

<https://doi.org/10.23913/ricea.v11i21.182>

Artículos Científicos

Crítica al concepto de liderazgo en la teoría administrativa norteamericana

Criticizes the concept of leadership in american administrative theory

Crítica o conceito de liderança na teoria administrativa americana

Francisco Ballina Ríos

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

fballina@fca.unam.mx

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2739-9245>

° Existe una versión precedente de este artículo (Ballina, 1996, 2001).

Resumen

Este artículo surge a partir de estas interrogantes: ¿es lo mismo dirección y liderazgo?, ¿existen diferencias o semejanzas?, y ¿cuáles son? Para intentar dar respuesta se analizan las características y variaciones de diferentes enfoques dentro de la teoría administrativa norteamericana del liderazgo, de la cual se reconocen sus alcances y limitaciones. Asimismo, se plantean las diferencias entre líderes y administradores, entre los siervos del poder y los servidores públicos, para considerar finalmente la posibilidad de una teoría alternativa del liderazgo que supere los límites del liderazgo individual ausente de consideraciones éticas y colectivas.

Palabras clave: dirección, liderazgo, mitos y estereotipos, teoría administrativa.

Abstract

This article raises some critical questions about the administrative theory of leadership: is it the same direction and leadership? Are there differences or similarities? In addition, what are they? The characteristics and variations of different approaches within the conventional theory of leadership, recognizing its scope and limitations, these questions framed in the differences of community, patrimonialism and bureaucratic administration. Likewise, the differences between leaders and administrators, between the servants of power and public servants, and finally consider the possibility of an alternative theory of leadership that exceeds the limits of individual leadership absent from collective considerations.

Keywords: Direction, leadership, myths and stereotypes, administrative theory.

Resumo

Neste artigo, algumas questões críticas são levantadas em torno da teoria administrativa da liderança: é a mesma direção e liderança? Existem diferenças ou semelhanças? E quais são? As características e variações de diferentes abordagens dentro Na teoria convencional da liderança, reconhecendo seu escopo e limitações, essas questões estão enquadradas nas diferenças de administração comunitária, patrimonialista e burocrática. Da mesma forma, as diferenças entre líderes e administradores, entre os servidores do poder e os servidores públicos, são levantadas para finalmente considerar a possibilidade de uma teoria alternativa da liderança que exceda os limites da liderança individual ausente de considerações coletivas.

Palavras chave: Direção, liderança, mitos e estereótipos, teoria administrativa.

Fecha Recepción: Junio 2021

Fecha Aceptación: Diciembre 2021

Introduction

Given the ambiguity in the use of the concepts of management and leadership within North American administrative theory, the following questions arise: are management and leadership equivalent? How does leadership take place in charismatic, traditional and bureaucratic domination? What are the characteristics and variations of the conventional theory of leadership? Are there differences in direction and leadership in companies and corporate and cooperative organizations? Is it possible to postulate a theory of leadership that incorporates ethical and collective considerations?

To try to answer these questions, a critical-hermeneutic analysis has been proposed, based on heuristics from political sociology. The methodology used, broadly speaking, is deductive analysis, based on documentary research support from the perspective of power and domination, analytical concepts with which this review begins.

Theoretical-conceptual framework

In social science studies, concepts are constructed that have a certain classificatory, terminological and humanistic utility, although in most cases they are typical-ideal constructions that come from conventional approaches. Concepts such as company, organization, public limited company, administration or leadership are representations that partly exist and partly become a must be, or what should not be (Ballina, 2019).

The Dictionary of the Royal Spanish Academy defines the term leadership as follows: “Condition of leader. Exercise of the activities of the leader. Situation of superiority in which an institution or organization, a product or an economic sector finds itself, within its scope”; while the word direction derives from the Latin term *directre*, from *regere* ('to govern'), that is, to send something to a certain point or in a certain direction, the action of leading, guiding or governing, or "the process of influencing people to that contribute to the objectives and goals of the organization” (Moliner, 1994, p. 1008).

North American administrative theory adopted the concept of leadership as a synonym for management, that is, a rational element through which everything planned is achieved. Likewise, thanks to authority and coordination, it is conceived as the process of influencing the activities of group members through motivation, communication and supervision (Argyris, 1978; Lewin, 1951, 1968; McGregor, 1969).

Among the modern precursors of the administration we find Adam Smith (1776), who used the term *direct* as the way to carry out the process of operation and development of a company. Later, John Stuart Mill (1848) referred to this as the action of delegating the management of the company to people who are not the owners.

Within the so-called classical management theory (end of the 19th century), Taylor (1903) linked the term management not only with the production process, but also with those who carry it out. Likewise, they considered that their object of study was focused on the formal organization, which must be regulated by principles and conceived through its functional areas, where man is perceived as a gear in a machine.

On the other hand, scientific management —a concept coined by Taylor (1973)— was based on time and motion studies. He established that the scientific method could be applied in the selection, training and qualification of workers to achieve a level of efficiency in production. This author defines it as “science, and not an empirical rule; harmony, and not discord; collaboration, and not individualism; maximum performance, instead of restricted performance; formation of each man until reaching the greatest efficiency and prosperity of him ”(Taylor, 1973, p. 121).

Likewise, directing personnel in organizations —called commanding by Fayol (1973)— was considered the vital part of administration. Good or bad management exists and has its influence on the development of companies and organizations, but the characteristics and analysis of leadership are not precisely stated in the classical theory of administration.

It is not necessary to present much documentary evidence to verify that military discipline is the ideal model of the capitalist company, which is adopted by Taylor (1973). This universal phenomenon gradually limits the importance of the charismatic leader, while individual behavior decreases as a creative power. In durable institutions, both in the company and in the bureaucratic state apparatus, this process is linked to a concentration of the material means of organization under the autonomy of a director or agent.

In the classical theory, scientific management was based on the substitution of control, which was in the hands of the workers, as well as a manager who gave orders, directed the work and supervised the results. To establish control by management, tasks should be simplified by means of times and movements.

In the 1930s, the experiments of Elton Mayo and his associates (1946) revealed the limitations of scientific management. Behavioral scholars —such as Lewin (1951, 1969), Argyris & Schön, (1978) and McGregor (1969) — recommended giving workers greater participation in decision-making, from which the confusion between the concepts of leader and boss arose. , manager and manager.

Variations on Leadership Theory

The concept of leadership within the North American administrative theory is directed to the search for "effective leadership" to achieve "success". The leader is capable of coordinating and balancing conflicts between individuals and groups, as well as overcoming crises and making decisions to find a solution. The differences between these theories lie in basic assumptions that are summarized below.

In general terms, leadership models in North American administrative theory present three approaches: 1) traits, 2) behaviors and 3) contingencies, all of which derive from "scientific management", "participatory management" or "management". for contingencies".

The leadership traits approach is based on the "great man" theory, according to which leaders are born, not made, an idea that dates back to the time of the ancient Greeks and Romans. Furthermore, researchers have tried to identify the physical, mental, and personality characteristics of various leaders. The great limitation of this approach is that neither the main traits nor the characteristics of the leaders are permanent or universal, since individual devotion or the cult of honor depend on geographical and cultural circumstances.

The behavioral approach is based on the behavioral school of psychology, beginning with experiments conducted by Elton Mayo between 1929 and 1945 at the Western Electric Company. His book—*The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization* (1946)—discussed some of the social and business costs of Taylor and Fayol's scientific management. Another prominent figure in this movement was Lewin (1951, 1969), who demonstrated the effectiveness of worker participation in decision making.

Then, in the 1950s and 1960s, behavioral scholars disappointed by traditional methods—such as Argyris, McGregor, and Likert—provided their versions of participatory management.

In the behavioral approach, Likert (1967) studied the patterns and styles of leaders and managers to understand leadership behavior. These researchers considered that the efficient manager was one who intensely oriented his actions towards subordinates and who relied on communication to keep all the divisions of the company functioning as a unit.

McGregor's Theory Y and Blake's (1964) 9-9 leadership style are non-contingent postulates, sharing the view that there is one management posture that is best and universal in its applications. Schreiber (1969) in his best-selling *The American Challenge* considered his management methods a model for the rest of the world to copy. Stable and routine

conditions seem to be generally associated with authoritative and rigorous supervision. The findings of these investigations suggest that a task-oriented "leader" is more appropriate for Taylorist "scientific management" conditions, where ideas of worker participation, employee engagement, and workplace democracy are not present. listed in the working methods.

However, rapidly changing conditions suggest that people-oriented management by the manager can be effective. Leavit (1951) said that Taylorism had become the dominant business philosophy at the lowest levels; thus the workers of the assembly lines, the cashiers, the secretaries and the like are subject to times and movements. Here Taylorism wins the battle.

At medium and high levels, participatory management can be introduced, increased worker intervention, "quality circles", self-managed work groups and high-performance teams, mechanisms that aim to improve productivity through greater participation. of the worker. The dilemma between scientific management and participatory management, according to this theory, is a job assignment problem, since positions and tasks change, and the axis of management is to maintain balance.

In general terms, participatory management theories and simplistic models —such as Likert's (1961), McGregor's Y theory (1969) or Ouchi's theory (1981)— generate skepticism when trying to apply their universal prescriptions to the Mexican reality, which teaches us that solutions are more difficult, if not unattainable.

What is questioned, therefore, is the level of motivation or satisfaction that workers obtain with the application of these models. When conducting an examination of the main theories on motivation and motivators, today there is hardly any reference to the carrot and the stick, an allegory that continues to be applied indiscriminately in these organizational models.

The replacement of the 9-9 argument ("one style for all occasions") occurs with situational leadership. The limitations of "participatory management" are that it does not take into account the type or size of the organizations and the environmental uncertainty caused by political, technological, socio-cultural and economic changes, or individual differences (values, ambitions, autonomy, tolerance). Contingencies are events or circumstances that occur unexpectedly. Thus, the contingency theory establishes this situational relativity.

Although Machiavelli (1969) —based on Aristotle (trans. 1984)— had reflected on this circumstantial relativity when developing the pendulum theory, the idea that the corruption of democratic institutions makes it necessary to restore dictatorships divides the

forms of government into pure and impure. The former are monarchy, aristocracy and the republic, while the latter are tyranny, oligarchy and demagoguery. Of the three pure forms, the best will be the one that has the best leaders, be it an individual of superior virtue, be it a race or a multitude, especially when public virtue coincides with private.

Vroom and Yetton (1973) developed a "leader-participation" model that relates leadership behavior and participation to decision making. The model sought to be normative and identified five alternative styles of "leadership" in a given situation: autocratic I (AI), autocratic II (AII), consultant I (CI), consultant II (CII), and group II (GII). This model attempted to prove that research on "leadership" should focus on the situation rather than the person.

Blake (1964), using the grid —or managerial grid— recognizes three types of administrations: impoverished, team, and country club. In the first they care very little about people and concentrate on production. In the second, the needs of individuals are harmonized with production. And in the third there is little or no concern for production, so they are only interested in people.

Fiedler (1967) sets up a deceptively simple test that requires directors to think of the person "they wouldn't want to work with" because they are suspected of being lazy or inept. That person is given the score with adjectives such as nice, nasty, or nice, nasty. Fiedler (1967) calls this measure the least preferred co-worker scale, who is assigned unfavorable adjectives by his co-workers.

Likewise, Fiedler found that relationship-motivated leaders are more successful in moderately favorable situations. On the contrary, those motivated by work tend to achieve greater success both in very unfavorable situations and in very favorable ones. Fiedler therefore concludes that autocrats are better for extreme situations (very favorable or very unfavorable), while participative managers are better when the situation is not extremely favorable or unfavorable.

The shortcomings of this model, apart from its simplism, are that it does not include standards for the effective performance of directors. There is no effective or unique "leadership", which depends on the "leader", the "followers", the situation and the interrelation between them.

Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1958) continue the confusion between leadership and direction. They focus on the situational nature of "leader" effectiveness, which is located along three situational dimensions: a) leader-member relationship, b) power of influence, and

c) group-task structure. For House and Browdith (1980), "effective leadership" depends on personal rewards to subordinates for achieving work goals and establishing the path towards those rewards.

Hersey and Blanchard's (1982) contingency leadership model focuses on follower maturity as the primary device for determining the four specific types of leadership they identify: communicating, selling, participating, and delegating. In the first case, the leader defines the roles and roles: he tells the people what, how, when and where they carry out their activities. In the second stage, the "leader" provides both directive and supportive behavior. Once participation in decision-making is achieved, through communication, the "leader" will finally be able to delegate.

In general terms, contingency models of leadership arise within the formal structures of companies, although they overcome the deficiencies of "scientific management" and "participatory management" that are based on these theories. Even when they recognize the complexity of the environment, the conclusions of these models by providing solutions that are too simple for complex problems are doubtful. The general deficiency is that these models recognize only the primitive contingencies that oversimplify the complicated nature of human groups.

From the Western perspective, particularly the North American, administrative theories have had as a central idea that the individual, and not society, should be the fundamental goal, an idea that encouraged Calvinism and Puritanism before the industrial revolution. The conflict between the individual and society has always entailed a dilemma that implies the conception of collective learning in the company and the organization, although in the North American context this education is based on utilitarian principles.

Zaleznik (1986) established the distinction between administrators and leaders, who interact to establish strategies and make decisions. This author mentions that a bureaucratic society that breeds managers may be suffocating young leaders, hence why there is conflict: can't managers and leaders exist within the same society? Can a single person be manager and leader? Perhaps the dilemma is that managers and leaders are two different types of people in terms of development, personal history, motivations and way of thinking?

Managers tend to adopt impersonal and passive attitudes towards goals. Leaders conceive their goals; they are active rather than reactive and shape ideas rather than respond to them. The influence exerted by a leader to alter moods, evoke images, hopes and set specific goals in the course of decisions is not determined by the manager or the people who

hold formal positions or positions. In other words, the leader becomes such through moral recognition of him, while the director achieves it through stubbornness.

American management theory considers that the essence of organizational leadership is to increase influence above the level of mechanical obedience to routine orders, and that any degree of influence in matters of an organizational nature corresponds to "leadership." North American organization theory (Parker et al., 1942)—considers the organization as a complex decision-making system, as a system of interactions of activities and feelings (Homans, 1950), and even as a closed or open system or contingencies.

There is evidence that the neoclassical theory of administration has not overcome the stumbling block of the classical, in terms of considering the worker as a simple cog in a machine. The interactionists (Mayo, 1946, 19898) were exclusively interested in the world of interactions-feelings as a productivity response to the economic conditioning of wages and performance, which is a proposal of Taylor's scientific management. If it is shown that affective behavior is subject to a series of controllable factors, it is difficult not to use this knowledge to try to manipulate workers and ignore, just like the classics, the problems of power and domination (Ballina, 2019).

Lewin (1968) (in group theory) wanted to show that there was a consistent and one-to-one relationship between individual satisfaction, productivity, and a permissive leadership style. In addition, they continued to ignore the relations of power and exploitation that are knotted around the hierarchical pyramid, and without which it only appears in a purely formal framework. Undoubtedly, by drawing attention to the problems of participation, the followers of Lewin (1968) introduced a vein of research that has proved fruitful, but they also locked themselves into a very narrow pattern of interpretation, which does not allow them to understand the acting forces within organizations.

Kahn et al. (1964) believe that human activities can be coordinated within an organization to obtain the maximum necessary acceptance using economic or ideological stimuli. Thus, perfect productivity and a balance between the goals of the organization and the individual satisfaction of its members are sought. Using a "permissive" system of command, in this theory it is not necessary to study the problems of power either: it is enough to fight so that the command apparatus does not disintegrate.

Michels (1974) and Mannheim (1982) they are the first to highlight the dilemma in which modern bureaucracies that want to achieve profound social transformations, whether reformist or revolutionary, necessarily find themselves. Social action is only possible through

organizations (that is, bureaucracy), but their existence is incompatible with democratic values, which are the only ones that make social action legitimate.

In this regard, the opinion of Barnard (1959) stands out, who conceptualizes the organization as a cooperative social system; that is, as a system of consciously coordinated social, biological and physical activities or forces, whose internal and external balance must be kept in balance.

However, any coordinated cooperative action requires that each participant can count on a sufficient degree of regularity from the others. This means, in other words, that every organization—whatever its structure, its objective and its importance—requires from its members a greater or lesser conformity, but always considerable and obtained in part by compulsion, appealing to the “good Will”.

The bureaucratic is not only a universe that is not corrected based on its errors, but is incapable of transforming itself according to the accelerated evolution of societies, as shown by nihilism taken to its most extreme consequences in the typical symbolic projections of Kafka. .

Within a systematic vision (Michel, 1974), the organization must be conceived as an open system, that is, with multiple relationships with the environment. It should also be understood as a scheme with multiple purposes or functions necessary to integrate and coordinate, involving many dynamically interacting subsystems. And since the subsystems are mutually dependent, their changes will affect the behavior of the others. The multiple relationships between the organization and its environment make it difficult to clearly specify the boundaries of a given entity.

From the point of view of the systemic approach, organizations are conceived as ordered structures, and this predisposition encourages functionalism that conceptualizes reality within a highly static and mechanistic framework. From the end of World War II to the late 1970s, the theoretical and methodological consensus in organizational studies revolved around functionalism, positivism, and structural-functionalism, which provided a basis for bureaucratic power.

During the 1960s and 1970s, Argyris & Schön (1978) conducted a study in which they observed and analyzed decision-making at the executive level in approximately 50 organizations, both public and private; In his studies, he obtained more than 50,000 samples of managerial behavior, collected in nearly 200 meetings. His findings, contrary to popular belief, reveal that most CEOs are competitive, but unconsciously encourage conformity

among their subordinates and discourage those who are willing to take risks. For this reason, Argyris (1978) affirms that if a director has achieved success, it is difficult for him to be willing to train another equal to him, because it would be like self-destruction.

Consequently, the credibility of any management system depends on the degree to which the CEO and other senior executives are willing to change. We can observe that, from its origin, in the management of the company there is the figure of power, since it has the possibility of imposing its own will within an employment relationship, even against all resistance, imposing the structure of authority within the company and attending to the value systems that legitimize them.

For their part, House and Browdith (1980) have elaborated “contingent theories”; According to these authors, leadership is conceived as the process of directing and influencing group activities in truly changing and unstable situations, where everything is casual or accidental. In these cases there cannot be a stable direction, since these organizations require styles and non-routine control systems. Every direction is influenced by the time in which it operates; social emergencies produce certain emphasis on the type of direction. These emergency situations become palpable in periods of chaos or economic crisis; the degree of uncertainty caused by political, technological and socio-cultural changes affects the management style.

Tavistock's studies—cited by Rice (1999)—emphasized the relationship between the technological and sociopsychological systems in English coal mines. The working method consisted of changing traditional exploitation methods for more advanced ones. Tavistock developed the following contingency relationship: if there is a change to a more advanced technology, then the working groups must be kept intact as far as possible to achieve the effective relationship of the proposed objectives.

The contingency variables differ according to the size of the organization, the routine tasks, the technologies used, individual differences, ambitions, autonomy and tolerance. Some authors explain broadly that management by contingencies becomes palpable in an emergency, and that under pressure, confusion and chaos the real bosses remain immovable because they face events and guide their subordinates to satisfactory solutions.

Contingencies are events or circumstances that occur unexpectedly; therefore, the success of situational management depends on managers adapting to situations, hence they must be flexible. However, none of these studies considered motivations, employee values,

or managers' experience. The contingency approach incorporates concepts and techniques from different administrative schools.

Discussion

In contemporary conditions, the concentration and centralization of capital occur on the basis of the technical-scientific superiority possessed by the large companies that are dedicated to productive processes and that have greater credit possibilities given their transnational oligopolistic nature. The organic form of domination of financial capital is the set of industrial, banking, credit, insurance, transport, commercial and other companies linked to capital, which has turned multinational companies into states within the state.

In corporate companies, decisions are made based on the number of votes held by each shareholder; In contrast, in cooperative societies, each member has the right to one vote. If we have to accept that cooperativism and mutualism are based on the exercise of social reciprocity, on a fundamentally humanist philosophy, liberalism breaks with all humanist tradition, detaches itself from the idea of equity and worships industry and technology .

Mutualism is based on the exercise of social reciprocity, and part of voluntary associations that direct a policy to achieve social security and the search for a collective production system. Ethics raised as the elaboration of a form of relationship with oneself, which allows the individual to constitute himself as a subject of moral conduct, is synonymous with the best understood cooperative spirit, which seeks human well-being in all its modalities.

Therefore, we must ask ourselves the following question: is “collective leadership” possible as a struggle for control of the conditions of productivity, organization, and the existence of particular spheres of life? In addition, how to gather the necessary strength to solve the problems that the world is experiencing today? If the political is the struggle for control of the conditions of each sphere of life, if this is the direction, then this would give meaning to the movements and struggles for the recognition of social, democratic, ideological, ecological, and so on.

All management models can be improved, but the only way to find out is to propose and apply them. In order for Mexico to be inserted in an avant-garde manner in the world context, novel and pragmatic models must be sought in the social, political, economic and administrative spheres that adapt to our cultural and historical characteristics.

In every company and organization, a circle of people interested in the mandate and its advantages participate, who collaborate in the exercise of imperative and coercive powers aimed at the preservation of domination (Ballina, 1996, 2000, 2006, 2017, 2019, 2021).

Domination—that is, the probability of finding obedience to a given command—is classified by Weber into three pure types: 1) charismatic domination, 2) traditional domination, and 3) bureaucratic domination. In the first, the patriarchal head is the administrator, and is sustained by his personal recognition and charisma. Likewise, the administrative staff is selected by the principle of discipleship and the fidelity of the entourage, and they do not receive salaries, but honorary gifts, donations, perks, etc.

In the patrimonial administration, administrators organized on traditional, loyal and servile principles arise: eunuchs, courtiers, monks, maceguals, overseers, foremen, etc. They become servants of traditional domination who participate in the domination of the working or tributary masses.

In the "bureaucratic" or "rational" administration, the figures of the "administrator", boss or management arise, organized on rational bureaucratic principles tending to legitimize social, political, economic and religious situations by privileged social strata.

This typology constructed by Weber (1992) corresponds to the ideal types, theoretical constructs of "power" and "domination", the most important elements of community action. Domination in almost all its forms—even where it is least suspected—plays a considerable role. This is the case both in ancient societies and in modern forms of bureaucracy. Weber found that the structure of domination is, almost always and to a large extent, an economically important factor and, in a certain way, historically conditioned.

The concept of "ideal type" or "historical type" of domination in Weber is not used univocally or casuistically to point out all forms of "dominate". On the contrary, these are so broad that it would be impossible to complete their casuistry here. For example, the case of Mexico —due to its sui generis conditions— does not strictly correspond to the bureaucratic type identified by this author, but is more similar to corporatism “as a system of interest representation in which hierarchically organized units are differentiated , recognized or legalized by the government (when they are not created by it), which are guaranteed a certain representative monopoly within their respective categories” (Schmitter, 1992, p. 11).

Instead, the type of charismatic domination enunciated by Weber occurs in most indigenous communities in Mexico, where there is an inseparable unity between worldview, history, territory, and culture.

According to various studies, it is confirmed that, throughout their history, indigenous communities in Mexico have developed different forms of community administration, which receive different names according to each indigenous community, such as tequio, tequil, gozona, manovuelta, fajina, guelaguetza, homework, chorima and middle work, among others, where each community articulates different relationships of power and domination, which generates various levels of legality and legitimacy. Through these community organizations, community services have been built: water, electricity, roads and other services (Zolla, 2010). In this regard, Weber (1969) establishes the difference between an elected leader and an elected official: "the official will behave in everything as his lord's agent" (p. 716), while the leader is exclusively responsible for himself—or that is, as long as he successfully aspires to their trust—he will act entirely according to his own will (caudillo democracy), and not as the official, according to the expressed or assumed will (in an "imperative mandate") of the electors.

Habermas (1976) characterizes traditional societies by the existence of an authority that is imposed by gerontocracy, routine or for reasons of honor. In tribal society, the political is above the specialist and commands respect, since it is decided collectively. In modern society the role has been reversed, since the specialist imposes his logic, and politics is subordinated to technique: "The political will of the people is replaced by the imminent legality of the things that man produces such as science and technology" (Habermas, 1976, p. 86).

In bureaucratic domination, administrators are organized based on rational principles. What Marx (1978) considered as alienation, Weber qualified as "process of rationalization". Erich Fromm (1997) continues this critical work against this central theme and points out that "rationalities lack, in essence, that character of discovery and revelation (...); rationalization does not represent an instrument to penetrate reality, but constitutes a post factum attempt aimed at harmonizing one's own desires with external reality" (p. 234).

From the point of view of Weber (1992), charisma in leadership is, by definition, not very controllable from above, which is why he establishes the difference between charisma and routine. The charismatic structure—as opposed to the official bureaucratic organization—does not recognize appointments, careers, promotions, or salaries. Charisma only estimates internal determinations and own limits. Its success depends on the corroboration of it towards its followers or henchmen. Consequently, the status of charismatic authority is by its very nature specifically unstable.

Leaders work in positions of high risk and danger. "Purely charismatic" authority cannot be conceived in an "organization" or "enterprise" in the usual sense of an association of men and things according to principles of end and means. The auxiliaries of the charismatic authority are selected according to the principle of discipleship and the fidelity of the entourage. The entourage or discipleship does not receive salaries, but rather honorary gifts, spoils, donations or "perks". The character of charisma as a creative power decreases in the face of organized domination in lasting institutions. The problem of innovation and the transformation of leadership escape the values of corporate organizations, which oblige and hold responsible.

In opposition to the corporate model, the cooperative arises, emanating from authors such as Saint-Simón, Charles Fourier, Esteban Cabet, Proudhon and Robert Owen, who criticized the liberalism of Adam Smith, David Ricardo, Augusto Comte and Herbert Spencer, and marked the theoretical principles of cooperativism. However, since they did not coincide with the path of violence indicated by the socialism of the first international, they were described by Marxists as "utopian" (Ballina, 2000).

Cooperativism is based on the exercise of social reciprocity, and part of voluntary associations that direct a policy to achieve social security and the search for a collective production system.

Throughout its history, cooperativism has been considered and defined in many ways, as a political doctrine, a mode of production, etc., although it is more than a concept. At present it can be affirmed that cooperativism is an economic plan that forms an important part of many States. Its development and diffusion indicate that it could modify the political structure of the societies that have implemented it and that it constitutes a reality for the 21st century.

In the structural-functionalist approach (Merton, 2002; Parson, 1977), the concepts of power and domination are taken as similar, although Weber (1992) establishes the difference:

The concept of power is sociologically amorphous. All imaginable qualities of a man and all sorts of possible constellations can put someone in the position of imposing his will in a given situation. The concept of domination has, therefore, to be more precise and can only mean the probability that a command will be obeyed. (p. 43).

According to Weber, domination requires an administrative cadre, no matter how incipient, to guarantee that the mandate is carried out promptly and automatically; Otherwise, a legal, physical, moral or hierocratic coercion or reaction may be exercised. Thus, the organization has an outward regulatory function, and through it a relationship of supremacy and subordination is characterized, since its actions permeate other instances. In this sense, society develops under the influence of different organizations, such as family, church, army, political parties, unions, government offices, prisons, etc., which respond to specific needs and contexts, so they take various forms and they represent different value systems within the social complex.

The so-called theory of administration (management science) —arising from the Anglo-Saxon liberal context— and the theory of organization (organizations theory) (Hatch, 1997) consider companies (companies) and organizations (organizations) as similar entities. They are assumed as relatively permanent communities or societies, oriented towards the same objective and focused on organizational action, as a set of organs and functions (Merton, 2002; Parsons, 1977).

In this regard, the North American administrative theory homologates the concept of organization with that of the company, although there is ambiguity in the first. Sometimes it is used as a function, that is, consisting of grouping activities necessary for the fulfillment of objectives; in others, as structure-design (strategic decision), or as a specific activity to design and structure the tasks aimed at achieving organizational goals (Dessler, 1996). In general, the authors who follow this theory ignore the power relations at the macro-micro level, implicit in organizations and companies.

Most situational leadership models have been relatively successful in the United States because American companies have lost competitiveness to Asian and European companies. The Japanese Ouchi theory (1981) based on participative management seeks to increase productivity by increasing the intervention of workers through "quality circles" or "excellence", self-managed work groups and high-performance teams. In the United States, attempts have been made to apply these models, although with very limited results.

In contemporary management theories —operational approach (McGregor, 1969)— and in current systems theory —contingency approach— tolerance and eclecticism prevail, a situation that can be seen in business study programs. American school, where confusion predominates in the theoretical field of administration.

In bureaucratic management, high-level executives must take charge of decisions that have already been made in accordance with the company's objectives. Therefore, leadership is the key to the success of the organization's development programs. The managers, inexorably, must reinforce the administrative control systems linked to a discipline, which consists of the solidly rationalized execution in which any personal criticism on the part of the executor is dispensed with. Its characteristic is mass action, rationally uniform; it replaces heady enthusiasm or devotion to a personal leader. The routine becoming of the charisma is due to the need to legitimize the social situations that draw their privileges from the economic, social and political orders.

The emergence of the director, the boss and the administrator intensifies in industrialized countries, where the concept of administration successively changes from its traditional and professional field through the routine becoming of charisma and the need to legitimize social, political, economic and religious situations. by privileged strata.

Bureaucratic organizations are generally risk-averse, seeking to succeed trained managers, not individual leaders, to power. Leadership inevitably requires the use of power to influence the thoughts and activities of others, while managers generally breed conformity.

In short, at this time when the fourth transformation of the Republic is being announced, undertaken by President López Obrador, a new stage full of expectations is opening and the need for a collective political leadership that encourages national reconstruction, from an ethical and moral perspective.

Conclusions

In the North American theory of administration every day we find new formulas to achieve "leadership"; however, in these moments of uncertainty, dominated by expectations and collective frustrations, the lack of political, economic, religious, business leadership, etc., becomes evident.

American management theory has confused the concepts of direction, power, and authority with leadership. The emergence of modern administration suggests the advent of the manager, boss, director or manager as the central figure of the bureaucratic organization, of routine management, where high-level executives must be in charge of carrying out decisions that have been previously made according to prevailing goals of power and domination.

Therefore, good or bad management is the key to the success of the company or organization. In general terms, the formal models of "scientific management", "participatory management" and "management by contingencies" are doubtful because they do not recognize the true dimension of leadership, which is by definition little controllable from above, from the formal authority. . In most cases, true leaders are not born or formed, but are shaped by circumstances, that is, they arise at the behest of their followers, in situations of crisis, dissatisfaction, indigence, lack or desire.

The influence exerted by a leader to shift moods, conjure up images or hopes, and set specific goals is not satisfied by the manager or formal authority. The problem of innovation and transformation of leadership escapes the values of companies and organizations that force and hold responsible. The informal leader is the true manager of change in modern organizations, since his legitimacy is based on moral authority, which is earned on a daily basis. In short, the informal leader is the one who could finally start the machinery of change in society.

The strength of cooperative and community organizations and companies is manifested by the fact of their transcendence and survival as entities, which challenge the "universal" values that are born of modernity and Eurocentrism. True leadership emerges in cooperativism, as well as in indigenous companies and organizations, where we find an association between ethics, worldview, productivity and identity, attributes that are not generally found in corporate companies and organizations.

Therefore, the study of empirical cases that exemplify how leadership occurs in companies and community organizations in Mexico and Latin America is a pending task.

References

- Argyris & Schön, D. (1978). *Organizational learning a theory of action perspective*. Reading, MA Addison-Wesley.
- Aristóteles (trad. 1984). *Política*. Madrid, España: Centro de Estudios Constitucionales.
- Ballina, F. (1996). Mitos y estereotipos en la teoría del liderazgo. *Contaduría y Administración*, (182), 43-54.
- Ballina, F. (2000). *Teoría de la administración, un enfoque alternativo*. México. Mc Graw Hill.
- Ballina, F. (2006). Diferencias en la administración premoderna, moderna posmoderna: propuestas para un debate en Latinoamérica. *Problemas del Desarrollo*, 37(144), 221-233.
- Ballina, F. (2017). Ordenamiento administrativo de las organizaciones sociales de México: un problema de legalidad y legitimidad. XXII Congreso de Contaduría Universitaria. Ciudad de México, septiembre 26, 27 y 28 de 2017.
- Ballina, F. (2019). Problemática epistemológica y sociológica de la administración. *Revista Iberoamericana en Contaduría, Economía, Administración*, 8(16).
- Ballina, F. (2021). Empresas y organizaciones indígenas en Méjico: ¿modalidades alternativas de etnodesarrollo? *Teuken Bidikay*, 12(18).
- Barnard, C. I. (1959). *Las funciones de los elementos dirigentes*. Madrid.
- Blake, H. (1964). *What is managerial grid? Definition and meaning*, Gulf Publishing.
- Dessler, G. (1976). *Organización y administración situacional*. Prentice-Hall.
- Fayol, H. (1973). *Administración industrial y general*. México: Herrero.
- Fiedler, F. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: Mc Graw Hill.
- Fromm, E. (1997). *El miedo a la libertad*. Buenos Aires, Paidós.
- Habermas, J. (1976). *Ciencia y técnica como ideología*. México, REI.
- Hatch, J. (1997). *Organization theory, modern, symbolic, and postmodern perspectives*. United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Hersey, P. and Blanchard, K. (1982). *Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources*. Prentice- Hall.
- Homans, G. (1950). *The human group*. New York, United States: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- House, E. y Browdith, J. (1980). *El comportamiento humano en la organización*. México: Fondo Educativo Interamericano.

- Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, and Rosenthal (1964). *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity*. New York: Wiley.
- Leavitt, H. J. (1951). Some effects of certain communication patterns on group performance. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 46(1), 38-50.
- Lewin, K. (1951). *Field Theory of Social Science*. Nueva York, United States: Harper and Row.
- Lewin, K. (1968). *Psychologie dynamique: Les relations humaines*. Paris, France: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Likert, R. (1967). *The human organization*. New York. Me Graw-Hill.
- Mannheim, K. (1982). *Libertad, poder y planificación democrática*. México, FCE.
- Maquiavelli, N. (1969). *Le opere. Discursi sopra la prima deca di Tito Livio* (Proemio I, II). Roma: Ed. Riuniti.
- Marx, C. (1978). *Contribución a la crítica de la economía política*. México: Ediciones Populares.
- Mayo, E. (1946). *The Humans Problems of Industrial Civilization*. Harvard University Graduate School.
- Mayo, E. (1989). *El temperamento humanista*. Richard CS Transaction Publishers.
- McGregor, D. (1969). *El aspecto humano de las empresas*. México: Diana.
- Merton, R. K. (2002). *Teoría y estructura sociales* (4.ª ed.). México: FCE.
- Michels, R. (1974). *Los partidos políticos* (tomos I y II). Buenos Aires, Argentina: Amorrortu.
- Moliner, M. (1994). *Diccionario del uso del español*. Madrid: Gredos.
- Ouchi, W. (1981). Theory Z: An elaboration of methodology and findings. *J. Contemp. Bus*, 11(1-2), 27-41.
- Parker, M., Metcalf, H. C. and Urwick, L. (eds.) (1942). *Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follett*. New York, United States: Harper & Brother Publishing.
- Parsons, T. (1977). *Social Systems and the Evolution of Action Theory*. Nueva York: The Free Press.
- Real Academia Española (2014). *Diccionario de la lengua española* (23.ª ed.). Madrid: Espasa Calpe.
- Rice, A. K. (1999). *Tavistock, Learning for Leadership: Interpersonal and Intergroup Relations*. New York, USA: British Library.

- Schmitter, P. (1992). *Teoría del neocorporativismo*. México: Laberinto de Cristal.
- Schreiber, J. (1969). *El desafío americano*. Barcelona: Plaza & Janés, S. A. Editores.
- Smith, A. (1976). *La economía política clásica*. Buenos Aires: Centro Editor de América Latina.
- Stuart Mill, J. (2008). *Principios de economía política*. España: Síntesis.
- Tannenbaum, R and Schmidt, W. (1958). *How to Choose a Leadership Pattern*. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/1973/05/how-to-choose-a-leadership-pattern>
- Taylor, F. (1973). *Principios de la administración científica*. México: Herrero.
- Vroom, V. and Yetton, P. (1973). *A New Look at Managerial Decision Making*. . Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt6wrc8r>
- Weber, M. (1992). *Economía y sociedad* (tomos I y II). México, FCE.
- Zaleznik, A. (1986). *Administradores y líderes, ¿diferentes?* México: Clásicos de la Administración de Harvard.
- Zolla, C. (2010). *Los pueblos indígenas de México: 100 preguntas* (vol. 1) (2.^a ed.). México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.