Research practices: an analysis from the epistemological horizon and theoretical corpus

AUTOR

Benjamín Barón-Velandia[1]
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4968-6336

Prácticas investigativas: un análisis desde el horizonte epistemológico y el corpus teórico

Abstract

The article analyzes an epistemological horizon, and a theoretical corpus composed of: Researcher training, Blended learning, Mode 3 of knowledge, Research practices, and Biographical trajectories of researchers that make up the scientific ecosystem of the Corporación Universitaria Minuto de Dios - UNIMINUTO as a contribution to the improvement of the routes of the formative processes of researchers, leading to Quality Education, gender equality and decent work. The analysis of the horizon and the theoretical corpus generates diverse ways of learning to investigate the processes of others for the improvement of their own. As results, the conceptual interactions that allow the recognition of qualitative changes between theories and practices to transform the realities of research training are evidenced.

Keywords: research training; blended learning; human capacities; Mode 3 knowledge; research practice, Biographical Trajectories

Resumen

El artículo analiza un horizonte epistemológico y un corpus teórico compuesto por: Formación de investigadores, Aprendizaje semipresencial, Modo 3 de conocimiento, Prácticas investigativas, y Trayectorias biográficas de investigadoras/es que conforman el ecosistema científico de la Corporación Universitaria Minuto de Dios – UNIMINUTO como aporte a la mejora de las rutas de los procesos formativos de las investigadoras, portando a la Educación de Calidad, la igualdad de género y al trabajo digno. El análisis del horizonte y del corpus teórico genera diversas formas de aprender a investigar de los procesos de otros para la mejora de los propios. Como resultados se evidencian las interacciones conceptuales que permiten el reconocimiento de los cambios cualitativos entre teorías y prácticas para transformar las realidades de la formación en investigación.

Palabras claves: formación de investigadores; aprendizaje semipresencial; Modo 3 de conocimiento; Prácticas Investigativas; trayectorias biográficas.

[1] Corporación Universitaria Minuto de Dios – UNIMINUTO. Colombia. bbaron@uniminuto.edu

1.-Introduction: Epistemic horizon

The epistemological perspective from which this article derives assumes a critical reading of the current context from which the positions and participants of the research emerge. It is a proposal that embodies the sentiments of the new research generations that reclaim places, their own spaces during the great scientific rationalities that have been empowered in a totalitarian way of the ways and means of producing knowledge (Cancino & Barón, 2024). The other ways of recognizing and constructing knowledge, societies, cultures and vehicles such as language are presented and represented as scenarios in which they are permanently recreated as a fabric of participating realities, problematics, contexts, among others. The other understandings that emerge from the qualitative changes in relationships are increasingly blurred to the extent that they are not interested in marking distinctions as in former times, on the contrary, now the debates are about identities for the unconditional recognition of the other as legitimate other (Maturana, 1992), not as the enemy, as the opponent to be eliminated, on the contrary, the other is assumed as co-constructor and differential of the self. This self is not defined in terms of itself, but acquires characteristics that allow it to be in relation to others, that is to say, that allow it to cohabit, to exist and to be in relation to others, that is to say, that allow it to cohabit, to exist and to be in relation to the others.

Our current era is primarily typified by the fact that it puts many of the traditional structures and paradigms in crisis, and in these crises it makes possible a number of epistemological and ontological emergencies that position the subject in places of profound transience in which the discoveries are not located in the externalities of the self, but quite the contrary, it is the subject by virtue of its interiority and its intersubjectivity, no longer the foreign subject that contemplates a science from a distance in which objectivity is understood as directly proportional to the distance that the actors of the research act have, which means that the more distant, the greater the degree of objectivity that one has of the results.

Now the subject is embodied and alive, inhabitant of the system of relationships that establishes to know, to build links, in terms of Morín & Domínguez (2018). The empathy that is established with the other and with others, in which the look for causes and consequences as the system of representation inherited from the modern scientific tradition is without foundation in front of the look of the subject of the complex subject that is framed in the understanding that is "always intersubjective, needs openness, sympathy, generosity" (Morín y Domínguez, 2018. p. 30).

In that order of ideas accepting the invitation to think ourselves a subject in terms of Morín (1992) and Morín & Domínguez (2018) also means going through human sensitivity, through human understanding far beyond knowledge for knowledge's sake, which puts us in the sphere of poetics, of learning for the heart in which the vital sense resumes a new existence, because this allows us to expand ourselves "Man poetically inhabits the earth", Morín & Domínguez (2018) quoting Hölderlin. According to the above, it is not difficult to glimpse that the formation of critical and creative thinking was not the priority, because what was fundamental was mechanization, repetition, rigid strategies, the quantitative approach, the use of deterministic, among others (Baron et al. 2017). The belief in measurement and determination systems led us to believe in the infallibility of the method.

In relation to this series of charms and disenchantments in which we currently live in front of modern paradigms, thinking about a strategy to accompany researchers is fundamental from the viewpoint of constructionist theories in which adaptive strategies obey human

capabilities and are self-managed by the same individuals who co-create them, because being adaptive they allow them to recognize the various dynamics in which teachers live in their daily lives (Szekely & Mason. 2018). Designing a strategy that can be managed through a flexible learning platform in which learning, resources and mediations are not determined by external factors, on the contrary, they are constitutive elements of the transformations of daily practices, which is why an interdependence and simultaneity in the processes of appropriation of knowledge is established (Ossa Taborda & Barón-Velandia, 2024).

2.-Theoretical Corpus

The following is a list of the categories around which the doctoral proposal revolves, together with the texts that most inspire its development. This theoretical framework is made up of four pillars that have been defined as priorities in the development of the "EVAI" research project. These are: Researcher training, Blended learning, Mode 3 of knowledge, Research practices.

2.1.-Researcher training

In the global context, researcher training processes have been understood in terms of training and have been implemented through a series of strategies such as workshops, seminars, courses or training processes within the framework of master's degrees, doctorates or postdoctorates. However, although many efforts have been made to link actions, processes, products to a more complex system of research that transcends the understanding of obtaining information on theories, methods, techniques, instruments and lately with the advent of ICT, we have experienced a strong trend in learning software for research (Castro & Sanchez. 2016).

> This is important for research processes and research culture. But it is important to emphasize that there are fundamentals that we have neglected in these research training processes, and it is interesting to rescue them, because they are part of all those actions that transcend the instrumental or methodical and enable the humanity of science, according to this Moreno (1997 and 2011) states that:

> In the training process of researchers, we find as a sine qua non condition the passion for something. It is interesting to observe how this element, which is supposedly not teachable, becomes a decisive factor in the training of women researchers. Approaches such as these should be included in educational policies, so that initial training levels offer a wide range of passions to which future scientists can adhere. This element demands flexibility and openness on the part of curricula and academic programs. (p. 43).

In this sense, in addition to the practical tools that are taught and applied in research, it is also important to promote attitudes, passions and emotions that overcome the solipsism of research and infect people more and more, so that they find in research an attitude, a new way of life (De Ibarrola, 1989). The need to involve more and more the entities that manage and provide horizons of possibility is urgent since it is from there that decisions are made and guidelines are established that establish this type of practices within educational organizations at all levels, because the motivation of competencies and concerns for research are not acquired in higher education, they are a process that takes place throughout life (Castro & Sánchez, 2016).

2.2.-Blended learning

To structurally modify the set of processes that generate individual and collective learning, the project will apply the category of blended learning because it is important to read the horizon, the rationality from where these environments are built and what they provide us with tools and medications in a technological perspective that promotes human capabilities. In accordance with the above, Hinojo & Fernandez (2012) state that the ability to incorporate ICT (Communication and Information Technologies) to education, not only gives more possibilities to bring knowledge closer to more places and people by bridging distances; it also implies an innovation in education. As there are more possibilities, learning is modified compared to more traditional teaching. Educational practices undergo a transformation, because the use of ICTs offers different possibilities that can only vary this education to a greater or lesser extent. What we cannot forget is that ICT in education, as well as its capacity for transformation, appeared before the current technological possibilities related to intercommunication and interconnection (Bustos & Coll, 2010).

Thus, this new way of understanding teaching gives the possibility to those who are being trained to have a more enriched learning, since there is the capacity of interconnection, in which the different reflections that it is causing in those who learn can be shared. Also, the possible appearance of difficulties in the process can be solved by the students themselves, without having to depend entirely on the tutor of these practices. Cooperation among the students is developed thanks to the virtual environment in which everyone develops and shares. In this line of ideas, it is important to highlight that both the mediations and the tools favor learning in different rhythms and scenarios. What is sought is that these processes focus much more attention on learning than on teaching (Bustos & Coll, 2010). In general, the multiple dynamics that are developed in the educational field are focused on teaching, neglecting the processes of personalized development, in which the development of dimensions of the person other than the instrumental ones is sought (Angustias & Fernández, 2012).

The promotion of activities and attitudes of autonomization are the guarantors of learning, because these are not limited or dependent on the existence of a tutor-professor-advisor who is there to direct, segment or manage content, in these rationalities the role of the student is much more self-managing, because he seeks to expand his permanent learning curve, because he finds in the tutor an advisor, a mediator who amplifies horizons of meaning of knowledge. In addition to the tutor, mediations and tools, the understanding of time and space are re-signified, they become much more plastic.

We can find three ways of experiencing time in learning: first, it is no longer defined by the Chronos, which limits the existential condition of the unit of measurement in seconds, minutes and hours, reducing everything to the objective, to the beginning, to end, which is found in the duality of losing or gaining, among others (Joya et al. 2024). Second, it is understood by the incomprehensible of the divine act of losing the consciousness of the passage of time, we speak of the Aion, in which the joy and pleasure of learning overcome the prison of Chronos, of the clock. And third, the timeliness of learning, the Kairos, the fundamentals of the perfect instant, when insight is conceived, when without pressure we find that water is wet, because it is our discovery, when we really understand it and not just repeat it. Regarding space, we also reconfigure or re-signify it, we no longer understand the limited vision of school or educational institutions as the only places where we learn. Now the multiplicity of scenarios overflows the intelligence and amplify and diversify the possibilities of learning, now, the experience of learning is not tied to a

particular condition of place, but emotional understanding of recognizing that learning and life are one and the same thing as Assmann (2002) stated.

2.3.-Mode 3 of knowledge

For the present article, understanding Mode 3 of knowledge as the relationship between university, society, state, business and environment is very important, since it allows us to place the research itself in the context of the new dynamics of knowledge production, as Acosta Valdeleón & Carreño Manosalva state:

> One of the characteristics that makes it relevant to actively reflect on the principle of responsibility from what we have called mode 3, is the strong and problematic linkage that knowledge and its production has with the process of globalization of the market economy (2013, p. 80).

To propose, within the framework of the research project, a mode of knowledge production is, in turn, a way of balancing forces that sometimes seem antagonistic but that from this point of view can be complementary and cooperative to a certain extent. To question ourselves about the symbiotic relationship between the diverse problems that societies live with all their complexities and the diverse activities of knowledge production that originate in university (Toledo Lara, 2022). This does not mean that we continue to perpetuate the understanding of the university as the panacea of the problems and transformations that society requires, on the contrary, in this scenario the participation of each of the actors is redefined, society is a participant and co-constructor of the transformations that it requires and the role of the university is that of an agent of change and within it all its microsystems are tuned to make it happen.

In this order of ideas, the role of researchers, students, research groups, seed groups and in general the entire research ecosystem, are also structurally modified to make research a more responsible environment with society and less erected to the needs of the market that sometimes ends up disguising the needs of the market to present them as the needs of a society, on the contrary, in this perspective the opportunity to co-create collaborative networks of support to empower, recognize and make visible the capacities acquired by the territories and communities in the search for understanding their dynamics and bet on other forms of social transformation and empowerment of current capacities (Acosta, 2015).

A Mode 3 of research implies that the gaze of the research agents moves towards the understanding and resolution of problems and realities that are situated in a much more transversalized plane, in which thought is delocalized and travels after the search for new networks of conversation that position scenarios of articulation of the various actors, that is, transcend the act of "fulfillment of their responsibilities as substantive functions of higher education, but also assume the challenges that arise for universities and that go beyond the required training and production profiles". In that order of ideas, the subject "agent" in Bourdieu's terms, because it is not a passive actor, but mobilizes and changes the relationships of its context "social field", emerges from the research or intervention processes, and demonstrates its potential, with political positioning and transforms its own reality (Roa-Mendoza, 2016). The point of arrival is the development of environments of transformation, agency and empowerment of communities as protagonist subjects of their realities and alternatives for change.

At the national level, a series of discussions on the relevance and legitimacy of knowledge production at the higher education level are underway, and they recognize the need to link with the communities and respond to the felt needs of the realities and not only

circumscribed to contextually delimited scenarios designed to satisfy disciplinary fields. Thus, "research processes are expected to incorporate inclusive practices, where researchers encourage the active participation of citizens and communities with whom they jointly develop initiatives for the social appropriation of science, technology and innovation (Colciencias, 2015, p. 8).

2.4.-Research practices

In this article, the category of research practices was constructed based on the field theory of Pierre Bourdieu (1980), who defines the field as the game scenario where the struggles for obtaining, increasing and transferring capitals (economic, social and cultural) take place. For the research, Bourdieu is illuminating insofar as he allows us to recognize the two understandings that practices have, to distinguish them and to define the direction they will take here. First, Bourdieu recognizes a way of understanding practices from the scientific disdain of these, for considering them as mechanical actions that are not reflected, nor thought, but executed in the order of the mechanical compression of the daily habitus. Bourdieu (2005)

> Practice is always undervalued and little analyzed, when in fact, to understand it, it is necessary to bring into play a great deal of technical competence, much more, paradoxically, than to understand a theory. It is necessary to avoid reducing practices to the idea that we have of them when we have no experience other than logic. However, scientists, lacking an adequate theory of practice, do not necessarily know how to use for the descriptions of their practices the theory that would enable them to acquire and transmit an authentic knowledge of their practices (p. 75).

In accordance with the above, it is important to recognize that practice transcends the mechanical events of everyday life and brings us the restitution of its value in the construction of theories, in the preponderant role it has in the exercise of reflexivity of themselves to feed and support in a singular way the theoretical sources. For this reason, Bourdieu (2005) intends to restore to them the value that requires permanent reflection, that is, on the context and its development at the level of everyday life and in the realization of practices in the scientific field, since it is from there that comprehensions and solutions are generated in correspondence with the theory and the observed problematic. The impossible and necessary dialogue between theory and practice must take place, because it is necessary to recognize the singular validity of the constructions of the practices in the context and in this sense the distinction of the points of reference from where each one has been constructed, without subalternizing the sui generis of the source of information or knowledge. The facts make sense from a theory; in turn, all the research practices that are organized because of the application of the chosen method are related to the respective theory (López De Parra et al, 2019. p. 197).

The above, allows us to recognize the current state of understanding of research practices for Villegas (2016), cited in López De Parra et al. (2019) research practices have a fundamental commitment to the problems of society, because they are intimately linked by their need to expand the capacities for change in the existing relationships between agents, by the mobility of habitus and the equitable redistribution of capitals, especially economic ones. For the project, it is of vital importance to conclude this section by taking up a third concept that in its system of relations produces practice, in Bourdieu's terms and for our work, research practice: the habitus (Collado. 2009). As a first step it is important to recognize habitus in the perspective of Pierre Bourdieu (1980).

Systems of durable and transferable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, that is to say as generating and organizing principles of practices and representations that can be objectively adapted to an end without presupposing the conscious search for ends and the express mastery of the operations necessary to achieve them, objectively 'regulated' and 'regular' without being the product of obedience to rules, and, at the same time as all this, collectively orchestrated without being the product of the organizing action of a conductor (p. 92).

Habitus can comprise durable, lasting and reproducible dispositions. It is the relationship that is built between the ways of thinking, feeling and acting, with the position occupied by an agent, in our case, a researcher in a specific field and the capacity she has to mobilize herself, which in Bourdieu's approach is understood as those struggles for the possession of some kind of capital. In general terms, what is pursued is the cultural capital, what an agent has, which has been incorporated from birth, passing through the school system, social, economic, political relations, among others that shape who we are and what we do.

3.-Biographical trajectories

This project's understanding of the category "trajectory" is derived from Bourdieu's notion, in which this is defined as a "series of positions successively occupied by the same agent (or the same group) in a space in itself in movement and subject to incessant transformations" (Bourdieu, 1997, p. 82). In this sense UNIMINUTO is constituted in that great field that recognizes biographical trajectories from research practices. The institution allows us to recognize a series of situations in the life cycle of our teams that delineate the rules of the game that enable the distinction as "researchers"; paraphrasing Rivera et al. (2018) through the biographical trajectories traversed by the researchers, positions are configured that allow them to agitate activities and move to belong to certain groups or categories validated by the scientific communities both in the national, as well as international context. According to the above, in the scientific field, the biographical trajectory for the project is configured as a trajectory through the life of our participants, through a succession of moments that are broken down into activities, procedures and processes that are carried out in research and allow us to recognize the paths with their successes and failures. The research that configures and reconfigures the habits through.

Within the structure of the organizations, the researchers, who maintain themselves in the logic of production of new knowledge, are culturally adapted and have incorporated enabling capitals of agency in the research and academic field, including the administrative field, because of the heritage of their experience in education (Orozco et al. 2023). In relation to the research field, this is also considered as a structure because it is constituted by agents (researchers), who in turn are linked to the institutions, this is configured by a set of culturally established rules, which the agents abide by and comply with, which guarantees their permanence; all of them have as a fundamental principle the functioning of the field. Researchers permanently reproduce the models that build the systems of power relations based on previously elaborated norms (Bourdieu & Passeron. 2009); in this sense, in the research field the agents will position themselves assuming as a basis the structures they inhabit, which in Bourdieu's terms would be the structured structures ready to be structuring structures.

In this order of ideas, the agents, who are in research as a structured scientific field, will have privileged places of operation and action. Accordingly, for Bourdieu, fields are like "structured spaces of positions (or positions) whose

properties depend on their position in these spaces and can be analyzed independently of the characteristics of their occupants" (Bourdieu, 2002, p. 135). For this reason, it is important to analyze biographical trajectories in the light of the research practices of our researchers to know how they have gained these positions and what struggles have occurred in their research process. For Bourdieu., Wacquant (1995) cited by Rivera & Alarcón (2018). Social agents are the product of history, that is, of the history of the entire social field and of the experience accumulated during a given trajectory in the subfield. It means investigating how the subjects arrived and what place they occupy in the academic space and how they accessed the position in which they are inscribed in the habitus (p.18).

The research field is also a game space, where power is exercised by agents who fight for the attainment, preservation and increase of capitals (economic, cultural and symbolic). Consequently, in this space, game sites are configured in which the agents make possible orthodox or unorthodox strategies to obtain and belong to the field, thus devising maneuvers to obtain the capitals. The fundamental aspect of such acquisition, conservation and growth of capital is prestige, legitimacy and authority, in other words, a place in the field granted by the community to which it belongs.

In the same line of strategies and maneuvers to enter, maintain and improve the position in the scientific field, the research agents must be configured by the rules of the games established by the field, which is why it is essential to recognize that within the Colombian system of Science, Technology, Innovation and Society, recognized by Minciencias, it is important to distinguish the categories of researchers and the requirements to access, maintain and recategorize themselves, since this will give them recognition, distinction and authority. One of the conditions required to obtain a category (Junior, Associate or Senior Merit Researcher) is training as researchers, which is built in the distinguished trajectory:

1. Academic Training
2. New Knowledge Generation Products
3. Processes of Social Appropriation of Knowledge (PASC)
4. Development of research projects as the germinal seed of transformations, processes and products.

One of the most important aspects to highlight in this project is to understand what it is to be a researcher, to be able to account for, through this revisiting the life of our participants, their academic paths, the relationships that are generated by being immersed in various contexts: family, cultural, university and scientific. The above contexts will also condition the access, recognition and positioning in the scientific field. It is important to recognize that those who had the possibility of being born in an academic culture (here it is important to emphasize that in addition to the family culture, the first entry to the academic world is also recognized, the School, University and the conditions that it offers, will allow the positioning of the agent within a game space), in which from the initial language construction is forged, "invisible" structures are transmitted, for him, but that in the context will be what distinguish this agent from others.

4.-A developing problem

During the last 10 years in Colombia there has been a growing concern on the part of researchers to improve both their research practices and their categorization processes before Minciencias. The discouragement due to the precarious living conditions experienced by researchers, the cornering by the increasingly factual and mass production of science, increasingly ambitious and demanding evaluation and accreditation systems that tend to detract from the research practices of those engaged in research, the disfigurement of the meaning of research by the reification of the processes, the perversion of research practices by the pursuit of foreign purposes devoid of human conscience, the crisis caused by the pandemic that generates "contractions of organizational structures" cuts in teaching staff, the perversion of research practices by the pursuit of foreign purposes devoid of human conscience, the crisis originated by the pandemic that generates "contractions of organizational structures" cuts in teaching staff, the perversion of research practices by the pursuit of foreign goals lacking in human conscience, the crisis caused by the pandemic that generates "contractions of organizational structures" cuts in teaching staff, the reassignment of roles that exceed their functions as researchers, the desertion of students due to difficult economic conditions.

As one of the responses to the above situations, we have experienced 3 National Calls for the Recognition and Measurement of Research, Technological Development or Innovation Groups and for the Recognition of Researchers of the SNCTeI (2017, 2018 and 2021) processes that mostly intend to encourage the improvement of the quality of science produced within Higher Education Institutions (HEI), Universities and Research Centers. As important points of reference the last two results of the Minciencias measurement systems (833-2018 and 894-2021), and to have an overview of their results, let's look in general at the following elements namely: First, in 2018 the National Call for the Recognition and Measurement of Research, Technological Development or Innovation Groups and for the Recognition of Researchers of the SNCTI - 833 - was carried out.

The results of this Call were published on December 6, 2019. The criteria defined for the recognition of Research, Technological Development or Innovation Groups were applied to 8,070 GrupLAC records that were endorsed by the institutions to participate in the 2018 Call 833. Of the total number of endorsed records, 5,772 were recognized as Research, Technological Development or Innovation Group. The distribution of the groups measured/classified, was as follows: A1 Groups: 717, A Groups: 1,023, B Groups: 1,285, C Groups: 2,328 and Recognized Groups that did not reach classification: 236. Additionally, 183 records in GrupLAC that did not enroll in the measurement/classification process, were recognized as Research, Technological Development or Innovation Group (Minciencias 2021. p. 2).

Second, in the year 2021, the National Call for the Recognition and Measurement of Research, Technological Development or Innovation Groups and for the Recognition of Researchers of the SNCTI - 894 was held. For the measurement/classification process, 7,115 records were submitted in the application, of which 6,812 were endorsed, and of which 5,950 meet the criteria to be recognized groups. The distribution of the measured/classified groups is as follows: Groups A1: 849, Groups A: 1,174, Groups B: 1,330, Groups C: 2,276 and Recognized - Unclassified: 5312. It is clarified that this is the total number of groups per category, however, the classification for each group was made in comparison by major area of knowledge. Despite all the efforts and sacrifices made by researchers to improve living conditions, we always end up like Albert Camus' Sisyphus

(1985), condemned to repeat the same vicious circle repeatedly, working until the early hours of the morning to fulfill the products and responsibilities acquired in the research projects they lead or are co-investigators.

Adding to the above, in the face of the post-pandemic phenomenon caused by the COVID-19 virus, has anyone seen how many researchers died? How many lost family members? Who is asking themselves about our lives? Who are we after the great challenges imposed on us by the new order of life, the new habits acquired, the multidimensional adaptations of the people we assist in this ecosystem? It is imperative that as research collectives we transcend the phenomenon of producing for the sake of producing, which sustains a system that every day looks more and more like a Chronos devouring its children. On the contrary, the great criticisms of national and international science measurement models are focused on their humanization, on their recognition as processes of impermanence, successions of subtle changes in the particles of the structures that irremediably modify the dynamics of the ecosystem. It is the care of the fundamentals, of what first makes us different, what allows us to make these changes, internal logics that are transformed without losing their own self-same, but without ignoring everything that triggers from outside and enables information flows.

We really live in a very difficult time for the development of science and research processes, unfortunately, because in many cases everything is reduced to the concept of product, as a result, as final, impoverishing the view of productivity, understood as the set of processes that gradually allow us to publicize our research advances, small or large contributions to understanding, problem solving or innovation, artistic and cultural creation.

As researchers, we face the unavoidable challenge of generating knowledge immersed in these conditions, which plunges us into a crossroads, on the one hand continue with the natural processes that scientific research has, that is, in the rhythms agreed with the communities or on the other hand, follow those established by the endless dynamics of accelerated production that, is far from the dynamics of generating new knowledge, useful inquiry that transforms the contexts from which it emerges, and which is more and more tinged with research processes with increasingly ephemeral and inconsistent results, but which respond to the needs of the market and of measurement indicators that cease to be indicators to assume the preponderant role of judges that determine what is researched and what is not, what is science and what is not. According to the above, in this context that mobilizes the process of accelerated and ephemeral knowledge production, there are also some evaluation and accreditation systems, which become true transformers of institutional identities, singular to reproduced identities, more standardized "uniform", pretending to take the institutions to a level, ignoring the various processes of maturation, research approaches, among others, that have constituted their history and what gave them life.

Going a little deeper into the idea, the construction of scenarios of measurements, parameterizations, standardizations, without human contemplations, without recognizing the natural dynamics of the products "understood as the fruits of the sensitive intellectual activity of the researcher" lead researchers to "bad research practices", to get a place in that field of research, as a consequence of foreign phenomena, lacking human conscience and scientific integrity (Torres, 2006). In tune with the "bad research practices", the scientific field has shown that, to the detriment of science, there are new modalities and strategies that respond to this series of impositions and reified views of science. That is why, to speak today of the concept of "Fake Science", the false science, the "scientific" results that are created to respond to economic needs, to mobilize or destabilize them,

emerges terribly as one of the gods that takes over the minds and hearts of human-scientists, because the objectives, the raison d'être of research, the reason why we do research, are inverted.

This "false science" brings with it the transformation of the consciousness of the subjects in which the Machiavellian principle "the end justifies the means" guides research behaviors and actions. For example, the elaboration of false data; predatory publications, journals and events, false indicators, impersonation, among others, are the scenarios that are permanently presented to our researchers as a panacea to the challenges that the system imposes on them. In this same sense, it is a challenge to fight against these new modalities of violation of the research collectives, generating mechanisms of accompaniment that tend to take care of the actors of the research process.

There is in the world scientific scenario and in the Colombian one an anguish in the community of researchers that moves the actions and processes, which delocalize and blur the aims and purposes of science "to improve the teaching-learning processes and improve the conditions of life", moving to the reification of science, to reduce it to factual results in multiple opportunities forgetting the foundations of organizations or research teams. The above does not mean that there is no science focused on results or products, what problematizes the reality is that all science is intended to be reduced to single results or that the teleology of science is measurements, metrics, these are important, of course, because they help to represent, indicate, mark, identify or improve processes.

In addition to the above, research budgets, like all resources, it should be noted, are always scarce, even generating in research teams the need to assume payments for publications through (APC- Article Processing Charges (APCs) charges for Article Processing Charges of their own resources, with the sole purpose of meeting the agreed products "articles in Scopus or WoS (Web of Science) preferably in Q1".

5.-Conclusions

According to the above, it is evident that modernity with all its control and deterministic structure continues to crack after the appearance of a new scientific "symptom", of new insubordinate, lateral and subversive ways that accept the error as a fundamental part of the scientific construction and of the subject that does science, in which utopias are presented as horizons of possibilities that are mobilized at the pace of those who conceive them, of those who walk the path. From the contemporary perspective, modernity is a paradigm that has been exhausted, that has completed its life cycle, that provided ways to solve with its rationality the life and conditions of women and men of another time. But for our time, it is necessary to unveil the existence of new paradigms that are more concerned with the meanings of existences, rather than with adjusting existences to a meaning.

This abandonment of modern rationality is not so simple to realize, because in one way or another it is to begin to dismantle those points of reference that formed in us as products of tradition, to expose ourselves to the creation of new languages that result from new associations, from new scientific communities that validate processes that go beyond instrumentalization. The paradigmatic break does not solve the problem, it increases it, now it is not a matter of solving, but of resignifying, of accommodating reality to theories, methods, ways of seeing the world, now it is a matter of constructing sets of views that recognize the singularity and complexity of life and not reduce it to causes and consequences.

Modern science inherited in our DNA the certainties that come from sticking to a method and from there giving answers to the multiple questions of life. The look that was imprinted in the scientific culture is that we solve it with methods, with mechanics of processes that, if rigorously applied, need not fail, banishing the human condition, the subjectivities, marking in the subject the error the "failure" of the system, condemning him to be an operator of methods, to follow a menu that has no errors, to stick to an algorithm for all the challenges of his existence. Without distinguishing the existing relationship between the singularity of life and the mechanical, the industrial, to which this type of processes and procedures would certainly apply, because they obey differentiated logic, different ways of being and existing.

6.-Referencias

Acosta, W. (2015). La producción de conocimiento desde la formación doctoral: elecciones y apuestas de la línea saber educativo, pedagógico y didáctico. *Nuevas rutas para investigar la relación educación - sociedad*, 3, 9-26. https://ciencia.lasalle.edu.co/server/api/core/bitstreams/09f6853f-ba27-494a-8281-af6734e97e29/content#page=8

Acosta Valdeleón, W., y C. Carreño Manosalva (2013). Modo 3 de producción de conocimiento: implicaciones para la universidad de hoy. *Revista de la Universidad de La Salle,* (61), 67-87. https://revistauls.lasalle.edu.co/files-articles/ruls/vol2013/iss61/4/fulltext.pdf

Angustias Hinojo, M. y Fernández, A. (2012). El aprendizaje semipresencial o virtual: nueva metodología de aprendizaje en Educación Superior. *Revista Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales, Niñez y Juventud, 10* (1), 159-167. https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=773/77323982008

Assmann, H, (2002). *Placer y ternura en la educación. Hacia una sociedad aprendiente*. Narcea Ediciones.

Bourdieu, P. (1980). Le capital social: Notes provisoires. *Actes de la Recherche en Siences Sociales*, 31, 2-3.

Bourdieu, P. (1997). *Razones prácticas sobre la teoría de la acción*. Anagrama.

Bourdieu, P. (2002). *Campo de poder, campo intelectual: itinerario de un concepto*. Montressor.

Bourdieu. P. (2005). *El Oficio del Científico. Ciencia y reflexividad*. Anagrama.

Bourdieu, P., y Passeron, J. (2009). *Los herederos: los estudiantes y la cultura*. Siglo XXI.

Bourdieu, P., y Wacquant, L. (1995). *Respuestas por una antropología reflexiva*. Grijalbo.

Bustos, A., y Coll, C. (2010). Los entornos virtuales como espacios de enseñanza y aprendizaje. *Revista Mexicana de Investigación Educativa, 44* (16),163-184. https://www.scielo.org.mx/pdf/rmie/v15n44/v15n44a9.pdf

Camus, A. (1985). *El mito de Sísifo*. Alianza Editorial.

Cancino Peña, J., y Barón Velandia, B. (2024). La importancia de la simbiosis entre investigación y responsabilidad social. En: Pacheco Luza, E., Alfaro Aucca, C. (eds). *Desarrollo Sostenible y Responsabilidad social: un deber universitario. Universidad Andina del Cusco* /High Rate Consulting. https://doi.org/10.36881/ODSRSU5

Castro, M., & Sánchez, M. (2016). La formación de investigadores en el área de humanidades: Los retos de la construcción de la voz autoral en la escritura de la tesis de doctorado. *Revista Signos. Estudios de lingüística, 49* (1) 30-51 https://scielo.conicyt.cl/pdf/signos/v49s1/art03.pdf

Colciencias (2015). Instituto Colombiano para el Desarrollo de la Ciencia y la Tecnología Francisco José de Caldas. *Estrategia de Medición de Grupos de Investigación, Desarrollo Tecnológico o de Innovación y de Reconocimiento de Investigadores del Sistema Nacional de Ciencia, Tecnología e Innovación*. Ministerio de Ciencia, Tecnología e Innovación-Minciencias. https://minciencias.gov.co/sites/default/files/upload/convocatoria/m601pr04g01 _modelo_medicion_grupos_investigacion_tecnologica_o_innovacion_y_recono cimiento_investigadores_-_2024_1.pdf

Collado, A. (2009). Las concepciones sobre la práctica en Pierre Bourdieu y Raymond Williams. Explorando similitudes y diferencias. *XXVII Congreso de la Asociación Latinoamericana de Sociología. VIII Jornadas de Sociología de la Universidad de Buenos Aires*. Asociación Latinoamericana de Sociología.

De Ibarrola, M. (1989). La formación de investigadores en México. *Revista Universidad Futura, 1*(3), 12-27. https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=60443089007

Hinojo, M. y Fernández, A. (2012). El aprendizaje semipresencial o virtual: nueva metodología de aprendizaje en Educación Superior. *Revista Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales, Niñez y Juventud, 10* (1), 159-167. http://www.scielo.org.co/scielo.php?pid=S1692-715X2012000100009&script=sci_arttext

Joya, A., Álvarez, G., Panche, D., González, A., Fernández, F., González, H., y Salazar, A. (2024). Red de Maestras y Maestros STEM + Transforma: una estrategia que impulsa la educación para el siglo XXI. *Praxis Pedagógica*, *24*(37), 93–121. https://revistas.uniminuto.edu/index.php/praxis/article/view/3745/3729

López de Parra, L., Prada-Arias, E., y Marín-Arango, D. (2019). Representaciones sociales sobre prácticas investigativas. Condiciones en la universidad. *Entramado, 15,* (1)192-211. https://doi.org/10.18041/1900-3803/entramado.1.5405

Maturana H., (1992). *Emociones y Lenguaje en Educación y Política*. Centro de Educación del Desarrollo (CEO) Ediciones Pedagógicas Chilenas.

Minciencias. (2021). *Estrategia de Medición de Grupos de Investigación, Desarrollo Tecnológico o de Innovación y de Reconocimiento de Investigadores del Sistema*

Nacional de Ciencia, Tecnología e Innovación. Instituto Colombiano para el Desarrollo de la Ciencia y la Tecnología Francisco José de Caldas – Minciéncias.

Morin, E. (1992). From the concept of system to the paradigm of complexity. *Journal of Social and Evolutionary Systems, 15* (4),371–385.

Morin, E., y Domínguez, E. (2018). *El octavo saber*. El octavo conocimiento. Diálogo con Edgar Morin. Multiversidad Mundo Real. https://carlosjdelgado.org/publicaciones-de-carlos-j-delgado/libros/el-octavo-saber/

Moreno, M. (1997). Dos pistas para el análisis de los procesos de formación de investigadores en las universidades colombianas. *Revista Nómadas, 7*, 38-49.

Orozco, Holguín. M., Ossa Taborda, E., y Gallego Hurtado, A. (2023). La formación electiva, una experiencia complementaria que favorece la cualificación de los educadores infantiles. *Praxis Pedagógica*, *23*(35), 196–222. https://doi.org/10.26620/uniminuto.praxis.23.35.2023.196-222

Ossa Taborda, E., y Barón Velandia, B. (2024). Challenges in Making Inclusive and Comprehensive Public Policy on Ethno-educational Processes. *Telos: Revista de Estudios Interdisciplinarios en Ciencias Sociales, 26*(3), 993-1005. www.doi.org/10.36390/telos263.13

Rivera García, C., y Alarcón Pérez, L. M. (2018). Carrera académica: una mirada desde el concepto de trayectoria de Pierre Bourdieu. *Ciencia y Sociedad, 43*(3), 13–23. https://doi.org/10.22206/cys.2018.v43i3.pp13-23

Roa-Mendoza (2016) Investigación en modo 3: Una alternativa para la articulación investigación e intervención en educación superior. *Revista Guillermo De Ockham*, *14*(2), 103–110. https://doi.org/10.21500/22563202.2635

Szekely, E., y Mason, M. (2018). Complexity theory, the capability approach, and the sustainability of development initiatives in education. *Journal of Education Policy*, *34*(5), 669-685. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2018.1465999

Toledo Lara, G. (2022). El currículum en la formación universitaria docente: aportes para un análisis crítico. *Revista Virtual Universidad Católica del Norte*, (66), 183-212. https://doi.org/10.35575/rvucn.n66a8

Torres, J. (2006). Los procesos de formación de los investigadores educativos: un acercamiento a su comprensión. *Educatio Revista Regional de Investigación Educativa, 3*, 67-79. http://www.educatio.ugto.mx/home.html

Villegas, Z. (2016). Prácticas y Praxis de Investigación en las Universidades. *Revista ciencias de la educación*, *26*(48), 347-359. http://servicio.bc.uc.edu.ve/educacion/revista/48/art20.pdf