

Evolution of Managerial Discourse: New Perspectives and Epistemological Dimensions in Digital Culture

Hilarión José Vegas Meléndez¹, Edith Josefina Liccioni², Magda Francisca Cejas Martínez³, Marizabeth del Carmen Malaver Guerra⁴

¹Pontificia Universidad Católica del Ecuador, Sede Manabí: Portoviejo, Manabí, Ecuador, hvegas@puce.edu.ec.

²Universidad Nacional del Chimborazo. Facultad de Ciencias Políticas y Administrativas. Chimborazo, Ecuador, edith.liccioni@unach.edu.ec

³Universidad Nacional del Chimborazo. Facultad de Ciencias Políticas y Administrativas. Universidad de las Fuerzas Armadas. Ecuador, magda.cejas@unach.edu.ec.

⁴Facultad de Ciencias Económicas y Sociales, Universidad de Oriente. Venezuela.

Abstract

This article explores the evolution of managerial discourse and its epistemological dimensions, from its roots to the present, through the analysis of the different bifurcations that have emerged in its development. The main objective is to start from the preponderance of the state of the art of managerial epistemology and its dimensions. The research adopts a qualitative and interpretative approach, with a methodology combining direct observation and documentary analysis at a descriptive level. The data analysis is based on a grounded theory approach to interpret the dimensions of the results. The findings highlight the importance of generating knowledge from the managerial structure, leading to the emergence of descriptors derived from a hermeneutic process and, consequently, strengthening the epistemological identity of the managerial discourse. Among the conclusions reached by the study is the need to take up the challenge of looking beyond the limitations of positivist epistemology and turn our gaze towards interpretative and constructivist epistemologies that will enable us to unravel the complexities of management discourse in its entirety.

Keywords: Dimensions, Discourse, Epistemology, Epistemology, Management, Perspectives.

The significant advances in administrative sciences from the managerial field have given rise to the generation of knowledge that has a significant impact on management, acquiring innovative methods that promote new paradigms and therefore new ways of thinking and acting knowledge; making substantive changes in the organizational ecosystem through the use of

transdisciplinarity. To this end, Damiani (2005, p.25) states that "the meaning of a science, a theory, a method, an investigation, is not understood if the epistemological background on which it is based is not clarified". The new managerial practices that have somehow been imposed by the same needs of the administration, have reinforced in this field the constant

bifurcations product of innovative and differentiating thinking, giving space to the substantive. In this order of ideas, the promotion of new managerial trends or the search for new paradigms that lead to the modernization of the organization has always been part of the discursive interest of the promoters of managerial change.

There is no doubt that management must understand the complexity of organizational processes and be able to analyze the concurrence of complementarity and contradictions that arise in organizations. This aspect becomes even more relevant when organizations represent authentic schools of knowledge and learning, as Senge points out (1992) when referring to organizations that learn. In this context, the shared and systemic vision, teamwork and the application of mental models by management play a fundamental role in the creation of new behaviors or paradigms, and in the overall success of the organization.

Epistemology, focused on the essence and evolution of scientific knowledge, immerses itself in a deep self-reflection to resolve its own basic description, as Ruiz (2018) points out, the search for an epistemic identity is highlighted, a journey that goes through the incessant introspection of the researcher. The route to discover such an identity is based on the cohesion of various philosophical dimensions, such as the ontological, axiological, epistemological and methodological. In addition, if we expand on the ideas of other contemporary scholars, the contributions of specialists in the area of management suggest that managerial discourse should not be merely a product of internal reflection, but also a result of interaction and lived experience. In this way, the understanding of management, and consequently, the epistemic analysis of it, should be impregnated both with personal reflections and with the palpable organizational reality. Therefore, managerial discourse becomes a fusion of multiple epistemological perspectives, adding complexity and richness to its study,

pointing out as motivation to develop the research proposed in this article the recognition from the academic field that epistemological studies has to better understand the foundations, theories and methods. It is the interactions of the ontological, the epistemological, and the axiological that define the work of a domain as a productive activity and, thus, reveal its critical role both in the evolution of knowledge and in the understanding of knowledge as a scientific entity. (López, 2015, p. 578)

In this sense, it should be pointed out from an integral vision that the ontological – understood as the essence of the being in question – has as its centrality the perception of reality; the nature of this reality and its values; The axiological shows the relevant values in the interaction between the subject and his environment, highlighting innovation and commitment. However, in the methodological from the inductive-interpretative character, reinforced by (Schütz, 1973, p.21) who affirms that "the choice of particular methodical perspectives that are configured from theoretical and conceptual presuppositions inherent to the construction of reality"; therefore, this approach is oriented from the understanding, interpretation and application of meaning in the discourses derived from the daily interaction between situations and trends of a managerial order.

Certainly, the managerial discourse whose epistemology has evolved due to the need for transformations that organizations have faced in the face of the various changes in the context and their own complexities (Pérez, Acosta, & Acosta, 2014), has led to the search for multiple approaches that allow organizational flexibility, to subjugate increasingly changing demands in environments of uncertainty. characterized by the presence of technological and sociocultural changes, which have been imposed by the environment and also in the context of scientific research. (Viaña, 2018; Zanotto & Gaeta, 2018)

That is why, in the field of managerial discourse, adopting an epistemology is an essential strategy that allows organizations to

successfully engage through transformational changes. This transformation involves not only the restructuring of management's theoretical and conceptual frameworks, but also of its practices. Epistemology, in its intrinsic nature, is characterized by a pluralistic approach to the world, articulating in a subject-object-reality trinomial (Corona & Kovac, 2016). This plurality derives from the diversity of emerging paradigms in the managerial field, where each of the results manifest a variety of techniques, theories and methods applied in intelligent organizations that are in constant search of knowledge. Such paradigms, ultimately, shape the subject's perspective on himself and his environment, which is why for Fuler (2020) this approach, by emphasizing the preponderance of epistemology in the framework of management, affirms that managerial discourse must consider how social realities and power dynamics influence the generation and application of knowledge. In this sense, the epistemological approach adopted in management must be sensitive not only to the methodologies and theories employed, but also to the broader social context that frames managerial practice.

In this way, scientific work is nourished by epistemological currents, and management as a practice is not exempt from this reality. Within the epistemological currents is the perspective that understands management as a social science, protected by a set of transdisciplinary knowledge, which places the human being as the main axis of development and the protagonist of transformative action in society. (Mendoza, 2018)

This study is designed to address the central question: How does manager discourse contribute to management's epistemological identity? Articulated with the objective of the research work that aims to interpret the managerial discourse from the new perspectives and epistemological dimensions in organizations.

Materials and method

The hermeneutical approach given to the research begins from dogmatic positions, but does not delve into its clear application in the field of administration and management, but rather highlights the importance of their contributions to the creation of new spaces in the business context. The literature review plays a fundamental role in segmenting the theories reviewed, in order to achieve a solid theoretical basis on the topics that are intended to be highlighted in the construction of the managerial discourse.

Based on the postulates of Grounded Theory, in which a conceptual framework is established that organizes data into categories carefully elaborated by researchers, categories are distinguished by their own properties and dimensions that emerge from them, and in turn, contribute to the enrichment and deepening of the understanding of the phenomenon studied (Corbin and Strauss, 2012). The interpretation of these categories and dimensions is developed through a dialectical process of explanation and understanding, allowing the categories that are finally established to be elucidated and defined.

The interpretation process is carried out from the descriptive level of the research, based on a variety of communicative styles that are generated during the collection of information and the construction of data. This procedure, known as theoretical saturation, is a strategy of collecting data until new properties or dimensions are identified in the categories (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). In this way, the importance of data interpretation and structuring is emphasized, and the value of theoretical saturation in the process of category construction is highlighted. Thus, the emergence of data (categories) allows researchers to reflect on the possibility of considering them as descriptors, after systematizing the commons and creative action in their conjunction, which may well generate spaces for future studies in relation to administration and management, obtaining greater prevalence of the term strategies and their

applicability in various fields or areas in which administration and management themselves can venture. not only to investigate but also to strengthen and provide new areas of knowledge.

From this methodological construct of the analysis, it is possible to contextualize the variables that are necessary to consider in order to continue contributing substantive knowledge to the sciences of administration in the terms of study situations that allow the debate or discussion of managerial positions that ultimately feed the academic and scientific contents. Empirical and substantive knowledge is generated from business spaces, therefore, it is necessary to review the emerging descriptors that deserve to be addressed in a more in-depth way in future research.

Among the descriptors that mention managerial dimensions based on the perspective of differentiation would be identified by reflections from the Latin American context, for this, it is necessary to work on constructs that are oriented towards the differentiation of the products and services that companies offer, especially in the characteristics of contexts such as Latin America itself. Differentiation is one of the strategic proposals that is most used to create new markets (blue oceans) and generate their own consumer profile. Likewise, business strategies based on creative competition and innovation for the generation of loyalty must take into account the originality and value chain that companies must possess to face the challenges of tomorrow, which is extremely changing and very immediate.

Analysis and discussion of the results

The analysis of the data is based on making an assessment of the subject through grounded theory to interpret the managerial dimensions. It is a fundamentally interpretative investigation, seeking to trace the evolution of definitions through the various deviations that have arisen from their origins to the present. In this way, areas of interest have been established that encourage debate around the topic, seeking an

updated overview in the epistemology itself and in an emerging managerial construct. This emergent research design is oriented towards the understanding of unique and particular situations.

For this purpose, the principles of hermeneutical phenomenology proposed by Heidegger (1988) have been applied. the analysis strategies used are based on the postulates of the Theory, which is aligned with the recommendations of Charmaz (2014) who argues that this method is especially useful to unravel the social reality and the underlying meanings in managerial discourses and practices.

New perspectives and epistemological dimensions in organizations

Epistemology is conceived as the philosophy of science, which would be the discourse through which knowledge is legitimized as a science; however, there are discussions that reflect a different vision, as indicated by García (2000, p. 15) when he states that epistemology and theory of knowledge are expressions that are usually used as if they were interchangeable, but they are not synonymous. In this regard, the conceptual configuration established in the study allows us to consider the contributions of Damiani (1997, p. 29) when he states that it is the discipline that privileges the analysis and evaluation of scientific cognitive problems; It is an intellectual activity that reflects on the nature of science, on the nature of its assumptions, for which epistemology seeks to reconstruct in a rational way the concept of scientific knowledge through methodological criticism, aiming to rationally and systematically formulate the conditions of validity, as well as the methodological requirements of the judgments assumed by scientists. Kuhn arguing that... Science does not progress linearly, but by ruptures. It is a new theory that usually proposes a cut, not continuity with the previous one. Thus, science does not gradually unveil a pre-given reality whose characteristics are increasingly appearing, but defines such a reality in each case differentially

according to the type of theoretical approach. (1999, p.10).

For Popper (1977, p.53) epistemology consists only in the investigation of the methods used in those systematic tests to which each new idea must be subjected if it is to be seriously taken into consideration; he thus emphasizes the need for validity and justification as the only objective of epistemology. However, the importance of the method used in the process of contrast is incorporated into the discourse as an instrument that generates rules. And as Foucault (1974) points out, when he declares discourse "as a symbol of power that stipulates a form of social control". (p.12)

Epistemology from complexity, in which he considers it important to follow the route of the laws, so that every human being can understand reality, whose intention is to legislate and apply these laws in everything that is studied, Morín (2007). But at the same time, Morín (2004) clarifies "how these formulas and those simple laws are increasingly insufficient, we are confronted with the challenge of complexity" (p.16), pointing out that "complexity is an epistemological position that admits the existence of diverse ways of thinking, therefore, knowledge and knowledge are organized according to the principles that govern a certain logic" (p.18). This range of positions regarding epistemology legitimizes knowledge and allows the evolution of science, transcending the method.

In correspondence with what has been stated, it is necessary to address the significance of epistemological discourse which, according to (Ricoeur 2003), is experience understood as expression, but it is also the intersubjective exchange itself, and communication with the receiver, incorporating the same specialist that "if a discourse is produced as an event, it is understood as meaning". (p. 85)

In order to understand the epistemological discourse of areas associated with administrative sciences, such as management, it is important to discern some conceptual categories that allow us

to facilitate the interpretation in the reading of what we want to leave for debate. In the first place, reference is made to the conceptualization of the theory, for these purposes the element for its configuration is considered when it identifies that it is a concept that has a priori content, before being unified (De la Garza, 2006 p.131); A configuration is an arrangement of characteristics that are extracted from reality itself, that is, it is a result rather than a priori that is subjected to unification.

Another relevant dimension is the one exposed by Moreno (1995, p. 45) referring to the approach, in which it depends on the intentions of the person who focuses and to a large extent on his or her will. In the context of knowledge, if it is not identified with mentality, individual or group, it is constituted by the conceptual and attitudinal presuppositions with which the knower accesses the object. Thus, the approach is interpreted as the perspective from which the knowing subject is located about his object. Likewise, the contributions of Koontz and Weihrich 2014 (p.11) establish that the scientific approach first requires clear concepts such as mental images of anything formed by generalizations from particularities. This refers to the approach, generalizations that come or group evidence of particularities that come to interpret as from the subjective point of view of the interpreter or observer.

Valles (1999) establishes the differentiation between perspective and paradigm, stating that "a paradigm usually encompasses several theoretical-methodological perspectives, and is also characterized by a series of general principles or assumptions (ontological, epistemological, methodological) therefore the perspectives could also be called, if one prefers, paradigms of lower rank or mini-paradigms..." (p. 52). Therefore, perspectives could be considered lower-ranking paradigms or mini-paradigms. These concepts are closely related and play a fundamental role in the construction of a specific reality and in the theoretical development of a particular discipline. For

Martínez (2005), in correspondence with Kunt's contributions, the paradigm

... it is a coherent structure, constituted by a network of concepts through which scientists see their field, of intertwined methodological beliefs that allow the selection, evaluation and critique of topics, problems and methods, of commitments among the members of a scientific community, all of which implies a specific definition of the corresponding field of science and is expressed in an organic tradition of Research. (p. 35)

This concept is of utmost importance, given that the theories express the discursivity generated by the episteme in the context and that Moreno himself (p. 52), complements in relation to its link with the paradigm by expressing "This is so because there are no signs of the episteme, since neither the concepts, nor the paradigms, nor are languages caused by episteme, they are born in it, in its horizon, but not by it." For Morín (2007, p.9) the paradigm "is conceived as the logical relationship between the key concepts that govern all the theories and discourses that depend on it". In this position, Morín involves theory and discourse as essential components within the category of the paradigm, in one way or another.

Martínez (2005, p.18), on the other hand, consolidating himself on Morín, argues that a scientific paradigm can be defined as a principle of fundamental distinctions-relations-oppositions between some matrix notions that generate and control thought, that is, the constitution of theories and the production of the discourses of the members of a given scientific community, is a conception that comes from recent discussions about the Kuhnian conception of paradigm and that at the same time it comes from the new episteme of the emerging context and that is present in the process of construction and formation of concepts that lead to the formation of theories. As explained below from the Foucauldian point of view, but we will add the epiphenomenology of power reflected in discursivity and in the paradigm.

In the words of Foucault (1990), the construction of theory is derived through the formation of various elements whose analysis is heterogeneous; therefore:

... some constitute rules of formal construction, others rhetorical habits; some define the internal configuration of a text; others the modes of relations and interference between different texts; some are characteristic of a specific era, others have a distant origin and a very large chronological scope. (p. 96-97)

Meanwhile, the elaboration of a theoretical construction is being constituted where multiple elements converge, converging discursivity, statements, all of them involved in a certain episteme, giving value to administration, training and transformation in its theoretical arguments, making room for the new approaches of administrative thought.

In this context, discursivity, seen as the manifestation of the predominant episteme, plays a crucial role in the configuration of these theoretical constructions. In particular, the discourse in Foucault's (1990) vision contributes significantly, where he argues that a discourse is "... the set of statements that depend on the same training system..." and exemplifies with the clinical, economic, natural history, and psychiatric discourse, among others (p. 181). In this way, the so-called discourse elaborated according to the perspective of those who gestation it is encouraged, strengthens it, and in certain cases, imposes it.

In addition, this analysis is expanded by Wodak (2011), who explores how managerial discourses can be used to reaffirm, challenge, or change existing power structures in an organization. In his view, the exploration of managerial discourse is not limited to the interpretation of the meaning of words, but must also consider the socio-political implications and power relations that underlie them.

Exploring the constructs of management from an epistemological perspective

The constant mutations in the managerial field have generated various trends that lead to

the daily review not only of its effects, but also of its origins or initial patterns, in order to give way to a new type of responses to the market and breadth of rights. The initiatives of Fayol and Taylor remain valid, as well as the ideas of Simon, Smith and Weber (Almanza ; Calderón and Vargas 2018) from the beginning of the so-called industrial revolution through that of knowledge, to the current era of information and digitalization, thus emerging various proposals by a range of thinkers who transformed the business world, such as Deming (Total Quality), Drucker (Modern Management), Hammer and Champy (Reengineering), Porter (Competitiveness), Senge (Learning Organizations), Toffler (Digital Revolution); these proposals fell within the framework of what Stoner (1996) and his collaborators proposed the approach known as dynamic engagement.

The contributions of Narváez (2023) coincide with this approach when he mentions that the evolution of management has been noted in the fact that the authors who developed the first stages produced improvements in productivity by emphasizing improving the productivity of a factor, just as Taylor did with Fayol's organization of the workforce with the administrative organization. Meanwhile, almost simultaneously, a group of businessmen – based on a strategic analysis – achieve substantial improvements by confronting all aspects related to productivity, and at the same time, as Alfred Sloan did at General Motors, segment markets, decentralize the organization, apply new financial guidelines, train and develop personnel, and at the same time, incorporating research and development into production and design, thus diversifying the business.

Undoubtedly, each situation prompted changes according to the context in which it was developed; however, today with the incorporation of new paradigms and discursivity exposed by Kuhn (1975) and Foucault (1990), in which even Morín (1990) proposes contributions from complexity by highlighting that there are

three principles of complex thinking: the first mentions dialogic, which is based on complex association; the recursive principle, the same one that mentions that every moment is, at the same time, product and producer, causing and caused, the product being the producer of what produces it, the causative effect of what it causes; and finally, the hologrammatic principle, which starts from the assumption that not only the part is in the whole, on the contrary, the whole, in a certain way, is in the part. This has generated a new paradigmatic corpus in the face of the concept of management and whose dimensions are complex and distant from the management processes that today are immersed in the transformations that information and communication technology have, and without neglecting the issue of artificial intelligence (AI).

The constructs that gave way to the Industrial Revolution in the eighteenth century and with the contributions of James Steuart (1767) and Adam Smith (1776) the first signs to manage processes are given through the scientific contributions provided by these precursors in the framework of the conduct of all industry and their contribution to the economy of production. respectively. These constructs gave way to theories with diverse currents, establishing conceptual schemes (many of which are in force today) and generally accepted (paradigms), instituting epistemes as evidence of power and that sustain the discourse of the field of knowledge in the administrative sciences.

The advances and evolution of administrative theory allow it to be classified as a science, but not management, whose controversial positions are manifested by what Armas and Malavé (2000) expressed about its scientific nature when they indicate that the proliferation of fashions has been attributed to the immaturity of management in terms of discipline: it still has confusing terminology, often not going much beyond common sense, its fundamental methods and text are still under development, it contains contradictions that would not be allowed in more rigorous

disciplines. The skepticism and lack of consideration with which management is treated in academic sectors are rooted in the fascination with neologisms and a certain tendency to exaggeration found in the management literature.

Despite this little recognition, management must be recognized for its ability to adapt and evolve, contributing to the generation of knowledge; in this regard, what Nonaka and Takeuchi (1999) have stated in relation to the creation of knowledge can be considered, and as they state it is carried out at three levels: individual, group, organizational; Therefore, "the analysis regarding organizational knowledge has two main components: the first deals with tacit and explicit knowledge; and the second with respect to the individual and the organization." (p. 34).

One of the commandments that reveals the importance of intellectual capital in the company and its need to enhance it is the one exposed in the work *The Third Wave*, in which it is assured that the new civilizing dimension is based on the change in the nature of power, moving from money to knowledge (Toffler, 1980, p.117).

On the other hand, Serrano and Zapata (2003, p. 292), in relation to knowledge in organizations, state that knowledge comes into play in an organization when people apply their knowledge and combine it with the information they have to carry out their work; This search for connection that these authors speak of has its bases in the organizational structure, in which it is required that it be able to produce knowledge and consequently its self-learning process; However, since the annals of business history, the organizational structure has always had its influencers who seek to predominate in the way in which it should be acted.

Weber (1974) called this proposal for organization "bureaucratization of social forms" (p. 882)... Warning of this dispute between the military establishment and the other social form, as the ecclesiastical one of a predominant model until then, he showed that what was advanced in

the West as modernization was nothing more than a new order of disciplinary power, in which discipline, and bureaucracy as its rational form of expression, it was nothing more than the institutionalization of the predominant military order in the organization (c.fr. Weber, 1974, p. 888). For his part, Foucault, in his studies on power, develops the idea that the modern societies of eighteenth-century Europe were born from the product of disciplinary power "whose basic function consisted in the surveillance, control and normalization of subjects" (Foucault, 2004, p.139 ff.).

This aspect strengthens the idea that most of the theoretical management proposals of the last 40 years are focused on the same dimension: suppression of supervision, organizational flattening, well-developed information and communication structures, participation and empowerment, dismantling of administrative sanctioning techniques, being in itself a new epistemological step for management sciences. Now, at what point can a manager sit down to think and reflect on the changes that his organization requires in epistemological terms? This is not to mention its connotations in the academic, axiological or deontological spheres.

It is no less true that the true emergence of learning organizations in the current post-modern era is focused on providing the means for the employee to develop competencies and acquire the necessary technological skills, which allow them to organize and develop in their daily life in the organization, to the extent that they build the functional fabric that regulates it in a strategic way. and with this, he builds himself in an organizational dialectic. This allows for a personal transformation in the social sphere, where behavior is adjusted to the way in which individuals interact with the internal logic of organizations; in addition, it implies adopting a communicative form based on dialogue and symbols.

Reflective postures

The study has allowed for a deeper understanding of the reality of managerial

discourse, highlighting throughout its development the various ways in which subjectivity and social construction that are intertwined in managerial practice (Fletcher, 2007; Kuhn, 2008). It has been highlighted that managerial discourse is a deep-rooted social construction that is formed and reinforced through a dialectical process of interaction and negotiation (Fairhurst & Grant, 2010). In this sense, research has revealed how managers not only communicate and explain organizational reality through their discourse, but also create it (Hardy, Palmer, & Phillips, 2000). In this sense, managerial discourse can be seen both as a means, but also as an outcome of organizational structures and processes. (Tsoukas and Knudsen, 2005)

In the literature review, the study significantly shows the influence of power on managerial discourse, understood as a power that is not static, but is constructed and maintained through discursive processes (Foucault, 1980; Mumby, 2004). Understanding in this area that management is not simply a position of authority, but an act of influence, shaping and transformation through discourse where the episteme is a central axis by virtue of the way we understand managerial discourse (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2000). Here, the challenge is to see beyond the limitations of positivist epistemology, to open ourselves to interpretive and constructivist epistemologies that can help us unravel the complexities of managerial discourse in its entirety.

In this regard, the contributions derived from Latour's (2005) actor-network theory (ANT) are

presented as a useful instrument to understand agency in managerial discourse since managers are not simply users of the discourse, but actors who create by bringing a better understanding of the power dynamics and social realities within organizations.

Conclusions

The epistemic processes linked to the managerial discourse are increasingly necessary to continue reflecting on the issue addressed, taking into account that emerging trends invite the transformation and opening of new deregulated markets, where demand is modeled on the foundations of creativity and innovation.

The construction of managerial descriptors favors the design of a corporate epistemological identity that establishes its course towards a discourse that is creative, innovative, differentiating, inclusive, diverse, proactive, empowered, and learning-oriented; therefore, discourse becomes a generator of new techniques and paradigms that provide a unique and authentic meaning.

The reflections presented aim to stimulate academic discussions about the so-called managerial trends that arise periodically to revitalize business environments (forums, congresses, meetings, etc.). From the grassroots of society, it is expected that these events will promote contributions and knowledge transfers that promote a stronger alliance between business and society, where dogmatic identity is present to facilitate its correct integration.

WORKS CITED

- Almanza Jiménez, Rebeca, Calderón Campos, Patricia; Vargas-Hernández, José G. (2018) Classical Theories of Organizations and Gung Ho Scientific Journal "Vision of the Future", vol. 22, no. 1, 2018 Universidad Nacional de Misiones, Argentina <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=357959311001>
- Alvesson, M., & Kärreman, D. (2000). Varieties of Discourse: On the Study of Organizations through Discourse Analysis. *Human Relations*, 53(9), 1125-1149. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726700539002>
- Araújo, P. C. de, Guimarães, J. A. C. and Tennis, J. T. (2021). A concepção de epistemologia da organização do conhecimento. *Palavra Clave (La Plata)*, 10(2), e120. <https://doi.org/10.24215/18539912e120Esta>

- work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International license.http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/deed.es_AR
<https://doi.org/10.24215/18539912e120>
- Armas, V. and Malavé J. (2000). Management and its fashions. IESA Debates.
https://www.angelfire.com/space2/fjr/211_06_1_modas_ger.htm
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2015). Basics of Qualitative Research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Corona, José and Kovac, Miguel (2017) Empirical-positivist and phenomenological-hermeneutic epistemological perspective: meaning, object of study and applicability. Novo Tékhné Magazine. December 2016. N° 2. pp. 89-97. <https://revistas.udistrital.edu.co/ojs/index.php/tekhne>
- Damiani, L. (1997). Epistemology and science in modernity. The transfer of rationality from the physical-natural sciences to the social sciences. Caracas: Ediciones de la Biblioteca de la Universidad Central de Venezuela.
- De la Garza, T. E. (2006). Social theories and work studies: new approaches. Iztapalapa. Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities. <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=39348723014>
- Fairhurst, G. T., & Grant, D. (2010). The Social Construction of Leadership: A Sailing Guide. Management Communication Quarterly, 24(2), 171-210. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318909359697>
- Fletcher, J. K. (2007). Leadership, Power, and Positive Relationships. In J. E. Dutton & B. R. Ragins (Eds.), Exploring positive relationships at work: Building a theoretical and research foundation (pp. 347-371). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Foucault, M. (1980). Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977. Edited COLIN GORDON
https://monoskop.org/images/5/5d/Foucault_Michel_Power_Knowledge_Selected_Interviews_and_Other_Writings_1972-1977.pdf
- Foucault, M. (1990). The Archaeology of Knowledge. . . . Editors Siglo Veintiuno.
- Foucault, M. (2004). A dialogue about power and other conversations. Madrid. Editorial Alianza,
- Fuller, Steve (2003). Social Epistemology. Second Edition. Indiana University Press
- García, R. (2000). Knowledge in construction. From the formulations of Jean Piaget to the theory of complex systems. Editorial Gedisa.
- Glaser, B. G. (1992). Basics of grounded theory analysis. California, United States of America: Sociology Press. Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: strategies for qualitative research. Hawthorne, N.Y.: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Hardy, C., Palmer, I., & Phillips, N. (2000). Discourse as a Strategic Resource. Human Relations, 53(9), 1227-1248. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726700539006>
<https://revistas.uclv.edu/index.php/teacs/article/view/2033>
- Kiernan (1999) in his work The Eleven Commandments of Management (Make organizational learning a religion of your company),
- Kiernan, M. (1999). The 11 Commandments of 21st Century Management. Prentice Hall.
- Knudsen, Christian, and Haridimos Tsoukas (eds) (2009) The Oxford Handbook of Organization Theory (2005; online edn, Oxford Academic, 2 Sept. 2009),
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199275250.001.0001>,
- Koontz, H., Weihrich, H., & Cannice, M. (2014). Administration. A global and business perspective. Mc Graw Hill Publishing.
- Kuhn, T. (1995). The structure of scientific revolutions. Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Kuhn, T. (2008). A communicative theory of the firm: developing an alternative perspective on intra-organizational power and stakeholder relationships. Organization Studies, 29(8-9), 1227-1254. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840608094778>
- Latour, B. (2005). Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-network-theory. Oxford university press. <http://www.bruno-latour.fr/node/70.html>
- López-Huertas, M. J. (2015). Domain analysis for interdisciplinary knowledge domains. Knowledge organization, 42(8), 570-580. <https://www.nomos-elibrary.de/10.5771/0943-7444-2015-8-570/domain-analysis-for-interdisciplinary-knowledge-domains-jahrgang-42-2015-heft-8?page=1>
- Martínez, M. A. (2005). The concepts of knowledge, epistemology and paradigm, as a differential basis in the methodological orientation of the degree project.

- <http://www.facso.uchile.cl/publicaciones/moebio/25/martinez.htm#:~:text=En%20otras%20palabras%2C%20un%20paradigma,de%20temas%2C%20problemas%20y%20m%C3%A9todos>
- Moreno, A. (1995). The hoop and the weft. Episteme, modernity and people. Editorial Texto.
- Morín, E. (2007). Introduction to Complex Thinking. Editorial Gedisa.
- Mumby, D. K. (2004). Discourse, power and ideology: Unpacking the critical approach to organizational communication. The Sage handbook of organizational communication, 237-261.
https://www.academia.edu/603346/Discourse_power_and_ideology_Unpacking_the_critical_approach
- Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). The Knowledge Creating Company. Ed. Oxford University Press.
- Pérez, M. E., Acosta Campos, I., & Acosta Campos, D. (2014). Management training and epistemology. *Refereed Journal of Management Training*, 13(1).
<https://produccioncientificaluz.org/index.php/rafg/article/view/6637>
- Popper, K. (1977). The logic of scientific research. Editorial Tecnos.
- Ricœur J., P. (2003). Theory of interpretation. Discourse and surplus of meaning. Siglo Veintiuno Editores.
- Schütz, A. (1973). Phenomenology and the theory of meaning. Editorial Paidós.
- Senge, P. (1993). The fifth discipline. Juan Granica Editions.
- Serrano-González, Susana and Zapata-Lluch, Mónica (2003). Information auditing, the starting point of knowledge management. The Information Professional, vol. 12, n. 4, pp. 290-297. [Journal article (Paginated)]
- Toffler, A. (1980). The third wave. Editorial Norma.
- Valles, M. (1999). Qualitative techniques of social research. Methodological reflection and professional practice. Editorial Síntesis.
- Otero, X., Santos-Estevez, M., Yousif, E., & Abadía, M. F. (2023). Images on stone in sharjah emirate and reverse engineering technologies. *Rock Art Research: The Journal of the Australian Rock Art Research Association (AURA)*, 40(1), 45-56.
- Nguyen Thanh Hai, & Nguyen Thuy Duong. (2024). An Improved Environmental Management Model for Assuring Energy and Economic Prosperity. *Acta Innovations*, 52, 9-18.
<https://doi.org/10.62441/ActaInnovations.52.2>
- Yuliya Lakew, & Ulrika Olsson. (2023). When We Don't Want to Know More: Information Sufficiency and the Case of Swedish Flood Risks. *Journal of International Crisis and Risk Communication Research*, 6(1), 65-90. Retrieved from <https://jicrcr.com/index.php/jicrcr/article/view/73>
- Szykalski, J., Miazga, B., & Wanot, J. (2024). Rock Painting Within Southern Peru in The Context of Physicochemical Analysis of Pigments. *Rock Art Research: The Journal of the Australian Rock Art Research Association (AURA)*, 41(1), 5-27.
- Mashaël Nasser Ayed Al-Dosari, & Mohamed Sayed Abdellatif. (2024). The Environmental Awareness Level Among Saudi Women And Its Relationship To Sustainable Thinking. *Acta Innovations*, 52, 28-42.
<https://doi.org/10.62441/ActaInnovations.52.4>
- Kehinde, S. I., Moses, C., Borishade, T., Busola, S. I., Aduhor, N., Obembe, N., & Asemota, F. (2023). Evolution and innovation of hedge fund strategies: a systematic review of literature and framework for future research. *Acta Innovations*, 50,3, pp.29-40. <https://doi.org/10.62441/ActaInnovations.52.4>
- Andreas Schwarz, Deanna D. Sellnow, Timothy D. Sellnow, & Lakelyn E. Taylor. (2024). Instructional Risk and Crisis Communication at Higher Education Institutions during COVID-19: Insights from Practitioners in the Global South and North. *Journal of International Crisis and Risk Communication Research*, 7(1), 1-47. <https://doi.org/10.56801/jicrcr.v7.i1.1>
- Sosa-Alonso, P. J. (2023). Image analysis and treatment for the detection of petroglyphs and their superimpositions: Rediscovering rock art in the Balos Ravine, Gran Canaria Island. *Rock Art Research: The Journal of the Australian Rock Art Research Association (AURA)*, 40(2), 121-130.
- Tyler G. Page, & David E. Clementson. (2023). The Power of Style: Sincerity's influence on Reputation. *Journal of International Crisis and Risk Communication Research*, 6(2), 4-29. Retrieved from <https://jicrcr.com/index.php/jicrcr/article/view/98>
- Viaña, Pulido. F. (2018). Epistemology towards Management Training in the XXI Century. Theories, Approaches and Applications in the Social Sciences. 11(23), 53-60
- Weber, M. (1974). Economy and society. Fondo de Cultura Económica. II Volume.