Geometric Communication in Organizations. A Review from the Administrative Sciences

Pedro Arcia-Hernández[1], Juan Manuel Martínez Zúñiga[2], Nancy Elizabeth Pruneda-Ávila[3], Antony Paul Espíritu-Martínez[4], Isabel Cristina Yepes[5], Mauricio Rincón-Moreno[6], Fredy Ibarra-Sandoval[7], Galvarino Casanueva-Yánez[8]

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to interpret geometric communication in business organizations from the perspective of administrative sciences. Among the main findings, it stands out that geometric communication within modern educational organizations is a complex whole that links institutional purposes and individual interests, giving a nuance to the information that is communicated not only by the personality of the informants, but also by the objects and people that surround them. without neglecting feelings, emotions and moods. To this end, geometric communication is understood as a process where self-regulation must be included as a dimension that articulates all the others (contour, environment and surroundings). Likewise, it is concluded that geometric communication is a guarantor of the good management of the educational leader, since it articulates the elements of authority and power, with those of interpersonal relationships and affectivity.

Keywords: *Communication, geometry, organization.*

Introduction

The human being is a unit of communication and a social being intrinsically interconnected with his environment. Their ability to use language and symbols to express thoughts, feelings, and ideas, along with verbal and nonverbal communication, facilitates mutual understanding and cooperation with their community and meaningful environment. This shows that people are individual constructions that weave social structures of coexistence through communication, since, by nature, they are social beings who need to interact and establish links with others for their integral development. Aristotle, in his work Politics, maintains that "man is a social animal" and that community life is essential to achieve his full potential and well-being. This social interdependence is key to human survival and growth.

Now then; If communication in its most natural and primary state involves interaction between humans, how can we understand it now that the arrival of technology has profoundly transformed the act of communicating, reducing face-to-face interaction and thereby affecting the quality of interpersonal relationships?

In the same vein, technology has transformed human interactions, enabling instantaneous and long-distance connections. Human beings have an innate need for belonging and connection, seeking to establish bonds from birth and organizing themselves in social structures such as family, school, and work. Moreover,

---

[1] Universidad de Talca, Chile. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4472-7642 Correo: Arciapedro30@gmail.com

[2] Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León, San Nicolás de los Garza N.L., México https://orcid.org/0009-0001-2599-5329 jmmzmartz@hotmail.com.

[3] Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León, San Nicolás de los Garza N.L., México https://orcid.org/0009-0007-3149-919X pruneda1966@hotmail.com

[4] Universidad Nacional Autónoma Altoandina, Tarma, Perú.

[5] Universidad Simón Bolívar, Facultad de Administración y Negocios, Centro de Crecimiento Empresarial – MACONDOLAB, Barranquilla, Colombia https://orcid.org/0009-0001-2750-3690 Correo: isabel.yepes@unisimon.edu.co

[6] Profesor de la Universidad de Cundinamarca-DBA(c) Universidad de la Salle, Colombia https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4124-9852, Email: hmrincon@ucundinamarca.edu.co hrincon94@unisalle.edu.co

[7] Pontificia Universidad Católica, Ambato, Ecuador

[8] Facultad de Ingeniería y Negocios Universidad de Las Américas, Sede Providencia, Manuel Montt 948, Santiago, Chile

personal and cultural identity is built through social interactions, sharing values and traditions that unite communities.

Hence, interdependence is key to satisfying physical, emotional and social needs, and effective communication is vital for the functioning of societies, allowing the coordination of activities and the resolution of conflicts. Thus, the ability to communicate and the need to live in society are fundamental characteristics that define our humanity and our place in the world.

In this of ideas, researchers from their imprints agree that communication is an act of natural talent that develops in all people in order to build social structures of coexistence in any type of stratum: families, community, school, among others.

Based on the above arguments, the study of communication that is dealt with in this work is of an organizational nature, as it is within business organizations. In this regard, the objective of this article is to interpret geometric communication in business organizations from the administrative sciences. The theoretical review is aimed at leaders who manage in companies and who have the social responsibility of directing the individual behavior of people towards a common good.

Therefore, the content is focused on the study of geometric communication in business organizations whose theoretical vision is inscribed in the discipline of management, therefore, it is pertinent, then, to start arguing with respect to the Theory of Administration, which refers, from the imprint of the researchers, to the simplified approach, It is a global and universally accepted approach that is oriented to the ability to structure an organization in such a way that efficiency is achieved in it, applying the various administrative principles, such as: the division of labor, the chain of command, specialization, hierarchy, among others, which reflect the channels and means for leadership and communication to take place.

Therefore, the structure of the work schematizes in the first place the study from organizational communication within the framework of the theory of management. Next, he describes the functions of administration as acts of communicative action and finally; he interprets the geometry of communication as a conceptual approximation.

Organizational Communication According to Management Theories

To give rise to the development of the article, it is necessary to talk about modern business organizations and the historical significance that has been attributed to them through the evolution of administrative thought, considering that in each school, theory or approach, communication has been understood in a divergent way, taking into account the development environment of nations in each period of time.

To do this, we must go back to the beginning of the eighteenth century, when the Classical Theory of Management appeared, promoted by Fredirick Tylor and Henry Fayol, who developed the first postulates that later became what is known today as the "General Theory of Management", and which manifested the first concepts and ideas. management, organization, administrative process, communication within organizations, and leadership; among other topics.

However, the following question arises: What motivated these researchers to express such initial postulates? The answer is based on the fact that a global phenomenon took place that gave way to technology and everything that is known about it today, which also gave a new meaning to work and development. The first steam engine is invented and with it the industrial revolution is explained as a new scheme of progress. With this, there also began an accelerated growth of companies that began to operate irregularly because they did not have theories and approaches on how to administer and manage them, and this, in our understanding, is the origin of management and what became the main concern of the aforementioned authors to write their postulates.

Paraphrasing Carro et. al. (2012), it was called "Scientific Theory of Management", whose essence emphasized the massive exploitation of workers, regardless of their physical and mental exhaustion at

intervals of time. It was considered the school of mechanistic management, dehumanized, interested in production and efficiency, where human talent was not important and formed interest in the background, which led to the use of concepts that defined a first linear and non-complex administrative process, measured in times and movements; a null communication that did not consider the needs of the low-level labor sectors and a totally autocratic exercise of leadership, because what was relevant here was to produce and nothing else.

However, the rigor of scientificity with which management is defined is rescued from this theory, since: "management, as a scientific discipline, is a set of accumulated theories that produce knowledge, concepts and principles that are related to each other, and that provide the strategies and techniques for the rationalization of resources in industrial organizations" (Rivas, 2024, p. 2).

In this theory, organizational communication is mainly conceived as a formal and structured process within organizations, designed to transmit information efficiently and accurately between hierarchical and functional levels, which led to the following main criticisms: (a) the rigidity and bureaucracy with which they emphasized too much structure and formality in communication, thus limiting adaptability and innovation within modern organizations; (b) centralization based on predominantly top-down communication may limit employee feedback and participation in decision-making, which affected worker motivation and engagement and (c) absence of agile mechanisms to deal with organizational complexity since in dynamic and complex environments, where speed and flexibility are key, Classical communication is insufficient to handle ambiguity and rapid changes.

In the second instance, it is necessary to describe the Humanistic Theory of Management, which is based on the citrus of the previous school whose maximum representative was Elton Mayo and Abraham Maslow. These scholars, in an eclectic way, respecting and taking advantage of the achievements of the previous school, and criticizing those that are not relevant, revolutionize administrative and organizational thinking by clarifying that it is not production and efficiency that are the most important things in industries, but human resources, without whose talent companies could not operate. This is corroborated by what De Peña et. al. (2018) argues:

> ... One of the great achievements that have been brewing within the framework of the development of administrative science is the recognition of the person who is within organizations, behind jobs, direct production or responding to certain processes within a management approach (p. 10).

In support of this argument, the researchers consider that the essence of humanistic management was that organizations cannot exist without people, and for them to be productive, the needs of their workers must be satisfied, because, if equipment or machinery is damaged, they can be repaired or replaced, however, this cannot be done with people. his performance and his intellectual talent.

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

In this theory, organizational communication is understood as a comprehensive and two-way process that facilitates the interaction, participation, and well-being of employees within the organization. Unlike classical theory, which focuses on structure and efficiency, humanistic theory places a significant emphasis on human relations and meeting workers' needs. Among its main criticisms are: (a) Marked idealism difficult to implement in practice when trying to balance attention to human needs with the demands of efficiency and profitability; (b) ambiguity and decentralization, considering that more informal and horizontal communication tends to lead to ambiguities and a lack of clarity in responsibilities and expectations, hindering coordination and control within the organization, and (c) inconsistency in its application, since, although humanistic theory promotes a people-centered approach, Not all organizations or managers are

willing or able to fully embrace these principles. This can result in inconsistent application and uneven results.

In these first two schools it can be seen how the topics of communication and organization take on different meanings; but like the mechanistic approach, this school was the product of criticisms that forced a reconsideration of its postulates; well, focusing its essence on both people and their needs, it emphasized the concept of informality that is excessively toxic for any organization, since in some way, elements such as absenteeism, laziness, prolonged rest, among other circumstances, were justified.

On the basis of these criticisms, the "Systematic School of Administration" appears, whose maximum representative is Ludwig Von Bertalanffy, in which the best of the previous approaches was also taken in an eclectic way, and its essence consisted in systematizing the internal and external processes of organizations, without running the risk of mechanizing man. but neither of exceeding their needs for humanization. Then, the "Managerial Systematization" appears, which emphasizes control as a permanent and necessary process and instrument to maximize the performance of Modern organizations.

The design of a systemic administration must consider the current demands of a changing world, and its main characteristic must be the constant transformation derived from internal or external changes, as well as self-learning learning to learn that allows it to respond interactively to the challenges that arise, so that it is recognized as an intentional system with possibilities for development (Pantoja-Aguilar et. Al, 2019, s/n).

Likewise, the main criticism of this third school was precisely the emphasis placed on control, since, in fact, everything began to be controlled: processes, people, time, movements, production, to the point of ignoring automation and with it, reporting a new mechanistic and classical school that was more interested in production than in employees. In this line, the administrative process within companies was understood as inflexible and controlled, leadership and communication were defined as chains of command in which the interaction was more between person and machine, than person to person, worker and boss.

However, despite the criticisms, it is in this school that the digital society takes place, supported by information and communication technologies, which continues and will continue to be functional today.

In addition to this, it is now necessary to speak of the fourth school of administration, known as the "Contingency School or School based on the Study of Situations. For Valencia (2024), there are many authors who defend this school: Collins (2010), García (2011), Koontz (2010) Krygier (2011), Londoño (2012), among others. The convergence of all these authors is that they study leadership and situations binomially.

This approach also relied on eclecticism to value and take advantage of positive aspects of the previous approaches, and under this recognition it focused its essence on the fact that management and the way of leading does not deny the applicability of all the previous approaches despite their criticisms, and states that leading groups must resort to the nature of the situation that arises. that is, it is necessary to mechanize (scientific school); It is necessary to humanize (humanistic approach), it is necessary to control and automate (systematic school), according to the characteristics of the situation that arises in the daily life of social organizations without execrating from these practices the concern for people and the complex communicative structures that by nature are complex and geometric.

Now, this evolutionary deconstruction of organizational communication through administrative thought is sustained from the beginning of the eighteenth century to the end of the twentieth century, a period in which all knowledge and knowledge was validated through the epistemological current of positivism, which is a product of the accumulated heritage of Western philosophy, and therefore, It is inscribed in what is known as the Modern Age of Knowledge.

However, it would be inopportune to reflect on communication, only in the modern age, if it is an irrefutable fact that postmodernity already attributes new conceptions to communication in the business context, which includes a post-modern and diachronic nuance, which indicates that they must be

understood transcending the concepts that have been given of them in modern literature. A priori, the administrative sciences for the sake of contemporaneity today break preconceived concepts and paradigms that explain that business management is no longer only a process of planning, organization, direction and control of various resources, but today the administration transcends the organization itself incorporating the community, the family, the company, among other contexts from a multidisciplinary dynamic that contributes to a more effective management.

In addition to this, communication as it has been explained by the relevant literature, cannot continue to be seen as a linear process, composed of factors that are supposed to close in a feedback stage, since it seems that the interlocutor is studied from the external perspective, without considering what he feels inside (emotions, feelings, moods).

The Functions of the Administration as Acts of Communicative Action

In the understanding of administrative theory, Arcia Hernández (2020) argues that there are important general functions within management, which in turn define the action of the leader: The first of these focuses on the planning or process by which the action plan that will be developed to achieve the objective is selected. That is, theplanning function as the primary function of management contributes significantly to organizational communication by establishing clear objectives and strategies that serve as a basis for communicating expectations at all levels. Through planning, plans and policies are determined that must be understood and followed by all employees, ensuring that the appropriate channels and methods are used to convey this information. In addition, planning facilitates the coordination and alignment of efforts, promoting effective communication that allows members of the organization to understand the goals and the steps necessary to achieve them, which is essential for organizational cohesion and success.

Next, there is the organization that involves the coordination of positions, with tasks and human performance and, therefore, gives structure to the organization. The organizational function contributes to organizational communication by establishing a clear hierarchical structure and well-defined lines of authority and responsibility, which facilitates an orderly and efficient flow of information. By accurately assigning roles and tasks, the organization ensures that all employees understand their responsibilities and how they interrelate with the rest of the team. This not only clarifies who reports to whom, but also allows for effective distribution of information, promoting fluid and consistent communication across the organization, which is critical for coordination and the achievement of organizational goals.

This functional compendium is accompanied by management, which, as its name suggests, tries to direct people, processes and tasks towards a common goal. The management function contributes to organizational communication by involving leadership and motivation, where managers use effective communication skills to inspire and guide staff toward organizational goals. Through interpersonal communication, leaders provide feedback, resolve conflicts, and foster a positive work environment, ensuring that guidelines and expectations are clearly conveyed. This promotes an open, two-way dialogue between managers and employees, which not only improves team morale and engagement, but also facilitates the alignment of efforts and collaborative decision-making, essential for organizational success.

Finally, the control related to the constant evaluation is presented, not only at the end of the administrative management, but also during it and at the end of it, which allows the correction and modification of erroneous actions to be communicated in time, to avoid unnecessary efforts, which must also be planned and designated. The control function within contributes to organizational communication by involving performance monitoring and evaluation, which requires the collection and analysis of information that must be communicated to employees so that they understand their performance and areas for improvement. Additionally, when deviations from plans are identified, managers must communicate the necessary corrective actions, ensuring that all employees are aligned with organizational goals. This continuous flow of information on performance and corrections fosters transparency, allows for timely adjustments, and improves coordination and efficiency within the organization, thereby strengthening communication and the achievement of organizational goals.

Meanwhile, these four basic functions are known as the administrative process, they directly impact the actions of the manager who, in order to develop them properly, must lead teams of people through permanent organizational communication.

In this context, it is clear that every leader develops functions in permanent interaction with others, and such interaction is only possible through the process of communication. Hence, the first factor or element that has historically been used to define managerial leadership is that referred to organizational communication. However, for communication within the exercise of leadership to be effective, it should not be seen only as a linear process based on a series of factors (sender, message, receiver, channel, others), but as a complex process that involves the integrity of the human being in all its aspects: cognitive, psychomotor and affective.

Towards An Interpretation of the Geometry of Communication

To give an initial idea of geometric communication, with which the reader can broadly understand the finding of this article, it is pertinent to metaphorize communication as a three-dimensional figure, that is, as a figure of three dimensions: Height, width and depth. From this metaphor, it is worth saying that geometric communication, in addition to being schematized in its factors of rigor, also hologizes the whole involved in this process, that is, it is interested in the gestures, face, tone of voice and body language of the one who communicates, which will be called environment or length. In addition, the context, objects, people and things that surround the communicative event are involved, and with this the environment or width is incorporated. Finally, the interlocutors try to approach the emotions and mood of the communicator to recognize what led him to communicate with certain characteristics, and this is known as the dintorno or depth.

Here it is explicit once and for all, the three dimensions with which communication will be studied as a distinctive element of the conception of the organization in this article to give it a geometric approach within companies. Therefore, the manager as a communicator and multiplier of communication in a complex and non-linear context is responsible for integrating each administrative function within all the components of the organization, making it understood that all the work carried out must be focused on the proposed mission, therefore he must be a great communicator. To be a bearer of creativity and to guide employees so that they can focus on making the best of their efforts to achieve this goal. In a more simplified way, the manager has to practice leadership of excellence and focused on the human process of geometric communication.

Now, administrative management in business organizations and the basic functions of the managers who lead this process do not occur in the simple sense of the facts, but rather, it is articulated through the application of these concepts to human relations, to relationships with others, and this emphatically detonates that management is a process that par excellence is communicational. In this context, it is relevant to affirm that communication is key to achieving good educational administration and management and therefore, it is important to define the Theory of Communication as that of studying the ability that living beings have with each other to relate, exchange and interpret information.

To this set of theoretical knowledge, there are also other theories that provide interpretative substance to the phenomenon of geometric communication within modern organizations, as is the case of motivation, since it is one of the important elements within communication, since it exposes the set of motives, by which a person behaves, which gives significance or importance to their actions. For people to be motivated within companies, there must be a motivator (leader in this case) and it will depend on this to influence and convince the other socio-labor actors in the achievement of a greater purpose, but that also implies the satisfaction of their individual interests (economic, personal, recognition, among others).

Based on what has been described above, Ortega-Barro (2019) deploys some characteristics of the Hierarchy of Needs or motivational theory developed by Abraham Maslow, who generates a taxonomy that first involves basic needs (necessary to survive, i.e. physiological and determined as priorities), and then hierarchically includes other forms of needs: Security needs, of love and (social) belonging, of esteem, and

of self-realization. However, if it is about needs and the impact that these have on people's behavior when they communicate with others, it is worth saying that modern organizations are no exception, because people make the existence of organizations possible, and this existence translates into a mesh of communicative relationships that allows social structures of coexistence to be generated within them.

By this situation, it is understood that geometric communication within any organization has three dimensions in which it develops: Image and corporate environment, referring to everything that surrounds the company (the environment); The second dimension refers to entity and corporate contour, referring to what people say about the company (the perception that gives it identity and reputation), that is, the contour refers to the profile of the company. The third dimension, on the other hand, materializes the culture and business environment, that is, those characteristics and traits that cannot be seen, such as values, norms, principles, emotional state, history, among other aspects. However, there is also a fourth dimension, which must be developed, which corresponds to the reengineering of our thinking, corresponding to a skill that goes beyond the domain of technological issues, that is, having the ability to self-regulate, not only as a person but as a team, as collaborators within it, which leads to continuous improvement. As can be seen in this topic, communication and the way we exercise it, affects the internal, external and invisible environment of organizations. Hence, Pizzolante Italo (2004) considers that these dimensions should be understood as reciprocal in the communication process to achieve the proposed objectives.

Methodology

As a product of dissemination, the work responds to a review article "considered as a detailed, selective and critical study that integrates essential information in a unitary and overall perspective (Icart and Canela, cited by Guirao-Goris et. Al., 2008, p. 4). Hence, its structure is defined by: Introduction, literature review, applied methodology, findings and conclusions.

The methodological design is bibliographic, described in the following phases: (a) Search, review and selection of the required bibliographic sources; (b) preparation of the introductory prologue of the topic that occupies the central axis of the aforementioned article; (c) diagramming and theoretical structuring of the content that refers to the object of study, supported by the documentary review and the author-date system; (d) description of the methodological protocol that gives technical meaning to the aforementioned article; (e) development of the article in which the findings and conclusions are presenteda.

Regarding the research approach, the work is qualitative, based on the interpretative paradigm where it was pertinent to use the hermeneutical method and content analysis as an information analysis technique. This methodological scrutiny is based on search criteria for both electronic and bibliographic sources of information of recent chronology.

Results

In the results stage, criteria are applied for the elaboration of solid arguments that allow the analysis of the information in an organized manner, through the construction of categories, contrasts and theorizations based on the techniques of contrast, structuring and triangulation of the information collected. From this, interpretations and reflections emerge around the study of geometric communication in business organizations.

However, from the discursive line of this article and in accordance with the qualitative validation criteria, the following findings were considered:

It is constituted as knowledge of this subject that communication and business organization as an articulating binomial of managerial practice in the context of administrative sciences refers to the set of both humanistic and managerial competencies that have as their ultimate goal, to satisfy the needs of organizations and their human actors supported by the principle of organizational balance. that is, where the interests of companies are as important as the interests of social actors.

The theoretical contribution of this finding consists of describing geometric communication within business organizations as a complex whole that links the culture and organizational climate with corporate purposes and individual interests, giving a nuance to the information communicated of being captivated not only by the personality of the interlocutors, but also by the personality of the interlocutors. but also by the objects and people that surround them, without neglecting feelings, emotions and moods. To this end, geometric communication is understood as a process where self-regulation must be included as the main dimension that articulates all the others (Contour, environment and surroundings).

The management of the business organization will be effective to the extent that the leader manages to articulate in the traits of his personality the characteristics of identity and image; capacity for transformation and emancipation and his ability to communicate with others and understand those who communicate with him in a geometric, complex and integral way.

To study the human being around communication as a complex framework where what gives efficiency to the communicative process does not only depend on the rigorous compliance with the communicational factors (sender, message, receptives, channel, others); but also of the integration of the extrinsic (environment) and the intrinsic (emotions) that is always present in the interaction with others, implies breaking linear paradigms that explain this human process and adopting complex ways to understand those who communicate. Meanwhile, it is the personality and characteristics of these interlocutors in their different facets of their ego that gives the real meaning. It is for this reason that, in relation to geometric communication, those who communicate must recognize in others and in themselves the three dimensions of the philosophy of the self: Sameness, otherness and otherness.

With the above, what is meant is that the interlocutor must assume various ontological facets of the "I" to achieve the desired rapport in social contexts; this is; the self that constitutes him as himself, that is, his sameness expressed and represented in what he knows about the world and what he knows about himself, in the cognitive, psychomotor and affective domains. The other self that he must assume in order to understand the reality of the one or those with whom he communicates that unfolds the daily experience, assuming himself in his otherness as one more member of the collective, living the experience of the collective as if it were his own; and the alter self, which is nothing more than their ability to interrelate with others in order to alter the discursive dialogue in terms of trust and activism in order to, in a joint way, begin the journey that will allow them to construct real meanings of communication.

Understood in this way, from these three dimensions of the self (sameness, otherness and otherness), human beings can adopt a multi-ontological and multi-context profile that will give them the character of community, adjusted to the specificity of the reality they live.

Conclusions

From the analysis of the discourse involved, it is concluded that there is a binomial relationship between communication and administration that materializes when these two areas are combined in the practical practice of a subject called leader or manager. Likewise, management in business contexts is the systematized and organized exercise of the basic functions of administration due to common purposes that benefit educational organizations.

On the other hand, it is also concluded that communication within business organizations cannot continue to be seen as a linear process supported by factors, but rather as a complex and/or geometric process that has three dimensions: The first dimension is the Communicational Contour of the leader, which shows the physical and gestural characteristics of those who communicate. The second dimension is the environment, which is a source of communicational contexts, since it refers to the environment or medium. And as a third dimension, the dynamic is presented, which is the invisible side of the communicational process related to feelings and emotions. It is then inferred that communication from a geometric context, within modern educational organizations, is a new and little explored process that focuses on its interest in recognizing that the communicational process is actually the main guideline for the internal procedures of any organization to be effectively complied with.

It is therefore a matter of generating structures of social coexistence in which the actor is seen and perceived as an integral being, with individual characteristics, with common interests and above all, with his own personality that imprints a seal of identity that is unrepeatable and that defines him as an interlocutor of complex understanding for his collaborators.

The effective management of today's business organization requires the linking of three main elements, which are: identity, transformation and communication; all of them materialized in the daily actions of the actor called leader, who must not only direct and influence others, but must also call for emancipation for the benefit of the work environment.

In congruence with administration and organization, communication detonates the necessary organizational climate to generate structures of social coexistence. In this regard, social coexistence within organizations must be one of the most comfortable possible, all humanistic aspects must be kept in mind and put into practice, maintain an excellent interpersonal, leader-leading relationship, with objectives, very clear and defined, good work and fluid communication, which reaches all levels of the organization equally, That an employee is not left without being clear about the mission and vision of the institution for which it is developed, persuade and motivate employees towards a sense of belonging to the organization, the manager must always seek to be at the forefront, in terms of quality of services provided and innovation.

In addition to this, communication is understood as the act of natural talent that gives life and meaning to organizations, since, thanks to it, networks of information and interaction between members are woven and stitched, establishing guidelines of behavior, corporate culture, ethical and moral canons, which promotes a code of identity and belonging among all labor actors. It is communication par excellence, the instrument to explain authority, power, criticism, questioning and organizational change, within a framework of action that respects business purposes (mission, vision, objectives, purposes, philosophy, among others).

In short, much has been written in the managerial literature on modern communication and organization: Concepts, characteristics, types, styles, theories, approaches, models, and other constituent elements of its theoretical heritage. This allows us to conclude properly that such information should be interpreted diachronically, that is, not practiced and defined as it was written in its beginnings because its meanings corresponded to a historical, political, social and cultural moment different from today's, that is, it is necessary that the learning and practice of organizational communication today focus on concrete problems, transcend their theories and adapt to new contingencies, since modernism has been giving way to postmodernism for a long time, so the manager must also take giant steps to equalize, or at least, adapt his participation in organizational scenarios with the required quality and speed.

References

Arcia-Hernández, P. (2020). Prospective vision of the complexity of the administrative process in educational management. Revista Estudios En Educación, 3(5), 48-52. Retrieved from http://ojs.umc.cl/index.php/estudioseneducacion/article/view/139

Carro, F. D., & Caló, A. (2012). Frederick W. Taylor's Scientific Management: A Contextualized Reading.

De Peña, B. R., & Montero, F. P. (2018). Reflections on humanistic administration. CITES, 4(1), 123-134.

Guirao-Goris, J. A., Olmedo Salas, Á., & Ferrer Ferrandis, E. (2008). The review article. Ibero-American Journal of Community Nursing, 1(1), 1-25.

Ortega-Barro, A. (2019). Social organizations in Mexico: A conceptual theoretical analysis. Research area: Environment of organizations Faculty of Accounting and Administration National Autonomous University of Mexico.

Pantoja-Aguilar, M. P., & Salazar Garza-Treviño, J. R. (2019). Stages of management: towards a systemic approach. Journal School of Business Administration, (87), 139–154. https://doi.org/10.21158/01208160.n87.2019.2412

Rivas, L. (2024). Intertextuality of discourse in the development of scientific management theory. Scientific journal FCES, (6).

Valencia Cardona, Y. (2024). Beyond Theory: How Schools of Management Thought Impact Business Reality.