Sociopolitical Culture of Knowledge Management

Guillen JC[1]*, Bustos JM[2], Valdes JH[1], Morales FE[3], Cordoba VHM[4], Vazquez FRS[5], Muñoz EM[6] and Lirios CG[7]

[1]Department of Social Work, National Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico

[2]Department of Psychology, National Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico

[3]Department of Economy, University of Sonora, Mexico

[4]Department of Economy, Amigo University, Mexico

[5]Department of Social Sciences, University in Cuernavaca, Mexico

[6]Department of Engineering, Public University in Pachuca, Mexico

[7]Department of Social Work, Autonomous Mexico State University, Mexico

*Corresponding author: Javier Carreon Guillen, Professor Research, Department Social Work, National Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico, Email: javierg@unam.mx

Abstract

Roughly, the management of knowledge lies in the establishment of institutional guidelines from which will generate the isomorphism and mimeticism necessary to produce relevant information when making decisions or carry out forward-looking actions. The objective of the present work is to specify a model with the purpose of studying the possible scenarios of knowledge management. A documentary study was conducted with a selection of sources indexed to leading Latin American repositories such as Dialnet, Latindex and Redalyc. Hypothetical dependency relationship trajectories between the specified variables are observed, as well as the inclusion of other factors according to the state of knowledge and the literature review is intensified.

Keywords: Institutional Ism; Culture; Leadership; Management; Collaboration

Introduction

The objective of this work is to establish a model to explain the incidence of work culture on organizational management. Based on a review of the theoretical, conceptual and empirical frameworks, the logical trajectories were established for the prediction of management in the face of demands that exceed resources and their optimization is encouraged. A *grosso way* human capital are paradigms from which knowledge networks acquire a formative, assimilative, technological, detached, motivational and social mobility sense [1].

In other words, the rational choice, an instrument of human capital, is limited to an omnipresent training system where the individual generates his own opportunities and develops both skills and knowledge based on the usefulness and gain of his decisions. In this sense, knowledge networks break human capital to give it legitimacy and transparency by debating and agreeing on decisions that will benefit a group or community, academic, scientific and technological.

The competition and cooperation involved in the formation of human capital determines knowledge networks, since these are the ones that delineate the strategies of balance between demands and resources. Once established innovations, s knowledge networks determine the symbols, meanings and relevant ways for collaboration and resolution of conflicts within groups. The innovations, as intelligent systems favor technological change and organizations must adjust their capabilities to the undertaking of new knowledge. The opportunities resulting from the dynamics of innovative

networks will delineate the development of skills and knowledge. It is a process of value creation of the individual, the collaborative group and the innovative organization [2].

Although human capital highlights the importance of individual decisions in relation to innovation groups, the management culture goes beyond this synergy because it represents a balance between the values of the company and the capacity of the leader. Therefore, the specification of a model for the study of the culture of knowledge management through collaborative networks will explain such complexity.

Work Culture Theory

The organizational culture is understood as a process of dependency relations between external variables with respect to internal variables to the organization. It is a scheme in which technology, structure, values, norms and needs determine the motivational variables-affiliation, power, utility-and these in turn affect the consequent variables-leadership, management, entrepreneurship, innovation, productivity, satisfaction, rotation, absenteeism, accident rate, adaptation, innovation, reputation [3].

In such a process, the theory of work culture maintains that values and norms are the determinants of consistent variables through mediating and moderating variables. The moderating variables are those that reduce or increase the negative or positive effect of the variables external to the organization. This is the case of knowledge as autocratic values decrease when they affect the commitment of workers, or they increase the influence of democratic values when they affect cooperation among employees. The mediating variables are those that only transfer the effects of the values and the norms on the consequent variables. This is the case of attitudes and intentions that not only link norms and values with behaviors, but also give it a cultural sense. In other words, autocratic values when linked to obedience and compliance behaviors are mediated by unilateral attitudes.

In this way, the theory of organizational culture explains scenarios of consistent variables based on autocratic or democratic values and norms [4]. Work culture involves indicators that would correspond to the traits of the consequent variables. In this sense, the management culture, being indicated by self-efficacy, hope, resilience and optimism, implies a process of autocratic values and norms from which a leadership emerges and with it a management specialist. In the opposite case, the absence of leadership and management is determined by depersonalization, exhaustion or frustration related to unilateral tasks, objectives and goals.

Therefore, labor culture theory explains the emergence of management only if norms and values indicate an autocratic process from which decisions and strategies are centered on a leader specialized in management. However, organizational management is a more specific process than those explained by the theory of work culture. As a management becomes specific, the work culture, its values and norms must be more punctual in order to be able to link with the objectives and goals of the management [5].

Organizational Management Theory

Organizational management, unlike the work culture, is a specific process, since it implies delimitable, comparable and comparable objectives and goals. In this sense, organizational management refers to a process of indicators linked to the systematic monitoring and evaluation of processes, strategies and behaviors.

Because the organizational management is guided by innovative values and norms, it is a process of systematic and constant change, according to the contingencies of the environment and therefore contrary to the vertical and unilateral structure of the autocratic culture where the dependence on a leader. However, organizational management derived from autocratic culture implies historically different objectives and goals in the face of specific innovations and changes.

As the organizational management is specified and intensified, the autocratic culture is reduced to its minimum expression and yields its site to a more participatory culture. Consequently, organizational management involves a competence related to proposals and monitoring and evaluations [6]. It is because of these differences between cultures and efforts that the theory of organizational management explains the advent of an innovation and a change based on the interrelation between power-unilateral decisions and vertical structures that produce obedience and conformity in the majority - and influence - intentions of change based on minority innovations.

That is to say, those who make the decisions are limited to power and influence relationships as the objectives and goals are more specific, but if both are not modified from the achievement of achievements, then it is an autocratic culture [7].

In this way, the transformational leadership is linked to variables related to the processes of influence rather than power, since the motivation for effectiveness, satisfaction and effort means features of concerted management between the leader and the followers. Or, when communication, cohesion and support correlate negatively with attrition, depersonalization and dissatisfaction, but positively affect the commitment, then we attend a scenario in which

the autocratic culture of majorities interacts with the participation of minorities. The theory of organizational management explains the advent of the interrelationship between power relations-leaderships deciding on the behavior of followers - and influence relationships- talents generating opportunities and knowledge. From both theories, work culture and organizational management, it is possible to specify the explanatory logical trajectories of consequent variables.

Specification of the Management Culture Model

Unlike the study son culture and labor management where fatalistic or optimistic scenarios based on correlations between external variables relative to internal variables to the organization anticipate, specifying a model integrates the variables that its systematic study is possible to infer trajectories of dependency relationships.

The specification of a model involves a review of the dependency relationships established in studies of the prediction of a process, strategy or behavior. It is assumed that the explanatory variables with respect to the variables to be predicted configure a logical path system known as the nomological network [8]. In this sense, the dependency relationship trajectories explain the nomological networks that are established based on a review of the literature during a certain period of time. However, the specification of a model, depending on a sufficient number of studies related to a process, strategy or behavior implies preponderant trajectories that have not always been demonstrated by the studies.

Therefore, it is necessary to postulate dependency relationships that, having not been established logically or empirically, creativity or intuition can postulate as feasible relationships between the revised variables, or, postulate variables not conceptualized or weighted by the state of knowledge [9]. In the case of relationships not established by the literature, it is possible to infer them from studies in which the variables were conceptualized and / or weighted in order to explain other processes, strategies or behaviors similar or different to those that are intended to explain. Finally, in the case of variables not used in the studies of an organizational process, strategy or behavior, it can be inferred from the correlations between indicators.

The specification of a model is made from 1) include the empirical relationships demonstrated by the reviewed literature and 2) propose the variables and relationships not established by the state of knowledge. In this sense, studies of culture and labor management have shown that values and norms are external variables to the relations of power

and influence in an organization. However, norms and values when interacting with the contingencies of the environment, is associated with the processing of available information known as beliefs and perceptions [10].

Thus, the external variables or determinants would be, values, norms, beliefs and perceptions that would explain consequent variables such as; entrepreneurship, innovation, satisfaction, productivity, competitiveness and its opposite variables such as rotation, absenteeism, dissatisfaction, unproductivity, compliance or obedience [11].

However, being the determining variables indicative of general processes that would affect specific variables, these should be mediated or moderated by variables such as attitudes, skills, opportunities, intentions, knowledge or emotions. The mediating and moderating variables allow to specify and intensify the effect of the determining variables on the consequent variables. This is how the knowledge management culture model would include six explanatory hypotheses of trajectories of logical relationships between the determining variables and management, mediated by motivation, attitude, intention, skills and knowledge.

These are studies related to traditional and transformational leadership styles that explain the difference between external demands and resources that can be optimized by the talent of the leader, but reducing participation to an expectation function. These are studies related to knowledge networks as a result of the interrelation between market demands and the optimization of resources based on information on possible scenarios. These are the studies of opportunities and abilities as a result of a participatory and competitive culture, since each opportunity corresponds to a skill.

In these investigations, the effects of the surrounding information regarding culture and management are explained by the interrelation of the variables determinants with leadership styles, opportunities, capacities, objectives and goals. The management that proposes feasible scenarios is studied from the intentionality of its objectives and goals based on information on the balances between demands and resources. The formation of knowledge networks is explained by the norms, values, beliefs and perceptions of talents, as well as for the motivation of leaders, the formation of skills, knowledge and attitudes around planned and systematic decisions.

Discussion and Conclusion

The contribution of this work to the state of knowledge consists in the specification of the relationships and logical paths between the cultural variables that determine the

management of knowledge through mediating variables.

However, the possible relationships between the variables included in the model involve more explanations that can be compared with those established. In this sense, the debate about the direct determination of management from the norms, values, beliefs and perceptions contrasts with the specification of this model, since the mediating variables could be suppressed in autocratic organizations and diversified in participatory organizations [12].

Therefore, the model specification explains the culture and management of organizations balanced between their demands and resources, opportunities and capabilities, power and influence. In contexts of uncertainty, scarcity and risk, organizations tend to be more participatory and require more diverse, specific and innovative models of culture and management. However, organizations, even when their environment is uncertain, have based their emergence and persistence from the balance between their processes. The objectives and goals of organizations not only reflect their culture, but also inform their human essence, since leaderships and followers are the central elements of their intentions and products.

References

1. Acar AZ, Acar P (2014) Organizational culture types and their effects on organizational performance in Turkish hospitals. Emerging Markets Journal 3(3): 1-15.

2. Janicijevic N (2013) The mutual impact of organizational culture and structure. Economic Annals 58(198): 35-60.

3. Cruz O, Arroyo P, Marmolejo J (2016) Technological innovations in logistics: inventory management, information systems and operations outsourcing. In: Quintero M, et al. (Eds.), Innovation and technology challenges for its practical application in companies pp: 165-178.

4. García C, Carreón J, Hernández J, Salinas R (2016) Governance of the actors and networks of technological innovation. In: Quintero M, et al. (Eds.), Innovation and technology challenges for its practical application in companies pp: 79-94.

5. Hernández A, Valencia R (2016) Instruments of innovation: social networks in the internalization of micro, small and medium sized Mexican companies. In: Quintero M, et al. (Eds.), Innovation and technology challenges for its practical application in companies pp: 47-66.

6. Mendoza E, Ramírez L, Atriano R (2016) Use of media and technologies in the creation of an innovation system for the common good. In: Quintero M, et al. (Eds.), Innovation and technology challenges for its practical application in companies pp: 95-114.

7. Adewale OO, Anthonia AA (2013) Impact of Organizational Culture on Human Resource Practices: A Study of Selected Nigerian Private Universities. Journal of Competitiveness 5(4): 115-133.

8. Quintero M, Velázquez E, Sales J, Padilla S (2016) A review of the state of the art about SMEs. And the innovation studies? In: Quintero M, et al. (Eds.), Innovation and technology challenges for its practical application in companies pp: 31-43.

9. Robles C, Alviter L, Ortega A, Martínez E (2016) Culture of quality and innovation in microenterprises. In: Quintero M, et al. (Eds.), Innovation and technology challenges for its practical application in companies pp: 11-30.

10. Saansongu E, Ngutor D (2012) The influence of corporate culture of employee commitment to the organization. International Journal of Business and Management 7(22): 1-8.

11. Sales J, Quintero M, Velázquez E (2016) Adaptation versus innovation: the formation of industrial districts from rural communities. Santa Cruz Atizapan and Chiconcuac. In: Quintero M, et al. (Eds.), Innovation and technology challenges for its practical application in companies pp: 181-199.

12. Vázquez C, Barrientos B, Quintero M, Velázquez E (2016) To government supporters for innovation, technology and training of small and medium enterprises in Mexico. In: Quintero M, et al. (Eds.), Innovation and technology challenges for its practical application in companies pp: 67-78.

Guillen JC, et al. Sociopolitical Culture of Knowledge Management. J Qual Healthcare Eco 2022, 5(3): 000271.

Copyright© Guillen JC, et al.