

DIALOGUE BETWEEN CULTURE, TECHNOLOGY AND INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION: A CO-CONSTRUCTION FROM CRITICAL HERMENEUTICS

Greys Patricia Núñez Ríos¹, Leonardo Antonio Diaz Pertuz², Fredy Julián Gómez Pedroza³, Melissa Alejandra Negrete Cervantes⁴, Edgardo Sánchez Montero⁵, Enrique José Orozco Daza⁶, Madeleyne Mercedes Daza Cuello⁷

¹ Universidad de la Costa, Colombia.

Email: gnunez4@cuc.edu.co

ORCID: 0000-0001-6426-2729

² Programa de Administración de Empresas, Universidad del Sinú, Colombia.

Email: leonardodiazp@unisinu.edu.co

ORCID: 0000-0002-8588-1075

³ Universidad Minuto de Dios, Colombia.

Email: fredy.gomez-p@uniminuto.edu.co

ORCID: 0000-0002-8912-8443

⁴ Institución Universitaria Barranquilla, Colombia.

Email: mnegretecervante@gmail.com

ORCID: 0009-0007-6192-7052

⁵ Universidad de la Costa, Colombia.

Email: esanchez2@cuc.edu.co

⁶ Programa de Formación Complementaria, Institución Educativa Escuela Normal Superior de San Juan del Cesar, La Guajira, Colombia.

Email: ejorozcodaza22@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0003-4208-2158

⁷ Facultad de Educación, Licenciatura en Básica Primaria, Universidad de La Guajira; Institución Educativa Escuela Normal Superior de San Juan del Cesar, La Guajira, Colombia.

Email: mdazacuello@uniguajira.edu.co

ORCID: 0000-0002-4585-5593

Abstract: This theoretical-reflective article, derived from the doctoral dissertation Intercultural Education Based on Curriculum Management for Strengthening the Quality of Higher Education, is grounded in a critical-hermeneutic documentary review. The study adopts a qualitative perspective supported by micro-ethnographies and an introspective-experiential approach, assuming the co-construction of the corpus through information analysis, textualization, theoretical triangulation, and analytical systematization. It examines the relationship between culture, intercultural education, curriculum management, and technology, understanding the latter not as a neutral resource but as a sociocultural mediation capable of expanding or restricting recognition, participation, and curricular justice. The findings suggest that intercultural education goes beyond discourses of inclusion and coexistence to become a transformative practice in the face of historically rooted cultural exclusion. They also show that the critical, ethical, accessible, and pedagogically relevant integration of digital technologies can foster dialogue among knowledge systems, the visibility of identities, collaborative knowledge production, and the democratization of learning. However, technology may also deepen

inequalities when gaps in connectivity, accessibility, digital competencies, and cultural representation persist. The article concludes that recognizing diversity, developing inclusive curricular practices, and critically managing technology contribute to strengthening educational quality.

Keywords: Culture; Intercultural Education; Educational Technology; Curriculum Management; Quality of Education; Cultural Diversity; Digital Inclusion

1. Introduction

In the global dynamics, the world is experiencing great political, social, and economic changes due to the organization of the current prevailing system, which generate uncertainty in the face of the permanent dynamics of transformation and education is not alien to them because from its function, it has the call for social cohesion. In this regard, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, OECD (2023) has emphasized that traditional models of knowledge production are insufficient to address these complex contexts, driving a shift towards critical and action-oriented interpretative approaches.

In this framework, understanding ceases to be a merely descriptive act to become a contextualized, reflexive, and ethically committed process to social alteration, recognizing that all interpretation affects collective interactions (Kinsella & Whiteford, 2009; Lugo, 2026), likewise the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization UNESCO (2017), considers that the fundamental role of education systems is primarily to strengthen peaceful coexistence, through programs that encourage dialogue between different cultures, beliefs and religions, recognizing human diversity in society, hence education can also contribute in an important way to promote sustainable and tolerant societies, generating in their classroom spaces, global interconnection between different cultures.

In this scenario of transformation, technology occupies an increasingly decisive place in the configuration of educational experiences and cultural relations. It is not only a set of devices or platforms, but a socio-technical mediation through which knowledge, languages, identities and forms of participation are selected, represented, circulated and legitimized. For this reason, their incorporation into intercultural education requires a critical reading that questions who designs technologies, what knowledge they privilege, what cultures they make visible and which may be excluded. UNESCO's Global Education Monitoring Report warns that the educational relevance of technology must be assessed from criteria of equity, scalability and sustainability, keeping the student and their contexts at the centre of decisions (UNESCO, 2023).

In accordance with the above, it is stated that in the educational scenario, the need must arise to understand and relate in a respectful, equitable and egalitarian way among all members of an ethnic group or social group. Based on this need, it seeks to build more inclusive and cohesive societies, under the principle of interculturality, as a recent field of study, which describes in a horizontal and synergistic way, the relationship and encounter between diverse cultures, from which it seeks to make visible the other, which for the purposes of the sample population of the doctoral thesis was established in the migrant population and ethnic minorities (Indigenous population, raizal, Rrom, Afro-descendants), which generates challenges, as well as tensions, which have made it possible, according to (Mondaca Rojas & Gajardo Carvajal, 2013), the opening of many social, political, economic and cultural barriers, which have generated different problems, such as inequality, racism and xenophobia, which translates into new conceptualizations and actions that must be addressed from the socio-political context based on diversity.

In accordance with the above, the recognition of diversity from an intercultural context seeks to respond to the needs of processes of transformation of humanity, since according to Fraser and Honneth (2006, as cited in Canton Mayo, 2006) and Osés Gil et al. (2022), the subjects that make up minority human groups have immersed a series of facts of social violation to which they are exposed from the absence of recognition of their identity conditions, which according to Zuñiga and Valencia (2018), present injustices that are a cause of conflicts since they have not acquired visibility, on the part of society, where the diverse population is at a disadvantage, before the dominant social classes, that justifies the social order that privileges them.

In this order of ideas, at a global level, it is necessary to understand how relationships with others are established, how societies are built and the fundamental role that education plays in these processes, since the lack of recognition can have devastating consequences for individuals and for society as a whole. Therefore, it is crucial to work to create more just and equitable societies, where all people feel valued and respected. According to Escobar (2012), the recognition of diversity is considered a key process based on equality, justice and equity, without discrimination or stigmatization and with respect, which is part of dignity, in the same way, it is the recognition of the context, beliefs, customs and habits of society (Rodríguez, 2023).

In this same sense, Taylor (2002, as cited in Mahecha López, 2017), argues that diversity is "due recognition is not only a courtesy that we owe to others: it is a vital human need", therefore the recognition of diversity must facilitate equitable access to high-quality education, eradicating discrimination (Zúñiga-Rodríguez, 2021; Pallares-Arévalo & Ravelo-Méndez, 2025). In accordance with the above and in order to shorten the existing theoretical gaps that allow a better understanding of reality in order to act on it, in-depth interviews are carried out such as microethnographies and a documentary review, based on critical hermeneutics, in order to provide some elements for an analytical reinterpretation and the co-construction of intercultural concepts. cultural education and curriculum management as an operational foundation for the quality of education.

2. Methodological notes

The research was developed under the contributions of microethnography as an analytical perspective through open interviews, which helped to understand the discourses present in the reviewed texts. From this point of view, the documents were assumed as sociocultural productions loaded with meanings, symbolisms, tensions and identity constructions that reflect the dynamics of educational contexts. Following Geertz (1973, as cited in Goyal, 2022), the analysis was oriented towards a dense description of the meanings present in the discourses, allowing the identification of the ways in which the relationships between diversity, recognition, interculturality, and educational quality are configured.

Likewise, it was approached from a qualitative perspective which (Solsona, 2024); allows us to understand and interpret human experiences through the production and analysis of textual data that are born from the singular and subjective discourses of social subjects in an everyday context Denzin & Lincoln (1994, as cited in Anadón, 2008). Similarly, from an introspective experiential epistemological approach, (Padrón, 1998; Vidanovic Geremich & Osorio Gómez, 2025), where the actors assume a certain work routine and a set of constitutive operational tools based on their inquiries and experiences, the essential thesis that this approach puts forward according to (Camacho & Marcano, 2003), is that knowledge lacks, as such, an objective, universal and independent status (it does not have a 'constant' character with respect to the 'variables' of the environment), but, on the contrary, it varies depending on the sociocultural standards of each historical period.

In this order of ideas, the study is based on a documentary review of hermeneutical-critical orientation, which can be conceived as the art and science of interpretation, it is a dynamic process in which the understanding of texts, symbols and human phenomena is framed within a historical, cultural and existential context, (Noroño, Vílchez, & Meriño, 2025), in order to contrast the different theoretical and methodological positions of the authors of the publications consulted and generate reflections, solid arguments and conclusions in this regard, In this order of ideas, this method is not presented as an inflexible structure, but as a tool that can be adapted according to the context and nature of the knowledge to be developed (Noroño et al. (2025), which seeks to understand social phenomena based on the interpretation and understanding of meanings, discourses and theoretical constructions produced in specific historical and cultural contexts through which human groups construct and explain their reality.

In this sense, the hermeneutical-critical orientation allowed the development of a systematic process of reading, interpretation, contrast and resignification of scientific literature, normative documents and theoretical references related to the categories of culture, interculturality, intercultural education, curricular management and educational quality. This order is established following Vidanovic and Gómez (2025), who consider that this approach favors the

understanding of social phenomena implies a permanent reflection on the experiences, meanings and contexts that give them meaning, promoting a critical reading of the educational reality.

To incorporate the technological dimension, the analysis included documents and literature related to educational technology, digital ecosystems, digital inclusion and data governance, examined from the categories of access, pedagogical relevance, cultural representation, participation, ethics and curricular justice. This expansion made it possible to interpret technology both as a possibility of democratization of knowledge and as a potential space for the reproduction of social, epistemic and cultural gaps.

The documentary corpus consisted of the bibliographic search of 250 scientific articles, doctoral theses, institutional documents and specialized publications selected through criteria of thematic relevance, topicality, scientific relevance and coherence with the object of study. The documentary review was carried out based on processes of search, selection, analytical reading and thematic categorization of the sources consulted. In this sense, Quintana and Hermida (2019) argue that hermeneutics is a method of interpretation that allows us to understand the underlying meanings of texts. Therefore, corpus analysis is not linear; It is a spiral process where you constantly navigate between the part (paragraphs, sentences, words) and the whole (the whole text and its context).

According to what has been proposed, the construction and foundation of the documentary corpus was developed following the methodological guidelines proposed by Vagle (2018) and taken up by Castillo (2025). In the first phase, the phenomenon of study was identified and described in the contexts where it manifests itself, considering its forms of appearance and the possibilities of social transformation that emerge from its understanding. From this perspective, the phenomenon is not conceived as a fixed or essential reality, but as a dynamic construction that acquires meaning based on the relationships it establishes with time, space, and the experiences of the subjects.

Subsequently, the documentary material was compiled and organized, seeking to understand the various ways in which the phenomenon is configured and expressed in specific contexts. This process was accompanied by an exercise of post-reflection, aimed at recognizing and explaining the researcher's pre-understandings, beliefs, and assumptions, with the purpose of critically examining their impact on the interpretation and production of knowledge. The analysis phase involved a rigorous exploration of the phenomenon based on the permanent interaction between the documentary material, the theoretical references and the reflective processes of the researcher. In accordance with Vagle (2018), a detailed and systematic reading of the texts was developed, favoring a constant dialogue between the emerging findings, the theoretical categories, and the reflections derived from the research process. This exercise made it possible to identify convergences, tensions, meanings and aspects that generated questions or new possibilities for understanding.

Finally, textualization was constructed, which according to Acosta Melchor (2023) points out that textualization constitutes a fundamental process in the construction and communication of scientific knowledge, in this order of ideas, textualization privileged analytical and reflective writing, aimed both at describing the ways in which the phenomenon is produced and transformed and at generating new understandings about its meaning, therefore, it allowed organizing and reconstructing the conceptual contributions identified in the sources. Likewise, theoretical triangulation is conceived as a procedure that allows approaching a phenomenon from multiple perspectives, increasing the precision and depth of its understanding.

According to (Denzin, 1978; Jick, 1979; Forni & De Grande, 2020), this process can be compared to the determination of the position of an object by crossing lines from different points of observation, therefore the theoretical triangulation facilitated the contrast of perspectives from different disciplinary fields; and the systematization made it possible to integrate the findings into a coherent interpretative structure aimed at understanding the relationship between intercultural education, curricular management and educational quality. Finally, the analytical systematization, understood as a space of interpretation in which the multiple manifestations of the phenomenon are articulated in its contexts of emergence, made it possible to integrate the findings into a coherent interpretative structure aimed at understanding the relationship between intercultural education, curricular management and educational quality.

Figure 1.



Synthesis of the imaginary of senior management in relation to the conceptions of intercultural education.

(Source: Núñez, 2025)

Quality of research: validity and reliability.

In qualitative research, the criteria of reliability and validity are aimed at guaranteeing the rigor of the procedures used during the research process and the consistency of the interpretations constructed from the data obtained. From this perspective, validity transcends the mere verification of results to incorporate aspects related to the quality of the relationships established between the researcher, the participants and the context studied.

In this regard, Denzin (1978) argues that postmodern perspectives have expanded the traditional criteria of validation by incorporating dimensions related to credibility, the authenticity of experiences, the ethical responsibility of the researcher, permanent dialogue with participants, and the ethics of care. These elements allow qualitative research to be assessed from a broader understanding of the processes of knowledge construction and the legitimacy of the interpretations produced.

In accordance with the above, Lincoln (1995) argues that integrative analyses carried out in the field of qualitative research show that these criteria converge in the recognition of the relational nature of the research process, highlighting the importance of the interactions between the researcher and the participating subjects as a foundation for the production of socially significant knowledge.

For his part, Martínez (2006) distinguishes between internal validity and external validity. The first refers to the degree to which the findings reflect the reality studied in a coherent, understandable and representative way, while the second alludes to the possibility of transferring or applying the theoretical constructions generated to contexts or groups with similar characteristics. Consequently, the interpretative quality of a research will depend both on the fidelity with which the analyzed phenomenon is understood and on the relevance of the contributions produced for similar scenarios. This procedure made it possible to contrast the interpretations elaborated by the researcher with the meanings attributed by the actors involved, favoring the construction of a shared understanding of the phenomenon studied and strengthening the credibility of the findings obtained.

3. The discussion for Co-construction

The concept of culture has been the subject of multiple theoretical elaborations in the anthropological tradition, configuring itself as a central category for understanding social, symbolic and identity processes. From a classical perspective, Tylor (1871, as cited in Podestá, 2006), points out that culture constitutes "that complex whole" that includes knowledge, beliefs, art, morals, laws, customs and any other capacities and habits acquired by human beings as a member of a society. This formulation introduces a broad and integrative understanding of culture, emphasizing its learned and socially transmitted character. Likewise, within the framework of anthropological evolutionism, Tylor gives the concept a progressive meaning, understanding culture as the result of historical processes of human development.

From a different perspective, although complementary in its explanatory scope, Malinowski (1931, as cited in Quetglas, 2023), conceives of culture as an integrated system composed of artifacts, institutions, customs and their relationship with the geographical environment, oriented to the satisfaction of universally recognized human needs. In this approach, each cultural element fulfills a specific function within the social system, contributing to the maintenance, cohesion and survival of the group. Thus, while Tylor emphasizes the cumulative and evolutionary character of culture, Malinowski emphasizes its functional dimension and its role in the organization of social life.

In the interpretative turn of symbolic anthropology, Geertz (1973, as cited in de Haro Honrubia, 2024), redefines culture as a "historically transmitted scheme of meanings", expressed in symbolic forms, institutions, rituals and works through which subjects construct meaning about their own existence. From this hermeneutical perspective, culture is not simply a set of observable practices, but a web of meanings that guides human action. Cultural interpretation thus becomes an analytical task aimed at understanding how individuals produce, communicate and transform meanings in specific contexts. Consequently, culture is closely linked to the construction of identity and to the processes of symbolic communication that structure social life.

In a contemporary vein, Araiza Díaz, Araiza Díaz, and Medécigo Daniel (2020) expand this conception by understanding culture as a network of articulations where the natural and the social, the material and the symbolic interact. It is not reduced to visible or empirically observable manifestations, but includes abstract dimensions such as collective imaginaries, social representations and forms of symbolic organization. From this perspective, culture allows us to recognize both the tangible and the intangible heritages that make up the identity of a social group.

On the other hand, (Alonso, 2006), he defines culture as the complex set of spiritual, material, intellectual, and emotional traits that characterize a society or social group. This definition incorporates normative and axiological dimensions, including life systems, human rights, values, traditions, and beliefs, broadening the scope of the concept towards a comprehensive vision of human development. In a complementary way, White (1964) conceives culture as the complex of behavior patterns acquired by human beings as a member of society, emphasizing their adaptive function in relation to the environment. In this neo-evolutionary perspective, culture acts as a mediation mechanism between the individual and the environment, enabling processes of adaptation and social organization.

In this order of ideas, Núñez (2025), states that Culture is a process created and recreated over time by human beings, communities or ethnic groups, it has a dynamic, adaptive and complex character product of the interaction of human groups, which implies the transmission of beliefs, customs, traditions, arts, morals, rights, values and norms,

of a social group from which they ensure their identity and survival as well as well-being, to find meaning in their relationships with the environment, interpret the world and guide their behavior as patterns learned from generation to generation.

According to the above, human beings need the recognition of their cultural values through time, not from the perspective that according to (González & González, 2022) affects their own identity, their behaviors and psychosocial development, but from a critical intercultural conception of the recognition and visibility of the other, which implies a break with the logics of instrumental domination that have historically configured the social relations, which do not limit, as Triviño and Ferrando (2024, as cited in Valenzuela Espinosa, 2024), point out, the dynamics of participation and deliberative practices in the social sectors that make it possible to recognize and include the citizen experience. From this perspective, interculturality cannot be reduced to a normative ideal, but must be constituted as an emancipatory practice aimed at questioning the structures that reproduce inequality.

In line with Paz-Mardones, Kotthoff-Cristensen, Fuentes-Jara, Collipal-Velásquez, Riquelme, and Halberstadt (2022), they consider that as an emancipatory practice, the recognition of diverse cultures worldwide has made it possible to integrate a historical perspective with which they can identify through more sincere and inclusive reconstruction processes, which have arisen from the need of some societies to take up and identify with the ideologies of each guild thus affirming what it considers (Abdallah-Pretceille, 2001; Altarejos, 2018), intercultural requires overcoming the historical processes of cultural homogenization and exclusionary differentiation that have characterized modern societies. In this order of ideas, cultural diversity should not be conceived as an exception, but as a structural condition of every society. That is, interculturality demands an open and dynamic dialogue between cultures that cohabit the social space, based on the awareness of otherness and an ethic of recognition. This approach shifts interculturality from the merely descriptive plane to an ethical and political dimension.

In this order of ideas, it is considered that Honneth's theory of recognition (1997; Zúñiga & Valencia López, 2018), provides a normative basis for this emancipatory understanding, from which three fundamental forms of recognition are identified—love, right, and solidarity—that constitute structural conditions of all social life. Love, as the foundation of primary intersubjective relationships, makes self-confidence possible; the law, as a principle of legal equality, guarantees mutual recognition as responsible subjects; and solidarity, as a social recognition of particular capacities, which allows individuals to be valued in their uniqueness. These dimensions not only structure social integration, but also ground moral struggles for dignity and justice.

Likewise, from the construction of the theoretical matrix, Faundes-Peñafiel (2019) proposes to expand the theory of recognition by incorporating the dimension of cultural identity as the axis of contemporary struggles. In this framework, collective demands for cultural autonomy are not limited to symbolic demands, but seek material conditions of existence that guarantee a pluralistic and intercultural democratic horizon. Cultural identity, therefore, becomes a political category linked to the protection of historically subordinate ways of life. At the level of global dynamics, Nieto, Cleminson, Gordo, and Sedano (2002) warn that migratory movements constitute complex scenarios where intercultural altruism and the reproduction of dominant discourses converge. Although respect for difference is presented as a normative principle of plural societies, it can coexist with practices of subtle exclusion or symbolic subordination. This tension reinforces the need for a critical intercultural approach that does not romanticize diversity, but examines its structural conditions.

From anthropology, (Poutignat and Streiff-Fenart. 1997; Bari, 2002) argue that the ethnic group is not defined by itself, but in relation to the cultural differences that emerge in contexts of interethnic interaction. In this sense, ethnic identity is not explained by the cultural content itself, but by the processes of inclusion and exclusion that delimit belongings. These borders are transformed into contexts of interethnic interaction and respond to relational dynamics. Along these lines, (Bonfil, 1991; Márquez Rosano & Legorreta, 2017), also introduces the concept of cultural control, understood as the social capacity of a group to decide on the cultural elements necessary to formulate and realize its collective purposes.

In accordance with the above, the cultural elements that make up these dynamics can be classified, according to the aforementioned authors, into material, knowledge, organizational, emotional and symbolic. The materials include objects and tools linked to everyday life; knowledge is knowledge transmitted intergenerationally; the forms of organization, structures of participation and internal governance; the emotions, values, traditions and beliefs that unite the group; and the symbolic ones, communicative mechanisms such as language and identity signs. Accordingly, Hernández Chacón (2021) stresses that these symbolic components are fundamental tools for the development of intercultural processes, as they facilitate dialogue and cultural transmission.

From this perspective, Núñez (2025) defines interculturality as a relational approach that regulates the coexistence of cultures in a geographical space from the egalitarian recognition of their differences. This approach implies the possibility of dialogue, joint transformation and identity self-realization, without reproducing hierarchies or relations of domination. Interculturality, understood in this way, is not a simple multicultural coexistence, but a political and ethical project aimed at cultural justice.

In this same sense, from a critical intercultural approach, communication between people of different cultures is possible to the extent that cultures are not fixed or static entities, but dynamic historical configurations susceptible to transformation. In accordance with what has been stated (Sáez Alonso, 2001), he argues that neither cultures remain immutable nor are their members incapable of recreating them to respond to the demands of their own social life. This affirmation deactivates any essentialist conception of culture and opens the possibility of an intercultural dialogue based on the reinvention and permanent resignification of cultural frameworks.

In the same way, the educational context acquires a structural role. It is not only a matter of transmitting knowledge, but also of generating spaces for the recognition and appreciation of culturally situated knowledge, especially that coming from historically vulnerable groups. Higher education, according to Matías González and Aquino (2018), in particular, becomes a strategic space for democratizing access to knowledge and for incorporating diverse epistemologies that have traditionally been marginalized from the academic canon. From this perspective, education cannot be conceived as neutral. Its role is decisive in shaping intercultural relations based on respect and solidarity. The relationship between education and interculturality is not contingent, but structural: it is through educational processes that a critical consciousness can be built aimed at the recognition of difference and the overcoming of practices of exclusion.

In this relationship between education and interculturality, digital technologies can expand the possibilities of communication between culturally diverse subjects and communities, facilitate access to memories, languages and local productions, and promote the collaborative creation of content. However, their intercultural potential does not automatically derive from their presence. A platform can open spaces for dialogue, but also impose homogeneous languages, categories and content that make non-hegemonic knowledge invisible. From critical hermeneutics, the question is not only what technology is used, but under what rationality, for what purposes, who participates in its design and what power relations are consolidated or transformed through its use.

In correspondence with the above, in order to achieve the relationship between education and interculturality, the curriculum constitutes a central axis in this transformation. In this regard, the author Castro Robles (2007) argues that its foundation should be understood as a cultural construction in two senses: on the one hand, in terms of the social and historical conditions that frame the educational process; and, on the other hand, considering the institutional culture of each establishment. The curriculum is not a technical device, but a space of symbolic production that articulates identities, memories and social projects. Consequently, an intercultural curriculum must integrate plural knowledge and promote pedagogical practices that strengthen the cultural identity of educational actors.

Consequently, the integration of technologies in the intercultural curriculum must be guided by principles of accessibility, cultural relevance, participation and pedagogical sovereignty. This involves selecting digital resources capable of incorporating multiple languages, narratives and forms of expression; promote the production of content by the educational actors themselves; develop skills to critically analyze information; and prevent digitalisation from replacing human dialogue or deepening inequalities of access. The OECD (2023) states that the digital transformation

of education requires a systemic vision that articulates tools, actors, data, institutional capacities, and governance rules. From an intercultural perspective, such articulation must also incorporate epistemic equity and the recognition of cultural contexts.

In addition to this, it is conceived that intercultural education is configured as an ethical and political commitment aimed at the integral development of the human being. The author, Alonso (2006) defines it as an innovative and coherent approach that accepts and enhances cultural diversity, promoting exchange, integration and tolerance. However, this tolerance should not be understood as mere coexistence, but as a critical dialogue that implies relativizing one's own culture without renouncing fundamental rights. From a socio-constructivist perspective, Berger and Luckmann (1983, as cited in Borges de Souza et al., 2025), allow us to understand that social representations are produced through continuous interaction between individuals in a social system. In culturally diverse contexts, these interactions generate processes of symbolic construction and reconstruction of the "other", which makes it essential to have an education that problematizes the forms of representation and avoids the uncritical reproduction of cultural stereotypes.

Likewise, Ramos Alarcón, Espinoza Alcívar, Palma Mendoza, Valencia Caicedo, and Ocampo Alcívar (2025) argue that interculturality in education represents a transformative approach that goes beyond the simple coexistence of cultures, promoting equitable relations, critical dialogue, and mutual recognition, therefore, as they state García-Segura and Agudo-Jurado (2024, as cited in Molina, 2025) interculturality as a formative approach proposes from educational management the recognition of intercultural diversity that penetrates in bringing to light the dialogue between a diversity of cultural in order to break the moral damage generated by discriminatory practices recognized as "racism, xenophobia and homophobia". From an inclusive pedagogical perspective, Pedrero-García et al. (2017, as cited in Agreda Sigindioy, 2024) argue that intercultural education is a vehicle of openness that favors the integration of diverse students in the educational process that favors knowledge and cultural exchange, thus promoting coexistence, curricular innovation, and community participation. This definition shifts interculturality from the discursive plane to institutional practice.

In terms of recognition, Núñez (2025) conceives intercultural education as a permanent and inclusive training process, characterized by a horizontal, reciprocal and self-critical dialogue, aimed at guaranteeing the right to quality education in culturally diverse contexts. This proposal integrates universal, national and local knowledge in a framework of equity, promoting intercultural professional skills and favoring the socio-labor integration of cultural minorities.

Within the framework of the promotion of comprehensive education from intercultural education, curricular management cannot be understood only as a technical device of academic organization, but as a strategic field of symbolic, political and epistemic dispute. In this sense, Vera Gómez & Salvador Moncada, 2023 recognize it as the nodal point that makes training goals viable in real scenarios, privileging development, contextualization, and flexibility over standardized teaching models. However, from a socio-critical perspective, this viability is not neutral: it involves axiological and political decisions regarding what knowledge is legitimized, what identities are recognized, and what forms of life are made visible in the curriculum.

In this sense, curriculum management is configured as a systemic and multilevel process – macro, meso and micro – that articulates public policies, institutional models and pedagogical practices. However, this articulation is not limited to operational coherence, but constitutes a space where power relations are materialized and cultural meanings are negotiated. At the macro level, educational policies express societal projects; in the meso, institutions interpret and translate these projects; and in the micro, the classroom becomes the stage where recognition structures are reproduced or transformed. Likewise, the curricular management of technology includes, therefore, decisions on infrastructure, connectivity, teacher training, accessibility, data protection, selection of platforms and evaluation of their pedagogical and cultural effects. These decisions must overcome an instrumental logic focused on the acquisition of equipment and be oriented towards the construction of inclusive digital ecosystems. The quality of technological integration is not measured by the number of devices available, but by its ability to broaden participation, diversify

ways of learning, strengthen intercultural dialogue, and ensure that no group is excluded for economic, territorial, linguistic, cultural, or functional reasons.

From the perspective of educational management, Alvarado Mendoza (2019) argues that curricular management involves unveiling needs, demands, and scenarios with a view to promoting social transformations. This understanding acquires greater density when it is articulated with the critical perspective of Castro Rubilar (2005), who conceives it as a structural component that integrates pedagogical and organizational knowledge. Consequently, curriculum management is not reduced to the administration of contents, but is instituted as a reflexive practice capable of interrogating the hegemonic logics that organize school knowledge.

In line with this, Maia and Pacheco (2019) underline the need for coherence between the prescribed, implemented, and evaluated curriculum. However, from a critical reading, this coherence must also be examined in terms of curricular justice: is there a correspondence between what is declared intercultural and what is actually taught and validated? Contemporary curriculum management therefore requires monitoring devices that are not only technical, but also ethical-political, which make it possible to evaluate whether the curriculum contributes to the effective recognition of cultural diversity. Likewise, the author Aparicio Gómez (2023) expands this vision by integrating planning, execution, and control processes aligned with principles of educational quality. However, from a critical theory perspective, quality cannot be understood exclusively in terms of efficiency or measurable results, but as the capacity of the education system to guarantee conditions of recognition, participation and emancipation.

On this point, Honneth's (1997) theory of recognition provides a fundamental normative framework. If the spheres of love, law and solidarity constitute structural conditions for the development of individual and collective autonomy, then curricular management must be conceived as an institutional device aimed at guaranteeing these conditions. A critically managed intercultural curriculum not only organizes content, but also enables formative experiences that promote self-confidence, self-respect, and social self-esteem in culturally diverse contexts.

In this sense, from an integrative perspective, Núñez (2025) conceives curricular management as a network of permanent processes that, articulated at the macro, meso and micro levels, allow the consolidation of high-quality comprehensive education focused on values, development of professional skills and continuous improvement. This conception emphasizes that curricular management not only seeks academic results, but also the strengthening of competencies for work performance and the ethical training of students.

4. Conclusions

As a result of the theoretical and analytical triangulation developed, it is evident that the concept of culture has moved from evolutionary and functionalist approaches to symbolic, structural and relational perspectives understood as a dynamic system of meanings, practices and structures in permanent historical configuration. Culture ceases to be understood as a static repertoire of customs to be assumed as a complex network that articulates material and symbolic dimensions, individual and collective, local and global. This reconceptualization is decisive to support an intercultural education that does not treat diversity as a peripheral add-on, but as a structuring principle of social and formative experience.

The conceptual journey allows us to affirm that interculturality, from a critical perspective, cannot be reduced to a normative principle of coexistence or cultural tolerance. On the contrary, it constitutes an ethical-political project aimed at transforming the power relations that have historically produced exclusion and subordination. Critical theory (Alvesson & Deetz, 2006) reveals that cultural dynamics are traversed by structures of symbolic domination and technocratic rationalities that legitimize hegemonic interests. In this framework, interculturality emerges as a counter-hegemonic practice that questions processes of homogenization and dismantles logics of structural exclusion (Pretceille, 2001).

The theory of recognition (Honneth, 1997), extended to its cultural dimension (Faundes-Peñafiel, 2019), provides the normative foundation that maintains that struggles for cultural identity are not merely symbolic claims, but structural moral demands linked to dignity, equality and solidarity. Cultural recognition is thus configured as a

constitutive condition of a democratic social life. Without recognition, there is no autonomy; without autonomy, there is no full citizenship.

From relational anthropology, Barth (1976) demonstrates that cultural identities are configured in dynamic processes of delimitation and negotiation, while Bonfil's (1991) concept of cultural control shows that autonomy depends on the effective capacity of peoples to decide on their material, symbolic and organizational elements. When this capacity is restricted, forms of imposed or alienated culture emerge that reproduce structural subordination. Critical interculturality, therefore, demands not only dialogue, but also a real redistribution of cultural power. Consequently, it is concluded that a critical interculturality demands:

1. Denaturalize the structures of cultural domination.
2. Guarantee effective forms of moral, legal and solidarity recognition.
3. To strengthen the decision-making capacity of peoples over their cultural elements.
4. Promote a non-hierarchical intercultural dialogue, based on reciprocity and epistemic equity.

In this horizon, intercultural education is consolidated as a transformative pedagogical project that articulates cultural recognition, curricular reconfiguration, development of intercultural competencies and democratization of knowledge. It is not limited to promoting respect for diversity, but seeks to restructure the symbolic and institutional matrices that reproduce inequality, orienting itself towards the construction of a plural and socially just citizenship. From this perspective, curriculum management acquires a strategic status. It transcends the technical dimension of content organization to become a political-pedagogical process of regulation, innovation and permanent evaluation of the curriculum. Its function is not only to ensure institutional coherence and relevance, but also to guarantee that the curriculum operates as a device for educational recognition and justice. In intercultural contexts, curricular management can reproduce logics of homogenization or, on the contrary, become a space of emancipation.

In this architecture, technology must be conceived as a transversal dimension of intercultural curriculum management. Its educational value depends on its being accessible, contextualized, ethically governed, and open to the plural production of knowledge. An uncritical incorporation can reproduce digital colonialities, homogenize content and widen gaps; on the other hand, a pedagogically and culturally situated appropriation can strengthen participation, the recognition of identities and the collective construction of knowledge. Therefore, intercultural digital competence must integrate technical skills with critical capacities to interpret information, recognize biases, protect rights, dialogue with difference, and create content that is representative of communities.

Finally, strengthening educational quality from an intercultural perspective implies, therefore, resignifying curricular management as a reflective, ethical and politically committed practice. Quality cannot be reduced to indicators of efficiency or performance, but must also be measured by its ability to generate recognition, inclusion, and epistemic equity. Only in this way can higher education become a plural democratic space where cultural identities are not tolerated, but recognized as the foundation of a fair and sustainable coexistence.

REFERENCES

1. Acosta Melchor, B. A. (2024). Textualization and textuality in research activity. *Revista Educación*, 22(23), 8–11. <https://doi.org/10.51440/unsch.revistaeducacion.2024.23.502>
2. Agreda Sigindioy, T. M. (2024). Transforming Education: The Role of Intercultural Teacher Training in the Integration of Foreign Immigrant Students. *Innovaciones Educativas*, 26(40), 223–234. <https://doi.org/10.22458/ie.v26i40.4816>
3. Alonso, Rafael. (2006). Intercultural education. *Revista de educación*, ISSN 0034-8082, No. 339, 2006 (Issue dedicated to: Advice and community support for the improvement of education), pp. 859-881. 339.
4. Altarejos Martínez, M. (2002). [Review of book Martine Abdallah-Pretceille (2001). *Intercultural education*. Barcelona: Idea Books, 100 pp.]. *ESE: Studies on education.*, 3, 168-170. <https://doi.org/10.15581/004.3.168>.
5. Alvarado Mendoza, N. J. (2024). Curriculum Management: A View from the Managerial Work of the Teacher. *Management and Management*, 18(2), 26–45. <https://revistas.uclave.org/index.php/gyg>
6. Anadón, Marta. (2008). The so-called "qualitative" research: from the dynamics of its evolution to the undeniable achievements and the present questions. *Nursing Research and Education*, 26(2), 198-211. Retrieved June 07, 2026, from http://www.scielo.org.co/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0120-53072008000200002&lng=en&tlng=es.

7. Aparicio Gómez, Oscar Yecid. (2023). Educational innovation and curricular management.
8. Araiza Díaz, V., Araiza Díaz, A., & Medécigo Daniel, U. (2020). Culture: A matter of information and communication. *Studies on Contemporary Cultures*, 26(51). <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=31662848003>
9. Barth, F. (1976). Ethnic groups and their borders: The social organization of cultural differences. Fondo de Cultura Económica
10. Bari, M. C., (2002). The Ethnic Question: An Approach to the Concepts of Ethnic Group, Ethnic Identity, Ethnicity and Interethnic Relations. *Cuadernos de Antropología Social*, (16), 149-163.
11. Bonfil, G., (1991). The theory of cultural control in the study of ethnic processes. *Studies on Contemporary Cultures*, IV(12), 165-204.
12. Borges de Souza, Amanda, Schultz, Glauco, & Triana Riveros, Jorge Luis. (2025). Beyond Surfaces: A Chronological Analysis of the Concept of Social Construction. *Revista Rupturas*, 15(1), 1-18. <https://dx.doi.org/10.22458/rr.v15i1.5666>
13. Camacho, H., & Marcano, N. (2003). The experiential introspective research approach and its operational sequences. Some case studies. *Omnia*, 9(1),
14. Cantón Mayo, I. (2006). Fraser, N. and Honneth, A. (2006): Redistribution or recognition? *Bordón. Journal of Pedagogy*, 58(3), 437-439. Retrieved from <https://recyt.fecyt.es/index.php/BORDON/article/view/39604>
15. Castillo-López, M. (2025). Develop hermeneutical research in education: Epistemological foundations and implementation. *International Journal of Educational Theory and Research*. <https://doi.org/10.5209/ritie.105041>
16. Castro Rubilar, F., (2005). CURRICULUM MANAGEMENT: A NEW LOOK AT THE CURRICULUM AND THE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION. *Educational Horizons*, (10), 13-25.
17. Castro Robles, Y. . (2007). Education for human development in a globalized world. *Trends and Challenges*, 12(1), 157-175. <https://revistas.lasalle.edu.co/index.php/te/article/view/4895>
18. de Haro Honrubia, Alejandro. (2024). The theory of symbols in the work of José Ortega y Gasset. *Anthropological perspectives1.. Logos (La Serena)*, 34(1), 189-208. <https://dx.doi.org/10.15443/rl3408>
19. Denzin, N.K. (2009). *The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315134543>
20. Escobar Triana, J. A. (2012). Defense of diversity and human dignity in the UNESCO Universal Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights. *Colombian Journal of Bioethics*, 7(2). <https://doi.org/10.18270/rcb>
21. Faundes-Peñañiel, Juan Jorge. (2019). Fundamental right to cultural identity of indigenous peoples: a new paradigm in indigenous criminal defense in Chile against the hegemonic rule of law. *Left*, (45), 51-78. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718-50492019000100051>
22. Forni, P., & De Grande, P. (2020). Triangulation and mixed methods in contemporary social sciences. *Revista Mexicana de Sociología*, 82(1), 159-189. <https://doi.org/10.22201/iis.01882503p.2020.1.58064>
23. Gibbs, G. (2007). *Analyzing qualitative data*. SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781849208574>
24. Gonzalez Martinez, Elier, & Gonzalez Castro, Lissette Andrea. (2022). Acculturation stress in natives: an approach to the Guayaquil reality. *International Journal of Social Science Research*, 18(1), 171-190. Epub June 00, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.18004/riics.2022.junio.171>
25. Goyal, Tanya. (2022). Review: Clifford Geertz. (1973). *The Interpretative of Cultures: Selective Essays*. New York: Basic Books. Pp. 470, ISBN-0006862608. 10.13140/RG.2.2.30998.56646.
26. Hernández Chacón, L. (2021). Interculturality and Knowledge Management: A Field Under Construction for Ecuadorian Higher Education. *Chakiñan, Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, volume (issue), xx-xx. <https://doi.org/10.37135/chk.002.13.10>
27. Jick, T.D. (1979) Mixing Qualitative and Quantitative Methods: Triangulation in Action. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24, 602-611. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2392366>
28. Kinsella, Elizabeth & Whiteford, Gail. (2009). Kinsella, E. A. & Whiteford, G. (2009). Knowledge generation and utilization: Toward epistemic reflexivity. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal*, 56(4), 249-258.. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal*. 56. 249-258.
29. Lincoln, Y. S. (1995). Emerging criteria for quality in qualitative and interpretive research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 1(3), 275-289. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107780049500100301>
30. Lugo, J. K. (2026). From Understanding to Transformation: A Systematic Review of Hermeneutical Approaches Oriented to Praxis and Social Change. *Revista Espacios*, 47(2). <https://doi.org/10.48082/espacios-a26v47n02p06>
31. Mahecha López, E. (2017). Peace and the politics of recognition in the thought of Charles Taylor. *Justice Juris*, 13(1), 113-121. <https://doi.org/10.15665/rj.v13i1.1528>
32. Maia, I. B, & Pacheco, J. A. (2019). Curriculum management based on results and standards and their effects on institutional evaluation. *Laplace em Revista*, 5, Special No., 18-30. doi: <https://doi.org/10.24115/S2446-622020195especial775p.18-30>.
33. Mahecha López, E. (2017). Peace and the politics of recognition in the thought of Charles Taylor. *Justice Juris*, 13(1), 113-121. <https://doi.org/10.15665/rj.v13i1.1528>
34. Márquez Rosano, Conrado & Legorreta, María del Carmen. (2017). Territorial appropriation, culture and power: Conceptual proposal for the study of indigenous and peasant communities in the Mexican context. 7.
35. Martínez Miguélez, Miguel. (2006). Validity and reliability in qualitative methodology. *Paradigma*, 27(2), 07-33. Retrieved on June 08, 2026, from http://ve.scielo.org/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1011-22512006000200002&lng=es&tlng=es.

36. Matías González, Alberto & Aquino, Orlando. (2018). EPISTEMOLOGICAL CHALLENGES OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY. *Cadernos de Pesquisa*. 25. 11. 10.18764/2178-2229.v25n1p11-22.
37. Molina, K. (2025). Educational management model for interculturality and inclusivity in Colombia. *Orbis: Electronic Scientific Journal of Human Sciences*, 60, 34–44. <https://doi.org/10.37135/chk.002.13.10>
38. Mondaca Rojas, C., & Gajardo Carvajal, Y. (2013). BILINGUAL INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION IN THE REGION OF ARICA AND PARINACOTA, 1980-2010. *Andean Dialogue*, 69–87. <https://doi.org/10.4067/s0719-26812013000200007>
39. Nieto, Ana & Cleminson, Richard & Gordo, Ángel & Sedano, Antonio. (2002). Intercultural education: a present-day challenge for Europe.
40. Noroño, J. G., Vílchez, R. A., & Meriño, V. H. (2025). Hermeneutics and Contrast: Multiparadigm and Multimethod Tools for Scientific Writing. *Journal of Social Sciences*, XXXI (Special 12), 422-436
41. Núñez Ríos, G. (2025). Intercultural education based on curricular management for the strengthening of the quality of higher education. *Corporación Universidad de la Costa*. Available in: <https://hdl.handle.net/11323/14676>
42. Oses Gil, A., Cabeza Herrera, O. J., Flórez Pabón, C. E., & Botero Urquijo, D. A. (2022). Critical Intercultural Education: An Alternative for the Construction of the Colombian Post-Conflict. *Analysis*, 54(101). <https://doi.org/10.15332/21459169.7579>
43. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.OECD. (2023). Education at a Glance 2023: OECD Indicators. Education at a Glance, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1787/e13bef63-en>
44. OECD (2023), OECD Digital Education Outlook 2023: Towards an Effective Digital Education Ecosystem, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/c74f03de-en>.
45. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 2023). Recommendation concerning education for peace and human rights, international understanding, cooperation, fundamental freedoms, global citizenship and sustainable development. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org>
46. Padrón, J. (1998): La Estructura de los Procesos de Investigación, in *REVISTA EDUCACIÓN Y CIENCIAS HUMANAS* Año IX, nº 17 julio-diciembre de 2001, p. 33 ...
47. Pallares-Arévalo, E., & Ravelo-Méndez, R. de J. (2025). Inclusive Education: The Voice of Academic Actors at the Universidad Popular del Cesar, Colombia. *ULEAM Bahía Magazine (UBM)*, 6(10), 42–52. <https://doi.org/10.56124/ubm.v6i10.005>
48. Podestá C., P., (2006). AN APPROACH TO THE CONCEPT OF CULTURE. *Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Science*, 11(21), 25-39.
49. Paz-Mardones, Fernando & Kotthoff-Cristensen, Francisco & Fuentes-Jara, Freddy & Collipal-Velásquez, Christian & Riquelme, Enrique & Halberstadt, Amy. (2022). Monocultural education in the teaching of visual arts in contexts of cultural diversity in Chile. *Educare Electronic Magazine*. 26. 1-20. 10.15359/REE.26-3.12.
50. Quetglas, Augusto. (2023). Critical Balance of Bronislaw Malinowski's Legal Anthropology. *Journal of the Museum of Anthropology*, 16(1), 127-138. <https://doi.org/10.31048/1852.4826.v16.n1.39690>
51. Quintana, Laura & Hermida, Julian. (2020). Hermeneutics as a Method of Text Interpretation in Psychoanalytic Research. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. 10.2139/ssrn.3593031
52. Ramos Alarcón, M. V., Espinoza Alcivar , O. U., Palma Mendoza , B. L., Valencia Caicedo , M. V., & Ocampo Alcivar, A. P. (2025). Interculturality in Education: An Approach to Inclusion and Respect for Cultural Diversity. *Ciencia Latina Revista Científica Multidisciplinar*, 9(2), 6515-6536. https://doi.org/10.37811/cl_rcm.v9i2.17383
53. Rodríguez Gómez, J. C. (2023). The importance of diversity and inclusion in education. *Studies and Perspectives: Scientific and Academic Review*, 3(2), 16–47. <https://doi.org/10.61384/r.c.a.v3i2.30>
54. Sáez Alonso, R. (2001). Intercultural education in the field of education for sustainable human development. *Complutense Journal of Education*, 12(2), 713–737.
55. UNESCO. (2023). Global Education Monitoring Report 2023: Technology in education: A tool on whose terms? UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000385723>
56. Vagle, M.D. (2018). *Crafting Phenomenological Research* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315173474>
57. Valenzuela Espinosa, Felipe. (2024). Deliberative practices and dynamics of citizen participation: systematic review on Doi conditions and criteria in empirical deliberation scenarios. *Ibero-American Journal of Municipal Studies*, 28, 11. Epub 2025 Mar 17.<https://dx.doi.org/10.32457/riem1.2811>
58. Vera Gómez, N. V., & Salvador Moncada, J. (2023). Competency-Based Curriculum Management for the Development of Teacher Teaching Processes in Basic Education Environments. *Ciencia Latina Revista Científica Multidisciplinar*, 7(3), 7554-7568. https://doi.org/10.37811/cl_rcm.v7i3.6744
59. Vidanovic, A., & Gómez, L. (2025). The phenomenological-hermeneutical method: Interpretation from the introspective-experiential approach. *Dialogus Magazine*, 15, 27–45. <https://doi.org/10.37594/dialogus.v1i15.1715>
60. White, L. A. (1961). The concept of evolution in cultural anthropology. *Journal of Social Sciences*, (1), 61–83. Retrieved from <https://revistas.upr.edu/index.php/racs/article/view/9566>
61. Zúñiga, L. A., & Valencia López, H. (2018). Axel Honneth's theory of recognition as a critical theory of contemporary capitalist society. *Political Reflection*, 20(39), 289–306. <https://doi.org/10.29375/01240781.3307>

62. Zúñiga Rodríguez, M. (2021). Basic principles and foundations of educational inclusion. The case of the Autonomous University of the State of Hidalgo, Mexico. *International Journal of Developmental and Educational Psychology. INFAD Journal of Psychology*, 2(2), 291–298. <https://doi.org/10.17060/ijodaep.2021.n2.v2.2235>