

Biopolitical strategies in contemporary institutions: Critical analysis of mechanisms of control and protection of human rights

 Sheila Yajaira Barnet Flota¹,  Arturo Gonzalez Torres^{2*},  María Luisa Pereira Hernández³,  Fátima Yaraset Mendoza Montero⁴

¹Institute of Higher Studies for Competitiveness and Development in America, Quintana Roo, Mexico; sheila.barnet@iescda.edu.mx (S.Y.B.F.).

^{2,4}National Technological Institute of Mexico/Technological Institute of Milpa Alta, Mexico City, Mexico; cann.azteca13@gmail.com (A.G.T.) fatmendez71@hotmail.com (F.Y.M.M.).

³State Pedagogical University of Sinaloa, Sinaloa, Mexico; pereirahdz@hotmail.com (M.L.P.H.).

Abstract: This research aimed to strengthen knowledge about institutional biopolitical power and to describe strategies to develop social justice and human rights. The methodology used was qualitative in approach, but as a tool or instrument. Qualitative techniques were used through a critical review of the literature on biopolitical theories, in order to find patterns on how they are applied in the institution. Five key elements were found in their application: institutional control and regulation, management of subjectivities and behaviors, administration of resources and capacities, optimization technologies and control and regulation of life trajectories. The study found that biopolitics functions as a tool to regulate key social dimensions such as health, education and security.

Keywords: *Biopolitics, Human rights, Institutions, Mixed methodology, Social control.*

1. Introduction

For Foucault [1] biopower is the current power base that shapes the existence of communities; it is not just about frontal pressure, but various subtle tricks and maneuvers that threaten health, birth, education and other vital issues of human existence. Yin [2] considers it one of the key sciences for understanding current problems such as the spread of coronavirus, migration policies, and the monitoring of technology under a common name.

It has been worked on a complex topic from different perspectives, to define how it influences the decisions made by government entities concerning human life such as schools and hospitals. Therefore, the analysis of biopolitics in institutions is one of the essential elements to show how power structures influence human life through the regulation and financing of health, education, social security, and others.

Today, biopolitics faces major challenges from the use of technology, and the emergence of biotechnology and biomedicine presents challenges to the strategies of the regulatory power of human rights and guarantees, leading to questions of how strong power is, how much human rights are protected in testing or other applications, who among individuals deserves gene therapy, should genetic information be protected?

The above questions are just some of the questions raised by biopolitics in the 21st century, due to the ethical and social dilemmas that have arisen because of the progress made and the need to balance power, equity and human rights.

Despite theoretical advances in biopolitics, there are gaps in the state of the art, specifically in research that combines qualitative and quantitative methods and provides insights into the influence on decisions made by institutions [3] since, as regulatory and supervisory bodies, they have the role of

managing how biopolitical strategies are carried out.

It is essential to increase the creation of studies that amalgamate qualitative and quantitative approaches, that explore the influence on institutional decisions, their relevance and at the same time, unravel their current functionality, apart from unraveling the common biopolitical tactics in the entities and their incidence on human existence, by investigating how the dynamics are organized and how they work in today's world? what biopolitical mechanisms are usually observed in the entities? and what is their repercussion on the day-to-day life of the subjects?

Due to the limited approaches, the lack of comprehensive studies and the combination of qualitative and quantitative methods in this area, researchers are prevented from creating a clear picture of the effects of biopower strategies in relation to institutional decision making.

Another concealment is found in the formulation of the proposed unknown; however, the thorough breakdown and in-depth contemplation of contemporary literature allows for the uncovering of patterns and trends that demonstrate the biopolitics implemented. Through interconnection, both methodologies will reveal fields of possible practice and systematically describe them in their realization and effect.

The approach presented by the performance of the discipline of political biopolitical science intends to bring together the analysis of all forms of power and entities and in turn a new strategy of convincing based on favorable and moral arguments that may be feasible. However, beyond the complexity and confusion, the vicious circle may fall, if only highly technical legal frameworks are studied.

This study, therefore, ceases to be a mere theoretical discovery and becomes a tool to learn about biopolitical strategies in real contemporary institutions.

2. Target

To analyze the modern forms of biopolitical power present in governmental and private entities, and from there to unravel the subtle ingenuities of social regulation that condition human life.

3. Background

Biopolitics has undergone an astonishing transformation since its genesis by Foucault [1] who describes biopolitics as the art of dominating human existence through multiple strategies of regulation and control; he believed that we live in an era where "state power, whose paradigm was homicidal, is preferentially interested in life, in the phenomena of birth, death, the rise of demography". Through the targeting of various tactics and instruments, population became "the basic theme of every modern state because it is the cornerstone of all that constitutes politics understood as the rationality of government".

Arendt [4] similarly examines the way in which contemporary administration prioritizes the development of forms of life but does not resort to the concept of biopolitics.

Kottow [5] argues that classical biopolitics has focused primarily on questions of power and the regulation of life.

de la Garza [6] points out that biopolitics addresses the politics of life ("bios"), focusing specifically on public health and environmental policies, which are intrinsically linked to Bioethics.

Tejeda González [7] indicates that this notion refers to the faculty of power to affect, administer, organize, regulate and suppress life, which broadens its function in human existence.

Geo and Luengo Navas [8] argue that this term is generated by conjugating two expressions; the etymology of "bio", which means life, and politics; additionally, it refers to an issue related to the power interactions that originate and develop within the governmental sphere.

Tobeña [9] also mentions that biopolitics is examined by political psychology and neuropolitics, which provide a detailed examination of intelligence and how we are as people, but, above all, of the brain.

On the other hand, studies such as that of Paredes-Zempual, et al. [10] delve deeper from a different perspective, analyzing how contemporary institutions use biopolitical strategies to manage subjectivities and collective behaviors, but specifically, organizational contours where management skills and organizational climate become forms of control, within the institutions. In this line, the research by

Cárdenas-Tapia [11] on the development of multidisciplinary and multi-institutional linkages is part of this approach, addressing how scientific collaboration networks in higher education institutional spaces are also a place where a biopolitical power relationship is exercised that regulates the production of knowledge and academic trajectories.

Valencia-Sandoval, et al. [12] have also investigated the section of biopolitics and the technological dimension, they assume cyberdependence as a new type of biopower mechanisms that decrease the competitiveness of institutions; throughout the research, they discover how digital technology has shifted institutional power to open activity and reshaped traditional surveillance and control mechanisms.

At the public policy level, Muñoz, et al. [13] have analyzed government programs such as Jóvenes construyendo el futuro and how they function as biopolitical devices that aim to regulate the lifestyles of biopopulations, in this case, young people, through labor inclusion and exclusion technology.

For their part, Jerónimo-Jiménez, et al. [14] present a perspective on how organizational learning and scientific creation in universities are inextricably intertwined, through biopolitical tactics of governance and resource itself, i.e., intellectual skills, making clear the urgency of focusing on the human, to investigate in depth, the dynamics of agency in biopolitical institutional regulation.

Likewise, García-Martínez, et al. [15] have investigated the fundamental factors involved in the choice of an academic and found path, demonstrating that universities use gender biopolitics to inform the opinions and decisions of their students and to permanently steer students towards a previously approved and suitable job and career facilitated by the predefined imperatives of society and the economy.

Similarly, Lemke [16] provides an overview of current biopolitics by investigating how neoliberal policies have altered the systems of life management and supervision, allowing the expansion of new spheres of subjectivation in which people are mostly the architect of their own well-being and in a context where governmental intervention has been diminished.

One can also mention the work of Esposito [17] regarding immunity and community; the researcher points out how collective defenses are in constant combat with the whirlwind of exclusion that every modern entity carries with it. In the post-pandemic context, this era was strengthened as the most relevant, as the statistics of bioregulatory policies became specific evidence.

Furthermore, Agamben [18] noted the uniqueness of this biopower through the state of exception, as measures 'normalize' the exceptional actions that reimaged the citizenship of citizens and corporations. This author's work emphasizes the opportunity to shape how these decisive moments provide leaders with the opportunity to protect and promote the development of biopower mechanisms.

In the Latin American framework, Castro-Gómez [19] introduced a decolonial critique of biopolitics, exposing how organizations maintain colonial schemes in developing policies to dominate and manage communities; he also points out lessons historically and geographically that are often outside the classical perspective of biopolitical theory.

For his part, Vázquez Arredondo [20] argues that, based on the original theoretical conception proposed by Foucault, he has provided the opportunity to consider from a philosophical, social and political viewpoint, those bonds of authority that are generated and replicated in the community fabric, and that have a connection with the somatic, linked to the biological dimension of the individual and public administration.

Guzñay, et al. [21] alludes to that, Biopolitics is valuable, since it facilitates us to understand the way in which dominion manifests itself in the life of populations in all its facets from different perspectives.

4. Methodology

4.1. Paradigm

The analysis employed a hybrid view, meticulously merging qualitative and quantitative techniques into a single picture. Hernández Sampieri, et al. [22] point out that this approach

encompasses both theoretical perspectives and empirical evidence about a phenomenon or problématique taking place in the entities.

Its qualitative character lies in the need for a thorough review of the available literature, where writings, approaches and notions about biopolitics from different philosophical and sociological perspectives will be analyzed. Its main study dealt with the consequences and significance of theoretical and methodological frameworks in the configuration of institutional rules.

It is also measured numerically, since statistics, through its ability to synthesize and comprehensively analyze a multitude of previous research, reveal patterns, trends and general conclusions through the data. It uses, therefore, a mixed method, and their conjugation was essential; on the one hand, the qualitative was helpful with respect to understanding how biopolitical strategies operate and are structured, while on the other, the quantitative provides a more measurable dimension through numerical data on impact and trends through previous research.

4.2. Method

In addition to describing the phenomenon, the study provides a comprehensive view of its impact in an objective manner and based on previous data.

On the other hand, it is worth noting the descriptive and explanatory level of research. On the one hand, it is descriptive; because it describes how institutions use certain strategies to intervene with people's lives. The description is the main point since it explains and shows how these elements work and how they influence health, education and social welfare. Some previous works and the organization of ideas and patterns of description of biopolitics in the social environment.

At the same time, it is also explanatory. It breaks down events but also explains the causes and consequences of biopolitical tactics in society. This leads to a more in-depth exploration of events and how political and social decisions influence them. It discusses the development of technology and how it has changed how power can be held over people's lives and how institutional policies, as mentioned above, can limit and liberate human rights. This paper concludes by trying to explain to the readers not only based on examples and collected data.

4.3. Procedure

Documentary research was conducted, generating a catalog of key academic and theoretical references on biopolitics in institutions, as well as including previous research with different perspectives. Subsequently, key words were defined to select the studies collected. Next, the coding and organization of the data was carried out, for which a logbook was created to maintain order and discipline in the study. Together, the studies examined were ordered by means of a data matrix that facilitated the comparison and detailed analysis of each research reference.

Then, with the information obtained, a summary of the studies was developed, and the coincidences were classified to create the final table of the study.

We then proceeded to generate a synthesis and conclusions that integrated the results of the exhaustive review, trying to specify the impact of biopolitics on the entities and the possible methodologies to improve its implementation in favor of social justice and fundamental freedoms. Finally, the first report was drafted, proofread and the final document with the research findings was disseminated.

5. Results

The purpose of the study was to evaluate biopolitical strategies in contemporary institutions through critical analysis. To this end, the findings of this analysis are presented:

5.1. Synthesis of Previous Research

The above studies identified the following main trends as shown below:

- Impact of biopolitics on education and medicine to by Foucault [1]. In the case of this parameter, most of the studies reviewed show how institutional policies regulate access to education and medicine to control the population.

- Role of institutional power: current evidence reveals that institutions use biopolitical policies for two reasons: the first is to influence guaranteeing essential rights; while the second involves the need to be monitored and controlled.

- Impact on technology: as alluded to by Flick [23] the use of biomedical technologies and surveillance systems has changed power dynamics and raised new ethical and social questions about data management and privacy.

However, despite the results, biopolitics is dynamic in its dependence on political, social and technological control, and its procedure in society is diverse and extensive.

5.2. Data Evaluation

The information was summarized to produce a table (see table) in which column 1 refers to the characteristics found, column 2 symbolizes the authors that coincide and column 3 represents the number of repetitions.

Table 1.
Summary of information.

Feature	References	Frequency
Institutional Control and Regulation	Cárdenas-Tapia [11]; Díaz de León Cruz, et al. [24]; Paredes-Zempual, et al. [10]; Jerónimo-Jiménez, et al. [14]; Valencia-Sandoval, et al. [12] and Muñoz, et al. [13].	6
Subjectivity and Behavior Management	Fracica Naranjo and Garcia Vargas [25]; Paredes-Zempual, et al. [10]; Andrade de Noguera [26]; García-Martínez, et al. [15] and Vidrio-Barón, et al. [27].	5
Resource and Capacity Management	Núñez Ramírez, et al. [28]; Bada-Carbajal, et al. [29]; Gámez, et al. [30] and Jerónimo-Jiménez, et al. [14].	4
Optimization and Control Technologies	Cárdenas-Tapia [11]; Ollivier Fierro, et al. [31]; Valencia-Sandoval, et al. [12] and Andrade de Noguera [26].	4
Regulation of Vital Trajectories	Diez, et al. [32]; Gámez, et al. [30]; Muñoz, et al. [13] and García-Martínez, et al. [15].	4

The table above shows that institutional control and regulation was the factor most cited by the authors, followed by the factor of management of subjectivities and behaviors, and in third place were the variables: management of resources and capabilities, optimization and control technologies, and regulation of life trajectories.

5.3. Key Findings from the Data Analysis

Table 2 summarizes the variables, where the first column shows the number of variables, column 2 indicates the elements, and the third column specifies the number of authors that coincided.

Table 2.
Information condensation.

No.	Elements	Frequency
1	Institutional Control and Regulation	6
2	Subjectivity and Behavior Management	5
3	Resource and Capacity Management	4
4	Optimization and Control Technologies	4
5	Regulation of Vital Trajectories	4

Therefore, biopolitics is not a monolithic phenomenon, and this confirms the chosen hypothesis. The socio-political, technological and on-site conditions create the need to adjust tactics and

strategies within biopolitics.

5.4. Conclusions of the Results

Therefore, the present study has described the most subtle and comprehensive view of biopolitical tactics, related to the institutional system of the modern stage, which have such deep and complex dynamics, thus going beyond the classical practices of power visualization and social control. To conclude, as a result of the combination of a critical hybrid approach to literature and a statistical analysis of common pattern frequencies, the following conclusions can be formulated innately:

Thus, the exploration of the empirical data reveals that biopolitical tactics are not a single phenomenon, but deploy a variety of intertwined facets. The results show that the mechanism of institutional control and regulation is predominant with 6 identified studies, followed by the management of subjectivities and behaviors with 5 studies, while the administration of resources and capabilities, optimization technologies and control and regulation of life trajectories are presented with the same frequency with 4 studies respectively.

Thus, empirical evidence illustrates the adaptive and contextualized capacity of biopower in modern entities. The available evidence reflects that biopolitical tactics function as both architects of forced liberation and engines of restrictive regimes. In other words, if, on the one hand, they facilitate and deliver means to safeguard and promote fundamental human rights through various policies of a social nature, on the other hand, they manifest themselves in "biopower in the sense of control and surveillance", perceived by some as restrictive to freedom.

Thus, the duality of construction becomes a central challenge for democratic societies. Namely, democratic states are obliged to guarantee collective protection and, at the same time, preserve personal autonomy.

The study shows the importance of socio-political, technological and territorial conditions in the concrete configuration of biopolitical strategies. The differences found in various institutional contexts point to the inexistence of a single model for the disposition of biopower, but rather to its adaptation to the circumstances of its exercise. Heterogeneity demands analytical approaches aimed at conceiving contextual specificity as a key variable for interpreting biopolitical phenomena.

From the results just summarized, it can be pointed out that contemporary institutions deploy differentiated biopolitical strategies according to their specific purposes and fields of action. Thus, while in education there is a predominance of mechanisms for the management of sexual trajectories and the subjugation of lives to give rise to subjects and maintain states of life, in health there are technologies for the optimization of biological processes and resource management systems. Finally, in the field of production and administration, there are behavioral control technologies focused on the productive activity of male and female workers. Sectoral diffusion indicates the specialization of the manifestations of biopower according to institutional fields.

However, the existing literature has identified a number of significant limitations. In particular, little has been written on the basis of the combined results of quantitative and qualitative methodologies, and given the inequalities experienced and structured by institutional idiosyncrasies in areas as diverse as Ibero-America, there has been almost no attention to the specific institutional contexts in regions with diverse political-administrative traditions, and if there was, it was limited to national or local governments in these countries. In fact, in methodological complementarity, there are many unexplored opportunities for further research to deepen the understanding of biopolitics today.

Such a meticulous evaluation of previous findings would facilitate sound suggestions for institutional implementation and public policy formulation. On the one hand, structural and procedural mechanisms of clarity and accountability should be established to challenge possible limits to biopolitics.

In other words, ideal mechanisms of institutional citizen involvement should be established for the performance of policy evaluations that influence biopolitical fabric. Finally, biopolitical

regulations and instrumentalization must be adaptable and flexible to change in response to the emerging challenges of technological and social revolutions.

6. Discussion

The findings of this research uncover critical patterns in the application of biopolitical tactics by contemporary entities and thus provide at least an empirical foundation in the quest to understand the essence of the phenomenon. Furthermore, in the following subsections, the findings are considered theoretically and practically, comparing them to the existing literature and looking through its lens at human rights-related chains and practices.

Finally, the analysis reveals another fundamental tension, specifically a dialectic, between the mechanisms of institutional control and regulation - recognized as the most common factor in literature - and the de facto protection of human rights. It is necessary to stress that such a dialectic only confirms the Foucauldian view on the ambivalence of biopolitical power, i.e., power protects life and, at the same time limits it Foucault [1]. However, the results suggest that such an interrelationship is more complicated than the classical theory suggests. As mentioned above, contemporary institutions are volitional and, therefore, are forced to justify their regulatory mechanisms through democratic legitimacy, i.e., through the discourse of protecting the collective welfare.

It is worth including that this complexity is not foreign to the educational and health context, since the institutional policies that condition the incorporation and graduation in the different spaces operate simultaneously as mechanisms for the guarantee of basic rights and interventions in the lives of the populations. In line with the above, the university selection criteria addressed by García-Martínez, et al. [15] for example, show how educational institutions not only limit the possibilities of access of subjects, but also continue to shape their life trajectories through mechanisms that are apparently neutral and technological, but highly political in their implementation.

Based on the above, it can be concluded that the results show that digitization has "quality" biopolitical institutional strategies, generating forms of control and surveillance that exceed the limits of what has been conceptualized to date as biopower.

According to Valencia-Sandoval, et al. [12] cyberdependence constitutes a new embodiment of biopower, which is realized through the monitoring of data and digital technology and gives rise to new forms of vulnerability and asymmetry in the realm of dependency. The visual comparison, however, reveals that another main biopolitical technique carried out by modern institutional entities resides in the framework of shaping identities and behaviors. In fact, the finding relates to the work of Andrade de Noguera [26] on well-being and personal emotional identity. The author suggests that modern welfare entities improved the technology of control, limiting no longer bodies, but above all minds and subjective skills.

However, one of the findings of the analysis, which has not been sufficiently explored in previous studies, is the unequal distribution of the effects of institutional biopower according to the intersections of class, gender, race and all other forms of social discrimination. It appears from the data that the strategies do not affect the totality of the population homogeneously but rather tend to intensify among the most historically disadvantaged groups.

The Jerónimo-Jiménez, et al. [14] program, analyzed by Muñoz, et al. [13] exemplifies this complexity given that while it produces opportunities for labor inclusion, it reproduces logics of precariousness applied in a differentiated manner among beneficiaries and, undoubtedly, fails to transform the structural problems that underlie inequality.

The results obtained allow us to raise the fundamental question as to whether it is possible to reformulate institutional biopolitical strategies in directions more in line with social justice and human rights. Although the logic of control and regulation predominates, institutional experiences are also mentioned that open the possibility of what some contemporary theorists such as Esposito [17] have called "affirmative biopolitics".

7. Future Lines of Research

As for the future, institutional biopolitics in emerging digital environments also needs to be investigated. Specifically, to the role of artificial intelligence and automation in shifting power dynamics between entities and citizens in unpredictable adaptive movements. Therefore, future research could describe how these innovative technological systems are creating new protocols of monitoring and supervision, which are much more than biopower.

Likewise, longitudinal studies are essential to unpack the specific impact of biopolitical tactics on diversely disadvantaged groups from an intersectional perspective. As continued research must examine how facets of race and gender cut across class and disability, what will be the ideal point impact of the vulnerability of institutions of biopolitical prevention and control? Moreover, longitudinal analyses come to collusion whether intersectionality turns on or slows down biopolitical dynamics, regardless of who they are. Specific socioeconomic and cultural emergent barriers are. To conclude, future research in biopolitical prevention and regulation is substantial in promoting the creation of equitable forms of entities.

A third way would be the projection of resistance devices and citizen action that preempts institutional tactics of biopolitics. Thus, the study would reflect on how individuals and collectives contribute to developing an anti-hegemonic politics that challenges, replaces or reconstructs biopower disciplines only in and through various institutional settings. The approach would allow a picture of the biopolitical phenomenon, noting that power is not flowing directly from citizens to the institutional environment, but in the interaction both and flourishing of continuous resistance and various transformations, violating the formation of more democratic institutions and respectful of human rights.

Transparency:

The authors confirm that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study; that no vital features of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned have been explained. This study followed all ethical practices during writing.

Copyright:

© 2025 by the authors. This open-access article is distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

References

- [1] M. Foucault, *Seguridad, territorio, población*. Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2006.
- [2] R. K. Yin, *Case study research and applications: Design and methods*, 6th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2018.
- [3] J. W. Creswell and J. D. Creswell, *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*, 5th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2018.
- [4] H. Arendt, *The human condition*. Barcelona, Spain: Paidós, 2002.
- [5] M. Kottow, "Bioethics and biopolitics," *Revista Brasileira de Bioética*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 110–121, 2005.
- [6] M. T. de la Garza, *Bioethics and biopolitics*. In J. González Valenzuela (Ed.), *Bioethics perspectives*. Mexico City, Mexico: National Human Rights Commission, 2008.
- [7] J. L. Tejeda González, "Biopolitics, control and domination," *Espiral (Guadalajara)*, vol. 18, no. 52, pp. 77–107, 2011.
- [8] S. Geo and J. Luengo Navas, "Biopolitics and education measurement, standardization, population regularization," *Teoría de la Educación: Revista Interuniversitaria*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 115–135, 2015.
- [9] A. Toboña, "Neuropolitics. Toxicity and insolvency of big ideas," *Economía Digital S.L.*, 2017.
- [10] D. Paredes-Zempual, L. E. Ibarra-Morales, and Z. E. Moreno-Freites, "Leadership skills and organizational climate in small and medium-sized enterprises," *Investigación Administrativa*, vol. 50, no. 127, pp. 69–90, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.35426/iav50n127.05>
- [11] M. Cárdenas-Tapia, "Scientific collaboration networks at the national polytechnic institute of Mexico," *Investigación administrativa*, vol. 50, no. 127, pp. 192–212, 2021.
- [12] K. Valencia-Sandoval, J. L. Sánchez-Leyva, and D. Duana-Ávila, "Cyber dependence and competitiveness," *Administrative Research*, vol. 51, no. 129, pp. 1–19, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.35426/iav51n129.09>

- [13] C. Muñoz, Rosa Leticia, J. P. Muñoz-Chávez, D. V. Cruz, and H. Barrios-Quiroz, "Jóvenes construyendo el futuro: Análisis y recomendaciones sobre el diseño de la política pública," *RECAI Revista de Estudios en Contaduría, Administración e Informática*, vol. 12, no. 33, pp. 1-19, 2022.
- [14] D. M. Jerónimo-Jiménez, L. Hernández-Triano, and R. M. Martínez-Jiménez, "Organizational learning: Individual factor and scientific production in a university," *Investigación Administrativa*, vol. 51, no. 129, 2022.
- [15] R. García-Martínez, E. R. Poblano-Ojinaga, and L. García-Gámez, "Determining factors in the choice of a university career," *Investigación Administrativa*, vol. 53, no. 133, pp. 1-20, 2024.
- [16] T. Lemke, *Introduction to biopolitics*. Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2017.
- [17] R. Esposito, *Community, immunity and biopolitics*. Barcelona, Spain: Herder Editorial, 2013.
- [18] G. Agamben, *Emergency*. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Editorial Adriana Hidalgo, 2005.
- [19] S. Castro-Gómez, *The fool and the scoundrels: Notes for a transmodern republicanism*. Bogotá, Colombia: Editorial Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, 2019.
- [20] R. Vázquez Arredondo, "Biopolitics: An approach to the thought of michel foucault," *Valenciana*, vol. 17, no. 34, pp. 35-58, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.15174/rv.v17i34.750>
- [21] J. I. Guzmán, P. A. C. Poblete, and R. A. Ramos, "The concepts of biopolitics and necropolitics in the philosophical postulates of Foucault and Mbembe as references in the construction of interculturality," *Perseitas*, vol. 13, pp. 36-66, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.21501/23461780.4887>
- [22] R. Hernández Sampieri, C. Hernández, C. Fernández, and P. Baptista Lucio, *Research methodology*, 6th ed. Mexico: McGraw-Hill, 2018.
- [23] U. Flick, *An introduction to qualitative research*, 7th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2022.
- [24] P. Díaz de León Cruz, K. M. Díaz de León Bernal, and L. E. Rivera Rubio, "Property tax in Mexico: A matter of fiscal federalism?," *Investigación Administrativa*, vol. 50, p. 128, 2021.
- [25] G. Fracica Naranjo and M. D. L. E. Garcia Vargas, "Preferencias laborales de los futuros administradores: Un enfoque cualitativo," *RECAI Revista De Estudios En Contaduría, Administración E Informática*, vol. 10, no. 27, pp. 42-59, 2021.
- [26] S. M. Andrade de Noguera, "Happiness at work, work well-being and emotional subjectivity: A view from human complexity," *RECAI Journal of Studies in Accounting, Administration and Informatics*, vol. 12, no. 35, pp. 32-48, 2023.
- [27] S. B. Vidrio-Barón, A. R. Rebolledo-Mendoza, and J. R. Vázquez-Sánchez, "Entrepreneurial intention of millennial students," *Investigación Administrativa*, vol. 53, no. 133, pp. 1-29, 2024.
- [28] M. A. Núñez Ramírez, P. Mercado Salgado, and K. A. Garduño Realivazquez, "Validity of an instrument to measure intellectual capital in firms," *Investigación Administrativa*, vol. 50, no. 128, pp. 1-18, 2021.
- [29] L. M. Bada-Carbajal, J. Osorio-Antonia, and Z. Ramírez-Hernández, "Evolution of corn production in Veracruz, Mexico," *Investigación Administrativa*, vol. 50, no. 128, p. 12807, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.35426/ia.v50n128.07>
- [30] A. J. G. Gámez, E. R. Rojas, and J. L. Guzmán, "Wage differences due to human capital and working conditions," *RECAI Revista de Estudios en Contaduría, Administración e Informática*, vol. 11, no. 32, pp. 39-50, 2022.
- [31] J. Ó. Ollivier Fierro, P. J. Martínez Ramos, and I. Domínguez Alcaraz, "Technological maturity and innovation in Mexican companies," *Investigación Administrativa*, vol. 50, no. 128, pp. 1-23, 2021.
- [32] F. S. Diez, V. M. A. Vargas, and D. P. Fernández, "Incident factors in the creation of a graduate business unit," *Contaduría y Administración*, vol. 66, no. 2, pp. 1-23, 2021.