



ELSEVIER



Available online at [www.sciencedirect.com](http://www.sciencedirect.com)

ScienceDirect

Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 191 (2015) 2112 – 2116

Procedia  
Social and Behavioral Sciences

WCES 2014

## Social Knowledge Management From The Social Responsibility Of The University For The Promotion Of Sustainable Development

Sergio González López<sup>a\*</sup>, J. Loreto Salvador Benítez y José María Aranda Sánchez

<sup>a</sup>*Instituto de Estudios sobre la Universidad (IESU), de la Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México.  
Dirección: Paseo Tollocan 1402 poniente, Cerro de Coatepec, CP 50100, Toluca, Estado de México, México.*

### Abstract

The aim is to present approaches on social knowledge management from the perspective of the social responsibility of the University to propose strategies aimed at the promotion of sustainable local development. The social management of the knowledge (GSC) should be one of the central functions of the institutions of education (IE), because the attribute work with and on the knowledge is precisely the reason to be and what distinguishes them from other forms of social organization. The development of cognitive abilities, the search for novel approach problems, participation in the resolution of social problems, the development of collective forms of work and, in a word, become agencies that manage knowledge responsibly is probably one of the ways that has been lost in the IE for internal and external reasons. In the first sense, dominated two options in dispute: the pursuit of knowledge in itself or knowledge subject to results. On the outside, between the subordination to a technical job market and contribution to innovations that meet probable social background. The above, recognizing that around knowledge of power for personal interest reasons and/or group, confrontations occur on political and economic affairs. But, in sum, these disputes in societies like ours - underdeveloped and lagging - in knowledge may be a veil to not move in directions that combine knowledge with problem solving through responsible for knowledge management forms.

© 2015 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Selection and peer-review under responsibility of the Organizing Committee of WCES 2014

*Keywords:* University social responsibility; social management of knowledge; environment; sustainable development; underdeveloped

### 1. Introduction

The significant social, economic and environmental global, and sharpness deterioration in underdeveloped

\* Sergio González López. Tel.: +2.222.222.2222.  
E-mail address: [sergiogonlop2@yahoo.com.mx](mailto:sergiogonlop2@yahoo.com.mx)

countries, our educational institutions like universities have played a role, partial and insufficient to deal with it, both on the cognitive as in practical action. The need for this University participation is fundamental to taking into consideration the marked inequality of the social structure of our countries. Where, few are relatively people who are able to access training at this educational level and, precisely for that reason, the responsibility should acquire is greater. To moving toward a more committed position involves the search for new knowledge schemes that sustenance it as the definition of priority areas of action. One of the conceptual frameworks and possible action, and that is assumed for this work, is that of environmental social responsibility linked to the social management of the knowledge. This work has one purpose: highlight the importance that the University take a more active role in the construction of the territories based on proposals for development of sustainable spaces.

## 2. The social knowledge management

On the management of knowledge there are two major aspects: one which refers to the management of knowledge in general and another that particularizes into its social character. This second is still emerging in comparison with the first located it's recognized, but we want to highlight it by acknowledging him greater identification to educational institutions. Looking for recent references on the GSC on the internet (<http://redalyc.uaemex.mx>) the first interesting finding is that those relating to the management of knowledge (GC), which although they also recognize the importance of knowledge and that it's complex organizational processes, do not have as main reference to universities or to social and governmental organizations, but companies or research centers predominate. This situation quantitative Bibliometrics found, without doubt also influences the confusion and applicability among both GSC and CG, unmarked emphasis on differences of purposes including for existence to consult only the first references regarding the hundreds, thousands or millions offered by the internet. On GC there is a homogeneous or clearly predominant position, they coexist different approaches. Even (Barragán, 2009: 74 and 75) proposes a **taxonomy** on models of knowledge management that revisits the classifications proposed by MacAdam and MacCreedy, Rodriguez, and Kakadabse and others, but adds the category of models holistic knowledge (Barragán, 2009:74). Based on the characteristics of the context which analyzes, designs and applies the GC, Barragan distinguishes five models: conceptual, theoretical and philosophical knowledge management, seeking the basis of theoretical and conceptual; Cognitive and intellectual capital of knowledge management, seeking to explain the causal mechanisms that allow to optimize the use of knowledge through a cause and effect relationship; Networking social and management of knowledge, which purport to explain how it is acquired, transferred, exchanged, and generates knowledge on the basis of the social processes and organizational learning; Science and technology of knowledge management, which aims to promote the research and development as well as the use of ICT; Models holistic knowledge management, includes models not seen in previous models and integrates new sub-disciplines. Perez and Dressler (2007) considered that the definition of Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) on the GC is one of the most widespread and which constitutes a relevant source of current proposals, and consists of ' the company **capacity** ' to create new knowledge, disseminate it in the Organization, and incorporate it into products, services and systems. Also mention that this "definition to imply that the GC integrates a complex range of activities ranging from creation or acquisition, structuring, transformation and transfer of knowledge to its storage and incorporation into all processes of the Organization". (Perez and Dressler, 2007:39). In the first sense, according to González and Joyanes (2008:114) from studies of GC Yogesh Malhotra the correct design of the organizational conditions (spaces, practices, and initiatives) promotes synergies between the abilities of people to learn, create and improve processes with the ability to leverage the technology. For these same authors (2008:106) is a new paradigm of **management** that "aims to untangle the complexities of knowledge: its creation, accumulation, use and transfer, to maximize the growth and effectiveness of the organization." In other respects, to Nagles (2007:77), "it is a **logical process**, organized and systematic to produce, transfer and apply in situations concrete a harmonic combination of knowledge", as well as - returning to Davenport and Prusak, 2001-'experiences, values, contextual information and expert insights that provide a framework for its evaluation and incorporation of new experiences' and information the own Nagles also believes that the GC is a source of **innovation** for the organization because "enables the generation of actions and" decisions aimed at the achievement of sustainability, through the use in effective and productive form of their knowledge, experiences, capabilities and resources,"(Nagles, 2007:86). For its part, (González et al., 2009:224), the GC is considered as an **asset of business** usable by others because it is a factor key

to sustainable and competitive development of the organization. To recognize the GC as a complex process management, one of the central themes on different proposals for GC is are of **type organizational and application of tools**, in particular those concerning ICT in combination with human skills and capabilities. The GC is now permeated by the rapid development of new technologies to the new forms of organization. However the path between the two is not clear. On the one hand, developments have been treated separately with a little link between them, and on the other hand, have been confused both routes, assuming that almost automatically the incorporation of one is the other. On the GC he also emphasizes the human capital call, requiring a specialized training to be consistent with the use of the new organizational tools. The social management of the knowledge (GSC) has been predominantly addressed by authors that deal with social responsibility university (RSU). The Latin American case, stand three referents, which are the Manual on social responsibility of François Vallaeys and other authors<sup>[3]</sup>, the project Chilean "University builds country"<sup>[4]</sup>, and the proposal of the AUSJAL (Association of universities entrusted to the society of Jesus in Latin America)<sup>[5]</sup>. Three approaches to develop in a context of recognition between them, be developed in periods and geographical areas close, as per the understanding between the authors. Which makes them share many similarities, especially in highlighting the implications of the knowledge regarding the questioning epistemological, interdisciplinary and linked with social issues in a participatory manner. About University social responsibility (MSW), for all practical purposes is defined by Vallaeys based on the four impacts the organization generates in your environment, which can be grouped into four categories: social and organizational (common to any type of organization), and educational and cognitive (specific to academic institutions), (Vallaeys, 2009:11 and 12). Also, these impacts defines four axes of social responsibility at the University: Campus responsible; vocational training and citizenship; social participation; and social knowledge management. All these axes considers socially responsible management; for the first case, of the Organization and its institutional procedures; for the second, the academic training; for the third, the participation of the University in the community; and for the latter, the production and dissemination of knowledge. (Vallaeys, 2009:15-17) Then Vallaeys located the social knowledge management (GSC) as one of the four axes of the University social responsibility (MSW), and notes in particular:

The GSC "is *socially responsible management* of the production and dissemination of knowledge, research, and epistemological models promoted from the classroom. The objective is to guide the scientific activity via *consultation* of University research with external partners in order to articulate the knowledge production with local and national development agenda and the social programs of the public sector. It also involves knowledge-building processes to include the *participation* of other social actors and the *transdisciplinarity* (which is not equivalent to interdisciplinarity). The social responsibility of Science also means the task of *spreading widely and understandably* the processes and results of scientific activity to facilitate *exercise critical thinking citizen* on the same (social accessibility of knowledge) and social outreach that has for the *development of society*." (Vallaeys et al., 2009:17). However, there are also differences, especially in the corresponding to the deepening impact of the GSC. In order to perform the comparison between approaches, we propose five criteria: articulation of the knowledge management; instruments; participants; variables and applicability.

### 3. Environmental social responsibility

The Group of researchers incorporated in the Manifiesto por la Vida, identified that the prevailing scientific progress is linked to the traditional ideology of the economic progress that commodified and dominates nature, which impoverishes and fragments the ability to understand complex social and environmental problems. It discussed two alternative policies for Science: to remain the main tool of the market economy; or produce knowledge to improve social and environmental well-being. (Manifiesto por la Vida, 2002:3)

Understand the environmental social responsibility within the framework of the ethical call of the future and of the human rights of the third generation which, in general, we could consider has as main features: include the human relationships with other humans and non-humans, relationships are present and for the future, includes weekends as the actions needed to achieve them, (Cecchetto, 2007: 61-65). As we are located in the context of the ethics of sustainability, which requires the hybridization of knowledge, (Manifiesto por la Vida, 2002: 4).

The importance given to environmental issues and the recognition of its complexity, makes that Amartya Sen points to the required combination of approaches, including from the institutional and the formation of values in a wider

context. Where are insufficient in themselves "the creation of property rights in the field of environment, or in forbidding legal, or only taxes and subsidies. Nor is it, on the other hand, throwing Clarion calling for more environmental ethics as the only way towards sustainability." (Sen, 2003:8-9) This brings us to the ethics of sustainability which, according to the *Manifiesto por la Vida* (2002:4), refers to the ethics of knowledge oriented towards a new vision of the economy, society and human beings. This implies promoting knowledge strategies open to the hybridization of science and modern technology with the popular and local knowledge in a policy of multiculturalism and the dialogue of knowledges. Implicit in the environmental knowledge ethics retrieves the 'evaluative knowledge' and puts the knowledge of the plot of relations of power in knowledge. Where, the evaluative knowledge involves the recovery of the value of life and the reunion of ourselves as humans social and natural, in a world where prevailing greed, profit, arrogance, indifference and aggression, on the feelings of solidarity, compassion and understanding. It also involves a new knowledge can understand the complex interactions between society and nature. Environmental knowledge promoted the indissoluble bonds of an interconnected world of ecological, cultural, technological, economic and social processes. Environmental knowledge changes the perception of the world based on thinking unique and one-dimensional, which lies at the root of the environmental crisis, by a thought of complexity. This ethics promotes the construction of an environmental rationality founded in a new economy - moral, ecological and cultural - as a condition for establishing a new mode of production that make viable socially fair and environmentally sustainable life styles. (*Manifiesto por la Vida*, 2002:2) Demand a new social compact that is founded on a framework of basic agreements for the construction of sustainable societies which include new social relationships, modes of production and consumption patterns. These agreements should incorporate the diversity of cultural production and life styles; recognize the disagreement, assume conflict, identify absent of dialogue and include the excluded in this globalized world, bridging the gap between growth and distribution, between participation and marginalization, between what is desirable and possible." (*Manifiesto por la Vida*, 2002:5). It is also an ethic of being and time. It is the recognition of time differentiated from natural, economic, political, social and cultural processes: the life and time of ecological cycles, time which is incorporated into the being of things and the time that embodied in the life of human beings; the time that marks the rhythm of the natural history and social history; time forging processes, coined identities and triggers trends; the meeting of cultural time differential of the various social actors to generate queries, consensus and decisions within their own codes of ethics, their traditions and customs, (*Manifiesto por la Vida*, 2002:8).

#### 4. Conclusion

The forms of organization that we taking, could be key to advance knowledge and action. Then, it could be inferred that although it is pointed out by various authors that the territorial studies gives an area par excellence for disciplinary action in the problematization multi, inter and trans-disciplinary convergence, it seems that the steps being taken towards that direction needed to be strengthened through greater collaboration, which could well start by knowledge of other programs, discussion on the State of knowledge of the issues that are fundamental to us the search for integral forms of collaboration not displaying only aspects to link, but the Constitution of authentic communities that can work as the informal institutional advantages. That, not only is perhaps an adjustment or change of rules of a game, but a completely new game to which we are entering. University can be a social institution that promotes the construction of social spaces agreed to social and environmental sustainability. For this purpose, it has enough social acceptance, the intellectual and technical capacity and human resources to operate social projects. But this requires you to think of it as an active part of the project of society and which systematically incorporate into its members in relevant projects that contribute to the vocational training, the development of knowledge as the formulation of projects that offer alternative solutions to social and environmental problems. In this regard, the reflection upon the GSC for the MSW is a likely route for the purpose of an institution more committed to social and environmental sustainability.

#### References

- AUSJAL (2008), "Políticas e indicadores de responsabilidad social universitaria en AUSJAL", Documento Base-Borrador de trabajo. Versión 15 de junio de 2008 [www.ausjal.org/files/rsu.pdf](http://www.ausjal.org/files/rsu.pdf)
- Barragán Ocaña, Alejandro (2009), "Aproximación a una taxonomía de modelos de gestión del conocimiento", en *Intangible Capital*, Vol. 5,

- núm. 1, Intangible Capital, España, pp. 65-101.
- Cecchetto, Sergio. “¿Una ética de cara al futuro? Derechos humanos y responsabilidades de la generación presente a las generaciones por venir”, en *Andamios*, Vol. 3, núm. 6, junio, 2007, pp. 61-80.
- Equipo Coordinador “Universidad: Construye País” (2004), Observando la Responsabilidad Social Universitaria, Versión actualizada del documento de trabajo, julio. Fundación Iberoamericana del Conocimiento. <http://www.gestiondelconocimiento.com/index.php3>
- González López, Sergio y José María Aranda Sánchez (2010), “La participación de las universidades en el diseño de políticas urbano-ambientales, desde el enfoque de la responsabilidad social”. *Scripta Nova. Revista Electrónica de Geografía y Ciencias Sociales*. [En línea]. Barcelona: Universidad de Barcelona, 1 de agosto de 2010, vol. XIV, nº 331 (94). <<http://www.ub.es/geocrit/sn/sn-331/sn-331-94.htm>>. [ISSN: 1138-9788].
- González Quintero, Yady Isabelle; Joyanes Aguilar, Luis (2008), “Una propuesta para la profesionalización de la gestión del conocimiento en Colombia”, en *Universidad y Empresa*, vol. 7, núm. 15, julio-diciembre, Universidad del Rosario, Colombia, pp. 105-124.
- González, Alberto de J.; Joaquín, Carroll Z.; Collazos, César A. (2009), Karagabi Kmmodel: Modelo de referencia para la introducción de iniciativas de gestión del conocimiento en organizaciones basadas en conocimiento”, en *Ingeniare. Revista chilena de Ingeniería*, vol. 17, núm. 2, agosto, Universidad de Tarapacá, Chile, pp. 223-235.
- Manifiesto por la Vida. Por una Ética para la Sustentabilidad [En línea], Colombia, 2002 disponible en: ([http://www.taller.org.ar/Eco\\_educacion/MANIFIESTO\\_POR\\_LA\\_VIDA\\_FINAL.doc](http://www.taller.org.ar/Eco_educacion/MANIFIESTO_POR_LA_VIDA_FINAL.doc))
- Nagles G., Nofal (2007), “La gestión del conocimiento como fuente de innovación”, en *Revista EAN. Escuela de Administración de Negocios*, núm. 61, septiembre-diciembre, Universidad EAN, Colombia, pp. 77-87.
- Pérez, Daniel y Matthias Dressler (2007), “Tecnologías de la información para la gestión del conocimiento”, en *Intangible Capital*, año/vol. 3, núm. 1, enero-marzo, Intangible Capital, España, pp. 31-59.
- Sen, Amartya (2003). “¿Qué impacto puede tener la ética?” [En línea], *Reunión Internacional sobre “Ética y Desarrollo”*, Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo/Gobierno de Noruega, disponible en: <http://www.iadb.org/etica>, febrero de 2008.
- Vallaëys Francois, Cristina de la Cruz y Pedro M. Sasía (2009), *Responsabilidad social universitaria. Manual de primeros pasos*, México: BID y McGraw-Hill Interamericana, 2009. Se puede encontrar también en <http://www.scribd.com/doc/29487202/RSE-Manual-de-Responsabilidad-Social-Universitaria-RSU-BID>.