammad Saleem¹



Abstract

This editorial argues for the decolonization of qualitative research, emphasizing the need to challenge dominant research paradigms and prioritize diverse epistemologies, inclusivity, and equity. We discuss strategies for decolonial research, including co-creation, community-based participatory research, and decentering dominant epistemologies. We also highlight the importance of power sharing, positionality awareness, and accountability in research relationships. Finally, we call for funding agencies, institutions, and peer review processes to support decolonial research practices.

Introduction

Qualitative research has long been dominated by Western positivism, perpetuating epistemic violence and marginalizing diverse perspectives (Kuhn, 1962; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Spivak, 1988; Collins, 2000). Decolonizing qualitative research requires a radical shift in research paradigms, methodologies, and power dynamics, prioritizing diverse epistemologies, inclusivity, and equity (Tuck & Yang, 2012; Smith, 2012).

Strategies for Decolonial Research

Co-creation and collaboration involve communities and stakeholders in research design and implementation (Bishop, 1998; Lavelle & van de Fliert, 2013). Community-based participatory research empowers local voices and knowledge systems (Israel et al., 2005; Minkler & Wallerstein, 2011). Decentering dominant epistemologies incorporates Indigenous, feminist, critical race, and other marginalized perspectives (Smith, 2012; hooks, 1984; Delgado & Stefancic, 2012). Power sharing and positionality awareness acknowledge and address researcher biases and privilege (Haraway, 1988; Thompson, 2015).

¹ Prof. Dr. Muhammad Saleem, Editor In-Chief, Pakistan Journal of Applied Psychology

Conclusion

Decolonizing qualitative research requires a commitment to inclusivity, equity, and epistemic diversity. By challenging dominant paradigms and embracing decolonial strategies, researchers can co-create knowledge that promotes social justice and positive change (Tuck & Yang, 2012). Funding agencies, institutions, and peer review processes must support decolonial

References

- Bishop, R. (1998). *Freeing ourselves from neo-colonial domination in research*. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 145-162). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Collins, P. H. (2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. New York: Routledge.
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2012). *Critical race theory: An introduction*. New York: New York University Press.
- Hartsock, N. C. M. (1983). *The feminist standpoint: Developing the ground for a specifically feminist historical materialism*. In S. Harding & M. B. Hintikka (Eds.), *Discovering reality: Feminist perspectives on epistemology, metaphysics, methodology, and philosophy of science* (pp. 283-310). Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Haraway, D. J. (1988). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies*, 14(3), 575-599.
- Hooks, b. (1984). *Feminist theory: From margin to center*. Boston: South End Press.
- Israel, B. A., Eng, E., Schulz, A. J., & Parker, E. A. (2005). *Methods in community-based participatory research for health*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lavelle, K., & van de Fliert, E. (2013). *Community-based participatory research and the ethics of reciprocity*. In M. K. Wallerstein & B. Duran (Eds.), *Community-based participatory research for health: Advancing social and health equity* (pp. 33-46). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Minkler, M., & Wallerstein, N. (2011). *Community-based participatory research for health: Advancing social and health equity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Thompson, C. M. (2015). Situated knowledge: Feminist and science and technology studies perspectives. *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 22, 1-4.