

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.63332/joph.v5i5.1848>

## Introduction to the Digital Genesis of Emerging Administrative Paradigms

Pedro Arcia-Hernández<sup>1</sup>, Mauricio Agustín García-Manríquez<sup>2</sup>, Jorge Torres-Vásquez<sup>3</sup>, Hugo Eusebio Romero-Delgado<sup>4</sup>, Antony Paul Espíritu-Martínez<sup>5</sup>, Orlando Gallegos-Gonzales<sup>6</sup>, Pedro Arturo Barboza-Zelada<sup>7</sup>, Reina Marlene Pérez-Vargas<sup>8</sup>, Galvarino Casanueva-Yáñez<sup>9</sup>

### Abstract

*The purpose of this study is to investigate the main currents of the new administrative paradigms in the digital environment and their influence on the understanding and internalization of renewed management strategies in today's organizations. The specialized bibliographic research is articulated around three central axes: (a) Idea of paradigm according to the stages of knowledge (b) Idea of paradigm according to the development of administrative thought (c) Paradigmatic currents of administrative practices originated and generated in the digital era. The methodological design is aligned with the attributes of a Documented Reflection, being a referential work that uses bibliographic review, hermeneutics and the experience of the researcher as techniques. The results highlight that the nascent administrative paradigms are distinguished by their greater adaptability, horizontality and centrality in people. It was determined that the primary difference between classical administrative paradigms and those founded in the digital age lies in their notion of structure. That is, while conventional organizations tend to have hierarchical and centralized structures with defined levels of authority and responsibility, digital organizations adopt flatter and decentralized structures, driving agile decision-making and organizational flexibility.*

**Keywords:** Paradigm, Administration, Transformation and Digital Era.

### Introduction

The relentless wave of the digital age has metamorphosed the operational innards of organizations, catapulting them into a relentless dance of adaptation and innovation. The venerable pillars of traditional administration, erected on the stony hierarchy and procedural standardization, are tottering before the onslaught of new currents of management and leadership, propelled by the dizzying technological march and the constant metamorphosis of commercial and labor expectations (Luque et. al., 2018; Rodríguez, Et. Al., 2020; Díaz de Cerio,

<sup>1</sup> Universidad Superior de Guadalajara, México. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4472-7642> Correo:

[Arciapedro30@gmail.com](mailto:Arciapedro30@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup> Universidad de Las Américas, Chile. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5926-8456> Correo: [mauricio.garcia1266@gmail.com](mailto:mauricio.garcia1266@gmail.com)

<sup>3</sup> Universidad Privada San Juan Bautista, Escuela Profesional de Turismo, Hotelería y Gastronomía, Lima, Perú.

<sup>4</sup> Universidad de Huánuco (UDH) ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7194-2415> Correo: [alborada-00@hotmail.com](mailto:alborada-00@hotmail.com)

<sup>5</sup> Universidad Nacional Autónoma Altoandina, Tarma, Perú.

<sup>6</sup> Universidad Tecnológica del Perú, Lima, Perú ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-9050-4702> Correo: [waiki1966@yahoo.es](mailto:waiki1966@yahoo.es)

<sup>7</sup> Universidad César Vallejo Tarapoto, Escuela de Posgrado, Perú <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9032-7821>

[pbarbozaz@ucvvirtual.edu.pe](mailto:pbarbozaz@ucvvirtual.edu.pe)

<sup>8</sup> Universidad César Vallejo, Lima, Perú <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2031-9495>

<sup>9</sup> Facultad de Ingeniería y Negocios Universidad de Las Américas, Sede Providencia, Manuel Montt 948, Santiago, Chile



2019).

However, the advent of disruptive technologies – artificial intelligence that emulates cognition, big data that unveils hidden patterns, the Internet of Things that connects the physical world, and automation that redefines the workforce – has given birth to unprecedented administrative approaches. These emerging paradigms embrace agility as a mantra, flexibility as a strategy, and lightning responsiveness as a weapon to navigate the turbulent currents of the environment (Calderón et. al., 2017). Far from being mere modifications of existing practices, these new models breathe a culture of perpetual innovation and malleable organizational learning (Estrada, Et. al., 2019).

In this context, the present exploration ventures into the intricate labyrinth of administrative paradigms that emerge in the era of digital transformation, where it is necessary to unravel the cardinal trends, exemplary practices and intrinsic challenges that accompany their implementation. Through a deep dive into the specialized literature, a lucid understanding of how organizations can not only survive, but also thrive in an increasingly digitized universe was achieved (Ramírez & Ordóñez, 2019).

To clear this path, it is necessary, in the first place, to elucidate the very essence of the concept of "paradigm" and to trace its historical evolution. In Kuhn's seminal work, "The Structure of Scientific Revolutions" (1992), the notion of paradigm is enshrined as a coherent network of concepts that configure the lens through which scientists perceive their field of study (Martínez, 1997: 58). However, the author himself warns that the scope of the term transcends the borders of each scientific discipline, permeating the totality of science and its rationality, demanding a more holistic understanding than initially postulated. Indeed, for this perceptive philosopher, every generalized cognitive structure, every way of apprehending reality within a specific community or society, germinates from an underlying epistemic matrix.

Under this integrative perspective, and considering the totality to which Martínez (Ob. Cit.) alludes, the researcher, from his own intellectual imprint, proposes the following roadmap for this work: (a) Idea of paradigm according to the stages of knowledge; (b) Management schools and their paradigm approach; and (c) Paradigmatic currents of administrative practices originated and generated in the digital age.

### **Idea of Paradigm According to the Stages of Knowledge**

Since time immemorial, the definition of "paradigm" has represented an epistemological knot, keeping the disciplines in constant dispute. In this sense, this exploration addresses the concept in a double aspect: (a) its genesis and evolution through the ages of knowledge, standing as the original source of its conceptual development to the present day; and (b) his trajectory within administrative thought, an instrumental discipline that is the backbone of this collaboration and whose roots extend back to the eighteenth century (Kuhn, 1992; Martínez, 1997).

Regarding the first aspect, the authors place the ages in the conceptual framework supported by San Segundo (1996) who argues that: "the problem of the classification of knowledge and scientific knowledge arose from man's need to systematize all knowledge about the external world and about the process of knowledge" (p. 25). Moreover, the authors of this work start from their experience and from the exhaustive review of the work carried out to describe this externalization from its interpretative imprint.

Thus, the history of education relates that the different ages of knowledge have sedimented a

significant weight, far from promoting a uniform conceptual dialectic, they have widened the gap that, today more than ever, distances the subject from the chimera of absolute truth. Thus, the transition from myth to logos, characteristic of the Ancient Age, impregnates the paradigm with a mythological vision where ways of life and social participation were articulated through a polytheistic explanation, with divinities dictating the rules of creation and coexistence. Those who inquired into these mysteries called themselves philosophers. At this stage, the dominant paradigm was based on mythology, religion and philosophy. Civilizations such as the Egyptians, Greeks and Romans wove their understanding of the cosmos through myths and sacred stories. Greek philosophy, with figures such as Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, also sculpted systems of thought based on reason and logic, configuring a paradigm that fused supernatural elements with rational principles. However, access to education and knowledge remained forbidden to the majority, reserving for powerful men, while women were assigned the domestic spheres.

Subsequently, the Middle Ages transcended the mythological conception of the paradigm, inscribing it in the sphere of the divine. During this era, the understanding of the world and existence was based on a single power, monopolized not by philosophers, but by saints, who held the explanation of creation. The theocentric paradigm dominated this period, with Christianity exerting an all-encompassing influence on life and thought. The Catholic Church held considerable power, and knowledge was anchored in faith and religious doctrine. Medieval monasteries and universities emerged as the main centers of learning, with a primary focus on theology and religious philosophy. This paradigm was characterized by a hierarchical view of the universe, with divinity at the top. As in ancient times, access to knowledge continued to be a male privilege.

This panorama lasted until the emergence of the biological conception of existence and, consequently, of the paradigm of the Modern Age. At this crucial moment, the classical approach to science emerged as hegemonic, establishing itself as the exclusive source for the generation of knowledge, displacing myth and divinity through rigorous inquiry into the rational explanation of existence. As a corollary, disciplines emanating from the hard, pure, and natural sciences proliferated (López Llano, 2012). It is crucial to note that the Modern Age, from the Renaissance to the eighteenth century, gave a significant nuance towards a more humanistic and rational paradigm. The Renaissance revitalized classical knowledge and revalued human beings and their abilities. The Scientific Revolution, with figures such as Copernicus, Galileo and Newton, promoted a paradigm based on empirical observation and the scientific method. The Enlightenment, with its emphasis on reason, logic, and progress, also marked this era, where science and philosophy began to challenge religious explanations of the world.

The Postmodern Age, emerging in the mid-twentieth century, is characterized by a radical critique of established paradigms, especially the rationalism and objectivism of modernity. At this time, the notion of absolute truths is questioned, promoting relativism and diversity of perspectives. Postmodern paradigms are fragmentary and decentralized, calling into question the great narratives that dominated modernity. Instead of looking for a single explanation, multiple interpretations are valued and the importance of context and subjectivity is underlined, accepting the production of knowledge through the human, soft and social sciences (Lema, 2018). In short, the current taxonomy of the sciences represents a convenient prerogative in research, imbricated in the integration of the degree of scientificity of various disciplines to satisfy the research canons of the scientific and social community, opening the "epistemological cage" so that every researcher is recognized as a source of information and discoveries in the ethical debate of scientific research. where technology and the media play a crucial role, and knowledge is

conceived as a dynamic social construction (Arcia & Reyes, 2020).

In this intricate historical evolution of the concept of paradigm, a new horizon of exploration is glimpsed in the emerging literature. The "ecology of knowledge", a concept coined by Boaventura de Sousa Santos, postulates the need to transcend the hegemony of the modern scientific paradigm and recognize the validity of other modes of knowledge, historically subjugated or invisible. This perspective invites a horizontal dialogue between different ways of knowing – ancestral knowledge, popular wisdoms, subjective experiences – enriching the understanding of the world and challenging the simplistic dichotomies between "science" and "non-science". Future research on the "Idea of paradigm according to the stages of knowledge" should, therefore, delve into this promising line, exploring how the integration of various epistemologies can offer a richer and more complex vision of the construction of knowledge throughout history and its impact on the configuration of contemporary administrative paradigms.

### Management Schools and Their Paradigm Approach

The study focuses on administrative sciences, with a focus on the discipline of management defined by Rivas (2024): "as a scientific discipline, it is a set of accumulated theories that produces knowledge, concepts, and principles that are related to each other, and that provide the strategies and techniques for the rationalization of resources in industrial organizations" (p. 2). Similarly, González (2024) states that management as a technique "is the process of planning, organizing, directing, and controlling the human, material, and financial resources of an organization to achieve specific objectives" (p. 1).

From this conceptual argument, it is necessary to understand the conception of paradigm through the evolution of *administrative thought*, taking as a reference the industrial revolution, which meant the establishment of the bases to speak today of a general theory of management. In addition to this, the review of specialized theoretical resources allows us to define the administrative paradigm as the set of theories, beliefs, methodologies and practices that guide the way in which management is understood, taught and practiced in organizations. An administrative paradigm establishes a dominant perspective on how organizations should be managed, including decision-making, planning, organizing, leadership, and control.

Now, it is necessary to elucidate that talking today about administrative paradigms and the historical significance that has been attributed to them, both synchronously and diachronically, implies making a journey, yes and just because, of the evolution of administrative, managerial, humanistic, systemic and contingency thought over time, since, in each school, theory or approach, The conception of paradigm has been signified in divergent ways, attending of course to a cultural, political, social and progressive moment that occupied the environment of the development of nations at that time.

To do this, we must go back to the beginning of the eighteenth century, in which two researchers, one named Frederick Tylor and the other Henry Fayol, without even knowing each other, located in different parts of the planet, developed the first postulates that later became what is now known as the *General Theory of Management*, and that manifested the first concepts and ideas, of management, organization, administrative process, communication within organizations and leadership; among other topics.

However, it is worth asking the following questions: What motivated these researchers to express these initial postulates? Did something happen that triggered the attempts of this

literature in a formal way? For both questions, the same answer corresponds, since, indeed; it was not by magic that the aforementioned researchers created *the Scientific Theory of Management*, recognized years later, as the Theory of Modern Management; but a worldwide phenomenon took place that gave way to technology and everything that is known about it today, which gave a new meaning to work. to development and the business process. Yes, gentlemen, the first steam engine is invented and with it the *industrial revolution* is explained as a new scheme of progress. The Industrial Revolution was a period of profound change in the economy, technology, and society, which began in Britain in the late 18th century and spread to other parts of the world in the 19th and 20th centuries. This process transformed agrarian and artisanal societies into industrialized and urbanized economies.

With this, there also began an accelerated growth of companies that began to operate irregularly because they did not have theories and approaches on how to manage them and this, in my opinion, would be the origin of management and what became the main concern of the aforementioned authors to write their postulates, which as mentioned, and paraphrasing Reyes (2011), it was called Scientific Theory of Management, whose paradigmatic vision emphasized the massive exploitation of workers, regardless of their physical and mental exhaustion in time intervals. It was considered the school of mechanistic management, dehumanized, interested in production and efficiency, where human talent was not important and formed interest in the background, which led to the use of concepts that defined a first linear and non-complex administrative process, measured in times and movements; a null communication that did not consider the needs of the low-level labor sectors and a totally autocratic exercise of leadership, because what was relevant here was to produce and nothing else.

However, as everything on our planet evolves and technological progress cannot be stopped, other critical researchers of this first school appear who begin to germinate new elements on these postulates to give rise to a second school, known as the *Humanistic Administration*, whose maximum representative was Elton Mayo, supported by extraordinary collaborators of the stature of Abraham Maslow. These scholars, in an eclectic way, respecting and taking advantage of the achievements of the previous school, and criticizing those that are not relevant, revolutionize administrative and organizational thinking by clarifying that it is not production and efficiency that are the most important things in industries, but human resources, without whose talent companies could not operate. Dialogically, it is inferred then that the humanistic paradigm of management consisted of organizations not existing without people, and for them to be productive, the needs of their workers must be kept satisfied, because, if equipment or machinery is damaged, they can be repaired or replaced, however, this cannot be done with people. his performance and his intellectual talent.

Moreover, from this approach, new meanings are given to the topics of leadership, communication and modern organization. The first is seen under a democratic and participatory style that is inclusive of the workforce and its concerns for excellence. Communication is no longer null and strictly formal, to give way to informal relationships as a means of recognizing that rest, recreation and properly coordinated informality added value to interpersonal relationships and the work of companies. For its part, modern organization ceased to be seen as mechanical and automaton, to be understood as social contexts of people.

In these first two schools it can be seen how the perception of paradigm takes on different meanings; but like the mechanistic approach, this school was the product of criticisms that forced a reconsideration of its postulates; since, focusing its essence on both people and their needs, it

emphasized the concept of informality that is excessively toxic for any organization. since in some way, elements such as absenteeism, laziness, prolonged rest, among other circumstances, were justified, and on the basis of these criticisms, the ***Systematic School of Administration appears***, whose maximum representative is Ludwig Von Bertalanffy, in which the best of the previous approaches was also taken in an eclectic way, and its paradigmatic essence consisted of systematizing the internal and external processes of organizations, without running the risk of mechanizing man, but neither of exceeding their needs for humanization. Then, the "Managerial Systematization" appears, which emphasizes control as a permanent and necessary process and instrument to maximize the performance of Modern organizations.

However, the main criticism of this school was precisely the emphasis placed on control, since, in fact, everything began to be controlled: processes, people, time, movements, production, to the point of ignoring automation and with it, reporting a new mechanistic and classical school that was more interested in production than in employees. In this line, the administrative process was understood as inflexible and controlled, leadership and communication were defined as chains of command in which the interaction was more between man and machine, than man and man, worker and boss. However, despite the criticisms, it is in this school that the digital society takes place, supported by information and communication technologies, which continues and will continue to be functional today. In this regard, Angulo (2011) defines the information society as an ideology based on the mental frameworks of progress, growth and modernity, developed from the eighteenth century onwards, based on different trends and changes, both scientific and technological, largely driven by innovation.

In addition to this, the fourth school of administration is referred to, known as ***the Contingency School or School based on the Study of Situations***. There are many authors who defend this school: Collins (2010), García (2011), Koontz (2010) Krygier (2011), Londoño (2012), among others. He also relied on eclecticism to value and take advantage of positive aspects of the previous approaches, and under this recognition he focused his essence on the fact that management and the way of leading does not deny the applicability of all the previous approaches despite their criticisms, and states that leading groups must resort to the nature of the situation that arises. that is, it is necessary to mechanize (scientific school); it is necessary to humanize (humanistic approach), it is necessary to control and automate (systematic schooling), according to the characteristics of the situation that arises in the daily life of social organizations.

Now, this evolutionary deconstruction of administrative thought is sustained from the beginning of the eighteenth century to the end of the twentieth century, a period in which all knowledge and knowledge was validated through the epistemological current of positivism, which is a product of the accumulated heritage of Western philosophy, and therefore, is inscribed in what is known as the modern age of knowledge. However, it would be inopportune to reflect on administrative thought, only in the modern age, if it is an irrefutable fact, that postmodernity, that which studies what lies beyond modernity, that which explores new ways of generating knowledge and knowledge detached from the fragmentary and fragmentary approach of positivism, already has enough to go in the twenty-first century. making room for the soft, social and human sciences as a context in which knowledge is generated, accepted and validated that is not necessarily absolute truths, that cannot necessarily be demonstrated mathematically or through the scientific method.

Thus, it signifies ***postmodern administration***, from the post-positivist epistemological currents, all with the purpose of interpreting, from an ontological and axiological context, the postmodern

paradigm of administration in the digital age characterized by a break with traditional approaches and an emphasis on flexibility, diversity, innovation and adaptation to rapid change. This paradigm recognizes the complexity and interconnectedness of the modern world, leveraging digital technologies to transform management and organizational structures. Among its elements are: (a) tendency of organizations to be flatter based on decentralization and reduction of hierarchies to promote participation; (b) emphasis on flexibility and adaptability through the adoption of agile structures; (c) focus on diversity and inclusion that recognizes the variety of perspectives to create and decision-making; (d) technology and digitalization as a crucial driver for innovation and efficiency; (e) interconnection and networks to promote strategic alliances and innovation ecosystems; (f) ethics and social responsibility with a focus on sustainability and ethics; among others.

### **Paradigmatic Currents of Administrative Practices Originated and Generated in the Digital Era.**

This study is anchored in the domain of administrative sciences, focusing on the discipline of management, defined by Rivas (2024) as: "an accumulated body of theories that engenders interrelated knowledge, concepts, and principles, providing the strategies and techniques for the optimization of resources in industrial organizations" (p. 2). In line with this, González (2024) postulates that administration, in its technical facet, "is the process of planning, organizing, directing, and controlling the human, material, and financial resources of an entity for the achievement of specific goals" (p. 1).

Starting from this conceptual foundation, it is imperative to understand the genesis of the paradigm through the evolution of administrative thought, taking the Industrial Revolution as a referential milestone, the crucible that laid the foundations for the current general theory of management. In addition, the review of the specialized literature allows us to delimit the administrative paradigm as the compendium of theories, beliefs, methodologies and practices that inform the understanding, teaching and exercise of management in organizations. An administrative paradigm establishes a dominant perspective on organizational management, encompassing decision-making, planning, organization, leadership, and control.

However, to discuss contemporary administrative paradigms and the historical significance that has been conferred on them, both synchronically and diachronically, inevitably requires a journey through the trajectory of administrative, managerial, humanistic, systemic and contingency thought over time. In each school, theory or approach, the conception of paradigm has been interpreted in divergent ways, attending, of course, to the cultural, political, social and progressive context that enveloped the development of nations at that time.

For this task, it is necessary to go back to the dawn of the eighteenth century, where two researchers, Frederick Taylor and Henry Fayol, without even knowing each other and located in opposite confines of the planet, articulated the original postulates that, over time, would crystallize in the General Theory of Management, outlining the first concepts and ideas about management, organization, the administrative process, intra-organizational communication and leadership, among other foundational topics.

However, the following questions should be asked: What prompted these pioneers to realize such initial postulates? Did a momentous event formally catalyze these literary endeavors? For both questions, the answer converges on the same point: it was not a spontaneous generation that gave birth to the Scientific Theory of Management, recognized years later as the Theory of

Modern Management; but a phenomenon of global scope, the invention of the first steam engine and the consequent Industrial Revolution, burst forth as a new paradigm of progress, redefining the meaning of work, development and the business process. The Industrial Revolution, a period of profound transformation in the economy, technology and society, which germinated in Britain at the end of the eighteenth century and spread throughout the world in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, metamorphosed agrarian and artisanal societies into industrialized and urbanized economies.

With this advent, an exponential growth of companies was unleashed that began to operate in a chaotic manner in the absence of theories and approaches to their management. This, in the author's opinion, constitutes the genesis of management and the primary concern that motivated the aforementioned authors to express their postulates, which, as mentioned and paraphrasing Reyes (2011), was called Scientific Theory of Management. His paradigmatic vision emphasized the massive exploitation of workers, neglecting their physical and mental exhaustion in long working hours. It was considered the mechanistic and dehumanized school of administration, focused on production and efficiency, relegating human talent to the background, which led to the implementation of a linear and simplistic administrative process, measured in times and movements; non-existent communication that ignored the needs of the lower levels; and an exercise of autocratic leadership, where production was the only imperative.

However, the inherent evolution of our planet and the unstoppable technological advance led to the emergence of critical researchers of this first school, who began to sow new elements on these postulates, giving rise to the second school, known as the Humanistic Administration, whose greatest exponent was Elton Mayo, supported by collaborators of the stature of Abraham Maslow. These scholars, adopting an eclectic perspective, respecting and building on the achievements of the preceding school and criticizing its less pertinent aspects, revolutionized administrative and organizational thinking, emphasizing that human resources, and not production and efficiency, constituted the most valuable asset of industries, without whose talent companies could not operate. In support of this argument, it should be noted that the humanistic paradigm of management postulated that organizations cannot survive without people and that, in order to achieve productivity, it is imperative to meet the needs of their workers. While broken equipment or machinery can be repaired or replaced, people's performance and intellectual talent are irreplaceable.

From this approach, the concepts of leadership, communication and modern organization were redefined. Leadership was conceived under a democratic and participatory style, inclusive of the workforce and their concerns. Communication transcended its formal rigidity to give way to informal relationships as a means of recognizing the added value of rest, recreation and properly coordinated informality in interpersonal and work relationships. For its part, the modern organization ceased to be perceived as a mechanical automaton to be understood as a social network of individuals.

In these first two schools, it is evident how the perception of paradigm acquires dissimilar meanings. However, like the mechanistic approach, this school was the object of criticism that demanded a reconsideration of its postulates. The excessive centralization of people and their needs emphasized the concept of informality, which is too harmful to any organization, justifying elements such as absenteeism from work and laziness. On the basis of these criticisms emerged the Systematic School of Management, whose highest representative was Ludwig von Bertalanffy, who also adopted an eclectic perspective, taking the best of the previous approaches.



Its paradigmatic essence consisted of systematizing the internal and external processes of organizations, avoiding both the mechanization of man and the exacerbation of his needs for humanization. "Managerial Systematization" then emerges, which emphasizes control as a permanent and necessary process and instrument to maximize the performance of modern organizations.

However, the main criticism of this school lay precisely in the excessive emphasis on control, which led to the exhaustive control of processes, people, time, movements and production, to the point of promoting automation and, with it, the resurgence of a new mechanistic and classical school more interested in production than in employees. In this line, the administrative process was conceived as inflexible and controlled, and leadership and communication were defined as chains of command where the predominant interaction was between man and machine, rather than between man and man or worker-boss. However, despite the criticisms, it is in this school that the digital society takes place, based on information and communication technologies, which continues and will continue to be functional today (Angulo, 2011).

In addition to this, the fourth school of administration is presented, known as the Contingency School or School Based on the Study of Situations, defended by authors such as Collins (2010), García (2011), Koontz (2010), Krygier (2011) and Londoño (2012), among others. This school also relied on eclecticism to value and take advantage of positive aspects of the previous approaches, focusing its essence on the fact that management and leadership do not deny the applicability of all previous approaches despite their criticisms, and propose that group management should resort to the nature of the situation that arises. That is, according to the characteristics of the organizational context, it must be mechanized (scientific school), humanized (humanistic approach) or controlled and automated (systematic school).

However, this evolutionary deconstruction of administrative thought, which spans from the beginning of the eighteenth century to the end of the twentieth century, is based on the epistemological current of positivism, a product of the accumulated heritage of Western philosophy and inscribed in the Modern Age of knowledge. However, it would be incomplete to reflect on administrative thought limiting ourselves only to the Modern Age, given the irrefutable fact that Postmodernity, that which explores what transcends modernity, that which investigates new ways of generating knowledge and knowledge detached from the fragmentary and fragmentary approach of positivism, already has a significant trajectory in the twenty-first century. making room for the soft, social and human sciences as the context where knowledge is generated, accepted and validated that is not necessarily absolute truths or susceptible to mathematical demonstration or through the scientific method (Lema, 2018; Arcia & Reyes, 2020).

At this point, it is pertinent to signify postmodern management from the perspective of postpositivist epistemological currents, with the purpose of interpreting, from an ontological and axiological context, the postmodern paradigm of management in the digital age, characterized by a break with traditional approaches and an emphasis on flexibility, diversity, innovation, and adaptation to rapid change. This paradigm recognizes the complexity and interconnectedness of the modern world, leveraging digital technologies to transform management and organizational structures. Among its elements are: (a) the trend towards flatter organizations based on decentralization and the reduction of hierarchies to promote participation; (b) the emphasis on flexibility and adaptability through the adoption of agile structures; (c) the focus on diversity and inclusion that recognizes the variety of perspectives for decision-making and decision-

making; (d) technology and digitalization as a crucial driver for innovation and efficiency; (e) interconnection and networks to promote strategic alliances and innovation ecosystems; and (f) ethics and social responsibility with a focus on sustainability (Quinaluisa, Et. al., 2023).

However, in order to postulate the new contribution to knowledge, the exhaustive review of the evolution of administrative thought reveals a trajectory marked by adaptation to the socioeconomic and technological contexts of each era. However, the emergence of the digital age, with its unprecedented speed, complexity, and interconnectedness, has exposed the obsolescence of many of the paradigmatic pillars that underpinned management during the Industrial Revolution and subsequent schools of thought, including those that attempted to humanize or systematize processes. The rigidity of hierarchical structures, the slowness of bureaucratic processes and resistance to change, characteristics of traditional paradigms, stand as burdens in an environment where agility, flexibility, constant innovation and customer centricity (Díaz de Cerio, 2019) are imperative for survival and success.

Emerging paradigms, with their emphasis on decentralization, collaboration, technology as a strategic linchpin, and sustainability as a core value, are not mere adaptations, but an essential recast of the way we conceive and practice administration in the twenty-first century. The current literature, by exploring postmodern management and the ecology of knowledge, begins to outline a future where artificial intelligence (The researcher with support in the literature review, 2024), predictive analytics (Arcia & Reyes, 2020) and ethical management (Quinaluisa, Et. al., 2023) converge to build more resilient, innovative and socially responsible organizations. leaving behind definitively the limitations of an administrative thought anchored in an analogical world.

## **Methodology**

This paper adopts the nature of a Documented Reflection, understood by Valderrama (2010) as an analysis, reflection and discussion of ideas on a topic lacking methodical scientific studies and traditional quantitative data. In addition, this written collaboration is characterized by being a referential work, a research dedicated to the compilation of specific bibliographic information on the topic in question.

To obtain information, a bibliographic review and the researcher's personal experience were used, complemented by the technique of testimonial narrative. The analysis of the information was carried out through hermeneutics, continuous reflection, discourse analysis and the author-date citation system. The methodological design was organized in the following stages: (1) Presentation of the topic by the researcher, based on his/her narrative and experience; (2) Review and selection of relevant theoretical topics; (3) Compilation of the selected documentary material (theoretical foundation), interpreted hermeneutically by the researcher in relation to the central theme and objective of the writing; (4) Detailed description of the methodological protocol used; (5) Presentation of the findings found; and (6) Argumentation of the final conclusions of the work. This methodological approach allows the topic to be explored from an informed and reflective perspective, despite the absence of traditional empirical data, offering a deep and articulated understanding of the issue at hand.

## **Finds**

In the present research, the insights reached are descriptive and interpretative in nature, based on the exhaustive bibliographic review that supported the construction of the state of the art. Firstly, it is revealed that the emergence of the digital age imposes an essential recasting of

conventional administrative pillars. Indeed, past management archetypes, anchored in hierarchy, bureaucracy and centralization of control, show a growing ineptitude to face the demands inherent in the digital ecosystem. Among the factors underlying this phenomenon, the speed, complexity and intricate interconnection of the digital environment stand out, which demand new architectures of thought and action, where agility, adaptability and collaboration stand as the epicenter and cardinal guideline of organizations.

A second finding of significant relevance lies in the observation that the nascent administrative paradigms are distinguished by an accentuated flexibility, a marked horizontality and a centrality in the human factor. In the context of the digital age, organizations must imperatively cultivate greater plasticity and adaptability to respond quickly to market fluctuations. This entails the adoption of flatter organizational frameworks, where communication and synergy flow unhindered between the various strata. Additionally, it becomes essential to focus attention on people, valuing their talent, creativity and initiative as strategic assets.

In close dialogue with the above, technology emerges as a transcendental vector in the metamorphosis of administrative paradigms. Specifically, artificial intelligence, big data, cloud computing, and social media are catalyzing the genesis of unprecedented opportunities for companies to innovate and optimize their operational processes. However, the importance of using these technological tools strategically and with a deep sense of responsibility, in coherence with the founding values and strategic objectives of the organization, is underlined.

An additional finding that deserves attention focuses on the growing importance of ethics and sustainability as constitutive elements of new administrative paradigms. The digital age, while offering countless advantages, also poses challenges in terms of data privacy, cybersecurity, and the environmental impact of technologies. Consequently, organizations looking to thrive in this new environment must integrate sound ethical principles into their decision-making and adopt sustainable business practices that minimize their ecological footprint and contribute positively to society. This commitment to corporate social responsibility is not only imperative from a moral perspective, but is also becoming a key differentiator in attracting and retaining talent, as well as building the trust of customers and stakeholders.

Finally, it is found that the organizational culture undergoes a substantial transformation under the influence of emerging administrative paradigms. Traditional hierarchical rigidity gives way to work environments that encourage autonomy, experimentation, and continuous learning. Interdisciplinary collaboration and open communication become fundamental pillars for innovation and the resolution of complex problems. Likewise, the adoption of a digital mindset, which values adaptability, curiosity and willingness to change, stands as a critical factor for success in the digital age. Organizations that succeed in cultivating an agile, learning-centric culture are better equipped to navigate uncertainty and capitalize on the opportunities presented by the dynamic digital environment.

Ultimately, scrutiny of emerging administrative paradigms stands as an imperative to apprehend and guide the transformation of organizations in the crucible of the digital age. Through rigorous research and insightful analysis, it is possible to unveil the new management models that are emerging and understand their intrinsic attributes, distinctive strengths, and potential weaknesses. This strategic intelligence empowers companies to formulate robust strategies that allow them to navigate the challenges of the digital environment and achieve a trajectory of sustained success.

## Conclusions

The literature exploration concludes that organizations that embrace malleable frameworks and agile methodologies exhibit a greater capacity to adapt to the dizzying mutations of the digital environment. Indeed, organizational agility enables a timely response to market demands and technological disruptions, translating into robust competitiveness and remarkable resilience to critical junctures.

The interweaving of cutting-edge technologies, such as artificial intelligence, big data, the Internet of Things (IoT), and cloud computing, has profoundly metamorphosed business operations and strategies. These technological advancements not only streamline operational processes and decrease costs, but also open up uncharted paths for new businesses and innovative operating models.

Fostering a culture of innovation stands as an imperative to maintain competitiveness in the digital melting pot. Open innovation practices, which include collaboration with startups, universities, and others, have proven effective in generating novel ideas and solutions. This synergy not only stimulates internal creativity, but also expands the capabilities and resources available to the company.

The literature review highlights a growing emphasis on corporate social responsibility and sustainability. Companies that integrate sustainable and ethical practices into their operations not only meet the demands of consumers and regulators, but also ensure their long-term viability. Social and environmental responsibility has established itself as an essential component of business strategy in the digital age, reflecting a growing awareness of the impact of business activities on the global ecosystem.

The emergence of the digital age has triggered a transformation in various domains of existence, including the way companies are managed and operated. In this new context, new administrative paradigms emerge that are distinguished by greater flexibility, horizontality and a people-centered approach. Organizations that adopt these new management models are in a more advantageous position to adapt to market fluctuations, stimulate innovation, and generate value in the digital age.

The primary distinction between traditional administrative paradigms and those cemented in the digital age lies in their structural conception. That is, while conventional organizations tend to exhibit hierarchical and centralized structures with clearly defined levels of authority and responsibility, digital organizations embrace flatter and decentralized architectures, promoting agile decision-making and intrinsic organizational flexibility.

## References

- Angulo, R. (2011). *Theory of Organization*. Spain.
- Arcia H., D. P. F., & Reyes, R. (2020). Social Research and Positivism: An Unfounded Epistemological Critique. *Consensus - Santiago*, 4(4), 03–22. Retrieved from <https://pragmatikasolutions.com/consensus/index.php/consensus/article/view/63>
- Calderón, J. L. G., Rozo, J. J. P., & Sandoval, J. A. P. (2017). Business intelligence and its role in organizational agility. *Criterio Libre*, 15(26), 239–258. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=6675988>
- Díaz de Cerio Escudero, J. L. (2019). Customer experience in the digital age. The new customer journey. <https://repositorio.comillas.edu/xmlui/handle/11531/27937>

- Estrada, G. C. T., Montero, J. M. C., Hernandez, Y. C. U., & Herrera, J. J. R. (2019). Technological innovation: Theoretical reflections. *Venezuelan Journal of Management*, 24(85).
- González García, A. (2024). Administration.
- M.E.G. The human sciences make us more human. Ecuador. IBERCIENCIA. Community of Educators for Scientific Culture (02/02/2018). Viewed in:  
<http://www.oei.es/historico/divulgacioncientifica/?Las-ciencias-humanas-nos-hacen-mas-humanos>
- López Llano, D. (2012). Classification of the sciences. Colombia. Retrieved from:  
<http://conceptosdelosocial.blogspot.CL/2012/04/Classification-of-Sciences.HTML>.
- Luque, F. V., Lozano, L. A. H., & Quiroz, A. F. B. (2018). Importance of digital marketing techniques. *RECIMUNDO: Revista Científica de la Investigación y el Conocimiento*, 2(1), 764-783.  
<https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=6732914>
- Martínez, M. (1997). The emerging paradigm. Towards a new theory of scientific rationality. Mexico: Trillas.
- Moreno Gomero, A. L. E. S. S. A. N. D. R. A. (2024). Human resources management and remote work.
- Plla, C. (2020). What is digital talent and how is it managed?, Blog <https://taktic.es/blog/que-es-el-talento-digital-y-como-se-gestionar/#:~:text=El%20talento%20digital%20es%20la,los%20miembros%20de%20la%20empresa>.
- Quinaluisa Morán, V. ., Flores Jaén, M. ., Recalde Aguilar, L. ., Merizalde Véliz, D. ., & Cadena Miranda, D. (2023). Social Responsibility in the Digital Age: An Analysis of the Impact of Social Media. *Revista Científica Referada Multidisciplinaria PENTACIENCIAS*, 5(6), 814–827.  
<https://doi.org/10.59169/pentaciencias.v5i6.893>
- Quinteros Flores, C., & Arcia Hernández, P. (2021). The Scientificity of Community Research in Latin America: Critical Perceptions of Researchers. *TECHNO REVIEW. International Journal of Technology, Science and Society*, 10(1), 33–47. <https://doi.org/10.37467/gka-revtechno.v10.2828>
- Ramírez, N. L., & Ordóñez, L. F. (2019). Maturity Model for Digital Transformation.  
[https://www.centrosdetransformaciondigital.gov.co/695/articles-78552\\_archivo\\_pdf](https://www.centrosdetransformaciondigital.gov.co/695/articles-78552_archivo_pdf).
- Rivas, L. (2024). Intertextuality of discourse in the development of scientific management theory. *Scientific journal FCES*, (6). Retrieved from  
<https://revistasacad.uasd.edu.do/index.php/rcfces/article/view/9>
- Rodríguez, K., Ortiz, O., Quiroz, A., & Parrales, M. (2020). E-commerce and MSMEs in times of Covid-19. *Revista espacios*, 41 (42), 100-118.
- San Segundo Manuel, R. (1996). Systems of Knowledge Organization: The Organization of Knowledge in Spanish Libraries.
- Téllez-Carvajal, E. (2017). Reflections on "digital citizenship". *DOXA Digital Magazine*, 7(13), 47-65.
- Valderrama, J. (2010). Preparation of an Article to be Published in the International Journal of University Training. [http://www.scielo.cl/scielo.php?script=sci\\_arttext&pid=S0718-50062010000100006](http://www.scielo.cl/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0718-50062010000100006).